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ABSTRACT

A Descriptive Study of the Organizational Culture and Structure of Accelerated Schools
By

Susan Virginia Steaffens

Dr. Carl R. Steinhoff, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to survey teachers at five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District to determine their perceptions of the organizational culture and properties of their respective schools, and to determine if there are any differences between the results on these surveys and the original studies.

Two instruments, the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI) and the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ), were administered in the Spring of 2001 to 277 teachers from five selected accelerated schools in the Clark County School District. This resulted in a response rate of 35%. The stories and metaphors obtained from the OCAI were analyzed using Spradley's participant observation method. Cultural phenotypes were created that characterized each of the five schools: a small town haven; an under-nurtured garden; an express train; a beehive; and a research vessel. Each of the schools were found to have unique cultures, however, there were
some similarities to the original phenotypes. There were many factors which impacted the culture of the school such as having a new principal or being connected to the university which appeared to have impacted the culture of the schools.

The data provided by the SPQ was analyzed first by using a factor analysis which extracted seven factors (Supervision with Hierarchy, General Rules for Teachers, Professional Training, Decision Making with Hierarchy, General Professional Latitude, Decision Making-Classroom Teacher, and Professional Latitude Provided by Principal) and accounted 36.7% of the variance in the responses. As the result of an analysis of variance and a post hoc comparison, Factor 1, Supervision with Hierarchy, and Factor 2, General Rules for Teachers, were found to be statistically significant. Specifically, the amount of perceived supervision in two of the schools were higher than those of teachers in the other three schools. The amount of perceived rules for teachers varied among the five schools, however, School D appeared to have consistently well-defined and implemented rules. There was no statistical significance found among the schools in the other five factors. All three structural properties (centralization, formalization, and complexity) were represented in the seven factors extracted.

In conclusion, the organizational culture and structure of accelerated schools have both similarities due to the cultural and structural aspects of the program and differences due to the individual needs of each school community.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Educational reform has been a societal issue emerging at numerous times since the first public school was founded (Cuban, 1988, 1990; Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993). In colonial times, schools taught a traditional curriculum to the elite of society (Cuban, 1988, 1990; Parker, 1994). In the 1840's and 1850's, the first truly nationwide educational reform initiative was begun with the common school movement (Cuban, 1988, 1990; Warren, 1990). According to Warren (1990), this movement had two goals. The first goal was to place teachers and schools where none had existed before (Warren, 1990). The second goal was to make schools comparable with regard to curricula, teacher preparation, and the length of the school year (Warren, 1990). Education began to be viewed as a way in which children could be prepared for citizenship (Warren, 1990). Since all of society would benefit, taxation became the avenue for funding schools (Warren, 1990).

By 1860, free public elementary schools had been established in most states (Gelberg, 1997). Industrialization, urbanization, and immigration impacted
America at this time when formal schooling was relatively new (Gelberg, 1997; Parker, 1994). The Reconstruction Amendments, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States were enacted (Richards, 1993). These amendments addressed the values of equality and human rights (Richards, 1993). Specifically, the thirteenth amendment which abolished slavery, and the fourteenth amendment which extended citizenship to all persons born in the United States, and forbade the states to violate the privileges and immunities of citizens, due process, and equal protection were ratified in 1865 (Richards, 1993). As a result of these actions, lower class children and girls were accepted into public schools (Cuban, 1988, 1990; Gelberg, 1997; Parker, 1994). Consequently, the issues of equity and excellence became major factors during this time period when there was great concern regarding educating the masses instead of just the elite (Gelberg, 1997; Parker, 1994). Three federal education initiatives took place during this time: land grant colleges, the U. S. Department of Education, and the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands (Warren, 1990).

In 1893, the National Education Association's Committee of Ten submitted a report stating that school should teach the same subjects for the college-bound students as for the majority of students leaving school for work (Chance, 1992; Parker, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). They recommended a four year high school curriculum consisting of English, history, science, mathematics, and a foreign language (Chance, 1992; Parker, 1994).

By 1900, there were two educational philosophies (Gelberg, 1997). The
first, a pro-efficiency agenda, called for standardized treatment for students (Gelberg, 1997). The use of a bureaucratic hierarchy whereby planning and decision-making were centralized was promoted (Gelberg, 1997). Contrarily, the educational progressives supported a decentralized education system (Gelberg, 1997). They promoted a child-centered education whereby individual needs were emphasized (Gelberg, 1997). Warren (1990) stated that the educational progressives had four major goals. The first goal was to rid schools of political control (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Warren, 1990). Secondly, the progressives wanted to organize and manage schools according to sound business principles (Warren, 1990). A third goal of the progressives was to differentiate the curriculum so that student interests and abilities would be addressed (Warren, 1990). Finally, the progressives contended that public schools should provide a variety of social services to address the needs of the poor so that they could concentrate on their studies (Warren, 1990).

John Dewey, an educational progressive, directed an experimental laboratory school from 1896-1903 which emphasized a child-centered, activity-oriented curriculum for all children (Gelberg, 1997; Parker, 1994; Sarason, 1990). Dewey facilitated group work, encouraged child-centered learning, student discussions, field trips and library research (Gelberg, 1997; Parker, 1994).

Dewey's approach to education was supported in the 1918 National Education Association's report which recommended seven cardinal principles (Chance, 1992; Parker, 1994; Ravitch & Vinovskis, 1995: Tyack & Cuban, 1995).
These seven educational purposes for public schools included: "health, command of fundamental processes (basic skills), worthy home membership, vocation, worthy use of leisure, citizenship, and ethical character" (Parker, 1994, p. 8).

According to Gelberg (1997), pro-efficiency reforms were prominent throughout the nation by 1925. This was reflected in the extensive implementation of vocational education, the adoption of corporate governance models, and training in specific skills that students would use in the factory, office or home (Gelberg, 1997).

After World War I, the United States was trying to obtain industrial and world leadership (Parker, 1994). Common schools were replaced with differentiated programs in comprehensive high schools. The child-centered progressive movement was reformed to meet the multiple needs of mass enrollment (Parker, 1994). As a result, American high schools lowered their academic standards for the average and below average (Parker, 1994).

The Great Depression caused vast unemployment, and capitalism and democracy were on trial (Parker, 1994). Social Reconstructionists promoted going beyond child-centered approach to help students confront socio-economic-political problems, propose solutions and bring about change (Parker, 1994). Progressivism was expanded to include a more diverse curriculum (Chance, 1992).

In the post World War II period, there was an unprecedented increase in the standard of living which brought about a growing middle class, steadily rising
educational requirements, and increasing affluence for almost everyone (Miller, 1983). The GI Bill of Rights provided government support so that people who had served in the armed forces could receive a college education (Sarason, 1990). This exposed them to knowledge and career possibilities that had not existed before the war (Sarason, 1990). Education was viewed as a process to personal and material advancement (Sarason, 1990). The more education one had the more opportunities that were available (Sarason, 1990). The university became more representative of the larger society, not for just the affluent (Sarason, 1990).

In 1954, Brown v. Board of Education, the landmark decision in school desegregation, brought attention to the legal and social inequities in the United States (Miller, 1983). In this case, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the opportunity of an education, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right that must be made available to all on equal terms (Weiner & Hume, 1987).

In 1957, the Soviet satellite Sputnik went up into space (Gelberg, 1997; Goens, 1991; Miller, 1983; Parker, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). This caused Americans to question their supremacy in science and technology (Gelberg, 1997), and forced science and math initiatives in schools (Goens, 1991). As a result, large funds of money were made available to schools from the National Science Foundation and the 1958 National Defense Education Act (Miller, 1983; Parker, 1994). Two major approaches to learning resulted. Bruner's (1960) study, The Process of Education, supported curriculum reform based on the
process of inquiry-based learning and, Conant's (1959) study, *The American High School Today*, recommended strengthening the comprehensive school by improving the preparation of the academically talented in science, math, and foreign language (Miller, 1983; Parker, 1994).

By the 1960's, civil rights, free speech, and protests from the Vietnam conflict questioned authority and brought social issues into school (Goens, 1991). Equity for minorities and the disadvantaged became critical issues as a result of the Civil Rights Act of 1962 (Gelberg, 1997; Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993; Miller, 1983). The Civil Rights Act and racial integration marked the beginning of equal opportunity for minorities (Gelberg, 1997).

President Lyndon B. Johnson presented his Great Society War on Poverty speech in 1964 (Miller, 1983). As a result, programs such as Headstart and Title I remedial assistance were created (Miller, 1983). Headstart was an early education program for preschoolers with the objective of preparing "underprivileged children for first grade, equipping them with basic academic skills, so that they would perform better in the early grades and be more likely to remain in school" (Schulman, 1995, p. 96).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was intended by the Congress to extend a broad range of services to low-income and minority-group students (Edmonds, 1981). Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act allocated a billion of education dollars for compensatory education programs specifically dedicated to improve education for poor children (Schulman, 1995).
The government distributed funds on the basis of the number of poor children in each district (Parker, 1994; Schulman, 1995).

In 1965, the Coleman Report was released indicating that schools had little impact over and above family background, and that achievement was highly associated with race and socioeconomic status (Edmonds, 1979b; Miller, 1983). As a result of this report, there was a significant change in thinking: the family background, not the schools, was the primary factor in explaining school success or failure (Miller, 1983).

Many researchers were unconvinced that the results of the Coleman Report were valid (Edmonds, 1979a, 1979b; Fredrikson, 1975; Miller, 1983). Effective schools research began in the late 1970's in an attempt to address the findings of this report (Deal & Peterson, 1999; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Miller, 1983). The Search for Effective Schools Project began in order to determine if there were schools that were instructionally effective for poor children (Edmonds, 1979a, 1979b; Edmonds & Frederiksen, 1978). In 1974, Lezotte, Edmonds, and Ratner described their analysis of pupil performance in the elementary schools that formed the Detroit's Model Cities Neighborhood (Edmonds, 1979a). In addition, they reanalyzed the 1966 Equal Education Opportunity Survey data (Edmonds, 1979a; Frederiksen, 1975). They concluded that the large differences in performance between the effective and ineffective schools could not be attributed to differences in the social class and family background of pupils enrolled in the schools (Edmonds, 1979a).
As a result of the Search for Effective Schools Project, five characteristics were found to be common in effective schools. They were (1) the principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction; (2) a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus; (3) an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning; (4) teacher behaviors that conveyed the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery; and (5) the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation (Block, 1983; Edmonds, 1979a, 1979b, 1981, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983). Edmonds (1981) explained that "to be effective a school need not bring all students to identical levels of mastery, but it must bring an equal percentage of its highest and lowest social classes to minimum mastery" (p. 60).

Edmonds (1982) proposed that as a result of the school effectiveness research, three types of school improvement programs evolved: school and school district; state programs which provided incentives and technical assistance to local schools and districts; and university programs involving research, development, and technical assistance.

Congress pushed to open schools to handicapped children in 1966, when lawmakers added Title VI to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Weiner & Hume, 1987). A grant program was launched to create a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped within the Office of Education. The Education of the Handicapped Act of 1970 kept the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and state grant programs, and also added funds to help schools buy equipment and build needed facilities (Weiner & Hume, 1987). Then, in 1975, the Education
of the All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) was enacted mandating a free appropriate public education and related services designed to meet the unique needs of the handicapped (Weiner & Hume, 1987). Revisions of the special education laws have continued to impact schools both financially and academically.

In the 1970's and 1980's, foreign economic and academic competition challenged standards and pressed for curriculum reform (Goens, 1991). The current round of educational reform began with the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report entitled A Nation at Risk (Chance, 1992; Gelberg, 1997; Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993; Murphy, 1990; Murphy & Beck, 1995; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Parker, 1994). This report proposed that the superior economic performance by Japan and Germany was directly related to a failure in the American educational system (Gelberg, 1997). Specifically, A Nation at Risk states:

Our Nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world.... We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5).
The American public was alarmed by the statements made in this report claiming that public education had placed the nation's economy and security at risk as a result of too many students who failed to acquire the basic skills (Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993). From this report, educational quality and excellence became priorities throughout the nation, and several waves of reform have occurred as a result of this report.

During the time period from 1982 - 1985, the first wave of reform focused on mandated, top-down initiatives predominantly from the state level (Futrell, 1989; Murphy, 1990, 1991). As states replaced the federal government as the unit of reform action, issues of accountability and achievement were priorities (Bacharach, 1990; Murphy, 1990). Policies were implemented at the state level and then, imposed on the local school districts (Chance, 1992). Mandates were intensified to produce higher educational outputs (Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993). As a result of these policies and mandates, "41 states raised high school graduation requirements, 33 states initiated student competency tests, 24 states started teacher career and salary enhancement programs, and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores rose within three years of this report being released" (Parker, 1994, p. 14).

The second wave of reform (1986 - 1989) called for a change of the structure of schools (Chance, 1992; Murphy, 1990) and improvement in the quality of teaching (Bacharach, 1990). Focus was placed on the way school were organized and governed (Murphy, 1990). Reform programs were developed at the district and school-site level instead of at the state level (Bacharach, 1990).
This wave of reform emphasized professionalism of teachers, decentralized schools, shared decision-making, consensus management (Bacharach, 1990; Chance, 1992; Murphy, 1993), and the enactment of specific reform topics, especially to address the needs of at-risk students (Murphy, 1990, 1991). The major philosophical foundation during this period emphasized empowering teachers to work more effectively with students (Murphy, 1990). Equity was once again a focus in discussions about school reform (Futrell, 1989). Collaborative efforts involving teachers, principals, superintendents, school boards, parents, business, and community concentrated on renewing and improving schools (Futrell, 1989).

Kowalski and Reitzug (1993) characterized the second wave of educational reform as follows: "(1) an investment in children (a concern for addressing the needs of children at risk) and (2) an investment in teaching strategies (attracting and retaining competent teachers, and a restructuring of schools to give teachers the opportunity to define and administer school policy)" (p. 283).

The third wave of reform, which began in 1988, focused directly on children (Murphy, 1990). The focus changed from the previous wave emphasizing change to emphasizing the structures for the delivery of services to children (Murphy, 1990). According to Murphy (1990), "The underlying philosophy is that children should be empowered to contribute successfully to the needs of a rapidly changing society" (p. 29). Lipsky (1992) asserted that the student must be placed at the center of reform; that it is the student who must do
the learning. Lipsky (1992) contended that in order to significantly improve schools and, therefore, increase student learning, schools must give students respect, build upon their knowledge, provide them with control over the learning process and appropriate materials, help them to see the connection between subjects, and encourage cooperation among students.

Other researchers (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992; Steffy & English, 1994) wrote about the third wave as a restructuring period. Sashkin and Egermeier (1992) contended that the third wave of reform began at the top with standards-based reform. Changes in teacher education and professional development occurred in order to implement state curriculum frameworks (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992).

Futrell (1989) contended that a fourth wave of reform has begun which is predicated on the assumption that schools must offer both excellence and equity, and that every student should be able to reach his or her potential.

Since the release of *A Nation at Risk*, several educators have responded to the accusations stated in the report. Among the respondents was John Goodlad, who believed the commission should have blamed the changing social conditions rather than the schools (Parker, 1994). Another educator, P. C. Schlechty, the president of the Center for Leadership in School Reform, contended that the authors had the problem wrong and that it was a better system that needed to be invented (Parker, 1994). Schlechty contended that schools were originally designed so that fifteen percent of students got a high quality of education, however, now ninety-five percent of students were expected
to have a high quality of education (Parker, 1994). Schlechty called for a systematic change which would restructure the community - "the public, business people and educators must change fundamentally the way the system is put together" (Parker, 1994, p. 15). Additionally, Henry Levin, a professor at Stanford University, questioned the report's neglect of at-risk students (Hopfenberg, 1991; Levin, 1991a; Parker, 1994). The report "demanded high standards in secondary schools but was not concerned with at-risk elementary school students" (Parker, 1994, p.14).

As a result of his concerns over reports such as A Nation at Risk, Henry Levin began studying the issues surrounding disadvantaged students in public schools (Levin, 1991a; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991). Specifically, Levin studied demography, educational outcomes, and social consequences of at-risk students (Levin, 1993). He defined at-risk students as "those who are unlikely to succeed in school because their home resources and experiences differ from the expectation on which school experiences are built" (McCarthy & Levin, 1992, p. 255; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg, Levin, Meister, Rogers, 1990b; McCarthy, Hopfenberg, & Levin, 1991). He found that approximately 30 percent of students in primary and secondary schools were at-risk (Levin, 1985, 1986, 1987a, 1987b, 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1996b; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991; McCarthy & Levin, 1992; Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1989), and that relatively little progress had been made in advancing the education of disadvantaged students during the last 20 years (Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy & Levin, 1992). Levin (1988a) concluded
that students who experienced poverty, cultural differences, or linguistic differences tended to have low academic achievement and therefore, tended to drop out of secondary school. These students were concentrated among racial and ethnic minority groups, immigrants, language minorities, and economically disadvantaged populations (Hopfenberg, 1991; Levin, 1988a; McCarthy et al., 1991).

Levin's study (1986) showed that remediation, the main strategy used in educating disadvantaged students, actually slowed down students' progress. Levin (1986) concluded that by sixth grade, many were two years behind in achievement. More than half failed to complete high school, and those who did were performing at only the eighth-grade level (Davidson, 1994; Hopfenberg et al., 1990b; Levin, 1986, 1989).

Levin observed that reforms stressed raising standards at the secondary level instead of providing additional resources or new strategies to assist disadvantaged students in meeting these higher standards (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990b; Levin, 1987a, 1987b, 1991a, 1996b). He asserted that improving education for disadvantaged students must begin at the elementary level (Hopfenberg et al., 1990b; Levin, 1987a, 1987b, 1991a, 1996b).

Levin (1987a) contended that an effective approach to educating at-risk students must be characterized by “high expectations, deadlines by which children will be performing in the educational mainstream, stimulating instructional programs, planning by the educational staff who will offer the
program, and the use of available resources including the parents and students" (p. 6).

Out of his research came the Accelerated Schools Project (Levin, 1996a). In 1986, Henry Levin began the first accelerated school in the San Francisco Bay school district (Levin, 1987a, 1987b, 1988b, 1989, 1991b, 1996b). These schools were based on the premise that students would be brought into the mainstream of academics by providing highly enriched educational experiences for all children - the educational process of at-risk students would be accelerated instead of remediated (Davidson, 1994; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1989, 1996b; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy & Levin, 1992).

Levin (1996a) specified that the goal of the Accelerated Schools Project was "to bring all students into a meaningful educational mainstream, to create for all children the dream school we would want for our own children" (p. 15; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). In order to accomplish this goal, the Accelerated Schools Project supported a comprehensive approach toward reforming a school's culture as well as its curriculum, instruction, and organization (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a; McCarthy, 1991; McCarthy et al., 1991). Efforts focused on making school more relevant and challenging to students (Hopfenberg, 1991). Curriculum was enriched and emphasis was placed on language development in all subject areas; instructional practices promoted active learning experiences; and the organization of the school was
characterized by shifting resources in the school as needed (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a).

Originally, the Accelerated School was a transitional elementary school that was designed to bring disadvantaged students up to grade level by the end of sixth grade so they could successfully participate in the mainstream of secondary school instruction (Levin, 1987a, 1988a, 1988b). In 1990, the Accelerated Schools model was expanded to the middle school level (Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy, 1991).

Accelerated schools, which were representative of the fourth wave of reform in schools, were considered to be self-governing communities whereby practices and results were closely evaluated, problem solving was a continuous process, and information was shared with the community (Levin, 1996a). No one feature made an accelerated program (Hopfenberg et al., 1990b). Emphasis was placed on the elementary school as a whole rather than on any particular grade, curriculum, approach to teacher training, or other limiting strategies (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a; Levin, 1987b, 1988a, 1991a, 1996b; Levin & Chasin, 1994).

The Accelerated Schools philosophy was derived from the work of John Dewey, who was also concerned about how society treated disadvantaged children (Finnan, 1992). The Accelerated Schools Project was built upon three principles, a set of values, and a commitment to powerful learning through integration of curriculum, instruction, and organization that reflected Dewey's philosophy of education (Finnan, 1992).
The unified approach in which organization, curriculum, and instruction worked together is illustrated in Figure 1 (Hopfenberg et al., 1990b).

Figure 1. Comprehensive approach to change.

Curriculum
- language across subjects
- higher order skills
- related to experience
- common curricular objectives
- interdisciplinary/thematic
- equitable content coverage
- full range of electives
- exploratory coursework

Instruction
- active learning
- primary sources
- projects
- peer tutoring
- cooperative learning
- educational technology
- alternative assessment
- heterogeneous grouping

Organization
- collaborative decision-making
- parents in partnership
- flexible scheduling
- faculty committees for inquiry
- central office staff collaboration
- principal as facilitator
- articulation with other schooling levels

According to Hopfenberg (1991) and Hopfenberg et al. (1990a, 1990b), the organization (base) of an accelerated school was characterized by broad participation in decision-making, community involvement, and central office interaction. Instruction (right side) included strategies and examples of teaching and learning in accelerated schools (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). Curriculum (left side) incorporated enrichment with emphasis on
problem-solving, higher order analytical skills, and language development in all areas (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b).

The Accelerated Schools Project had three guiding principles: unity of purpose, empowerment with responsibility, and building on strengths ("Catalog of School Reform Models," 1998; Levin, 1996a). Along with these three principles, accelerated schools acknowledged a set of nine values that penetrated the relationships and activities of the school: expertise/professionalization, equity, community, risk taking, experimentation, reflection, participation, trust, and communication (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hopfenberg, 1991; Levin, 1996b). Powerful learning situations resulted from the change process and school practices that implemented these three principles and nine values (Levin, 1996a). The philosophies and processes of accelerated schools are detailed in Chapter 2.

There are currently over 1000 accelerated schools functioning in the United States at this time ("Catalog of School Reform," 1998; "Accelerated Schools Project," 2000; Fashola & Slavin, 1998). Nine elementary schools are actively participating in the Accelerated Schools Project in the Clark County School District.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to describe the organizational culture and structure of selected accelerated schools.
Research Questions

The following questions will be addressed in this study:

1. What are the organizational cultures of accelerated schools?
2. What are the structural properties of accelerated schools?
3. What are the patterns in the organizational cultures of accelerated schools?
4. What are the patterns in the structural properties of accelerated schools?
5. What is the difference between the metaphors of accelerated schools on the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory and the initial sampling conducted by Steinhoff and Owens (1989)?
6. What is the difference between accelerated schools on the Structural Properties Questionnaire and the normed schools from Bishop and George's original study (1973)?

Definition of Terms

Accelerated School: For the purpose of this study, “an Accelerated school is a school that has been transformed through the accelerated schools philosophy and process to bring all of its students into the academic mainstream” (Hopfenberg & Levin, 1993, p.2).

Organizational Culture: According to Schein (1985), organizational culture is defined as follows:

A pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered
valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 9).

For the purpose of this study, organizational culture is defined as "a pattern of basic assumptions developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration" (Lester & Bishop, 1997, p. 51).

**Structural Properties:** According to Misker, Fevurly, and Stewart (1979), structural properties are defined as follows:

The formal characteristics or enduring patterns of operation in a school.
They are components that are designed to be relatively independent of particular individuals. That is, structures refer to the relationship among different roles that have been created to achieve educational goals (p. 100).

For the purpose of this study, structural properties are defined as "the characteristics of the enduring, more or less permanent, patterns of the operation of an organization" (Bishop & George, 1973, p. 67). Note: The terms structural properties and organizational structures are used interchangeably in this study.

**Significance of the Study**

Since A Nation at Risk was released in 1983, schools have been under scrutiny. Today's call for reform essentially parallels the debate for educational reform that occurred during the beginning of the 1900's (Gelberg, 1997). Gelberg
(1997) cites six common themes that were evident in both the current and past debates for educational reform: "fear of global competition, the breakdown of the family, an influx of new immigrants, rampant crime in the cities, corruption in government, and a generation of youth that seem ill-prepared to take its place as adults in society" (p. 2).

In addition, the participants of the reform movement are the same as in the past: business leaders, school administrators, teacher unions, government officials, and university professors (Gelberg, 1997). As in earlier times, business leaders have criticized schools for being inefficient and for failing to prepare the youth to enter into the world of work (Gelberg, 1997). They continue to argue that schools must change to meet the needs of a changing economy (Gelberg, 1997). Gelberg (1997) has listed similarities in the role business has played in the present period of educational reform as well as the beginning of the century:

Criticism is leveled at the schools for failing to prepare children for their roles as future employees, business sponsors surveys aimed at revealing the failings in the existing system, publicity and the media are utilized to make the public see the need for educational change... business philanthropy gives support to examples of the preferred model of education, business leaders play an influential role in educational organizations sponsoring reform, and form alliances between themselves and school officials (p. 140).

Warren (1990) wrote that "educational reform has tended to arise from perceived failures of schools to serve certain social goals adequately" (p. 76).
Several reform programs have been developed as a result of these concerns. Among them is the Accelerated Schools Project which was designed to develop more effective ways of serving at-risk youth (Murphy, 1991).

Through the Accelerated Schools Process, restructuring occurs by changing the culture and structure of the school. Hopfenberg (1990a, 1990b, 1991) contended that it is through a comprehensive approach such as the Accelerated Schools Project which reforms a school’s culture, attitudes, meaning and beliefs as well as its curriculum, instruction, and organization that long-term, effective school change will occur. Finnan (1992), in her study, found that “the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Projects is guided by a belief that interventions such as Accelerated Schools are essentially attempts to change existing school cultures” (p. 16). Finnan (1992) further concluded that all schools have a unique school culture which includes a set of beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and behavior which are predictable and meaningful to the school community. Finnan and Levin (1998) asserted that the cultures of accelerated schools are quite different than the cultures of other at-risk schools.

According to Brunner and Hopfenberg (1992), there are a set of values, beliefs, and attitudes underlying the accelerated principles and practices which help create the culture for accelerated school change. The three principles (unity of purpose, empowerment coupled with responsibility, and building on strengths); the central values (equity, participation, communication, collaboration, community, reflection, experimentation, trust, risk-taking, and the school as the center of expertise); and the theory about what creates powerful learning
comprise the philosophy or culture of the accelerated school (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). The structure of accelerated schools is comprised of the process of taking stock, forging a shared vision, setting priorities, creating governance structures, and implementing the Inquiry Process (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). The involvement of the staff, students and community determine how each of these components fit the needs of each school.

This study will describe the organizational culture and structure of five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District. The results of this study could provide additional understanding regarding the impact of implementing the Accelerated Schools Process in elementary schools.

Conceptual Framework

Many perspectives in administration and organizational behavior compete for the attention of leaders in educational organizations (Barnard, 1938; Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Deal, 1990; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Ouchi, 1991; Owens, 1991; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984; Snowden & Gorden, 1998; Steinhoff & Owens, 1989; Tagiuri, 1968). The culture of the organization is one such perspective. Its importance has been written about extensively in both corporate and educational research (Getzels & Guba, 1957; Hughes, 1994; Schein, 1985).

According to Hughes (1994), organizational culture has its theoretical roots in social systems theory which provides the basis for understanding the behavior of people in organizations. Social systems theory is a theory which
broadly interprets and explains human and organizational behavior based upon a range of interactions which reflect individual and organizational needs and dispositions as well as cultural and societal influences (Getzels et al., 1968). This theory describes organizations as two-dimensional: the nomothetic or institutional dimension, and the idiographic or personal dimension (Getzels, 1958; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968; Hughes, 1994). The nomothetic dimension refers to the official roles occupied by individuals (Hughes, 1994). The conceptual elements of this dimension are the institution, role, and expectation (Getzels, 1958; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, et al., 1968). Institutions minimally have five basic properties. They are: purposive, peopled, structural, normative, and sanction-bearing (Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, et al., 1968).

Getzels (1958) and Getzels and Guba (1957) stated that the element of role is the most important subunit of the institution. According to Getzels, et al. (1968), roles are the structural or normative elements, such as mutual rights and obligations, which define the behavior expected of people in the institution. Getzels (1958) and Getzels and Guba (1957) further identified generalizations which could be made about the nature of roles:

- Roles represent positions, offices, or status within the institution.
- Roles are defined in terms of role expectations.
- Roles are institutional givens.
- The behaviors associated with a role may be thought of as lying along a continuum from "required" to "prohibited."
- Roles are complementary (Getzels & Guba, 1957, pp. 426 - 427).

The element of expectations in the nomothetic dimension is the rights and duties that delineate what a person should and should not do under various circumstances (Getzels, et al., 1968).

The idiographic dimension refers to the individual style each person brings to a particular role (Hughes, 1994). The conceptual elements of this dimension are the individuals, personalities and needs dispositions (Getzels, 1958; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, et al., 1968). Individuals are the real people who inhabit the social system.

Getzels and Guba (1957) defined personality as “the dynamic organization within the individual of those need-dispositions that govern his unique reactions to the environment” (p. 428). Getzels, et al. (1968) provides a three-pronged definition of personality:

(1) personality as the totality of what can be observed about an individual, including his habitual behavior; (2) personality as the external-stimulus value of one individual for another individual or group; and (3) personality as the internal motivational system of an individual that determines his unique reactions to the environment (p. 66).

Need dispositions are conceived as forces within the individual which are goal oriented; determinants of cognitive and perceptual forms of behavior; vary in specificity; and are patterned (Getzels, et al., 1968).

The observed behavior of individuals in the organization is the result of the interaction of the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions (Getzels, et al.,
1968; Hughes, 1994). Getzels (1958) and Getzels and Guba (1957) depicted this interaction using the equation \( B = f(R \times P) \), where \( B \) is observed behavior, \( R \) is a given institutional role defined by the expectations attached to it, and \( P \) is the personality of the individual. Therefore, behavior is a function of both role and personality, although the proportion of each may vary depending on the situation and the act (Getzels, 1958; Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, et al., 1968).

Hughes (1994) contended that in order to understand the culture of the organization, administrators need to address both the personal needs of individuals and the institutional needs of the organization. The expectations for behavior derive from both the requirements of the institution and from the values of the culture (Getzels & Guba, 1957; Getzels, et al., 1968). The component elements of culture are ethos and value (Getzels, et al., 1968). Getzels et al. (1968) defined ethos as "a distinguishing pattern of values in a culture" (p. 93). They defined values as "a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action" (Getzels, et al., 1968, p. 96).

According to Getzels, et al. (1968), there is an interaction between the values of a culture and the expectations of institutional roles. Values form the context for the expectations for behavior. However, specific values may be considered of varying importance for individuals and institutions (Getzels, et al., 1968).
Organizational Culture

It is evident that organizational culture is an integral part of the social systems theory. Therefore, the next section of the conceptual framework will be a discussion of organizational culture starting with the different definitions.

Ouchi (1981) defined organizational culture as “symbols, ceremonies and myths that communicate the underlying values and beliefs of the organization to its employees” (p. 41). Schein (1992) defined organizational culture as:

...a pattern of basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 9).

Tagiuri (1968) contended that culture refers to the values, belief systems, norms, and ways of thinking that are characteristic of the people in the organization. Deal and Kennedy (1982) defined culture using the definition from the Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary as “the integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thought, speech, action, and artifacts and depends on man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations” (p. 4).

Deal (1990) asserted that at the center of these definitions of culture is the idea of a learned pattern for unconscious thought, reflected and reinforced behavior that shapes the experience of people. According to Deal (1990), culture, which is a “subtle, elusive, intangible, largely unconscious force” (p. 132), shapes a society or workplace. Culture provides stability, fosters certainty,
solidifies order and predictability and creates meaning (Deal, 1990). It is created by people to give meaning to work and life (Barnard, 1938; Deal, 1990). It shapes human behavior and thought within and beyond organizations (Deal, 1990).

The culture of organizations is composed of three common elements: norms, shared values and basic assumptions/expectations (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Snowden & Gorton, 1998). Norms are the unwritten rules and informal expectations that provide guidelines as to what should and should not be done (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1991; Snowden & Gorton, 1998). They regulate and control behavior (Snowden & Gorton, 1998). Stories and ceremonies are often the vehicle by which norms are communicated to the members of the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Snowden and Gorton (1998) referred to this as symbolic activity.

