8-1-1984

Assessing the Procedures for Teaching Basic Skills in the Cleveland Public Elementary Schools

Marlene Burr Ward

ASSESSING THE PROCEDURES FOR TEACHING BASIC SKILLS IN THE CLEVELAND PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by
Marlene Burr Ward

Bachelor of Science, Dickinson State College, 1972
Master of Science, Black Hills State College, 1976

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August
1984

This Dissertation submitted by Marlene Burr Ward in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Donald K. Lemon
(Chairman)

Richard G. Landry
Richard T. Reid
S. Harlow
Richard W. Wilsnack

This Dissertation meets the standards for appearance and conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

A. William Johnson 7/25/84
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title Assessing the Procedures for Teaching Basic Skills in the Cleveland Public Elementary Schools

Department Center for Teaching and Learning

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholary purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Marlene Burns Ward

Date July 12, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people to whom I will be forever grateful for the inspiration, the learning, the judiciously applied kick-in-the-pants, accommodations to my schedule, the opportunity to do this study, and the indomitable belief that I could complete the task. Education administration staff, all the members of my doctoral committee, the Cleveland Special Committee on Education, and Dr. Ann Grooms of Educational Services Institute form a large part of that group.

Special words are needed for those significant people who have taught me, upheld me, and cared so very much throughout my graduate program, this study, and in many instances my whole life. To Dr. Donald K. Lemon--my gifted teacher, my trusted mentor, and my most challenging adversary--a thank you cannot convey all that I feel for his gifts to me of knowledge, skills, and sensitivity to my special needs as a learner and as a person. I can only trust again that the depth of meaning in these simple words is understood. To Dr. Richard G. Landry, statistical genius-in-residence, for the technical assistance and time he gave in bringing light to what often seemed an abyss of numbers and "possibilities," a humble and grateful thank you. Sincere appreciation is extended to Drs. Richard L. Hill, Richard W. Wilsnack, and Steven D. Harlow, who provided many thoughtful and provocative responses to the study, for their quality professional advice and many personal schedule adjustments to help me meet my goals. For Sharon Fields, my typist and editor, who labored with me into the late hours--her typing skills and knowledge of

Turabian were invaluable. For Bette Haskins, Isabel Hovel, and Betty Myers--my cohorts in "think sessions" and refreshing breaks who provided the sustenance both mind and body required--a very special thank you.

To my husband, Michael, whose unfailing laughter, encouragement, insight, and generosity are the foundations of my life--his willingness to bear the total burden of home and child care while I read and wrote enabled me to have the freedom I needed to finish this task. He was a major share of the we who made this happen. For Devyn, Cherese, Dave, Justin, Bobbi, and Mike--who have never questioned my need for more "schoolwork" or complained about the time it took from them. I thank them all for their love and support.

For my mother, no longer with me except in spirit, her love and belief in me have sustained me beyond the too few years I had her. Her loving influence still grows in the family she left who has encouraged me throughout this task--father, brothers, and sisters. A special note of gratitude is given to Joyce and Dennis, who cared for my children as though they were their own so that I could immerse myself in finalizing the dissertation. Thank you all.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess how the Cleveland public elementary schools were perceived by teachers, principals, parents, and students to be addressing the basic skills. The hypotheses state that the perceptions of these groups did not differ significantly in the following variables: planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills in regard to school policies and procedures, the school plan, learning support, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, performance expectations, and parent involvement.

Parent and community volunteers administered and collected both adult and student surveys. The instruments yielded data on 184 statements in the adult survey and 38 statements in the student survey about how the schools addressed basic skills. Multivariate analysis of variance was the statistical procedure used in the treatment of the data. Findings among the teachers, principals, and parents showed significant differences at the .05 level or less. There were no significant differences in perceptions between the third- and fifth-grade students.

Conclusions drawn from the results were that principals perceived a more favorable picture of how schools addressed basic skills in all areas than did parents. When compared to teachers, principals held a more favorable view than did teachers. Teachers' perceptions of how schools were addressing basic skills were more favorable than parents, however they were more aligned with parents than they were principals

in nearly all areas.

The study permitted comparative rationales that suggested what the schools may have been doing to address basic skills. The significant differences among the adult groups suggested an apparent lack of communication and understanding between the groups--both oral and written--on vital school processes which affected basic skills. As a beginning point for those who administer in, teach in, and send their children to the Cleveland public elementary schools, this information could assist them in making decisions on future plans that will affect student achievement on basic skills.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and History of the Problem

One of the greatest challenges facing educators and communities today is to effectively and equitably provide a quality education for all students. This challenge has reached staggering proportions in many major cities. Plagued by the same economic and social problems that the nation as a whole is experiencing, urban education is confronted with declining enrollments, diminishing budgets, school closings, desegregation issues, public disenchantment, and lack of student achievement. Cleveland, Ohio, is one of those cities.

In the five years from 1976 to 1981, Cleveland Public Schools experienced court-mandated desegregation, fifteen school closings, a six-week teacher strike, and financial bankruptcy followed by state fiscal control, three school superintendents, and a steady decline in junior and senior high school math and reading scores. The senior high school dropout, truancy, and nonattendance were the highest of any school district in Ohio and Cleveland parents were publicly voicing their anger and concern with the schools. Public education in Cleveland was at a crisis.

The complexity of the issues and problems encountered by the schools in Cleveland was complicated by the sheer size of the system.

At the beginning of the 1981-1982 school year, there were approximately 77,000 students; 5,600 certified employees; 4,500 classified employees; 132 school buildings; and an annual budget in excess of $200 million.

Cleveland public school problems became a regular feature in the city's news media. Under a court order of 30 July 1979 the Cleveland Public Schools began to desegregate their schools. During the following school year 42,000 students in fifty-five schools were reassigned. Educators and the community were coping with mass transportation and security issues; 144 security aides provided services to students on buses; and 93 security officers were placed in the secondary schools. Student achievement at the end of 1980 had reached the lowest level ever recorded in the district's history. Reading and math scores in all senior high grades were below both national norms and large-city norms on standardized tests.

The plight of the schools became a concern in the community, and several community leaders turned to a group that was interested and available to address the issue--the Federation for Community Planning. The Federation, a nonprofit organization for research and planning in the health and social services fields, was requested by a variety of community leaders including city council members, business and industry heads, civic leaders, and many parent groups to find a way to assess the educational needs of the school system and to provide data so that decisions could be made for improvement. The Federation's first step was to establish a Special Committee on Education for the purpose of examining what the community wanted from its schools.

The Federation for Community Planning was founded in 1913 and over the years had been supported by funds through United Way Services,

foundation grants, purchase of service contracts, and endowment income. Its membership was primarily representative of community business leaders, committees, and boards from throughout the city. The Federation was governed by a Board of Trustees. A staff of professional planners, researchers, community educators, and other specialists was employed to carry out the goals of the Federation.

The Special Committee on Education's first goal was to identify a consensus among the citizens of Cleveland in regard to the educational elements necessary for a student to be graduated with an adequate preparation to seek a job, pursue further training, or attend a college or university. "YOU'RE THE TEACHER," Phase I was the first educational needs assessment in ballot form that was developed as a means through which the entire community could be polled. The ballot was printed by the city's only large newspaper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The Special Committee on Education believed that the elected Board of Education of the school system should act, whenever possible, in response to the expressed needs and desires of the community. Thus, the group sought a channel of communication through which it could relay the collective opinions and concerns of the community to the Cleveland Board of Education, and then to ask the Board of Education to act on those concerns. The committee presented their ballot and polling plan to the Board of Education in early 1982. The Board of Education unanimously agreed that the ballot was a valid instrument and the process a legitimate means to seek community opinion on the kind of education Cleveland students should receive. The Board of Education further resolved "that the information provided by the polling be used for the development of a more effective educational plan with

goals, objectives, methods to achieve those goals, and an evaluation procedure at each level" (Cleveland Board of Education Record of Minutes 1982).

The Special Committee on Education's plan centered on using the balloting process as a means to involve the Cleveland parents and community members in seeking a cross-section of citizen responses about schooling from the whole community. Task forces were established with a makeup of people from throughout the city. The five task forces were comprised of seventy parents of children in Cleveland schools. The task forces then researched and developed procedures for the ballot distribution and the collection process. The task forces provided information directly to community groups and developed media presentations that were carried out between late March 1982 and mid May 1982, when the balloting would occur. They tabulated the results, analyzed data, and provided information on the results directly to the Board of Education, administration, students, and community.

To ensure that all citizens had a chance to voice their opinions, advertising and distribution of the ballot were aimed at five populations: parents of students in the Cleveland Public Schools, community employers, students of the Cleveland Public Schools, classified employees of the Cleveland Public Schools, and citizens. A task force was assigned to each population group. The Special Committee on Education attempted to validate that the opinions were representative of parents and citizens of Cleveland by conducting a random-selection telephone survey.

The balloting and telephone survey were conducted and completed during the week of 16 May 1982. A total of 35,847 individuals responded to the questions on the ballot published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer;

and 7,349 persons voiced their opinions by writing additional comments. An analysis of the data was reported in all local media sources and to major community organizations. Community consensus among different populations was also reported.

The six targeted populations achieved consensus on five responses. Consensus was considered the agreement of all populations based on the most frequent response to a given statement. For example, if most of the individuals selected a particular response, it became a priority. The consensus of the community from the balloting stated the need for the Cleveland Public Schools to ensure the following in order of priority: that students master the basic skills of their present grade before they are promoted; that students improve their reading, writing, and mathematics performance; that students learn to solve problems and make decisions on their own; that students develop good work habits and self-discipline; and that the Cleveland Public Schools improve their vocational education programs.

The Special Committee on Education, through the balloting process and data summary, had met its goal of identifying a consensus among the citizens of Cleveland regarding the educational elements necessary for the adequate preparation of students. The committee then recommended that the Board of Education take action to prepare an operational plan that would incorporate the priorities in the plan; review the current status of each consensus item as it existed in the schools covering policies, procedures, goals, objectives, and administration; utilize the services of a free-standing external group of community people, such as the Special Committee on Education, to work with the Board of Education to undertake the review; and to develop a plan

for addressing the priorities beginning with the 1982-1983 school year.

The Special Committee on Education, through the Federation for Community Planning, assured the Board of Education that the committee would utilize its staff and resources to assist in future data collection and planning. The Cleveland Board of Education welcomed the assistance being offered by the Federation and selected two top-priority issues: (1) mastery of the basic skills of the present grade level before promotion; and (2) improving performance in reading, writing, and mathematics. The Board of Education's decision was based on the belief that before the mastery of basic skills could be tested, there had to be clarification that these skills were currently being taught and learned in the classrooms of the Cleveland Public Schools. The second priority became the issue the committee sought to address.

The Special Committee on Education sought assistance from an Ohio firm with experience in addressing educational issues. Educational Services Institute in Cincinnati was selected to assist the committee by providing technical assistance and the educational experience necessary for Phase II of the follow-up study. This included the development of data collection instruments, training of community volunteers in data collection procedures, and analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the surveys.

Educational Services Institute (hereafter referred to as ESI) offered professional services in research, auditing, and management in both the public and private sector. The firm's educational experience included working with both public and private schools in twenty-two states, and American schools in six countries through the United States State Department. ESI had extensive experience in developing kindergarten

through grade twelve student outcomes and verification measures in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Ohio. Work with American Indian schools had been done in Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Arizona, Washington, and California. It was through the work of ESI in American Indian schools that the writer became part of the firm's research team. ESI requested the writer to become part of the on-site team to work with the Cleveland project. The writer's tasks included the development of data collection instruments, the development of the training guide for parent volunteers, assistance in the training of parent volunteers for data collection, and the analysis of the data collected in "YOU'RE THE TEACHER," Phase II. Although the study was in kindergarten through grade twelve, the writer was responsible for only the kindergarten through grade six data analysis and reporting.

Phase II data collection examined those elements of education that virtually all populations agreed had high priorities in the education of children in the Cleveland Public Schools--the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics--and how the Cleveland Public Schools were providing for their development and mastery.

Need for the Study

The problems confronting urban education were increasing in scope and magnitude every year, and from all indications will continue to grow as the complexities of present and future social and economic exigencies dramatically impact upon these school systems. A real need existed for these urban schools and communities to know how to respond effectively to these problems if they were to adequately prepare students for a quality life after graduation from their schools.

Several research studies have been conducted in urban schools across the nation. The research and findings from these studies have contributed to a pool of information about effective schooling and improved learning in urban schools. However, to improve school administration in urban centers, to involve parents in educational problems of the schools, and to document such efforts with research were further needed. Such research could be helpful to any urban school or community (and probably to others) in providing direction for undertaking the task of improving their total education delivery system.

Each city and town, regardless of its size, has its own unique characteristics, conditions, populations, and problems that may be reflected in its schools; and yet delivering a sound program of education to the students is a common goal of all cities. Cleveland citizens had recognized this and had begun to apply themselves to the task of addressing these problems. In this effort they had started at the beginning by asking themselves what they wanted from their schools for their children. The community-wide needs assessment had provided this information: The citizens wanted the schools to provide for improved learning in the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. Therefore, the schools planned to address that goal. There was a perceived need to determine how the schools were currently addressing the issue. There was also a perceived need to understand school functions and structures which appeared to have a relationship to basic skills acquisition by students. This information was perceived as being essential to determine how the school system and community could intervene to make needed changes and provide resources support necessary to achieve the goal of improved learning in the three basic skills areas.

Other needs included (1) the need to involve the parents and members of the Cleveland community in an effort to improve the learning program; (2) the need to acquire information about student acquisition of the basic skills; and (3) the need to assist the Cleveland Board of Education, school administration, and school staff by providing information that enabled them to make the necessary plan to improve student acquisition of the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics. These needs, while pertinent to Cleveland, were probably applicable to many, or even most, of America's urban centers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose for conducting this study was to examine how the Cleveland Public Schools planned, organized, delivered, and monitored the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics in the Cleveland elementary schools. The study focused specifically on the perceptions of parents, teachers, administrators, and students in relation to district policies and procedures; the school plan; learning support services; teaching strategies; verification of student learning; student performance expectations; and parent involvement as they affected the basic skills. Data were gathered from samples of the four populations in twenty-eight elementary schools. Two data instruments were designed. One was used with the adult samples of teachers, parents, and administrators; the other was used with students in grades three and five.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to the following:

1. Students in grades three and five presently enrolled in the Cleveland Public Schools.

2. Parents of students presently enrolled in the Cleveland Public Schools.

3. Teachers presently employed in the Cleveland Public Schools.

4. Administrators presently employed in the Cleveland Public Schools.

5. The following variables to be studied: school policy and procedures, the school plan, learning support efforts, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, student performance expectations, and parent involvement.

6. The areas of planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring.

7. The basic skills identified as reading, writing, and mathematics.

Assumptions

The following major assumptions were identified concerning the study:

1. The instruments used to collect the data yielded valid, reliable, and appropriate information.

2. The instruments were appropriately administered by the parents and volunteers.

3. The respondents provided honest and forthright responses on the survey instruments.

4. The examination of how Cleveland Public Schools now plan, organize, deliver, and monitor the three basic skills from the perceptions of the sample populations was necessary before recommending educational changes.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms were utilized in this study:

Basic skills. For the purpose of this study, basic skills were reading, writing/composition, and mathematics.

Central office administrators. Staff employed in the Cleveland Public School District who served all of the schools administratively from a central center and not located in a school.

Cluster. For the purposes of this study, a cluster referred to a grouping of all of the schools in a city by using the twelve senior high schools as the center with junior high schools and elementary schools that fed students into each senior high school.

Criterion-reference testing. Tests usually constructed by the teacher which measure student performance on identified skills.

Evaluation. Processes for determining the worth or quality of school programs.

Graded course of study. A school guide that stated what will be taught and learned in a given subject at each grade level.

Learning styles. In this study the means whereby a student learned through seeing, hearing, touching, or a combination of those senses.

Learning support. The schools' coordination of supplementary instructional resources of people, programs, and materials available for the purpose of providing additional bolstering to regular classroom programs.

Nationally normed population. A representative national group (e.g., a large sample of third graders selected to provide a set of test scores to compare against the test scores of a local population).

School plan. An annual effort undertaken by individual school staffs for the purpose of directly focusing school goals and objectives to be attained during that school year.

Research Questions

The study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the district's policies and procedures in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

2. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through each individual school plan in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

3. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the learning support programs in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

4. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the teaching strategies in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

5. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the verification of student learning in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

6. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned,

organized, delivered, and monitored through the student performance expectations in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

7. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through parent involvement in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

8. How do Cleveland Public School third-grade students and fifth-grade students perceive that the basic skills are planned in relation to teaching strategies and basic skills delivered through the school plan, learning support, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, performance expectations, and parent involvement?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The intent of this study was to assess how the Cleveland Public Schools were planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring the basic skills attainment of their students. A literature search was conducted to determine how other school systems had purportedly achieved success in basic skills achievement for their students. Much of the literature reviewed was found under the heading of "effective schools."

This review encompassed the studies and research that were predominant in the education field. Public discourse on effective schools was dominated by summarizations and scholarly editorials on the subject. An effort was mounted to go beyond that form to examine primary sources of case studies, outlier studies, surveys, and evaluations that attempted a more scientific approach to the study of schools that were effective and the means of replicating them.

This chapter provides a characterization of urban schools, an effective schools perspective, premises underlying the effective schools movement, origins of the movement, related literature, related research, dimensions of an effective school, and the implications for this study. Summaries are provided at the end of each section.

Characterization of Urban Schools

In 1961 Conant wrote: "I am not nearly so concerned about the plight of suburban parents whose offspring are having difficulty finding places in prestige colleges as I am about the plight of parents in the slums whose children drop out or graduate from school without prospects of either future education or employment. In some slum neighborhoods I have no doubt that over half of the boys between 16 and 21 are out of school and out of work" (p. 2).

For two decades after Conant, the literature of education had described the inner-city public schools as low in achievement, lacking in parental involvement and interest, plagued by low teacher morale and job satisfaction, high rates of teacher absenteeism, and student absenteeism and vandalism (Levine 1977). Levine noted:

> Overloaded with too many students who themselves are overloaded with a multitude of individual and family problems, the public schools as traditionally organized and operated sometimes then may all but cease functioning educationally at all, becoming little more than custodial institutions in which students and teachers expect little and achieve less. (p. 30)

Passow (1982), in writing about urban education from the 1960s to the 1970s, stated:

> [H]aving spent billions of dollars on compensatory education initiated thousands of projects . . ., completed hundreds of studies of uneven significance, and even more disparate quality, entered numerous judicial decisions and rulings, experienced dozens of riots and disorders, and generated whole new agencies and educational institutions, the nation's urban schools continue to operate in a vortex of declining achievement. (p. 519)

Wolf (1978) provided an update on the status of urban schools by examining the gap between the achievement of students in inner-city schools and elsewhere. Her conclusions, summarized from the study in cities, were:

1. A student attending public school in a large city was almost twice as likely to be low achieving as were his or her peers elsewhere in the country.

2. Inner-city students performed at lower levels than their suburban counterparts even when their families had comparable incomes.

3. Inner cities had much higher percentages of schools with large proportions of low achievers, and their low-achieving students also tended to be concentrated in the low-achieving schools.

Chase (1979) thought there was reason to believe that large-city school systems were beginning to find constructive paths through multi-dimensional problems that were threatening to engulf them. The three-year Urban Education Studies project attempted to identify strategies and developments which could contribute to a revitalization of educational institutions, personnel, and practices. From 1977 through 1979 project staff gathered information from sixteen large cities, looking particularly for factors and conditions which contributed to system-wide improvement. Chase stated that there were "many excellent schools, many dedicated, highly competent teachers and other staff, and serious efforts were being made to improve educational performance at all levels" (p. 355). He indicated that there were many schools from his study of thirty large districts that were using strategies and developing programs in financial reform, involving business and industry as resources, altering learning environments by using the city as a cultural and educational resource, and by placing new emphases given to the place of arts at all levels of schooling.

Guba (1980) listed thirteen problems facing urban educators in the 1980s. He thought that any one of the problems was enough to

stagger even the most committed of educators. Those problems were money, pressure for desegregation, demands for accountability, negative public perceptions, the cross fire generated by multiethnic values, inadequate plants, political pressures, union demands, dissatisfied teachers, struggle for state and federal dollars, revolving-door programs, unresponsive students, and declining enrollments. He did hold out hope for urban education however:

> Despite the fact that many of the reasons for today's state of affairs are beyond the school's control, they have not avoided making every effort to respond. Good use is now being made of the adversity that now confronts them and a variety of interventions have been constructed--R & E [Research & Evaluation] planning, management, and special projects, and substantive intervention such as program innovations, new materials, organizing strategies, community involvement, financing strategies, cooperative efforts among districts, teacher/administrator retraining, and marketing of the schools--that give reasonable promise of success. (p. 32)

Forbes (1981), director of the National Assessment of Educational Programs (NAEP), observed that cities with populations greater than 200,000 seemed to be showing slightly more gains than students in smaller cities in reading and math. Reading scores of thirteen year olds in cities larger than 200,000 dropped 4 percent between 1971 and 1975, but they gained 2.6 percent in the four years following 1975. In math, 43 percent of the grade one through grade eight students in these schools were above the national average after 1975 which was up from 33 percent for the years 1971 through 1975. These results seemed to indicate positive growth, although they also showed that much more work needed to be accomplished to reach national norms.

Chase (1980) provided these thoughts on urban education:

> Urban education has an inner vitality which is generating innovative programs and strategies of great potential even in

> the midst of extremely adverse conditions. Despite well-documented testimony on the low achievement in urban schools and recent statistics purporting to show the schools as the most dangerous place to be, we are discovering many administrators, teachers, and other staff members who are demonstrating ability to rouse zest for learning in students from diverse backgrounds, including those whose histories have been marked by failure, loss of hope, and/or antisocial behaviors. (p. 33)

He seemed to view urban education, despite its many problems, as showing strong signs of revitalization and effectiveness that could begin to do more than just ameliorate problems; they could find lasting solutions.

