DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 405 EA 022 064

AUTHOR Schwartz, Audrey James
TITLE School Social Context, Teacher Culture, and School-Based Management.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Influences; *Educational Environment; High Schools; *Institutional Characteristics; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; School Security; Social Environment; Teacher Alienation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *California (Los Angeles County)

ABSTRACT

An analysis of the relationship between teachers' work culture and the school's social context is the purpose of this study, with a focus on teachers' shared psychological work orientations as components of a teacher culture. The methodology relates high school teachers' attitudes in two high schools to different social contexts with the cultural attributes that affect teacher participation in schoolwide decision making. School social context is defined by educators' and students' perceptions of the school's level of safety. The sample includes 19 high schools from 13 school districts chosen because of a concern about increasing Latino gang activity in the schools. Data were collected from surveys of 150 to 250 students and 13 to 15 randomly selected teachers, and from interviews with administrators and counselors. Findings indicate that teachers in schools with unfavorable social contexts, unlike teachers in schools with favorable social contexts, lack the psychological conditions necessary for effective participation in decision making. Teachers in unfavorable cultures feel alienated from their schools, which is antithetical to collaboration. A long- term implication is that cultural transformation is necessary for increased teacher involvement. However, the problems that initially created unfavorable school contexts must also be addressed. Tables present statistical substantiation of the findings. An extensive bibliography is provided. (LMI)

SCHOOL SOCIAL CONTEXT, TEACHER CULTURE, AND SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

Audrey James Schwartz
University of Southern California

SCHOOL SOCIAL CONTEXT, TEACHER CULTURE, AND SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT

Audrey James Schwartz
University of Southern California

Introduction

In the continuing search for improved student outcomes, many boards of education have reconceptualized district governance so that part of the centralized authority is transferred to school sites. Some decentralization plans call for teacher empowerment in which teachers and principals together make policy for their schools. Restructuring of school districts may be one of the most far reaching educational innovations of the 1990's. At least four networks thus far nurture school-based reform (Wise, 1988). Whether this change will lead to more effective education depends on a number of factors including the scope and kinds of decisions granted to local schools, the collective skills and wisdom of their educators, and the environmental and cultural conditions under which the change is attempted. With respect to the last factor, Max Weber (1958) observed almost a century ago that "psychological" conditions and social structure are interdependent, and not all cultures can be combined effectively with new social structures. First, there must be values and ideas that are favorable to the change.

The research reported here is an examination of teachers' "psychological" orientations about their work. If these orientations are shared by members of a faculty, they become important components of teachers' culture which defines the role of teacher and how this role might be changed. The hypothesis underlying the study is that the work culture of teachers is related directly to their school's social context. Although an occupational culture traditionally has been associated with teaching, it is modified as teachers make adjustments to local school conditions (Fiedler, 1964; Yukl, 1989; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1989).

This hypothesized relationship between school social and cultural contexts has implications for the efficacy of teacher participation in group decisions. If it is substantiated, school governance policies that include teacher involvement should not be mandated routinely, for some school environments foster cultures that are incompatible with it. Teachers' work-related orientations must determine if and how teacher empowerment proceeds and whether the culture itself needs to be reformulated.

Background

The body of literature supporting participation of teachers in the development of school-site policy incorporates perspectives from organizational studies, school change, and teachers' work life.

Organizational Literature argues that participation in decisions by implementation-level employees leads to a unified system of meanings which, in turn, heightens organizational productivity (Barnard, 1938; Coch & French, 1960; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kanter, 1983; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Selznick, 1957). Further, goals and procedures developed at the task level of an organization are accepted more readily than those developed at the top and gain additional strength from peer reinforcement. Observers of industrial techniques in Japan (Lincoln and Kallenberg 1985; Ouchi, 1981, 1984) report that workers are committed to their organizations and satisfied with their jobs because they participate in decisions relevant to their work. Observers of American industry have begun to reach similar conclusions. Findings indicate that: worker participation results in greater morale, satisfaction, organizational commitment, acceptance of change, cooperation, and reduction of conflict (Conely, Schmildle, & Shedd, 1988).

