DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 736 EA 028 899

AUTHOR Furtwengler, Willis J.; Furtwengler, Carol B.; Owens, Melva; Turk, Randall

TITLE "Split and Fit": A Faculty Subgroup Self-Organizes and Creates a Different Culture.

PUB DATE 1997-10-00

NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration (Orlando, FL, October 26-28, 1997).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Leadership; Interviews; Norms; Professional Isolation; Program Effectiveness; Qualitative Research; Rural Schools; *School Culture; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Collaboration; *Teamwork

IDENTIFIERS Continuous Improvement; *United States (Midwest)

ABSTRACT

A team of graduate students and educational administration professors, as part of a field-based doctoral program, discovered the "split and fit" culture during an evaluation of the school's Continuous Progress Primary Program (CPPP). According to Pascale (1990), "split and fit" can work to an organization's benefit. Fit contributes to coherence, but too much of it risks overadaptation. Split helps instill vitality, but too much of it can diffuse energy. In this study, researchers identify conditions leading to "split and fit" cultures and discuss their advantages and disadvantages. Data from the School Culture Inventory and information gleaned from interviews, focus groups, and observations revealed sharp differences between primary and upper-level staff cultures in eight areas: instructional leadership, problem-solving support, order enforcement, role clarity, sense of community, recognition of success, quality ethic, environmental support, student membership, collaborative problem solving, and personal/professional self-worth. The split culture may help test new sets of agreements among faculty, increase efficacy, and "reculturate" the entire faculty. Disadvantages of split cultures include failure to support the existing culture's core values, lack of communication and cooperation between different camps, and perceived policy implementation inconsistencies. Implementation strategies are outlined. (Includes an abstract, 2 tables, 22 references, and 3 appendices.) (MLH)

"Split and Fit":
A Faculty Subgroup Self-Organizes and Creates a Different Culture

Willis J. Furtwengler

Carol B. Furtwengler

Melva Owens

Randall Turk

Wichita State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

University Council for Educational Administration

Orlando, Florida

November 1997

This paper presents findings from a program evaluation conducted as part of a field-based doctoral program. The evaluation results revealed a "split and fit" school culture between subgroups of an elementary school's faculty. A description of the research methods and findings about the differences between the "split and fit" cultures are presented. Links between culture and program success are identified. The paper also describes the conditions that created the "split and fit" culture and the advantages and disadvantages of "split and fit" cultures. The authors propose suggested guidelines for the effective use of "split and fit" cultures.

"Split and Fit":

A Faculty Subgroup Self-Organizes and Creates a Different Culture

A first grade teacher being interviewed during a program evaluation study said:

> The faculty was not prepared to work in teams to create a continuous learning program for elementary students. As a result, we [the primary teachers] did it without the participation of teachers in grades two through five. Now, two years later, we have a problem. We, the split group [the primary school teachers] work in the same school with the fit group [the upper grade teachers]. They [the upper grade teachers] teach the traditional way. We teach using collaboration, teaming, and continuous progress. We share with each other, have paras, work long hours, and have great parental support. They tend to work in isolation.

After completion of the program evaluation, findings and conclusions were shared with the staff and community. A first grade teacher in the school commented, "The most interesting thing about the study is the differences they [the program evaluation team] found between our two faculty groups. How did we become so different?

This paper answers the teacher's question. It presents findings that depict the differences between subgroups of an elementary school's faculty. Pascale (1990) described how "split and fit" can work to the benefit of an organization, although the combination can be tenuous. Pascale stated that

"fit contributes to coherence–but too much of it risks overadaptation. Split helps instill vitality and focus–but too much of it diffuses energy (p. 49).

A team of graduate students and educational administration professors, as part of a midwestern state university's field-based doctoral program, discovered the "split and fit" culture during a program evaluation of the school's Continuous Progress Primary Program (CPPP). The paper emphasizes the findings that demonstrate the "split and fit" differences among the dimensions of school culture. The program evaluation's methodology and findings are outlined. The researchers identify the conditions that lead to the "split and fit" culture and the advantages and disadvantages of a "split and fit" culture. The paper concludes with guidelines for the creation and use of "split and fit" cultures.

Importance of School Culture to Program Success

Weickert (1994) defined school culture as the norms, values, beliefs, ceremonies, rituals, traditions, and myths that are understood in varying degrees, by members of the general school community. Furtwengler (1985) proposed that shared social agreements among the members of the school also assist in determining the culture of the school. Social agreements are defined as "the decisions teachers and students make as a result of their involvement in the daily activities of the school" (Furtwengler, p. 263).

Saphier and King (1985) believed that "if certain norms of school culture are strong, improvements in instruction will be significant, continuous, and widespread. Without these norms, change will depend upon individual teachers and be confined to certain classes" (p. 67). They

further identified 12 school norms that are highly interactive with school culture, five of which are noteworthy for this discussion: collegiality, experimentation, trust and confidence, involvement and decision making, and honest, open discussion.