The picture that had emerged from the literature on the status of urban education was dismal. There were, however, many positive signs of growth. There were efforts for reform surfacing throughout many major cities in education. One of the more apparent reform efforts centered around creating schools in urban centers that were successful in raising student achievement. That movement was examined and its implications addressed--as it applied to effective schools in general and as it applied to the city of Cleveland, Ohio, in particular--in the remainder of this chapter.

Effective Schools Perspective

The effective schools movement has been a recent trend in the history of education. Identifying effective schools and replicating their features in ineffective schools had become a focus in the work of a growing number of educational researchers and practitioners since the 1960s. These writers have contributed significantly to a data base describing the characteristics of effective schools (Brookover, Beamer, Ephthim, Hathaway, Lezotte, Miller, Passalacqua, and Tornatzky 1982; Cohen 1982; Squires, Huitt, and Segars 1984).

A corollary of their studies was the development of many state and local school improvement programs that were designed to implement the characteristics of effective schools to state and local schools in need of improvement. Educators such as Austin (1978), Edmonds (1981), and Weber (1971) have described these efforts.

To better understand the role of effective schools research, it was important to distinguish between research on effective schools and research on school effects. The effective schools research tried to identify specific differences among schools and then characterize those schools that were successful beyond expectations. Research on school effects, though conceptually related to research on effective schools, was based on a large amount of survey research that investigated school- and classroom-level variables that might have affected student achievement.

Premises of the Effective Schools Movement

There were three premises indicated by Bickel (1983) that underlay the effective schools movement and are paraphrased as:

1. Schools can be identified that are unusually effective in teaching poor and minority children basic skills as measured by standardized tests.

2. Those successful schools exhibit characteristics that are correlated with their success, and these characteristics are well within the domain of educators to manipulate.

3. The characteristics of successful schools provide a basis for educators to improve schools that are not deemed successful.

These premises framed the research reported on effective schools.

Lezotte (1984) extended those premises by giving a specific definition of an effective school. His definition stated two standards which must be met. These standards were (1) the level of achievement to which the students rise must be high; and (2) the distribution of that high achievement cannot vary substantially across the major subsets of sex, socioeconomic status groups, or racial-ethnic groups of the student population.

Both Lezotte (1984) and Bickel (1983) were careful to note that the term "effective school" had been closely identified with the characteristics of such schools as they had been described in the literature. While this was not inappropriate, in their opinion it was best to denote an effective school as a place where students were able to demonstrate what the schools wanted them to learn. The characteristics, they asserted, were best thought of as a framework for assessing the current status of a school. Such an assessment served as an aid in planning how a school could become more effective.

Eubanks and Levine (1983) defined effective school projects as efforts to improve student achievement through school-level planning which was based on research of the conditions of schooling that affected the disadvantaged students. Similarly, the Ohio State Department of Education had defined effective schools as those schools which obtained significant increases in student achievement for the economically disadvantaged pupils (Evans 1983).

Origins of the Effective Schools Movement

The effective schools movement was traced to three major factors, as stated by Bickel (1983). The first factor was a line of

educational research that tried to dispel the pessimism in the education community that had resulted from some highly publicized studies in the 1960s and early 1970s. The second factor was a more hopeful psychological climate prevailing among educational practitioners and leaders during the middle 1970s. The third factor was the appeal of the much-publicized findings of effective schools research to individuals in the field.

In the aftermath of the turbulent 1960s, the most exhaustive studies of schools and their impact (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, and York 1966; Jencks, Smith, Ackland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns, and Michelson 1972) appeared to show again and again that schools make little difference in achievement when compared to the effect of family background (Hodgson 1975). Some of the most acceptable assessments of programs for the disadvantaged seemed to indicate that compensatory education had been tried and failed (Jensen 1969). Rist (1970) showed that study after study documented the roots of failure in American public education. Bowles and Gintis (1976) argued that such pervasive and systematic school failure would cast the American education system in the role of a tool for reproducing an unequal class structure. Averch, Carroll, Donaldson, Kiesling, and Pincus (1977), in a comprehensive and authoritative review of educational intervention research, concluded that there was no particular strategy to improve education that was effective enough to guide or focus any national policy on schooling. In effect, the research showed that many factors found to have a strong influence on student learning, such as family background and related variables, were difficult to manipulate. Many of the other variables that were measured and, in theory, could have

been changed more easily, usually by spending money, had been found to cause few changes in student achievement. Decreasing class size, buying more library books, changing the textbook series, constructing new schools, raising teacher salaries, and injecting compensatory programs had little influence on student achievement (Averch et al. 1977; Coleman et al. 1966; Hanushek 1975; Jencks et al. 1972).

Since that time, without really overturning the original evidence for such conclusions, more recent research raised credible challenges to the deep pessimism of this line of research. Although earlier findings have remained substantially intact (Purkey and Smith 1983) concerning school effects, other research began to look more carefully at the processes centered in educational interventions as opposed to the labels and formal prescriptions attached to them. Rosenshine (1976) showed that the attitudes of effective teachers were more important than their attributes. New study of old evidence conducted by Wiley and Harnischfeger (1974) brought back the idea that greater concentration of time given to learning was essential to achievement. Further study by Heyns (1978) suggested that time spent in school was especially crucial to those who were least exposed to educational resources in their homes and neighborhoods. Denham and Lieberman (1979) defined some basic aspects of instructional quality that raised achievement in reading and math. Good and Grouws (1979) applied many of those lessons with significant success in classrooms. Gage (1976), in examining the psychology of teaching methods, found that instructional techniques and methodologies seldom had as much impact on learning as did teacher differences in personality and attitude. Lightfoot (1978) and Mehan (1979) focused on close observation of behavior and relationships in the

classroom and found key elements of effective teacher-student interaction that cut across differing methods of instruction and forms of classroom organization.

The literature of the early 1980s had focused on how the determinants of achievement were related to (1) how schools and school districts were structured and made decisions, (2) the process of change in schools and school districts, and (3) how classrooms and schools were changed to increase the time spent on productive instruction. Bloom (1981) considered these variables less susceptible to mechanical changes in policy but alterable by educators with some difficulty and requiring few monetary expenditures.

Variables that influenced student achievement were found at all levels of schooling--from the individual classroom and the school to the district itself. Examples at each level included increasing classroom academic learning time (Fisher, Berliner, Filby, Marliave, Cahen, and Dishaw 1978); creating a school atmosphere that was orderly and conducive to high expectations for student learning (Weber 1971); and district allowance of more autonomy in individual school-site management (Hargrove, Graham, Ward, Abernathy, Cunningham, and Vaughn 1981). Barr and Dreeben (1981) postulated a view of a school system as "nested layers" in which each organizational level set the context and defined the boundaries for the layer below, with a reciprocal influence at all levels. Since the center of the educational process was at the lowest structural level (the classroom), it was nonetheless the adjacent layer (the school) that formed the immediate environment in which the classroom functioned. They believed that the quality of learning and achievement processes at the classroom level were enhanced or diminished by the

quality of the level of the activity at the level above it. Only when the total system functioned to promote the chance of efficient learning being able to take place within the classroom could classroom or teacher-specific intervention have had much probability of succeeding or could effective schools have become possible.

The second basis for the effective schools movement was found within the educational climate prevailing among practitioners by the middle 1970s. According to Bickel (1983), teachers, principals, and administrators wanted to hear a more hopeful message about the ability of the schools to educate children. Many educators in schools cited examples of teachers, classrooms, and schools that seemed to be genuine success stories. Edmonds (1978) reviewed the work of Coleman, Moynihan and Mostellar, Jensen, and Jencks. Edmonds' major criticism of their work was that their conclusions served mainly to absolve schools of responsibility for student achievement. This was, to him, a despairing message to all educators, as it left the ability and the will to make changes that would have raised achievement outside of the control of the school. The new mood signaled by Edmonds--that was to emerge as optimistic and receptive to the effective schools message--was that educators could effect change and that they could raise achievement levels, even among the disadvantaged and the minorities.

Bickel's (1983) third factor which explained the extensive growth of the effective schools movement was a direct result of the findings most publicized by the effective schools research itself. While there were many lists of characteristics of effective schools that emerged and varied in detail, outstanding features such as strong instructional leadership, an orderly school climate, high expectations,

emphasis on basic skills attainment, and frequent monitoring of instructional progress became the essential steps to effective schooling. This research revived the idea that schools could be organized to improve student achievement. These characteristics were manipulable by educators and attainable in their schools. This common-sense approach and appeal appeared to explain the ready acceptance in the education community of the research findings.

The impetus of the school effectiveness movement during the past decade has been extensive. A recent survey by Odden and Dougherty (1982) pointed out that most states now have undertaken a school-improvement program of one form or another that reflected features of the effective schools literature. The effective schools model also ranked high among the research priorities of the National Institute of Education (Curran 1982).

Related Literature

The best-known summarizations of school effectiveness studies were provided by Edmonds (1979a, 1979b, 1981). Edmonds (1981) listed five ingredients of an effective school that are summarized as strong administrative leadership, high expectations for children's achievement, an orderly atmosphere conducive to learning, an emphasis on basic skills acquisition, and frequent monitoring of student progress. He based his list on his work and the work of others such as Averch et al. (1977); Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, and Wisenbaker (1977); and Weber (1971).

Purkey and Smith (1983) synthesized research on effective schools and provided a systematic, critical view of the empirical work behind the literature. They argued that school-level factors promoted

learning in the classroom. They also concurred with the tenor of the research that by studying academically successful schools, characteristics could be identified that together created a school culture conducive to learning. They emphasized, however, that facile solutions should be avoided, further research conducted, and that the process by which schools were made more effective be considered crucial to any further work.

Weber's (1971) study was consciously designed and stated to overcome an attitude of fatalism about school achievement and to demonstrate that school leaders could raise the reading achievement levels of the urban, disadvantaged children through a consistent, school-wide emphasis on the basic skills. Weber examined four inner-city elementary schools that he labeled exemplary because the students were performing at or above grade level. Weber's description, based on tests administered to third-grade students and site visits for observation, listed eight school-wide characteristics that influenced reading achievement. Those characteristics were (1) strong school leadership, (2) an atmosphere of order and purposefulness and pleasure in reading, (3) a strong emphasis on reading, (4) high expectations, (5) additional reading personnel, (6) use of phonics in the reading program, (7) individualization, and (8) careful evaluation of student progress. Weber's study had become the most widely cited study of school effectiveness; but according to Purkey and Smith (1983), Weber's study suffered from the lack of a comparison group and the lack of clear definitions for his characteristics. Ralph and Fennessey (1983) criticized him for a weak research design and lack of critical evidence.

Brookover and Lezotte (1979) did a case study of eight urban elementary schools in Michigan. They identified ten characteristics that differentiated between schools with increasing reading scores and schools with decreasing reading scores. The ten characteristics they enumerated from the study were summarized as follows into seven characteristics:

1. An emphasis on accomplishing reading and math objectives.
2. A belief by most teachers that most students could master basic skills objectives.
3. High expectations for students' educational accomplishments.
4. More time spent in direct reading instruction.
5. A less satisfied staff.
6. Less overall parent involvement, but more parent-initiated involvement.
7. Compensatory education programs with less emphasis on paraprofessional staff and involvement of teachers in identifying compensatory education students.

Austin (1979); Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980); and Tomlinson (1981) also conducted reviews on effective schools. The lists of characteristics they generated were somewhat different although there were many features that were the same. Austin (1978, 1979) listed twenty-nine characteristics which included some that were similar to the five given by Edmonds (1981). But Austin (1979) also included characteristics such as experienced teachers who had tenured status, principals who had education and experience as elementary teachers, and schools that required a great amount of direct instruction in the classroom. The remainder dealt with principals' specific behaviors

and staff attitudes. Tomlinson (1981) concurred with Edmonds that a common purpose and clear goals, along with instructional leadership from the principal, contributed to school effectiveness. He, and the others, added efficient use of classroom time and using parents or aides to help keep children on task. Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980), in their Phi Delta Kappan review, suggested an increased child and adult ratio, high levels of parental contact and involvement in school activities, and goal-specific staff development programs which were essential characteristics in an effective school. It appeared that effective schools had been differentiated from ineffective ones, but there was no consensus yet as to a precise list of characteristics that must be present to denote an effective school. None of these studies included recommendations as to how schools could be changed to become more effective. The implication, according to D'Amico (1982), was that the same ingredients placed in ineffective schools at various times would produce effective schools.

Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980) listed factors associated with success in urban elementary schools as (1) leaders who framed goals, set standards, created a productive working environment, and obtained needed support; (2) programs that provided staff development based on specific goals and objectives; (3) financial support with special programs and funds from federal, state, and local sources; (4) resource and facility management to enhance school goals; (5) curricular goals and objectives clearly stated and acceptable to the school community; (6) classroom organization and instructional strategies; and (7) high levels of parental contact and involvement with the school. This review was particularly relevant to this study

as it dealt with urban elementary schools. The analysis considered more than 1,200 studies of case literature, reviews, and expert opinion.

These reviews have received the most public attention and formed the basis for most of the interest in the effective schools movement. They have been subjected to critiques by many educational researchers and have, generally, been found lacking in methodologically acceptable procedures and have been cited for a lack of empirical evidence. Nevertheless, most reviewers, dissenting or not, agreed that there was an intuitive appeal and acceptance of these editorials and their message (Bickel 1983; Cuban 1983; Eubanks and Levine 1983; Purkey and Smith 1983; Rowan, Bossert, and Dwyer 1983).

Related Research

An examination of the related or applied research revealed case studies which investigated a specific school or program and comparative case studies which compared two or more schools, usually in a matched-pair design. Outlier and survey research studies were also found which used a sizable data base involving many schools and applying a multivariate analysis technique.

Case Studies

Six case studies were examined. These were by Brookover and Lezotte (1979); Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith (1979); Weber (1971); Glenn (1981); Levine and Stark (1981); and the California State Department of Education (1980). Each case study was examined in terms of its strengths and weaknesses in design, methodology, and conclusions.

The study by Rutter et al. (1979) was a longitudinal study carried out from 1970 to 1974. It examined twelve inner-city secondary schools in London, England. The study controlled for socioeconomic status and examined four outcomes: achievement, attendance, student behavior, and delinquency. It concluded that school processes--the characteristics of a school as a social organization--influenced the school's effectiveness. They concluded that, generally, schools differed in the listed outcomes due to the characteristics of schools as social institutions, and that it was a school's ethos that affected students as a group. They defined "ethos" as the patterns of student and teacher behavior, the treatment of students as a group, management of students within the school, care and maintenance of school buildings and grounds, and the style and quality of school life.

Rutter et al. (1979) hypothesized that certain school processes influenced the school differences and further that those processes were generally under the control of teachers and administrators. Their findings were summarized as follows:

1. Variations were partially related to intake of students, in that where there was a substantial nucleus of children of at least average intellectual ability, students generally scored higher on tests. Delinquency rates were higher in those schools with a preponderance of the least able. However, the differences in intake, although they affected outcomes, did not affect school processes.

2. Variations among schools were stable for five years and not related to physical factors.

3. Better-than-average schools tended to perform at higher levels on all outcome measures.

This summary was much briefer than all of the findings by Rutter et al., but it does cover the issues relevant to this study.

Rutter et al. (1979) found that the differences between schools were systematically related to their characteristics as social institutions. Following is a list of the most significant characteristics from that study: academic emphasis, skills of teachers, teachers' actions in lessons, rewards and punishments, pupil conditions, pupil responsibility and participation, and staff organization. Rutter et al. then took those measures that correlated with outcomes and set them into four areas: (1) group management in the classroom, (2) school values and norms of behavior, (3) consistency of school values, and (4) pupil acceptance of norms. A summary of their analysis was that effective processes in these schools were:

1. Classroom management that kept students actively engaged in learning activities.

2. Classrooms in which praise was freely given and discipline applied consistently and firmly.

3. A general attitude and expectation for academic success coupled with specific actions emphasizing those attitudes and expectations.

4. Giving a high proportion of students responsibility for personal and school duties, and school resources.

5. Immediate feedback to students on what was acceptable behavior and performance at school.

6. Staff consensus on the values and aims of the school as a whole.

7. The establishment of clearly recognized principles and guidelines for student behavior.

8. The provision of a clean, comfortable, and maintained physical environment for students.

9. Demonstrated staff concern for individual and group student welfare.

10. The treatment of students in ways that emphasized and assumed their success and potential success.

These variables comprised the school process, and their overall effect was to create a school culture leading to better student outcomes in students' in-school behavior, attendance, examination success, and reduction of delinquency.

As one of the few longitudinal studies that had been completed on effective schools, the study by Rutter et al. (1979) was significant as the processes matched many of the characteristics coming from other studies, less rigorous on the subject. Critiques of this study were overwhelmingly positive. Comments ranged from "elegant" to "finely controlled" and no adverse opinions on the methodology were found. Purkey and Smith (1983) were troubled by one aspect of the results. Their concern was that more of the effective schools had higher percentages of middle-income students than did the less-effective schools. In their view, if academic achievement, attendance, and delinquency were strongly linked to social-class integration, then the possibility existed that the significant difference between schools was not in the school processes but in the school composition.

Glenn's (1981) study was conducted in four urban elementary schools, predominantly poor and minority. Her findings, in summary,

emphasized the importance of explicit basic skills goals, discipline and order in a supportive atmosphere, high expectations for student achievement, and instructional and distributive leadership from the principal. She also recommended enhanced joint planning by the staff, staff development activities, and coordinated scheduling and planning of activities in the basic skills.

Like some of the other studies, Glenn's study offered no comparisons, no measures of effectiveness beyond the instructional, and she aggregated data to the school level based on single-grade information (Purkey and Smith 1983). Her findings, however, supported other findings of the effective school characteristics of other studies.

Levine and Stark (1981) examined the Chicago Mastery Learning Reading Program (CMLRP) in three New York elementary schools and one Chicago elementary school. They also investigated five urban elementary schools in Los Angeles and two in Chicago that were involved in comprehensive curriculum and instruction planning designed to increase achievement that would exclude pull-out programs. Their conclusions on effective elementary schools suggested that it was possible to increase school-wide math and reading scores by combining individualized strategies with general principles of school effectiveness, innovation implementation, and organizational development. They identified processes and arrangements common to most of the improving schools that were summarized as (1) focusing on the educational needs of low-achieving children; (2) emphasizing high-order cognitive skills such as reading comprehension and math problem solving; (3) assuring availability of materials and resources and reducing record-keeping to a minimum; (4) coordinating required homework for math and reading and improved

parental involvement in student learning; (5) instructional planning that emphasized grade-level planning among teachers and between those teaching adjacent grade levels; (6) staff supervision based on the outcome data for student achievement in essential skills; (7) comparative monitoring of student progress on a class-by-class basis; (8) outstanding leadership by administrators characterized as supportive of teachers and skilled in providing a structured institutional pattern in which teachers could function effectively, and willingness to interpret rules in a manner that supported effectiveness; and (9) coordination of curriculum, instruction, and testing focused on specific learning objectives achieved through careful planning and staff development. They concluded that the arrangements and processes had to be coordinated with each other and had to be adapted for each individual school.

D'Amico (1982) criticized Levine and Stark's findings because they were obtained through unstructured interviews on brief site visits, which were inadequate to support the conclusions drawn. Their findings, however, again supported the commonality of findings among the other studies.

The California State Department of Education (1979) developed a study of early childhood education schools that compared the characteristics of schools in which third-grade reading scores were improving in eight schools with the scores of students in eight schools who had decreasing reading achievement. Their findings, in summary, showed that schools with increasing scores usually exhibited a strong sense of educational purpose; positive leadership from the building principal or a group of teachers that shared decision making, implementation, planning, and evaluation of school goals; high expectations for

student learning; teacher accountability for student performance; ongoing in-service training for staff; and an integrated reading program with other subject areas. They particularly noted that while these characteristics were common to all the schools with increasing scores, each school had a unique way of achieving them.

Brookover et al. (1977) took an extended look at the nature of effective schools. They theorized that student achievement was strongly affected by the school social system, which varied from school to school even within similar subgroups with socioeconomic status and racial composition controlled. They defined a composition of three interrelated variables that comprised the school social system. These variables were summarized as (1) social inputs based on student body composition and staff inputs; (2) social structure based on school size, open or closed classrooms, and other organizational sets; and (3) social climate based on school norms, expectations, and feelings about the school held by staff and students. They contended that while school social inputs affected academic achievement, they were modified by the interaction with the school social structure and school social climate. They analyzed two pairs of public elementary schools which were matched on the basis of race, socioeconomic status, and urban location. Each pair had one high-achieving and one low-achieving school. They found substantive differences in (1) time spent on instruction, (2) commitment to student achievement, (3) use of competitive team games in instruction, (4) expectations for student achievement, (5) ability-grouping procedures, (6) use of appropriate reinforcement and rewards, and (7) the leadership role of the principal. They concluded that

> an effective school is characterized by high evaluations of students, high expectations, high norms of achievement, with the appropriate patterns of reinforcement and instruction by which students acquire a sense of control over their environment and overcome the feelings of futility which characterize the students in many schools. (p. 243)

Purkey and Smith (1983) found attempts by Brookover et al. to control for socioeconomic status and racial composition commendable. They went on to point out that the two high-achieving schools, one "white" and one "black," differed in significant ways. The high-achieving white school stressed achievement over discipline and the high-achieving black school stressed discipline over achievement, without ignoring achievement. The role of the principal also differed in both schools. They concurred with the conclusion by Brookover et al. (1977) that these variations suggested that there was no single combination of variables that produced an effective school. They also pointed out that there was a considerable difference on standardized tests between the mean score of the high-achieving black school and the mean score of the high-achieving white school which indicated that there was a gap for minorities.