Shared values define the basic character of the organization and give the organization a sense of identity (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). These values are usually communicated to the members through rules and processes (Snowden & Gorton, 1998). They influence almost every aspect of the organization and often define what members should do to be successful in the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Basic assumptions (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1991) or expectations (Snowden & Gorton, 1998) are the norms applied to specific situations. Owens (1991) proposed that cultural norms originate from the underlying assumptions.
Schein (1992) contended that assumptions are implied, taken for granted, unwritten, and accepted as true and nonnegotiable.

According to Snowden and Gorton (1998), new members are taught the correct way to perceive, think, and feel through the communication of expectations and sanctions. Story telling, group rituals and the organization’s slogans are common ways in which these expectations/assumptions are communicated to the members (Snowden & Gorton, 1998).

Schein (1992) developed a model of levels of culture. The first level was artifacts, which included what one sees, hears, and feels when encountering a unfamiliar culture. Schein (1992) described artifacts as:

...the visible products of the group such as the architecture of its physical environment, its language, its technology and products, its artistic creations, and its style as embodied in clothing, manners of address, emotional displays, myths and stories told about the organization, published lists of values, observable rituals and ceremonies, and so on (p. 17).

The visible behavior of the group and the organizational processes are included in this level (Schein, 1992). Schein (1992) contended that this level of the culture is easy to observe, but very difficult to decipher.

The second level of Schein’s model (1992) was espoused values. Espoused values predict what people will say in situations, but may or may not be the same as what they would do in situations (Schein, 1992). Owens (1991)
suggested that mission statements, philosophy statements, and credos are examples of espoused values which are written.

Basic assumptions, which are the ultimate source of values and action, are at the third level of Schein’s model. Schein (1992) described these basic underlying assumptions as unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings. These basic assumptions define “what to pay attention to, what things mean, how to react emotionally to what is going on, and what actions to take in various kinds of situations” (Schein, 1992, p.22). Schein (1992) contended that in order to understand a group’s culture, one must understand the shared basic assumptions.

After reviewing the literature, Steinhoff and Owens (1989) identified six interlocking dimensions of organizational culture in schools:

1. The history of the organization,
2. Values and beliefs of the organization,
3. Myths and stories that explain the organization,
4. Cultural norms of the organization,
5. Tradition, rituals and ceremonies, and
6. Heroes and heroines of the organization (p.18).

Steinhoff and Owens (1989) contended that these are the elements through which the symbolism of organizational culture is preserved, stated, and transferred.

Cunningham and Gresso (1993) contended that the culture of an organization is important because it effects the way in which different events are
interpreted and responded to in an organization. Culture provides informal rules and regulations that explain how people within the organization conduct their work life (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993). The behavior and structure of the organization will naturally evolve and support the appropriate culture (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993).

**Structural Properties**

The inclusion of organizational culture in the discussion of social systems theory is evident, however, structural properties are merely implied in the conceptual element of role expectations in the nomothetic dimension (Briner, 1970). Briner (1970), and George and Bishop (1971) modified the Getzels' model of social behavior in their study. They suggested that the interaction process between the variables could be expressed as

\[ Cp = f(S \times P) \]

Therefore, the equation would read: "the perceived organizational climate (Cp) defined as the function (f) of the interaction between the demands of the structural properties of the organization (S) and certain personality characteristics (P) of organizational members" (George & Bishop, 1971, p. 468).

Bishop and George (1973) defined organizational structure as

...the characteristics of the enduring, more or less permanent, patterns of the operation of an organization. Structure refers to the relations between different roles that have been created to achieve the purposes of the organization and define objectively who can tell whom to do what (p. 67).

Bishop and George (1973) pointed out that in order for an organization to have structure, it must first have policies, programs, standing orders, procedures and
operating instructions in place so that members know how to behave in a prescribed manner.

Miskel, et al. (1979) defined organizational structures as the formal characteristics or enduring patterns of operation in a school. These components are designed to be somewhat independent of any particular individual (Miskel, et al., 1979). According to Miskel, et al. (1979), the structures refer to the relationship among different roles created to achieve educational goals.

Hage (1965) proposed four properties or means of accomplishing the organizational goals: centralization, formalization, complexity, and stratification. Centralization or hierarchy of authority refers to the distribution of power within the school (Briner, 1970; Miskel, et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). According to Bishop and George (1973), this measures the decision-making dimension, and therefore, the power distribution within the organization. More specifically, it includes "the extent or proportion of positions that participate in decision-making at both the policy and work level" (p. 68), and "the hierarchy of authority or how power is distributed among organizational positions" (Bishop & George, 1973, p. 68).

Formalization or standardization refers to the utilization of rules in the school and the amount of flexibility allowed from the stated procedures (Briner, 1970; Miskel, et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). Bishop and George (1973) defined the degree of formalization as the measure of the degree of standardization and regulations. They included "the extent or proportion of jobs that are codified (job codification and role specification)" (p. 68), and "the degree of latitude (range of
variation) of individual discretion allowed within a particular position or organizational role" (Bishop & George, 1973, p. 68).

Complexity or specialization involves the number of areas of expertise, how much training is required for each area, and how much professional activity is required (Briner, 1970; Miskel, et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). Bishop and George (1973) contended that this concept is concerned with the level of specialization that is required. This concept includes "the number of occupational specialists, level of professional training required, and extensiveness of professional involvement and related activities" (Bishop & George, 1973, p. 69).

Stratification refers to the status system of the organization and the difference in rewards (Briner, 1970; Murphy, 1979). Bishop and George (1973, p. 69) stated that "this is concerned with the division of labor within the organization and the concomitant status system". Included in this concept are "the rate of mobility between status levels" (p. 69), and "the distribution of rewards and status symbols" (Bishop & George, 1973, p. 69).

Both the structural properties and the organizational culture of an organization play a large role in the effectiveness of the organization itself. Understanding these two aspects of an organization may, therefore, help in understanding the effectiveness of a reform program.

Limitations

Data will be collected through surveys from teachers in selected accelerated schools in the Clark County School District.
The scope of this study will be limited by the willingness of teachers to respond at all or in a timely manner.

Not all accelerated schools will have the same number of years as participants in the Accelerated Schools Project. Respondents may have a variety of years experience in accelerated schools. Changes in administration may impact the responses of teachers who have been at an accelerated school.

Delimitations

This study will focus only on schools in the Clark County School District which fit the criteria as an accelerated school.

Assumptions

The assumptions underlying this study are:

1. The administration and staff of the selected accelerated schools have an understanding of the culture and structure of their organization.

2. The structural properties of accelerated schools support and promote the culture of the organization.

3. Information resulting from this study would be helpful to schools considering becoming accelerated schools.

Research Design

This is a descriptive study of the organizational cultures and structures of accelerated schools. With assistance from the local Accelerated Schools Project...
Center, accelerated schools which meet the predetermined criteria will be selected for participation in this study.

Two instruments have been selected to collect the information for this study, the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI) and the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ). The research for the proposed study will be conducted by using both qualitative and quantitative data in order to portray the perceptions of teachers regarding the cultural and structural characteristics of their accelerated schools. The descriptions will be further examined to determine if there are any common patterns in the organizational cultures and properties of these schools.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Accelerated Schools


After the publication of reports such as A Nation at Risk, Levin became concerned with society ignoring the needs of disadvantaged schools (Ascher, 1993). Levin (1993) suggested that at-risk students must learn at a faster rate, not at a slower rate that allows them to fall further and further behind. He
proposed a new kind of school, where staff, parents, students, district office representatives, and local community members would work together to accelerate learning by providing all students with the challenging activities that have been traditionally reserved for students identified as "gifted and talented" ("Accelerated Schools Project," 2000; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a; Levin, 1991a; McCarthy et al., 1991). Therefore, the Accelerated Elementary School focused on attempting to raise the achievement level of students through enriched curricula and instructional programs so that at-risk students perform at grade level by the end of the sixth grade (Guthrie & Hale, 1990; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1991a, 1993; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy & Levin, 1992; McCarthy & Still, 1993; McCollum, 1994; "What are Accelerated Schools," 1991).

Levin's philosophy stated that students at risk of school failure should be educated in the same way affluent parents would choose for their own children (McCollum, 1996). According to the Accelerated Schools model, this is accomplished by building on natural strengths and by creating high expectations for the students, providing a high status of teachers, and expanding the involvement of parents ("Accelerated Schools Project," 2000; McCollum, 1994; "What are Accelerated Schools," 1991). Specifically, the development of higher order thinking skills is used to show students how learning can be both enjoyable and relevant to their lives (McCollum, 1994).

The Accelerated Schools Project is both a philosophy about acceleration of academics for all students and a concrete process for achieving it (Finnan,
1992; Hopfenberg, 1991). Each school community adapts the accelerated schools philosophy and process to develop its own vision and collaboratively work to achieve its goals ("Accelerated Schools Project." 2000). Although no single feature makes a school accelerated, emphasis is placed on the integration of curricular, instructional, and organizational practices with the school's own vision (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a).

There are three over-arching principles which form the foundation of accelerated schools. These three principles, unity of purpose, empowerment, and building on strengths, are integrated into virtually all the activities of an accelerated school (Levin, 1993; Levin & Chasin, 1994), and are necessary to establish curricular, instructional, and organizational change (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a).

The first principle, unity of purpose, refers to developing a shared common vision (Ascher, 1993; Davidson & Dell, 1995; Fashola & Slavin, 1998; Finnan, McCarthy, Slovacek, & St. John, 1996; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; LeTendre, 1990; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1993; "What are Accelerated Schools," 1991). Unity of purpose refers to the common purpose and practices of the school on behalf of all children (Levin, 1993, 1996, 1996b). According to Levin (1993), "unity of purpose refers to both a vision or dream of what the school can be and an action plan that will get the school there" (p. 34). It empowers the entire community to develop a vision of an effective school that focuses on the academic and social success of all students (McCarthy & Levin, 1992). The vision must focus on bringing children into the mainstream so that
they can benefit from the experiences and opportunities of school (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1989, 1993; Levin & Chasin, 1994; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991). The administrators, teachers, students, parents, and other interested community members reach an agreement about the goals of the school (Levin, 1996a). The entire school community strives toward a common set of goals for the school which becomes the focal point of everyone's efforts (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1991b, 1993, 1996a, 1996b; McCarthy & Levin, 1992; "What are Accelerated Schools," 1991). Activities that take place in the school are then developed based on these goals (McCarthy & Levin, 1992; McCollum, 1994, 1996; "What are Accelerated Schools", 1991). As a result of developing the school's vision, "all participants share a common language, a common set of goals, and a common dream that drives their daily behavior" (McCarthy & Levin, 1992, p. 256).

Empowerment coupled with responsibility, the second principle, refers to all groups sharing in decisions about curriculum, instructional materials and strategies, personnel, and allocation of resources inside the school (Ascher, 1993; Davidson & Dell, 1995; Fashola & Slavin, 1998; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; LeTendre, 1990; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1993; Levin & Chasin, 1994; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy & Levin, 1992). The school staff, parents, and students make educational decisions and take responsibility for the consequences of those decisions (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992).
Building on the strengths of school staff, students, parents and communities, rather than on their weaknesses is the third principle (Ascher, 1993; Davidson & Dell, 1995; Fashola & Slavin, 1998; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; LeTendre, 1990; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1993; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; “What are Accelerated Schools,” 1991). By building on the strengths of all members of the school community, collaborative leadership and decision-making are utilized to create an agreed-upon vision (McCarthy, 1992). The strengths are also used to develop curricular and instructional strategies that are appropriate for the school’s population (McCarthy & Levin, 1992). These strengths are the basis for providing enrichment and acceleration (Levin, 1996a; Levin & Chasin, 1994). Classroom and schoolwide curricular approaches are implemented based on the inclusion
of every child (Levin, 1996a). According to Levin (1996a), this is often accomplished through multi-ability and multi-age grouping. All available community resources are utilized including the parents' and students' skills and interests (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990b; Levin, 1996b; McCollum, 1994, 1996; "What are Accelerated Schools," 1991).

Along with the principles and practices, are a set of values, beliefs, and attitudes which help create the culture for accelerated school change (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992). The central values that penetrate the relationships and activities of the school include expertise/professionalization, equity, community, risk taking, experimentation, reflection, participation, trust, and communication (Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996; Levin & Chasin, 1994). Levin (1996a) defined these values (See Table 1).

Powerful learning, the cornerstone of accelerated schools, is based on the premise that the type of education provided for gifted children works well for all children (Hague & Walker, 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1993). Powerful learning situations result from the change process and school practices that implement these three principles and nine values (Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996a). According to Levin (1996a), "a powerful learning situation is one that incorporates changes in the school organization, climate, curriculum, and instructional strategies to build on the strengths of students, staff and community to create optimal learning results" (p. 18). Therefore, change occurs through an integrated approach which involves all aspects - curriculum, instruction, and school organization - of the learning situation with the ultimate goal of these
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>All students can learn and have an equal right to a high-quality education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Students participate in learning; all school staff participate in school decision-making responsibilities and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/</td>
<td>Students engage in active and group learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>School staff and community work toward a shared purpose by meeting, talking, and learning from each others' experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Students engage in problem-solving exercises and interpretive approaches to curricula. Teachers and other adults constantly scrutinize the world of the school and address challenges to school improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation</td>
<td>Students are involved in discovery exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All school staff and parents launch, implement, and evaluate experimental programs as a result of communicating about and reflecting upon the school's problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Teachers, parents, administrators, and students must believe in each other and focus on each other's strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td>All parties must be more entrepreneurial in their efforts. Although some new programs fail, the ones that succeed are the keys to lasting school improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise/</td>
<td>The entire school community has the ability to understand and respond to school challenges, and because of the wealth of talent and experience within the school, can acquire additional expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

changes being the academic and social achievement of all students (Levin, 1996b; McCarthy & Levin, 1992).

In accelerated schools, learning situations should be created where each student has an interest in learning, sees a meaning in the lesson, perceives connections between the school activity and real life, is able to learn actively, and learn in ways that build on his/her strengths (Finnan, 1992). Brunner and Hopfenberg (1992) stated that every powerful learning experience has three dimensions: content (curriculum), context (organization), and process (instructional strategies).

Powerful learning is rooted in constructivist learning theory which allows students to use previous knowledge and experiences to develop their own understanding of the world (Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Hague & Walker, 1996). The constructivist framework for teaching and learning is utilized to explore situations, look at problems in different ways, test hypotheses, brainstorm alternative solutions, stimulate, and test those solutions (Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996a).

The connection between the “big wheels” of the school and the “little wheels” is also emphasized in the transformation process of accelerated schools (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996a). Big wheels pertain to the overall school philosophy and change process that involves the entire school community in order to alter the culture and governance structure so that empowerment and responsibility is extended to all stakeholders (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hague & Walker, 1996; Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin,
1996a). In terms of philosophy, the big wheel components consist of the overall goal of creating the kind of school we would want for our own children for all children: the three principles; the nine values; and the theory about what creates powerful learning (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). In terms of process, the components include: taking stock, forging a shared vision, setting priorities, creating governance structures, and using the Inquiry Process (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992).

Little wheels pertain to the informal innovations which come from individuals and small groups to transform individual classrooms into powerful learning environments (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hague & Walker, 1996; Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996a). Little wheels occur as small, creative experiments by members of the school community (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). According to Brunner and Hopfenberg (1992), these little wheel innovations give participants an outlet for making some immediate changes, and give all members of the community an opportunity to take responsibility for making improvements and changes in daily activities.

Accelerated schools are considered to be self-governing communities, whereby practices and results are closely evaluated, problem solving is a continuous process, and information is shared with the community (Hopfenberg et al, 1990b, 1993; Levin, 1996a). The process which is followed to address challenges has numerous steps (Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996a). The first step for the school community is to examine its present situation through a process called “taking stock” which looks at the school’s resources, activities,
teaching and learning processes, students, community and other dimensions (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; "Catalog of School Reform Models", 1998; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1991a, 1996a, 1996b; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991). This is done through data collection which requires analysis of the data as well as reflection of the results in order to provide a baseline (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1991a, 1996a, 1996b; Levin & Chasin, 1994; McCarthy & Levin, 1992). Special attention is given to student, staff, parental and program strengths that can serve as a basis for action and enrichment (McCarthy & Levin, 1992).

By working through the accelerated schools governance structure, school community members address the priority areas so that there is a complete understanding before addressing solutions ("Catalog of School Reform Models," 1998; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1996a; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991; McCarthy & Levin, 1992). Task forces or cadres are developed in order to address each priority area using a collaborative inquiry process (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a; Levin, 1996b; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991).

Teachers, administrators, parents, students, and community all play a part in collaboratively determining the activities the school undertakes in quest of its vision (McCarthy & Levin, 1992). The school is governed by its staff, students, and parents (Levin, 1993). Task groups approach the priorities through a systematic inquiry process for problem solving, implementation, and evaluation (Levin, 1993; Levin & Chasin, 1994; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991).

The governance structure of accelerated schools, which supports the process of collaborative decision-making, is three tiered (Levin, 1987b). First, cadres are small, task-oriented groups that address specific areas of concern like assessment, family involvement, discipline, etc. (Ascher, 1993; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Davidson, 1994; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b, 1993; Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1996a; 1996b; Levin & Chasin, 1994; McCollum, 1994, 1996). Using the Inquiry Process, cadres define specific problems that the school faces and searches for and
The second tier is the steering committee which is comprised of participants from each cadre as well as the principal, school staff, students, and parents (Ascher, 1993; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1993; Levin, 1988b, 1991a; Levin & Chasin, 1994). It is responsible for coordinating activities, distributing information, monitoring progress of the cadres, keeping them moving in the direction of the vision, and refining the recommendations of the cadres before they go to the school as a whole (SAW) (Davidson, 1994; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1991a, 1996, 1996a, 1996b).

The SAW, which consists of all staff members, parents and student representatives, is the primary decision making body (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b, 1993; Levin, 1996b). It is the school as a whole which must approve all major decisions on curriculum, instruction, and allocation of resources that have school-wide implications (Ascher, 1993; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1991a; Levin & Chasin, 1994).

The principal plays an important leadership role in the school governance by identifying problem areas, obtaining pertinent information, coordinating the decision process, and assisting in group dynamics (Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1991b). The principal also has the responsibility of obtaining and allocating resources from the school district to implement the decisions the school as a whole has
made (Levin, 1987b, 1988b). In an accelerated school, a good principal is one "who is an active listener and participant, who can identify and cultivate talents among staff, who can keep the school focused on its mission, who can work effectively with parents and community, who is dedicated to the students and their success, who can motivate the various actors, who can marshal the resources that are necessary, and who is 'the keeper of the dream'" (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, p. 22).


The first stage is focusing on the problem area (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). In this stage the broad challenge areas are refined so that specific concerns surrounding the challenge can be understood (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). This includes exploring the problem from all relevant angles, developing hypotheses which seek to explain the broad concern, testing
hypotheses to see if they hold water, interpreting tested hypotheses and coming up with a focus area (Finnan, 1992).

Stage two involves brainstorming solutions (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). Possible solutions are identified by looking inwards at their own situation and outwards to the experiences and practices of others (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b).

The third stage involves synthesizing solutions and coming up with an action plan to address the area of need (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b).

During stage four, support for the plan is given by the steering committee and school-as-a-whole and the action plan is piloted (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1996b).

The final stage involves evaluating and reassessing to determine either to continue working on this issue or to select another piece of the vision to focus on (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b).

By using the Inquiry Process, a more complete and in-depth understanding of the school and its community is developed ("The Inquiry Process," 1991). This process provides a mechanism for moving the school toward acceleration and a model for the governance of an accelerated school through the emphasis of the school's curricular, instructional, and organizational practices (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). The solutions are different for each school depending on the problems.
An evaluation system, which is aligned with the goals of the Accelerated Schools Process, is a critical component of the Accelerated Schools Project (Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1996b). This system should assess the entry level performance of children, school contextual factors, and the progress made toward the overall school goal (Levin, 1988a, 1991a; McCarthy et al., 1991). Regular assessments will assist in making informed decisions and keeping track of progress (Hopfenberg et al., 1990b). Standardized achievement tests and criterion-based assessments should be utilized in order to serve both accountability and diagnostic purposes (Levin, 1988a, 1991a).

Parental involvement is also a central focus of the Accelerated Schools Project (Levin, 1991a, 1996b). Membership on task forces and the steering committee is one way in which parents can be involved in the governance structure (Levin, 1991a). All parents are expected to agree to an agreement that explains the goals of the Accelerated School and their obligations toward the program (Levin, 1991a). They are also expected to encourage that their children participate in daily reading and completion of independent assignments (Levin, 1991a).

According to Levin (1988a), attention should be given to addressing the nutritional and health care needs of disadvantaged students to improve their capacity to learn by working with families and various social service agencies in the community.

The curriculum and instruction of accelerated schools encourages teachers to accelerate the learning process by developing higher order thinking

According to the Accelerated Schools model, students should be grouped heterogeneously whenever possible (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a; McCollum, 1994, 1996). In this type of setting, techniques such as peer tutoring and cooperative learning are encouraged in order to involve students in helping one another learn (Levin, 1987b, 1989; McCollum, 1994, 1996). The model also stresses active learning experiences which are provided through independent projects, problem solving, and applying learning to concrete situations through the use of primary

Teachers serve as facilitators of the instructional activities ("What are Accelerated Schools," 1991). They arrange the learning environments, select materials and provide activities that allow students to used several modalities (McCarthy & Levin, 1992). Teachers also develop alternative ways to assess student progress (McCarthy & Levin, 1992).


- emphasis on the instrumental goal of bringing students to either grade level or above by the completion of sixth grade; its stress on the acceleration of learning, on critical thinking, and on high expectations; its reliance on a professional model of school governance; its capacity to benefit from instructional strategies which provide good results for disadvantaged; and its ability to draw upon all resources of the community (p. 227).
According to McCarthy et al. (1991), the uniqueness of the Accelerated Schools Project is that it does not provide a packaged program, but instead provides a process for school change.

According to Ascher (1993), schools are considered to be accelerated schools when they have the following qualities:

1. Accelerated schools should aim to bring all children into the educational mainstream, and should adhere to a core curriculum, instructional and organizational practices.
2. Language development should enrich the entire curriculum in all subjects.
3. Emphasis should be placed on problem-solving and higher order analytical skills.
4. Lessons should be connected to the students' culture and experiences.
5. Students should be active learners; teachers should be facilitators of learning.
6. Community resources should be utilized as well as teachers, parents and students to develop interventions (pp. 19 - 20).

Glickman (1998) included accelerated schools as examples of school networks that have experienced dramatic results from embracing democratic pedagogy. The Accelerated Schools Project has rethought the entire structure of schooling and has provided networks that support change practices throughout the United States (Glickman, 1998).
Organizational Culture

Organizational culture has been written about in both business (Beach, 1993; Deal & Kennedy, 1982, 1992; Kilmann, Saxton, & Serpa, 1985; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Schein, 1985, 1992; Shafritz & Ott, 1996) and educational literature (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Deal, 1990; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Leithwood & Aitken, 1995; Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). According to Kotter and Heskett (1992), the concept of “corporate” or “organizational” culture began to be asserted into academia in the late 1970's. The basis for the research on organizational culture evolved out of three arenas: Japanese firms were consistently outperforming American competitors; United States firms that were doing well despite the competitive business environment that emerged in the 1970s; and companies that were having difficulty coping with the new competitive environment (Kotter & Heskett, 1992).

Several definitions of culture have been included in the first chapter. Schein (1985) further described culture as “the pattern of underlying assumptions, a pattern that is implicit, taken for granted, and unconscious unless called to the surface by some process of inquiry” (p. 23). Learned underlying assumptions are what really drive or create the values and overt responses in an organization (Schein, 1985). According to Schein (1985), values are the manifestations of the culture. Values provide understanding behind the reasons for specific behaviors. Schein (1985) considered artifacts and creations, the visible behavioral manifestations of underlying concepts, at the most superficial
level of culture. Even though artifacts are easy to observe, they are difficult to decipher (Schein, 1992).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993) described culture as the informal understanding of the "way we do things around here". Culture expresses organizational values, ideals, attitudes and beliefs; and provides a set of learned behaviors that give meaning and reality to the participants (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993) stated the evidence of culture is expressed through "shared values and beliefs, heroes and heroines, rites and rituals, priests and priestesses, stories and myths, symbols and dress, clans and tribes, norms and practices, legacy and saga, customs and traditions, and common meanings" (p. 20). Additionally, Cunningham and Gresso (1993) contended that culture is transmitted through "observation, shared beliefs, symbolic gestures, mores, folkways, customs, rituals, games, play, art, myths, memories, clothing, method of physical and emotional relations, and eating" (p. 21).

Deal and Peterson (1999), and Leithwood and Aitken (1995) wrote that culture is comprised of values, beliefs, assumptions, and norms. Specifically, values are the declarations of what an organization stands for; beliefs are how members of the organization comprehend and deal with the world around them; assumptions are the beliefs, perceptions, and values that guide behavior; and norms are the unstated group expectations for behavior, dress, and language (Deal & Peterson, 1999).
After reviewing the literature, Steinhoff and Owens (1989) identified six interlocking dimensions of organizational culture in schools:

1. The history of the organization,
2. Values and beliefs of the organization,
3. Myths and stories that explain the organization,
4. Cultural norms of the organization,
5. Tradition, rituals and ceremonies, and
6. Heroes and heroines of the organization (p. 18).

Steinhoff and Owens (1989) contended that these are the elements through which the symbolism of organizational culture is preserved, stated, and transferred.

Leithwood and Aitken (1995) proposed that school and district cultures vary along three dimensions: strength, content, and form. First, their strength may vary depending on the extent to which the staff share norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions (Leithwood & Aitken, 1995). Second, their content is characterized by the specific nature of the norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions (Leithwood & Aitken, 1995). Third, the form of an organization’s culture may vary (Leithwood & Aitken, 1995).

Shafritz and Ott (1996) wrote that culture “is made up of many intangible things such as values, beliefs, assumptions, perception, behavioral norms, artifacts, and patterns of behavior” (p. 420). Basic assumptions that are held by the members of an organization predetermine the organizational behaviors and decisions (Shafritz & Ott, 1996). After repeated use, assumptions unconsciously
influence organizational decisions and behaviors (Shafritz & Ott, 1996). Personal preferences of organizational members are controlled by cultural norms, values, beliefs and assumptions (Shafritz & Ott, 1996).

Kotter and Heskett (1992) viewed organizational culture as having two levels. At the less visible level, culture represents the values that are shared by the people in a group and that persist over time even when the membership of the group changes (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). At the more visible level, culture refers to the behavior patterns of an organization that new employees are automatically encouraged to follow by other employees (Kotter & Heskett, 1992).

According to Deal (1990), the primary function of culture in organizations is to give meaning to human activity. Deal and Kennedy (1982) identified the key elements of culture as: values, heroes, rites and rituals, and the cultural network. They considered values as the "bedrock of any corporate culture". Values provide a shared sense of what an organization stands for (Deal, 1990), and direction for the employees and guidelines for their behavior (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). In order for companies to be successful, employees must be able to identify, accept, and act on the organization's values (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Deal and Kennedy (1982) found that successful companies place a great deal of emphasis on values. They shared three characteristics:

1. They stand for something - that is, they have a clear and explicit philosophy about how they aim to conduct their business.
2. Management pays a great deal of attention to shaping and fine-tuning these values to conform to the economic and business environment of the company and to communicating them to the organization.

3. These values are known and shared by all the people who work for the company - from the lowliest production worker right through to the ranks of senior management (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 23).

The second element of culture that Deal and Kennedy (1982) identified was heroes. They contended that heroes “personify the values and epitomize the strength of the organization” (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). The basic values of the culture are reinforced by the heroes through making success attainable and human; providing role models; symbolizing the company to the outside world; preserving what makes the company special; setting a standard of performance; and motivating employees (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Rites and rituals, the third element of culture, communicate exactly how people are to behave (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1999). Symbolic actions in the form of play, ritual, and ceremony build culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Play releases tension and encourages innovation by bonding people together, reducing conflict, and creating new visions and values (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Rituals are rules which guide behavior and dramatize the basic cultural values of the company (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Rituals are physical expressions of cultural values and beliefs (Deal, 1990) that hold a school together (Deal & Peterson, 1999).
Heroes, myths, and sacred symbols are celebrated through ceremonies (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). These ceremonies display the culture of the company, and provide experiences that employees will remember (Deal, 1990; Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Ceremonies provide a way for schools to celebrate successes, communicates its values, and recognizes special contributions of staff and students (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

According to Deal and Kennedy (1999), rituals and ceremonies often become traditions. Traditions are events that are significant to the school and are held every year (Deal & Peterson, 1999). They have special meaning and are a part of the history of the school (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

The fourth element of culture, network, is the primary means of communication in the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). The network transmits information and interprets the significance of the information for the employees (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). According to Deal and Kennedy (1982), “the network is powerful because it can reinforce the basic beliefs of the organization, enhance the symbolic value of heroes by passing on stories of their deeds and accomplishments, set a new climate for change, and provide a tight structure of influence for the CEO” (p. 86).

Within this cultural network, there are several characters which play influential roles in the company (Deal, 1990). They are responsible for carrying on and protecting the culture (Deal, 1990). Storytellers impart legends of the company to new employees thereby preserving the institution and their values (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1999). These stories provide people
with direction, courage and hope (Deal, 1990). Priests are the designated worriers and guardians of the culture's values of the company (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1999). Whisperers are considered to be the power behind the throne because they have the boss's ear (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Gossips share the day-to-day happenings with the rest of the employees (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Deal & Peterson, 1999).

Kilmann et al. (1985) also contended that culture affects organizational behavior and performance. They asserted that culture is manifested in behavioral norms, hidden assumptions, and human nature (Kilmann et al., 1985). Behavioral norms are:

the unwritten rules of the game. Norms describe the behaviors and attitudes that the members of a group or organization pressure one another to follow. Norms are not written but are transmitted from one generation of employees to another by stories, rites, rituals, and sanctions that are applied when anyone violates a norm (Kilmann et al., 1985, pp. 5-6).

Hidden assumptions underlie culture in that they are the fundamental beliefs behind all decisions and actions (Kilmann et al., 1985). These assumptions pertain to what members want and need, how decisions are made, and which actions are likely to be taken (Kilmann et al., 1985).

Human nature involves human dynamics, wants, motives, and desires that make a group of people unique (Kilmann et al., 1985). In order to understand how human nature impacts culture, it is necessary to understand
which issues will be addressed, what information will be retained, and how information will be distorted (Kilmann et al., 1985). In essence, human nature affects the way in which new problems and opportunities are approached (Kilmann et al., 1985).

According to Schein (1992), culture evolves from external pressures, internal potentials, responses to critical events, and somewhat to chance. Schein (1985) contended that culture is learned through two interactive mechanisms: anxiety and pain reduction, and positive reward and reinforcement. He described basic anxiety as that which comes from uncertainty as to whether or not the group will survive and be productive (Schein, 1985). Therefore, members of the group learn how to handle crisis and prevent it from occurring again in the future (Schein, 1985). Positive reinforcement, the second major learning mechanism, results in people repeating what works and giving up what does not (Schein, 1985).

Deal and Peterson (1999) contended that culture takes form over time as people learn to cope with problems, develop routines and rituals, and create traditions and ceremonies that reinforce the underlying values and beliefs. As teachers, students, parents, and administrators work together and deal with crises and accomplishments, the school culture is developed (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

Schein (1985) proposed that culture is the solution to external and internal problems that has worked consistently for the members. These solutions are taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think about, and feel in
given situations (Schein, 1985). These solutions become assumptions about the “nature of reality, truth, time, space, human nature, human activity, and human relationships” (Schein, 1985, p. 20) which are eventually taken for granted. Schein (1985) contended that the power of culture derives from the set of assumptions that are unconscious and taken for granted.

Kilmann et al. (1985) proposed that culture causes an organization to follow a particular course. Specifically, culture influences behavior so that organizational goals are accomplished, or influences behavior so that members behave contrary to the organization’s goals and mission (Kilmann et al., 1985). The degree to which the culture of an organization is shared by all members of the group impacts the ability of the group to act effectively (Kilmann et al., 1985). In addition, the amount of pressure that a culture exerts on the members will influence the organization’s movement toward accomplishing its goal (Kilmann et al., 1985).