School Change Literature of the early 1980's identified teachers as major inhibitors of improved educational outcome. Accordingly, reform proposals sought to modify teachers' behavior through policies reducing classroom discretion. By the middle of the decade, top-down edicts were criticized for absence of teacher input, and by 1990, most reform proposals argued for at least some teacher empowerment (e.g. California Commission on Education Quality, 1988; Carnegie Commission on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; Committee for Economic Development, 1985; Holmes Group, 1986; National Governors' Association, 1986). Recent research suggests that teachers' resistance to change diminishes when they are involved in the initiation of change, or at least in planning for its implementation (Crandall et al., 1986; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Odden & Marsh, 1988; Rossman et al., 1988; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Teacher Work Life Literature abounds with discussions of interrelationships among teacher empowerment, teacher morale, and school effectiveness. Most authors contend that teachers should control their own work-related activities since teaching requires technical knowledge, discretion, and judgment in meeting the needs of individual pupils (Good & Brophy, 1987; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1989). As Drucker (1973) has put it, teachers are "knowledge" workers, concerned with concepts and theories more than with tools or brawn; they cannot be supervised closely by people who know less than they do about their work. In fact, contemporary teacher recruitment and retention problems often are laid at the feet of "paternalistic" bureaucratic control (Chapman, 1983).

Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, argues that teachers are rewarded more for blind obedience than for the creativity and professional judgement

required for effective classrooms, and the time has come to take education decisions away from bureaucrats and put them in the hands of teachers. This, he contends, "would give them a sense of ownership of the enterprise--a stake in the outcome--that is a much more powerful motivator than being treated as a hired hand" (Shanker, 1986: 213-214). Many recent teacher contracts require teachers or their representatives to participate in school decisions (Lewis, 1989).

Nevertheless, negotiated "empowerment" has been interpreted more as a tactic to increase the power of teachers' unions than as a move to change the teaching occupation. This reaction could have been predicted since teacher participation in the development of school policy is a radical departure from the bureaucratic approach common in public education. Not only is it a threat to the ideology of lay control (Corwin, 1970) since it dilutes the authority of school boards and their administrative representatives, empowerment helps teachers as a group deflect some of the growing number of state controls over their work.

Empirical examinations of teachers' working conditions point to the need for change. In Horace's Compromise, Sizer (1984) described an overburdened secondary school teaching staff—often assigned to work in areas for which they had no training. In Shopping Mall High School, Powell, Farrar, and Cohen (1985) related how teachers lose their moral authority as they "bargain" with students to attract them to their classrooms. Similar findings were reported by Sedlak and associates (1986) in Selling Students Short. Grant (1988) and Metz (1986) provide optimistic examples of what has been created where teachers are in charge of educational practice.

Traditional Teacher Culture

With a reconceptualization of school governance, the roles of building-level educators necessarily change. Principals acquire new decision-making responsibilities and relinquish others to the teaching staff. Teachers, in turn, participate as colleagues in newly-allocated decision areas, but lose control as individuals over some of the tasks for which they are accountable. To fill the role of empowered teacher requires modification in the teacher's sense of occupational self and in the culture teachers share.

A work culture is the common understandings that employees have about their organization and its work. It is a combination of values, norms, and knowledge that helps them define what is and what ought to be in the workplace. Teacher culture has a potentially strong influence on the classroom behavior of individual teachers and on teachers' interactions with other adults in their schools. The qualities of teacher culture that are noted most are its superficiality, its

conservatism, and its emphasis on individual autonomy. None of these would support a bottom-up decision-making process.

Superficiality. Teachers often claim professional status, arguing that they have authority over their pupils and possess systematic knowledge, skills, and techniques gained from experience and formal study. Even so, the occupation of teaching is professionally marginal since there are contradictions and inconsistencies in the extent it exhibits other characteristics associated with a profession (Pavalko, 1971). Most lacking is a strong teacher community through which ideas about education are diffused. In his classic treatise on American teachers, Lortie (1975) described teacher culture as superficial and incomplete, a phenomenon he attributed to teachers' limited opportunities for interaction. Lortie rightly pointed out that schools are organized around teacher separation, not interdependence. Elaborating on the theme of self-reliance, Metz (1986) described the "tacit" quality of teacher culture in which its elements are rarely debated and internal contradictions seldom articulated.

Conservatism. When it comes to changing the structure of schooling, individual teachers are basically conservative. For one thing, most teachers were successful in schools similar to those in which they teach; consequently they identify with these arrangements (Lortie, 1975; Goodlad, 1983). For another, school principals usually assume "significant other" importance for teachers since they directly control many rewarding factors and indirectly control others through their links to the central district (Maeroff, 1988). The authority many contemporary teachers grant their principals is inconsistent with teacher empowerment.