Each of the six case studies, omitting Rutter et al. (1979), focused on urban elementary schools. Together, the six studies examined a total of thirty-eight schools, which was less than seven schools per study. This was not a large set of samples for that number of studies. Ralph and Fennessey (1983) criticized the effective schools studies for what they viewed as an inherent weakness, the use of small samples, and the wide conclusions drawn from them. Rowan, Bossert, and Dwyer (1983) made three criticisms of the effective schools case studies. Those criticisms were that their measures of effectiveness were narrowly defined on instructional effectiveness and ignored the

variety of school goals and consequently yielded measures that were invalid and unreliable; their research designs generally measured samples of effective and ineffective schools against each other and ignored causal relationships on individual schools' organization and culture; and the designs had aggregated data to the school level and drawn global characteristics of the schools which ignored important variations in school outcomes that occurred within each school. Purkey and Smith (1983) expressed concern that none of the researchers had measured the extremely high or extremely low schools against the average school, rather than the exemplary or the unsuccessful only against each other.

Examined together, all of these studies shared a commonality of findings and their similarity to other kinds of studies increased their credibility. Five factors or characteristics were common to most of the studies. These characteristics were strong leadership by the principal or other administrators, high expectations from the staff for student achievement, a mission for the school with a clear set of goals, elective school-wide staff development programs, and a system for monitoring the progress of students in the basic skills. Four of the studies indicated that it was necessary to emphasize an atmosphere of order and discipline.

Outlier and Survey Research

Outlier and survey research on effective schools have received more acceptance from educational researchers than the case study or essay type. Most of these studies, according to Ralph and Fennessey (1983), employed regression analyses of school mean achievement scores, controlling for socioeconomic factors. The major strategy used had

been to determine, statistically, highly effective schools called positive outliers and unusually ineffective schools called negative outliers. Based on the regression formula, an expected mean achievement score was calculated for each school. This score was subtracted from the actual achievement level of the school to give a residual score for each school. A selection then was made of the most positive and the most negative residual scores, and the schools were labeled effective or ineffective from their scores.

The New York State Department of Education (1974a, 1974b, 1976); the Maryland State Department of Education (Austin 1978); Lezotte, Edmonds, and Ratner (1974); Brookover and Schneider (1975); and Spartz, Valdes, McCormick, Myers, and Geppert (1977) conducted outlier studies. These studies all adopted a general approach that was similar in the means of school identification and the use of only elementary schools as study sites.

The New York studies of school achievement in reading extended over a three-year period (1970-1972). The first study (New York State Department of Education 1974a) investigated twelve schools that were matched on socioeconomic status, background factors, and reading achievement based on standardized test scores. A regression analysis technique was used to establish an expected school mean. Each school's actual mean was subtracted from that mean to give a residual score that was either high or low. The two schools that were outlying farthest at each end of the mean were identified; one was considered effective and the other ineffective. Direct observations were then made by a team of evaluators who visited each school for one day. The observations and findings of the first study indicated that teachers

in the higher-achieving school had "better rapport with students; exercised more classroom control; engaged in more extensive lesson preparation; taught reading at a level appropriate for students; regrouped students more; and used more materials in the reading program" (p. 16). These characteristics were not observed in the ineffective school.

The follow-up New York study (New York State Department of Education 1974b) used the observations from the initial study, in addition to the achievement test data, to identify two outlier schools. A case study approach was then used to identify factors influencing reading. Interviews and/or classroom observations were undertaken with administrators and classroom teachers. Formal classroom observations of reading were augmented with interviews with parents and students. Informal textbook reading tests were administered in addition to standardized tests. The findings from the study were that no single factor could account for school effectiveness but that a number of factors were important. The factors that influenced reading were closely related to administrative behavior, school policies, and teacher practices.

The third New York study (New York State Department of Education 1976) used the same procedure as the first two studies but studied in greater depth the two identified schools. They looked closely at student populations and teacher variables. They found significant differences in classroom instruction. Major differences between the schools were that effective schools had identified reading as a problem, developed a plan of action that provided leadership to teachers, and created an atmosphere in which learning could occur.

The New York studies, while contributing to the body of research on effective schools, were cited for lack of control of background variables and limited observations (Purkey and Smith 1983). Again, their findings coincided with other findings from the research.

A study conducted for the Maryland State Department of Education (Austin 1978) on urban elementary schools also used regression analysis to identify effective and ineffective schools. Austin concluded that effective schools were characterized by strong instructional leadership. He used six schools in the study for his sample. This was considered a small number (Ralph and Fennessey 1983). Ralph and Fennessey also cited him for not using a measure that partialed out the effects of social class and home background. An example was that the average income of high and low schools differed by over one-half a standard deviation, and 36 percent of the fathers of the students in the high-scoring schools had graduated from secondary schools, compared with only 9 percent in the low-scoring schools. This lack of control over background variables made the findings lack credibility.

Spartz et al. (1977), in their study of Delaware elementary schools, found that their effective schools had principals who emphasized administrative activities and provided structure and support for staff. They also specified ability grouping among the seven general variables found in their effective schools. The other five were related to high expectations, goal setting in basic skills, and an orderly school atmosphere. Brookover and Schneider's (1975) Michigan study found six characteristics of effective schools with no real variations from the other studies, except that they did not have ability grouping in their identified effective schools. The six

variables were a strong sense of school purpose, staff development linked to teacher needs, staff development linked to the instructional program, emphasis on basic skills achievement, established levels of mastery for students, and high expectations from school personnel.

The more pervasive common elements from all the outlier studies provided the following effective school characteristics: (1) better control or discipline, (2) high staff expectations for student achievement, (3) an emphasis on instructional leadership by the principal or another important staff member, and (4) classroom management. Emphasis on instructional leadership from the principal was found to be important in four of the seven studies.

Criticisms of the outlier and survey studies (Purkey and Smith 1983; Ralph and Fennessey 1983) were that the studies used narrow and relatively small samples for intensive study, which greatly increased the possibility that the characteristics that appeared to discriminate between high and low outliers were chance events; there was error in the identification of outlier schools because the quality of the measures used to partial out the effects of social class and home background was weak or inappropriate. The studies also aggregated achievement data at the school level which could have masked differential effects for specific subgroups of students, and the comparisons of schools were always constructed on high-achieving and low-achieving schools. No attempts were conducted to compare outliers with an average school which could mean that ineffective schools would have to contrive quantum leaps to emulate the effective schools. Subjective criteria were used for determining school success, which meant that an unusually effective school which might have served a

predominantly low-income and minority student population actually may have had considerably lower achievement than a middle-class white suburban school. Despite the criticisms, the reviewers held that, in general, outlier studies and survey research approaches held the greatest potential for establishing a sound research base for the two primary propositions of effective schools. Further, they asserted there were consistently high-performing, inner-city schools and an identifiable set of characteristics was associated with the outlier schools.

Program Evaluations

Evaluations of school-level programs were conducted by Doss and Holley (1982); Trisman, Waller, and Wilder (1976); and Armor, Conry-Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonnell, Pascal, Pauly, and Zellman (1976). These studies all reported on the consequences of variation in school-level factors. Rowan, Bossert, and Dwyer (1983) called them methodologically stronger than case studies and outlier studies, despite the commonality of their findings with both of those types of studies.

Doss and Holley (1982) compared the effectiveness of Title I pull-out programs with school-wide effectiveness programs. The school-wide programs required the staff to develop and implement plans for programs to work with all of the students in a target school. They concluded that school-wide Title I projects directed at changing the way classrooms and schools treated low-achieving students had a greater positive effect on achievement than programs that isolated the students by pulling them out of the regular classroom. Doss and Holley also concluded that high morale and a sense of control over the school

program by teachers were established in the school-wide programs.

Trisman, Waller, and Wilder (1976) examined schools with highly effective compensatory reading programs in New Jersey. They characterized schools by survey data and looked at six schools closely. They looked for curriculum, teacher training, class size, and teacher-characteristic effects in those schools; they could find no commonalities that explained why certain programs were effective. They found instead that programs in the effective schools were characterized by strong instructional leadership, high expectations for student achievement, good school atmosphere, student-teacher rapport, a clear focus on basic skills, small-group instruction, and evidence of interchange of ideas among staff.

Armor et al. (1976), in an examination of twenty Los Angeles schools participating in a special program to improve reading, tried to identify school and classroom policies that had been most successful in raising the reading scores of minority children. They concluded that the following characteristics of schools were associated with raising the reading scores of children: (1) teachers' strong sense of efficacy and high expectations for students, (2) maintenance of orderly classrooms, (3) high levels of parent-teacher and parent-principal contact, (4) ongoing staff development, (5) principals who achieved a balance between a strong leadership role for themselves and reasonable autonomy for teachers, and (6) teacher flexibility in modifying and adapting instructional approaches.

The common findings from the program evaluations depicted a generally consistent pattern. Most schools with identified effective programs were characterized by high staff expectations and morale,

some degree of control by the staff over instructional and staff development decisions in the school, clear leadership from the instructional leader, clear goals for the school, and a sense of order in the school.

Other Studies

Three other studies contributed to the literature on effective schools. These were the comparative study of private and public schools (Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1981; the National Institute of Education's Safe Schools Study (United States Department of Education 1978); and Ohio's Effective School Program (Evans 1983).

Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1981) did a comparative study of public and private secondary schools in this country. They concluded that private schools were academically superior to public schools. They suggested that private schools were more likely to exhibit those characteristics that seemed to encourage academic performance. Those characteristics were better attendance, more homework, more required academic subjects, and greater academic demands by school staff. They also suggested that private schools were less likely than public schools to have characteristics detrimental to academic achievement: disruptive behavior, students' lack of acceptance of school rules and discipline, and student perceptions of teachers' lack of interest in student achievement.

The Coleman Report on Public and Private Schools: The Draft Summary and Eight Critiques (Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1981) has been subjected to many critiques (Campbell, Crain, Klitgaard, Kirst, Kratwohl, Murnane, Ravitch, and Thomson). Essentially, the reviewers

were not convinced that Coleman had controlled the study enough to account for student body composition, parental financial commitment, or private schools' privileges in selecting or expelling students. They also expressed concern with comparing such disparate school systems. Public schools were larger, had a wider mandated curriculum diversity, and had a greater variety of goals than public schools. This study remains a subject of controversy over both purpose, conclusions, and methodology.

There was, however, in the Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1981) study a close relationship between the characteristics specified as contributing to the higher academic achievement of private schools and some of the characteristics believed by effective schools researchers to distinguish effective from ineffective schools. Those characteristics were an atmosphere conducive to learning, high expectations from school staff and parents, emphasis on academic subjects, and clearly defined goals.

The Safe Schools Study sponsored by the National Institute of Education (United States Department of Education 1978) tried to identify features that made schools safe for students and staff. They profiled 4,000 schools in their effort. The study did not attempt to assess the success of schools academically. Nevertheless, many of the findings of the study concerning the differences between safe and violent schools were pertinent to effective schools research.

The most critical feature identified by the Safe Schools Study (United States Department of Education 1978) was school governance in creating safe schools. The principal played the key role in governance. Principals who were educational leaders, strong role models for teachers

and students, and who fairly and consistently exercised discipline were essential in making schools safe. The study also outlined the following factors for safe schools which were summarized as: (1) Teachers had high job satisfaction and were in consensus with the principal's governance role; (2) there was a cohesiveness among teachers; (3) there were clearly stated, known rules that were firmly enforced; (4) there was resource and moral support from the administration; (5) there was a high emphasis on academic achievement; (6) the individual's success and improvement were acknowledged and rewarded; (7) there were organized class sizes that increased close relationships between students and teachers; (8) there were high staff morale and school spirit; (9) the students believed that learning and school subject matter were relevant and valuable; and (10) the students held beliefs that school was a good place to be and that they had some control over what happened to them there.

The study concluded that schools with those characteristics were safer and more successful in achievement also. One of the recommendations for the turnaround of a violent school was to "stress the improvement of the academic program and the importance of academic excellence" (United States Department of Education 1978, p. 169). The alignment of the safe schools characteristics with the effective schools characteristics indicated strong similarities.

Ohio's Effective School Program (Evans 1983) operated through the Ohio State Department of Education. They piloted six programs throughout the state in 1982. The effect of those programs has yet to be determined. They elected, as a result of studying the effective schools research, to work with seven factors in the pilot schools.

Those seven factors were summarized as (1) a strong sense of school mission, (2) strong-building leadership, (3) high expectations for staff and students, (4) frequent monitoring of student progress, (5) a positive learning climate, (6) sufficient opportunity for learning, and (7) parent-community involvement. They defined effective schools as "those schools which obtain significant increases in student achievement for economically disadvantaged pupils" (Evans 1983, p. 3). Increased academic achievement for a targeted student population was the primary goal.

Evans (1983) explained how an effective school was achieved. He stated that "to make a school an effective school, the leadership and a majority of teachers must believe that all children can learn. They must embrace the philosophy . . . that all children can learn what any child can learn, . . . given the appropriate teaching-learning environment. . . . Effective schools expect to be effective schools" (p. 3). He stated that effective schools required collegial planning, organizing, and decision-making strategies. There was a commonality in problem sharing, planning for resolution of the problems, and implementation of collectively agreed-upon interventions.

Ohio's Effective School Program incorporated seven of the characteristics most commonly found in effective schools research. It also attempted to provide some direction as to how to begin to create more effective schools. This was in the form of technical assistance for local districts from the Ohio State Department of Education, pilot programs, five statewide conferences, and a strategies conference on implementation of effective schools models.

Dimensions of an Effective School

Despite the limitations of the available research on effective schools, there were cohesive elements that were found throughout the literature. These elements related to three broad components that provided a framework for an effective school. The first component was composed of organizational and structural elements that were developed by administrative means and were manipulable. The second component contained process elements that related to the climate and culture of the school. These were not as manipulable as the organizational elements. The third component related to the classroom-level operations in a school as they affected direct teaching and learning. These were regarded as being adaptable by individual schools and teachers. These elements were called characteristics. They were drawn from the lists found in effective schools research and other related literature.

There were seven characteristics of an effective school that comprised the organizational and structural components. These characteristics generally related to the management of the total school and the district.

1. The role of the principal. Effective schools had strong instructional leaders; instructional leadership from the principal was important to initiate and maintain the improvement process (Brookover et al. 1977; Edmonds 1981; Glenn 1981; New York State Department of Education 1974b; Rutter et al. 1979; Tomlinson 1981; Trisman, Waller, and Wilder 1976; Weber 1971). One study indicated that the principal had to display strong leadership and also be experienced as an elementary classroom teacher (Austin 1979). This characteristic was found to be among the five most predominantly recurring characteristics

in the literature review. Most reviewers stated that the centrality of the principal's role between administration and teachers made it, in the improvement process, a critical position to start the process; and his or her support was essential, particularly in the early stages of the process (California State Department of Education 1980).

2. District support. Effective schools needed total district support which related to basic changes in the school and system, school-level management, staff stability, and resource attainment. Most of the variables found to be significant were unreachable without the support of central office administration (Hersch et al. 1981; United States Department of Education 1978). One study specified help in specialized areas of learning and management, such as reading or mainstreaming (Hargrove et al. 1981) from central offices. The more accepted role was seen as supportive rather than one of leadership or top-down administration.

3. Staff development. Staff development in effective schools required planning, systematizing, and school-wide emphasis. Planned changes that altered people's attitudes and behaviors, as well as supplied new skills and techniques, encompassed all staff, not just individual teachers. Staff in-service required a close relationship to the instructional program (Armor et al. 1976; California State Department of Education 1980; Glenn 1981; Levine and Stark 1981) and pervaded the whole curriculum.

4. Curriculum development, articulation, and organization. Curriculum in effective schools was goal specific. If elementary school students were expected to acquire basic and complex skills of content and thinking, this had to reflected in a school-wide curriculum

emphasis. The curriculum then focused on those skills in a specific and accountable way (Armor et al. 1976; Glenn 1981; Trisman, Waller, and Wilder 1976; Weber 1971). Children received appropriate instructional time on those skills (Fisher et al. 1978). The skills were articulated and coordinated across grade levels (California State Department of Education 1980; Levine and Stark 1981; New York State Department of Education 1974b).

5. Academic press. Successful schools promoted academic press which was considered the school-wide recognition of student achievement. Schools that publicly honored, with ceremonies and symbols, student success were more likely to encourage the students to adopt similar attitudes and values (Brookover et al. 1977; Brookover and Lezotte 1979; Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1981).

6. Increased learning time. Schools which were successful chose to stress basic skills or academic subjects then had to devote a greater part of the school day to those subjects (Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1981). Class time was less interruptable for announcements and other disruptions (Fisher et al. 1978). Students in such schools were engaged in direct instruction and active learning (Brookover et al. 1977; Fisher et al. 1978). School policies, regulations, planning, organizing, and scheduling reflected this emphasis.

7. School policies. Schools that had established a clear sense of mission--that is, were united by commonly understood and accepted purposes--were more effective (Austin 1978; Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy 1980; Edmonds 1978; Hersch et al. 1981; Tomlinson 1981). Clearly established goals, coordinated curriculum, and required monitoring of student progress were effective schools characteristics

noted by Armor et al. (1976); Brookover et al. (1977); Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980); Hersch et al. (1981); and Levine and Stark (1981).

The second component in the effective school dimensions was school climate (Brookover et al. 1977) and culture (Rutter et al. 1979). School climate and culture were characterized in effective schools as providing academic emphasis, orderly environments, and high expectations for students and teachers. Culture and climate referred to a conception of schools that linked content (organizational structure, norms, values, and instructional techniques) with process (political and social relationships, and communication flow in the school). The schools' practices needed to reflect the interrelated characteristics of content and process by a school-wide cultural press towards academic achievement with clear goals, high expectations, and a structure to maximize learning opportunities.

The recurring characteristics of schools deemed successful were high expectations for student achievement (Brookover et al. 1977; Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy 1980; Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1981; Edmonds 1978, 1979a; Rutter et al. 1979; Weber 1971) and an orderly and disciplined environment (Armor et al. 1976; California State Department of Education 1977; Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy 1980; Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore 1981; Edmonds 1979a; Hersch et al. 1981; Tomlinson 1981; United States Department of Education 1978).

Other characteristics that came from the studies and were related to school climate and culture were student belonging needs (Rutter et al. 1979); appropriate reinforcement techniques (Brookover et al. 1977); student-teacher rapport (Trisman, Waller, and Wilder 1976); and collaborative planning and collegial relationships (Armor et al.

1976; Glenn 1981; Hargrove et al. 1981; New York State Department of Education 1974b; Trisman, Waller, and Wilder 1976).

Parental involvement and support were characteristics that belonged in all of the components of an effective school. They were placed in the climate component because they were less manipulable than organizational and classroom characteristics.

Studies that found parental involvement and support major factors in student achievement were Armor et al. (1976); Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1981); Levine and Stark (1981); and New York State Department of Education (1974b). Brookover and Lezotte (1979) cited less overall parent involvement but more parent-initiated involvement. It was reasonable to conclude that parents needed to be informed of school goals and student responsibilities. The evidence appeared to indicate that parental support was likely to positively influence student achievement.

The third effective school dimension was classroom-level characteristics that affected student achievement in effective schools and dealt with teaching strategies and techniques, classroom management, and monitoring of such progress. Teaching strategies and techniques characteristics dealt with effective use of instructional time (Denham and Lieberman 1979), academic engaged time (Rosenshine and Berliner 1978), and direct instruction (Rosenshine 1978). Three studies suggested an emphasis on structured activities which required instruction that was teacher managed and which was content focused. This direct instruction of specific contents and skills emphasized to students that they could achieve success (Brookover et al. 1977; Rosenshine 1976; Rutter et al. 1979). Time spent on instruction and use of competitive games in

teaching were found to be characteristics of effectiveness by Brookover et al. (1977) and Fisher et al. (1978). More homework, more required academic subjects, and more extensive performance demands of students were conclusions about successful student achievement from Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1981).

Classroom management by teachers was found to be an effective characteristic in some studies. These characteristics were more small-group instruction (Trisman, Waller, and Wilder 1976); efficient use of classroom time (Tomlinson 1981); ability grouping of students (Brookover et al. 1977; Clark and McCarthy 1983); more individualization of instruction (Weber 1971); coordinated planning of classroom activities across subjects (Glenn 1981); specifying mastery performance of students in basic skills (California State Department of Education 1980); and emphasizing higher-order thinking skills (Levine and Stark 1981). Classroom management that kept students actively engaged in learning activities was specified by Rutter et al. (1979).

Monitoring of student progress was among the most recurring of the effective schools characteristics (Averch et al. 1977; Brookover et al. 1977; California State Department of Education 1980; Levine and Stark 1981; Weber 1971). Monitoring of student progress was defined as continuous diagnosis, evaluation, and feedback on students' learning (Mackenzie 1983). This verifying of student achievement entailed record-keeping, testing, and conferencing with and about students.

Implications for the Study

The effective schools movement rested on three empirical claims. The first was that there were verifiable examples of successful schools that served poor, urban, minority children. Secondly, there were

specific characteristics that determined the performance of those schools. Thirdly, if those characteristics were manipulated by educators in ineffective schools, better student achievement occurred and the schools were considered effective.

A review of the literature revealed that those claims were not empirically proven. Effectiveness was linked, generally, to testing low-level skills only in math and reading. There were no clear definitions on the effective characteristics that were named from the studies and no consensus among the researchers on a precise characteristics list. There were no clear descriptions as to how to exactly improve achievement. A majority of the research was conducted in inner-city elementary schools with a diverse student population which made replication difficult in secondary, rural, and possibly suburban schools. The methodologies of the research itself were found inadequate by many reviewers.

The criticisms that were raised about the existing research were concerned primarily with how the studies were conducted, observer biases, and the paucity of verifiable evidence. The critics, overall, found the ideology behind the studies reasonable and commendable. Their cautions were directed at researchers with future agendas who could strengthen, or not, the empirical claims that were made about how to increase the basic skills achievement of children.

Concerning the many and varied lists of effective schools characteristics, the reviewers tended to agree that working to create them in ineffective schools made sense, even if their validity lacked evidence in the available research. They found the research itself intriguing in its attempts to develop procedures in locating successful

schools and in assessing the quality of those schools. The rapid development of school-improvement programs across many states based on the effective schools model (Odden 1982) attested to interest in and its widespread acceptance.