The effective schools literature also documented the importance of collaborative problem solving and decision making among administrators, teachers, and the community. Weickert (1994) believed that a healthy and sound school culture correlates strongly with increased student achievement and motivation. Newmann and Wehlage (1995) and Bryk and Driscoll (1988) supported collaboration among teachers as a means to increase student achievement and teacher satisfaction.

The process of change in school culture is a matter of concern for any new program or project. It is much easier to make educational policy than to change the ways in which schools operate (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Fullan and Miles identified seven reasons why reform fails in schools and seven reasons why some school reforms are successful. Many successful reforms cannot be sustained over time because their initial success was due primarily to the determination and efforts of a few people who eventually suffer 'burn-out'. Fullan and Miles believed that "reform fails unless we can demonstrate that pockets of success add up to new structures, procedures, and school cultures that press for continuous improvement" (p. 748).

Duttweiler (1986) gave additional clues on successful program implementation efforts in schools. Teachers must have a clear

understanding of the program goals; the focus must be at the school level. Major changes should not be implemented throughout the entire school at once. Even though changes should not be sought initially throughout the school, Fullan and Miles (1992) clearly identified the focus for reform. Reform must focus on the development of all the interactive components of the system simultaneously. Reform cannot focus only on structure, policy, or regulations. It must consider the deeper issues of organizational culture as well.

School culture, therefore, is a prime determinant of the success of program implementation. Teachers must be supportive of and understand program goals. The program must be accepted and valued by those who are responsible for implementation.

Methodology

A K-5 elementary school in a midwestern school district requested an evaluation of its Continuous Progress Primary Program (CPPP). The school had a CPPP in kindergarten and first grade. Grades two through five remained traditional. These two programs are referred to as the primary program (K-1) and the upper level program (2-5). They school district wanted program evaluation information to determine if the CPPP should remain and, if so, should it be expanded within the building and to the other elementary school in the district.

The pseudonym, Heartland, is used throughout the paper to refer to the elementary school. Heartland has a staff of 30 teachers, enrolls 400 students, and has one principal. The students are primarily Caucasian

with only a few minority students enrolled at the school. Heartland Elementary is located in a rural farming area in a midwestern state whose patron population is lower-middle to middle class. The school district is approximately 60 miles from the nearest metropolitan center. The district incorporates two townships, each of which has its own elementary school. The district also has a high school building.

A program evaluation team of three professors and five doctoral students conducted the 6-month evaluation. In addition to the conduct of a literature review on primary and elementary school continuous progress programs, the evaluation team collected data using five methods of inquiry. These methods included interviews, focus groups, observations, document reviews, and surveys. The methods were selected to answer five research questions:

1. Does the program meet recommended criteria found in the literature for successful continuous progress programs in elementary and early childhood units?

2. Does the program achieve its goals? How many students are meeting or exceeding the outcome goals of the program?

3. Does the program meet the customers' (teachers', parents', and students') expectations?

4. What effect does the program have on the second and third grade programs?

5. What are the implications for future programmatic direction?

Appendix A shows the match of the multiple data collection methods to the inquiry questions.

The study team interviewed 19 staff members using an open-ended interview protocol to provide for consistency among multiple interviewers. Purposive sampling selected the K-3 instructional staff (10 teachers and 4 paraprofessionals), the principal, speech clinician, two Title 1 teachers, and the school counselor as interview participants.

The research team facilitated three focus groups. Two parent focus groups included those who had students currently enrolled in the primary program and those whose children were in second or third grade but had attended the primary program for at least one year. An additional focus group involved teachers from grades two through five who taught at the school. The research team also conducted 35 on-site observations, completed a variety of document and record reviews including standardized test results, and administered a School Culture Inventory.

A constant comparative method was used to analyze the qualitative data from interviews and focus groups. Content analysis helped researchers distill data from document reviews. The School Culture Inventory (r=.93) was administered to 42 faculty and staff members (see Appendix B). The Inventory included 50 questions with a five-point response option for each question (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree) designed to show the strength of 11 components of culture. Data from 62 other elementary schools provided a set of established norms for comparison of Heartland's cluster and item mean scores. The

responses to each item were disaggregated by the two faculty groups (primary and upper-level teaching staff). Differences among the mean item and cluster response scores on the School Culture Inventory were identified for the two faculty groups. The data from the multiple inquiry sources – interviews, focus groups, document review, observations, and a survey– were triangulated to identify themes that lead to findings and the development of a set of recommendations for the school.

Findings

The multiple inquiry methods generated findings for each of the five research questions. A comparison of the information gleaned from the literature review and information obtained through interviews, focus groups, document review, and observations revealed that the school's continuous progress program met the criteria for successful programs. During interviews teachers made comments such as: "we help all kids achieve individual success at their highest levels"; we make kids feel good about themselves"; "our goal is to supply a more developmental classroom for every single child."

During on-site observations the research team saw students working in centers, working in small groups with paras and teachers, and, at times, participating in total group instruction. A parent commented during the focus group that:

> They allow each child to work at their [sic] own pace and succeed at their highest level. This happens through the teachers' use of

centers, where the older students model and serve as appropriate role models for the younger students.