Autonomy. With the exception of school reform literature of the early 1980's, teachers have been assumed to have adequate expertise and motivation to serve the needs of their pupils. Inconsistencies between centralized control and teacher discretion have been accommodated through the loose coupling of classrooms and school administrative structures, (Weick, 1976; Rosenholtz 1987; cf. Darling-Hammond, 1984). Unlike workers in classical bureaucracies, teachers have been insulated from detailed supervision and like social workers and police officers, two other relatively unsupervised "street-level bureaucrats" (Lipsky, 1980), they have wide discretion with their clients. According to Lipsky, employees are given functional autonomy when limited knowledge and resources prevent them from attaining formal organizational goals. By eliminating accountability through loose structuring, the failures of the organization are obscured.

In spite of occasional efforts at team teaching, collegial teams, and teacher mentoring, task interdependence among teachers traditionally has been absent. It follows,

then, that there is little in traditional teacher culture about working together. School norms discourage seeking and giving advice (Little, 1982) and define peer criticism as "unprofessional" (McLaughlin, 1984). Moreover, teachers' most-valued work-related rewards come from classroom activities: from the development, achievement, and positive affect of pupils (Lortie, 1975; Mitchell, Ortiz, & Mitchell, 1987). Involvement of teachers as a group in school-level decisions is contrary to traditional teachers' culture and teachers' experience, yet effective teacher empowerment requires horizontal integration, collegiality, and collaboration.

Methodology

This paper reports the opinions and attitudes of teachers who work in high schools of two different social contexts and identifies the cultural attributes that have implications for teacher participation in school-wide decisions. School social context was defined by the perceptions of educators and pupils about the safeness of their schools and the amount of gang-related activities reported on their campuses. Contingencies arising from the social contexts of each school were expected to interact with and modify the school's teacher culture.

Nineteen high schools, grades 10 to 12, in 13 school districts in Los Angeles County were selected for study. The choice of schools was driven by an interest in the rapidly increasing teen-age Latino population and concern that the Latino gang phenomenon, which had reached epidemic proportions in some Los Angeles City high schools, would be replicated in growing urbanizations of the County.

Data were obtained in 1984 from surveys of 150 to 250 10th grade pupils and 13 to 15 randomly selected teachers in each of the 19 high schools, and from interviews with administrators and counselors. The variables in this analysis are school social context and selected aspects of teacher culture determined from teachers' questionnaire responses.

The perceived safeness of the school was measured by the Pupils' Feelings of Physical Insecurity at School Guttman Scale and the Teachers' Perception of the Safeness of Different Places on Campus Index. The amount of school gang activity was determined from a combination of: teachers' responses to items about their own experiences with gang members and their perceptions of gang members' relations with other pupils at school; perceptions of administrators and counselors about gang activity on campus; and pupils' awareness of gang members and gang activity at school. (Schwartz & Stallings, 1987; Schwartz 1989). These summary measures were cross-classified to create a typology of school contexts.

Twelve of the 19 schools in the sample fell into one of two congruent types: seven were Most Safe with Least Gang Activity and five were Least Safe with Most Gang Activity. The seven mixed-type schools were omitted from this analysis, delimiting it to 12 congruent schools that defined Favorable and Unfavorable School Contexts. These schools are displayed in Table 1 with the rankings of each on the defining variables.

(Table 1 about here.)

Mean demographic and achievement characteristics of the two school types indicate that Least Safe, Most Gang Activity schools present a comparative educational disadvantage to their pupils (Table 2). On measures of parent education, family poverty, school expenditures, and community racial-ethnic balance, all shown to be related negatively to mean achievement (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland & Mood, 1966), Least Safe, Most Gang Activity schools are significantly lower. Also, mean academic achievement, as measured by school percentile rankings in reading, math, writing and spelling on California Achievement Tests, indicates that pupils in Least Safe, Most Gang Activity schools do not perform as well.

(Table 2 about here.)

Findings

Similarities Between Teachers in the Two School Contexts.

The teachers who work in the two school types are from similar populations. There are no statistically significant differences in their backgrounds except that 7 percent less of the Least Safe, Most Gang Activity school sample is white Anglo. From Table 3, which displays teachers' characteristics, it is seen that over 85 percent are white, 40 percent majored in Education in undergraduate school, about 70 percent hold outside jobs, and over half are more than 40 years of age.