The formula that was followed in many school districts to implement the effective schools model generally contained these steps (Cuban 1983):

> 1. The school board and the superintendent establish district-wide instructional goals, often stated in terms of student outcomes, i.e., test score improvement.
> 2. A goal-setting process is constructed for each school and its classrooms. School and classroom goals deal with student outcomes; i.e., they are aligned with district goals.
> 3. The district curriculum (K-12) is reviewed to determine whether the objectives for subject matter and skills, the textbooks, and the tests are consistent with what teachers teach in classrooms.
> 4. District supervisory practices and evaluation instruments used in schools and classrooms are revised in light of the focus on student outcomes and what the literature on effective teaching has produced; i.e., evaluation of teachers and principals is linked to district and school objectives.
> 5. A monitoring process is mandated to assess progress in reaching district, school, and classroom goals. The information is used to determine program changes and to evaluate staff performance.
> 6. An extensive staff development program is set up for teachers, principals, central office supervisors, and the school board. It concentrates on effective teaching, effective schools, and the gradual implementation of the other five steps. (p. 695)

The significance of this approach indicated that the effective schools model mandated changes in the district, the school, and the classroom. These changes affected how the total system planned, organized, delivered, and monitored learning and achievement for students through school-level factors.

Some of the criticisms of effective schools research were, for the purposes of this study, not negative. The intent of this study

was to assess how the basic skills attainments of the Cleveland public school students were being addressed; most of the literature on effective schools concerned itself with assessments of basic skills and student achievement levels. The majority of the research was conducted in urban elementary schools with greater proportions of poor, minority children; this study developed in just such a setting.

This study used many of the characteristics of effective schools as the basis for assessing procedures for teaching basic skills. Seven characteristics were selected from those most recurring in the lists to assess how the Cleveland Public Schools planned, organized, delivered, and monitored basic skills. Each characteristic corresponded to the significant characteristics that evolved from a review of the literature. Those seven characteristics were (1) district policies and regulations--a sense of mission, resource support, school-wide objectives, and communications; (2) school plan--goal-specific objectives, testing, staff development, instructional leadership; (3) learning support--special programs, library services, textbooks, and materials; (4) teaching strategies--classroom management, direct instruction, groupings, teacher preparation; (5) verification of student learning--monitoring of student progress, diagnosis, testing, evaluation, and reporting; (6) performance expectations--high expectations of student achievement, order, and discipline; and (7) parent involvement--information on and support of schools.

A depiction of what needed to be known about basic skills attainment in an effective school had emerged from the review of the literature. Acquisition of that information needed the involvement of those people who were most directly affected by and affecting what

was happening in the schools--teachers, principals, parents, and students. The study queried and compared their perceptions through questions that reflected effective schools ideology on basic skills attainment.

There were no attempts in this study to identify effective or ineffective schools. The study intended to identify what was being done to assure that Cleveland Public Schools elementary children acquired basic skills. The framework that was provided for seeking that information was based on research of schools that had raised achievement levels on the basic skills of inner-city children. Their successes were thought to be attributable to characteristics that existed in their schools but that did not exist in schools which were not raising the achievement levels of their students.

Findings from the study were expected to indicate basic skills needs of the school system that were subject to change by educators. Based on the review of the literature and information on the Cleveland Public School system that had been subject to financial problems, desegregation issues, and declining school enrollment, there seemed reason to expect that the results would indicate that changes would be required at the district, school, and classroom levels if basic skills achievement was to be raised at the elementary school level.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The design of the study to assess how basic skills were being addressed in Cleveland Public Schools focused on comparing the perceptions of samples of those people directly affecting and affected by what was being accomplished or not accomplished in the schools: teachers, administrators, parents, and two groups of students. The design allowed various factors of school functions and elements as they affected basic skills to be used in testing the hypotheses.

Chapter 3 provides a description of the methods and procedures used in conducting this study. It contains a description of the factors to be studied, the instrument development, population selection, data collection methods, and the explanation of the statistical treatment that was applied to the data.

Factors to be Studied

The study was originally designed to compare perceptions among four groups: parents, principals, teachers, and students from grades three and five. Changes on the student survey instrument were such that the final instrument used in the data collection was different in both content and number of scale choices (four to five) from the adult instrument. It was deemed inappropriate to compare the

student data with the data from the adult populations. It was decided to consider student data as a separate part of the study. Since there were two groups of students--third-graders and fifth-graders--their perceptions were compared for significant differences apart from the adult populations.

The role or position of the respondents in each of the four groups was the independent variable. Three categories of dependent factors considered were the functions of the schools, specific elements in the schools, and basic skills. These multiple dependent variables were selected and controlled for this study. The following explanations will assist the reader to better understand these variables.

Functions

Functions were considered the tasks necessary to carry out the operations of the school. For the purpose of this study, those identified functions were planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring.

Planning. Planning was a single variable which referred to designing--before the fact--the purposes, the means, and the responsibility for implementation.

Organizing. Organizing was a single variable which referred to bringing the resources and efforts of the school together so that work could proceed in an orderly manner.

Delivering. Delivering was a single variable which was considered to be the actual enactment of the plans of the school.

Monitoring. Monitoring was a single variable which was considered to be the people and devices used to check, regulate, and assess the worth of what had been planned, organized, and delivered.

Elements

Elements were considered to be the identifiable areas of the school operation which directed and influenced how the basic skills were addressed. Seven elements were identified to be considered in the study.

School policies and procedures. School policies and procedures was a single variable which was considered to be the formal and published rules and regulations that were established by the school district for the purpose of providing direction for all aspects of the school functions and structure.

The school plan. The school plan was a single variable which related to the annual efforts undertaken by individual school staffs for the purpose of directly focusing on goals and objectives to be attained during each school year.

Learning support. Learning support was a single variable which related to how the school coordinated the supplementary instructional resources of people, programs, and materials available for the purpose of providing additional bolstering to a regular classroom program.

Teaching strategies. Teaching strategies was a single variable which related to the methods and techniques of instruction employed by classroom teachers for the purpose of promoting learning.

Verification of student learning. Verification of student learning was a single variable which related to how schools test, document, and report student progress.

Student performance expectations. Student performance expectations was a single variable which related to how the school set and conveyed the quantity and quality of learning expected from the

students.

Parent involvement. Parent involvement was a single variable which related to how the schools provided and sought opportunities to have parents engage in actively supporting the efforts of the schools.

Basic Skills

Basic skills for the purposes of this study were reading, writing, and mathematics.

Reading. Reading was a single variable which related to the act of deriving meaning from the printed word.

Writing. Writing was a single variable which related to the act of expressing meaning in print through spelling, handwriting, and composition.

Mathematics. Mathematics was a single variable which related to the organization of structures and relationships of numbers. Arithmetic was that part of mathematics which used computational methods to work with numbers.

Instrument Development

During January of 1983 the consultant team of Educational Services Institute (ESI) met and developed initial drafts of instruments in conducting the study. Once the initial instruments were developed they were reviewed by the Special Committee on Education. The Special Committee on Education then submitted the original drafts to educational personnel, students, parents, and community groups for jurying. The Special Committee on Education revised the juried drafts and prepared the final instruments. Two questionnaires were constructed. The general, adult form (appendix A) contained 184 statements. The

student form for both third- and fifth-grade students (appendix B) contained 38 statements. Each questionnaire was prefaced by a cover sheet, a definition of terms page, and a directions page with examples of the statements and scales. The title given to the questionnaire was "YOU'RE THE TEACHER," PHASE II: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN ASSESSING THE BASIC SKILLS IN THE CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The original instruments developed by the writer and other education specialists from ESI contained 384 items in four separate instruments for educators, parents, and two levels of students. Specific attention was given to the level of vocabulary difficulty of key words in each statement by using the Basic Skills Word List (Instrument Objective Exchange 1980). This booklet listed common words by grade-level appropriateness.

Statements in the instruments were generated to represent the functions of the school in the specific elements as they related to reading, writing, and mathematics. For example, the function of planning for reading in district policies and procedures had specific items developed with a minimum of six statements for each. The same process was followed for writing, and then for mathematics. Organizing was approached in the same manner for each of the basic skills, followed by delivering and then monitoring. The whole process proceeded in this same pattern for each of the seven elements. Appendix C contains a matrix of numbers of statements developed for each of the areas. The original large pool of statements was generated to allow for the editing which occurred through jurying by several groups in the Cleveland school district and community.

A Likert-type of scale construction was used with the items. The perception statements were constructed to indicate whether the respondents believed the actions always, sometimes, rarely, or never occurred for the adult and student populations. An additional option for responses was did not know. Henerson, Morris, and Fitz-Gibbon (1978) described an agreement scale such as the Likert-type scale as one which achieved a wide range of scores by having respondents report the intensity of a perception. This was accomplished by providing gradations within the response alternatives. The scales used with the items allowed for those gradations in the questionnaires.

The original instruments were submitted for jurying by the staff of the Special Committee on Education to the following groups: thirty-two members of the Research Department of the Cleveland Public Schools; fifty-four central office staff from assistant superintendents to programs directors and supervisors; sixty principals from the Cleveland Public Schools; thirty-five members of parent groups; student groups of twenty from each school level (e.g., elementary, junior, and senior high); a cross-section of thirty teachers from all grade levels representing the Cleveland Teacher's Education Association; twenty-four members of the Executive Board of the Federation for Community Planning; and twelve community members at large. Each of the groups provided suggestions for revisions and corrections of the instruments. The Special Committee on Education considered many of the suggestions from these groups and decided to use one general form for all of the adult populations and two simplified forms developed from the general form for the student populations--one for the junior and senior high students and the other for the elementary students.

The Special Committee on Education decided to use a four-point scale for student responses. The gradations in the scale were never, sometimes, always, or do not know as the choices. They also changed the format and content of the original questions and instrument. The factors remained the same, as did the number of questions.

Selection of the Population

The populations selected for this study were the third- and fifth-grade students in elementary schools, parents of elementary students, elementary school teachers, and principals in the Cleveland Public Schools. There were eighty-four elementary schools in the city. Twenty-eight (one-third) were identified from across the city by the Special Committee on Education to be considered in this study. The priority of the Special Committee on Education was to include those kinds of schools attended by a majority of public school students. Therefore, no magnet or special schools were included since the majority of students did not attend these schools. In order to get a clear picture of all schools in the city, it was decided to assess all twelve senior high schools, twelve junior high schools, and at least twenty-eight elementary schools. This approach was taken to assure that eventually a majority of students in Cleveland would attend a school which had been assessed, if only at the senior high level.

It was possible to identify the junior high schools and elementary schools which fed students into that particular school by arranging all of the schools into groups with a senior high school as the focus. This grouping of students was called a cluster. The schools were then organized into paired clusters of two senior high schools, two junior high schools, and a minimum of four elementary

schools. A total of fifty-two buildings was assessed.

The number of the elementary schools in each cluster was identified on the basis of their cluster organization. The Special Committee on Education looked at what percentage of all public school students from kindergarten through grade twelve were in each cluster. They wanted a total of twenty elementary schools. To assure the selection of twenty elementary schools which were appropriately distributed, they used an averaging process based on the total number of students in each cluster. From these data they determined whether to choose four or more elementary schools within each cluster.

Other criteria were established to assure that the elementary schools selected were representative of the Cleveland Public Schools based on (1) a high, median, and low distribution of parent economic status; (2) a completed desegregation plan to assure racial balance; (3) school staffs with the greater numbers of racial representation; (4) the organization of the different schools from kindergarten through grade three, grade four through grade six, and kindergarten through grade six, with the selection of at least one kindergarten through grade six school, where there was one in the cluster; and (5) the existence of at least one bilingual program in each school or in at least one of the schools. Schools were randomly selected from those which met the criteria. An effort was extended to attend to all criteria but matching, though generally representative, was imperfect because it was impossible to uniformly meet all the criteria in all clusters.

The populations were selected from within the identified schools. From each school there were ten parents, ten teachers, one third-grade class, one fifth-grade class, all principals, and assistant

principals. Principals of each school identified all of those populations in their schools. Principals were requested to seek a representative selection of classrooms, teachers, and parents from their schools based on the same criteria by which the schools had been selected, such as economic status and racial balance. It was assumed that this was followed, although no controls were available to assure the process. The samples were drawn from those schools. There were 100 students, 100 parents, 42 principals, and 100 teachers considered in the study.

The other population selected was the parents and other "volunteers" from the community who collected the data from the schools. The Special Committee on Education recruited eighty people on the basis of residency, willingness to be trained, and their availability for the actual data collection. Members of the volunteer teams represented the great diversity of Cleveland's population. There were representatives of all races, ages, and socioeconomic groups. For example, one team of five volunteers had the vice-president of a major city bank, a welfare mother, the local secretary for the "gray panthers," a church janitor, and an unemployed teacher. Two were Black, one was Mexican American, and two were Anglos.

Training the Parents and Volunteers and Data Collection

Community involvement was one of the primary intents of the project, which included using parents and volunteers from Cleveland to administer the instruments. For this purpose, eighty parents and volunteers were recruited and trained in two separate, two-day training sessions in March of 1983. Training was provided by five members of the ESI staff, including the writer. A training manual was developed

by the writer to use in the sessions and served as a handbook and guide for the volunteers in the actual data collection. The manual contained a description of the project; goals for the training; data collection principles; verbatim directions for collection procedures with each population; evaluation forms; task completion check sheets; phone numbers of all volunteers, team leaders, and project staff; and suggestions for handling unanticipated events (Educational Services Institute 1983).

The participants were divided into teams of four, with one member serving as the team leader. Each team collected data from three schools. Eighteen teams were assigned schools, and two teams served as a back-up when needed on data-collection days.

The objectives of the training were that all persons would understand the project, know the general principles of data collection, know the instruments, and be able to perform the data collection procedures in their designated schools. To meet the objectives the participants experienced simulations of administering the instruments to each of the populations and giving and taking the instruments with each other. Exact directions were provided about whom to see, what to say, and how to complete each stage of the collection. Particular practice was given to administering the instruments to the student populations, as this involved reading all of the directions and all of the statements to the students.

Team leaders were given additional training that provided practice in contacting principals, establishing schedules for the team, managing the on-site collection, organizing the data, coordinating team efforts, and delivering the data. Ameri-Trust Banking Corporation

of Cleveland provided vans that picked up the completed data at each school site and delivered them to the Special Committee on Education.

The staff of the Special Committee on Education maintained master schedules on all data-collection teams with their scheduled dates, times, and contacts. They also made themselves available for assistance and information when needed. The staff had made preliminary contact with each of the principals in the selected schools and provided them with the names of the team members who contacted them to schedule collection times. All of the data collection with each of the populations occurred on the school site.

The training of the volunteers was completed on 14 March 1983. Team leaders reported that all scheduling with the principals for data collection was completed by 21 March 1983. Projected completion for all collections was 29 April 1983. This goal was met.

There was a lengthy delay in the receipt of the completed surveys from the Special Committee on Education. The sample survey data were not released to the writer until May of 1984--more than a year after they had been completed. Several changes occurred in the composition of the Special Committee on Education and its staff during the intervening time and this contributed to the delay.

Instruments were scored by the writer on a National Computer Systems General Purpose answer sheet for computer reading. There was a total of 342 questionnaires tabulated--100 parents, 42 principals, 100 teachers, 50 third graders, and 50 fifth graders. These samples were drawn from all of the groups that had been surveyed in the twenty-eight elementary schools. The principals were representative of all of the schools. However, the samples of teachers, parents, and students

may not have been representative of all twenty-eight schools because of the way they were chosen for the writer by the staff of the Special Committee on Education. The Special Committee on Education was instructed to select these samples on a random basis, but the writer had no controls of the process actually used. The IBM 370/158 computer at the University of North Dakota Computer Center was used to process the data. The Statistical Package For The Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent 1975) was used in the treatment of the data.

Statistical Design

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used in the statistical treatment of the data from the Likert-type scales. The MANOVA test of statistical significance was conceived as a statistical technique that was to be used when the research hypothesis incorporated two or more groups as the independent variable, and used tests of differences among multiple dependent variables and their respective sample means (Williams 1977).

Essentially, MANOVA was designed to test simultaneous differences among groups on multiple dependent variables. "The most widely used among tests for this purpose is a test of Wilks' Lambda. That is a test of Lambda serves as an overall test of the null hypothesis of the equality of mean vectors of two or more groups" (Pedhazur 1979, p. 710). Lambda was recommended for application when there were strong differences among groups. Lambda provided a probability statement about the null hypothesis in a statistical value called F and its level of significance. "This value can be interpreted in a sampling distribution to determine its probability associated with occurrence

under the null hypothesis" (Williams 1977, p. 80). A level of .05 or less was used as the criterion of significance for rejecting the null hypothesis.

Univariate F tests were then applied to the multivariate case. The procedures of the F test allowed the differences among the groups on all significant variables to be taken into account. "The end result of the univariate ANOVA test produces a summary table listing each source of variance, its associated degree of freedom, and the error term for the F-ratio testing the null hypothesis that this particular component of variance is truly zero in the population" (Harris 1975, p. 118). The summary table, in effect, was a matrix of sums of cross products of deviation scores for each effect tested and each error term, that is for each row of the summary table. Each variable was computed to yield the sum of squares (SS), sum of squares error, the mean of squares (MS), the mean of squares error, the F-ratio, and the significance of F. "The sum of squares for the effect and the sum for the error in the averaged F test were obtained by summing over the hypothesis sum of squares and error sum of squares" (Hull and Nie 1981, p. 38).

On variables where the univariate F tests were significant--and only in such cases--the t-test was then applied as the statistical model for testing the significance of difference between the means of each population on the variables (e.g., parents with teachers, teachers with principals). Multiple comparisons were performed among the groups which yielded a t value and its significance.

A significant difference at the .05 level or less was used for all of the treatments. The results of the analyses are reported in

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results and analysis of the data for this study. The study sought to assess how the Cleveland public elementary schools were perceived to be addressing the basic skills through their planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring systems. This information was sought by surveying those people most directly affecting and affected by schools. Eight null hypotheses were developed to test the perceptions of those populations. The results and analyses of the collected data and its effect on the hypotheses are presented in the same numerical order as the research questions were presented in chapter 1. The higher mean scores, in the comparisons of groups, implied that more of the desirable educational activities were perceived as occurring more often. A .05 or less level of significance was established for rejecting each hypothesis.

Results

Null hypothesis 1. In relationship to school policies and procedures there are no significant differences among the perceptions of teachers, parents, and principals on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 1, 2, and 3. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 1. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant difference of those means equaled .55292 with an F value of 13.05 with 12 and 454 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the groups means was less than .001. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. There were significant differences among the perceptions of the three groups.

The univariate F test was applied to test the significant differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables in the hypothesis. The results are shown in table 2. The findings indicated that there were significant differences among the groups on all dependent variables ($p < .001$). Teachers, parents, and principals differed significantly in their perceptions of planning basic skills, organizing basic skills, delivering basic skills, and monitoring basic skills related to school policies and procedures.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 3 and mean scores of each group, indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 1. The findings showed that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than

TABLE 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO SCHOOL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=97)	Principals (N=42)	Teachers (N=96)
Planning Basic Skills	M/SD	9.65/6.86	19.26/3.85	16.74/7.48
Organizing Reading	M/SD	4.27/2.40	7.29/1.24	3.93/2.53
Writing	M/SD	3.51/2.54	6.93/1.60	3.76/2.42
Math	M/SD	4.00/2.45	7.10/1.34	3.78/2.43
Delivering Basic Skills	M/SD	3.80/3.03	7.52/1.25	5.29/3.03
Monitoring Basic Skills	M/SD	2.15/3.04	6.31/3.50	2.77/3.70

Wilks' Lambda = .55292 with an F value of 13.05 with 12 and 454 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

TABLE 2

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO SCHOOL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning Basic Skills	3702.95	10434.69	1851.48	44.98	41.16	<.001
Organizing Reading	356.02	1224.09	178.01	5.28	33.74	<.001
Writing	377.97	1280.52	188.99	5.52	34.24	<.001
Math	356.42	1214.03	178.21	5.23	34.06	<.001
Delivering Basic Skills	413.03	1813.59	206.52	7.82	26.42	<.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	529.17	2690.61	264.59	11.60	22.81	<.001

All analyses performed with 1 and 232 degrees of freedom

TABLE 3

THE t-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning Basic Skills	-7.76	<0.001	2.03	0.043	-7.34	<0.001
Organizing Reading	-7.11	<0.001	7.90	<0.001	1.03	0.304
Writing	-7.89	<0.001	7.29	<0.001	-0.75	0.451
Math	-7.33	<0.001	7.83	<0.001	0.66	0.507
Delivering Basic Skills	-7.20	<0.001	4.32	<0.001	-3.70	<0.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	-6.61	<0.001	5.62	<0.001	-1.26	0.210

did parents in terms of school policies and procedures. There was also a significant difference ($p < .001$) on organizing, delivering, and monitoring and on planning ($p = .043$) between the perceptions of principals and teachers in terms of whether school policies and procedures were addressing basic skills. Principals had a more favorable view than did teachers. Differences between the perceptions of parents and teachers were found to be significant at the .001 level on the planning and delivering variables, but to not be significant on the organizing and monitoring variables in terms of whether the schools were addressing basic skills through school policies and procedures. Where significant differences occurred between parents and teachers, teachers held the more favorable view.

Null hypothesis 2. In relationship to the school plan there are no significant differences among the perceptions of parents, principals, and teachers on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of the basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 4, 5, and 6. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 4. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant differences of those means equaled .59726 with an F value of 8.01 with 16 and 434 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the groups' means was high ($p < .001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Significant differences existed among the perceptions of the three groups.