The evaluation team observed a flexible classroom instructional arrangement that provided a variety of staff and student group assignments designed to meet individual students' needs. Students were grouped and regrouped periodically in the attractive, stimulating classrooms. The classroom organization varied, but all rooms included the use of centers and large and small group instructional areas.

The evaluation team experienced more difficulty in answering the second research question about how many students were meeting or achieving program goals. The team found that minimal student achievement data were available to make this determination. The standardized testing program had changed during the implementation period of the program and comparable information was not available.

The program evaluation team found that the program does meet stakeholder needs. There was a high degree of satisfaction expressed about the program, with some reservations expressed by upper level teachers.

Interesting findings appeared as the research team addressed question four. This question inquired about the effect of the program on second and third grade programs. Basically, the evaluation team found that the continuous progress staff and parents see the program's effect as positive and the transition to other grade levels as satisfactory. Teachers representing second grade and higher, however, had mixed views about the effect of the program. Some saw advantages; others saw disadvantages.

The findings to the fifth question highlighted the importance of the school culture and its "split and fit" status. The evaluation team found that the major determinant to the success of the program at other grades levels was the acceptance, commitment, and attitude of teachers involved. In other words, the "split and fit" culture created a situation that could lead to continued program success or could create a divisive, unproductive environment.

Data from the multiple inquiry methods were triangulated to increase the degree of confidence in the interpretations and confirm findings about the differences in the culture. By combining multiple observers, methods, and data sources, the researchers reduced bias. The findings about the differences in the culture of the two groups clustered into eight major themes.

The next two sections of the paper describe how the "split and fit" culture became apparent through the findings from the program evaluation. First, the results from the School Culture Inventory are reported, followed by a discussion of the evaluation's eight major themes.

The School Culture Inventory: "Split and Fit"

The "split and fit" in the school culture was most apparent through an examination of the data obtained from the School Culture Inventory. The primary through fifth grade certified and noncertified staff of the school completed the School Culture Inventory. Responses to the School Culture Inventory showed the strength of six components of culture present in a school, namely (a) cultural management, (b) quality ethic, (c)

environmental support, (d) student membership, (e) collaborative problem solving, and (f) personal and professional self-worth. One profile is constructed for each component except for cultural management. Cultural management is divided into six profiles: Instructional Leadership, Problem Solving Support, Consistency and Order Enforcement, Role Clarity, Sense of Community, and Recognition of Success.

The evaluation team analyzed the results obtained from the School Culture Inventory in several ways. First, the results were compared with a norm group of 62 other elementary schools. Table 1 provides a definition for each profile and shows a comparison of the school's profile mean scores with the profile mean scores of 62 other elementary schools. All of the mean profile scores from Heartland Elementary School were above the mean profile scores of the norm group, reflecting a stronger school culture. Additionally, the mean responses for each item were disaggregated by primary staff (K-1) and upper level staff (grade 2 to 5) (see profiles in Appendix C).

Cultural Differences Between the Primary Staff (K-1) and Upper Level Staff (Grades 2 to 5)

In addition to the dissaggregated data from the School Culture Inventory, information gleaned from interviews, focus groups, and observations showed sharp differences between the culture of the primary staff and the upper level staff. The study team identified eight themes that reflected differences between the cultures. One of the most apparent

Table 1

A Comparison of the School's Culture Profile Mean Scores with the Mean Profile Scores for 62 Elementary Schools

Profile Definitions	School's Profile Mean Scores	Profile Mean Scores Norm Group (N=62)
Instructional Leadership: Instructional leadership is the communication of the school's goals that emphasize the importance of learning and instruction, and the ongoing process to monitor progress and implement changes as needed to achieve school goals. A high score represents a high level of communication of the school's goals and a strong emphasis on school improvement.	28.9	26.4
Problem Solving Support: Problem-solving support is the systematic identification and resolution of problems in the school. A high score represents a belief that provisions are made for identifying problems and that they are consistently confronted and resolved. A high score indicates that barriers to improvement are modified and that change and improvement are evident in school activities.	20.0	17.4
Consistency/Order Enforcement: Consistency/order enforcement is the regularity with which school policies, standards, and operational procedures are enforced. A high score reflects an orderly environment in which standards for behavior are fairly enforced. This includes a social order and respect for the rules and policies of governance which exist within the school.	19.1	17.4

(table continues)

Profile Definitions	School's Profile Mean Scores	Profile Mean Scores Norm Group (N=62))
Role Clarity: Role clarity is the distinctiveness of various roles and responsibilities of the students, teachers, administrators, and support staff within the school. A high score reflects faculty belief that the roles of school personnel and students are clear.	16.3	14.4
Sense of Community: Sense of community is the presence among most individuals of a sense of belonging to the school. Teachers believe that they are accepted by others as members of the school faculty. A high score indicates that high levels of trust and mutual respect exist among teachers. A high score also reflects faculty belief that teachers are accepted as individuals, that a consensus about the goals of the school exists, and that each teacher contributes to the school in some significant way.	20.2	17.7
Recognition of Success: Recognition of success is the faculty belief that outstanding student and teacher performances are recognized and rewarded. A high score reflects faculty belief that teachers and students receive individual and/or organizational awards and benefits for their achievements.	7.6	6.9
Quality Ethic: Quality ethic is the shared faculty commitment to achieving the goals of the school and to change, growth, and constant improvement. A high score indicates that teachers believe they share a strong commitment to achieve school goals and to constantly learn, improve, and change themselves and their system of learning and teaching.	23.9	22.5