According to Kilmann et al. (1985), these three aspects of impact (direction, pervasiveness, and strength) affect the performance of an organization. When culture has a positive impact on an organization, behavior moves in the right direction, the culture is shared among the members, and pressure is placed on members to follow the established cultural guidelines (Kilmann et al., 1985).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993) submitted that culture provides members or organizations with a sense of identity and a meaningful direction. The culture defines what the group is committed to
and what members think of each other. It provides an informal structure by which membership is defined and the process by which members become acculturated (p. 61).

Beach (1993) claimed that an organization's culture serves seven functions:

1. Specifies what is of primary importance to the organization, the standards against which its successes and failures should be measured.
2. Dictates how the organization's resources are to be used, and to what ends.
3. Establishes what the organization and its members can expect from each other.
4. Makes some methods of controlling behavior within the organization legitimate and makes others illegitimate.
5. Selects the behaviors in which members should or should not engage and prescribes how these are to be rewarded and punished.
6. Sets the tone for how members should treat each other and how they should treat nonmembers.
7. Instructs members about how to deal with the external environment.

(p. 12)

Deal and Kennedy (1982), in their book Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, wrote about the powerful influence of culture throughout an organization. They contended that the success of American
business is directly related to the presence of a strong culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). According to early leaders of American business believed that the lives and productivity of their employees were shaped by where they worked (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). These early leaders saw their role as creating an environment whereby employees could be secure and work to make the business a success (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Deal and Kennedy (1982) suggested that successful organizations share common cultural characteristics: (a) they contend that successful organizations have a widely shared organizational philosophy; (b) there is a concern for individuals that is more important than formal rules and policies; (c) rituals and ceremonies are demonstrated that build a common identity among the members; (d) the informal rules and exceptions of the organization are well-understood by all; and (e) there is a common belief that what members do is important to others in the organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Deal and Kennedy (1982) asserted that a strong culture can guide behavior in two ways. First, informal rules determine how people are to behave, thereby assisting employees in deciding how to act in any given situation (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Second, people tend to feel better about what they do, so they usually work harder (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Companies with strong cultures provide structure, standards and a value system in which to operate thereby, eliminating uncertainty (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Deal and Peterson (1999) proposed that strong, positive, collaborative cultures have powerful effects on many features of schools: (a) culture fosters
school effectiveness and productivity; (b) it improves collegial and collaborative activities that foster better communication and problem-solving practices; (c) it fosters successful change and improvement efforts through culture; (d) culture builds commitment and identification of staff, students, and administrators; (e) it amplifies the energy, motivation, and vitality of a school staff, students, and community; and (f) culture also increases the focus of daily behavior and attention on what is important and valued (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

According to Cunningham and Gresso (1993), the central components of an effective work culture are:

1. Vertical integration whereby all levels of an organization are given the opportunity to discuss their values and visions on a regular basis;
2. Vision and optimism whereby the entire school works together to develop a collective vision of what the school should be;
3. Collegiality whereby the team learns how to respect, appreciate, and foster the individual identities of group members;
4. Trust and support whereby activities are provided in order to build upon a climate of mutual understanding, trust, and commitment to one another and the organization;
5. Values and interest, not power and position whereby the focus of the group should always be on reconciling of interests and not positions;
6. Access to quality information whereby employees have free and open access to needed information;
7. Broad participation whereby a group appreciates and fosters the diversity and commonality of experiences, interests, talents, skills, and knowledge among its members;

8. Lifelong growth whereby the organization promotes personal and professional growth;

9. Individual empowerment whereby the individual uniqueness of each employee is supported and encouraged;

10. Continuous and sustained innovation whereby long-term accomplishments are endorsed (p. 41-49).

Beach (1993) presented three categories of beliefs that comprise organizational culture. The first belief is about how employees should be treated and the opportunities afforded them and is composed of specific beliefs about respect, growth, rewards, communication and fairness (Beach, 1993). The second belief is about professionalism and support of the efforts put forth to do a good job including effectiveness, efficiency, support, innovation, and enjoyment (Beach, 1993). The final belief is about how the organization interfaces with the environment and accomplishes its mission which includes achievement, competitiveness, resourcefulness, judgment, and integrity as specific components of this belief (Beach, 1993).

If a company’s culture is weak, they typically lack some or all of the following characteristics:

- Weak cultures have no clear values or beliefs about how to succeed in their business; or
• They have many such beliefs but cannot agree among themselves on which are most important; or
• Different parts of the company have fundamentally different beliefs.
• The heroes of the culture are destructive or disruptive and don't build upon any common understanding about what is important.
• The rituals of day-to-day life are either disorganized - with everybody doing their own thing - or downright contradictory - with the left hand and the right hand working at cross purposes (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, pp. 135-36).

Dennison (1990) warned that cultures can be functional or dysfunctional. However, effective organizations have a fit among strategy, environment, and culture (Dennison, 1990).

Hoy and Miskel (1996) identified four different kinds of culture: adaptability, mission, involvement, and consistency. The adaptability culture has an emphasis on the external environment and focuses on change and flexibility (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The mission culture is concerned with serving the external environment, but stability and direction are important as well as a shared vision which is critical in order to provide clarity and purpose to the work (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The primary purpose of the involvement culture is the participation of the members while dealing with a rapidly changing environment with an emphasis on a sense of commitment and responsibility are important (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). A consistency culture has an internal focus and stable external environment, and is characterized by dependability and reliability (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).
Deal and Kennedy (1982) identified four general categories or types of cultures according to the degree of risk associated with the company's activities and the speed of feedback on whether decisions or strategies are successful. A tough-guy, macho culture consists of individualists who take high risks and receive feedback quickly on whether their actions were right or wrong (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). In a work hard/play hard culture where fun and action are the norm, employees take few risks, but receive quick feedback (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). The bet-your-company culture makes big-stakes decisions with years passing by before employees know whether their decisions have paid off (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). The process culture or bureaucracy provides little or no feedback, and employees concentrate on how it's done (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Deal and Kennedy (1982) cautioned that companies do not fit into any one of these categories, but are often a blend of all four types.

Steinhoff and Owens (1989) categorized culture according to phenotypes. The first phenotype is The Family where the principal was described as a parent (strong or weak), nurturer, friend, sibling or coach, and the school itself was referred to as the family, home, team or womb (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). The second phenotype, Modern Times, described the principal's central role as providing regulation and maintaining order, and the schools were referred to as well-oiled machines, political machines, beehives of activity, or rusty machines (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). In The Cabaret, the third phenotype, the principal was seen as a master of ceremonies, a tightrope walker, and ringmaster, and the school was referred to as a circus, a Broadway show, a banquets, or a well-
choreographed ballet (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). Finally, The Little Shop of Horrors, described a principal who is a self-cleaning statue whose main function is to keep things smoothed-over, and the school was referred to as an unpredictable, tension-filled nightmare (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989).

Kotter and Heskett (1992) warned that all organizations have multiple cultures which are usually associated with different functional groupings or geographic locations.

In order to understand an organization's culture, it is important to attempt to get at the shared basic assumptions and understand the learning process which brought about these basic assumptions (Schein, 1992). In order for the organization to perform effectively, the mission, goals, means used to achieve goals, measurement of its performance, and remedial strategies must be agreed upon by all members of the organization (Schein, 1992). Schein (1992) asserted that "culture fulfills not only the function of providing stability, meaning, and predictability in the present but is the result of functionally effective decisions in the group's past" (p. 68).

Deal and Kennedy (1982) cautioned that in order to survive in a culture, the leader must understand the cultural network; recognize the network's existence and importance; develop appropriate contacts; cultivate exposure to people at all levels of the organization; use anecdotes and stories to reinforce important values; seek out friendships; and rely on the network to provide their communications with people in the organization.
According to Leithwood and Aitken (1995) the power of an organization's culture is shown in at least three distinct ways: (a) the way an organization conducts its day-to-day business, (b) its response to specific proposals for change, and (c) its influence on the nature and type of organizational learning that occurs.

A successful executive must be able to read the corporate culture accurately, and refine and shape it to fit the ever-changing needs of the marketplace (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). In order to understand a culture, the executive must study the physical setting; read what the company says about its culture; test how the company greets strangers; interview company people; and observe how people spend their time (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

In their book entitled Changing Leadership For Changing Times, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) included a study which described how transformational leaders build culture in schools. Leadership behaviors aimed at being student-centered, supporting continuing professional growth by teachers, and encouraging collaborative problem solving (Leithwood et al., 1999). Specifically, the school culture was strengthened by:

1. clarifying the school's vision in relation to collaborative work and the care and respect with which students were to be treated;
2. reinforcing, with staff, norms of excellence for their own work and the work of students;
3. using every opportunity to focus on, and to publicly communicate, the school's vision and goals;
4. using symbols and rituals to express cultural values in the context of social occasions in which most staff participate;
5. confronting conflict openly and acting to resolve it through the use of shared values;
6. using slogans and motivational phrases repeatedly;
7. using bureaucratic mechanisms to support cultural values and a collaborative form of culture;
8. assisting staff to clarify shared beliefs and values and to act in accordance with such beliefs and values;
9. acting in a manner consistent with those beliefs and values shared within the school;
10. sharing power and responsibility with others;
11. working to eliminate 'boundaries' between administrators and teachers and between other groups in the school;
12. providing opportunities and resources for collaborative staff work (Leithwood et al., 1999, pp. 83-84).

The nature, strength and form of a school's culture are critical in its contribution to students, and school leaders have many ways of influencing the culture of the school, both directly and indirectly (Leithwood et al., 1999).

Deal and Peterson (1999) asserted that culture provides a way to help school leaders better understand their school's unwritten rules and traditions, norms and expectations that appear to permeate everything including "the way people act, how they dress, what they talk about or avoid talking about, whether
they seek out colleagues for help or don’t, and how teachers feel about their work and their students” (pp. 2-3).

Schein (1992) contended that in order for leaders to create and manage culture, they must have the ability to understand and work with culture. Leader behavior only partially influences culture which is created by a complex group learning process (Schein, 1992).

Gorton and Snowden (1998) provided several principles for modeling creative teaching and leadership behaviors that enhance school cultures. They include:

1. Envision a future direction of collaboration.
2. Clearly establish connection between mission and practice by being an enthusiastic facilitator, meeting the needs of teachers and students, understanding the motivations of each employee, and promoting growth in all school personnel.
3. View problems as opportunities and focus on solutions.
4. Be creative in stimulating good teaching practices.
5. Think of others.
6. Foster staff development.
7. Create networks that decrease teacher isolation and promote professional sharing.
8. Stay focused on the most important outcome, student performance.  
   (Gorton & Snowden, 1998, p. 113)
According to Purkey and Smith (1983), academically effective schools are distinguished by their culture: a structure, process, and climate of values and norms that emphasize successful teaching and learning. School cultures can vary and still be academically effective (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Schools are made up of interconnected characteristics that are unique to each school and provide each with a definite personality or climate (Purkey & Smith, 1983). The sustaining characteristics of a productive school culture include: (a) collaborative planning and collegial relationships; (b) a sense of community; (c) clear goals and high expectations; and (d) order and discipline (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

The culture of accelerated schools is critical to its success. Sergiovanni (1994) included in his book Building Community in Schools, the example of how the teachers and principals of accelerated schools join together to create a “community of mind” (culture) for their own school by taking stock in order to develop a deep vision of the future. The Inquiry Process also results in the implementation of solutions which affect the culture and pedagogical practices of the school (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990b).

Finnan and Levin (1998) contended that “the Accelerated Schools Project is a prime example of an educational reform movement that recognizes the importance of working within the context of each school’s existing culture” (p. 12). A school’s history molds both the structure and culture of a school (Finnan & Levin, 1998; Schlechty, 1990). The history of a school includes its origin, the population it has served and its unique claims and accomplishments (Finnan & Levin, 1998).
Table 2 Five Critical Components That Shape School Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School's expectations for children</td>
<td>The basic beliefs and assumptions of a school's culture undergird the acceptance that students are capable of performing at a certain level. The Accelerated Schools Project is based on an enriched learning environment similar to those usually reserved for gifted and talented students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's expectations for their own school experience</td>
<td>These expectations are shaped by explicit and subtle messages that they receive from adults in their community and by the trust their community places in education. Due to the challenging curriculum and instruction, students in accelerated schools rise to the challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for adults</td>
<td>Expectations for teachers are shaped by the students they teach. Expectations for parents stem from the characteristics of their children. The Accelerated Schools Project encourages higher expectations through the democratic decision-making process and governance structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs and assumptions about acceptable educational practices</td>
<td>The nature of these practices is related to the mission of the school and the expectations for the students and parents. The Accelerated Schools Project is built upon the concept of powerful learning which is authentic, interactive, learner-centered, inclusive and continuous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic beliefs and assumptions about the desirability of change</td>
<td>Teachers and administrators often actively and passively resist imposed change from the district or state level because the proposed changes do not fit their school culture. Schools are expected to research the Accelerated Schools Project prior to joining, and obtain at least a 90% agreement vote to join the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ceremonies, rituals, legends, stories, and heroes come from this history (Finnan & Levin, 1998). Finnan (1992) contended that changes can take place if they are designed to help the members of the culture make the changes they want in their school. Community members must want to make the changes as a part of their culture and shape it to fit the culture (Finnan, 1992).

According to Finnan and Levin (1998), there are five critical components that shape school culture, and each of these components are addressed through the philosophies and processes of the Accelerated Schools Project (See Table 2).

Schlechty (1990) stated that structural change requires cultural change. The culture of an organization is comprised of social structures which are embedded in systems of meaning, value, belief, and knowledge (Schlechty, 1990). In order to change an organization’s structure, one must address these systems of belief, values and knowledge (Schlechty, 1990).

Structural Properties

Newmann and Associates (1996) conducted a study on school restructuring which concluded that in order to be successful, both new structures and a professional culture are needed. Structural properties are formal characteristics or patterns of operation in a school (Miskel et al., 1979). These characteristics are designed to be relatively independent of particular individuals (Miskel et al., 1979). The structures refer to the relationship among different roles in the organization which have been created to achieve educational goals.
(Miskel et al., 1979). Miklos (1969) defined organizational structure as the “characteristics of the enduring, more or less permanent, patterns of the operation of these organizations” (p. 2).

Many researchers agreed that the study of structural properties began with Weber’s work on bureaucracy (Abbott, 1969; Blau & Scott, 1969; Hague, 1965; Murphy, 1979). Weber (1947) contended that all administrative organizations are bureaucratically organized. Weber (1947) delineated the following characteristics of this type of organization:

1. Organization tasks are distributed among the various positions as official duties. Implied is a clear-cut division of labor among positions which makes possible a high degree of specialization. Specialization, in turn, promotes expertness among the staff, both directly and by enabling the organization to hire employees on the basis of their technical qualifications.

2. The positions or offices are organized into a hierarchical authority structure. In the usual case this hierarchy takes on the shape of a pyramid wherein each official is responsible for his subordinates; decisions and actions as well as his own to the superior above him in the pyramid and wherein each official has authority over the officials under him. The scope of authority of superiors over subordinates is clearly circumscribed.

3. A formally established system of rules and regulations governs official decisions and actions. In principle, the operations in such administrative organizations involve the application of these general regulations to
particular cases. The regulations insure the uniformity of operations and, together with the authority structure, make possible the coordination of various activities. They also provide for continuity in operations regardless of changes of personnel, thus promoting a stability lacking, as we have seen in charismatic movements.

4. Officials are expected to assume an impersonal orientation in their contacts with clients and with other officials. Clients are to be treated as cases, the officials being expected to disregard all personal considerations and to maintain complete emotional detachment, and subordinates are to be treated in a similar impersonal fashion. The social distance between hierarchical levels and that between officials and their clients is intended to foster such formality. Impersonal detachment is designed to prevent the personal feelings of officials from distorting their rational judgment in carrying out their duties.

5. Employment by the organization constitutes a career for officials. Typically an official is a full-time employee and looks forward to a lifelong career in the agency. Employment is based on the technical qualifications of the candidate rather than on political, family, or other connections. Usually such qualifications are tested by examination or by certificates that demonstrate the candidate's educational attainment - college degrees for example. Such educational qualifications create a certain amount of class homogeneity among officials, since relatively few persons of working-class origins have college degrees, although their number is
increasing. Officials are appointed to positions, not elected, and thus are dependent on superiors in the organization rather than on a body of constituents. After a trial period officials gain tenure of position and are protected against arbitrary dismissal. Remuneration is in the form of a salary and pensions are provided after retirement. Career advancements are according to seniority or to achievement, or both. (p.334)

According to Blau and Scott (1969), Weber viewed these organizing principles as ways to maximize rational decision-making and administrative efficiency. Blau and Scott (1969) further contended that Weber viewed bureaucracy as the most efficient form of administrative organization. Specifically, experts were best qualified to make technically correct decisions, and disciplined performance supported the organizational objectives (Blau & Scott, 1969).

Abbott (1969) contended that American schools have been particularly receptive to the bureaucratic ideology. First, the school organization has been influenced by the need for specialization and the factoring of tasks (Abbott, 1969). Second, a clearly defined and rigid hierarchy of authority is clearly evident in school organizations (Abbott, 1969). Third, school organizations have emphasized the use of general rules of conduct and standards to assure reasonable uniformity of task performance (Abbott, 1969). Fourth, impersonality in organizational relationships is evident in the school organization (Abbott, 1969). Fifth, technical competence has been the basis for employment which has constituted a professional career for most members (Abbott, 1969).
Several other theories have been presented to describe organizational structures. In 1961, Burn's and Stalker distinguished between mechanistic and organic forms of management. Rowan (1995) further described these differences. Rowan (1995) contended that the mechanistic approach assumes that teaching can be routinized, and relies on elaborate controls to constrain teachers' decisions and activities. As a result, classroom teaching is regulated and student opportunities for learning is standardized by providing uniform and high-quality instruction (Rowan, 1995). In this approach, technical uncertainty can be eliminated through the development of an elaborate set of input behavior, and output controls intended to standardize and routinize the instructional work of teachers (Rowan, 1995). Curriculum alignment is one central feature of the mechanistic approach (Rowan, 1995). This approach specifies a clear set of instructional goals and focuses the work of teachers and students on the achievement of these goals by constraining teachers' content decisions through the development input and output controls (Rowan, 1995). Behavior controls are also emphasized in the mechanistic design strategy (Rowan, 1995). These controls are designed to provide in-service training programs in effective teaching practices and increased evaluation of teachers in order to standardize teaching practices (Rowan, 1995).

The organic approach views teaching as a non-routine activity that tolerates uncertainty in teaching by developing managerial practices designed to cope with it (Rowan, 1995). In the organic approach, teachers are given considerable autonomy by controlling decision making in order to adapt to
instructional uncertainties, and collegial controls which increase the amount of knowledge and expertise available to teachers in making these adaptations (Rowan, 1995). It relies on teachers' problem solving and expertise to improve teaching and student achievement (Rowan, 1995). Another characteristic of organic management is collaboration which enhances teachers' capacity for learning and problem solving, builds solidarity and cohesiveness within the school, and satisfies teachers' needs for affiliation (Rowan, 1995). A final theme in the organic approach entails the development of shared values that unify members of different subunits and orients them to a common purpose (Rowan, 1995).

Another view of organizational properties is provided by Simon (1957) who conceived of administrative organizations primarily as decision-making structures. Effective administration requires rational decision-making, and decisions are rational when they select the best alternative for reaching a goal (Simon, 1957). According to Simon (1957), rationality can be approached only through limiting the scope of the decisions that each member must make. This is accomplished by first, defining the responsibilities of each official by providing goals to guide his actions; and secondly, mechanisms such as formal rules, information channels, and training programs are set up to help narrow the range of alternatives considered before making a decision (Blau & Scott, 1969).

Decisions, according to Simon (1957), are based either on factual or value premises. Factual premises are subject to empirical testing in order to determine
if they are true or false (Blau & Scott, 1969). Value premises are concerned with what is good or preferable (Blau & Scott, 1969).

Simon (1957) conceptualized rational behavior as means-ends chains in that appropriate means are selected to attain certain ends. The hierarchical organization of responsibilities serves as the framework for means-ends chains, therefore delineating the duties of an official as the selection of the best means for achieving the ends (Blau & Scott, 1969). Directives from the superior and procedural regulations provide limits so that rational decision-making can take place (Blau & Scott, 1969).

Talcott Parsons (1960) provided another conception of formal organization which he called the Social Functions Typology. Parsons' schema, which is viewed in its relationship to social systems, proposed that formal organizations are major mechanism for mobilizing power to achieve collective objectives (Blau & Scott, 1969). Each formal organization may be viewed as its own social system that must possess subsystems to address the four basic problems of adaptation, goal achievement, integration, and latency (Blau & Scott, 1969).

Parsons (1960) distinguished three major hierarchical levels in formal organizations. The first level is the technical level, where the product of the organization is manufactured or dispensed (Blau & Scott, 1969). The managerial level, which is above the technical employees, mediates between the various parts of the organization and coordinates their efforts (Blau & Scott, 1969). The highest level, the institutional level, connects the organization with the wider
social system (Blau & Scott, 1969). Parsons (1960) suggested that there are clear-cut breaks in the hierarchy of authority and responsibility between these three levels.

Katz and Kahn (1978) expanded on Parsons' typology by adding second order functions to the description of organizations. Katz and Kahn (1978) categorized organizations according to functions. The productive or economic organizations are concerned with the creation of wealth, the manufacture of goods, and the provision of services for the general public or for specific segments of it (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Maintenance organizations are devoted to the socialization of people for their roles in other organizations and in the larger society (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Adaptive structures create knowledge, develop and test theories, and, to some extent, apply information to existing problems (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Finally, the managerial or political function is concerned with the adjudication, coordination and control of resources, people and subsystems (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Blau and Scott (1969) proposed a classification of organizations based on *cui bono* - who benefits. According to Blau and Scott (1969), the four types of organizations that result from the cui bono criterion include (a) mutual-benefit associations, where the prime beneficiary is the membership; (b) business concerns, where the owners are prime beneficiary; (c) service organizations, where the client group is the prime beneficiary; and (d) commonweal organizations, where the prime beneficiary is the public-at-large. Schools would fit into the classification of a commonweal organization.
Leithwood and Aitken (1995) proposed five variables and corresponding indicators for school structure and organization in order to foster organizational learning. The first variable stated that the purposes of the curriculum and requirements for instruction implied by the school’s mission and goals is supported by the school’s organization and structure (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995). This variable is demonstrated by the school’s instructional time meeting all legal and contractual requirements; the structure of the school day maximizing instructional use; and the instructional time being maximized within the school year (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995).

The second variable referred to the school being structured and organized in order to facilitate the professional work of teachers (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995). This variable is measured by an organization which supports flexible classroom-level decision making within the day; provisions for collaborative teacher planning time; and the availability of realistic levels of clerical support (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995).

The third variable contended that the organizational structures facilitate the learning and long-term problem-solving capacity of the organization (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995). This variable is demonstrated by the perception that the staff is encouraged to work collaboratively with others; ideas from outside the school are easily accessible; and quality time is made available to assist in making the discussion of new ideas meaningful (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995).

The fourth variable stated that teacher collaboration, initiative and leadership are encouraged through the school structure for the purpose of...
maximizing student learning opportunities. This is measured through the staff's perceptions (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995).

The last variable proposed that both achievement and equity goals are nurtured through the way in which students are organized within and across classes (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995). This is demonstrated through (a) heterogeneous grouping of students within and across classes; (b) homogeneous grouping being limited to a small proportion of any student's day, being provided for high-achieving students in one or two areas of especially high aptitude or interest, and being provided to low-achieving students only in areas where they are experiencing special difficulty; (c) procedures for homogeneous groupings being clearly understood and shared by all involved in the decision, involving specific criteria related to the instructional purposes of grouping, incorporating explicit checks against bias, and providing frequent review of decisions; (d) homogeneous grouping of low-achieving students which allocate more than average instructional resources, adapt instruction to met the needs of the group, and ensure the quality of the academic program (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995).

Leithwood and Aitkin (1995) proposed that decentralized structures encourage learning and reflective action taking. This is accomplished by including all the members of the organization in assimilating new information (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995). Contrarily, centralized, hierarchical structures are not suited to the adaptation of organizational practices (Leithwood & Aitkin, 1995).
Hage's axiomatic theory of organizations (1965) provided another conceptual model which can be looked at when investigating structural properties of schools. These characteristics corresponded to bureaucratic characteristics or features of Weberian bureaucratic theory (Murphy, 1979).

Hage (1969) identified four organizational means and four organizational ends. The four organizational means or properties identified to accomplish educational goals are centralization, formalization, complexity, and stratification (Hage, 1965, 1969).

Centralization, or hierarchy of authority, is a measure of how power is distributed (Hage, 1965; Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). It is measured by the proportion of occupations or jobs whose occupants participate in decision making and the number of areas in which they participate (Hage, 1965, 1967, 1969; Murphy, 1979) as well as the degree of reliance on the hierarchy of authority (Hage, 1967). It also details where teachers or administrators can induce authority in the organization (Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979), and the degree of involvement in deciding classroom and curriculum policy (Miskel et al., 1979).

Formalization, or standardization, is a measure of how many rules are used (Hage, 1965, 1967; Miskel et al., 1979). It is measured by the proportion of codified jobs and the deviation that is tolerated within the rules defining the jobs (Hage, 1965, 1969; Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). The major components of formalization are job codification, role specificity, standardization, rule observation, and professional latitude (Miskel et al., 1979). Job codification is a
measure of how many rules define what the occupants of positions are to do (Hage, 1967). Rule observation is a measure of whether or not the rules are employed (Hage, 1967).

Complexity, or specialization, is a measure of how many specialties are utilized, the lengths of training required by each, and the level of professional activity required (Hage, 1965, 1969; Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979).

Stratification, or status system, is a measure of how rewards are distributed (Hage, 1965, 1969; Murphy, 1979). It is measured by determining the difference in rewards between jobs and the relative mobility rates between them (Hage, 1965; Murphy, 1979).

The four organizational ends included: adaptiveness, production, efficiency, and job satisfaction (Hage, 1969). Adaptiveness, or flexibility, of an organization, is measured by the number of new programs and techniques adopted in a year (Hage, 1969). The higher the rate of changes, the more adaptive the organizations (Hage, 1969).

Production, or effectiveness is measured by the number of units produced and the rate of increase in these per year (Hage, 1969). The higher the volume of production and increase in volume, the more productive the organization (Hage, 1969).

Efficiency, or cost, of an organization is measured by computing the amount of money used to procure a single unit of production and the amount of the resources (Hage, 1969). The lower the cost, the more efficient the organization (Hage, 1969).
## Table 3 Hage’s Major Propositions and Corollaries of the Theory

### Major Propositions
1. The higher the centralization, the higher the production.
2. The higher the formalization, the higher the efficiency.
3. The higher the centralization, the higher the formalization.
4. The higher the stratification, the lower the job satisfaction.
5. The higher the stratification, the higher the production.
6. The higher the stratification, the lower the adaptiveness.
7. The higher the complexity, the lower the centralization.

### Derived Corollaries
1. The higher the formalization, the higher the production.
2. The higher the centralization, the higher the efficiency.
3. The lower the job satisfaction, the lower the efficiency.
4. The lower the job satisfaction, the lower the adaptiveness.
5. The higher the production, the lower the adaptiveness.
6. The higher the complexity, the higher the formalization.
7. The higher the complexity, the lower the formalization.
8. The higher the production, the higher the efficiency.
9. The higher the stratification, the higher the formalization.
10. The higher the formalization, the lower the complexity.
11. The higher the centralization, the lower the job satisfaction.
12. The higher the centralization, the lower the adaptiveness.
13. The higher the stratification, the lower the complexity.
14. The higher the complexity, the higher the job satisfaction.
15. The lower the complexity, the lower the adaptiveness.
16. The higher the stratification, the lower the adaptiveness.
17. The higher the stratification, the lower the job satisfaction.
18. The higher the formalization, the lower the job satisfaction.
19. The higher the formalization, the lower the adaptiveness.
20. The higher the formalization, the lower the adaptiveness.
21. The higher the formalization, the lower the adaptiveness.

### Limits Proposition
VIII. Production imposes limits on complexity, centralization, formalization, stratification, adaptiveness, efficiency, and job satisfaction.

---

Job satisfaction, or morale, is measured by standard attitude batteries and the amount of turnover (Hage, 1969). The higher the morale and lower the turnover, the higher the job satisfaction in the organization (Hage, 1969).

Each variable is a formal characteristic of organizations and refers to a major issue in organizational life (Hage, 1969). The theory provides a basis for making improvements in organizational performances by specifying the interrelatedness of the means and the ends (Hage, 1969). Through his research, Hage (1969) developed eight (8) major propositions and twenty-one (21) corollaries of his theory (see Table 3).

Bishop and George (1973) used the concepts in Hage’s theory to develop the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ) which is applied to school settings in order to measure the school’s organizational characteristics. This instrument will be utilized in this research to describe the structural properties of accelerated schools.

Summary

This review of literature provides the reader information on accelerated schools, organizational culture, and structural properties. The philosophy and processes of the Accelerated Schools Project might lead the reader to assume that the organizational structure and culture are the same in every accelerated school. Whether this is, in fact, the case in accelerated schools is the impetus for this study. Thus, the necessary elements exist from which to develop a methodology to look at these aspects of the accelerated schools.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction and Review of Study

As the result of the school reform efforts following A Nation at Risk, many reform programs have been developed. One such reform program is the Accelerated Schools Project which was begun by Henry Levin at Stanford University in the 1980's. This project was developed in an effort to address the needs of at-risk students. The Accelerated Elementary School focused on attempting to raise the achievement level of students through enriched curricula and instructional programs so that at-risk students perform at grade level by the end of the sixth grade (Guthrie & Hale, 1990; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1991a, 1993; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy & Levin, 1992; McCarthy & Still, 1993; McCollum, 1994; “What are Accelerated Schools,” 1991).

The Accelerated Schools Project is both a philosophy about acceleration of academics for all students and a concrete process for achieving it (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg, 1991). Each school community adapts the accelerated
school's philosophy and process to develop its own vision and collaboratively work to achieve its goals ("Accelerated Schools Project", 2000). Although no single feature makes a school accelerated, emphasis is placed on the integration of curricular, instructional, and organizational practices with the school's own vision (Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a).

There are three overarching principles which form the foundation of accelerated schools. These three principles, unity of purpose, empowerment, and building on strengths, are integrated into virtually all the activities of an accelerated school (Levin, 1993; Levin & Chasin, 1994).

According to Levin (1993), "unity of purpose refers to both a vision or dream of what the school can be and an action plan that will get the school there" (p. 34). The entire school community strives toward a common set of goals for the school which becomes the focal point of everyone's efforts (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1991b, 1993, 1996a, 1996b; McCarthy & Levin, 1992; "What are Accelerated Schools," 1991).

Empowerment coupled with responsibility, the second principle, refers to all groups sharing in decisions about curriculum, instructional materials and strategies, personnel, and allocation of resources inside the school (Ascher, 1993; Davidson & Dell, 1995; Fashola & Slavin, 1998; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; LeTendre, 1990; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1993; Levin & Chasin, 1994; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy & Levin, 1992).
Building on the strengths of school staff, students, parents and communities, rather than on their weaknesses is the third principle (Ascher, 1993; Davidson & Dell, 1995; Fashola & Slavin, 1998; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; LeTendre, 1990; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1993; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; “What are Accelerated Schools,” 1991). By building on the strengths of all members of the school community, collaborative leadership and decision-making are utilized to create an agreed-upon vision (McCarthy, 1992).

Along with the principles and practices, are a set of values, beliefs, and attitudes which help create the culture for accelerated school change (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992). The central values that penetrate the relationships and activities of the school include expertise/professionalization, equity, community, risk taking, experimentation, reflection, participation, trust, and communication (Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996; Levin & Chasin, 1994).

Powerful learning, the cornerstone of accelerated schools, is based on the premise that the type of education provided for gifted children works well for all children (Hague & Walker, 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1993). Powerful learning situations result from the change process and school practices that implement these three principles and nine values (Hopfenberg et al, 1993; Levin, 1996a). Change occurs through an integrated approach which involves all aspects - curriculum, instruction, and school organization - of the learning situation with the
ultime goal of these changes being the academic and social achievement of all students (Levin, 1996b; McCarthy & Levin, 1992).