(Table 3 about here.)

The two groups also are similar in their perspectives about teaching. In both school types, 98 percent of the teachers sampled indicated they "usually" or "always" are glad they are teachers, and they rated the importance of various classroom objectives the same way. In addition, they allocate like amounts of time to pupils outside of class. About 40 percent of the teachers reported that they spend more than two hours discussing school work with pupils, 30 percent just visiting, and 22 percent discussing pupils' personal problems. (Table 4.)

(Table 4 about here.)

Differences Between Teachers in the Two School Contexts.

The relationship between school context and teachers' attitudes and opinions become apparent from responses to questions about teachers' satisfaction with their facilities, pupils, peers, and administrators.

School morale differences are seen from the percentages of teachers who reported that they would move to another school and that they are dissatisfied with their teaching facilities. Almost half of the teachers in Unfavorable Contexts compared to less than one-fourth in Favorable Contexts indicated they would change schools given the opportunity. Fifty-five percent compared with 36 percent indicated they were not satisfied with their classrooms. (Table 4.)

Pupils' ability levels also were perceived in significantly different ways. Over 50 percent of the teachers in the Unfavorable Context, compared with 14 percent in the Favorable Context, reported that "all" or "most" of their pupils have low ability. Reciprocally, about 63 percent in the Unfavorable Context, compared with 40 percent in the Favorable Context, reported that "few" or "none" of their pupils have high ability. Similar differences were apparent in their expectations for pupils' school completion. In response to the question "How many of your students do you think will drop out of school?" 38 percent of the teachers in Unfavorable Contexts compared with 66 percent in Favorable Contexts replied "few" or "none." (Table 5.) These responses are congruent with the California Achievement Test scores for 12th grade pupils displayed in Table 2.

(Table 5 about here.)

Teachers in Unfavorable Contexts portrayed themselves as significantly less collegial than teachers in Favorable Contexts. About 20 percent fewer reported that they like "all" or "most" of the teachers in their schools (61% compared with 80%) and, more importantly for this study, about 25 percent fewer reported that they respect "all" or "most" of them (34% compared with 59%). (Table 6.) Furthermore, teachers in Unfavorable Contexts described teachers as not getting along well with other adults. For example, in response to the question, "Do the following people get along together in school?" about 30 percent fewer Unfavorable Context teachers replied that teachers "always" or "often" get along well with other teachers (61% compared with 90%) and with the school administrators (51% compared with 79%). (Table 6.)

(Table 6 about here.)

Administrators in Unfavorable Context schools were perceived to have little consensus about educational issues. "(H)igh" agreement among them about educational objectives was reported by only 27 percent of the teachers; about curriculum content by 21 percent; and about instructional methods and teacher evaluation by less than 20 percent. These percentages differ significantly from those of teachers in Favorable School Context schools. (Table 7.)

(Table 7 about here.)

School Principals, on the other hand, were perceived similarly in the two school types. With the exception of principals' encouraging social relations among teachers, with which 31 percent of teachers in Unfavorable Contexts compared to 52 percent in Favorable Contexts agreed, differences between their responses were not significant. Most teachers described their principals as friendly, and over half indicated that the principal: is concerned with teachers' morale; takes teachers' ideas into account; tries to understand the perspective of teachers; and gives reasons for decisions. Further, over 60 percent responded "yes" to the question, "If teachers had a part in selecting a new principal, do you think the existing principal would be chosen?" (Table 7.)

Summary and Discussion

The two major findings from this study are first that many teachers in unfavorable school contexts lack strong commitment to their school social system, and second, that most teachers in all schools are positive about classroom work. Work satisfaction and organizational commitment, then, are independent phenomena in spite of the fact that the two have been associated theoretically and empirically. This study demonstrates that when organizational and task levels are loosely linked, as they traditionally have been in schools, the two concepts are distinct. (See also Curry, Wakefield, Price & Mueller, 1986.)