TABLE 4

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THE SCHOOL PLAN AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=93)	Principals (N=41)	Teachers (N=94)
Planning Basic Skills	M/SD	4.25/3.26	8.98/2.15	5.43/3.18
Organizing Reading	M/SD	7.26/4.58	14.05/1.82	8.40/5.37
Writing	M/SD	6.87/4.70	13.76/1.80	8.27/5.44
Math	M/SD	7.16/4.67	13.98/1.78	8.46/5.31
Delivering Basic Skills	M/SD	5.57/3.41	9.34/1.64	8.23/2.66
Monitoring Reading	M/SD	1.83/1.70	3.54/0.87	2.18/1.61
Writing	M/SD	1.77/1.66	3.27/0.92	2.16/1.62
Math	M/SD	1.85/1.73	3.39/0.89	2.18/1.63

Wilks' Lambda = .59726 with an F value of 8.01 with 16 and 436 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

The univariate F test was applied to test the significant differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables in the hypothesis. The results are shown in table 5. The findings indicated that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) among the groups on all dependent variables. Teachers, parents, and principals differed from each other significantly in their perceptions of planning basic skills, organizing basic skills, delivering basic skills, and monitoring basic skills in regard to school policies and procedures.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of the groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 6 and mean scores of each group, indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 4. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than did parents in terms of the school plan. There was also a significant difference of .001 on planning, organizing, and monitoring and .040 on delivering between the perceptions of principals and teachers in terms of whether the school plan was addressing basic skills. Principals had a more favorable view than did teachers. Differences between the parents and teachers were found to be significant at the .001 level for the delivering variable, at the .009 level for planning basic skills, and at .043 for organizing writing but to not be significant on the organizing of reading and math in terms of whether the schools were addressing basic skills through the school plan. Where significant differences occurred between parents and teachers, teachers held the

TABLE 5

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO THE SCHOOL PLAN

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning Basic Skills	640.15	2101.27	320.08	9.34	34.27	<.001
Organizing Reading	1360.12	4750.35	680.06	21.11	32.21	<.001
Writing	1376.90	4924.36	688.45	21.89	31.46	<.001
Math	1355.69	4748.89	677.85	21.11	32.12	<.001
Delivering Basic Skills	530.76	1836.87	265.38	8.16	32.51	<.001
Monitoring Reading	84.67	535.37	42.33	2.38	17.79	<.001
Writing	63.81	530.91	31.90	2.36	13.52	<.001
Math	68.64	553.57	34.32	2.46	13.95	<.001

All analyses performed with 2 and 225 degrees of freedom

TABLE 6

THE t-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF THE SCHOOL PLAN AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning Basic Skills	-8.25	<0.001	6.21	<0.001	-2.64	0.009
Organizing Reading	-7.88	<0.001	6.56	<0.001	-1.71	0.089
Writing	-7.85	<0.001	6.27	<0.001	-2.04	0.043
Math	-7.91	<0.001	6.42	<0.001	-1.93	0.055
Delivering Basic Skills	-7.04	<0.001	2.07	0.040	-6.38	<0.001
Monitoring Reading	-5.91	<0.001	4.70	<0.001	-1.56	0.119
Writing	-5.19	<0.001	3.86	<0.001	-1.72	0.088
Math	-5.24	<0.001	4.12	<0.001	-1.44	0.150

more favorable view.

Null hypothesis 3. In relationship to learning support there are no significant differences among the perceptions of teachers, principals, and parents on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 7, 8, and 9. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 7. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant differences of those means equaled .45216 with an F value of 13.40 with 16 and 440 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the group means was high ($p < .001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Significant differences existed among the groups.

The univariate F test was applied to test the differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables in the hypothesis. The results are shown in table 8. The findings indicated that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) among the groups on all dependent variables. Parents, teachers, and principals differed from each other significantly in their perceptions of planning basic skills, organizing basic skills, delivering basic skills, and monitoring basic skills in regard to learning support.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of the groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 9 and mean scores of each group,

TABLE 7

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO LEARNING SUPPORT AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=93)	Principals (N=42)	Teachers (N=95)
Planning Basic Skills	M/SD	5.12/4.15	10.93/3.43	9.13/4.72
Organizing Reading	M/SD	4.51/3.12	8.24/1.59	5.89/2.68
Writing	M/SD	3.77/2.93	7.14/1.88	3.88/2.46
Math	M/SD	3.39/3.10	7.19/1.85	4.01/2.30
Delivering Reading	M/SD	10.41/5.48	16.26/2.10	14.07/3.77
Writing	M/SD	8.37/4.90	14.26/2.59	12.77/4.55
Math	M/SD	9.74/5.30	15.29/2.37	13.05/4.55
Monitoring Basic Skills	M/SD	5.54/5.04	13.48/2.10	5.48/5.13

Wilks' Lambda = .45216 with an F value of 13.40 with 16 and 440 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

TABLE 8

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO LEARNING SUPPORT

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning Basic Skills	1246.75	4156.97	623.38	18.31	34.04	<.001
Organizing Reading	406.03	1673.81	203.02	7.37	27.53	<.001
Writing	377.39	1501.13	188.70	6.61	28.53	<.001
Math	436.02	1519.53	218.01	6.69	32.57	<.001
Delivering Reading	1180.91	4277.08	590.45	18.84	31.34	<.001
Writing	1373.75	4432.59	686.88	19.53	35.18	<.001
Math	1029.48	4755.11	514.74	20.95	24.57	<.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	2178.40	4991.32	1089.20	21.99	49.54	<.001

All analyses performed with 2 and 227 degrees of freedom

TABLE 9

THE t-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF LEARNING SUPPORT AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning Basic Skills	-7.30	<0.001	2.27	0.024	-6.42	<0.001
Organizing Reading	-7.39	<0.001	4.66	<0.001	-3.51	0.001
Writing	-7.05	<0.001	6.84	<0.001	-0.29	0.770
Math	-7.91	<0.001	6.63	<0.001	-1.65	0.100
Delivering Reading	-7.25	<0.001	2.72	0.007	-5.79	<0.001
Writing	-7.18	<0.001	1.82	0.069	-6.83	<0.001
Math	-6.52	<0.001	2.63	0.009	-4.96	<0.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	-9.11	<0.001	9.20	<0.001	-0.08	0.938

indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 7. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than did parents in terms of learning support. Differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers were found to be significant at $<.001$ on the organizing and monitoring variables and $<.02$ on the planning variable and on the delivering reading and math variables, but to not be significant on the delivering of writing variable in terms of whether learning support was addressing basic skills. Where significant differences occurred between principals and teachers, principals had the more favorable view. Differences between the perceptions of parents and teachers were found to be significant at the $\leq .001$ on the planning variable, the delivering variable, and the organizing of reading variable but to not be significant on organizing writing and math variables and monitoring variable in terms of whether schools were addressing basic skills through learning support. Where significant differences occurred between teachers and parents, teachers had the more favorable view.

Null hypothesis 4. In relationship to teaching strategies there are no significant differences among the perceptions of parents, principals, and teachers on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 10, 11, and 12. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing

the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 10. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant differences of those means equaled .45285 with an F value of 10.35 with 20 and 426 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the groups' means was high ($p < .001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Significant differences existed among the perceptions of the three groups.

The univariate F test was applied to test the significant differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables in the hypothesis. The results are shown in table 11. The findings indicated that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) on all dependent variables. Teachers, parents, and principals differed from each other significantly in their perceptions of planning basic skills, organizing basic skills, delivering basic skills, and monitoring basic skills as they related to teaching strategies.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of the groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 12 and mean scores of each group, indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 10. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than did parents in terms of teaching strategies. There was also a significant difference of $< .001$ on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring variables between the perceptions of teachers and principals in terms of

TABLE 10

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO TEACHING STRATEGIES AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=92)	Principals (N=41)	Teachers (N=92)
Planning Basic Skills	M/SD	5.13/3.82	10.46/1.60	4.97/4.84
Organizing Reading	M/SD	9.20/5.75	16.29/3.17	10.49/5.90
Writing	M/SD	9.07/5.78	16.12/3.17	10.49/6.00
Math	M/SD	9.09/5.82	16.17/3.20	10.46/6.01
Delivering Reading	M/SD	17.72/11.66	36.68/5.50	26.15/9.94
Writing	M/SD	19.24/11.77	36.34/5.76	28.28/9.38
Math	M/SD	18.83/11.23	35.95/5.14	28.16/8.56
Monitoring Reading	M/SD	4.01/3.01	9.34/2.07	6.81/3.29
Writing	M/SD	3.58/3.14	8.49/1.93	6.62/3.24
Math	M/SD	3.92/3.01	9.34/2.08	6.66/3.24

Wilks' Lambda = .45285 with an F value of 10.35 with 20 and 426 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

TABLE 11

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO TEACHING STRATEGIES

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning Basic Skills	984.18	3567.53	492.09	16.07	30.62	<.001
Organizing Reading	1471.97	6577.96	735.99	29.63	24.84	<.001
Writing	1443.01	6716.99	721.51	30.26	23.85	<.001
Math	1459.19	6783.94	729.60	30.56	23.88	<.001
Delivering Reading	10565.49	22577.40	5282.74	101.70	51.94	<.001
Writing	9068.75	21936.61	4534.37	98.81	45.89	<.001
Math	9212.84	19185.67	4606.42	86.42	53.30	<.001
Monitoring Reading	879.19	1980.07	439.60	8.92	49.29	<.001
Writing	811.40	2000.40	405.70	9.01	45.02	<.001
Math	894.54	1956.24	447.27	8.81	50.76	<.001

All analyses performed with 2 and 222 degrees of freedom

TABLE 12

THE t-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING STRATEGIES AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning Basic Skills	-7.08	<0.001	7.30	<0.001	0.28	0.783
Organizing						
Reading	-6.94	<0.001	5.68	<0.001	-1.61	0.108
Writing	-6.83	<0.001	5.45	<0.001	-1.76	0.081
Math	-6.82	<0.001	5.50	<0.001	-1.68	0.094
Delivering						
Reading	-10.02	<0.001	5.56	<0.001	-5.67	<0.001
Writing	-9.16	<0.001	4.32	<0.001	-6.17	<0.001
Math	-9.81	<0.001	4.46	<0.001	-6.81	<0.001
Monitoring						
Reading	-9.51	<0.001	4.50	<0.001	-6.37	<0.001
Writing	-8.71	<0.001	3.31	<0.001	-6.88	<0.001
Math	-9.72	<0.001	4.81	<0.001	-6.26	<0.001

whether teaching strategies were addressing basic skills. Principals had a more favorable view than did teachers. Differences between the perceptions of parents and teachers were found to be significant at the .001 level on the delivering and monitoring variables but to not be significant on the planning and organizing variables in terms of whether the schools were addressing basic skills through teaching strategies. Where significant differences occurred between parents and teachers, teachers held the more favorable view.

Null hypothesis 5. In relationship to the verification of student learning there are no significant differences among the perceptions of parents, principals, and teachers on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 13, 14, and 15. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 13. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant differences of those means equaled .40131 with an F value of 15.48 with 16 and 428 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the groups' means was high ($p < .001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Significant differences were apparent among the perceptions of the three groups.

The univariate F test was applied to test the significant differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables in the hypothesis. The results are shown in table 14. The findings indicated that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) among the

TABLE 13

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO VERIFICATION OF STUDENT LEARNING AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=89)	Principals (N=42)	Teachers (N=93)
Planning				
Reading	M/SD	4.73/3.01	9.38/2.50	5.49/3.24
Writing	M/SD	3.85/2.85	6.83/2.51	5.44/3.42
Math	M/SD	4.49/2.99	9.19/2.31	5.56/3.36
Organizing				
Reading	M/SD	8.66/4.58	14.86/1.79	13.10/2.89
Writing	M/SD	8.49/4.65	14.12/1.33	11.86/3.22
Math	M/SD	7.61/4.32	12.69/2.41	11.44/3.07
Delivering Basic Skills	M/SD	28.00/12.15	45.86/6.91	39.16/9.50
Monitoring Basic Skills	M/SD	4.84/3.51	9.64/1.78	5.44/3.38

Wilks' Lambda = .40131 with an F value of 15.48 with 16 and 428 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

TABLE 14

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO VERIFICATION OF STUDENT LEARNING

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning						
Reading	645.87	2014.68	322.94	9.12	35.42	<.001
Writing	275.00	2047.86	137.50	9.27	14.84	<.001
Math	639.85	2041.65	319.92	9.24	34.63	<.001
Organizing						
Reading	1420.73	2749.16	710.36	12.44	57.10	<.001
Writing	1001.70	2751.14	500.85	12.45	40.23	<.001
Math	1035.52	2927.83	517.76	13.25	39.08	<.001
Delivering Basic Skills	10706.21	23257.72	5353.10	105.24	50.87	<.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	705.62	2264.37	352.81	10.25	34.43	<.001

All analyses performed with 2 and 221 degrees of freedom

groups on all dependent variables. Teachers, parents, and principals differed significantly in how they perceived the planning of basic skills, the organizing of basic skills, the delivering of basic skills, and the monitoring of basic skills were addressed through the verification of student learning.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of the groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 15 and mean scores of each group, indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 13. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than did parents in terms of verification of student learning. Differences between the perceptions of teachers and principals were also found to be significant at $<.05$ on the planning variables and the organizing of reading and math variables, and at $\leq .001$ on the delivering and monitoring variables but to not be significant on the organizing writing variable in terms of whether verification of student learning was addressing basic skills. Where significant differences occurred, principals held the more favorable view. Differences between the perceptions of teachers and parents were found to be significant at the $<.001$ level on organizing and delivering variables and at $<.05$ on the planning writing and math variables, but to not be significant on the planning reading variable and monitoring variable in terms of whether schools were addressing basic skills through verification of student learning. Where significant differences occurred between

TABLE 15

THE t-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF VERIFICATION OF STUDENT LEARNING AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning						
Reading	-8.23	<0.001	6.92	<0.001	-1.71	0.089
Writing	-5.23	<0.001	2.46	0.015	-3.52	0.001
Math	-8.25	<0.001	6.43	<0.001	-2.36	0.019
Organizing						
Reading	-9.38	<0.001	2.68	0.008	-8.48	<0.001
Writing	-7.70	<0.001	1.91	0.058	-7.33	<0.001
Math	-8.25	<0.001	3.34	0.001	-6.24	<0.001
Delivering Basic Skills	-9.30	<0.001	3.51	0.001	-7.34	<0.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	-8.01	<0.001	7.06	<0.001	-1.26	0.209

teachers and parents, teachers held the more favorable view.

Null hypothesis 6. In relationship to performance expectations there are no significant differences among the perceptions of parents, principals, and teachers on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 16, 17, and 18. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 16. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant differences of those means equaled .49411 with an F value of 9.13 with 20 and 432 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the groups' means was high ($p < .001$). Significant differences existed among the groups' perceptions. The null hypothesis was rejected.

The univariate F test was applied to test the significant differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables. The results are shown in table 17. The findings indicated that there were significant differences ($p < .001$) among the groups on all dependent variables. Teachers, parents, and principals differed from each other greatly on their perceptions of planning basic skills, organizing basic skills, delivering basic skills, and monitoring basic skills through performance expectations.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of the groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 18 and mean scores of each group,

TABLE 16

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=91)	Principals (N=42)	Teachers (N=95)
Planning Basic Skills	M/SD	11.35/7.08	22.62/4.16	16.19/7.55
Organizing				
Reading	M/SD	3.22/2.98	10.64/1.59	4.92/4.52
Writing	M/SD	3.09/3.04	10.12/1.73	4.88/4.50
Math	M/SD	3.31/3.12	10.62/1.58	4.92/4.50
Delivering				
Reading	M/SD	2.76/1.34	3.57/0.50	3.06/0.85
Writing	M/SD	2.10/1.56	3.02/0.81	2.96/0.94
Math	M/SD	2.58/1.51	3.33/0.79	3.05/0.83
Monitoring				
Reading	M/SD	4.54/2.69	7.40/0.86	5.56/2.20
Writing	M/SD	3.55/2.66	5.67/1.87	4.51/2.50
Math	M/SD	4.36/2.73	7.48/0.99	6.08/1.90

Wilks' Lambda = .49411 with an F value of 9.13 with 20 and 432 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

TABLE 17

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning Basic Skills	3739.02	10575.24	1869.51	47.00	39.78	<0.001
Organizing						
Reading	1606.74	2828.57	803.37	12.57	63.90	<0.001
Writing	1430.62	2853.43	715.31	12.68	56.40	<0.001
Math	1563.37	2874.62	781.68	12.78	61.18	<0.001
Delivering						
Reading	19.13	240.59	9.57	1.07	8.95	<0.001
Writing	42.39	328.92	21.20	1.46	14.50	<0.001
Math	19.21	294.20	9.61	1.31	7.35	0.001
Monitoring						
Reading	236.82	1134.17	118.41	5.04	23.49	<0.001
Writing	133.39	1367.61	66.69	6.08	10.97	<0.001
Math	308.79	1050.84	154.40	4.67	33.06	<0.001

All analyses performed with 2 and 225 degrees of freedom

TABLE 18

THE *t*-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning Basic Skills	-8.81	<0.001	5.06	<0.001	-4.81	<0.001
Organizing Reading	-11.22	<0.001	8.72	<0.001	-3.26	0.001
Writing	-10.58	<0.001	7.93	<0.001	-3.44	0.001
Math	-10.97	<0.001	8.61	<0.001	-3.07	0.002
Delivering Reading	-4.22	<0.001	2.65	0.009	-2.01	0.046
Writing	-4.10	<0.001	0.29	0.769	-4.84	<0.001
Math	-3.52	0.001	1.32	0.187	-2.80	0.005
Monitoring Reading	-6.84	<0.001	4.44	<0.001	-3.10	0.002
Writing	-4.60	<0.001	2.54	0.012	-2.64	0.009
Math	-7.72	<0.001	3.48	0.001	-5.43	0.001

indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 16. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than did parents in terms of performance expectations. Differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers were found to be significant at $< .001$ on the planning and delivering variables and $\leq .001$ on the delivering reading and monitoring variables, but to not be significant on the delivering writing and math variables in terms of whether performance expectations were addressing the basic skills. Where significant differences occurred, principals held the more favorable view. There was also a significant difference ($p < .05$) on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring variables between the perceptions of parents and teachers in terms of whether performance expectations were addressing basic skills. Teachers had a more favorable view than did parents.

Null hypothesis 7. In relationship to parent involvement there are no significant differences among the perceptions of teachers, parents, and principals on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in tables 19, 20, and 21. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 19. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine

TABLE 19

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS IN RELATION TO PARENT INVOLVEMENT AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Means/Standard Deviations	Parents (N=92)	Principals (N=42)	Teachers (N=91)
Planning Basic Skills	M/SD	11.89/5.46	18.31/4.56	15.07/4.14
Organizing Basic Skills	M/SD	6.14/4.13	11.00/3.07	8.74/3.11
Delivering Basic Skills	M/SD	7.88/4.25	12.62/3.05	10.57/3.78
Monitoring Basic Skills	M/SD	3.53/3.65	8.64/2.51	4.52/3.62

Wilks' Lambda = .63377 with an F value of 14.02 with 8 and 438 degrees of freedom, $p < .001$

the significant differences of those means equaled .63377 with an F value of 14.02 with 8 and 438 degrees of freedom. The level of significance for differences on the groups' means was high ($p < .001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Significant differences were present among the perceptions of the three groups.

The univariate F test was applied to test the significant differences among the three groups on each of the dependent variables in the hypothesis. The results are shown in table 20. The findings indicated that there were significant differences among the groups on all dependent variables. Teachers, parents, and principals differed significantly from each other in their perceptions of how parent involvement affected the planning of basic skills, the organizing of basic skills, the delivering of basic skills, and the monitoring of basic skills.

The final treatment of this hypothesis was multiple comparisons between each pair of the groups on the dependent variable. The tests of significance are shown in table 21 and mean scores of each group, indicating the direction of the differences, are shown in table 19. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference ($p < .001$) between parents and principals on all variables. The principals perceived that the schools were more adequately addressing the basic skills through planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring than did parents in terms of parent involvement. There was also a significant difference ($p \leq .005$) on the planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring variables between the perceptions of principals and teachers in terms of whether there was parent involvement addressing the basic skills. Principals had a more favorable view than did teachers.

TABLE 20

UNIVARIATE F TEST OF PERCEPTIONS AMONG PARENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS ON PLANNING, ORGANIZING, DELIVERING, AND MONITORING OF BASIC SKILLS IN RELATION TO PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Source of Variation	Hypotheses SS	Error SS	Hypotheses MS	Errors	F	p
Planning Basic Skills	1261.15	5107.49	630.57	23.01	27.41	<.001
Organizing Basic Skills	743.02	2810.83	371.51	12.66	29.34	<.001
Delivering Basic Skills	726.28	3311.88	363.14	14.92	24.34	<.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	773.73	2645.27	386.86	11.92	32.47	<.001

All analyses performed with 2 and 222 degrees of freedom

TABLE 21

THE t-TEST COMPARISONS OF PARENTS TO PRINCIPALS, PRINCIPALS TO TEACHERS, PARENTS TO TEACHERS ON PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT AFFECTING BASIC SKILLS

	Parents to Principals		Principals to Teachers		Parents to Teachers	
Source of Variation	t value	p	t value	p	t value	p
Planning Basic Skills	-7.19	<0.001	3.63	<0.001	-4.48	<0.001
Organizing Basic Skills	-7.33	<0.001	3.41	0.001	-4.93	<0.001
Delivering Basic Skills	-6.59	<0.001	2.84	0.005	-4.71	<0.001
Monitoring Basic Skills	-7.95	<0.001	6.41	<0.001	-1.93	0.055

Differences between the perceptions of parents and teachers were found to be significant at <.001 on the planning, organizing, and delivering variables but to not be significant on the monitoring variable in terms of whether the schools were addressing basic skills through parent involvement. Where significant differences occurred between teachers and parents, teachers held the more favorable view.

Null hypothesis 8. In relationship to the school plan, learning support, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, performance expectations, and parent involvement there are no significant differences between students in grades three and five on the delivering of basic skills and the planning of basic skills in teaching strategies.

The results of the statistical treatment of this hypothesis are presented in table 22. The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the statistical procedure for testing the data relevant to this hypothesis.

The mean scores and standard deviations for all dependent variables are shown in table 22. The Wilks' Lambda test to determine the significant differences of those means equaled .9134 with an F value of .90567 with 9 and 87 degrees of freedom. Significance exceeded the criterion of .05 ($p = .524$). The null hypothesis was retained. There were no significant differences between the third- and fifth-grade students' perceptions on how basic skills were delivered through the school plan, learning support, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, performance expectations, or parent involvement.