Accelerated schools are considered to be self-governing communities, whereby practices and results are closely evaluated, problem solving is a continuous process, and information is shared with the community (Hopfenberg et al., 1990b, 1993; Levin, 1996a). The process which is followed to address challenges has numerous steps (Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1996a). The first step for the school community is to examine its present situation through a process called "taking stock" which looks at the school's resources, activities, teaching and learning processes, students, community and other dimensions (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; "Catalog of School Reform Models", 1998; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1991a, 1996a, 1996b; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991). Next, the school community develops a shared vision of what it wants the school to be (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; "Catalog of School Reform Models," 1998; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1991a, 1996a, 1996b; McCarthy, 1992).

By working through the accelerated schools governance structure, school community members address the priority areas so that there is a complete understanding before addressing solutions ("Catalog of School Reform Models," 1998; Hopfenberg, 1991; Hopfenberg et al., 1993; Levin, 1996a; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy et al., 1991; McCarthy & Levin, 1992).

The governance structure of accelerated schools, which supports the process of collaborative decision-making, is three tiered (Levin, 1987b). First,
cadres are small, task-oriented groups that address specific areas of concern like assessment, family involvement, discipline, etc. (Ascher, 1993; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Davidson, 1994; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b, 1993; Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1996a; 1996b; Levin & Chasin, 1994; McCollum, 1994, 1996). The second tier is the steering committee which is comprised of participants from each cadre as well as the principal, school staff, students, and parents (Ascher, 1993; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1993; Levin, 1988b, 1991a; Levin & Chasin, 1994). It is responsible for coordinating activities, distributing information, monitoring progress of the cadres, keeping them moving in the direction of the vision, and refining the recommendations of the cadres before they go to the school as a whole (SAW) (Davidson, 1994; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990b; Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1991a, 1996, 1996a, 1996b). The SAW, which consists of all staff members, parents and student representatives, is the primary decision making body (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b, 1993; Levin, 1996b). It is the school as a whole which must approve all major decisions on curriculum, instruction, and allocation of resources that have school-wide implications (Ascher, 1993; Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992; Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1987b, 1988b, 1991a; Levin & Chasin, 1994).

School communities begin the process of exploring and solving their problems collaboratively through the Inquiry Process (McCarthy, 1992; “The Inquiry Process,” 1991). The Inquiry Process is defined as “a systematic method

There are five stages that schools go through to solve their problems (Ascher, 1993; Finnan, 1992; Finnan et al., 1996; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b, 1993; "The Inquiry Process," 1991). The first stage is focusing on the problem area (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). In this stage the broad challenge areas are refined so that specific concerns surrounding the challenge can be understood (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). Stage two involves brainstorming solutions (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). Possible solutions are identified by looking inward at their own situation and outward to the experiences and practices of others (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). The third stage involves synthesizing solutions and coming up with an action plan to address the area of need (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b). During stage four, support for the plan is given by the steering committee and school-as-a-whole, and the action plan is piloted (Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1996b). The final stage involves evaluating and reassessing to determine either to continue working on this issue or to select another piece of the vision to focus on (Finnan, 1992; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b).

Through the Accelerated Schools Process, restructuring occurs by changing the culture and structure of the school. Hopfenberg (1990a, 1990b, 1991) contended that it is through a comprehensive approach such as the Accelerated Schools Project which reforms a school's culture, attitudes, meaning
This study examined what affect the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Process has on the culture and structure of elementary schools. The culture of the accelerated schools were explored through the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989) to determine the perceptions of teachers.

In their study, Steinhoff and Owens (1989) utilized Schein's definition of culture as the basis of their research. According to Schein (1985), organizational culture is defined as follows:

A pattern of basic assumptions - invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 9).

Owens and Steinhoff (1989) went further to define culture “as the shared philosophies, ideologies, values, assumptions, beliefs, expectations, attitudes, and norms that knit a community together” (p.11).

In the development of the Organizational Culture Assessment Inventory, Steinhoff and Owens (1989) identified six dimensions that define the culture of a school: (a) the history of the organization; (b) values and beliefs of the organization; (c) myths and stories that explain the organization; (d) cultural norms of the organization; (e) traditions, rituals, and ceremonies; and (f) heroes.
and heroines of the organization (Lester & Bishop, 1997; Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). Using this taxonomic structure, respondents were asked to generate stories about their organization and then to summarize their stories by providing a metaphor for the school, the principal and the community.

As a result of their study, Steinhoff and Owens (1989) categorized the culture of the schools studied according to phenotypes. The first phenotype is The Family where the principal was described as a parent (strong or weak), nurturer, friend, sibling or coach, and the school itself was referred to as the family, home, team or womb (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). The second phenotype, Modern Times, described the principal's central role as providing regulation and maintaining order, and the schools were referred to as well-oiled machines, political machines, beehives of activity, or rusty machines (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). In The Cabaret, the third phenotype, the principal was seen as a master of ceremonies, a tightrope walker, and ringmaster, and the school was referred to as a circus, a Broadway show, a banquet, or a well-choreographed ballet (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). Finally, The Little Shop of Horrors, described a principal who is a self-cleaning statue whose main function is to keep things smoothed-over, and the school was referred to as an unpredictable, tension-filled nightmare (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989).

Steinhoff and Owens (1989) asserted that by using this instrument, a root metaphor or phenotype could be developed that described the culture of an organization. These phenotypes may be similar to those posited by Steinhoff and Owens in their original study or they may be unique to the schools studied.
The perception of teachers regarding the structure of accelerated schools were explored through the Structural Properties Questionnaire (Bishop & George, 1973) Bishop and George (1973) defined structural properties as “the characteristics of the enduring, more or less permanent, patterns of the operation of an organization” (p. 67).

In their study, Bishop and George (1973) used Hage's axiomatic theory of organizations (1965) as the conceptual model to develop the Structural Properties Questionnaire to measure the structural properties of schools. Hage (1969) identified four organizational means and four organizational ends. The four organizational means or properties identified to accomplish educational goals are centralization, formalization, complexity, and stratification (Hage, 1965, 1969).

Centralization, or hierarchy of authority, is a measure of how power is distributed (Hage, 1965; Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). It is measured by the proportion of occupations or jobs whose occupants participate in decision making and the number of areas in which they participate (Hage, 1965, 1967, 1969; Murphy, 1979) as well as the degree of reliance on the hierarchy of authority (Hage, 1967). It details where teachers or administrators can induce authority in the organization (Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979), and the degree of involvement in deciding classroom and curriculum policy (Miskel et al., 1979). Hage (1967) also defined the degree of centralization as how power is distributed among social positions.
Formalization, or standardization, is a measure of how many rules are used (Hage, 1965, 1967; Miskel et al., 1979). It is measured by the proportion of codified jobs and the deviation that is tolerated within the rules defining the jobs (Hage, 1965, 1969; Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979). The major components of formalization are job codification, role specificity, standardization, rule observation, and professional latitude (Miskel et al., 1979). Job codification is a measure of how many rules define what the occupants of positions are to do (Hage, 1967). Rule observation is a measure of whether or not the rules are employed (Hage, 1967).

Complexity, or specialization, is a measure of how many specialties are utilized, the lengths of training required by each and the level of professional activity required (Hage, 1965, 1969; Miskel et al., 1979; Murphy, 1979).

Stratification, or status system, is a measure of how rewards are distributed (Hage, 1965, 1969; Murphy, 1979). It is measured by determining the difference in rewards between jobs and the relative mobility rates between them (Hage, 1965; Murphy, 1979).

Only the structural properties of centralization, formalization, and complexity are measured using the Structural Properties Questionnaire. In addition, the Structural Properties Questionnaire further delineated twelve subscales which characterize schools: decision making - classroom teaching; decision making - instruction and curriculum; decision making with hierarchy; supervision with hierarchy; general rules for teachers; rules for teachers lesson plans; rules for teachers centers of study; general professional latitude; latitude
provided by principal; specialization in teaching assignment; professional activities; and professional training.

In order to determine the effectiveness of the Accelerated Schools Project as a reform program, research must be conducted to determine the affect its implementation has on a school. By collecting data relevant to the perceptions of teachers regarding the culture and structure of accelerated schools, further insights into the affect of its implementation in these areas will be made. Therefore, this study described the organizational culture and properties of five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the organizational culture and structure of selected accelerated schools.

Research Questions

The following questions will be addressed in this study:

1. What are the organizational cultures of accelerated schools?
2. What are the structural properties of accelerated schools?
3. What are the patterns in the organizational cultures of accelerated schools?
4. What are the patterns in the structural properties of accelerated schools?
5. What is the difference between the metaphors of accelerated schools on the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory and the initial sampling conducted by Steinhoff and Owens (1989)?
6. What is the difference between accelerated schools on the Structural Properties Questionnaire and the normed schools from Bishop and George's original study (1973)?

Design of Study

Population

Since this descriptive study involved the organizational culture and properties of accelerated schools, only schools which had participated in the Accelerated Schools Project for at least three years participated in this study. After three years, it is expected that the schools have a strong understanding of the accelerated schools philosophy and processes, and have implemented it accordingly. Specifically, only elementary schools (K-5) from the Clark County School District were included in this study. In addition, schools which were participating in any other reform programs, such as Success for All, were not included in this study.

The names of those schools meeting these criteria were obtained from Dr. Jane McCarthy, Professor of Education and Director of the Accelerated Schools Project at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

There were nine elementary schools which were participating in the Accelerated Schools Project. Of these schools, only five of them met the criteria for participating in this study. They were Daniel Goldfarb Elementary, Paradise Elementary, Helen Jydstrup Elementary, John S. Park Elementary, and Elaine Wynn Elementary.
**Instrumentation**

The purpose of this research was to describe the organizational culture and structure of accelerated schools. Instrumentation in education was searched to identify possible survey instruments which could be used to assess the organizational culture and structure of elementary schools. Two instruments were found. The first instrument, Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI), was developed by Steinhoff and Owens (1988) as an objective measure of organizational culture. The second instrument, the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ), was developed by Bishop and George (1973) for the purpose of measuring structural characteristics within elementary and secondary schools.

**Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory**

This inventory looked at the six dimensions that define the culture of a school: (a) the history of the organization; (b) values and beliefs of the organization; (c) myths and stories that explain the organization; (d) cultural norms of the organization; (e) traditions, rituals, and ceremonies; and (f) heroes and heroines of the organization (Lester & Bishop, 1997; Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). Using this taxonomic structure, respondents were asked to generate stories about their organization and then to summarize their stories by providing a metaphor for the school, the principal and the community. According to Rummel (1958), this open-end form is "characterized by the presence of a blank on which the respondent writes the information called for by the directions. This
open-end form may provide a verbal picture of how the respondent feels about a topic, what it means to him, and the background of his answer" (p. 90).

Initially, the OCAI was administered to several classes of graduate students. Subsequently, data representing the major themes identified in the initial analysis were collected from eight elementary schools. Steinhoff and Owens (1989) attempted to determine (1)" the degree to which a given faculty would respond in a consistent fashion to the OCAI, and (2) the relationship, if any, between the reputation of a school and the metaphors provided by the faculty" (p. 19). In the initial analysis of data, "four distinctive culture phenotypes were clearly describable and differentiated from one another in terms of the metaphorical language recognized by respondents as characteristic of the schools in which they work" (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989, p. 19). These phenotypes included the Family, Modern Times, The Cabaret, and The Little Shop of Horrors. The first phenotype is The Family where the principal was described as a parent (strong or weak), nurturer, friend, sibling or coach, and the school itself was referred to as the family, home, team, or womb (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). The second phenotype, Modern Times, described the principal's central role as providing regulation and maintaining order, and the schools were referred to as well-oiled machines, political machines, beehives of activity, or rusty machines (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). In The Cabaret, the third phenotype, the principal was seen as a master of ceremonies, a tightrope walker, and ringmaster, and the school was referred to as a circus, a Broadway show, a banquet, or a well-choreographed ballet (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). Finally, The Little Shop of
Horrors, described a principal who is a self-cleaning statue whose main function is to keep things smoothed-over, and the school was referred to as an unpredictable, tension-filled nightmare (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989).

**Validity of the OCAI**

McMillan and Schumacher (1997) defined the validity of qualitative designs as the degree to which the interpretations and concepts have mutual meanings between the participants and the researcher. The researcher and participants agree on the description (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Steinhoff and Owens (1989) initially administered the OCAI to several classes of graduate students. After several changes, data were collected from eight elementary schools representing the major themes identified in the initial analysis. Steinhoff and Owens (1989) attempted to determine the degree to which a given faculty would respond in a consistent fashion to the OCAI, and the relationship, if any, between the reputation of a school and the metaphors provided by the faculty. Steinhoff and Owens (1989) found that an analysis of the responses indicated that the instrument could invoke consistent patterns of institutional images.

**Structural Properties Questionnaire**

Bishop and George (1973) developed this questionnaire for the purpose of measuring structural properties. Organizational or bureaucratic structure was defined by Bishop and George (1973) as the "characteristics of the enduring, more or less permanent, patterns of the operation of an organization" (p. 67). They further defined structure as "the relations between different roles that have been created to achieve the purposes of the organization and define objectively
who can tell whom to do what" (p. 67). Furthermore, according to Bishop and George (1973), a prerequisite of structure includes the need to have policies, programs, standing orders, procedures and operating instructions which allow members of the organization to behave in a prescribed manner.

Since the project focused on a conceptual base for measuring structural characteristics of schools, Hage's organizational means (centralization, formalization, complexity, and stratification) served as the theoretical framework for developing the instrument (Bishop & George, 1973). Specifically, centralization measures the decision-making dimension including the power distribution within the organization (Bishop & George, 1973). This includes the extent or proportion of positions that participate in decision-making at the policy and work level, and the hierarchy of authority (Bishop & George, 1973). Formalization measures the degree of standardization and regulations (Bishop & George, 1973). Included are the extent or proportion of jobs that are codified and the degree of latitude of individual discretion allowed within a particular position or role (Bishop & George, 1973). Complexity is concerned with the level of specialization required including the number of occupational specialists, the level of professional training required, and the extensiveness of professional involvement and related activities (Bishop & George, 1973). Stratification is concerned with the division of labor within the organization and the concomitant status system (Bishop & George, 1973). Included are the rate of mobility between status levels, and the distribution of organizational rewards and status symbols (Bishop & George, 1973).
In the development of items for this questionnaire, Bishop and George (1973) created an item pool based upon the operational definition associated with each of the four structural properties. Each item was written so that they consistently represented the definition of the property to be measured and the educational setting (Bishop & George, 1973). This resulted in an item pool that contained 350 items that supposedly addressed each of the four structural properties. Five students of organizational theory served as independent judges (Bishop & George, 1973). Seventy (70) items survived the first screening process. Then, the SPQ was administered to 296 elementary school teachers from two contrasting public school systems (Bishop & George, 1973). One district was considered to be innovative and non-bureaucratic, and the other was recognized as traditional and highly bureaucratic (Bishop & George, 1973). These responses were subjected to a four-factor varimax rotational solution to determine whether the four measures of structural properties were factorially pure (Bishop & George, 1973). Those items receiving factor loadings of .40 or higher were identified as sufficient enough to measure the factor (Bishop & George, 1973).

The final instrument, a 58-item Likert-type questionnaire, identified the teacher's perception of three structural properties of the school's organization: centralization, formalization, and complexity. Likert scales are generally used for some kind of rating to assess opinions or attitudes (Orlich, 1978). The likert scale is usually constructed so that participants select one category that best describes their opinion or attitude towards the question (Orlich, 1978). The SPQ has a likert
scale ranging from 1 (rarely occurs) to 4 (very frequently occurs). This instrument
does not have a neutral position, therefore, requiring the respondent to provide a
clear dichotomous distinction.

There are 12 subscales which fall under the three structural properties
(see Table 4). The factor structure for the SPQ depicts the distribution of the
questions among the 12 factors.

Reliability and Validity of the SPQ

Bishop and George (1973) conducted several tests to determine the
psychometric properties of this instrument. McMillan and Schumacher (1997)
stated that reliability determines "the extent to which measures are free from
error" (p. 239). Reliability for the original sample was determined using the
Cronbach alpha coefficient. The Cronbach alpha coefficient is used to determine
internal consistency, and is generally used for survey research and other
questionnaires in which there is a range of possible answers for each of them
(McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). The score for the entire scale was 0.94, and
individual coefficients for the 12 subscales ranged from 0.74 to 0.85.

According to Gall et al. (1996), "Content validity refers to the degree to
which the scores yielded by a test adequately represent the content, or
conceptual domain, that these scores purport to measure" (p. 250). Colleagues
and content experts within the field are credible sources to determine if the
content that the questionnaire is assumed to represent is accurate with the
specific domain of the content (Gall et al., 1996). In order to establish content
validity. Bishop and George (1973) employed five students of organizational theory. All of the judges had to agree in order for an item to be retained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Property</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>Decision Making - Classroom Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making - Instruction and Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making with Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision with Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>General Rules for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rules for Teachers Lesson Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rules for Teachers Centers of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Professional Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latitude Provided by Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Specialization in Teaching Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997), "Criterion-related evidence indicates whether the scores on an instrument predict scores on a well-specified, predetermined criterion" (p. 236). Bishop and George conducted a criterion-related validity study by comparing two school districts (known-groups method). One of the districts was considered to be highly structured (bureaucratic), and the other significantly less structured. Comparisons of average responses of teachers on all 12 subscales indicated the ability of the test to discriminate without exception between the two types of organizational structures (Lester & Bishop, 1997).

**Procedure for Collecting Data**

In order to collect data relevant to the perceptions of accelerated schoolteachers regarding organizational culture and structure, specific steps were followed to ensure accuracy of the questionnaire/inventory research design.  
1. The principals of the selected schools were contacted prior to the administration of the instruments. The pre-contact included the identification of the researcher, the purpose of the study and the request for participation (Gall et al., 1996). 
2. The researcher attended a staff meeting at each of the selected schools where the purpose of the study and the request for participation was given. Due to the length of time needed to complete the instruments (approximately 40 minutes), teachers were given the option of completing it at that time or returning it to a designated staff member by a certain date. The agreement to participate,
questionnaire and inventory were coded to represent the school (letter) and the participant (number).

3. A follow-up cover letter and a second set of instruments were mailed directly to those teachers who had not returned the first set which was distributed at the staff meeting. The follow-up cover letter included the purpose of the study and the necessity of the respondent's contribution. A self-addressed label was provided so that the participant could return the instruments directly to the researcher.

**Analysis of Data**

The perceptions of accelerated schoolteachers regarding the organizational culture of their school were described and compared through qualitative data analysis. According to Marshall and Rossman (1995), "Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data; it builds grounded theory" (p. 111). Organizing the data involved careful reading and rereading of the data, thereby allowing the researcher to become familiar with the data and themes/categories began to emerge. The researcher then recorded available data, created retrievable field notes and/or reduced overwhelming data (Marshall and Rossman, 1995: Tesch, 1990).

The OCAI asked participants to generate stories that describe the history, the values, the stories, the behavioral norms, the rituals, and the heroes and heroines of their schools and identify the metaphors that describe the principal, the school, and the community. By analyzing these stories and metaphors for
themes, cultural patterns of the schools were described. Organized data was carefully analyzed to identify cultural domains, which are categories of cultural meaning that include smaller categories (Spradley, 1980). The cultural domains were further delineated using a taxonomic analysis in order to create a taxonomy depicting relationships within the domains (Spradley, 1980). Finally, a componential analysis was completed to systematically search for the attributes associated with the cultural domains (Spradley, 1980). As a result, cultural themes which were recurrent across a number of domains were identified (Spradley, 1980). The analysis of the metaphoric language resulted in descriptions of cultural phenotypes that were characteristic of the schools that the respondents worked in.

An analysis was undertaken to compare the variance within the accelerated schools' metaphors and the variance between the accelerated schools' metaphors and the metaphors identified in the original study. The cultural phenotypes and the stories generated to describe the history, values, stories, behavioral norms, rituals, and heroes and heroines were included in the descriptions of the accelerated schools singly and in general.

The perceptions of accelerated schoolteachers regarding the organizational structure of their school were described and compared through descriptive statistics. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997), "descriptive statistics transform a set of numbers or observations into indices that describe or characterize the data" (p. 203). It is used to summarize, organize and reduce large numbers of observations.
In order to accurately analyze the numerical data that has been collected, a system of organization was developed (Best, 1959). Frequency distributions were utilized to display the number of times each score was attained (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Subsequently, percentages, means, medians, modes and standard deviations were calculated for each of the subscales in the SPQ. The mean, median, and mode are three different measures of central tendency, a single numerical value that describes the average of an entire set of scores (Gall et al., 1996). The standard deviations measure the extent to which scores in a distribution deviate from their mean (Gall et al., 1996).

Due to the large number of variables in this research project, a factor analysis was conducted. According to Gall et al. (1996), "a factor analysis provides an empirical basis for reducing all these variables to a few factors by combining variables that are moderately or highly correlated to each other" (p. 447-448). A factor was formed from each set of variables that was combined. The factor analysis was used to determine whether the 12 subscales of the SPQ could be grouped into a smaller number of factors (Gall et al., 1996). In order to accomplish this analysis, a correlation matrix was computed to show the correlation between every possible pair of variables to be analyzed. Next, a search for clusters of variables that were all correlated with each other was identified as a factor. Each factor was then treated as a new variable.

Using the new variables, an analysis of variance was undertaken to compare the amount of between-groups variance in individual school scores on each of the new variables with the amount of within-groups variance (Gall et al.,
"If the ratio of between-groups variance to within-groups variance is sufficiently high, this indicates that there is more difference between the groups in their scores on a particular variable than there is within each group" (Gall et al., 1996, p. 392). Finally, a post hoc comparison was used to determine which school's means differed significantly from one another.

During the final step, the report of findings, the researcher shaped and formed the meaning of the raw data. For this study, the qualitative data (inventory) and the quantitative data (questionnaire) were used to portray the perceptions of accelerated schoolteachers regarding the organizational cultures and structures of their schools.

Significance of the Study

Since A Nation at Risk was released in 1983, schools have been under scrutiny. Today's call for reform essentially parallels the debate for educational reform that occurred during the beginning of the 1900's (Gelberg, 1997). Gelberg (1997) cites six common themes that were evident in both the current and past debates for educational reform: "fear of global competition, the breakdown of the family, an influx of new immigrants, rampant crime in the cities, corruption in government, and a generation of youth that seem ill-prepared to take its place as adults in society" (p. 2).

In addition, the participants of the reform movement are the same as in the past: business leaders, school administrators, teacher unions, government officials, and university professors (Gelberg, 1997). As in earlier times, business
leaders have criticized schools for being inefficient and for failing to prepare the youth to enter into the world of work (Gelberg, 1997). They continue to argue that schools must change to meet the needs of a changing economy (Gelberg, 1997). Gelberg (1997) has listed similarities in the role business has played in the present period of educational reform as well as the beginning of the century:

Criticism is leveled at the schools for failing to prepare children for their roles as future employees, business sponsors surveys aimed at revealing the failings in the existing system, publicity and the media are utilized to make the public see the need for educational change... business philanthropy gives support to examples of the preferred model of education, business leaders play an influential role in educational organizations sponsoring reform, and form alliances between themselves and school officials (p. 140).

Warren (1990) wrote that “educational reform has tended to arise from perceived failures of schools to serve certain social goals adequately” (p. 76). Several reform programs have been developed as a result of these concerns. Among them is the Accelerated Schools Project which was designed to develop more effective ways of serving at-risk youth (Murphy, 1991).

Through the Accelerated Schools Process, restructuring occurs by changing the culture and structure of the school. Hopfenberg (1990a, 1990b, 1991) contended that it is through a comprehensive approach such as the Accelerated Schools Project which reforms a school’s culture, attitudes, meaning and beliefs as well as its curriculum, instruction, and organization that long-term,
effective school change will occur. Finnan (1992), in her study, stated that “the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Projects is guided by a belief that interventions such as Accelerated Schools are essentially attempts to change existing school cultures” (p. 16). Finnan (1992) further stated that all schools have a unique school culture which includes a set of beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and behavior which are predictable and meaningful to the school community. Finnan and Levin (1998) asserted that the cultures of accelerated schools are quite different than the cultures of other at-risk schools.

According to Brunner and Hopfenberg (1992), there are a set of values, beliefs, and attitudes underlying the accelerated principles and practices which help create the culture for accelerated school change. The three principles (unity of purpose, empowerment coupled with responsibility, and building on strengths); the central values (equity, participation, communication, collaboration, community, reflection, experimentation, trust, risk-taking, and the school as the center of expertise); and the theory about what creates powerful learning comprise the philosophy or culture of the accelerated school (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). The structure of accelerated schools is comprised of the process of taking stock, forging a shared vision, setting priorities, creating governance structures, and implementing the Inquiry Process (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). The involvement of the staff, students and community determine how each of these components fit the needs of each school.

This study described the organizational culture and structure of five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District. The results of this study
provided additional understanding regarding the impact of implementing the Accelerated Schools Process in elementary schools.

Limitations

Data was collected through surveys from teachers in selected accelerated schools in the Clark County School District.

The scope of this study was limited by the willingness of teachers to respond at all or in a timely manner.

Not all accelerated schools had the same number of years as participants in the Accelerated Schools Project. Respondents may have had a variety of years experience in accelerated schools. Changes in administration may have impacted the responses of the teachers who had been at an accelerated school.

Summary

The research for the proposed study was conducted by using both qualitative and quantitative analysis. This study determined the affect the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Process had on the organizational culture and properties of the selected accelerated elementary schools. The Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory and the Structural Properties Questionnaire were the instruments used to measure these two dimensions.

As a reform program, further research is necessary in order to determine the effectiveness of the Accelerated Schools Process. The organizational culture and structure are only two dimensions in a multi-faceted program. This study
provided educators with data to assist in the understanding of the impact of the Accelerated Schools Process on elementary schools in the Clark County School District.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

As the result of the school reform efforts following A Nation at Risk, many reform programs have been developed. One such reform program is the Accelerated Schools Project which was begun by Henry Levin at Stanford University in the 1980's. This project was developed in an effort to address the needs of at-risk students and focused on attempting to raise the achievement level of students through enriched curricula and instructional programs so that at-risk students perform at grade level by the end of the sixth grade (Guthrie & Hale, 1990; Hopfenberg et al., 1990a, 1990b; Levin, 1988a, 1988b, 1991a, 1993; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991; McCarthy, 1992; McCarthy & Levin, 1992; McCarthy & Still, 1993; McCollum, 1994; “What are Accelerated Schools,” 1991).

Through the Accelerated Schools Process, reform occurs by changing the culture and structure of the school. Hopfenberg (1990a, 1990b, 1991) contended that it is through a comprehensive approach such as the Accelerated Schools Project which reforms a school's culture, attitudes, meaning and beliefs as well as its curriculum, instruction, and organization that long-term, effective school
change will occur. Finnan (1992), in her study, found that "the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Projects is guided by a belief that interventions such as Accelerated Schools are essentially attempts to change existing school cultures" (p. 16). Finnan (1992) further stated that all schools have a unique school culture which includes a set of beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and behavior which are predictable and meaningful to the school community. Finnan and Levin (1998) asserted that the cultures of accelerated schools are quite different than the cultures of other at-risk schools.

According to Brunner and Hopfenberg (1992), there are a set of values, beliefs, and attitudes underlying the accelerated principles and practices which help create the culture for accelerated school reform. The three principles (unity of purpose, empowerment coupled with responsibility, and building on strengths); the central values (equity, participation, communication, collaboration, community, reflection, experimentation, trust, risk-taking, and the school as the center of expertise); and the theory about what creates powerful learning comprise the philosophy or culture of the accelerated school (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). The structure of accelerated schools is comprised of the process of taking stock, forging a shared vision, setting priorities, creating governance structures, and implementing the Inquiry Process (Brunner & Hopfenberg, 1992). The involvement of the staff, students and community determine how each of these components fit the needs of individual schools.

Hence, the purpose of this study was to describe the organizational culture and structure of selected accelerated elementary schools. Survey data
were collected from the teaching staffs at five elementary schools (K-5) in the Clark County School District which have participated in the Accelerated Schools Project for a minimum of three years. Both qualitative statistics derived from the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI) and quantitative statistics derived from the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ) were used to measure the organizational culture and structure of these schools.

Method

The teachers from the five selected accelerated schools responded to two instruments which provided information regarding the affect the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Process had on the culture and structure of elementary schools. The first instrument, Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI), provided a measure of organizational culture. The information provided by the participants in the stories and metaphors were analyzed using domain analysis as developed by Spradley (1980). The analysis of the stories resulted in cultural themes which were recurrent across the identified domains (history, values, stories, behavioral norms, rituals, and heroes/heroines). The analysis of the metaphoric language resulted in descriptions of cultural phenotypes that were characteristic of each of the five schools. The identified cultural themes from the stories were further analyzed to show support for the individual phenotypes. The five phenotypes and their supporting statements were then analyzed to determine if there were any recurrent themes among the five schools.
The second instrument, the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ), measured structural characteristics within schools using a four point Likert scale. The data provided by this instrument was analyzed first using a factor analysis in order to determine whether the 12 subscales of the SPQ could be grouped into a smaller number of factors. A correlation matrix was computed and clusters of variables that were correlated were identified as new variables. These new variables were used in an analysis of variance which compared the amount of between-group variance in individual school scores with the amount of within-group variance. Finally, a post hoc comparison was conducted to determine which school's means differed significantly from one another.

Description of the Sample

Each subject surveyed was a teacher in one of the five selected accelerated schools. In order to collect data relevant to the perceptions of accelerated schoolteachers regarding organizational culture and structure, the principals of the selected schools were contacted prior to the administration of the instruments. The administrators were given copies of the instruments, and a date was scheduled for the administering of the instruments to the staff. The purpose of the study and the request for participation was provided to the teaching staff during a scheduled staff meeting. Due to the length of time needed to complete the instruments, teachers were given the option of returning the instruments at a later date. Due to the extended time needed to complete the instruments, the participating teachers were cautioned not to collaborate. A
follow-up letter and a second set of instruments were mailed directly to those
teachers who had not returned the first set of instruments.

This study surveyed a sample of 277 teachers from the five selected
accelerated schools. Of the instruments given to the teachers, and after a
second mailing, a total of 97 usable responses were received resulting in a
response rate of 35%. The following number of teachers responded from each of
the schools: School A – 22 responses out of 47 (47%); School B - 13 responses
out of 58 (22%); School C – 19 responses out of 58 (33%); School D – 25
responses out of 56 (45%); and School D – 18 responses out of 58 (31%).

The first section of the OCAI provided demographic and descriptive
information from each respondent which included (a) professional position, (b)
gender, (c) number of years completed as a professional educator, and (d)
number of years completed working in present school. Table 5 shows the
demographic information relating to the respondents of each of the five schools.

Specifically, contained in Table 5 were the professional positions the
respondents held at their respective schools: grade level teachers such as first
grade teachers, and specialists such as art, music, or physical education
teachers; the gender of the respondents: female or male; the mean number of
years the respondents completed as a professional educator; and the mean
number of years completed working in the present school.

As shown on Table 5, Demographic and Descriptive Information, the
majority of the respondents were grade level teachers (66%) and female (82%).
The mean years of teaching ranged from 6.67 to 17.71 years with a total mean
of 10.71 years, and the mean number of years teaching at their present school ranged from 2.71 to 6.06 with a total mean of 3.77 years.

Table 5. Demographic and Descriptive Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Years of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching at School</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of Findings

As indicated previously, the purpose of this study was to describe the organizational culture and structure of five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District. In order to accomplish this, two instruments, the OCAI and the SPQ, were used to gather the data needed to answer the research questions posed by this researcher. In this section, each of the six research questions is addressed using descriptive and inferential statistics as well as ethnography as appropriate.

Findings for Research Question 1

What are the organizational cultures of accelerated schools?

The analysis of the data produced descriptions of cultural phenotypes for each of the five accelerated schools. The descriptions were expressed using metaphors recognized by the teachers as characteristic of the schools in which they worked. Each school is described below in terms of their metaphorical content and narrative descriptions.