Most teachers in both Unfavorable and Favorable school contexts come from similar populations and share similar values about the functions of the classroom. And although their evaluations and expectations of pupils are not the same, teachers in both school contexts view educational objectives in the same way and spend similar amounts of time with pupils outside of class. Moreover, most teachers like what they do. Almost all of them are glad they are teachers despite differences in their opinions about classroom facilities, pupils' ability, respect for fellow teachers, and the administrative ability of the staff. This favorable occupational attitude can be understood in light of traditional teacher culture in which the most valued work-related rewards derive from the classroom, not the school social system (Lortie, 1975; Mitchell et al., 1987).

The large number of positive responses by teachers in both school contexts to the question "Is the principal friendly with all teachers?" also can be explained by traditional teacher culture. Being "nice" to subordinates--for example teachers being friendly with pupils--is endemic to school culture, and principals frequently assume relationships with teachers resembling those they once had in their classrooms. That about two-thirds of the teachers in each school context thought "teachers would choose this principal if given the chance" is best explained by the conservatism of teacher culture. The present principal is known to them and some kind of working relationship has been established. Even teachers who are not satisfied with their principal's leadership may prefer a known status quo to the indeterminacies of administrative change.

Nevertheless, teachers in the two school contexts differ in their attitudes and opinions about other adults in the school. In Unfavorable Contexts the adult social environment is described in terms resembling the students' social system. Half indicated that teachers do not "always" or "often" get along with school administrators and 40 percent indicated that teachers do not "always" or "often" get along among themselves. In fact, 40 percent of the teachers admitted that they do not like "all" or "most" teachers in their schools. Most damaging to collaboration in school-based management is the finding that two-thirds of the teachers in Unfavorable Context schools reported that they do not respect "all" or "most" of their colleagues. Teachers in Unfavorable School Contexts apparently locate causes of their own frustrations with fellow educators. For example, they claim they are not supported by administrators whom they see as disagreeing among themselves about issues affecting the classroom such as educational objectives, instructional methods, curriculum content, and teacher evaluation. Further, they find fault with fellow teachers for being ineffective rather than blame pupils for their rowdy behavior and low achievement.

Conclusions

The major conclusion from this research is that teachers in schools with unfavorable social contexts, unlike teachers in schools with favorable contexts, lack the "psychological" conditions required for participation in local-school governance. So much is this the case, that school-district restructuring should not proceed before careful examination of the culture of each school. Unfavorable school contexts reenforce the attributes of traditional teacher culture that inhibit teacher collaboration. With norms of isolation and reliance on pupils for rewards, it is unlikely that teachers would cooperate in reaching decisions affecting their classrooms.

Nor would they consider themselves bound by policies with which they disagree. Not only would threats to unilateral classroom control be seen as hostile, the empowering process itself could be seen as a way to submerge individual teachers to the will of the group.

That teachers in unfavorable school contexts tend to be alienated from their school social systems has both short and long run implications for their participation in school governance. In the short run, effective restructuring cannot be expected since it requires cooperation among teachers who neither like nor respect each other. Alienation is antithetical to collaboration and attempts to coerce it produce misinvolvement in which participants do not focus on organizational issues. Forced cooperation creates unconnectedness and irrelevant preoccupations which inhibit constructive interaction. As elaborated by Goffman (1967), misinvolvement is revealed in a number of ways: by focusing exclusively on some external matter, on oneself, on other participants, or on the way in which interaction qua interaction proceeds (pp.117-126).

The long term implications of these findings relate to the cultural transformation required for teacher involvement. While mandated participation in unfavorable context schools would be ineffective initially, its latent consequences for teacher culture could lead to cooperative decision making later on. Structural properties do influence culture, and occupational cultures grow out of the interactions of people who work together. Just as traditional teacher culture was a response to the bureaucratic, cellular organization of schools, a new teacher culture could emerge with values and attitudes supporting collegiality and empowerment. Mandates requiring teachers to relate to one another offer opportunities for positive sentiments to develop (Homans, 1950) as well as fulfilling the need for adult affiliation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). With time, teachers would come to recognize the advantages of peer interaction and to value the exchange of information and technical knowledge. This would then stimulate increased interdependence and the emergence of a professional teacher community.

Of course restructuring need not wait for the spontaneous generation of a suitable teacher culture. Sensitive, skilled leaders in other organizational contexts have shown that norms and values appropriate to their goals can be nurtured (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Kanter, 1983). Principals could capitalize on their acceptance by teachers and use their authority to initiate changes that foster an integrative environment.