(table continues)

Profile Definitions	School's Profile Mean Scores	Profile Mean Scores Norm Group (N=62))
Environmental Support: Environmental support is the general and continuous support for the learning activities in the school provided by the school facilities, the existing school order, and the level of people-to-people caring. A high score represents a high level of support from the physical facilities, the flow of activities, and the existing levels of caring among school personnel.	17.1	13.9
Student Membership: Student membership is the existence of the students' sense of being a member of the school organization. A high score reflects the teachers' beliefs that: 1) students have strong commitments to the aims of the school, 2) high expectations exist for students' academic performance, 3) students have a sense of belonging to the school, and 4) the school is responsive to students' needs and concerns.	23.0	21.0
Collaborative Problem Solving: Collaborative problem solving is the school's ongoing problem-solving process that involves teams of students, parents, teachers, and administrators. A high score reflects the belief that representatives of various school groups are routinely involved in solving school problems.	7.5	6.3
Personal/Professional Self-Worth: Personal professional self-worth is teachers' beliefs that they are respected and treated as equals by their colleagues, consulted before decisions are made or actions taken, and safe in the school environment. A high score reflects a strong sense of self-worth in the school.	16.2	14.3

differences was their approaches to learning and their instructional philosophies. Table 2 presents these differences in narrative form.

Table 2

Perceived Instructional Differences Between Primary and Upper-Level Staff

Primary Teachers (K-1)	Upper Level Teachers (2 -5)
Viewed the principal as being a strong supporter of student learning and instruction.	Viewed the principal as being committed to learning and instruction, but not a strong supporter of student learning and instruction. (Believed the K-1 teachers received more materials and leadership support than they did.)
Emphasized learning and instruction in the school.	Placed some emphasize on learning and instruction.
Viewed structural barriers as being flexible (grade level grouping).	Viewed structural barriers as being rigid (grade level grouping).
Viewed the delivery of instruction primarily from the children's perspective.	Viewed the delivery of instruction primarily from the teachers' perspective.
Viewed the chaos produced by the presence of multiple classroom learning activities as reflections of a broad pattern of organized instruction.	Viewed the order produced through "batch" processing of students as organized instruction.
Reduced student wait time by giving students opportunities to self-organize and collaborate.	Created student wait time by organizing most activities for students and by providing teacher assistance when available.
Included projects that involved parents in the learning activities.	Required learning assignments that seldom involved parents in the processes.

(table continues)

Primary Teachers (K-1)	Upper Level Teachers (2 -5)
Permitted students to pull instruction from the value stream of resources and learning activities.	Used the value stream of resources and learning activities to push instruction to the students.
Increased classroom efficiency by allowing student movement in the classroom to obtain materials and instruction.	Created inefficiency in classroom by restricting student movement to predetermined times to obtain materials and instruction.
Trusted students frequently to determine what was relevant, when they could learn it, and where to use what they learned.	Determined for students what was relevant, when it should be learned, and where it should be used.
Provided opportunities for students to link the learning activities thus allowing them to create their own knowledge structures from the value stream.	Required groups of students to accept the teachers' structure of knowledge from the value stream of learning activities.
Developed and maintained a data management system to identify student progress toward standards.	Developed and maintained an evaluation system to determine which students met specific standards.
Kept the data management information transparent (progress available to students, parents, and teachers).	Kept the data management evaluative information restricted to the student and parent.
Maintained a constant interactive flow of information among students, parents, and teachers.	0 Used one-way communication to keep parents informed about student progress to meet standards.

In addition to the major differences in how the two groups of teachers approached instruction, they also revealed differences in their approaches to conflict and problem resolution. The primary teachers believed that

appropriate provisions existed for identifying problems and consistently confronting and resolving them. The primary teachers believed that feedback systems functioned and provided opportunities for continuous improvement. Upper grade teachers believed that the feedback systems failed to provide information for identifying and resolving problems. They also believed changes did not meet some of their expectations.

The third theme, consistency and order/enforcement, also was viewed differently by the two groups. The upper-level teachers did not believe that the school's policies, standards, and operational procedures were enforced consistently. They thought the primary teachers had the flexibility to "bend the rules" and to do things differently. The upper-level teachers viewed the structures and lack of resource support as possible reasons for lack of improvement. Their agreements about the roles and responsibilities of teachers were not as clear as those of the primary teachers.

Roles and responsibilities were clear among primary teachers because of their high levels of interaction and information transparency For example, primary teachers and their students were aware of the overall learning progress of students, status of instructional activities, and roles and responsibilities of students and teachers.