The cultural phenotype which described School A was a small town haven. Specifically, the school was described to be a happy, safe home and community with a balance between work and play. Metaphors and explanations from the inventory supported the small town haven phenotype in that the school was described as being a happy, warm place; a Modern Day Brady Bunch that is bright, cheerful, happy-go-lucky; Disneyland that is fun, innovative and exciting; a school from heaven; a shelter or a safe place; and home away from home where they feel comfortable, loved, and needed. The values and beliefs statements
reflected a positive, safe, caring, welcoming school. The heroes and heroine statement referred to a safe and loving environment.

The principal in School A was described as a devoted leader, a role model, gentle and kind, and an effective manager. The metaphors and explanations described the principal as being a house mom who is helpful and runs the house; a saint who never loses her temper; gentle, kind, and loving; a mother who takes care of everything; and a caring, highly qualified person who is always out for best interest of the students. The stories referred to the principal promoting educational values and being caring, fair and kind. The heroes and heroine statements reflected a principal as a leader who treats others kindly and who is willing to do what is needed.

The teachers from School A were described as gifted, hard working, dedicated team players. The teachers were portrayed in the metaphors and explanations as overachievers who are constantly improving, participate in high levels of staff development and spend extra time at school; team players with everyone being involved; and a member or part of a family. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school also spoke of the school-wide training of the staff. The values and beliefs statements, the stories and expectations referred to the teamwork. The descriptions written about the expectations also spoke of the teachers doing their best.

In School A, the students were described as respectful as well as worthy of respect, receptive, and unique. The metaphors and explanations depicted the students as respectful by following the expectations; receptive by
reflecting the wonderful environment; a sponge that soaks up knowledge; a
neighbor since there are no buses; a seashell that is unique in beauty and
characteristics; and a child that needs to be respected. In the values and beliefs
statements, the stories, and the expectations, students were portrayed as being
respectful.

School A’s community was described as involved and supportive. In
the metaphors and explanations, the community was described as being a small
town where everyone knows one another and looks out for one another; a
square on a quilt; a safe haven with an ideal school, the community at their
fingertips and parents encouraged to be involved; a picket fence, lawn mower
neighborhood where houses are small, but there is lots of pride and they are
clean and neat; and a garden in that it is a pleasant, nice area. The narrative
descriptions written about the history of the school spoke of the parent
participation in activities. In addition, the stories referred to the community being
supportive.

The cultural phenotype which described School B was an under-nurtured
garden. Specifically, the school was described as uncertain and diverse.
Metaphors and explanations from the inventory supported the under-nurtured
garden phenotype in that the school was described as a garden where students
are the plants and flowers that need tending; a bomb ready to explode because
teachers are miserable; a dysfunctional family that is not close but gets the job
done; and a lightning storm that you never know when it is going to strike, but its
deadly. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school
reflected the diverse population, the changing demographics, and the school being one of the oldest in the district.

The principal in School B was described as an authoritarian, ruler, and manager of things. The metaphors and explanations described the principal as the captain of the ship where the rules are fair and just but he's the authority; a little man with a Napoleon complex; an egotist whose decisions are motivated by self-aggrandizement; and a banty rooster who struts around stating how great things are yet morale is low. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school depicted the principal as a dictator, the purchase of copiers, a cleaner school, and not being as focused on tests. The values and beliefs statements stated that the principal adheres to the letter of the law, whatever you do must be okayed by the principal, listen to what you are told to do and do it, and morale is low.

The teachers from School B were described as hard working, dedicated and unappreciated. The teachers were portrayed in the metaphors and explanations as caretakers dedicated to teaching children; a gardener who tends the garden with great care; and a ladybug climbing a slippery mountain and for every two steps forward, you get knocked back three. The value and belief statements spoke of the teachers caring about the learning of students, students being first, and all students being able to achieve. The stories and expectations referred to the professional behavior of the teachers, and the teachers doing their jobs.
In School B, the students were described as hungry, eager and special. The metaphors and explanations depicted the students as a frog on a lily pad waiting for a fly because they are hungry for food, clothes, love and education; a budding flower just starting their lives and teachers are tending to their growth; and a victim of circumstance that is tossed around from schools and homes.

School B's community was described as having quiet courage, being hopeful, and in need of tending. In the metaphors and explanations, the community was described as a once prosperous area that is now going down in value; a rose bed needing tending in that some homes/families are in full bloom, some are in disrepair needing tending, and some wilting needing water and attention; an unkempt garden, a lower income area with good, caring people; and a whale with quiet courage.

The cultural phenotype which described School C was an express train. Specifically, the school was described as stormy, changing, and with unbending rules. Metaphors and explanations from the inventory supported the express train phenotype in that the school was described as a study in motion because they are expecting a mass exodus of teachers; a storm waiting for the dust to settle because of all the changes coming fast; a fast moving train with new people boarding and disembarking; in the flux of change with a new principal; a machine that moves to stated tolerances with no variances; an army camp with everything by the book; and a finely tuned machine with all the parts working together successfully. The stories referred to things being up in the air.
The principal in School C was described as fair, but unpredictable authoritarian. The metaphors and explanations described the principal as a task master with a school to run; an engineer that is the driving force; by the book following strictly the policies and procedures; unbiased whereby everyone is treated equally and fairly; a time bomb that may blow at anytime; Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde with extreme mood swings and never knowing what to expect; and on the edge in that she has to have a problem to solve to feel important. The stories referred to not making the principal mad, the principal not backing the teachers, and kissing up to the principal. The narrative descriptions written about the expectations and values and beliefs spoke of following the rules and regulations.

The teachers from School C were described as young, uncertain team players. The teachers were portrayed in the metaphors and explanations as a team player working together; just out of the cradle in that they are young; ready to fly the coop because they are having a problem adjusting to the new person in charge; and a conductor walking up and down the aisles monitoring passengers. The importance of teamwork was mentioned in the history of the school, the expectations, and the heroes and heroine statements. The stories also referred to teachers needing to keep their nose clean, not complaining and keeping your opinion to yourself.

In School C, the students were described as eager to learn, diverse, and transient. The metaphors and explanations depicted the students as rolling stones that keep moving in and out; movers that move schools 2 to 3 times in one year; a sponge that soaks up what is going on; and an eager beaver really
wanting to learn. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school reflected the transient population.

School C's community was described as transient, but helpful when asked. In the metaphors and explanations, the community was described as a train station where passengers get on and off; an airport terminal where planes come and go, but don't stay long; and a very healthy cash crop that has a desire to give a great deal when asked and used.

The cultural phenotype which described School D was a beehive. Specifically, the school was described as fun, active, hard working and diverse. Metaphors and explanations from the inventory supported the beehive phenotype in that the school was described as an active, fun, learning place with many activities and projects as well as life skills and information for students; a beehive of activity where everyone is busy; a happy place to work; home away from home; a garden with students growing everyday; and a zoo with different animals with different problems. The stories referred to always celebrating and eating.

The principal in School D was described as caring, approachable, positive, supportive, and student-centered. The metaphors and explanations described the principal as a children's nurse who is approachable, student-centered, and caring; a jewel who is fair, positive and supportive; a bumble bee who is well structured, professional and hard working; a mentor who is always available for help, suggestions, and resources; and an Energizer bunny who works hard and keeps going. The narrative descriptions written about the history...
of the school spoke of the principal as being a positive person who deeply cares about education; a new look at determining who students truly are and how this guides/drives instruction; a principal who believes in teaching through character education to promote appropriate behavior; and a commonality of goals for the good of the students. The value and beliefs statements stated that the principal is positive and proactive, provides training and materials, and makes the teachers feel important. In addition, the heroes and heroine statements expressed that the principal was very approachable.

The teachers from School D were described as hard working, dedicated, enthusiastic, and diverse. The teachers were portrayed in the metaphors and explanations as stars that work so hard they shine; a clown who is cheery, enthusiastic, creative, and jumps through hoops for students; an excellent facilitator of learning, but no two are alike; and a hot rod that is ready to rev, get on the move and strong. The values and beliefs statements stated that teachers were involved in the school; teachers do their job and take it seriously; teachers put great effort into lessons and classrooms; teachers are here to make a difference in students; all children can succeed/learn; the results are worth the extra effort. The stories referred to the many meetings; a warm, caring staff; and always having someone there to lift you up with a joke, hugs or a card. The narrative descriptions written about the expectations of the school spoke of the many extra-curricular activities; teachers participating enthusiastically; active learning; and the value and respect of exciting learning.
In School D, the students were described as diverse, needy, transient, happy, loving, and having potential. The metaphors and explanations depicted the students as shooting stars that blaze past you so fast, but you wish so much on them; empty wagons that have not had enough experiences/learning before coming to kindergarten; an abandoned cub that receives little support from parent/community; and unique in that all are different.

School D’s community was described as opposites, diverse, alive, and changing. In the metaphors and explanations, the community was described as Beauty and the Beast in that expensive homes are next to apartments; a study in opposites with custom homes and government subsidized apartments; diversified with many cultures, beliefs, home lives, and ideas; a jungle, an environment that is wild and unpredictable, but growing and changing; and a needy one with people hungry for whatever they can get. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school spoke of a large apartment area; the students from the custom homes enrolling elsewhere; changes in the family educational level; and the community being a warm, inviting place.

The cultural phenotype which described School E was a research vessel. Specifically, the school was described as diverse, busy, teamwork, and a fish bowl. Metaphors and explanations from the inventory supported the research vessel phenotype in that the school was described as a cruise ship that needs many people to run it; a tossed salad with students, teachers, university professors and administrators providing tastes to the palette; a stew being stirred with many programs, adults, and teachers being mixed together; an orchestra
where teamwork and goal setting is in continual drive to meet every student; a fish bowl with everyone watching and looking; and a carnival where something is always going on. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school spoke of the Professional Development School; the at-risk population; the large English Language Learner population; and the diverse population. The stories referred to hard work being the norm, but also play; the high pressure due to the university link; the challenges and rewards of dignitary visits; piloting new programs; and testing theories and strategies. The narrative descriptions written about the expectations of the school spoke of teamwork and working hard.

The principal in School E was described as a visionary, articulate, positive salesperson. The metaphors and explanations described the principal as a captain that guides the ship toward the mission (destination); a visionary with concrete goals; a public relations wizard that keeps calm and cool, and articulates well regardless of whom the audience is; and a gracious hostess who greets many visitors and explains how the school works.

The teachers from School E were described as hardworking, talented, energetic, and nurturing. The teachers were portrayed in the metaphors and explanations as workaholics because extra time is asked of teachers above and beyond most schools - they work hard, give their all and do their best; an Energizer bunny that has a lot of energy; a wizard who is very talented; shipmates who work together for a smooth trip; a compass that points children in the right direction; and a gardener who has a nurturing disposition. The narrative descriptions written about the history of the school spoke of the teaching
expertise; the additional meetings and responsibilities; lunchtime collaboratives; study groups; pod sharing; and a lot of work. The values and beliefs statements stated that all students can learn; importance of meeting students' needs; concentrating on student's strengths; ensuring every child is successful; the rigorous, accepting program; and ensuring the future of the culture is intact. The narrative descriptions written about the expectations of the school spoke of being a model teacher, and helping others. The heroes and heroine statements referred to working hard; teaching district classes and workshops; relating and caring; and being a master teacher.

In School E, the students were described as being resilient and resourceful, and having potential. The metaphors and explanations depicted the students as a flower bursting with color and life; a dynamo bursting with potential; a bundle of life because they have had many life experiences which make them tough and able to survive; disadvantaged and extremely resourceful in that they pull emotional resources from unpredictable places; and a guest on a ship whose needs must be met.

School E's community was described as a transient, unique, diverse culture. In the metaphors and explanations, the community was described as a melting pot with a diverse population, many languages, and many countries represented; a polyglot where many languages are spoken, many life styles present, many beliefs, and kids with and without parents; a revolving door where people move all the time; and one of a kind since they can see the casinos on the LV strip from the playground.
Findings for Research Question 2

What are the structural properties of accelerated schools?

The Structural Properties Questionnaire was administered to 97 teachers at five different accelerated schools to determine their perceptions of the organizational structure of their school. The questionnaire, a 58-item Likert-type questionnaire, identified the teacher’s perception of three structural properties of the school’s organization: centralization, formalization, and complexity. The SPQ has a four point Likert scale with the response patterns for items 1-10 as follows: 1.) teachers; 2.) department chairmen; 3.) consultants or specialists; 4) administrators, and the response patterns for items 11-58: 1.) rarely occurs; 2.) sometimes occurs; 3.) often occurs; 4.) very frequently occurs.

A four-step process was used to perform the factor analysis. First, a correlation matrix for all variables was computed (See Appendix C).

Next, a factor extraction was conducted using the Principal Components Analysis (PCA), which provided estimates of the initial factors by calculating the linear combinations of the 58 variables. As a result of the factor extraction, eighteen factors were identified which captured 73.9% of the variability (See Appendix C).

The third step involved using a Maximum Likelihood Extraction Method along with a factor rotation involving multiple iterations of the Varimax Rotation Method in order to simplify the factors. Using 9 iterations, the 18 factors were reduced to 6 factors. The Maximum Likelihood Analysis created a factor matrix which showed the relationship between each variable and the percentages
amount of the total variance which is accounted for by each of the six identified factors (See Appendix C).

Only those items receiving factor loadings of .40 or higher were identified as being sufficiently representative of a measure of the factor. The Maximum Likelihood Analysis computed the Final Statistics showing the factor statistics after the six factors had been extracted as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Maximum Likelihood Analysis – Final Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.131</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.522</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.463</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.295</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first factor accounts for the largest amount of variance (9.3%). The second factor accounts for the next largest amount of variance (7.6%) and is uncorrelated to the first. The remaining factors show smaller amounts of the total sample variance.

A reliability analysis was conducted using the Alpha coefficient which is the most commonly used reliability estimate, and is often used with Likert-type
scaled instruments. The Alpha coefficient is a test of the "internal consistency of the items in the scale or the degree to which a scale score for each respondent represents either true measurement of measurement error" (Lester & Bishop, 2000, p. 24). A reliability analysis was conducted with each of the six factors using the standardized item alpha procedure (See Table 7). Factor 1 originally resulted in a standardized item alpha of .69. However, when SPQ 12 (.77) and SPQ 54 (.78) were excluded from the reliability analysis, the standardized item alpha became .87. Factor 2 had a standardized item alpha of .79, and all items appeared to be reliable. Factor 3 initially produced a standardized item alpha of .20, which indicated that the items were not consistent. After further analysis, it was determined that there were two factors occupying the same factor. After running the items separately, Variables 43, 44, 49, 50 produced a standardized item alpha of .72 and Variables 4, 7, 9, and 10 produced a standardized item alpha of .69. An analysis of Factor 4 provided a standardized item alpha of .88, and all items appeared to be reliable. Factor 5 had a standardized item alpha of .76, and Factor 6 had a standardized item alpha of .68.

Due to the refactoring of Factor 3, the scores do not represent beta weighted scores, but instead reflect mean scores. In addition, Factor 3 was separated out to be Factor 6 and Factor 7 with the other factor numbers being adjusted accordingly.
Table 7. Cronbach Alpha Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Standardized Item Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Factors 6 and 7 are calculated using means.

In the final step of the factor analysis procedure, names for each of the factors were chosen based on the content of the questions. Therefore, the names chosen for Factor 1 was Supervision with Hierarchy, with a computed SUPWH-score; Factor 2 was General Rules for Teachers, with a computed RULESTG-score; Factor 3 was Professional Training, with a computed PROFTR-score; Factor 4 was Decision Making with Hierarchy, with a computed DECMKH-score; Factor 5 was General Professional Latitude, with a computed PROFLATG-score; Factor 6 was Decision Making, Classroom Teacher, with a computed DMCT-score; and Factor 7 was Professional Latitude Provided by Principal, with a computed PROLATP-score. The calculated means and standard deviations are shown in Table 8.
Table 8. Factor Score Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPWH</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULESTG</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFTR</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECMKH</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFLATG</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCT*</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROLATP*</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean and standard deviation for DMCT and PROLATP are calculated using mean scores.

The three structural properties, centralization, formalization, and complexity, were represented in the seven factors. The following Tables (9, 10, and 11) provide a list of the original items, the factor loading for each variable, and the communalities for each variable \((H^2)\). In Table 9, the Varimax Rotated Factor Structure for the Centralization Factors included the following factors: Decision Making – Classroom Teacher, Decision Making with Hierarchy, and Supervision with Hierarchy. The items for Decision Making – Classroom Teacher identified how much influence the administrators and teachers had in decisions made at their school. The items for Decision Making with Hierarchy identified how often non-routine decisions must be referred to someone higher up for a
The items for Supervision with Hierarchy identified how often supervision was provided to determine if teachers were following the rules.

Table 9. Varimax Rotated Factor Structure for Centralization Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Name and Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making, Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.685</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.633</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.537</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence in decisions about textbooks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.479</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence in decisions about hiring new staff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making with Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.845</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Vice-principals and department chairmen in your district must refer most non-routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.736</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Principals in your district must refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for a final O.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.556</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Teachers in your district must refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for a final O.K.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues.
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### Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Name and Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.669</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>There can be little action taken here until a superior approves a decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.668</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.623</td>
<td>52.</td>
<td>The teachers are constantly being checked on for rule violation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.581</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>People here feel as though they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all the rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence in decisions about the instructional program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.465</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Teachers are required to go through channels (chain of command).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.410</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Who has the greatest influence in decisions about curricular offerings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the response patterns for items 1-10 are as follows: 1.) teachers; 2.) department chairmen; 3.) consultants or specialists; 4.) administrators. The response patterns for items 11-58 are 1.) rarely occurs; 2.) sometimes occurs; 3.) often occurs; 4.) very frequently occur.

In Table 10, the Varimax Rotated Factor Structure for the Formalization Factors included the following factors: General Rules for Teachers, General Professional Latitude, and Professional Latitude Provided by Principal.
The items for General Rules for Teachers identified how often rules and procedures were followed within the school. The items for General Professional Latitude identified how often teachers were allowed to make their own decisions. The items for Professional Latitude Provided by Principal identified how often the principal was willing to bypass regulations to help teachers and students.

In Table 11, the Varimax Rotated Factor Structure for the Complexity Factors included Professional Training which identified how often academic degrees were considered when recruiting and promoting instructional and administrative staff.

Table 10. Varimax Rotated Factor Structure for Formalization Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Name and Items</th>
<th>$H^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Rules for Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.728</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Rules and regulations are uniformly applied.</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.707</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>At this school, procedures for disciplining students is well defined.</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.633</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Responsibilities and lines of authority within the formal chain of command are well defined.</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.590</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Uniform grading procedures are required.</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.504</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Teachers are evaluated according to a formalized procedure.</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.491</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Teachers are required to follow suggested instructional sequences and unit plans as closely as possible.</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Name and Items</th>
<th>H²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.488</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The administration adheres to established rules and regulations in dealing with the teaching staff.</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.452</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Rules and regulations govern teacher decisions and outcomes.</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Professional Latitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.669</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Most people here make their own rules on the job.</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.589</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>People here are allowed to do almost as they please.</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional Latitude Provided by Principal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.567</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>The principal is willing to by-pass regulations to help teachers.</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>The principal is willing to by-pass regulations to help students.</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.402</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>A person can make his own decisions without checking with anybody else.</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.480</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>How things are done here are left up to the person doing the work.</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Varimax Rotated Factor Structure for Complexity Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor Name and Items</th>
<th>( H^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.910</td>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Academic degrees are an important consideration in recruiting of instructional staff.</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.821</td>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Academic degrees are an important consideration in recruiting of administrative staff.</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.666</td>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Advanced degrees are an important consideration in promotion.</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings for Research Question 3

What are the patterns in the organizational cultures of accelerated schools?

Using the descriptions of the school, principal, teacher, student, and community from the metaphors and explanations on the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory, similarities and differences were found among the five participating schools.

The most frequently identified description was diverse which was used 7 different times. This description was used in all of the schools except for School A. This description was used for Schools B, D, and E under the category school; Schools C and D under the category student; and Schools D and E
under the category community. Only School D used diverse as the description under three categories: school, student and community.

The second most commonly identified description was hard working which was found in four of the five schools. In Schools A, B, D, and E the description hard working was used to identify the teacher. School D also identified hard working under the category school. Only School C did not identify their teachers or school as hard working.

The third most commonly identified description was dedicated which was found in three of the five schools. Dedicated was used to describe the teachers in Schools A, B, and D. School A also identified the word devoted to describe the principal.

The fourth most commonly identified description was transient which was found in three out of the five schools. Transient was used to describe the student in Schools C and D, and the community in Schools C and E.

Other combinations of descriptions were identified in the analysis of the schools. In Schools C, D, and E, diverse and transient were identified in the description of the overall school. In Schools A, B, and E, hardworking and unique were identified in the description of the overall school. In Schools B, D, and E, diverse and hardworking were identified in the description of the overall school. Schools D and E have six common descriptions: diverse, hard working, transient, positive, enthusiastic/energetic, and potential. Schools A and D have five common descriptions: hard working, dedicated, happy/fun, gentle/kind/caring, and supportive. Schools A and E have four common descriptions: hard working,
team player/teamwork, unique, and gifted/talented. Schools B and C have four common descriptions: diverse, uncertain, authoritarian, and eager. Schools B and D have four common descriptions: diverse, hard working, dedicated, and hungry/needy.

Positive descriptions were identified for all of the schools in the category of students and community. The students were described as being receptive and unique (School A); eager and special (School B); eager to learn (School C); happy, loving and having potential (School D); and resilient, resourceful and having potential (School E). The community was described as being involved and supportive (School A); hopeful and having quiet courage (School B); helpful when asked (School C); alive (School D); and unique (School E).

Several differences were observed among the descriptions of the five schools. The schools in Schools A, D, and E were described as being happy and safe (School A); fun and active (School D) and busy (School E); whereas, School B and C were described as being uncertain (School B) and stormy and changing (School C). The principal in Schools A, D, and E were described as being effective, gentle and kind (School A), caring, positive, and supportive (School D), and visionary and positive (School E). In contrast, the principal in Schools B and C were described as being an authoritarian and ruler (School B), and an unpredictable authoritarian (School C). The teachers in Schools A, B, D, and E were described as being hard working (Schools A, B, D, E) and dedicated (Schools A, B, D). School C described teachers as being uncertain and young.
Findings for Research Question 4

What are the patterns in the structural properties of accelerated schools?

An analysis of variance was undertaken to compare the means of each factor across the five schools. These calculations produced an F-ratio and Significance value which indicates whether the schools are significantly related to each of the extracted factors shown in Table 12.

Finally, to determine where there was a significant difference between the schools, a Post Hoc test, with a Scheffe option, was conducted. Four out of the seven factors, Supervision with Hierarchy, General Rules for Teachers, Decision Making – Classroom Teachers and Professional Latitude Provided by Principal, produced a significant F ratio (p ≥ .05). The F ratio for Supervision with Hierarchy was statistically significant at 8.993. Statistical significance existed between Schools A and B (.011), Schools A and C (.004), Schools B and D (.006), Schools B and E (.016), Schools C and D (.002), and Schools C and E (.008).

The F ratio for General Rules for Teachers was statistically significant at 7.584. Statistical significance existed between Schools A and E (.000), Schools B and E (.045), Schools C and E (.005), and Schools D and E (.037).

The F ratio for Decision Making – Classroom Teachers was statistically significant at 3.261, and the F ratio for Professional Latitude Provided by Principal was statistically significant at 2.656. However, there was no meaningful difference between any pair of means. Table 13 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for all of the factors according to individual schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1 – Supervision with Hierarchy</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.480</td>
<td>5.870</td>
<td>8.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>60.054</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2 – General Rules for Teachers</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.772</td>
<td>5.193</td>
<td>7.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62.993</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>83.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3 – Professional Training</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.883</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>78.153</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4 – Decision Making with Hierarchy</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83.074</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5 – General Professional Latitude</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>D.F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.785</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>1.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69.461</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
Table 12. (continued)

Factor 6 — Decision Making-Classroom Teacher*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>118.298</td>
<td>29.575</td>
<td>3.261</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>797.981</td>
<td>.9068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>916.280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 7 — Professional Latitude Provided by Principal*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54.761</td>
<td>13.690</td>
<td>2.656</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>371.057</td>
<td>5.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>425.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note. Factors 6 and 7 were calculated using mean scores.
An analysis of the means for each factor provides further information regarding the teachers' perceptions of the structural properties for their respective schools. Under Decision Making – Classroom Teacher, the means, which were calculated using mean scores, ranged from 11.87 in School E to 14.58 in School C indicating that administrators had a great deal of influence when making decisions about the school.

Table 13. Means and Standards Scores for All Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School ID</th>
<th>DMCT *</th>
<th>DEC MKH</th>
<th>SUP WH</th>
<th>RULES TG</th>
<th>PROF LATG</th>
<th>PROF LATP*</th>
<th>PROF TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. DMCT and PROLATP were calculated using mean scores.

Under Decision Making with Hierarchy, the means ranged from -.16 in School B to .31 in School D indicating that the teachers in School B felt that non-
routine decisions must be referred to someone higher up less often than in School D. Although not significant, School B’s mean (.31) reflected a noteworthy difference from the other schools, with Schools A and C being the next closest with a mean of -.01. Thus, the teachers in School B felt that there was much more hierarchy in their school than the other four schools.

Under Supervision with Hierarchy, the means ranged from -.36 in School D to .72 in School B indicating that the teachers in School D felt that supervision was provided to determine if teachers were following the rules less often than in School B. The means for Schools A (-.33), D (-.36), and E (-.33) were consistent indicating less hierarchy in these than in Schools B (.72) and C (.69).

Under General Rules for Teachers, the means ranged from -.87 in School E to .52 in School A indicating that the teachers felt that rules and procedures were followed more often in School E than in School A.

Under General Professional Latitude, the means ranged from -.34 in School C to .23 in School A indicating that the teachers felt they were allowed to make their own decisions less often at School C than at School A.

Under Professional Latitude Provided by Principal, the means, which were calculated using mean scores, ranged from 7.63 in School B to 9.53 in School A indicating that the teachers in School B felt that the principal was willing to by-pass regulations to help teacher and students less often than School A. The means for Schools A (9.53), D (9.16), and E (8.64) were consistent indicating more professional latitude in these schools.
Under Professional Training, the means ranged from -.23 in School A to .25 in School D indicating that the teachers in School A felt that academic degrees were considered when recruiting and promoting instructional and administrative staff less often than School D.

An analysis of the individual questions identified under Decision Making - Classroom Teacher shows similarities in the perceptions of the teachers at the five schools. Responses from all of the schools showed that administrators had the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new programs (Question 10), adoption of new policies (Question 9), and hiring new staff (Question 7). All five schools responded to Question 4 indicating that both the teachers and administrators having the greatest influence in decisions about textbooks.

An analysis of the individual questions identified under Decision Making with Hierarchy shows similarities and differences in the perceptions of the teachers at the five schools. Question 18 responses for all the schools showed a range of responses evenly distributed between sometimes, often and very frequently occurring in regards to vice-principals and department chairmen in their district referring most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K. Teachers from Schools A, B, and E felt that most principals in their district must often refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K. (Question 17); and teachers from School C and D felt this sometimes happened. In a similar question (Question 13), regarding teachers referring most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K., responses from
Schools B, C, and D indicated that this often or very frequently occurred; responses from School A indicated that this sometimes or very frequently occurred; and responses from School E indicated this often occurred.

An analysis of the individual questions identified under Supervision with Hierarchy shows differences in the perceptions of the teachers from Schools A, D, and E, and Schools B and C. The responses from Question 20 indicated that the teachers in Schools A, D, and E felt that they were rarely or sometimes discouraged from making their own decisions, whereas, teachers from Schools B and C felt they were sometimes or often discouraged from making their own decision. According to the responses from Question 22, teachers from Schools A, D, and E felt that the decisions that they make rarely or sometimes had to have their superior's approval, whereas, teachers from Schools B and C sometimes or often had to have their superior's approval for the decisions that they make. Teachers from Schools A, D, and E felt that sometimes little action can be taken until a superior approves a decision, whereas, Schools B and C often or frequently felt they needed their superior's approval (Question 19). On Question 21, teachers from Schools A, D, and E felt that they rarely had to refer small matters to someone higher up for an answer, while Schools B and C felt that this sometimes happened. Responses for Question 52 indicated that Schools A, D, and E felt that they are rarely checked for rule violations, whereas, the responses from Schools B and C indicated that they felt they were sometimes checked. Teachers from Schools A, D, and E indicated that people rarely felt they were being watched to see that they obeyed all the rules.
whereas, teachers from Schools B and C felt this sometimes happened (Question 53). Responses from Schools D and E indicated that teachers felt that they were sometimes or often required to go through channels or chain of command; responses from Schools A and B indicated that they often or very frequently are required to go through channels; and School C indicated that this very frequently happened (Question 11). Schools A, B, and D felt that both teachers and administrators made decisions about the instructional program; School C indicated that administrators made these decisions; and School E indicated that teachers made them (Question 1). Schools B, C, and D indicated that administrators had the greatest influence in deciding curricular offerings; School A felt both teachers and administrators had the greatest influence; and School E felt that teachers had the greatest influence.

Differences in the perceptions of the teachers were evident after an analysis of the individual questions identified under General Rules for Teachers. Teachers in Schools A and B indicated that rules and regulations were very frequently uniformly applied; teachers from Schools C and D indicated that they are often or very frequently applied; and School E indicated that it often or sometimes occurred (Question 28). Responses for Question 41, procedures for disciplining students is well defined, varied: teachers from School A felt it very frequently occurred; School B felt it sometimes occurred; School C responses varied from sometimes to very frequently; School D indicated it often occurred; and School E varied from rarely to often occurring. Responses from Schools A and D on Question 23 indicated that they often felt that responsibilities and lines
of authority within the formal chain of command were well defined; School B felt that this very frequently occurred; School C felt it often or very frequently occurred; and School E felt it sometimes or often occurred. Responses from Question 29, uniform grading procedures are required, also varied: School C and D indicated that this often or very frequently occurred; responses from School A were split between sometimes and very frequently occurring; School B indicated that this sometimes occurred; School E responses varied from rarely to often occurring. Teachers from all five schools indicated that they were very frequently evaluated according to a formalized procedure (Question 34). Responses from Question 35 indicated that Schools A and B felt teachers were very frequently required to follow suggested instructional sequences and unit plans as closely as possible; School C felt this often happened; School D felt this often or very frequently happened; and School E felt this sometimes or often happened. According to the responses for Question 47, Schools B, C, and D felt the administration often adheres to established rules and regulations in dealing with the teaching staff; School A felt this very frequently happened; and School E felt this sometimes or often happened. Teachers from Schools A, B and D felt that rules and regulations often or very frequently govern teacher decisions and outcomes; School C indicated that this very frequently occurred; and School E indicated that this often occurred (Question 32).

An analysis of the individual questions identified under General Professional Latitude, shows similarities and differences in the perceptions of the teachers at the five schools. All of the schools indicated that most of the people
here rarely or sometimes make their own rules on the job (Question 46). On Question 45, people here are allowed to do almost as they please. Schools C and E indicated that this rarely occurred; School A indicated that this sometimes or often occurred; School B indicated that this sometimes occurred; and School D indicated that this rarely or sometimes occurred. Responses for question 44 showed that all of the schools felt that how things are done here is sometimes or often left up to the person doing the work.

An analysis of the individual questions identified under Professional Latitude Provided by Principal shows similarities and differences in the perceptions of the teachers at the five schools. Responses from Schools A, C and D indicated that the principal is sometimes willing to by-pass regulations to help teachers (Question 50); responses from School B indicated this rarely occurred; and responses from School E indicated that this sometimes or often occurred. According to the responses for Question 49, Schools A, C, D, and E felt that the principal was sometimes willing to by-pass regulations to help students; and School B felt this rarely happened. On Question 43, responses from all five schools showed that a person can sometimes make his own decisions without checking with anybody else. Likewise, all five schools responded to Question 44 similarly: How things are done here is sometimes or often left up to the person doing the work.