Before a school's teacher culture could be modified, however, the school turbulence that initially created the unfavorable school context would have to be addressed (Newmann, Rutter, & Cohen, 1989). No amount of teacher empowerment and cooperative activity can substitute for firm, fair administration of school policy for dealing with disruptive students. Principals must adopt procedures to assure a safe school environment (Schwartz, 1989). Along with this, teachers must be given opportunities to deal with the tensions and frustrations that produce their alienation. Hiding out in classrooms with gratification dependent solely on pupils is unhealthy individually and organizationally and should be unacceptable. A teacher peer system can provide affiliation and tension management opportunities which would modify the exclusive classroom focus of teachers. Principals can encourage this by providing times, places, and reasons for teachers to meet. Teacher interaction can be task as well as socially oriented and by sharing experiences at in-service sessions, observations of other professionals, conferences, and the like, the teachers work culture will begin to change.

One other suggestion is to use the potential of teacher training institutions for creating collegial teacher climates. Just as teacher candidates are encouraged to support cooperative learning among their pupils, they, too, can be given opportunities to develop peer interpersonal skills required for collaboration. Peace Corps, Vista, and Teacher Corps (Corwin, 1973) training programs, for example, built affective bonds and support systems among recruits that facilitated cooperation after placement. The teacher preparation program at one university recently instituted a "buddy" system in which teacher interns observe one another in the classroom and provide one another with constructive criticisms. Results so far indicate that these relationships continue as neophyte teachers rely on their buddies to help in their own professional development (Lemlech, 1990).

In conclusion, effective participation of teachers in site-level governance is most likely in schools that are functioning well, and is least likely in schools that are not. Nevertheless, teacher empowerment and school-based management were designed to give teachers responsibility for constructive change in schools with unfavorable as well as favorable social contexts. In essence, teachers are asked to be successful where other have failed. The research reported here indicates that teachers alone, even with changed governance structures, will not succeed in turning malfunctioning schools around.

REFERENCES

Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

California Commission on Educational Quality (1988). Report to the Governor. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Educational Quality.

Carnegie Commission on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Chapman, D. W. (1983). A model of the influences on teacher retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 43-49.

Coch, L. & J. R. P. French (1960). Overcoming resistance to change. in D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds) Groups dynamics Research and theory, 2nd ed. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Coleman, J. S., E. O. Campbell, C. J. Hobson, J. McPartland & A. M. Mood (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Committee for Economic Development (1985). Investing in our children. NY: Committee for Economic Development.

Conley, S. C., T. Schmidle, & J. B. Shedd (1988). Teacher participation in the management of school systems. Teachers College Record, 90, 2 (winter) pp.259-280.

Corwin, R. G. (1970). Militant professionalism: A study of organizational conflict in high schools. NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Corwin, R. G. (1973). Reform and organizational survival: The Teacher Corps as an instrument of educational change. NY: John Wiley.

Crandall, D., J. W. Eisman, & L. K. Seashore (1986). Strategic planning issues that bear on the success of school improvement efforts. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 22, 3, 21-53.

Curry, J.P., Wakefield, D.S., Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal 29, 847-858.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984. Beyond the commission reports The coming crisis in education. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Darling-Hammond, L. & B. Berry (1988). The evolution of teacher policy. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Deal, T.E. & A. E. Kennedy (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Drucker, P. (1973). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, and practices. NY: Harper and Row.

Education Commission of the States (1986). What next? More leverage for teachers? Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. Pp.149-190 in L. Berkowitz (Ed) Advances in experimental social psychology Vol 1. NY: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essay on face-to-face behavior. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Good, T. L. & J. E. Brophy (1987). Looking in classrooms. NY: Harper & Row.

Goodlad, J. (1983). A place called school. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Grant, G. (1988). The world we created at Hamilton High. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hersey, P. & K. Blanchard (1982). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (4th ed.). Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Homans, G. (1950). The human group. NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Huberman, M. & M. Miles (1984). Innovation up close. NY: Plenum.

Kanter, R.M. (1983) The changemasters: Innovation and entrepreneurship in the American corporation. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Lawrence, P.R. & J. W. Lorsch (1967). Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Lemlech, J. (1990). Personal communication. Graduate School of Education, University of Southern California. March 10, 1990.

Lewis, A. (1989). Restructuring America's schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Lincoln, J. R. & A. L. Kallenberg (1985). Work organization and workforce commitment: A study of plants and employees in the U.S. and Japan. American Sociological Review, 50, 738-760.

Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19,3 (fall) 325-340.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago.

McLaughlin, M. W. (1984). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86,1 (fall) 193-207.

McNeil, L. M. (1985). Teacher culture and the irony of school reform." Pp.183-202 in P. G. Altbach, G. P.Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.) Excellence in education. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. NY: Teachers College Press.

Metz, M. H. (1986). Different by design: The context and character of three magnet schools. NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mitchell, D. E., F. I. Ortiz & T. K. Mitchell (1987). Work orientation and job performance: The cultural basis of teaching rewards and incentives. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

National Governors' Association (1986). Time for results: The Governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

Newman, F. M., R. A. Rutter & M. S. Smith (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, & expectations. Sociology of Education 62, 4 (October 221-238.

Odden, A. & D. Marsh (1988). State education reform implementation: A framework for analysis. Pp. 41-59 in J. Hannaway & R. Crawson (Eds) Politics of reforming school administration. 1988 Yearbook of Politics of Education Association. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Ouchi, W.G. (1981). Theory Z. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ouchi, W.G. (1984). They M-form Society. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesely.

Pavalko, R. M. (1971). Sociology of occupations and professions. Itasca, IL: Peacock Publishers.

Peters, T. J. & R. H. Waterman Jr. (1982). In search of excellence. NY: Harper & Row.

Powell, A G., E. Farrar, & D. K. Cohen (1985). (The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Purkey, S.C. & M.S. Smith (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. Elementary School Journal, 83, 4 (March) 427-452.

Rosenhotz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace. NY: Longman.

Rossman, G. B., H. D. Corbett, W. A. Firestone (1988). Change and effectiveness in schools: A cultural perspective. Albany: SUNY.

Schwartz, A. J. (1989). Middle-class educational values among Latino gang members in East Los Angeles County High School. Urban Education, 24, 3 (October) 323-342.

Schwartz, A. J. & J. W. Stallings (1987). Youth gangs and high schools in the communities of Eastern Los Angeles County. Los Angeles: Institute for Research in Educational Administration. University of Southern California.

Sedlak M., C. Wheeler, D. Pullin, & P. Cusick. (1986). Selling students short Classroom bargains and academic reforms in the American high school. NY: Teachers College Press.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration. NY: Harper & Row.

Shanker, A.(1985). Teachers and reform. Pp.203-216 in P. G. Altbach, G. P. Kelly, L. Weis (Eds.) Excellence in education: Perspectives on policy and practice. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Weber, M. (1958). The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. (T. Parsons Trans.) NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly 21, 1-19.

Wise, A. E. (1988). Two conflicting trends in school reform: Legislated learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan 69, 5, (January) 328-333.

Yukl, G. A. (1989). Leadership in organizations. 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall.

Table 1. Two School Contexts with Schools Rank Ordered by Gang Activity and Lack of Safeness.

	School Rank Order*		
	Gang Activity Perceptions of Pupils and Educators Combined	Unsafe Perceptions of: Pupils	Teachers
	Unfavorable School Context		
School A			
Gang Membership	2		
Negative Activity	3	6	1
School B			
Gang Membership	2		
Negative Activity	7	3	6.5
School C			
Gang Membership	5		
Negative Activity	6	5	6.5
School D			
Gang Membership	8		
Negative Activity	4	2	3
School E			
Gang Membership	5		
Negative Activity	8	9	9
	Favorable School Context		
School M			
Gang Membership	8		
Negative Activity	14	14	13.5
School N			
Gang Membership	13.5		
Negative Activity	9	11	15
School O			
Gang Membership	17		
Negative Activity	16	18	10.5
School P			
Gang Membership	13.5		
Negative Activity	15	17	16
School Q			
Gang Membership	17		
Negative Activity	17	13	18
School R			
Gang Membership	15		
Negative Activity	19	15	17
School S			
Gang Membership	19		
Negative Activity	18	19	19

*Rankings are of 19 schools on Gang Activity and Lack of Safeness. Unfavorable Contexts are schools above both means and Favorable Contexts are schools below both means. The middle 7 schools are omitted.