In summary, the results and analyses of the data showed that the seven hypotheses relating to the adult samples were rejected.

TABLE 22

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS IN GRADES THREE AND FIVE IN RELATION TO THE DELIVERY AND PLANNING OF BASIC SKILLS AND THE WILKS' LAMBDA CRITERION FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source of Variation	Grade	School Variable	N	M	SD
Delivering Basic Skills	3	School Plan	48	3.02	0.48
	5		49	2.96	0.58
Delivering Basic Skills	3	Learning Support	48	14.42	2.45
	5		49	14.65	2.79
Planning Basic Skills	3	Teaching Strategies	48	3.17	0.60
	5		49	2.94	0.75
Delivering Reading	3	Teaching Strategies	48	10.44	1.41
	5		49	10.20	1.46
Delivering Writing	3	Teaching Strategies	48	10.79	1.75
	5		49	10.39	1.58
Delivering Math	3	Teaching Strategies	48	10.63	1.28
	5		49	10.37	1.33
Delivering Basic Skills	3	Verify Student Learning	48	21.58	3.30
	5		49	20.73	2.72
Delivering Basic Skills	3	Performance Expectations	48	8.83	0.78
	5		49	8.65	1.11
Delivering Basic Skills	3	Parent Involvement	48	7.94	1.45
	5		49	7.63	1.83

Wilks' Lambda = .91434 with an F value of .90567 with 9 and 87 degrees of freedom, p = .524

The hypothesis relating to student samples was retained. The results and analyses were presented in both narrative and tabular form. Chapter 4 elaborated the findings of the study. Chapter 5 will provide a summary of the results, conclusions, and recommendations based upon the findings.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The primary purpose of the study was to examine how the Cleveland public elementary schools were perceived to be treating the acquisition of basic skills for their students. This was accomplished by adapting characteristics to the study from schools that had purportedly achieved success in raising their students' achievement levels on reading, writing, and mathematics. These characteristics were thought to have contributed to the increased achievement levels in the reported effective schools described in the effective schools research literature. The characteristics provided a framework upon which to query how the schools planned, organized, delivered, and monitored basic skills. Seven of the most prevailing characteristics from the available research on effective schools were selected: school policies and procedures, individual school plans, learning support, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, student performance expectations, and parent involvement. Those populations thought to have the most knowledge or information about the schools were surveyed for the assessment: parents, teachers, principals, and students.

Survey instruments were developed for the study. The adult form contained 184 statements and the student form 38 statements.

Response options were on a Likert-type scale. The instruments were juried by school and community groups, and final selection of items and format was made by the Special Committee on Education. Changes on the student instrument did not allow for an acceptable comparison of student perceptions with the adult samples. Since students in grades three and five were surveyed, it was decided to compare the perceptions of those two groups separately from the adults so that their perspectives would be given representation in the study.

Data collection was completed by a group of eighty parent and community volunteers. They were trained for the process in two-day training sessions. Their training required learning data collection procedures, simulations of collection with each population, and familiarization with the instrument.

Community involvement in the project had been a primary concern of the Cleveland Special Committee on Education. Efforts were directed to engaging the interest and support of business, industry, and city leaders as well as parents of children in the Cleveland schools. The success of this community involvement effort was apparent from such events as the number of volunteers who were released from their work to participate in the training and collection process, the computer time and advice that were provided, the vans that were provided to pick up the completed surveys at school sites, the organizations who translated the instruments into Spanish, and the companies who provided shopping bags for the data collectors to carry their materials.

A sample of 100 parents, 42 principals, 100 teachers, 50 students in grade five, and 50 students in grade three was selected from the twenty-eight elementary schools participating in this study. Data from

the instruments were tabulated for use with the computer at the University of North Dakota Computer Center. The data were treated for significant differences among the populations using the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), Wilks' Lambda, univariate F tests, and t-tests. The eight null hypotheses were analyzed from the data. The .05 or less level of significance was considered sufficient to reject a hypothesis of no difference.

The results of the study, overall, revealed that there were significant differences among the parents, teachers, and principals regarding how the elementary schools were addressing the basic skills. Further analysis showed that principals, in particular, differed in a more favorable view of how basic skills were addressed from both teachers and parents in almost all areas. There were some differences between the teachers and parents with teachers having more favorable perceptions but, generally, those differences were not nearly as great as those between both teachers and parents when compared with principals. In addition, students in grades three and five responded to six of the seven elements on how basic skills were delivered and on the planning of basic skills through teaching strategies. There were no significant differences between their perceptions regarding how the basic skills were addressed.

Following are the conclusions drawn from those results. Each of the seven elements (e.g., school plan, learning support) was examined with regard to the functions of the school (i.e., planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring) as they were perceived by all groups, by differing perceptions among the groups on each element, and by comparing the groups to each other on each element.

Conclusions

The conclusions were drawn from the results and analyses of the statistical treatment of the data. The conclusions apply only to this study.

Research question 1. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the district's policies and procedures in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

School policies and procedures were regarded as the formal and published rules and regulations that were established by the school district for the purpose of providing direction for all aspects of the school functions and structure. There were significant differences among all the groups on how they perceived the school policies and procedures addressed basic skills. These group differences were perceived in all areas of planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills through school policies and procedures. Further analysis showed that each group differed in comparison with each of the other groups, but with varying degrees of magnitude. Principals perceived the basic skills were addressed to a significantly greater degree through school policies and procedures than did parents. Similar findings surfaced in a comparison between principals and teachers but with lesser magnitude than was shown in the other two groups. In a comparison of teachers and parents, teachers perceived the school policies and procedures addressed the basic skills more adequately than did parents. However, parents and teachers were generally closer together in their perceptions than either group was to principals. Teachers

perceived school policies and procedures addressed the planning and delivering of basic skills more than did parents. Both groups perceived organizing and monitoring of basic skills were addressed in school policies and procedures to about the same degree.

An examination of the results appeared to reflect the hierarchy of "those in a position to know." Principals in their mid-management role between central office and teachers may have been privy to the enactment or existence of policy or procedures that had not been communicated or not adequately to the other two groups. Principals may also have had information or memoranda which had not been read or, if read, not internalized by the other two groups. Another alternative was that there were no specific policies or procedures which emphasized each basic skill and principals responded to a common-knowledge frame of reference that indicated how those subjects were being addressed in the schools. Parents showed less perception than both other groups regarding how the basic skills were addressed through school policies and procedures. It was possible that because the establishment of school policies and procedures is part of the more formalized tasks of a school board and its administration, parents were not familiar with their place in the school structure and their impact on how basic skills were addressed. Another alternative was that policies directly addressing basic skills were on the books but that teachers and parents had too recent a tenure in the district to know of them. Teachers may have perceived more planning and delivering of basic skills than did parents through school policies and procedures because their positions in schools provided more information about them and because of the impact such directives would have on classroom operations. Teachers

and parents perceived that school policies and procedures addressed organizing and monitoring basic skills to about the same degree. It seemed possible that this agreement, in light of their wide differences with principals, indicated their lack of information on or input into how policies and procedures addressed organizing and monitoring of basic skills. The most definite conclusion seemed to be that if there were school policies and procedures directing the establishment of and commitment to basic skills for the district, these directives were not as clear to teachers and not as well known to parents as they were to principals. This appeared to indicate a lack of in-school communication, across-schools communication, and public communication throughout the district.

Research question 2. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through each individual school plan in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

The school plan, for this study, was defined as the annual efforts undertaken by individual school staffs for the purpose of directly focusing on goals and objectives to be attained during each school year. The results showed that there were significant differences among all groups on how they perceived the school plan addressed basic skills. The results indicated that these group differences were perceived in all areas of planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills through the school plan. Further analysis indicated that each group differed in comparison with each of the other groups, but with varying degrees of magnitude, on how they perceived the basic skills were addressed through the school plan.

Principals perceived the school plan addressed the basic skills to a significantly greater degree than did parents. Similar findings surfaced in a comparison between principals and teachers, but with lesser magnitude than was shown between the other two groups. Further analysis showed teachers perceived the school plan addressed the basic skills more than did parents. However, parents and teachers were generally closer together than either group was to principals. In a comparison of teachers and parents, teachers perceived the planning and delivering of basic skills and the organizing of writing were addressed more through the school plan than did parents. Both groups tended to perceive that reading and math were organized and all basic skills were monitored through the school plan to about the same degree.

An examination of the results indicated that the role or position of the groups, in regard to schools, profoundly influenced their perceptions. A principal, as building-level leader, would have been responsible for developing a yearly plan and either involving teachers in planning and organizing how the yearly goals would be met or informing them that such a plan had been made. Principals would also have had the option of informing parents. Even so, principals may not have had a formal or consistent process to communicate or confer with teachers and parents. Principals may have held meetings that sought teachers' opinions or instructed them on what the school would concentrate on for that year; this may not have been interpreted by teachers or parents as participation in the planning or organizing of yearly goal setting, thus not delivering or monitoring such a plan either. Another alternative was that principals may have had school plans that were longer range than one year. Furthermore, principals

may have made yearly plans that designated responsibilities for themselves to carry through. The differences between the teachers' and parents' perceptions may have indicated that teachers, because of their positions, were more aware of how the school plan addressed basic skills. Another alternative was that their agreements in some areas, in light of their wide differences with principals, may have indicated the mutual perception that they lacked input into the decision-making processes of planning and organizing that set goals and established the processes for delivering and monitoring to address basic skills each year. The most definite conclusion that could be drawn from the results was that there appeared to be broad misunderstandings or a lack of communication within the school, across schools, and with parents concerning the existence of yearly plans or how such plans were developed to address the basic skills.

Research question 3. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the learning support programs in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

Learning support, for this study, was defined as the coordination of the supplementary instructional resources of people, programs, and materials which were made available for the purpose of providing additional bolstering to a regular classroom program. The results of the study revealed that there were significant differences among parents, principals, and teachers as to how they perceived that the learning support system addressed basic skills. Further analysis indicated that all three groups held significantly differing perceptions on how learning support was planned, organized, delivered, and monitored

to address basic skills. The final analysis showed each group differed in comparison with each of the other groups, with varying degrees of magnitude, on how learning support addressed the basic skills. Principals perceived learning support addressed the basic skills to a significantly greater degree than did parents. Similar findings surfaced in a comparison between principals and teachers, but with lesser magnitude than was shown between the other two groups. Comparing parents with teachers indicated teachers perceived the school plan addressed basic skills more than did parents. However, parents and teachers were generally closer together than either group was to principals. Teachers perceived that more learning support efforts addressed planning and delivering of basic skills and organizing of writing than did parents. Both groups perceived writing and math were organized and all basic skills were monitored through learning support to about the same degree.

The examination of the results again indicated the importance of each group's role or position regarding how they perceived the learning support system addressed the basic skills. Principals may have perceived that learning support efforts were addressing the basic skills more than did teachers because they had a composite picture of the total school. Teachers saw only a part of that picture--their individual classrooms. Parents' perceptions may have been based on limited exposure to how learning support addressed the basic skills since this was more of a school-level task that may or may not have involved parents. Another alternative was that with the fiscal difficulties the district was having, there were diminishing materials and resources available at the classroom level. Then, another

alternative was that there may not have been consistent or clear administrative practices in the district for the allocation or dispersal of resources and materials. Still another possibility was that there were no processes available for teachers and parents to have regular input into decision making on the selection of materials or adoption of programs. Parents and teachers perceived the learning support system was addressed through organizing, writing, math, and monitoring the basic skills in about the same way. However, they differed significantly on how they perceived learning support addressed the organizing of reading and planning and delivering of basic skills with teachers having a more favorable view than parents. Because schools and special programs generally focused on math and reading, with writing given a third priority, their agreement may have indicated learning support was given to the organizing of reading more than to the other two basic skills. After examining all possibilities, there seemed to be one more clear conclusion linking most of the alternatives. If there were learning support efforts made to address all basic skills, these efforts were not as clear to teachers and even less clear to parents than they were to principals. This would seem to indicate a lack of communication throughout the district on how finances, resources, and programs were linked to supporting all of the basic skills.

Research question 4. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the teaching strategies in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

Teaching strategies were defined, for this study, as the methods and techniques of instruction employed by classroom teachers

for the purpose of promoting learning. The results of the study, overall, revealed that there were significant differences among parents, principals, and teachers regarding how they perceived teaching strategies addressed basic skills. Further analysis showed that these groups differed significantly in their perceptions of most of the areas in planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills through teaching strategies. The final analysis showed that each group differed in comparison with each of the other groups, but with varying degrees of magnitude. Principals perceived teaching strategies addressed the basic skills to a significantly greater degree than did parents. Similar findings surfaced in a comparison between teachers and principals, but with lesser magnitude than was shown between the other two groups. In a comparison of teachers and parents, teachers perceived the schools addressed the basic skills through teaching strategies to a greater degree than did parents. There were no significant differences between how teachers and parents perceived that basic skills were planned and organized through teaching strategies. Teachers, however, perceived the schools more adequately delivered and monitored the basic skills than did parents.

The examination of the results again indicated the hierarchical nature of each group's position influenced their perceptions. Principals, from their vantage point of overseeing the whole school, may have perceived more teaching strategies addressing basic skills than did teachers from individual classrooms. Parents would, ostensibly, have access to even less opportunity to perceive beyond limited contacts with singular classrooms. Another alternative was that if there were no specific district or school goals to focus

directly on basic skills that teachers perceived, they could not have planned or organized towards such objectives nor would they have taught or evaluated specifically on the basic skills. A further possibility was that teachers may not have perceived a school-wide emphasis on improving teaching of the basic skills without staff development or teacher supervision and evaluation supporting such an effort. It was also possible that instructional leaders in the school and district were not providing enough opportunities for teachers to participate in developing basic skills curriculum. Still another alternative was that there were not enough available supportive supervisory services due to budget and staff cuts to assist teachers in directing efforts toward focusing on basic skills. The differences between parents' and teachers' perceptions on how teaching strategies addressed the basic skills may have indicated that the teachers' positions alone would provide them more information than would parents. The lack of differing perceptions between these two groups could be considered exceptional, since it could be expected that teachers and principals were closer together in perceptions of teaching strategies. It seemed that teachers and parents were indicating, in their perceptions, a mutual feeling of frustration at not having more information or more opportunity to participate in some level of directing or having meaningful input into the school instructional program. Again, the most definite conclusion to be drawn from the results was that if teaching strategies were addressing the basic skills, teachers were not as aware of this and parents even less aware than were principals. This indicated a breakdown in communication throughout all levels of the school and with the community.

Research question 5. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the verification of student learning in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

Verification of student learning was defined as how schools test, document, and report student progress. The results of the study indicated that there were significant differences among parents, principals, and teachers regarding how they perceived the verification of student learning addressed basic skills. The analysis further indicated that these groups held differing perceptions on how verifications of student learning addressed the basic skills. The final analysis showed that each group differed in comparison with each of the other groups, with varying degrees of magnitude, on how verification of student learning addressed basic skills. Principals perceived that verification of student learning addressed the basic skills to a much greater degree than did parents. In a comparison of principals with teachers the same findings surfaced but to a lesser magnitude than between the two other groups. The comparison of teachers and parents showed differences in some areas but not in others on how they perceived verification of student learning addressed the basic skills. Teachers perceived verification of student learning addressed organizing and delivering of basic skills to a greater extent than did parents. Teachers also perceived more planning of writing and math than did parents. Teachers and parents perceived the planning of reading and monitoring of basic skills through verification of student learning in about the same way.

The examination of the results indicated again that the position of the groups influenced their perceptions. Perhaps principals, from their vantage points, perceived a greater degree of addressing basic skills than did parents and teachers because they had access to or information on testing and grading procedures plus how these results were used school wide than either of those groups. Another alternative was that there were no procedures guiding teachers in verifying student progress or directing how those measures were to be used for addressing basic skills. Still another possibility was that teachers had no avenue available for input in the planning or organizing of how these processes were to be used. Yet another alternative was that principals perceived verifying of student progress in basic skills as classroom-level responsibility that belonged to teachers. Principals and teachers agreed in their perceptions of how writing was organized through the verification of student learning. The most reasonable rationale for this agreement was that they may have viewed writing as not being organized to the same degree as the other two basic skills. This seemed a more reasonable explanation since writing generally has received less emphasis than math and reading and had been usually considered more difficult to assess on objective measures. The differences in teachers' and parents' perceptions indicated that teachers perceived more verification of student learning than did parents. Again, teachers's positions would have given them more access to how verifying of student learning addressed basic skills than would parents. Their areas of agreement may only have indicated their mutual lack of information since they both had such wide differences with principals in their perceptions of how basic skills were addressed

through verification of student learning. The most apparent conclusion from all the results and possible alternatives was that significant differences in perception among all groups indicated that there was a lack of communication in planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of the basic skills through verification of student learning within schools, across schools, and with the public.

Research question 6. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through the student performance expectations in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

Performance expectations were defined, for this study, as how the school set and conveyed the quantity and quality of learning expected from students. The results showed that there were significant differences among all the groups on how they perceived the basic skills were addressed through performance expectations. The results also indicated that the groups' perceptions differed in all areas of planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills through performance expectations. Further analysis showed that each group differed in comparison with each of the other groups, but with varying degrees of magnitude, on how basic skills were addressed through performance expectations. Principals perceived the basic skills were addressed through performance expectations to a significantly greater degree than did parents. Similar findings surfaced in a comparison between teachers and principals, but with lesser magnitude than was shown between the other two groups. Principals and teachers were generally closer together in their perceptions of how performance expectations addressed the basic skills than on any of the other school

elements. They agreed in how they perceived delivering of writing and math was addressed but differed on the delivering of reading. In a comparison of teachers and parents, teachers perceived that performance expectations addressed the basic skills more than did parents.

The examination of the results indicated that the role or position of the group may have influenced their perceptions. A hierarchical position in the school's structure may have accounted for principals perceiving to a significantly greater degree that performance expectations addressed the basic skills more adequately than did parents. The same could hold true regarding the significant differences between principals and teachers, as principals held the more favorable view. Principals may have had the documentation of established expectations on mastery levels in curriculum guides or graded courses of study that neither of the other groups had. Another alternative was that such guides existed and were available to teachers but mastery or expectation levels were not specified, or not for all of the basic skills. Principals and teachers shared similar views on how performance expectations were addressing the delivery of writing and math, but differed in the delivery of reading. Principals, because of their opportunity for numerous contacts with many classrooms, perceived greater performance expectations in the delivery of reading. Such efforts may not have been formally directed but were apparent to the principal in the individual endeavors of teachers. Teachers may have been indicating a lack of formal structure upon which performance expectations were delivered in reading. This possibility seemed more likely because teachers and principals concurred in writing and math. It did not seem reasonable that performance expectations would have

been clarified for writing and math if reading, which usually receives a major proportion of emphasis in elementary schools, had not been addressed. Teachers and parents had significantly differing views on how performance expectations addressed the basic skills, with teachers having a more favorable view. Teachers' positions and classroom-level tasks would have provided them more information than parents would have on performance or mastery level expectations for the basic skills. It was also possible that if parents were not informed of what was expected from their children they assumed such expectations were not there. Again, an overriding conclusion was that the widely differing views among all the groups indicated a lack of written or oral communication on how performance expectations were planned, organized, delivered, and monitored to address the basic skills.

Research question 7. How do parents, teachers, and administrators perceive that the basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics are being planned, organized, delivered, and monitored through parent involvement in the Cleveland public elementary schools?

Parent involvement was defined, for the study, as how the schools provided and sough opportunities to have parents engage in actively supporting the efforts of the schools. The results indicated that parents, principals, and teachers differed significantly from each other on this element. Principals perceived the most parent involvement in addressing the basic skills, teachers were in the middle, and parents perceived the least degree of parental involvement of the three. There were no significant differences between the teachers and parents on one element--the monitoring of basic skills.

The analysis of these findings showed that principals perceived a greater degree of parent involvement in planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills than did parents and teachers. It seemed reasonable to expect that parents' views would have been reflected in closer alignment to principals, but such was not the case. Teachers were closer to principals and both of these groups perceived more parent involvement than did parents.

The examination of the findings indicated the perspectives of all groups were influenced by their positions and the access they may have had to information. Principals may have known of policies and procedures that directed parental involvement in planning, organizing, delivering, and monitoring of basic skills in the schools. Further, principals may have had parent representatives participate in those functions. Unless those efforts were clearly communicated--orally and in writing--teachers and parents would not have the same perspectives as principals. Another alternative was that the procedures did not designate specific responsibility for communication with the public or the coordination of such efforts, so parents did not know whom to seek or what communique to read for information about where they could or when they should become directly involved in school efforts. The possibility existed that some parents were actively engaged in the school but their activities were not known to the respondents to the survey. Teachers perceived a significantly greater degree of parent involvement in planning, organizing, and delivering of basic skills than did parents, but the two groups were in agreement on monitoring basic skills in the schools. These findings, aligned with their wide differences with principals, indicated teachers were aware of some

parental involvement because of their roles in the school. Parents would have had less information because their contacts were limited in scope to a few classrooms. It was reasonable to conclude that parents and teachers agreed that there was not enough parent involvement in monitoring basic skills rather than that it was adequate, since they differed so much in the other three functions. The most apparent conclusion on parent involvement in addressing basic skills was principals perceived that parental involvement was addressing the basic skills to a greater degree than did teachers, and to much greater degree than did parents. Such findings indicated a lack of clarity in school direction regarding parent involvement and a lack of communication at all levels within the schools, across schools, and with the community on how parents could support school efforts with addressing basic skills.

Research question 8. How do Cleveland public school third-grade students and fifth-grade students perceive that the basic skills are planned in relation to teaching strategies and the basic skills delivered through the school plan, learning support, teaching strategies, verification of student learning, performance expectations, and parent involvement?