The fourth theme, sense of community, showed that the primary group reflected a strong sense of belonging to a group within the school. Teachers in the primary group believed that they were accepted by other primary school faculty members. They had high expectations for each

other, and they communicated frequently about instruction and student progress. The upper-level teachers did not share a similar strong sense of community, did hold high expectations for each other, and seldom communicated about instruction and student progress.

The culture of the primary grade teachers regarding the fifth theme–change, growth, and improvement–differed from the teachers in grades 2 through 5. The primary grade teachers reflected a strong commitment to change, growth, and constant improvement. Upper-level teachers showed less of a desire to learn, improve, and change themselves and their system of learning and teaching.

The primary teachers reported strong environmental support which emerged as the evaluation's sixth theme. This support included the physical facilities, flow of activities, and levels of caring among school personnel in the school. Upper-level teachers viewed the environment as less supportive.

The seventh theme identified in the program evaluation concerned the students' sense of belonging to the school. Primary teachers viewed students as having a strong sense of belonging to the school. They believed that students had (a) strong commitments to the aims of the school, (b) high expectations for academic performance, (c) a sense of belonging to the school, and (d) the school was responsive to their needs and concerns. Upper-level teachers spoke more critically of the students and their sense of membership in the school.

Collaborative problem solving, the last of the eight themes, emerged again as a distinguishing factor between the two groups of teachers. Primary teachers believed that the school had an ongoing problem-solving process that involved teams of students, parents, teachers, and administrators. The upper-level teachers portrayed the school as having less student and parental involvement in collaborative problem-solving activities.

The study revealed that some staff and the principal were not aware of the existing and potential border conflicts between the two school cultures. These conflicts were beginning to emerge between the primary and upper-level teachers around two issues: student preparation for entry into the traditional second grade program and differences in their work commitments. The upper-level teachers knew that the primary teachers demonstrated, through their many hours of extra work during evenings and weekends, a strong commitment to instruction. Upper-level teachers mutually did not share agreements to extend their work day beyond normal contract hours.

When the findings from the program evaluation were released, the entire faculty became acutely aware of the differences between the "split and fit" cultures. The findings sharpened the tension and the need to resolve the differences between the two faculty groups.

Conditions Contributing to the Split

How did the differences in the school's culture develop? The content analysis of the school's documents and interview data revealed that the

primary teachers, prompted by a desire to improve their program, received administrative permission to design and implement a planned program of continuous progress in grades K-1. The school district supported the primary teachers' plan to collaborate and organize themselves for instruction. Wheatley (1996) and Schlechty (1997) suggested that cultural changes and school productivity are altered when faculty, students, and parents are permitted to self-organize and participate in discovery and sensemaking activities. Self-organizing and sensemaking lead to the development of a new group identity and culture (Gleick, 1987; Weick, 1995).

In this study, only the primary teachers were involved in the innovation. The upper-level teachers, although invited to become involved in the planning for the change process, did not choose to participate. Limited communication existed about the program across the primary and upper-level grades.

The principal supported the primary school teachers attendance at numerous planning meetings. In addition, the district's superintendent and board of education provided funds necessary to employee teacher aides in some of their classrooms.

Another factor contributed to the development of the split culture. Administrators and the Board of Education gave the primary school faculty permission to experiment as it implemented the program. This freedom provided opportunities for correcting mistakes during the early stages of program implementation. The primary teachers, during their interviews,

talked about the administrative trust, structural flexibility, and lack of constraints during program development and implementation.

Without realizing it, the primary teachers contributed to the split culture by altering the goals of their curriculum, especially the "hidden" curriculum. Neither the upper-level teachers nor the principal appeared to be aware of the lack of curriculum alignment resulting from the introduction of the new program. The primary team became a school-within-a-school with its own unique mission, curriculum, and culture.

In sum, at least four factors contributed to the development of the split culture. First, the teachers wanted to implement the new program, and the administrators and policy makers supported the development of the culture by providing resources, special privileges, and the opportunities for self-organization. Second, upper-level teachers, although invited, chose not to participate in the reculturing process. The primary team organized its time, students, and methods of instruction without involving or communicating with the upper-level teachers. Third, the trust extended to the primary teacher team helped them experiment and learn as they implemented the program. Fourth, the team changed the "hidden" curricular goals in its areas of responsibility for student outcomes.

Advantages of Split Cultures

In this program evaluation, the opportunity to innovate resulted in the formation of a split culture. Upon release of the evaluation's findings and recommendations, the upper-level teachers initiated actions to negotiate the borders, reduce the friction between the two cultures, and

generate collective solutions to the challenges they faced as a school. Recent informal reports suggest that the upper-level teachers scheduled a series of meetings designed to expand their opportunities to self-organize as an entire faculty. The split culture appears to be leading to a reculturing of the entire faculty.

The split culture may be especially useful to test new sets of agreements among faculty members. When the faculty functions as a whole, it may support, monitor, and discuss the formation and results of the split culture experiences. Negotiating the boundaries should be easier when the "split and fit" groups understand their differences and why the new agreements were created.