Table 2. Summary of Demographic Information and Achievement Test Scores for Schools with Favorable and Unfavorable Social Contexts

School Characteristics	Mean	S.D.
Demographic Information		
Expenditure per ADA		
Unfavorable Context	$1,978	567.40
Favorable Context	$2,201	58.04
White Residents in District		
Unfavorable Context	54%	3.71
Favorable Context	77%	4.82
School State-Rank in Pupils Receiving AFDC		
Unfavorable Context	87	5.19
Favorable Context	40	16.04
School State-Rank in Parents' Education		
Unfavorable Context	8	4.88
Favorable Context	54	16.08
California 12th Grade Achievement Test Scores		
Reading Percentile		
Unfavorable Context	9.6	6.44
Favorable Context	59.7	15.98
Math Percentile		
Unfavorable Context	12.0	7.18
Favorable Context	51.0	18.94
Writing Percentile		
Unfavorable Context	10.4	6.37
Favorable Context	52.2	15.44
Spelling Percentile		
Unfavorable Context	26.8	19.39
Favorable Context	51.8	18.19

Table 3. Characteristics of Teachers in Two School Contexts.

Characteristics	School Contexts: Unfavorable %	Favorable %	Significance of Difference (chi sq. test)
Male	58.4	56.9	ns
Over 40 years	62.9	53.8	ns
White Anglo	85.2	92.1	.017
Undergrad major-Educ.	40.0	39.2	ns
Masters Degree	67.4	71.7	ns
Outside Job	68.5	70.3	ns
N	(89)	(146)	

Table 4. Attitudes About Teaching in Two School Contexts.

Attitudes	School Contexts: Unfavorable %	Favorable %	Significance of Difference (chi sq. test)
"Usually/always" glad to be a teacher	97.7	98.6	ns
Would move to other school if possible	48.3	21.7	.000
Not satisfied w/ classroom facilities	55.1	35.6	.005
"Very Important" objectives for pupils:			
Develop self-esteem	74.2	82.9	ns
Respect for others	87.6	91.8	ns
Interest in learning	86.5	89.7	ns
Basic skills	88.8	82.2	ns
Preparation for work	57.3	63.0	ns
Preparation for college	29.2	41.8	ns
Spend more than 2 hours with pupils outside of class on:			
school work	39.8	43.3	ns
personal problems	21.7	24.1	ns
visiting	28.6	32.6	ns

Table 5. Teachers' Evaluations and Expectations of Pupils.

Evaluations/ Expectations	School Contexts Unfavorable %	Favorable %	Significance of Difference (chi sq.test)
"Few/none" have High ability	63.4	40.3	.000
"All/most" have Low ability	52.9	14.1	.000
"All/most" interested in school work	20.4	29.6	ns
"Few/none" can succeed in college	25.0	19.3	ns
"Few/none" will drop out of school	37.9	66.4	.000

Table 6. Attitudes and Opinions About Other Teachers in Two School Contexts.

Attitudes	School Contexts Unfavorable %	Favorable %	Significance of Difference (chi sq. test)
Like "all/most" teachers in the school	60.7	79.5	.005
Respect "all/most" teachers in the school	34.1	58.9	.000
Teachers "always/often" get along well with:			
Other teachers	60.7	90.4	.000
Teachers of different racial/ethnic bkg.	75.6	96.2	.000
Teachers from different teacher organizations	56.8	89.0	.000
Administrators	51.2	78.7	.000
Parents	72.4	87.6	.025

Table 7. Teachers' Attitudes and Opinions About School Administrators in Two School Contexts.

Attitudes	School Contexts: Unfavorable %	School Contexts: Favorable %	Significance of Differences (chi sq. test)
"High" agreement among administrators about:			
Educational objectives	27.3	52.1	.000
Instructional methods	18.8	30.1	.048
Curriculum content	21.4	35.4	.014
Teacher evaluation	17.9	33.6	.012
"Strongly agree/Agree" that the principal is:			
Friendly w/ all teachers	80.2	82.1	ns
Interested in teachers' personal problems	44.2	61.8	ns
Concerned w/ teachers' morale	57.0	64.8	ns
Tries to understand teachers' perspective	61.7	56.7	ns
Takes teachers' ideas into account	58.1	58.0	ns
Teachers share in policy making	34.5	41.7	ns
Gives reasons for decisions	57.4	62.3	ns
Resolves conflicts among teachers	48.2	61.4	.052
Encourages teachers' social relations	31.4	52.4	.005
Think teachers would choose this principal if given the chance	60.0	67.7	ns