The results from the statistical treatment of the data indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups. Third graders and fifth graders perceived that the basic skills were essentially delivered about the same, that they were essentially planned to the same degree insofar as teaching strategies were concerned. Both groups of students concurred also in their perceptions of how basic skills were delivered through the school plan, learning

support, verification of student learning, performance expectations, and parent involvement. Their agreement may indicate that classrooms in both grades were addressing learning activities, grading, homework, and enrichment activities in the same manner. The results may also indicate that despite differences in how the adults perceived basic skills being addressed across the schools they were still conveying to children learning consistency and expectations in the classrooms. Another alternative was that perhaps the ages of the students and the presence of teachers and parents during the collection process caused the children to respond with what they thought was expected of them.

Limitations

Following are limitations which may have affected the results of the study:

1. There is a general question concerning the stability of attitude surveys. This study sought to measure perceptions. If the measures of perceptions were not relatively stable, the results of the study cannot be generalized to the sample population and thus not to the general population.

2. An effort was made to obtain a random sample of the population and thus to randomize the possibility of error. However, the controls for this process were left in the initial selection of participants to the principals and in the final selection to the Special Committee on Education. There was no way of assuring that the requirements of randomization were uniformly met.

3. The selection of the school functions and elements was accomplished after a review of the literature. These elements and functions may not have been inclusive of all information that would

have been relevant to the research questions.

4. The jurying process used was not controlled and final selection of all items was determined by the Special Committee on Education.

5. The changes determined through the jurying process on the student instrument did not allow student perceptions to be compared with the other groups.

Discussion

The findings from the study indicated that there were significant differences among the adult groups on how they perceived the basic skills were being addressed in the Cleveland public elementary schools. One of the more exceptional findings, in the writer's view, was that teachers and parents, although they differed, were closer together in perspectives than teachers were to principals. Since this study concerned school elements and functions that sometimes required professionally oriented perspectives, it would have seemed more likely, in the writer's opinion, that principals and teachers would be more in similar alignment than teachers and parents. This did not prove to be the case in most instances.

There were several rationales that were implied to the writer from the results. Principals consistently projected an "in the know" position on instructional programs and the procedures that established them. Teachers appeared to be exhibiting feelings of disenfranchisement concerning their ability to influence the instructional programs and their direction. Parents seemed to be implying that not only did they not know whether the instructional program was addressed in vital areas, but further that they did not have the confidence in schools to assume

this was occurring.

Recurring conclusions drawn from the results were that principals, because of their positions in the school hierarchy, were more likely to "be in the know" and that communication to groups at lower levels in the hierarchy concerning basic skills was lacking. However, there were also other possibilities that had to be considered. Principals may have really believed that basic skills were being addressed to a much greater degree than the other two groups. Principals could also have inflated their responses to present a more positive picture of administrative actions directed towards the basic skills because of the very public nature of the study. The possibility of inflationary responses from the principals to protect top administration did not seem as likely as the alternative which was that principals bore the major responsibility for interpreting directives and disseminating that information in and through their domains. As such, in a publicized study, they would be more subject to criticism if the results were not positive. Consideration was also given to the possibility that the power positions of each of the groups influenced their perspectives. Principals would have held a superordinate role with the other two groups in more subordinate positions. There is always potential conflict between management and workers or clientele. If management was generally top-down there could have been resentment from the more subordinate groups. Again, the most likely conclusion was that where principals had information they were not communicating it consistently to the other groups with the added interpretation that where they did not have information, they may have inflated responses to present a more positive picture of how basic skills were addressed because this directly reflected upon their

positions and the ensuing responsibilities of those positions.

It is the view of this writer that principals may have depicted a more favorable picture of how the basic skills were being addressed because they bore the largest measure of responsibility for leading in the development and implementation of the instructional program and for the arrangements to carry it forward and then assess its effectiveness. Howell (1981) conducted a study under the auspices of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) on time logs of principals' school tasks in schools across the nation. Those time logs revealed that principals spend less than one-third of their time in instructional leadership activities such as visiting classes, curriculum work, or staff development. The findings from this study, in the writer's opinion, reflect that this may have been the case with principals in the Cleveland elementary schools. This is not, in the writer's view, an indictment of principals for a disregard of the instructional program. Rather it is an indictment of a system that imposes managerial tasks to a degree that overburdens principals to the detriment of their most critical role as the school's instructional leader. That leadership should ensure the best instructional program for the greatest student achievement.

Teachers, in the writer's view, presented a picture of disenfranchisement to such a degree that they were closer to parents in their perspective than they were to the other professionals--the principals--with whom they should have shared a more professional outlook on the processes directing instructional programs. Cawelti and Reavis (1980), in an ASCD study in seven major cities, six medium-sized cities, and three suburban communities on how well instructional

improvement services were being provided, found the reference groups (principals, supervisors, superintendents, and assistants) farthest from the teachers regarding the adequacy of instructional services more favorable than did teachers. Only 28 percent of 357 teachers in the urban schools rated curriculum services high compared to 41 percent of the principals from those same urban schools. Instructional supervision was rated the least adequately provided service among all three types of schools. The administrative groups also felt attention had been given to direct instruction techniques; teachers did not. Teachers differed significantly from all administrators in how instructional services addressed individualized instruction, school climate, high expectations, and materials availability. Cawelti and Reavis' findings support the findings from this study. In the opinion of the writer, it is the responsibility of any profession to continually seek evidence that relates how well its services meet the needs of its clientele. In this instance the study attempted to find out how well the schools were providing instructional services for the basic skills attainment of students. The teachers, who had primary responsibility for that instruction, were saying that this was not being adequately provided. Their perceptions, in the writer's view, need to be given a great deal of credence.

Parents' perspectives indicated, in the writer's opinion, a distinct lack of information that they should have had concerning some of the areas like the goals of the school, expectations of their children, and how their children's progress was monitored. Further, the responses could be construed to mean that not only they did not know but did not have confidence that these processes were being

adequately provided in the schools. Although the research literature did not consistently rate parent involvement in schools among the more prevailing characteristics in effective schools, most of the researchers espoused an appeal to the logic of parental support for school efforts having a positive effect on student achievement. This is also the writer's opinion. A great deal has been written concerning the "loss of public confidence" in the public schools in recent years. Certainly the more knowledge of and the more input into public education, the more likely there would be increased confidence and support from parent and community groups for the schools' efforts.

The researchers on schools that had reported success in raising student achievement levels on basic skills claimed that such schools had identifiable characteristics which contributed to this achievement. These characteristics were thought to be manipulable by educators and to pervade all levels of the school system--the district, the school, the classroom, and the community. Following is a comparison of the results of the study with seven of the most prevailing characteristics in effective schools:

1. District policies and procedures. Effective schools research cited successful schools with having a "sense of mission," adequate resources support, school-wide objectives, and the communication of all of those elements throughout the system. This study indicated that the significant adults in the schools had wide differences of perceptions in all those areas. Principals, representing administration, seemed to hold the view that these features were addressed. Teachers and parents differed from principals significantly in this view. The differences appeared to indicate a lack of

communication throughout the system. It also suggested that there was a lack of clarity in procedures regarding responsibilities for communication efforts.

2. School plan. Effective schools had strong instructional leaders who developed goal-specific objectives with student outcomes, had staff development programs linked to instructional programs, and had supportive relationships with staff. The significant differences among the groups in the study seemed to indicate that some of these features were missing or confused in the Cleveland public elementary schools. Principals seemed to see more of those features in the schools, but parents and teachers were seeing much less.

3. Learning support. Effective schools provided the resources of special programs, materials, textbooks, scheduling, and personnel to support basic skills achievement. From the differing perceptions of the groups in this study, this apparently was not occurring enough to meet the perceived needs of parents and teachers concerning classrooms.

4. Teaching strategies. Effective schools had teachers who prepared for instruction, provided an orderly learning environment, directed instruction, and monitored student progress in basic skills. From the perceptions of the populations with their differing views, this was not occurring with as much satisfaction for parents and teachers as for principals in the Cleveland schools. It seemed that teachers' perceptions were indicating a need for more instructional leadership or direction.

5. Verification of student learning. Effective schools monitored student progress through diagnosis, testing, evaluation, and reporting. There were differing perceptions from the populations in

this study as to the degree this was occurring in the schools. This likely indicated a lack of communication, both oral and written, about the processes to be used and about the results obtained in verification of student learning, plus a lack of involvement in the planning process for both teachers and parents on such verification measures. Or, as with other points, it could indicate that verification measures were not being carried out, and that principals simply did not want to own up publicly to a problem or failure that might ultimately be their responsibility.

6. Performance expectations. Effective schools had established mastery levels for students on the basic skills and held high expectations for student achievement of those skills. The results from the study appeared to indicate that all of the populations differed in their perceptions as to the degree this was occurring in their schools. This seemed to indicate a need for greater participation in this area that more meaningfully involved teachers and parents with principals to establish commonly held and understood expectations.

7. Parent involvement. Effective schools provided information to and elicited support from parents for the schools. All of the populations of this study again differed in this area. The lack of agreement appeared to indicate that there were no clear directives or responsibilities for this area.

Recommendations

Recommendations suggested from this study are:

1. The Cleveland Board of Education review the district philosophy to ensure that students' achievement on the basic skills is a priority in the district.

2. The Cleveland Board of Education have placed in all school buildings and community public libraries complete copies of the district's policies and procedures manual. Further, that the Board of Education have published in newspapers and parent handbooks summaries of the policies and procedures that are articulated in language comprehensible to the public.

3. The Cleveland Board of Education review with the superintendent and central office staff existing policies and procedures regarding designated responsibilities for within-schools, across-schools, and public communication of basic skills information. If these policies and procedures are inadequate or incomplete, they should be revised. The executive officers should then insist that the policies and procedures should be carried out in full with serious consequences to those who fail to do so.

4. The Cleveland Board of Education establish school-level parent and teacher advisory councils or some other workable structure to allow teachers and parents meaningful access to the decision-making process and the flow of information on basic skills and student achievement.

5. The superintendent and central office staff review district procedures to ascertain how those directives support student achievement in basic skills and report their findings to the Board of Education.

6. The superintendent and central office staff review the financial structure of the district. Reports be provided, orally and in writing, as to how the district policies and procedures impact on all aspects of student achievement on the basic skills (e.g., staff

development, materials, equipment). Such reports would allow each school to plan for direct budget line items for their schools with those resources that would provide the support needed to improve basic skills achievement.

7. Central office staff conduct a materials and resources audit throughout the district. The feasibility of establishing a central materials center or some other appropriate structure be explored which would catalog all existing materials and resources and then be made available to schools and teachers for information and requests.

8. Central office staff examine with principals and teacher representatives staff development and evaluation procedures for their impact on basic skills and student achievement.

9. Each school principal submit quarterly reports on student achievement to the superintendent, staff, and community. The superintendent would provide the compilation of those reports to the Board of Education. All such reports would culminate in an annual report in each school and in the district. Such reports would be given to teachers and parents.

10. School principals establish quarterly planning sessions with grade-level teachers to examine student progress, plan interventions, organize resources, and refocus goals for the next quarter.

11. School principals examine with teachers the methods of verifying student learning through results on standardized tests, criterion-referenced tests, and classroom grading procedures. This information could be compared with curriculum guides or graded courses of study for appropriate levels of student performance expectations.

This information could be placed in parent handbooks and presented at open house meetings and other parent meetings.

12. Parents in Cleveland actively collaborate with their community school principals and staff, central office staff, and Board of Education through established parent organizations or through new action committees in providing the support their school system will need to assist the schools in raising the student achievement levels of their children.

13. Further study is recommended on all of the areas of the study where significant differences occurred. This study attempted to find out how differently those people most directly involved in the schools perceived the basic skills were being addressed. Further study is recommended to find out why those differences occurred.

14. Further study is also recommended in the Cleveland school system to identify those schools that are successfully raising student achievement levels on basic skills with the prospect of replicating their efforts in the less successful schools.

APPENDIX A

ADULT BASIC SKILLS INSTRUMENT

"YOU'RE THE TEACHER", PHASE II:

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN ASSESSING

THE BASIC SKILLS IN THE CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

_____ Teacher
_____ Principal
_____ Central Office Administrator
_____ School Board Member
_____ Parent
_____ Non-Certified Employee
_____ Other

_____ Grade Level

_____ Grade(s) your child(ren) is(are) in.

PLEASE PRINT

Name of School or Work Site: _____

Cluster Name: _____

Data Collected By: _____ Data Collector's Phone Number: _____

To each respondent:

The purpose of this project is to assess how the Cleveland Public School System now plans, organizes, delivers and monitors the basic skills. This study is being conducted by the Special Committee on Education of the Federation for Community Planning. For purposes of this study, basic skills are defined as reading, writing/composition and mathematics. The purpose of this document is to survey your perceptions of and your experiences in this school/district.

This project is being supported by the Cleveland Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools. While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this study comprehensive, accurate and timely. The results of the project will be reported to the Cleveland Public School System and the community in September of 1983.

Identity will be protected to the fullest extent of the law. Names will not be associated with the data reported.

DEFINITIONS: The following definitions will help you to understand the statements. Please read this sheet carefully and refer to it as you read each statement.

1. BASIC SKILLS are reading, writing/composition and arithmetic/mathematics.

2. CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS are the staff serving all schools in the Cleveland Public School District. Responsible for activities which include: payroll, curriculum, research, purchasing.

3. CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING is the measurement of student abilities in specific skills or understandings, rather than their overall understanding of a "whole subject."

4. DIAGNOSTIC is providing information on specific strengths and weaknesses of a student.

5. DISTRICT POLICIES AND REGULATIONS are the rules set by the Cleveland Board of Education which apply to all schools, staff and students in the Cleveland Public School System.

6. EVALUATION is the judgement by qualified persons as to whether or not another person (or thing) is "doing" as well as he or she should be doing.

7. GRADED COURSE OF STUDY is the outline of what should be taught and learned in a given subject at each grade-level.

8. LEARNING STYLES are a combination of the kinds of methods used to teach or learn most easily (for example: speaking, touching, hearing).

9. LEARNING SUPPORT is the people (staff), places (for example: classroom), time and things (for example: textbooks) that help students learn the basic skills.

10. NATIONALLY NORMED POPULATION is a typical national group (for example: "all third graders") selected to provide a set of "test scores" to compare against the test scores of Cleveland Public School students.

11. PARENT INVOLVEMENT means the way that parents (or others) and the school work together to help students learn.

12. PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS are the amounts of learning desired of students.

13. SCHOOL BUILDING PLAN is a design/plan of steps to be taken over the next year to bring about certain results/improvements that are believed to be needed at the school.

14. STANDARDIZED TESTING is the giving and scoring of standard questions in a specific way, so that student's score can be compared with the scores of others (same, age, grade, and so forth).

15. TEACHING METHODS are the ways and activities used by teachers to help students learn.

DIRECTIONS:

All questions have five (5) possible responses Record your answer by circling the appropriate number. The possible answers for each item are:

1. Never: No. To the best of my knowledge and experience this just isn't happening here.
2. Rarely: There may be one or two cases of this happening but, if so, they are rare.
3. I Don't Know: It may be happening at some level or in some schools, but I just don't know.
4. Most of the Time: This happens often.
5. Always: Yes. This happens without exception.

If you are a central office administrator or school board member, please respond to all statements based on your knowledge and experience as they apply district-wide.

If you are a teacher, non-certified employee or principal, please respond to all statements based on your knowledge and experience related to the school building in which you work.

If you are a parent please respond to all statements based on your knowledge and experience as they apply to this school which your child(ren) attends.

Each item must be read carefully. There is no time limit. You can expect to take approximately thirty (30) minutes to fill this out.

EXAMPLE:

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
• The library in this school building makes available:					
1. films	1	2	3	(4)	5
2. books	1	2	3	4	(5)
3. magazines	1	2	3	(4)	5

* Remember that each statement following a number needs to have an answer circled.

IMPORTANT:

DO answer all statements based on what you know is being done now.

DO NOT answer statements based on what you believe should be done or will be done in the future.

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
In this school, the reading program is supported by:					
1. services from the school library.	1	2	3	4	5
2. on-the-job training for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
3. parent involvement.	1	2	3	4	5
The Cleveland Public School District's regulations state that instruction be made available to students every year, kindergarten through twelfth grade, in:					
4. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
5. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
6. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
This school building's plan sets goals for mastery of grade level skills in:					
7. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
8. writing and/or composition skills.	1	2	3	4	5
9. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
Before promotion from one grade to another, students are expected to meet grade level requirements in:					
10. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
11. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
12. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching methods used in the mathematics program in this school include:					
13. directed math activities.	1	2	3	4	5
14. problem-solving.	1	2	3	4	5
15. use of computers.	1	2	3	4	5
16. mathematics for everyday living.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
Basic skills courses of study in this school are prepared by:					
17. classroom teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
18. principals.	1	2	3	4	5
19. district supervisors.	1	2	3	4	5
20. parents.	1	2	3	4	5
21. outside curriculum specialists.	1	2	3	4	5
This school prepares a yearly plan for the:					
22. basic skills.	1	2	3	4	5
Students in this school find out about their basic skills performance:					
23. at grade reporting time.	1	2	3	4	5
24. when assignments have been graded.	1	2	3	4	5
25. when standardized tests are given.	1	2	3	4	5
26. whenever they ask.	1	2	3	4	5
27. at scheduled student-teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4	5
28. when deficiency reports are sent out.	1	2	3	4	5
29. when their parents come to a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
Performance expectations in writing are evaluated by:					
30. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
31. standardized testing throughout the district.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
The Cleveland Public School District's policies and regulations related to basic skills are prepared in order to:					
32. define lines of authority and responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
33. define the district's educational goals.	1	2	3	4	5
Planning for evaluation of student learning includes comparing the general achievement of students in this school district with that of a nationally normed population in:					
34. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
35. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
36. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
This school building's plan makes sure there are connections:					
37. between the basic skills programs.	1	2	3	4	5
38. between the basic skills programs from grade to grade.	1	2	3	4	5
39. between the basic skills programs and other subject areas.	1	2	3	4	5
The Cleveland Public School District's policies and regulations related to the basic skills are:					
40. made available to staff.	1	2	3	4	5
41. made available to the public upon request.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
In this school, the writing and/or composition program:					
42. provides supplementary materials which match the textbook used.	1	2	3	4	5
43. uses materials which match this school district's objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
44. is taught by writing and/or composition teachers in junior and senior high schools.	1	2	3	4	5
45. is taught by regular classroom teachers in elementary schools.	1	2	3	4	5
46. uses a classroom which provides an orderly environment for learning.	1	2	3	4	5
Ways to evaluate student learning in mathematics in this school include:					
47. standardized achievement tests.	1	2	3	4	5
48. uniform district-wide criterion-referenced tests.	1	2	3	4	5
49. teacher observation of student work.	1	2	3	4	5
50. teacher-made tests.	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching methods used in this school in the reading programs include:					
51. directed reading activities.	1	2	3	4	5
52. self-selected reading.	1	2	3	4	5
53. reading for everyday living.	1	2	3	4	5
In this school, the mathematics programs are supported by:					
54. services from the school library.	1	2	3	4	5
55. on-the-job training.	1	2	3	4	5
56. parent involvement.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
The Cleveland Public School District's regulations related to basic skills are planned and prepared by:					
57. the school board.	1	2	3	4	5
58. central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
59. the principal.	1	2	3	4	5
60. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
61. parents/community.	1	2	3	4	5
Learning performance expectations in reading are verified by:					
62. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
63. standardized testing throughout the district.	1	2	3	4	5
Persons involved in planning and preparing basic skills performance expectations for students include:					
64. central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
65. principals.	1	2	3	4	5
66. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
67. parents.	1	2	3	4	5
Individual teachers use basic skills teaching methods:					
68. to help students use their basic skills in other classes (for example: social studies, science).	1	2	3	4	5
69. to give continuous skill development.	1	2	3	4	5
70. to provide for a variety of learning speeds.	1	2	3	4	5
71. to provide for a variety of learning styles.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
The mathematics program in this school:					
72. uses textbooks which are matched to student abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
73. provides supplementary materials (e.g., learning aids) which match the textbook used.	1	2	3	4	5
74. uses materials which help teach what this school district says must be learned.	1	2	3	4	5
75. is taught by regular classroom teachers in elementary school.	1	2	3	4	5
76. uses a classroom which provides an orderly environment for learning.	1	2	3	4	5
Parents receive information about basic skills programs through:					
77. letters/notes.	1	2	3	4	5
78. school newsletters.	1	2	3	4	5
79. neighborhood newspapers.	1	2	3	4	5
80. parent handbooks.	1	2	3	4	5
81. principals' meeting in the community.	1	2	3	4	5
This school building's plan for basic skills is evaluated by checking on student achievement in:					
82. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
83. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
84. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
This school district's policies and regulations direct that year-by-year sequential skill development will be identified for:					
85. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
86. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
87. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
Evaluation of this school district's policies and procedures related to basic skills includes:					
88. checking the uniformity of standards throughout the district.	1	2	3	4	5
89. comparing policy statements to district practices every year.	1	2	3	4	5
90. doing program reviews at this school, kindergarten through 12th grade.	1	2	3	4	5
Planning for evaluation of student learning includes finding out whether students have mastered each grade level objective in:					
91. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
92. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
93. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
The reading program in this school:					
94. uses textbooks which are matched to student abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
95. provides supplementary materials which match the textbook used.	1	2	3	4	5
96. uses materials which help teach what the school district says must be learned.	1	2	3	4	5
97. is taught by regular classroom teachers at the elementary level.	1	2	3	4	5
98. uses a classroom which provides an orderly environment for learning.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
This school is organized so that teachers in all subject areas (e.g., science, social studies) help students to improve skills in:					
99. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
100. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
101. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
In planning how to teach students basic skills, teachers in this school consider:					
102. school goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
103. district educational goals.	1	2	3	4	5
104. individual student needs.	1	2	3	4	5
Planning and preparing basic skills performance expectations:					
105. is done by using state minimum standards.	1	2	3	4	5
106. varies with students' background.	1	2	3	4	5
107. is based on having students achieve at learning levels that are nationally accepted.	1	2	3	4	5
108. is based on community/employer needs.	1	2	3	4	5
Standardized test scores in the basic skills are reported to:					
109. students.	1	2	3	4	5
110. parents.	1	2	3	4	5
111. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
112. principals.	1	2	3	4	5
113. superintendent's office.	1	2	3	4	5
114. board of education.	1	2	3	4	5
115. community.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
This school building's plans for basic skills are carried out by the:					
116. principal.	1	2	3	4	5
117. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
118. parents.	1	2	3	4	5
Performance expectations in mathematics are verified by:					
119. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
120. standardized testing throughout the district.	1	2	3	4	5
District basic skills performance expectations:					
121. are stated in the graded courses of study.	1	2	3	4	5
122. are stated separately for each grade.	1	2	3	4	5
Principals evaluate the effectiveness of teaching methods used for:					
123. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
124. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
125. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
In this school the writing and/or composition program is supported by:					
126. services from the school library.	1	2	3	4	5
127. on-the-job training for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
128. parent involvement.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
Ways to evaluate students' learning in writing include:					
129. standardized achievement tests.	1	2	3	4	5
130. uniform district-wide criterion-referenced tests.	1	2	3	4	5
131. teachers' observations of student work.	1	2	3	4	5
132. teacher-made tests.	1	2	3	4	5
There is a district plan for developing criterion-referenced tests for:					
133. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
134. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
135. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
Parent involvement in the basic skills is noted in:					
136. the records of parent-school contacts.	1	2	3	4	5
137. the records of parents involved in school functions.	1	2	3	4	5
138. the records of parents attending teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4	5
The principal evaluates the following learning support used in the basic skills programs:					
139. materials.	1	2	3	4	5
140. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
141. library use.	1	2	3	4	5
142. on-the-job training for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
Parents can participate in basic skills programs through:					
143. advisory groups.	1	2	3	4	5
144. curriculum development teams.	1	2	3	4	5
145. public hearings.	1	2	3	4	5
146. parent-teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers evaluate the effectiveness of teaching methods used for:					
147. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
148. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
149. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
In this school, the following are used in teaching basic skills lessons:					
150. diagnostic testing.	1	2	3	4	5
151. direct teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
152. individual instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
153. testing of skills learned.	1	2	3	4	5
154. re-teaching when needed.	1	2	3	4	5
155. holding to standards which student must meet.	1	2	3	4	5
156. applying the skills.	1	2	3	4	5
In this school, students are assigned homework in:					
157. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
158. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
159. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
Central office administrators evaluate the effectiveness of teaching methods in:					
160. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
161. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
162. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
Performance expectations for students are based on the Cleveland Public School District's educational goals in:					
163. reading.	1	2	3	4	5
164. writing and/or composition.	1	2	3	4	5
165. mathematics.	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching methods used in the writing and/or composition program in this school include:					
166. directed writing activities.	1	2	3	4	5
167. modeling examples of creative writing.	1	2	3	4	5
168. writing for everyday living.	1	2	3	4	5
Involving parents in basic skills program planning is the responsibility of:					
169. parents.	1	2	3	4	5
170. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
171. principals.	1	2	3	4	5
172. central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
Ways to evaluate student learning in reading include:					
173. standardized achievement tests.	1	2	3	4	5
174. uniform district-wide criterion-referenced tests.	1	2	3	4	5
175. teacher observations of student work.	1	2	3	4	5
176. teacher-made tests.	1	2	3	4	5