Split cultures may help faculty perceive that they have more influence on decisions that affect them than they did as a member of the "fit" culture. These perceptions may lead to feelings of ownership among the group and to increased levels of motivation (Langer, 1989). In this program evaluation, the split group reported a strong sense of efficacy and ownership. They demonstrated high levels of work motivation.

Even with faculty support, a small group of teachers may find it difficult to develop a split culture under the watchful eye of the supporters of the existing culture. High levels of communication between the potential "splitters" and existing "fitters" may retard the formation of new sets of social agreements among the splitters (Fullan & Miles, 1992).

Given the appropriate professional climate and setting, cultural splits may be viewed as advantages. Professional disagreements involving

different sets of agreements about how things can and should be done may result in cultural changes that accompany school-wide improvements.

Disadvantages of Split Cultures

The most obvious disadvantage of the split culture is its failure to support the core values of the existing culture. This assumes, of course, that the core values include improvement and other worthy values (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Splits may pull resources from the whole, create groups with favored and unfavored status, and lead to misalignment of the goals and curricula. Other disadvantages include the lack of communication, cooperation, and professional collegiality that may exist between defenders of the different camps.

In this program evaluation, additional resources supported the split group. Upper-level teachers believed they did not receive a favored status, and the two cultures differed on the importance of some curricular goals. The lack of communication and cooperation between the two groups was apparent. These differences did not result in open hostilities. Data from the study prompted action to establish communication and cooperative links between the two groups.

Another disadvantage of a "split and fit" culture in a school is the breakdown in the existing order of behaviors that result in perceptions of administrator inconsistency in policy implementation and norm reinforcement (Fullan, 1993). Split cultures frequently are viewed as breaking the rules, an, thus, create administrative problems. When

members of the fit group have endorsed the "breaking of the rules," policy implementation may not be an issue.

The time and human energy required to resolve differences in the cultures can be excessive. Once the split is formed, even when the sets of new agreements do not result in performance improvement, it may be extremely difficult to alter the new sets of agreements. These agreements, demonstrated through observational data during this evaluation, can be linked with the "fitters" feelings of potential loss of control and ownership and feelings of alienation. These feelings affect their motivation to work.

The short-term disadvantages of splits may be necessary if a school is to receive long-term benefits from reculturing. Results of this program evaluation and data from the informal follow-up suggest that the long-term effects of creating the new culture may lead to school cultural changes that improve the overall performance of the school.

Effective Use of "Split and Fit" Cultures

The seeds for creating and using split cultures effectively are found in the data from this program evaluation. Unfortunately, many such split and fit cultures do not resolve their border differences through discussions similar to those occurring in the school. Strategies administrators might use are based on the findings from this study and school improvement and organizational change research (Deal, 1987; Fullan, 1993; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kanter, 1992; Schein, 1992; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni; 1990; Watkins, 1994; Weick, 1995; Wheatley, 1995).

When the school's culture is fractured, administrators should focus on strategies proposed by Deal (1987) and Schein (1992) that involve participants in symbolic events, storytelling, and ceremonies for creating a strong culture. In addition, modified versions of the strategies that the principal in this study used to support the split might help create a strong school culture. For example, instead of encouraging and supporting selected individuals or groups with resources, opportunities to self-organize, and permission to violate the norms, the principal could encourage all members of the faculty to participate as partners in the endeavors. The principal in Heartland Elementary School may not have believed that some of the upper-level teachers were ready for the responsibility that accompanies these opportunities.

Conclusions in the form of guidelines about the administrators' potential contributions and uses of "split and fit" cultures when reculturing for school improvement include:

1. Introduce the "split and fit" strategy when the fit culture has ingrained a set of core values that prevent restructuring and school improvement (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Extend trust and provide conditions that include opportunities for teachers who (a) are ready to self-organize, (b) believe they can discover as they implement, (c) are willing to attend to student transitions, and (d) want to be accountable for student progress.

2. Create plans for the formation of a split culture that include descriptions of expected benefits for the entire school and its performance.

State in the plans the strategies for resolving the potential conflicts that may arise from the changes to the school's existing culture.

3. Support split cultures that are based on designs to improve student performance.

4. Encourage faculty to use splits as opportunities to conduct action research that will improve the entire school. Suggest that they direct the action research toward improving students' performances and reducing waste in the educational processes (Womack & Jones, 1997).

5. Use caution in supporting a limited number of split cultures. Fragmenting the core of the "fit" school culture may lead to the development of a weak school culture (Deal, 1987).

References

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988). The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers. Madison, WI: National Center of Effective Secondary Schools, University of Wisconsin.

Deal, T. (1987). The culture of schools in leadership–examining the elusive. In 1987 ASCD Yearbook (pp. 3-29). Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Duttweiler, P. (1986). A practical school-based method for improving the school learning climate. Spectrum Journal of School Research and Information, 4(3), 18-22.

Fullan, M., & Miles, M. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 744-752.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces. New York: Falmer.

Furtwengler, W. J. (1985). Implementing strategies for a school effectiveness program. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 262-65.