An analysis of the individual questions identified under Professional Training shows similarities and differences in the perceptions of the teachers at the five schools. On Question 55, responses from Schools A and D indicated
that academic degrees are often or very frequently an important consideration in recruiting of instructional staff; School B indicated that this very frequently occurred; School C indicated that this sometimes or often occurred; and responses from School E ranged from sometimes to very frequently occurring. According to the responses for Question 56, Schools B and D felt that academic degrees are often or very frequently an important consideration in recruiting of administration staff; School A indicated that this very frequently occurred; School C indicated that it often occurred; and the responses from School E ranged from sometimes to very frequently occurring. Responses for Question 57 indicated that School A and C felt that advanced degrees were sometimes an important consideration in promotion; School B felt that this very frequently happened; School D felt this often or very frequently happened; and School E felt this often happened.

The following answers to the questions on the SPQ were found to be consistent among all five schools: Teachers and administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about textbooks (Question 4); Administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about hiring new staff (Question 7); Administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new policies (Question 9); Administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new programs (Question 10); Rules and regulations often or very frequently govern teacher decisions and outcomes (Question 3); Teachers are very frequently evaluated according to a formalized procedure (Question 34);
A person can sometimes make his own decisions without checking with anybody else (Question 43); How things are done here is sometimes or often left up to the person doing the work (Question 44); Most people here rarely or sometimes make up their own rules on the job (Question 46).

Other noteworthy findings included the following response variations: Principals in your district must sometimes or often refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K. (Question 17); Vice-principals and department chairmen in your district must sometimes or often refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K. (Question 18); The Principal is rarely or sometimes willing to by-pass regulations to help students (Question 49); The teachers are rarely or sometimes being constantly checked on for rule violations (Question 52); People here feel as though they are rarely or sometimes being constantly watched to see that they obey all the rules (Question 53).

Findings for Research Question 5
What is the difference between the metaphors of accelerated schools on the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory and the initial sampling conducted by Steinhoff and Owens (1989)?

In the original study conducted by Steinhoff and Owens (1989), four distinctive culture phenotypes were identified. As previously described in Chapter 2, the first phenotype was The Family where the principal was described as a parent (strong or weak), nurturer, friend, sibling or coach, and the school itself was referred to as the family, home, team or womb (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989).
The second phenotype, Modern Times, described the principal's central role as providing regulation and maintaining order, and the schools were referred to as well-oiled machines, political machines, beehives of activity, or rusty machines (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). In The Cabaret, the third phenotype, the principal was seen as a master of ceremonies, a tightrope walker, and ringmaster, and the school was referred to as a circus, a Broadway show, a banquets, or a well-choreographed ballet (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989). Finally, The Little Shop of Horrors, described a principal who is a self-cleaning statue whose main function is to keep things smoothed-over, and the school was referred to as an unpredictable, tension-filled nightmare (Steinhoff & Owens, 1989).

Some similarities occurred between the original phenotypes and the individual phenotypes of the five accelerated schools. For example, the descriptions of School A, a small town haven, and School D, a beehive, were most similar to the original Family phenotype. In School A, the school was described as a happy, safe home and a home away from home. The principal was described as gentle and kind, a house mom and a mother. The teachers were described as overachievers who are constantly improving, spend extra time at school, and were a part of a family. However, although food rituals were important, there was a balance between treats and special occasions, and activities and procedures.

School D was described as a happy work place and a home away from home. The principal was described as student-centered, caring, a mentor, and someone who makes the teachers feel important. The teachers felt they jumped
through hoops for the students, made a difference in students, and believed that all children can learn. The stories and rituals referred to always celebrating and eating with monthly treats and birthday cakes, and always having someone there to lift you up.

Descriptions of Schools B and C most closely depicted the original The Little Shop of Horrors phenotype. School B was described metaphorically as an under-nurtured garden, and the school was described as uncertain, a bomb ready to explode, a dysfunctional family that is not close but gets the job done, and a lightning storm that you never know when it is going to strike, but its deadly. The principal was described as a manager of things, an egotist, and a banty rooster. The values and beliefs statements stated that whatever you want to do must be okayed by the principal, and you should do what you are told to do.

The school described in School C was stormy, like a storm waiting for the dust to settle. The principal was depicted as unpredictable, a task master, a time bomb, Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde, and someone who does not back up the teachers. The stories referred to teachers needing to keep their nose clean, not complaining, keeping your opinion to yourself, not making the principal mad, and kissing up to the principal.

School E, the research vessel, most closely aligned with the original Modern Times phenotype. They are similar in that the principal was described as a captain that guides the ship, a public relations wizard, someone who articulates well, and a gracious host. The teachers are described as workaholics. The
stories referred to hard work being the norm but also play, the high pressure due to the university link, and the challenges and rewards of dignitary visits.

Findings for Research Question 6

What is the difference between accelerated schools on the Structural Properties Questionnaire and the normed schools from Bishop and George's original study (1973)?

The original study which was conducted by Bishop and George (1973), identified twelve factors. Under the structural property of centralization, Bishop and George (1973) identified four factors: Decision Making - Classroom Teacher, Decision Making – Instruction and Curriculum, Decision Making with Hierarchy, and Supervision with Hierarchy. The following five factors were identified under the structural property of formalization: General Rules for Teachers, Rules for Teachers Lesson Plans, Rules for Teachers Centers of Study, General Professional Latitude, and Latitude Provided by Principal. The third structural property, complexity consisted of three factors: Specialization in Teaching Assignment, Professional Activities, and Professional Training.

Through the factor analysis conducted in this research, seven factors were identified. The seven identified factors have been listed according to Bishop and George's (1973) categorization of structural properties in Table 15. Factors representing all three of the structural properties: centralization, formalization, and complexity, were present. Centralization had three out of the original four subscales represented; formalization had three out of the five
subscales represented; and complexity had one out of the three subscales represented (See Table 4 in Chapter 3).

Table 14. Categorization of Structural Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Property</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>Decision Making – Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision Making with Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision with Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalization</td>
<td>General Rules for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Professional Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Latitude Provided by Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Professional Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the differences in the number of samples for the original study (296) and this study (97), any further comparisons could not be made.

Validity and Reliability

In qualitative research, claims of validity rest on the data collection and analysis techniques (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Strategies used to enhance validity of the design included verbatim accounts and low-inference descriptors (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). The results from the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory were not set up to generalize to other settings. However, thick descriptions were provided in the descriptions of the phenotypes,
the comparison among the five accelerated schools, and the comparison to the original study so that the reader could reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The internal consistency of the OCAI was addressed through inter-rater reliability. This was achieved through the cooperation of Dr. LeAnn Putney, Professor of Educational Psychology, at the University of Las Vegas, Nevada who is well versed in qualitative analysis, specifically, Spradley's domain analysis (1980). After several joint meetings, agreement regarding the recurrent themes in the narrative descriptions, and the analysis of the metaphors and explanations resulting in cultural phenotypes occurred.

Construct validity was established through the factor analysis of the SPQ. The seven factors which emerged from the data confirmed the dimensions of the structural properties hypothesized in the original study (See Table 14).

Internal consistency for the SPQ was conducted using the Crombach Alpha coefficient procedure. The standardized item alpha for all of the 58 items was calculated at .77. The standardized item alpha was also calculated for each of the seven factors ranging from .69 to .88 (See Table 9).
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe the organizational culture and structure of five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District. A great deal of research has been conducted separately on organizational culture and structure as well as the Accelerated Schools Project. However, this study attempted to look at both the culture and structure of elementary schools after they have experienced the process of becoming an accelerated school. According to the research on accelerated schools, the culture and structure of these schools should vary according to the needs and involvement of the staff, students and community. Therefore, this study has looked at the similarities and differences of these five accelerated schools using both qualitative and quantitative methodology.

Two instruments, the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI) and the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ), were administered to 277 teachers from five selected accelerated schools in the Clark County School...
District. After the second mailing, a total of 97 usable responses were received resulting in a response rate of 35%.

The OCAI provided the following demographic and descriptive information about each respondent: (1) 66% of the respondents were grade level teachers (K-5); (2) 82% were female; (3) the mean years of teaching was 10.71 years; and (4) the mean number of years teaching at their present school was 3.77 years.

The stories and metaphors obtained from the OCAI were analyzed using Spradley’s domain analysis. This resulted in descriptions of cultural phenotypes that were characteristic of each of the five schools. The analysis of the stories resulted in the identification of cultural themes which were recurrent across the identified domains of history, values and beliefs, stories, behavioral norms, rituals, and heroes/heroines. These cultural themes were analyzed to further support the individual school’s phenotypes. The five phenotypes and their supporting statements were then analyzed to determine if there were any recurrent themes among the five schools.

The data provided by the SPQ was analyzed first by using a factor analysis which extracted seven factors. An analysis of variance was then conducted to compare the amount of between-group variance in individual scores with the amount of within-group variance. Finally, the Scheffe, a post hoc comparison was conducted to determine if any of the school’s means differed significantly from one another. The six research questions were addressed using the data provided from these analyses.
Research Question 1

The first question asked: What are the organizational cultures of accelerated schools? The analysis of the data from the OCAI produced cultural phenotypes and descriptions of the five accelerated schools.

The cultural phenotype which described School A was a small town haven. Specifically, the school was described to be a happy, safe home and community with a balance between work and play. The principal was described as a devoted leader, a role model, gentle and kind, and an effective manager. The teachers were described as gifted, hard working, dedicated team players. The students were described as respectful as well as worthy of respect, receptive, and unique. The community was described as involved and supportive.

The cultural phenotype which described School B was an under-nurtured garden. Specifically, the school was described as uncertain and diverse. The principal was described as an authoritarian, ruler, and manager of things. The teachers were described as hard working, dedicated and unappreciated. The students were described as hungry, eager and special. The community was described as having quiet courage, being hopeful, and in need of tending.

The cultural phenotype which described School C was an express train. Specifically, the school was described as stormy, changing, and with unbending rules. The principal was described as fair, but unpredictable authoritarian. The teachers were described as young, uncertain team players. The students were
described as eager to learn, diverse, and transient. The community was described as transient, but helpful when asked.

The cultural phenotype which described School D was a beehive. Specifically, the school was described as fun, active, hard working and diverse. The principal was described as caring, approachable, positive, supportive, and student-centered. The teachers were described as hard working, dedicated, enthusiastic, and diverse. The students were described as diverse, needy, transient, happy, loving, and having potential. The community is described as opposites, diverse, alive, and changing.

The cultural phenotype which described School E was a research vessel. Specifically, the school was described as diverse, busy, having teamwork, and a fish bowl. The principal was described as a visionary, articulate, positive salesperson. The teachers were described as hardworking, talented, energetic, and nurturing. The students were described as being resilient and resourceful, and having potential. The community was described as a transient, unique, diverse culture.

Research Question 2

The second research question asked: What are the structural properties of accelerated schools? Using the data obtained from the SPQ, a factor analysis was conducted resulting in the extraction of seven factors. Name for each of the factors which were chosen based on the content of the questions were: Decision Making-Classroom Teacher, Decision Making with Hierarchy, Supervision with Hierarchy, General Rules for Teachers, General Professional
Research Question 3

The third research question asked: What are the patterns in the organizational cultures of accelerated schools? Using the descriptions of the school, principal, teacher, student, and community from the metaphors and explanations on the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory, similarities and differences were found among the five participating schools.

The most frequently identified description was diverse which was used 7 different times in four of the schools. The second most commonly identified description was hard working which was found in four of the five schools. The third most commonly identified description was dedicated which was found in three of the five schools. The fourth most commonly identified description was transient which was found in three out of the five schools.

Other combinations of words which were identified in at least three of the schools were diverse and transient; hardworking and unique; and diverse and hardworking. Schools D and E have six common descriptions: diverse, hard working, transient, positive, enthusiastic/energetic, and potential. Schools A and D have five common descriptions: hard working, dedicated, happy/fun, gentle/kind/caring, and supportive. Schools A and E have four common descriptions: hard working, team player/teamwork, unique, and gifted/talented. Schools B and C have four common descriptions: diverse, uncertain, authoritarian, and eager. Schools B and D have four common descriptions: diverse, hard working, dedicated, and hungry/needy.
Positive descriptions were identified for all of the schools in the category of students and community. The students were described as being receptive and unique (School A); eager and special (School B); eager to learn (School C); happy, loving and having potential (School D); and resilient, resourceful and having potential (School E). The community was described as being involved and supportive (School A); hopeful and having quiet courage (School B); helpful when asked (School C); alive (School D); and unique (School E).

Several differences were observed among the descriptions of the five schools. The schools in Schools A, D, and E were described as being happy and safe (School A); fun and active (School D) and busy (School E); whereas, School B and C were described as being uncertain (School B) and stormy and changing (School C). The principal in Schools A, D, and E were described as being effective, gentle and kind (School A), caring, positive, and supportive (School D), and visionary and positive (School E). In contrast, the principal in Schools B and C were described as being an authoritarian and ruler (School B), and an unpredictable authoritarian (School C). The teachers in Schools A, B, D, and E were described as being hard working (Schools A, B, D, E) and dedicated (Schools A, B, D). School C described teachers as being uncertain and young.

**Research Question 4**

Research question four asked: What are the patterns in the structural properties of accelerated schools? An analysis of variance was undertaken to determine the amount of between-groups variance in individual school scores on
each of the new variables with the amount of within-groups variance. These calculations produced an F-ratio and Significance value which indicated whether the schools were significantly related to each of the extracted factors.

In order to determine where there was a significant difference between the schools, a Post Hoc test, with a Scheffe option, was conducted. Four out of the seven factors, Supervision with Hierarchy, General Rules for Teachers, Decision Making – Classroom Teachers and Professional Latitude Provided by Principal, produced a significant F ratio (p ≥ .05). The F ratio for Supervision with Hierarchy was statistically significant at 8.993. Statistical significance existed between Schools A and B (.011), Schools A and C (.004), Schools B and D (.006), Schools B and E (.016), Schools C and D (.002), and Schools C and E (.008). The F ratio for General Rules for Teachers was statistically significant at 7.584. Statistical significance existed between Schools A and D (.000), Schools B and D (.045), Schools C and D (.005), and Schools D and E (.037). The F ratio for Decision Making – Classroom Teachers was statistically significant at 3.261, and the F ratio for Professional Latitude Provided by Principal was statistically significant at 2.656. However, there was no meaningful difference between any pair of means.

The following answers to the questions on the SPQ were found to be consistent among all five schools: Teachers and administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about textbooks (Question 4); Administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about hiring new staff (Question 7); Administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new
policies (Question 9); Administrators have the greatest influence in decisions about adoption of new programs (Question 10); Rules and regulations often or very frequently govern teacher decisions and outcomes (Question 32); Teachers are very frequently evaluated according to a formalized procedure (Question 34); A person can sometimes make his own decisions without checking with anybody else (Question 43); How things are done here is sometimes or often left up to the person doing the work (Question 44); Most people here rarely or sometimes make up their own rules on the job (Question 46).

Other noteworthy findings included the following response variations: Principals in your district must sometimes or often refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K. (Question 17); Vice-principals and department chairmen in your district must sometimes or often refer most non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a final O.K. (Question 18); The Principal is rarely or sometimes willing to by-pass regulations to help students (Question 49); The teachers are rarely or sometimes being constantly checked on for rule violations (Question 52); People here feel as though they are rarely or sometimes being constantly watched to see that they obey all the rules (Question 53).

Research Question 5

Research question five asked: What is the difference between the metaphors of accelerated schools on the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory and the initial sampling conducted by Steinhoff and Owens (1989)? A
comparison was made between the original phenotypes and the phenotypes created to represent the five accelerated schools.

Some similarities occurred between the original phenotypes and the individual phenotypes of the five accelerated schools. For example, the descriptions of School A, a small town haven, and School D, a beehive, were most similar to the original Family phenotype. In School A, the school was described as a happy, safe home and a home away from home. The principal was described as gentle and kind, a house mom and a mother. The teachers were described as overachievers who are constantly improving, spend extra time at school, and are a part of a family. However, although food rituals were important, there was a balance between treats and special occasions, and activities and procedures.

School D was similar to the Family phenotype in that it was described as a happy work place and a home away from home. The principal was described as student-centered, caring, a mentor, and someone who makes the teachers feel important. The teachers felt they jumped through hoops for the students, made a difference in students, and believed that all children can learn. The stories and rituals referred to always celebrating and eating with monthly treats and birthday cakes, and always having someone there to lift you up.

Descriptions of Schools B and C most closely depicted the original Little Shop of Horrors phenotype. This may be due, to a large part, because the principals in those two schools had changed within the last year. School B was described metaphorically as an under-nurtured garden, and the school was
described as uncertain, a bomb ready to explode, a dysfunctional family that is not close but gets the job done, and a lightning storm that you never know when it is going to strike, but its deadly. The principal was described as a manager of things, an egotist, and a banty rooster. The values and beliefs statements stated that whatever you want to do must be okayed by the principal, and you should do what you are told to do.

School C was similar to the Little Shop of Horrors phenotype in that it was described as stormy, like a storm waiting for the dust to settle. The principal was depicted as unpredictable, a task master, a time bomb, Dr. Jekyll/Mr. Hyde, and someone who does not back up the teachers. The stories referred to teachers needing to keep their nose clean, not complaining, keeping your opinion to yourself, not making the principal mad, and kissing up to the principal.

School E, the research vessel, most closely aligned with the Modern Times phenotype. They were similar in that the principal was described as a captain that guides the ship, a public relations wizard, someone who articulates well, and a gracious host. The teachers were described as workaholics. The stories referred to hard work being the norm but also play, the high pressure due to the university link, and the challenges and rewards of dignitary visits.

Research Question 6

Research question six asked: What is the difference between accelerated schools on the Structural Properties Questionnaire and the normed schools from Bishop and George's original study (1973)? The factors extracted
from this study were compared to the original study’s factors and structural properties.

The original study which was conducted by Bishop and George (1973), identified twelve factors. Through the factor analysis conducted in this research, seven factors were identified, and factors representing all three of the structural properties: centralization, formalization, and complexity, were present. Centralization had three out of the original four subscales represented: Decision Making – Classroom Teacher, Decision Making with Hierarchy, and Supervision with Hierarchy. Formalization had three out of the five subscales represented: General Rules for Teachers, General Professional Latitude, and Professional Latitude Provided by Principal. Complexity had one out of the three subscales represented: Professional Training.

Factors not extracted in this analysis that were included in the original study were: Decision Making – Instruction and Curriculum, Rules for Teachers Lesson Plans, Rules for Teachers Centers of Study, Specialization in Teaching Assignment and Professional Activities. Further comparisons could not be made due to the differences in the sample sizes.

Conclusions

This research looked at the organizational culture and structure of five accelerated schools in the Clark County School District. The cultural aspects of accelerated schools which include the guiding principles, the central values and powerful learning philosophy, and the structural aspects which include the
Accelerated Schools Process, the Inquiry Process, and the governance structure were evident in the analysis of the Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ).

There were common descriptions of the culture and structure among all five schools. The responses from the OCAI were very positive in their descriptions of the students and the community. This may be reflective of the accelerated schools' principles especially building on strengths. This principle encourages teachers to build on the strengths of the school community when developing a vision for the school, curricular and instructional strategies, enrichment, and acceleration.

Many of the schools used the words diverse and transient when describing their schools, community or students. This is not surprising since the Accelerated Schools Project is geared toward at-risk populations of which these are common descriptors. School A is the only school that did not use the term diverse when describing their school. This might be explained by the location of the school which is in an outlying area of the city. Schools in these areas tend to be less diverse ethnically. Also, School C is the only school that did not use the term transient when describing their school. One explanation might be that it is one of the oldest schools in the district, and they have become accepting of the fact that their population is transient.

Hardworking and dedicated were frequent descriptors of the teachers. Commitment to the Accelerated Schools Project by the teachers and administration indicates that they agree to implement The Accelerated Schools.
Process, the Inquiry Process and the governance structure which are very structured. They involve teachers extensively in the decision making process and therefore, would require teachers to be hardworking and dedicated.

Responses on the SPQ also reflected the impact of the implementation of the Accelerated Schools Process, the Inquiry Process, and the governance structure of accelerated schools as well as the principles, central values, and powerful learning. For example, all of the schools indicated that they rarely or sometimes make their own rules on the job. In addition, they indicated that a person can sometimes make his own decisions without checking with anybody else. The principle, unity of purpose, refers to the common purpose and practices of the school on behalf of all children. The schools develop their own common purposes and practices through the implementation of the Inquiry Process and the governance structure. Therefore, it would be expected that they do not make their own rules on the job, or make decisions without checking with someone else.

Another common response among the five schools was that how things are done here is sometimes or often left up to the person doing the work. The principle, empowerment coupled with responsibility, refers to school staff making educational decisions about curriculum, instructional materials and strategies, personnel, and allocation of resources inside the school. These decisions are made through the Accelerated Schools Process and the Inquiry Process. These decisions would also include the selection of textbooks by the teachers and administrators, which was another common response from the five schools.
Either district procedure or state law may have affected some of the responses. For example, the teachers indicated that the administrators had the greatest influence in decisions about the adoption of new programs, new policies, and hiring new staff. This is most likely due to district procedures. In addition, the responses indicated that teachers were frequently evaluated according to a formalized procedure. This procedure is included in the Nevada Revised Statutes and further defined in district policies and regulations as well as the teachers’ association contracts.

Overall, the responses on the SPQ indicated that Decision Making with Hierarchy, General Professional Latitude, and Professional Training were consistent among the five schools. The slight variations in the mean scores of these schools may be reflective of the extent of implementation of the Inquiry Process and the governance structure.

There were several responses regarding both culture and structure which were common in Schools A, D, and E or Schools B and C. Schools B and C recently had new principals assigned to their schools and many of the differences may reflect that change in leadership. The next section will address these differences. First, the commonalities of the responses from Schools A, D, and E will be focused on.

According to the responses on the OCAI, these schools referred to the schools and principals in positive terms along with the students and community, which were shared by all of the schools. Specifically, these schools were described as happy, safe, fun, active, and busy. Not surprisingly, these three
schools also described their teachers as being hard working. The principals were described as effective, gentle, kind, caring, positive, supportive and visionary. This description of the principal reinforces what Hopfenberg et al. (1990a) stated a good principal in an accelerated school is: an active listener, dedicated, motivational, focused, effective, and visionary.

The responses on the Professional Latitude Provided by Principal questions indicated that there was somewhat more latitude provided in these three schools than in Schools B and C. For example, the responses indicated that the principal was sometimes willing to by-pass regulations to help students. There was less Supervision with Hierarchy in Schools A, D, and E as well. Specifically, the teachers responded that they were rarely or only sometimes discouraged from making their own decisions; decisions they make rarely or only sometimes had to have their supervisor’s approval; sometimes little action can be taken until a superior approves a decision; rarely teachers had to refer small matters to someone higher up for an answer; they were rarely checked for rule violations; and they rarely felt they were being watched to see that they obeyed all the rules. This may be more reflective of the fact that Schools B and C have new principals than on being an accelerated school. Teachers who have had the same principal are more comfortable with understanding what decisions they can make without asking and what procedures need to be followed such as the Inquiry Process. The principals also know their teachers better and do not feel that they need to monitor them as closely.
Schools B and C had some shared descriptions. On the OCAI, the schools were described as being uncertain, stormy and changing. The principal was described as being an authoritarian and a ruler. Again, this may be largely due to the new principals at these schools who are not familiar with the components of the Accelerated Schools Project and are still becoming familiar with the faculty and how things were done.

This is also reflected in their responses on the SPQ. Specifically, the responses indicated that there was more Supervision with Hierarchy especially in the following responses: teachers are sometimes or often discouraged from making their own decisions; decisions they make sometimes or often had to have their supervisor's approval; little action could often or frequently be taken until a superior approves a decision; sometimes they had to refer small matters to someone higher up for an answer; and sometimes they felt they were being watched to see that they obeyed all the rules. Professional Latitude Provided by the Principal was also somewhat less than in Schools A, D, and E.

Interestingly, all of the schools used the language of accelerated schools when they wrote their narrative descriptions and metaphors on the OCAI. Some of the wording that they used included empowerment, responsibility, community, the governance structure including cadres, each person being integral, involvement, powerful learning, active learning, innovation, and little wheels growing into bigger wheels. One might surmise then that the teachers have internalized the cultural and structural aspects of the Accelerated School Project.
Another noteworthy observation is that factors from each of the structural properties of centralization (Decision Making with Hierarchy), formalization (General Professional Latitude), and complexity (Professional Training) were found to be common in the five schools.

Implications

Several implications can be made from the results of the OCAI and the SPQ in view of the cultural and structural aspects of accelerated schools.

The impact of the principal on the cultural and structural aspects of these schools was especially evident in this study. The differences in responses from Schools B and C demonstrate this impact. On the OCAI, the differences in the descriptions of the school and principal from School B and C were striking in comparison to the descriptions from Schools A, D, and E. On the SPQ, the differences were evident particularly in the areas of Professional Latitude Provided by Principal and Supervision with Hierarchy. To minimize the impact of this change, training should be carefully planned and implemented in order to transition new principals into the leadership roles of an accelerated school. Specifically, new principals need to become familiar with the philosophy and processes involved in accelerated schools. In addition, when the Accelerated Schools Project contracts with a school district, they should include language which allows them to be involved in the selection of principals as well as in their training and transitioning into the position of principal at an established accelerated school.
The structure of the Accelerated Schools Process, the Inquiry Process and the governance structure may have impacted the responses regarding Decision Making with Hierarchy and General Professional Latitude which were found to be similar in all of the schools studied. The specificity of these processes affects how decisions are made within the school setting. Therefore, teachers and administrators who are committed to the Accelerated Schools Project would follow these processes carefully. The slight differences in the responses may be due to variations in the implementation of these processes.

District procedures, state law and teacher association contracts may have impacted the responses on both the OCAI and the SPQ. Obvious impacts were noted in the areas of evaluations, adopting new programs or policies, and hiring new staff. Legal issues may also influence other responses that were not as obvious.

In a previous study regarding the culture of accelerated schools, Finnan (1992) contended that all schools have a unique school culture which includes a set of beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and behavior which are predictable and meaningful to the school community. The findings from this study appear to support this statement in that all of the schools have unique cultures. The similarities in culture, which are evident among these schools, appear to be reflective of the common principles, central values and powerful learning philosophy that all accelerated schools follow.

In light of the cultural and structural aspects which have been defined by Brunner and Hopfenberg (1992), there appears to be an interrelatedness
between the cultural and structural aspects in accelerated schools as found in
the responses from the OCAI and the SPQ. Specifically, the cultural aspects of
guiding principles, central values, and powerful learning philosophy drives the
structural aspects of the Accelerated Schools Process, the Inquiry Process, and
the governance structure. With this in mind, one can conclude that the OCAI
data supports the SPQ data, therefore further validating the OCAI.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings from this study suggest several areas for future research to
address. The possibilities include:

1. Conduct a similar study comparing the organizational culture and structure of
   other at-risk schools with accelerated schools.

2. Conduct a follow up study on School B’s teachers, principal and the school
   itself, which have now become an Edison School.

3. Conduct a similar study comparing the organizational culture and structure of
   at-risk schools with non at-risk schools.

4. Conduct a similar study comparing the organizational culture and structure of
   accelerated schools with schools which have implemented other reform
   programs such as Slavin’s Success for All and Comer’s School Development
   Program.

5. Conduct a study of the effect of new administration on the organizational
culture and structure of accelerated schools. This would be useful for new
administrators in determining what impact they would have on their school's culture and structure.

6. Conduct a study of the leadership styles of principals in accelerated schools. This could be useful in learning the effect that leadership styles have on the school's culture and structure.

7. Conduct a case study of the change process and its effect on the organizational culture and structure during the first three to five years of the Accelerated School Process.

8. Conduct a study on accelerated schools which have developed a program to transition and train new principals on the accelerated school's philosophy and processes.
THE ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE ASSESSMENT INVENTORY
FORM 1D

Carl R. Steinhoff, Ed.D.                              Robert G. Owens, Ph. D.

What the study is about. While much has been written about schools, very little of it tells the teachers' point of view. We are interested in finding out more about how teachers see their schools as places in which to do their professional work.

To find this out, we ask you to simply write out in your own words responses to some questions about your school. We are not looking for "textbook" answers; we are looking for your answers, in your own words. So, we ask that you be as straightforward and forthright as you can.

Introduction. Schools across the country are much alike in many ways: an elementary school on Long Island would normally be a lot like an elementary school in Texas, a Long Island high school is similar in many ways to a high school in Florida. But teachers also know that each school is unique, distinctive, and in important ways unlike other schools. We would like to know more about your school: what it is like; what its' special characteristics are.

Directions. This questionnaire asks you to tell us in your own words some simple, ordinary things about your school that help to explain what it is really like. Since we don't know your school, please respond to the questionnaire as you would respond to any other colleague who would like to know more about what your school is really like. For example, you might think of answering each question as if it had been asked by a colleague who was planning to join the faculty in your school.
Confidentiality. Being professionals like yourself, we assure you that your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence. Any report of the study will describe only summaries of the aggregated data from many teachers in a number of schools.

Copyright October 19, 1990, by Carl R. Steinhoff and Robert G. Owens. Not to be reproduced by any means or quoted without permission.
First, tell us a little about yourself.

Your professional position (please include grade level and/or subject of specialty, as appropriate) ______________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

Sex      F ____     M ____

How many years have you completed as a professional educator?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

How many years have you completed working in your present school?

__________________________________________________________________________________________
1. Every school has a unique history all of its own. Teachers know something of that history even if they have not worked there for a long time, because people talk about things that went on in former times. Some of these events may have been powerful incidents in the community that affected the school, and others may be purely internal matters that might seem unimportant or even mundane to outsiders.

Please describe in a brief paragraph some of the more important events or trends that helped to shape the character of your school as it is today.

2. Schools usually espouse some official, formal, public set of values and beliefs. Ordinarily these appear in handbooks, newsletters, speeches, and so on. but in day-to-day work, a school may sometimes seem to be operating from values and beliefs that are different from the official public statements. The latter values and beliefs are, of course, often implicitly understood but not often talked about.

In a brief paragraph, please describe the actual, functional values and beliefs that are important in your school.
3. People who work in schools very often tell stories -- perhaps mythical, or apocryphal, or humorous -- that help to explain what life in them is really like.

Briefly describe a common story that is likely to be told to a newcomer by an "old hand" in your school to impress upon the individual "how things are really done around here."

4. Every school has established but unwritten expectations for behavior on the job.

In a brief paragraph, please describe some of the most important expectations that have to be met in your school in order for one to get along.
5. Schools often develop informal customs, or rituals, that are more or less unique. For example, in one school that we know of there is a bridge game going on in the teachers' lounge every day with different people sitting in as they come off of hall and cafeteria duty. In another school, the principal has an informal coffee klatsch in the school kitchen every morning. And so on.

In a brief paragraph, please describe any such rituals that are important in the daily life of your school.

6. Schools seem to have at least one person, either now or in the past, who is thought of with great respect (or even reverence) because he or she is/was so outstanding in the life of the school.

If you can think of such an individual in the history of your school, please describe in a brief paragraph why it is that the individual is so well regarded.
7. In responding to the previous questions you have provided a rich description of important aspects of the culture of your school. But the culture of a school is a total entity, even greater than the sum of its parts. We now would like you to try to summarize the descriptions that you have provided by using metaphors as a way to convey the essence of the culture of your school. A metaphor identifies one object with another and ascribes to the first object one or more qualities of the second. For example, some administrators speak of the school as a family.

People often use metaphors to succinctly describe complex ideas. For example, when we say that a school is a ‘well-oiled machine’, that metaphor makes clear what that particular school is really like in the eyes of the people who work in it. For another example, for teachers to speak of a principal as being “Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde” tells us a lot about the impact of the behavior of that individual principal on the teachers in that particular school.