	Never	Rarely	I Don't Know	Most of the Time	Always
Parent involvement with basic skills planning is:					
177. required by the Cleveland Public School District's policy.	1	2	3	4	5
178. happening in this school.	1	2	3	4	5
179. coordinated at the district level.	1	2	3	4	5
Results of student progress in the basic skills are used to decide:					
180. student placement.	1	2	3	4	5
181. curriculum effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5
182. the effectiveness of learning materials.	1	2	3	4	5
This school building's plan is prepared by the principal with help from:					
183. teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
184. parents.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

STUDENT BASIC SKILLS INSTRUMENT

"YOU'RE THE TEACHER", PHASE II:

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN ASSESSING

THE BASIC SKILLS IN THE CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

_____ 3rd Grade Student
_____ 5th Grade Student

Name of School: _____

Cluster: _____

Data Collected By: _____

Data Collector's Phone Number: _____

To each student:

The reason you are being asked to fill out this questionnaire is to help us prepare a "word picture" for everyone in the City of Cleveland and the Cleveland Public School System. The "word picture" will help us to all better understand how basic skills (reading, writing and arithmetic) are planned, put together and taught by Cleveland's public schools.

We all think that basic skills (reading, writing and arithmetic) are very important for students to learn. The Special Committee on Education of the Federation for Community Planning has the support of your Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools to ask you the following questions. In September of 1983 we will report the answers given to the questions.

We do not want you to put your name on this, just put an "x" next to the grade you are in.

DIRECTIONS:

All of the questions have four (4) possible answers. All answers are "right." We just want to find out what you know about some things in your school. This will not be graded. Just circle the number that best shows what you know about your school.

The possible answers for each question are:

1. Never: No. From what I know, this does not happen in my school.
2. Sometimes: From what I know, this happens sometimes in my school.
3. Always: Yes. From what I know, this always happens in my school.
4. I Don't Know: I don't know if this happens in my school or not.

EXAMPLE:

	Never	Sometimes	Always	I Don't Know
My school library has:				
1. films.	1	(2)	3	4
2. books.	1	2	(3)	4
3. magazines.	1	2	(3)	4

* Read each question carefully.

* Remember that each question needs to have a number circled.

Statement	Never	Sometimes	Always	I Don't Know
This school's rules say that we must learn something new every year in				
1. reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
This school gives us				
2. a very important, timed test once a year.	1	2	3	4
In this school				
3. we have homework to do on school nights in reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
We take tests to find out how much we have learned				
4. in reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
If we get behind in reading, writing, or arithmetic				
5. we get special help.	1	2	3	4
Teachers plan lessons before they teach us				
6. reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
When we learn how to write, the teacher:				
7. gives directions for each step.	1	2	3	4
8. shows examples of good writing.	1	2	3	4
9. gives us practice exercises.	1	2	3	4

Statement	Never	Sometimes	Always	I Don't Know
When we learn arithmetic, the teacher:				
10. gives directions for each step.	1	2	3	4
11. gives us practice exercises.	1	2	3	4
12. explains how to solve word problems.	1	2	3	4
When we learn how to read, the teacher:				
13. gives directions for each step.	1	2	3	4
14. lets us practice by ourselves.	1	2	3	4
15. teaches us new words.	1	2	3	4
The principal expects me to learn				
16. reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
My parents expect me to learn				
17. reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4
My teacher expects me to learn				
18. reading, writing, and arithmetic.	1	2	3	4

Statement	Never	Sometimes	Always	I Don't Know
To see how much we have learned in reading, writing, and arithmetic my teachers give tests:				
19. once a year.	1	2	3	4
20. at the end of each unit.	1	2	3	4
21. just before report cards are given out.	1	2	3	4
I know how well I am learning reading, writing, and arithmetic from my:				
22. report card.	1	2	3	4
23. classroom work.	1	2	3	4
24. talking with my teacher.	1	2	3	4
25. test scores.	1	2	3	4
26. homework grades.	1	2	3	4
27. parent/teacher conferences.	1	2	3	4
In this school, the principal knows how well I do my work in reading, writing, and arithmetic by:				
28. talking with me.	1	2	3	4
29. checking my grades.	1	2	3	4
30. seeing me work in class.	1	2	3	4
In this school, my classroom				
31. is an easy place to think and work.	1	2	3	4

Statement	Never	Sometimes	Always	I Don't Know
To help teach me reading, writing, and arithmetic, my school uses:				
32. the library.	1	2	3	4
33. field trips.	1	2	3	4
34. visitors who come to my school or class to talk with us.	1	2	3	4
35. parents.	1	2	3	4
Parents help at our school by:				
36. being on a committee.	1	2	3	4
37. helping our teachers.	1	2	3	4
38. coming to a parent/ teacher conference.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX C

QUESTION MATRICES FOR ADULT AND STUDENT SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

ADULT MATRIX

School Policies and Procedures	School Plan	Learning Support	Teaching Strategies	Verification of Student Learning	Performance Expectations	Parent Involvement
Planning basic skills (32,33, 57-61)	Planning basic skills (22,183-184)	Planning basic skills (17-21)	Planning basic skills (102-104)	Planning Reading (34,91,133) Writing (35,92,134) Math (36,93,135)	Planning basic skills (64-67, 105-108)	Planning basic skills (169-172, 177-179)
Organizing Reading (4,85) Writing (5,86) Math (6,87)	Organizing basic skills (37-39)	Organizing Reading (37-39) Writing (126-128) Math (54-56)	Organizing Reading (68-71,99) Writing (68-71,100) Math (68-71,101)	Organizing Reading (173-176) Writing (129-132) Math (47-50)	Organizing Reading (121-122,166) Writing (121-122,164) Math (121-122,165)	Organizing basic skills (143-146)
Delivering basic skills (40-41)	Delivering basic skills (116-118)	Delivering Reading (94-98) Writing (42-46) Math (72-76)	Delivering Reading (150-157, 166-168) Writing (51-53, 150-156,158) Math (13-16, (150-156,159)	Delivering basic skills (23-29,109-115)	Delivering Reading (10) Writing Math (12)	Delivering basic skills (77-81)
Monitoring basic skills (88-90)	Monitoring Reading (82) Writing (83) Math (84)	Monitoring basic skills (139-142)	Monitoring Reading (123,147, 160) Writing (124,148, 161) Math (124, (149,162)	Monitoring basic skills (180-182)	Monitoring Reading (62-63) Writing (30-31) Math (119-120)	Monitoring basic skills (136-138)

STUDENT MATRIX

School Policies and Procedures	School Plan	Learning Support	Teaching Strategies	Verification of Student Learning	Performance Expectations	Parent Involvement
			Planning basic skills (6)			
	Delivering basic skills (1)	Delivering basic skills (5,31, 32-35)	Delivering Reading (3,13-15) Writing (3,7-9) Math (3,10-12)	Delivering basic skills (2,4,19-21, 28-30)	Delivering basic skills (16-18)	Delivering basic skills (36-38)

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Armor, David; Conry-Osequera, Patricia; Cox, Millicent; King, Nicelma; McDonnell, Lorraine; Pascal, Anthony; Pauly, Edward; and Zellman, Gail. Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools. Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand, 1976.

Austin, Gilbert R. Process Evaluation: A Comprehensive Study of Outliers. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1978.

_____. "Exemplary Schools and the Search For Effectiveness." Educational Leadership 37 (October 1979): 10-14.

Averch, Harvey A.; Carroll, Stephen J.; Donaldson, Theodore S.; Kiesling, Herbert J.; and Pincus, John. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings. Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand, 1977.

Barr, Rebecca, and Dreeben, Robert. "School Policy, Production, and Productivity." Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago, 1981. (Typewritten.)

Benbow, Carolyn. Review of Instructionally Effective Schooling Literature. New York: Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Columbia University Teachers College, ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series No. 70, 1980.

Berliner, David. "Research on Teaching: Implications For Practice." Proceedings from a conference sponsored by the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., February, 1982.

Bickel, William E. "Effective Schools: Knowledge, Dissemination, Inquiry." Educational Researcher 12 (April 1983): 3-5.

Bloom, Benjamin S. "The New Direction in Educational Research and Measurement: Alterable Variables." Paper presented at the American Education Research Association conference, Los Angeles, California, April, 1981.

Bowles, Samuel S., and Gintis, Herbert. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Beady, Charles; Flood, Patricia; Schweitzer, John; and Wisenbaker, Joe. School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference. New York: Praeger, 1977.

Brookover, Wilbur; Beamer, Lawrence; Ephthim, Helen; Hathaway, Douglas; Lezotte, Lawrence; Miller, Stephen; Passalacqua, Joseph; and Tornatzky, Louis. Creating Effective Schools. Holmes Beach, Fla.: Learning Publications, Inc., 1982.

Brookover, Wilbur B., and Lezotte, Lawrence. Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 181 005, 1979.

Brookover, Wilbur B., and Schneider, Jeff. "Academic Environments and Elementary School Achievement." Journal of Research and Development in Education 9 (Fall 1975): 9, 82-91.

California State Department of Education. Report on the Special Studies of Selected E.C.E. Schools with Increasing and Decreasing Reading Scores. Sacramento, Cal.: Office of Program Evaluation and Research, 1979.

_____. Report on the Special Studies of Selected E.C.E. Schools with Increasing and Decreasing Reading Scores. Sacramento, Cal.: Office of Program Evaluation and Research, 1980.

Cawelti, Gordon, and Reavis, Charles. "How Well Are They Providing Instructional Improvement Services?" Educational Leadership 38 (December 1980): 236-40.

Chase, Francis S., ed. "Educational Revitalization: A Search for Promising Developments.: In Educational Quandaries and Opportunities, p. 33. Dallas: Urban Education Studies, 1980.

Chase, Francis S. "Regeneration of Public Education In Our Cities." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (January 1979): 353-56.

Clark, David L.; Lotto, Linda S.; and McCarthy, M. "Factors Associated with Success in Urban Elementary Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (March 1980): 467-70.

Clark, Terry A., and McCarthy, Dennis P. "School Improvement in New York City: The Evolution of a Project." Educational Researcher 12 (April 1983): 17-24.

Cleveland Board of Education. Record of Minutes, 11 January 1982, p. 10.

Cohen, Michael. "Effective Schools, Accumulating Research Findings." American Education 8 (January-February 1982): 13-16.

Coleman, James S.; Campbell, Ernest; Hobson, Carol; McPartland, James; Mood, Alexander; Weinfeld, Frederic; and York, Robert. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, James; Kilgore, Sally; and Hoffer, Thomas. Coleman Report on Public and Private Schools: The Draft Summary And Eight Critiques. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1981.

Conant, James B. A Commentary on Schools In Metropolitan Areas. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Cuban, Larry. "Effective Schools: A Friendly But Cautionary Note." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (June 1983): 695-96.

Curran, Edward A. "NIE: An Agenda For the 80's." Educational Researcher 11 (May 1982): 10-12, 21.

D'Amico, Joseph. "Using Effective Schools Studies to Create Effective Schools." Educational Leadership 40 (December 1982): 61-62.

Denham, Carolyn, and Lieberman, Ann. Time To Learn. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 192 454, 1979.

Doss, David, and Holley, Freda M. A Cause for National Pause: Title I Schoolwide Projects. Austin, Tex.: Office of Research and Evaluation, Austin Independent School District, 1982. (ORE: Publication No. 81 55.)

Edmonds, Ronald R. "A Discussion of The Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling." Paper prepared for the National Conference on Urban Education, CEMREL, St. Louis, Missouri, July, 1978.

_____. "Effective Schools For The Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37 (October 1979a): 15-27.

_____. "Some Schools Work and More Can." Social Policy 9 (March-April 1979b): 28-32.

_____. "Making Public Schools Effective." Social Policy 12 (September-October 1981): 56-60.

Edmonds, Ronald R., and Fredriksen, John R. Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools that are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 170 396, 1979.

Eubanks, Eugene E., and Levine, Daniel U. "A First Look at Effective Schools Projects in New York City and Milwaukee." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (June 1983): 697-702.

Evans, Robert W. "Ohio's Effective School Program." American Secondary Education 12 (Special Issue 1983): 2-4.

Fisher, Charles W.; Berliner, David; Filby, Nikola; Marliave, Richard; Cahen, Leonard S.; and Dishaw, Marilyn D. Teaching Behaviors, Academic Learning Time, and Student Achievement: Final Report of Phase II-B, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 183 525, 1978.

Forbes, Roy. "Scores Up Because of Hard Work, Big City School Administrators Say." Education USA, 6 July 1981, p. 345.

Gage, Nathaniel L., ed. The Psychology of Teaching Methods. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Glenn, Beverly C. What Works? An Examination Of Effective Schools For Poor Black Children. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Law and Education, Harvard University, 1981.

Good, Thomas L., and Grouws, Douglas A. "The Missouri Effectiveness Project: An Experimental Study in Fourth-Grade Classrooms." Journal of Educational Psychology 71 (June 1979): 355-62.

Guba, Egon. "Challenges to Public Education." In Educational Quandaries and Opportunities, pp. 10-17, 32. Edited by Francis S. Chase. Dallas: Urban Education Studies, 1980.

Hanushek, Eric A. Education And Race. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1975.

Hargrove, Erwin C.; Graham, Scarlett; Ward, Leslie; Abernathy, Virginia; Cunningham, Joseph; and Vaughn, William. Regulations and Schools: The Implementation of Equal Education for Handicapped Children. Nashville: Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, 1981.

Harris, Richard J. A Primer of Multivariate Statistics. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Henerson, Marlene E.; Morris, Lynn Lyons; and Fitz-Gibbon, Carol Taylor. How to Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.

Hersh, Richard; Carnine, Douglas; Gall, Meredith; and Stockard, Jean. The Management of Education Professionals In Instructionally Effective Schools: Toward A Research Agenda. Eugene, Ore.: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1981.

Heyns, Barbara Lee. Summer Learning And The Effects of Schooling. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Hodgson, Godfrey. "Do Schools Make A Difference?" In The "Equality" Controversy: Schooling and Distributive Justice, pp. 22-44. Edited by Donald M. Levine and Mary Jo Bane. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Howell, Bruce. "Profile of The Principalship." Educational Leadership 38 (January 1981): 333-36.

Hull, C. Hadlai, and Nie, Norman H. Statistical Package For the Social Sciences New Procedures and Facilities for Release 7-9. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.

Jencks, Christopher; Smith, Marshall; Acland, Henry; Bane, Mary Jo; Cohen, David; Gintis, Herbert; Heyns, Barbara; and Michelson, Stephen. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jensen, Arthur R. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement." Harvard Educational Review 39 (Winter 1969): 1-124.

Levine, Daniel U. "Concentrated Poverty and Reading Achievement in Five Big Cities." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, New York, New York, April, 1977.

Levine, Daniel U., and Stark, Joyce. Extended Summary and Conclusions: Institutional and Organizational Arrangements and Processes For Improving Academic Achievement at Inner-City Elementary Schools. Kansas City, Mo.: University of Missouri-Kansas City, School of Education, Center For The Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, 1981.

Lezotte, Lawrence W. "Just a Reminder!" The Effective School Report from Research and Practice 2 (February 1984): 2.

Lezotte, Lawrence W.; Edmonds, Ronald R.; and Ratner, Gordon A. A Final Report: Remedy For School Failure to Equitably Deliver Basic Skills. East Lansing, Mich.: Department of Urban and Metropolitan Studies, Michigan State University, 1974.

Lightfoot, Sarah L. Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Mackenzie, Donald E. "Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Decent Trends." Educational Researcher 12 (April 1983): 5-17.

Madaus, George F.; Airasian, Peter W.; and Kellaghan, Thomas. School Effectiveness: A Reassessment of the Evidence. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980.

Mehan, Hugh. Learning Lessons; Social Organizations: Social Organizations in the Classroom. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

New York State Department of Education. Reading Achievement Related to Educational and Environmental Conditions in 12 New York City Elementary Schools. Albany: Division of Education Evaluation, 1974a.

_____. School Factors Influencing Reading Achievement: A Case Study of Two Inner City Schools. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 089 211, 1974b.

_____. Three Strategies For Studying The Effects of School Processes. Albany: Bureau of School Program Evaluation, 1976.

Odden, Allan. "Local Strategies For Making Schools Better." Education Digest 48 (January 1982): 30-32.

Odden, Allan, and Dougherty, Uri. State Programs of School Improvement: A 50 State Survey. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1982.

Passow, A. Harry. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College Press, 1963.

_____. "Urban Education For the 1980s: Trends and Issues." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (April 1982): 519-22.

Pedhazur, Elazar J. Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Purkey, Stewart C., and Smith, Marshall S. "Effective Schools: A Review." Elementary School Journal 83 (March 1983): 427-52.

Ralph, John H., and Fennessey, James. "Science or Reform: Some Questions About The Effective Schools Model." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (June 1983): 689-94.

Rist, Ray C. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review 40 (Winter 1970): 411-51.

Rosenshine, Barak V. "Academic Engaged Time, Content Covered, and Direct Instruction." Journal of Education 160 (August 1978): 38-66.

_____. "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (Spring 1976): 61-65.

Rosenshine, Barak V., and Berliner, David. "Academic Engaged Time." British Journal of Teacher Education 4 (March 1978): 3-16.

Rowan, Brian; Bossert, Steven; and Dwyer, David C. "Research on Effective Schools: A Cautionary Note." Educational Researcher 12 (April 1983): 24-31.

Rutter, Michael W.; Maughan, Barbara; Mortimore, Peter; Ouston, Janet; and Smith, Alan. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Spartz, James; Valdes, Alice; McCormick, William; Myers, Judith; and Geppert, William. Delaware Educational Accountability System Case Studies: Elementary School Grades 1-4. Dover: Department of Public Instruction, 1977.

Squires, David A.; Huitt, William G.; and Segars, John K. Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Tomlinson, Tommy M. "Effective Schools: Mirror Or Mirage?" Today's Education 70 (April/May 1981): 60-61.

_____. "The Troubled Years: An Interpretive Analysis of Public Schooling Since 1950." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (January 1981): 373-76.

"Training Manual for Data Collection: You're The Teacher, Phase II." Cincinnati: Educational Services Institute, 1982.

Trisman, Donald A.; Waller, Michael; and Wilder, Gita. A Descriptive and Analytic Study of Compensatory Reading Programs: Final Report. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, (Vol. 2, PR.-75-27), 1976.

United States Department of Education. Violent Schools-Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

Weber, George. Inner City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council For Basic Education, 1971.

Wiley, David E., and Marnischpeger, Annegret. "Quantity of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction, Major Educational Vehicles." Educational Researcher 3 (April 1974): 7-12.

Williams, Frederick. Reasoning with Statistics. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977.

Wolf, Alison. "The State of Urban Schools: New Data on an Old Problem." Urban Education 13 (July 1978): 179-94.