Gleick, J. (1987). Chaos: Making a new science. New York: Penguin.

Kanter, R., Stein, B., & Jick, T. (1992). The challenge of organizational change. New York: The Free Press.

Langer, E. (1989). Mindfulness. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Pascale, R. T. (1990). Managing on the edge: How the smartest companies use conflict to stay ahead. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Saphier, R. & Curley, J. (1985). Good seeds grow in strong cultures. Educational leadership. 42(6). 67-74.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P. (1997). Inventing better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Value–added leadership. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Upton, B. (1986). Measuring school effectiveness using the school culture inventory: A validation study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Watkins K., & Marsick, V. (1994). Sculpting the learning organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wheatley, M., & Rogers, M. (1996). A simpler way. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Weick, K. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weickert, M. (1994, September). Leadership: Defining, changing, school culture. The Memo. p. 1.

Womack, J., & Jones, D. (1996). Lean thinking. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Appendix A

Multiple Data Sources Matched to Inquiry Questions

Research Questions	Literature Review	Inventory Staff	Interviews Staff	Observations School	Focus Groups Parents, Staff	Document Review Program Materials, Test Scores
1. Does the program meet recommended criteria found in the literature for successful continuous progress programs in elementary and early childhood units?	X		X	X		X
2. Does the program achieve its goals? How many students are meeting or exceeding the outcome goals of the program?			X		X	X
3. Does the program meet the customers' (teachers', parents', and students') expectations?			X		X	
4. What effect does the program have on the second and third grade programs?			X		X	
5. What are the implications for future programmatic directions?	X	X	X	X	X	X

Appendix B
School Culture Inventory

This inventory represents descriptive statements of many aspects of school culture found in schools. Respond to each item independently according to your perception of each aspect at your present school.
First, please fill in the blanks at the top of the response card as follows:

A. For "Name," write the name of **your school** and the name of **the inventory.**
B. For "Date," write in the current month and year.
C. Leave the "Identification" and "Course" fields blank.

Select one response from the choices below that best represents your present view:

A = strongly agree
B = agree
C = tend to agree
D = disagree
E = strongly disagree

1. The principal's policies and behaviors convey the importance of instruction.
2. I am treated as an equal among others.
3. Student behavior reflects a belief in the purposes for this school.
4. The school's physical conditions support learning.
5. Students share a commitment toward their work.
6. Roles and responsibilities of the school's administrators are clear.
7. An attitude exists that people are basically considered worthwhile, competent, and good.
8. Teachers share a focused intensity toward their work.
9. The environment of the school is orderly.
10. Procedures and processes for anticipating and resolving problems are in place.
11. Members of the school feel that they belong to the organization.
12. Students feel that the school is responsive to their needs and concerns.
13. The teaching staff is committed to achieving the goals of the classroom.
14. Activities throughout the school (classroom, extracurricular, special events) support and reinforce school goals and purposes.
15. Long-term solutions to problems are sought rather than quick-fix answers.
16. My suggestions are respected by my colleagues.
17. Recognitions and rewards are given to teachers and students for outstanding academic achievement.
18. The physical facility supports learning.
19. A sense of community exists in the school.

School Culture Inventory Continued:

20. Administrators utilize teams of students, parents, teachers, and administrators in problem solving.
21. Standards for student behavior are consistently enforced.
22. Principals constantly assess practices and procedures for their support of the educational endeavors of the school.
23. Roles and responsibilities for support staff members of the school are clear.
24. Students have a sense of belonging to the school.
25. Our school has an ongoing problem-solving process that involves representatives of various school groups (parents, administrators, teachers, and students).
26. Student progress is systematically monitored and assessed.
27. High levels of trust and mutual respect exist.
28. Teachers are strongly committed to achieving the aims of this school.
29. Successes of students and teachers are recognized.
30. Rules are fairly enforced.
31. I work in an orderly environment.
32. A consensus about the purposes and goals of the school exists among the faculty.
33. Policies and procedures for school operations are consistently enforced.
34. The principal communicates school goals and purposes through both verbal means and behavioral examples.
35. The environment of the school is a safe place.
36. Roles and responsibilities for teachers are clear.
37. Administrators encourage and support problem-solving activities.
38. A high standard of performance for all students exists throughout the school.
39. Provisions are made in our school for solving school problems.
40. Students identify with the goals of the school.
41. Classroom policies and procedures support the goals of the school.
42. Administrators communicate to teachers the ideals this school should reach for.
43. People in school care about one another.
44. Teachers set high expectations for the students' academic performance.
45. Roles and responsibilities for students are clear.
46. When problems arise in this school, they are addressed.
47. Consistency exists in handling the day-to-day activities of the organization.
48. The staff is committed to change, growth, and improvement.
49. Others consult with me before they take action.
50. Our faculty constantly looks for ways to improve our school.

Source: Upton, B. (1986). Measuring school effectiveness using the school culture inventory: A validation study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Appendix C

School Culture Inventory: Disaggregated Item Analysis

The Disaggregated Item Analysis Report shows the item mean scores by CPPP staff and staff in grades two through five by profile clusters.