In this sense, considering the descriptions that you have already written, what one best metaphor would you use to complete the following sentences:

a. My school “is” a (an, the) ______________________________________

b. Please explain why you chose this metaphor. _______________________


c. The principal in my school “is” a (an, the) ________________________

d. Please explain ________________________________________________


e. The typical teacher in my school “is” a (an, the) ____________________

f. Please explain why you chose this metaphor ________________________


g. The typical student in my school “is” a (an, the) ____________________

_____________________________________________
h. Please explain why you chose this metaphor ____________________

i. The community in which my school is situated “is” a (an, the)

j. Please explain ____________________

8. What, in your opinion, would be the metaphor for the ideal school? ___

9. What, in your opinion, would be the metaphor for the ideal school principal? __________________

10. What, in your opinion, would be the metaphor for the ideal teacher? ___

11. What, in your opinion, would be the metaphor for the ideal student? ___

12. What, in your opinion, would be the metaphor for the ideal school community? __________________
STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES QUESTIONNAIRE
The items in this questionnaire describe structural characteristics that may be present in your school. Please do not evaluate these characteristics in terms of being desirable or undesirable, but respond in terms of how accurately the statement describes your school.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS
Printed below is an example of a typical item found in the questionnaire:

1. Rarely
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. Very frequently

SAMPLE:
Teachers are required to maintain lesson plans. 1 2 3 4

In this example the respondent marked alternative 4 to indicate that most teachers in his school maintain lesson plans. Any of the other alternatives can be selected depending upon the behavior described by the item.

Please mark your response clearly. Please mark every item.
STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Teachers
2. Department Chairmen
3. Consultants or Specialists
4. Administrators

(Circle one)

Who has the greatest influence in decisions about:

1. The instructional program? 1 2 3 4
2. Curricular offerings? 1 2 3 4
3. Teaching methods? 1 2 3 4
4. Textbooks? 1 2 3 4
5. Pupil regulations? 1 2 3 4
6. Teacher regulations? 1 2 3 4
7. Hiring new staff? 1 2 3 4
8. Promotion of professional staff? 1 2 3 4
9. Adoption of new policies? 1 2 3 4
10. Adoption of new programs? 1 2 3 4

1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

11. Teachers are required to go through channels (chain of command). 1 2 3 4
12. Teaching in your district is a good job for someone who likes to be “his own boss”. 1 2 3 4
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

(Circle one)

13. Teachers in your district must refer most
    non-routine decisions to someone higher
    up for a final O.K. 1 2 3 4
14. In your district teachers have to follow
    procedures which conflict with their own
    professional judgment. 1 2 3 4
15. Teachers are free to use any teaching techniques
    they think best. 1 2 3 4
16. Teachers are free to discipline students as they
    see fit. 1 2 3 4
17. Principals in your district must refer most
    non-routine decisions to someone higher up for a
    final O.K. 1 2 3 4
18. Vice-principals and department chairmen in your
    district must refer most non-routine decisions
    to someone higher up for a final O.K. 1 2 3 4
19. There can be little action taken here until a
    superior approves a decision. 1 2 3 4
20. A person who wants to make his own decisions
    would be quickly discouraged here. 1 2 3 4
21. Even small matters have to be referred to someone
    higher up for a final answer. 1 2 3 4
22. Any decision I make has to have my superior's
    approval. 1 2 3 4
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

(Circle one)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Responsibilities and lines of authority within the formal chain of command are well defined.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Teachers are required to maintain lesson plans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teachers are required to follow an adopted course of study.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Teachers are required to report to school or leave school at specific times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teachers are required to sign in and sign out when coming or leaving school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Rules and regulations are uniformly applied.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Uniform grading procedures are required.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. &quot;Appropriate&quot; teacher dress is prescribed by the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Teachers are required to select textbooks from an approved textbook list.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Rules and regulations govern teacher’ decisions and outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Rules and regulations govern administrative decisions and actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Teachers are evaluated according to a formalized procedure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Teachers are required to follow suggested instructional sequences and unit plans as closely as possible.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Rarely occurs
2. Sometimes occurs
3. Often occurs
4. Very frequently occurs

(Circle one)

36. Teachers are allowed to teach only those subjects which are included in the course-of-study.
   1 2 3 4

37. Teachers are required to observe minimum time allotments for academic subjects.
   1 2 3 4

38. Teachers are required to submit lesson plans for review.
   1 2 3 4

39. Teachers are required to attend PTA meetings.
   1 2 3 4

40. Teachers at this school expect other teachers to be strict with students.
   1 2 3 4

41. At this school, procedures for disciplining students is well defined.
   1 2 3 4

42. Teachers at this school expect other teachers to teach a certain way.
   1 2 3 4

43. A person can make his own decisions without checking with anybody else.
   1 2 3 4

44. How things are done here is left up to the person doing the work.
   1 2 3 4

45. People here are allowed to do almost as they please.
   1 2 3 4

46. Most people here make their own rules on the job.
   1 2 3 4

47. The administration adheres to established rules and regulations in dealing with the teaching staff.
   1 2 3 4

48. Supervisors and/or administrators visit my classroom unannounced.
   1 2 3 4
49. The Principal is willing to by-pass regulations to help students.  
   1 2 3 4

50. The Principal is willing to by-pass regulations to help teachers.  
   1 2 3 4

51. Teachers in this school are closely supervised.  
   1 2 3 4

52. The teachers are constantly being checked on for rule violations.  
   1 2 3 4

53. People here feel as though they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all the rules.  
   1 2 3 4

54. Teachers in this school are considered to be specialists in their respective fields.  
   1 2 3 4

55. Academic degrees are an important consideration in recruiting of instructional staff.  
   1 2 3 4

56. Academic degrees are an important consideration in recruiting of administrative staff.  
   1 2 3 4

57. Advanced degrees are an important consideration in promotion.  
   1 2 3 4

58. Teachers are required to attend teacher's institutes.  
   1 2 3 4
APPENDIX B

APPROVAL OF HUMAN SUBJECT USE
Name: Susan Steaffens  
Department: Educational Administration  
Title of Study: A Descriptive Study of the Organizational Culture and Structure of Accelerated Schools

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY:

1. SUBJECTS: The teaching staffs of five elementary schools (K-5) in the Clark County School District which have participated in the Accelerated Schools Project for a minimum of three years: Daniel Goldfarb Elementary, Paradise Elementary, Helen Jydstrup Elementary, John S. Park Elementary, and Elaine Wynn Elementary.

2. PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to describe the organizational structure and culture of Accelerated Schools.  
METHODS: Two instruments will be utilized in order to collect this data: Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ), and Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI). The Structural Properties Questionnaire was developed by Bishop and George (1973) for the purpose of measuring structural characteristics within elementary and secondary schools. This 45-item Likert-type questionnaire identifies the teacher's perception of three structural properties of the school's organization: formalization, centralization, and complexity. The Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory, was developed by Steinhoff and Owens (1988) as an objective measure of organizational culture. This inventory looks at the six dimensions that define the culture of a school. The history of the organization; values and beliefs of the organization; myths and stories that explain the organization; cultural norms of the organization; traditions, rituals, and ceremonies; and heroes and heroines of the organization. The questionnaire uses metaphoric language to differentiate four different phenotypes of school cultures: the Family, Modern Times, The Cabaret, and The Little Shop of Horrors.  
PROCEDURES: This researcher will attend a staff meeting at each of the selected schools where the questionnaires will be completed by the teaching staff.

3. RISKS: Individual school results will be reported in the study, however, they will be referred to by letter not by name. The questionnaires will be coded to represent the school (letter) and the participant (number) thereby, keeping the participants anonymous.
4. **BENEFITS**: The results of this study will add to the general body of knowledge on the Accelerated Schools Project.

5. **RISK-BENEFIT RATIO**: There is limited risk compared to the amount of information which may be provided to the Accelerated Schools Project.

6. **COSTS TO SUBJECTS**: There is no cost to subjects.

7. **INFORMED CONSENT**: The teaching staff will receive a copy of the informed consent form prior to filling out the questionnaires. The administration at each school will be asked to assist in obtaining these signed forms. Additional forms will be available on the day of the staff meeting for teachers who have not signed, but want to participate in the study. The informed consent forms will be stored in a safe and confidential location in the Department of Educational Administration. (See attached copy of the Informed Consent Form.)
I am Susan Steaffens, a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in the Department of Educational Administration.

I am asking for your participation in a research project on the organizational structure and culture of Accelerated Schools. The expected length of time of your participation is approximately forty (40) minutes. Your participation will involve completing information regarding your educational and teaching background as well as completing two questionnaires: Structural Properties Questionnaire and Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory.

There are no foreseen risks involved in this research. By participating, you will be adding to the general body of knowledge on Accelerated Schools. Your participation is completely voluntary and your anonymity will be protected. All records will be retained for a period of three years in a safe and confidential location in the Department of Educational Administration.

For questions concerning this research study, you may contact me through the Department of Educational Administration at 895-3491. If you have questions regarding the rights of research subjects, please contact the UNLV office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from participation at any time during the study. By signing below, you are acknowledging receipt of this information regarding the study and agree to participate. You will be given a copy of this form.

_________________________  ____________
Signature of Participant       Date

_________________________  ____________
Signature of Researcher        Date

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Date: September 1, 2000

Name of requester/researcher: Susan Steaffens

Position: Principal of Derfelt Elementary School

Primary reason for research: Doctoral Dissertation

Purpose of study: The purpose of this study is to describe the organizational structure and culture of selected accelerated schools in an urban setting.

Rationale for study: The Accelerated Schools Project is a reform project which was begun by Henry Levin at Stanford University in the 1980's in an effort to address the needs of at-risk students. This project has been implemented throughout the United States and within the Clark County School District. Research indicates that the organizational structure and culture of schools are affected when the project is implemented in schools. This study would look at these two aspects in five Clark County School District elementary schools: Daniel Goldfarb Elementary, Helen Herr Elementary; Helen Jydstrup Elementary, John S. Park Elementary, and Elaine Wynn Elementary.

Brief description of research design: Two instruments have been selected to collect the information for this study, the Structural Properties Questionnaire (SPQ) and the Organisational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI). The researcher will attend a staff meeting at each of the selected schools where the questionnaires will be completed by the teaching staff. The questionnaires will be coded to represent the school (letter) and the participant (number) thereby, keeping the participants anonymous. The information provided from these
instruments will be used to develop a description of the organizational structures and culture of each of the selected schools. The descriptions will be further examined to determine if there are any common patterns in the organizational properties and cultures of these schools.

Number of schools involved: 5  
Amount of time per school: 40 min.

Number of classes involved: 0  
Amount of time per class: 0

Number of students involved: 0  
Amount of time per student: 0

Number of teachers involved: 200  
Amount of time per teacher: 40 min.

Amount of time per school district administrator involved: 5  
Amount of time per school district administrator: 40 min.

Specific services/resources requested of school district to conduct/facilitate the research: None

Provisions for maintaining confidentiality of student information: Student information is not being utilized in this study.

Provisions for providing CCSD access to findings and final report of findings: A copy of the findings will be provided to the CCSD upon the completion of the research.

Description of short-term and/or long-term benefits to education based on findings from this research: Reform programs such as the Accelerated Schools Project need research to support their effectiveness. Since the Accelerated Schools Project is being implemented nationwide, as well as in the Clark County School District, the results of this study could provide additional information which would support further implementation of the program.

I certify that the above information is accurate to the best of my knowledge.
I have reviewed and approved the design of this research.

Signature, Faculty Advisor

Thank you for providing this information. Within the next month, the Committee to Review Cooperative Research Requests will review the information provided herein to determine if your request to conduct a cooperative research study with the district will be approved. If committee members feel it is necessary to obtain further information, you will be asked to address the committee directly. Thank you for inviting the district to participate in this study.

Please return this form to Judy Costa, Testing and Evaluation, Clark County School District.
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OCAI NARRATIVE DESCRIPTIONS
OCAI NARRATIVE RESPONSES

School A

History

Atmosphere (15)
Students (6)
  Consistent rules and procedures (2)
  Citizenship assemblies and incentives (2)
  Mutual love (1)
  Positive response to climate (1)
Staff (5)
  Involved (2)
    Staff member facilitator of project (1)
    School's namesake (1)
Ownership (1)
  Land owned by principal's grandfather (1)
Pride (1)
  Creation of mural (1)

Staff (11)
Characteristics (2)
  Young (1)
  Energetic (1)
Training (9)
  School-wide (6)
  Latest educational trends (3)

Parent Involvement (8)
Participation (6)
  Reading and math nights (1)
  Involved in setting high standards (1)
Creates a community (2)
Support (1)
Activities (1)

Governance (6)
Decision-making by all (5)
  Cadres (3)
    Creates unity (1)
    Creates progress and academic feeling (1)
  Ad hoc committees (1)
  Steering committees (1)
    Maintains calendar of events (1)
Principal's characteristics (5)
  Positive (1)
  Concerned for good of all (1)
  Provides organization and direction (1)
  Creates unity (1)
Values and Beliefs

Child-centered (13)
  Children first (6)
    Valued (2)
    Important (1)
  Every child can learn (2)
  Best interest (1)
  Best education (1)
  Education priority (1)
  Community involvement (1)

School Centered (8)
  Expectations (3)
  Operating values (1)
  Pride (1)
  Self-esteem (1)
  Decision-making (1)
  Motto: "from great parents come great students" (1)

Environment (7)
  Educational (2)
  Safe (1)
  Welcoming (1)
  Caring (1)
  Positive (1)
  High expectation (1)
  Consistency (1)
  Follow through (1)

Staff Development (6)
  Progressive (3)
  Project Stars/Life (1)

Teamwork (5)
  Unity (1)
  Good relations (1)
  High standards (1)
  Helpful (1)

Respect (4)
  Students (2)
    Rules and procedures (1)
    Individual diversities (1)
  Parents (2)
    Input heard (1)
    Individual diversities (1)

Community Involvement (4)
  Good communication (3)
  Contentment (1)

Stories
  Principal (10)
Promotes educational values (4)
  Pride (1)
  Attend meetings (1)
  Hard work (1)
  Dedication (1)
  Involvement (1)
Open communication (2)
Supportive of teachers (2)
Caring (2)
Fair (1)
Kind (1)
Teamwork (6)
Community (3)
  Flood (2)
  Meet student needs (1)
Staff (3)
  Improvement (2)
  Fair (1)
  Helpful (1)
  Do your best (1)
  Supportive (1)
  Welcoming (1)
Expectations for students (3)
  "Paycheck procedure (2)
  Recognition (1)
  Rewards (1)
Expectations
  General (32)
  Respect all (7)
Teamwork (6)
  Participate (4)
  Provide consistent programs (2)
  Encourage (1)
  Support (1)
High (3)
Excellence (3)
  Do your best (3)
  Give of yourself (1)
Be professional (2)
Pride (1)
Classroom Management (14)
  Practice procedures (11)
  Be prepared (2)
  Be prompt (1)
  Follow directions (1)
  Consistency (1)
Be flexible (1)
Expectations (1)
Consequences/rewards (2)

Communication (7)
Share (5)
Open (1)

Meetings (4)
Trainings (2)
Common preps (1)

Rituals
Staff Related (24)
Staff meeting (9)
Treats (9)
Coffee and juice (2)
Breakfast (2)
Coffee cake (1)

Special Occasions (9)
Baby showers (6)
Bridal showers (3)
Farewells (1)
Retirements (1)

Luncheons (4)
Grade level (2)

School Related (5)
Citizen assembly (2)
Morning procedures (1)
DEAR times (1)
“Paycheck” procedures (1)

None (4)

Classroom related (3)
Harry Wong's procedures and expectations (2)
Super citizens (1)

Heroes/Heroines
Principal (12)
Leader (9)
Diplomacy (2)
Sets standards of excellence (2)
Makes expectations clear (1)
Encourages creativity (1)
Dynamic (1)
Involved with students (1)
Motivating (1)

Willingness to do what is needed (4)
Crossing guard (1)
Playground duty (1)

Treats others kindly (3)
Sincerity (1)
Respects needs of all (1)
Shows appreciation (1)
Puts children first (1)
Creates a safe and loving environment (1)
Educator (1)
Positive (1)

Teachers (9)
Former RIP teacher (4)
  Provided Project Stars/Life training (4)
  Created share library (1)
Others (5)
  Helpful (3)
  Continuing education (2)
  Involved in activities (2)
  Experienced (1)
  Well-like (1)
  Go-getter (1)
  Committee members (1)
  Shares knowledge and learning (1)
  Patient (1)
Not one person (2)

School B
History
Demographics (9)
  Population (4)
    High Hispanic population (3)
    At-risk (2)
    Diverse population of students and teachers (2)
    60% poverty
    Transient (1)
    Older residents childless (1)
    Students bussed in (1)
  One of oldest schools in district (4)
    Located in central part of city (3)
    Historical; built in 1940s (2)
    Oldest buildings have been rebuilt (1)
People (5)
  Disappearance of second grader (2)
  State Senator attended (1)
  Former principal (2)
    Empowered staff (1)
    Gathered strong-minded staff (1)
    Initiator (1)
    Encouraged (1)
High expectations (1)
Supported (1)
Teachers responded positively (1)
Used talents of students and teachers (1)

Present principal (1)
Dictator (1)
Purchased new copiers (1)
Cleaner school (1)
Not as focused on tests (1)
Staff not as close (1)

Programs (5)
Full Bilingual program (2)
Strong bilingual teacher created openness and cooperativeness (1)
Accelerated School for eight years (1)
    Student's academics progressed (1)
    Too many meetings and responsibilities (1)
Cinco de Mayo celebration (1)

Values and Beliefs
Teacher-centered (9)
Characteristics (2)
    Responsibility (2)
    Respect (1)
    Professionalism (1)
    Rewarding (1)
Motto: “If it is to be – it is up to me” (1)
Site-based decision making (1)
Community and parent involvement (1)
Different teaching methods good (1)
Bilingual education important (1)
Appearances important – cleanliness (1)
Adhere to letter of the law (1)

Child-centered (5)
Students first (2)
All students can achieve (2)
Care about learning of students (1)

Cohesive values, beliefs and teaching philosophies are lacking (1)

Stories
Teacher Expectations (6)
Leaders within (2)
Help (1)
Cooperate (1)
If you really want to get something done, you need to go after it (1)
Listen to what you are told and do it (1)
Whatever you want to do must be okayed by principal (1)
Watch your back, don't trust anyone (1)
Complete lesson plans accurately or be written up (1)
Attend committees, activities, and meetings (1)

Administration (4)
Former principal (1)
Parents went to school board regarding hiring non-bilingual Pre-K teacher (1)
New administration (3)
Head custodian no longer controls school; must answer to principal (1)
Not sure how things are done (1)
Morale is low (1)

None (4)

Expectations
Teacher-centered (12)
Behaviors (11)
Professional (attire/behavior) (4)
Cooperate (3)
Be on time (3)
Do your job (2)
Be friendly (2)
Support others (2)
Prepare and execute lesson plans (2)
Keep room clean (1)
Be on task (1)
Be honest (1)
Ask for help (1)
Do not air differences at work (1)
Respect others (1)
Communicate what’s best for students (1)
Be open and tolerant (1)
High expectations (1)

Programs (1)
Bilingual program (1)
Technology/Computer usage (1)

Child-Centered (3)
Children first (1)
Responsibility to children (1)
Be nice to children (1)

Inconsistent (1)

Rituals
Staff-Related (10)
Monthly potluck breakfast (5)
Informal (4)
In classrooms (1)
At copiers (1)
Eating in lounge (1)
Various places (91)
Staff/committee meetings (1)
School-Related (2)
Monthly flagpole ceremony (1)
Assemblies with performances by African Drum Group and Drill Team (1)
Administration mad Thanksgiving meal for whole staff (1)
None (1)
Heroes/Heroines
Former Principal (6)
School Impact (6)
Influential (1)
Inspired/encouraged everyone to do their best (1)
Put school on path to academic success (1)
Willing to take risks (1)
Practiced site-based management (1)
Looked at positives (1)
Staff Impact (5)
Felt appreciated (91)
Kept everyone working together (1)
Friend (1)
Saw the best in teachers (1)
Helped and defended everyone (1)
Student Impact (4)
Sincere interest in students' well-being (1)
Felt safe and warm (1)
Put kids first (1)
Interacted with children daily (1)
Preschool Teacher (1)
Runs Safekey program (1)
Been there awhile (1)
None (4)

School C

History
Former Principal (6)
Relaxed and informal atmosphere (2)
Proactive (2)
Counseling background (1)
Understood where child was coming from (1)
Each child special (1)
School haven from life's difficulties (1)
Made school excellent place for all (1)
Parents had their way (1)
More cooperative (1)
Fewer problems (1)
Philosophy to keep staff happy (1)
Encouraged individualistic approach towards teaching style (1)

Staff (4)
Work well together (1)
Help each other (1)
Positive rapport (1)
Like a big family (1)
Friendly atmosphere (1)

Demographics (4)
Transient population (4)
Lots of cultures represented (1)
Apartment dwellers (1)
One parent families (1)

Activities (3)
Carnivals (3)
Track assemblies (1)
Family nights (1)
Fundraisers (1)
Talent show (1)

Named after a wonderful educator (1)
Changed over years partially due to accelerated schools (1)

Values and Beliefs
Child-centered (11)
School is a safe environment (3)
“A Nice Place for Kids” (2)
All students can learn (2)
Mission statement: The school will be a safe and positive
environment which encourages creativity, positive attitudes,
and positive self-esteem (2)
Foster self-esteem (2)
Do not participate in “bad parenting” (1)
Children come first (1)
All children treated equal with equal opportunity to learn (1)
Every child important (1)
Every child can be successful (1)
Encourage each student toward personal responsibility for
own action (1)
Value teacher comfort more than children (1)

Staff-centered (6)
Emphasis on district policy and standards (3)
All members of school community work to best ability (1)
Find unique characteristics (1)
Develop talents (1)
Respect for each other and teaching profession (1)
Responsibility for actions and students (1)
Do not operate in original accelerated school’s format (1)

Stories

Present (5)
Follow rules (2)
Up in the air (2)
Keep nose clean (1)
Won’t back you (1)
Don’t complain (1)
Keep opinion to self (1)
Don’t make administration mad (1)
Kiss up (1)

Past (3)
Do your job and I’ll respect your choices (1)
Clique of teachers ran school to their needs (1)
Warm, friendly atmosphere; “A Nice Place for Kids” (1)

Behaviors (3)
Be flexible (1)
  One year portable was moved and roof fell in; then
  portable was vandalized; resulting in sharing a room
  for three weeks (1)
Don’t expect smaller classes even with new addition and 11
portables (1)
Check master calendar before scheduling (1)
If lunch count inaccurate, end of line won’t get an entrée (1)

Activities (3)
Staff meetings/staff development days (1)
  Establish policies to be used, however, old programs
  often re-established (1)
New Year’s Party (1)
  First faculty meeting of year (1)
  Breakfast, hats and horns (1)
Happy Hour on Fridays (1)
  Discuss week’s events (1)
  Decisions made (1)

None (2)

Expectations
Teacher-centered (14)
Follow rules (5)
Be professional (3)
Teamwork (3)
Be prompt (2)
Be organized (2)
Maintain dress code (2)
Document all work (2)
Do your job (2)
Be courteous (1)  
Maintain security (1)  
Be efficient (1)  
Be prepared (1)  
Keep lesson plans current (1)  
Grade books = one grade per week (1)  
Reading and ability groups (1)  
Be flexible (1)  
Kiss up to everyone (1)  

Student-centered (3)  
All children can learn (1)  
Do whatever so students achieve (1)  
Take responsibility for students (1)  
Do what's best for students (1)  

Rituals  
None (8)  
Activities (5)  
Happy hours (2)  
Wearing school t-shirt on Fridays (1)  
Treats on holidays (1)  
Breakfast leftovers when visitors are here (1)  
Rotary Club (1)  
   Monthly recognition of teachers and students (1)  
   New toys at Christmas (1)  
Smoking area (1)  

Behaviors (2)  
Kindness to others (1)  
Check computer for what's happening (1)  

Heroes/Heroinies  
Former Principal (8)  
   Opened school (3)  
      Set tone of school (2)  
         Fostered attitude of family (1)  
         Warm homey atmosphere (2)  
      Personified motto: "A Great Place for Kids" (1)  
Energetic (2)  
Caring (2)  
Supported teachers (2)  
   Morale (1)  
   Materials (1)  
   Innovative (1)  
   Liked by all (1)  
   Liked to socialize (1)  
   
Former counselor (1)  
   Great compassion for kids (1)  
   Treated each child with respect and understanding (1)  
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Respect for teachers (1)
Personal motto: Not above you, not below you, but beside you (1)
Child centered (1)
Praised staff (1)
Friend first (1)
Not one person (5)
Each person integral (2)
Philosophy/belief all staff equal (1)
Doors always open (1)
Respected (1)
Teamwork essential (1)
Having something positive to offer (1)
Contribute unselfishly (1)
People come and go quickly (1)
Staff (3)
Office manager (1)
Kind (1)
Respectful (1)
Reliable (1)
Second grade teacher (1)
Embraced technology (1)
Innovative (1)
Librarian (1)
Interacts with entire staff (1)
First with Master’s in Computers (1)

School D

History
Effect of New Principal (7)
Helped shape character of school (4)
Positive person who deeply cares about education (1)
Before more behavior problems and overall negative behaviors (1)
Instituted programs i.e. Peer Mediation, Character Education (1)

Big role in school’s structure (3)
New governance (1)
New attitude toward overall instruction (1)

Becoming an Accelerated School (3)
New look at determining who students truly are and how this guides/drives instruction (1)
Believes in teaching through character education to promote appropriate behavior (1)
Commonality of goals for good of students (1)

Changes (6)
Presently (6)
  Large ELL/minority population (5)
  High transience (2)
  Marginally at-risk (2)
  Year round (2)
  Large apartment area (1)
  Students from custom home area enrolled elsewhere (1)
  More time on remediation (1)
  Changes in family educational level (1)

Opened (2)
  Middle-high economic base (1)
  Custom home area (1)
  Lobbied to have school built (1)

Elaine Wynn (6)
  Namesake (4)
  Supportive interest in library and art program (3)
  Visits school (2)
  Donated money (1)
  Provided valet parking at dedication (1)
  Who's paying for upcoming tenth birthday celebration? (1)

Staff Focused (4)
  Toilet seat award for teacher with most unusual/disruptive class (1)
  Teachers used to be called “Elaine Wynn Dollies” because past principal hired women teachers who dressed professionally (1)

Activities (2)
  Holiday get-togethers (2)
  Celebrate holidays (1)
  Staff development days (1)
  End of year get-togethers (1)
  Mini-retreats (1)
  Warm and welcoming (1)

Community focused (3)
  Strong community involvement (1)
  Strong parent-teacher communications (1)
  Warm, inviting place (1)

Activities (1)
  Fall festival (1)
  Family math night (1)
  Parent institute which provides information and education to families on services in community and parent education classes (1)

Values and Beliefs
  Staff-Centered (11)
Be involved in school (1)
Do job and take it seriously (1)
Not all values/beliefs same (1)
Problems with favorites/cliques (1)
Don't trust people (1)
Some take positive, proactive approach, others just collect a paycheck (1)
Here to make a difference in students (1)
Address each student's needs (1)
Too busy writing grants and doing inservices (1)
Put great effort into lessons and classroom (1)
Want to instill values and good character (1)
Effort to involve parents with students (1)
Mission statement: to provide a safe, caring and positive learning environment where we promote academic success, seek to develop a broad sense of the world and grow together through mutual respect and unity of purpose (1)

Child-Centered (10)
Children most important (5)
All children can succeed/learn (2)
Insure all children can learn (2)
Children come first (1)
Children do not come first (1)
Result worth extra effort (1)
Value all children (1)
School open place for children (1)

Character Education (8)
Behavior very important (3)
Values honesty and respect (1)
Emphasizes building good character and good citizens (1)
Followed publicly and internally (1)
Beliefs/pillars: responsibility, trustworthiness, respect, caring, fairness, citizenship (1)
Brings skills of communication and healthy value system home (1)

Administration (2)
Positive and proactive (1)
Strives to be on cutting edge (1)
Provides training and materials (1)
Values teachers (1)
Makes teachers feel important as person and education (1)

Stories
None (10)
People (4)
Respect all specialists; teases that they are mean and degrading, but actually great to work with (1)
Is one of the stories since “old hand” of district (1)
Paula Story: Compulsive liar and staff believed her. Sent
wedding gifts, baby gifts and flowers to the hospital when
none of it occurred. Staff is not as trusting anymore (1)
Old nurse was crazy and ran her mouth about things when
she shouldn’t have. Principal ran her out of school (1)

Communications (3)
So many activities, no time to gossip (1)
The louder you bitch and complain, the more you’ll get (1)
Be prepared to have “dirty laundry” aired with all grade level
teachers (1)

Behavior (3)
Brown nosers = do your best and follow the crowd (1)
When Xerox machine breaks down, use one in the first
grade storage area (1)
Everything needs to look pretty (1)
Stay on top of things (1)

Governance (3)
Teachers decide what’s best for school (2)
Many meetings (2)
Understood that principal gets final say (1)
Tough to get everyone to cooperate (1)
Teachers part of team (1)
Principal no longer the only authority (1)
Bottom-up governance versus top-down (1)

Atmosphere (1)
Always celebrating (1)
Staff is warm and caring (1)
Always someone there to lift you up with joke, hug or card
(1)
Great school (1)

Expectations
Staff Behaviors (18)
Dress professionally (5)
Display student work neatly (3)
Respect one another and beliefs (3)
Do your part (3)
Act professionally and civilly (2)
Don’t rock the boat (2)
Be flexible (2)
Reinforce STAR with students that help solve problems (1)
Be friendly (1)
Don’t gossip (1)
Don’t complain (1)
Volunteer (1)
Clean up your own mess (1)
Don't be critical of others (1)
Smile often (1)
Keep a sense of humor (1)
Communicate (1)
All important decisions made by principal, staff given token note (1)
Be considerate (1)
Everything you say probably will be heard by everyone (1)
Following rules makes a better working atmosphere (1)
Take in and attempt suggestions (1)
Do not alter suggestions or offer own ideas (1)
Respect kids (1)
High expectations (1)

Staff Involvement (6)
Do many extra-curricular activities (2)
  PTA
    Family Math Night (1)
    Christmas Project (1)
Active participants on cadres to ensure site-based decisions (2)
Participate enthusiastically (1)
Use activities that embody powerful learning (1)
  No worksheets (1)
  Value and respect exciting learning (1)
  Active learning (1)

None (3)

Rituals
Staff-Centered (11)
  Monthly treats (7)
  Monthly birthday cakes (5)
  Happy hour (4)
  Celebrations (2)
    Weddings (1)
    Birthdays (1)
    Baby showers (1)
  Lunch locations (2)
  Teacher Appreciation Week (1)
None (6)

Meetings (3)
Donuts and junk food (2)
Theme with decorations, dress and refreshments (1)

Heroes/Heroines
Staff (13)
  Judith Berry, art teacher (5)
    Wonderful art (2)
    Did projects with students (1)
Taught things most don't learn (1)
Artist in own right (1)
Respected other creativity (1)
Displayed art throughout school (1)
Fun (1)
Honest (1)
Hard working (1)
Loved to be with children (1)
People cried when she left (1)
Not specific (4)
Could be trusted (1)
Staff here for children (1)
Provide best quality education (1)
Works hard (1)
Involved (1)
High degree of professionalism (1)
Loves the school (1)
Makes sure everything is maintained (1)
Looks for new ways to improve educational programs (1)
Welcoming and inviting to newcomers (1)
Helpful and giving (1)
Funny (1)

Pat Helbert (2)
Hard working (1)
Fun (1)
Honest (1)
Loved to be with children (1)

Special Education Facilitator (1)
Opened school (1)
Highly regarded (1)
Helped many in difficult situations (1)

David Hudzick (1)
Remarkable teacher and leader (1)
Organizes events (1)
Takes special assignments that make school enjoyable (1)
Personality shines through (1)
Enthusiastic (1)

Diana Tyler (1)
Opened school (1)
Lends self to almost every project (1)
Works very hard (1)
Respected and admired (1)
Popular (1)

Karen Ames (1)
Didicated educator and leader (1)
Innovative (1)
Brought wonderful ideas to school (1)

None (5)
Elaine Wynn (3)
Attends special activities (3)
Open House (1)
DARE (1)
Nevada Day/Halloween (1)

Given many things (2)
Reads/talks to students (2)
Speaks to teachers/parents (1)
Namesake (1)

Current Principal (2)
Very approachable (1)
Understanding (1)
Easy to get along with (1)
Good sense of humor (1)
Instrumental in shaping school (1)