Profile #1: Instructional Leadership

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
1	The principal's policies and behaviors convey the importance of instruction.	4.31	4.55
14	Activities throughout the school (classroom, extracurricular, special events) support and reinforce school goals and purposes.	3.94	4.66
22	Principal(s) constantly assess practices and procedures for their support of the educational endeavors of the school.	3.44	4.11
26	Student progress is systematically monitored and assessed.	4.11	4. 66
34	The principal communicates school goals and purposes through both verbal means and behavioral examples.	3.72	4.33
41	Classroom policies and procedures support the goals of the school.	4.00	4.44
42	Administrators communicate to teachers the ideals this school should reach for.	3.77	4.44

Profile #2: Problem Solving Support

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
10	Procedures and processes for anticipating and resolving problems are in place.	3.77	4.22
15	Long-term solutions to problems are sought rather than quick-fix answers.	3.76	4.22
37	Administrators encourage and support problem-solving activities.	4.05	4.44
39	Provisions are made in our school for solving school problems.	3.77	4.11
46	When problems arise in this school, they are addressed.	3.61	4.33

Profile #3: Consistency/Order Enforcement

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
21	Standards for student behavior are consistently enforced	3.38	3.75
30	Rules are fairly enforced.	3.38	4.00
31	I work in an orderly environment.	4.16	4.66
33	Policies and procedures for school operations are consistently enforced.	3.38	4.44
47	Consistency exists in handling the day-to-day activities of the organization.	3.61	4.33

Profile #4: Role Clarity

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
6	Roles and responsibilities of the school's administrators are clear.	3.88	4.33
23	Roles and responsibilities for support staff members of the school are clear.	3.77	4.00
36	Roles and responsibilities for teachers are clear.	4.16	4.33
45	Roles and responsibilities for students are clear.	4.00	4.44

Profile #5: Sense of Community

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
7	An attitude exists that people are basically considered worthwhile, competent, and good.	4.27	4.66
11	Members of the school feel that they belong to the organization.	4.11	4.55
19	A sense of community exists in the school.	3.94	4.22
27	High levels of trust and mutual respect exist.	3.61	4.22
32	A consensus about the purposes and goals of the school exists among the faculty.	3.66	4.11

Profile #6: Recognition of Success

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
17	Recognitions and rewards are given to teachers and students for outstanding academic achievement.	3.64	3.88
29	22 Successes of students and teachers are recognized.	3.72	4.

Profile #7: Quality Ethic

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
5	Students share a commitment toward their work.	3.38	4.00
8	Teachers share a focused intensity toward their work.	3.72	4.11
13	The teaching staff is committed to achieving the goals of the classroom.	3.94	4.44
28	Teachers are strongly committed to achieving the aims of this school.	3.94	4.33
48	The staff is committed to change, growth, and improvement.	3.88	4.22
50	Our faculty constantly looks for ways to improve our school.	3.94	4.44

Profile #8: Environmental Support

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
4	The school's physical conditions support learning.	4.33	4.88
9	The environment of the school is orderly.	3.83	4.55
18	The physical facility supports learning.	4.11	4.44
43	.People in school care about one another.	4.05	4.44

Profile #9: Student Membership

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
3	Student behavior reflects a belief in the purposes for this school.	3.37	4.00
12	Students feel that the school is responsive to their needs and concerns.	3.77	4.22
24	Students have as sense of belonging to the school.	3.77	4.33
38	A high standard of performance for all students exists throughout the school.	3.44	4.00
40	Students identify with the goals of the school.	3.22	4.00
44	Teachers set high expectations for the students' academic performance.	3.94	4.22

Profile #10: Collaborative Problem Solving

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
20	Administrators utilize teams of students, parents, teachers, and administrators in problem solving.	3.83	4.11
25	Our school has an ongoing problem-solving process that involves representatives of various school groups (parents, administrators, teachers, and students).	3.72	4.00

Profile #11: Personal and Professional Self-worth

Item #	Item Questions	Elem Grades Grs. 2-5 n=18	Elem Grades K-1 n=9
2	I am treated as an equal among others.	4.22	4.33
16	My suggestions are respected by my colleagues.	4.11	3.88
35	The environment of the school is a safe place.	4.11	4.77
49	Others consult with me before they take action.	3.23	3.88

EA028899

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:
"Split and Fit": A Faculty Subgroup Self-Organizes and Creates a Different Culture

Author(s): Willis J. Furtwengler, Carol B. Furtwengler, Melva Owens, & Randall Turk

Corporate Source:
Wichita State University

Publication Date:
November 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents	
[X] Check here **For Level 1 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	[ ] Check here **For Level 2 Release:** Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.
	Level 1	**Level 2**	

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title:	
Willis J Furtwengler	Professor	
Organization/Address:	Telephone:	FAX:
Wichita State University ACES Dept. 1845 Fairmount, Wichita, KS 67260-0142	(316) 978-6393	(316) 978-3102
	E-Mail Address:	Date:
		December 17, 1997

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com