School E

History
University connection (16)
Professional Development School (9)
Train and educate future teachers (9)
Extensive professional development (2)
Inclusion program where all students educated with peers (1)
More help so able to individualize (1)
Still being developed (1)

Demographics (6)
At-risk population (3)
One of older schools in district (2)
Some parents and “old timers” attended old school (2)
Large ELL/diverse population (2)
Serves neighborhood students (1)

Teacher Expectations (5)
Teaching expertise (2)
Additional meetings and responsibilities (2)
Cadres (1)
Lunchtime collaboratives (1)
Study groups (1)
Theme planning (1)
Pod sharing (1)

Have a say (1)
A lot of work (1)
Need to meet/exceed all expectations in order to set standards for other schools (1)

Parents (1)
Parent Institute where parents work on academic skills with their children (1)

Values and Beliefs
Child-Centered (10)
All children can learn (6)
Meet student’s needs (3)
Value each child (2)
Put child’s needs first (2)
Concentrate on child’s strengths (1)
No special education (1)
Entitled to equal education (1)
Give best education (1)
Ensure every child is successful (1)

Staff-Centered (10)
Be and prepare life-long learners (4)
Powerful learning experience (2)
Reading/literacy (3)
Math (1)
High expectations (2)
Teaching (1)
Research-based materials (1)
All staff shares in responsibility (1)
Rigorous, accepting program (1)
Spend time on reflection, study and classroom participation (1)
Always do your best (1)
Be professional (1)
Value other teacher’s opinions and expertise (1)
Mentor/help preservice teachers (1)
Ensure future of culture intact (1)
Governance structure allows everyone to have say (1)
Develop expertise (1)
Principal has final say (1)

Other (1)
Same as public statement (1)

Stories
Teacher expectations (7)
All teachers help one another and visitors (2)
Hard work the norm, but also play (1)
Spanish classes (1)
Teacher’s choir (1)
Guitar lessons (1)
Principal is hard working too (1)
Student work on bulletin board perfect or redone (1)
Always be on your toes (1)
Don't take small problems to administration (1)
Flexibility (1)
Always on the go (1)

None (6)
Decision-making (2)
Have one teacher, not group present idea to principal (1)
If you have a new idea, go for it (1)
Use any and all materials (1)
Be careful what you write on the white board (1)
School not a place to vent frustrations (1)
Things accomplished by little wheels growing into bigger wheels (1)
Things often done at last minute (1)
Things done poorly if people uninformed (1)
Difficult and stressful to plan since mentoring new (1)

People (2)
Intens preparing lessons comment about their lessons (1)
Teachers learn about struggles of writing detailed plans thought interns knew more (1)
Like nurses during war – tend wounds and help students survive (1)

Atmosphere (1)
High pressure due to University link (1)
Challenges/rewards of dignitary visits, piloting new programs and testing theories and strategies (1)

Expectations
Teacher-Focused (17)
Teamwork (7)
Be open/flexible (6)
Expressing ideas (1)
Improving school (1)
Be involved (4)
In at least one cadre (2)
Work with University students (3)
Work hard (3)
If something is wrong, work on solution (2)
Be prepared (2)
See larger picture (2)
Admit mistakes/don't make mistakes (2)
Get along well with others (1)
Dress appropriately (9)
Take responsibility (1)
Take risks (1)
Try something before criticizing (1)
Be a model teacher (1)
Help others (1)
Be sensitive to at-risk students and needs (1)
Be professional (1)
Don't be petty (1)
Do what's best for kids (1)
Keep up with recent research (1)
Have well designed lessons (1)
Have good discipline (1)
If well-liked and admired by administrator or have reputation as quality teacher, all's well (1)

Instructional Issues (2)
Continual staff development (3)
Thorough lesson plans a week in advance (1)
Support/Use Reading Recovery programs (1)

School (1)
Only half of copiers function at usable level (1)

Rituals
Staff-Centered (9)
Food-related (9)
Eat lunch together (4)
Monthly potlucks (3)
TGIF/Happy Hour (2)
Holiday luncheons (1)
Cookie exchanges (9)
Coffee and talk in reading room (1)
Poetry share with continental breakfast (1)

Other (8)
Playing guitar/flute (4)
Study groups (3)
Teacher choir (2)
Literacy clubs (1)
Bunko night (1)
Not enough morale building activities (1)

None (3)

Heroes/heroines
Not specific (7)
Works hard (3)
Love of teaching (2)
Years of teaching experience (2)
Teachers district classes/workshops (2)
Willing to help out (2)
Positive and creative (2)
Relentless (2)
Life-long learners (1)
Mentor/mentee (1)
Professional (1)
Working for national board certification (1)
Trainer of mentor teachers (1)
Knowledge of children and learning (1)
Wonderful resource (1)
Hands-on, motivating ways to teach (1)
Well-liked (1)
Researching new methods (1)
Exemplary program (1)
Many outstanding, respected teachers (1)
Listens (1)
Relates and cares (1)

Marsha Morgan (2)
Mentor (2)
Coordinates activities (1)
Well-regarded (1)
Kind, generous person (1)
Established reading room (1)
Collaborates (1)

Juanita Falls (2)
Experienced teacher (1)
Instills self-respect in students (1)
Students have own governance structure (1)
Totally devoted to kids (1)
Great influence on kids’ lives (1)
Community building activities in classroom (1)

Kay Cromes (1)
Been at school a long time (1)
Knows everyone (1)

Mary Sowder (1)
Outstanding educator (1)
Provides exemplary models (1)
Leads through being part of planning (1)
Doesn’t step on those who don’t see the big picture (1)
Teaches class for district (1)
Master teacher (1)
Demeanor of a learner (1)
Skills to bring out/teach us how to learn more (1)

Sue Hendricks (1)
Reading specialist (1)
Presented reading inservices (1)
Knowledgeable (1)

School Clerk (1)
  With school a long time (1)
  Member of community (1)
  Knows all families/children (1)

Mr. Moore, interim principal (1)
  Very personable and well known in community (1)
  Trusted the teachers (1)
  Know what was going on at all times (1)
  Staff loyal to him (1)
  Firm when required (1)
  Patient and reflective in assessing situations (1)

None (1)
APPENDIX D

OCAI METAPHORS AND EXPLANATIONS
OCAI METAPHORS

School A

School

Climate (8)
- Happy, warm place (3)
- Modern Day Brady Bunch – bright, cheerful, happy-go-lucky (1)
- Community – people working, playing and being involved in each other’s lives (1)
- Disneyland – fun, innovative, exciting (1)
- School from heaven – to good to be true (1)
- Shelter – safe place, make lives better (1)

Working together (4)
- Family – work together; helps each other, cares about what happens (2)
- Home away from home – feel comfortable, loved, and needed (1)
- Team – all work together (1)

Hard working (3)
- Community meeting place – place where things get done (1)
- Freight train – moves at fast pace and loaded with goods (talents) (1)
- Sorority house – know when to work and when to play (1)

Learning (2)
- Forbes 500 company – successful in creating well-rounded students (1)
- Road of knowledge – learn something every day (1)

Reputation (2)
- Taj Majal of Education – best reputation for excellence; unique and diverse (1)
- Shining beacon – well known in district for progress (1)

Miscellaneous (2)
- Family – always used by parents, staff (1)
- Melting pot – teachers of various ages, experiences (1)

Principal

Sets tone (5)
- Leader – sets tone for school; very good at her job (2)
- Born administrator – natural at managing and directing people (1)
- Chief of wise owl – runs the show, aware, has respect (1)
- Chameleon – can change and adapt to any situation she needs (1)

Characteristics (5)
Sweetheart – very sweet and nice but puts foot down when needed (1)  
House mom – helpful, runs house so well (1)  
Saint – never looses her temper (1)  
Dear – gentle, kind, respectful (1)  
- Gentle, kind, loving (1)  
Gets job done (4)  
Leader of the pack – makes it all work (1)  
Go-getter – knows how to get the job done, never slows down (1)  
Butterfly – flutters around sharing her many insights (1)  
Mother – takes care of everything (1)  
Devotion (4)  
Apple of Education’s eye – unconditionally devoted to children (1)  
Caring, highly qualified person – always out for best interest of students (1)  
Angel – totally positive, high standards of excellence, consistent caring spreads (1)  
Leader – believes in her cause, displays traits of strength, equality, compassion (1)  
Role model (3)  
Ultimate educator – role model (1)  
Role Model – wonderful example (1)  
Leader – models what she wants practiced (1)  
Teacher  
Dedicated (5)  
- Dedicated (2)  
Hercules – always striving to be the best (1)  
Overachiever – constantly improving (1)  
Professional – care about quality of work provided (1)  
Hard worker (4)  
Work horse – work hard to be good educator (1)  
Overachiever – high levels of staff development, extra time (1)  
Worker bee – work hard, but don’t receive the glory (paycheck) (1)  
Work horse – work well beyond paycheck (1)  
Team player (3)  
Giver – gives, share (1)  
Sculptor – mold and shape children’s lives everyday (1)  
Team players – everyone involved (1)  
Part of whole (3)  
Member – part of family, but no less important (1)
Bed – different sizes and shapes, soft or hard, feel safe and warm (1)
Cog in the wheel – each individual is important to keep the school running smoothly (1)
Professional (2)
Loving profession – gives 100% (1)
- Excellent teacher, loves children, loves job (1)
General (2)
Bright star in sky – gifted teachers (1)
Sorority boy/girl – young, friendly, energetic (1)
Student
Follow expectations (5)
Well-behaved – reviewed expectations (1)
Respectful – follow expectations, good (1)
Caring student – show respect (1)
- Happy, curious, enjoy and respect school (1)
Receptive – reflects wonderful environment (1)
Eager to learn (5)
Hard worker – wants to do their best (1)
Sponge – soak up knowledge, love and attention given; eager to learn, ready to soak up as much as can (2)
Angel – sweet, eager to learn (1)
Dreamer – dreams of achieving great things (1)
Miscellaneous (3)
Client – we work for them (1)
Video game vanguard – middle class champs at TV and video games (1)
Neighbor – no-bus school (1)
Unique (2)
Seashell – unique in beauty and characteristics (1)
Book – each unique, can learn from them (1)
To be respected (2)
- To be respected (1)
- Child that needs to be respected (1)
Community
Support system (11)
Support system (1)
Square on a quilt (1)
Small town – knows one another, looks out for one another (1)
Mother hen – very involved, concerned about all children (1)
Team (1)
Involved – PTA involves lots of helpers (1)
Safe haven – ideal school, community at fingertips, parents encouraged to be involved (1)
- Exceptionally caring and interested (1)
- Caring and helping (1)
Zesty – add enjoyment to lives, finds ways to enhance it (1)
- Concerned, want best possible education (1)

Background/description (5)
  Garden – pleasant, nice area (1)
Picket fence, lawn mower neighborhood – small houses, lots of pride, clean and neat (1)
- Middle class, religious community, high family values (1)
Melting pot – all backgrounds and walks of life (1)
Facade of Paradise – looks great but children come with problems like everywhere (1)

School B

School

Negatives (4)
  Bomb ready to explode – teachers are miserable (1)
  Lightning storm – you never know where it is going to strike and it’s deadly (1)
  Organization of a larger organization – system is too big (1)
  Dysfunctional family – staff not close, but does their job (1)

Positives (2)
  A cool place – people friendly and easygoing (1)
  Mix of many different talents – everyone has a lot to offer (1)

Diversity (2)
  Diverse place (1)
  Diamond – multi-faceted i.e. bilingual, multi-cultural (1)

Miscellaneous (2)
  Roseanne Barr – a good facelift doesn’t change inside of person (1)
  Garden – students are plants and flowers that need care (1)

Principal

Manager/Leader (5)
  Manager of school affairs (1)
  Leader – sets tone for school (1)
  Person who does his best – taken on new responsibilities and projects with pride (1)
  Truckin – new principal, trying to figure it all out (1)
  Captain of ship – rules fair and just but he’s the authority (1)

Authoritarian (4)
  A little man with a Napoleon complex – authoritarian (1)
Egotist – motivation behind decisions is self-aggrandizement (1)
By-the-book guy – doesn’t want to bend rules, hasn’t bonded with staff (1)
Banty Rooster – struts around stating how great things are yet moral is low (1)

Teachers
Dedicated, hard worker (9)
  Caretaker – dedicated to teaching students (1)
  Missionary – belief in helping at risk students, hard work done willingly (1)
  Super drone – hard worker (1)
  Dedicated person – work hard (1)
  Dedicated to point of being overbearing – some teachers do things their way and don’t like change (1)
  Working person earning a living – work not babysitters (1)
  Hard worker – work hard to get message across to students, need to work smarter (1)
  Gardener – tends garden with great care (1)
  Israelite from Old Testament – hard workers who get little praise but only lashings (1)

Variety (1)
  - Different types, don’t fit in one category (1)

Not appreciated (1)
  Ladybug climbing slippery mountain – for every two steps forward, you get knocked back three (1)

Students
Hungry (3)
  Frog on lily pad waiting for fly – hungry for food, clothes, love, education (1)
  Puppy – always hungry for love, learning, security, and food (1)
    - Eager to learn (1)

Good (3)
  Angel – good/great kids (3)

Miscellaneous (3)
  Special person – each child is different (1)
  Angel – all have ended up here for some reason (1)
  Victim of circumstance – tossed around from schools and homes (1)

Growing (2)
  Budding flower – just starting their lives, tending to their growth (1)
    - Normal and on their way up (1)
Community
Changes (8)
  Once prosperous area – was affluent, now going down in value (1)
  - Community historical and changing with times (1)
  Hopeful place – immigrant poverty, still hope situation with change (1)
  Rose bed needing tending – some homes/families in full bloom, disrepair – needing tending, wilting – needing water and attention (1)
  - A nice old neighborhood (1)
  - Transient (1)
  Unkempt garden – lower income area with good, caring people (1)
  Old – highly populated with Hispanics (1)
Caring and Courageous (2)
  Whale – quiet courage (1)
  Caring community – parents worry about future and safety of children (1)

School C

School
Changes (5)
  Study in motion – expect mass exodus of teachers (1)
  Storm waiting for dust to settle – changes coming fast, probably new staff next year (1)
  Fast moving train – new people boarding and unboarding (1)
  In the flux of change – new principal (1)
  Trying to find itself – big shake up with change of principal (1)
By the book (3)
  Run by the clock/rules – lectures about rules by administration (1)
  Army camp – everything by the book (1)
  Machine – moves to stated tolerances with no variances (1)
Miscellaneous (3)
  Bulging at the seams – too many kids in classes, lots of zone variances (1)
  Learning place – fits the bill (1)
  Nut house – staff riddled with personal problems (1)
Melting pot (2)
  Melting pot – 29 different languages spoken, multi-cultural student body (2)
Positive (2)
Finely tuned machine – all parts work together successfully (1)  
Paradise – great place (1)  

Principal  
Leader (3)  
Team leader – excellent leadership qualities (1)  
Task master – school a place to run (1)  
Engineer – driving force (1)  

By the book (3)  
By the book – strictly policy and procedures, does not play favorites (1)  
Charge nurse – authority, follow her rules (1)  
My way or the highway – goes by the book (1)  

Treatment of others (3)  
Mystery novel – sometimes you can figure out the ending before it happens (1)  
Unbiased – treats everyone equally and fairly (1)  
Tower of strength – able to handle all situations effectively and successfully (1)  

Attitude (3)  
Time bomb – never know when she will blow (1)  
Dr. Jekyll /Mr. Hyde – extreme mood swings, never know what to expect (1)  
On the edge – has to have a problem to solve to feel important (1)  

Newness (2)  
Administer – don’t know her well enough (1)  
New person on the block – nine years under one administration, changes in progress (1)  

Teacher  
Professional (4)  
Overworked but underpaid – dip into pockets for extras, put in a lot of overtime (1)  
Professional (1)  
Educator – do their job (1)  
Shining star – do their job well (1)  

Teamwork (1)  
Team player – working together (1)  
People person – everyone gets along with each other (1)  
Cheerleader – always try to positively cheer each other on (1)  

Characteristics (3)  
Candy bar – very sweet people (1)  
Cold as ice – very colicky (1)
Just out of the cradle – young staff (1)

Miscellaneous (3)
- Ready to fly the coop – problem adjusting to new person in charge (1)
- As different as day and night – no one typical (1)
- Unknown – has not visited other teacher’s classrooms (1)

Student involvement (2)
- Trip to the money – staff leads their class like a guide or great adventure (1)
- Conductor – walking up and down aisles monitoring passengers (1)

Students
At-risk (8)
- Calculus problem – must have understanding to solve their problem (1)
- Clueless – unstable home life leave them bewildered and confused (1)
- Jumping Jack – deal with stress at home and school, feel they are being pulled up and down (1)
- Rolling stone – keep moving in and out (1)
- Low income and nonwhite (1)
- Good kid with difficult home life – sometimes problems from home overwhelm concerns at school (1)
- At-risk child – high transience rate = gap in education (1)
- Movers – move schools 2-3 times in one year.

Desire to learn (3)
- Sponge – like it here, soak up what is going on (2)
- Eager beaver – really want to learn (1)

Miscellaneous (3)
- Team player – working together (1)
- Apple of my eye – very proud of majority of students (1)
- Passenger – along for the ride (1)

Community
Demographics (14)
- Apartment community – apartments, no stability, always moving, 99.9% (3)
- Tossed salad – variation in background socially and education (1)
- Extremely transient – high transience rate (1)
- Middle of the road community – families move in and out (1)
- Patchwork quilt – many types of families and cultures (1)
- Trailer park – low-income families (1)
- Shifting sand – transience (1)
- 95% apartments/rentals (1)
Transient hotel — students move in and out (1)
Train station — point where passengers get on and off (1)
Garden of good and evil — good here, but bad element in neighborhood (1)
Airport terminal — comes and goes, doesn’t stay long (1)

Helpers (2)
Partner — helping school (1)
Very wealthy cash crop — desire to give great deal when asked and used (1)

School D

School

Positive (8)
Diamond in the rough — unique school (1)
Day at the beach — everyone excited to come to school (1)
Home away from home — comfortable, caring (1)
Disneyland — happy, warm, loving (1)
Positive workplace environment (1)
Happy place to work — love being there (1)
Family — close (1)
Example — very good school, model for others (1)

Active (6)
Active fun learning place — many activities and projects, life skills and information for students (1)
Beehive of activity — everyone busy (1)
Tranquil sea — soothing, but takes work to get where going (1)
Learning community — everyone learning (1)
Kaleidoscope — always changing (1)
Fun factory — hard working while producing original exciting ideas (1)

Variety (3)
Split decision — half staff effective hard working, half negative (1)
Small, rural town in small state — gossip (1)
High school dance — too many separate groups, lots of gossip (1)

Miscellaneous (2)
Garden — students growing everyday (1)
Zoo — different animals with different problems (1)

Principal

Instructional leader (3)
Leader (1)
Instructional leader — created powerful team (1)
Negotiator – integrate district policies without disrupting apple cart (1)

Characteristics (16)

Children’s nurse – approachable, student-centered, caring (1)
Approachable model in making – not perfect, but approachable (1)
Kind, knowledgeable professional provider – recognizes individuals with positive reinforcement on consistent basis (1)
Jewel – fair, positive, supportive (1)
Mentor – always available for help, suggestions, resources (1)
Well-oiled machine – positive, hard working (1)
Bumble bee – well structured, professional, hard working (1)
Cheerleader with an attitude – positive, student centered, works hard (1)
- Caring (1)
Cheerleader – positive, loving, helpful (1)
Bomb (kid speak) – wonderful (1)
Peach – in good mood, gives compliments, willing to help (1)
Icon – always looks good, recognizable, stands out and for something (1)
Energizer bunny – works hard, keeps going (1)
Gem – does a lot (1)
Hamster in wheel – long hours to offer best education (1)

Teacher

Dedicated (10)

Star – work so hard we shine (1)
Hard worker – do a lot, love what they do (1)
Hot rod – ready to rev, get on the move, strong (1)
Rock – dedicated, hard working (1)
Tiger – great (1)
Clown – cheery, enthusiastic, jump through hoops for students, creative (1)
Eye of tiger – ferocious, always watching out for students (1)
- Dedicated, caring (1)
Dedicated to life long learning (1)
Dead relative – gives it their all (1)

Diversity (4)

B – good, not excellent (1)
Human beings – make mistakes, have issues and baggage (1)
A ok – not all go the extra mile (1)
Excellent facilitator of learning – no two alike (1)
Giving (3)
  Rainbow — unique, colorful, bring pot of gold knowledge to students (1)
  Clam — capable of producing gems when left alone (1)
  Creative nurturer (1)
Young (1)
  New to the game — young, being molded to good educators (1)

Students
  Needy (13)
  Empty wagons — not enough experiences/learning before coming to kindergarten (1)
  Suitcase — comes with lots of baggage (1)
  Sally Struthers — always in need, looking for more (1)
  Dependent — school needs to be consistent place in life, high degree of transience (1)
  Few French fries short of a happy meal — needy yet happy (1)
  Street smart (1)
  Abandoned cub — little support from parents/community (1)
  Journeyman — high turnover (1)
  Hard to judge kids, they change a lot (1)
  Challenge — at-risk/ELL population (1)
  Shooting star — blaze past you so fast, but wish so much on them (1)
  Very loving — love to receive attention, love to give it back (1)
  Teddy bear — sincere, appreciative, warm, need plenty of hugs (1)
Potential (3)
  Butterfly — come as caterpillar shaped into butterfly (1)
  Rosebush — beautiful yet thorny (1)
  Piece of clay — moldable at times to become masterpiece (1)
Diversity (2)
  Unique — all different (1)
  Wide range of students hard working to lazy (1)
Miscellaneous (1)
  Round, yellow smiley face (1)

Community
  Homes (7)
  Smorgasbord — expensive, custom homes and government homes (1)
  Cinderella and two stepsisters — expensive homes next to apartments (1)
Beauty and the Beast — expensive homes next to government project homes; $300,000 homes and ghetto apartments (2)
Study in opposites — custom homes and government subsidized apartments (1)
Diamond in the rough — very nice surrounded by not so nice (1)
Cage loaded with life — many adults and children live in small apartments (1)

Diversity (6)
- Diversified — many cultures, beliefs, home lives, ideas (1)
- Diverse (1)
- Melting pot — very diverse (1)
  - Low socioeconomic Hispanic (1)
- Dive — not much support, low socioeconomic (1)
- False storefront — looks pretty, but kids are poor (1)

Changing (2)
- Jungle — environment wild and unpredictable, but growing and changing (1)
- Horse of many colors — constantly changing (1)

Miscellaneous (2)
- Pitfall — easy to jump over but once you fall in trap, you never escape (1)
- Needy one — people hungry for whatever they can get (1)

**School E**

Many people and talents (4)
- Tossed salad — students, teachers, UNLV professors and administrators provide many tastes to the palette (1)
- Spring of ideas — each person brings a unique perspective and talent (1)
- Stew being stirred — many programs adults, teachers and programs being mixed together (1)
- Cruise ship — needs many different people to run it, sometimes water is smooth, sometimes rough (1)

Teamwork (3)
- Orchestra — Teamwork and goal setting in continual drive to meet every student (1)
- Sports team (baseball) — work as a team striving toward one goal — to be the best (1)
- Work in progress — have a lot to do to organize mentoring program (1)

Laboratory (3)
- Laboratory in progress — experiment and are experimented on (1)
Fish bowl – everyone watching and looking (1)  
Stage – many opportunities to be observed by visitors (1)  
Busy (2)  
Carnival – always something going on (1)  
Peace Corp – the more we accomplish, the more we are given, no down time (1)  
Teaching (2)  
Oven – cooks up a storm of good teaching (1)  
Garden – students are flowers, teacher is the gardener (1)  
Miscellaneous (2)  
Haven – safe place for many (1)  
Tip of iceberg – it shows (1)  

Principal  
Visionary (6)  
Mayor – always on top of things (1)  
Diamond on field – bright and visionary, many facets and functions she does well (1)  
Visionary – concrete goals (1)  
Politician – uses her power to get things done, but plays game to appease people (1)  
Captain – guides ship toward mission (destination) (1)  
Crystalline vessel – reflective, articulate, sharp, clear and assumes big job making others shine and do their best (1)  
Articulate (3)  
Umpire – regulates and sets rules, answers technical questions (1)  
Barbara Walters – very articulate and capable in media coverage and in speaking before public (1)  
A public relations wizard – keeps calm and cool, articulates well regardless of whom the audience is (1)  
Busy (2)  
Roller coaster with many wheels – hard to keep up with her (1)  
Busy bee – has her hand in several projects at once (1)  

Changes mind (2)  
Jekyll and Hyde (1)  
Chameleon – changes mind, don’t always know where she’s coming from (1)  

Miscellaneous (3)  
Gracious hostess – greets many visitors and explains how school works (1)  
Bologna in sandwich – takes direction from each side (1)  
Cheerleader – always thinks we can do it (1)  

Teacher
Workaholics (7)
- Workaholic - extra time asked of teacher above and beyond most schools; work hard, give it their all and do their best (3)
- Cog in a wheel - always moving on, never deterred, part of a greater (1)
- Super person - always busy with several things (1)
- Ox - pull a lot of weight and do a lot of work (1)
- Energizer bunny - have a lot of energy (1)

Talented (3)
- Wizard - very talented, professional staff (1)
- Master teacher (1)
- Time juggler - jack of all trades (1)

Miscellaneous (3)
- Prayer - bulk of team (1)
- Puppet - administration calls the shots (1)
- No typical teacher - very diverse (1)

Guides (2)
- Compass - points children in right direction (1)
- Gardener - each has nurturing disposition (1)

Teamwork (1)
- Shipmate - work together for smooth trip (1)

Student
Potential (6)
- Flower - bursting with color and life (1)
- Dynamo - bursting with potential (1)
- Bundle of life - have had many life experiences which make them tough and able to survive (1)
- Diamond in the rough - has potential that needs to be developed; have great potential (2)
- Tortoise - slow in beginning, but gains at end (1)

Survival (4)
- Tinkerbell - home is not a safe haven (1)
- Fish out of water - struggling to survive (1)
- Emotionally deprive child - lack stability in lives, strive for attention (1)
- Disadvantaged, extremely resourceful - pull emotional resources from unpredictable places (1)

Miscellaneous (3)
- Monkey - adorable but mischievous (1)
- Desi Arnez - lot of ELL students acquiring proficiency in English and confuse idioms (1)
- Patient - assess condition and treat symptoms (1)

Needs (2)
- Guest on a ship - needs must be met (1)
- Fan - benefactors of the team (1)
Community

Diversity (5)
- Melting pot – multiculturally diverse group; diverse population; all languages, many countries (3)
- Polyglot – many languages spoken, many life styles present, many beliefs, kids with/without parents (1)
- Culturally rich, yet economically impoverished (1)
- Jungle – a lot of socioeconomic problems (1)

Transience (4)
- LV strip suburbs – 100% apartments and transience (1)
- Revolving door – people move all the time (1)
- Fault line – ever shifting and unstable (1)
- Transient area – families more often (1)

Miscellaneous (3)
- At-risk (1)
- Home city – have pride in home team (1)
- One of a kind – from playground, casinos on LV strip can be seen (1)
### Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPQ1</th>
<th>SPQ2</th>
<th>SPQ3</th>
<th>SPQ4</th>
<th>SPQ5</th>
<th>SPQ6</th>
<th>SPQ7</th>
<th>SPQ8</th>
<th>SPQ9</th>
<th>SPQ10</th>
<th>SPQ11</th>
<th>SPQ12</th>
<th>SPQ13</th>
<th>SPQ14</th>
<th>SPQ15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPQ1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ2</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ3</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ4</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ5</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ6</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ7</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.205</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ8</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ9</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ10</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ11</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ12</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>-.452</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>-.419</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ13</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ14</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ15</td>
<td>-.433</td>
<td>-.428</td>
<td>-.615</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ16</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.548</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>-.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ17</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ18</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ19</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ20</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>-.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ21</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>-.396</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>-.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ22</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>-.372</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>-.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ23</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ25</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ26</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ27</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>-.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ28</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ29</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ1</td>
<td>SPQ2</td>
<td>SPQ3</td>
<td>SPQ4</td>
<td>SPQ5</td>
<td>SPQ6</td>
<td>SPQ7</td>
<td>SPQ8</td>
<td>SPQ9</td>
<td>SPQ10</td>
<td>SPQ11</td>
<td>SPQ12</td>
<td>SPQ13</td>
<td>SPQ14</td>
<td>SPQ15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.293</td>
<td>-.467</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.342</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>-.427</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.301</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>-.274</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>-.407</td>
<td>-.441</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>-.277</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ16</td>
<td>SPQ17</td>
<td>SPQ18</td>
<td>SPQ19</td>
<td>SPQ20</td>
<td>SPQ21</td>
<td>SPQ22</td>
<td>SPQ23</td>
<td>SPQ24</td>
<td>SPQ25</td>
<td>SPQ26</td>
<td>SPQ27</td>
<td>SPQ28</td>
<td>SPQ29</td>
<td>SPQ30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ17</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ18</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ19</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ20</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ21</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ22</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ23</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ24</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ25</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ26</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ27</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ28</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ29</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ16</td>
<td>SPQ17</td>
<td>SPQ18</td>
<td>SPQ19</td>
<td>SPQ20</td>
<td>SPQ21</td>
<td>SPQ22</td>
<td>SPQ23</td>
<td>SPQ24</td>
<td>SPQ25</td>
<td>SPQ26</td>
<td>SPQ27</td>
<td>SPQ28</td>
<td>SPQ29</td>
<td>SPQ30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ30</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ31</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ32</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ33</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ34</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ35</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ36</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ37</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ38</td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ39</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ40</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ41</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ42</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.345</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ43</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.517</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ44</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.420</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.452</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ45</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.345</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ46</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ47</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ48</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ49</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ50</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ51</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ52</td>
<td>-.402</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ53</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ54</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ55</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ56</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ57</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ58</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ30</td>
<td>SPQ31</td>
<td>SPQ32</td>
<td>SPQ33</td>
<td>SPQ34</td>
<td>SPQ35</td>
<td>SPQ36</td>
<td>SPQ37</td>
<td>SPQ38</td>
<td>SPQ39</td>
<td>SPQ40</td>
<td>SPQ41</td>
<td>SPQ42</td>
<td>SPQ43</td>
<td>SPQ44</td>
<td>SPQ45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ31</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ32</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ33</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ34</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ35</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ36</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ37</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ38</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ39</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ40</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ41</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ42</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ43</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.372</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ44</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ45</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.345</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ46</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.370</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ47</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ48</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ49</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ50</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ51</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ52</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ53</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ54</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ55</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ56</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ57</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPQ58</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ46</td>
<td>SPQ47</td>
<td>SPQ48</td>
<td>SPQ49</td>
<td>SPQ50</td>
<td>SPQ51</td>
<td>SPQ52</td>
<td>SPQ53</td>
<td>SPQ54</td>
<td>SPQ55</td>
<td>SPQ56</td>
<td>SPQ57</td>
<td>SPQ58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ30</td>
<td>SPQ31</td>
<td>SPQ32</td>
<td>SPQ33</td>
<td>SPQ34</td>
<td>SPQ35</td>
<td>SPQ36</td>
<td>SPQ37</td>
<td>SPQ38</td>
<td>SPQ39</td>
<td>SPQ40</td>
<td>SPQ41</td>
<td>SPQ42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ43</td>
<td>SPQ44</td>
<td>SPQ45</td>
<td>SPQ46</td>
<td>SPQ47</td>
<td>SPQ48</td>
<td>SPQ49</td>
<td>SPQ50</td>
<td>SPQ51</td>
<td>SPQ52</td>
<td>SPQ53</td>
<td>SPQ54</td>
<td>SPQ55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPQ56</td>
<td>SPQ57</td>
<td>SPQ58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPQ46</th>
<th>SPQ47</th>
<th>SPQ48</th>
<th>SPQ49</th>
<th>SPQ50</th>
<th>SPQ51</th>
<th>SPQ52</th>
<th>SPQ53</th>
<th>SPQ54</th>
<th>SPQ55</th>
<th>SPQ56</th>
<th>SPQ57</th>
<th>SPQ58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigen-Value</th>
<th>Percent of Var</th>
<th>Cum Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.022</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.371</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.928</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.288</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.612</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Maximum Likelihood Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-.567</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Likelihood Rotated Factor Matrix continues
Maximum Likelihood Rotated Factor Matrix (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.430</td>
<td></td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td></td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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