

ASSESSING CHANGE IN SCHOOL CLIMATE:
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM

by

MELISSA BETH LUSKY

(Under the direction of Richard L. Hayes)

ABSTRACT

Educational reform is an ongoing process that has seen many incarnations over the past four decades. Initially beginning as a top down process dictated by individuals far removed from the school site, then shifting to a bottom up process dictated largely by school personnel. Reforming education has become both a top down and bottom up process. Despite the number of years and the number of evolutions in the reform process, questions remain unanswered about the success of educational reform efforts.

Additionally, when success has been declared, it has been based primarily on feedback from teachers or other school personnel. Given that students are central to the success of educational reform, it is surprising that there are so few studies that focus on student feedback. In the current study, counseling psychologists obtained student feedback on the intended outcomes of school-wide reform in an attempt to determine its effectiveness in changing school climate.

The findings from this study illustrate that students can provide valuable feedback about the reform process. The data also demonstrate that school reform efforts have varying effects on students according to differences in gender, ethnicity, length of experience with the intervention, and class standing. Clearly, efforts to assess the

effectiveness of school reforms must be based on more than teacher feedback alone. School reform efforts should be both school-wide and individualized to address the unique needs of different student groups. Ultimately school restructuring is a complex issue that demands comprehensive and sustained efforts to maximize its impact in creating schools that are empowering for every one.

INDEX WORDS: School Restructuring, School Reform, School Climate, Empowerment, Counseling Psychology, High School Students

ASSESSING CHANGE IN SCHOOL CLIMATE:
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM

by

MELISSA BETH LUSKY

B.A., The University of Texas, 1989

M.A., The University of Colorado, 1991

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

© 2002

Melissa Beth Lusky

All Rights Reserved

ASSESSING CHANGE IN SCHOOL CLIMATE:
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM

By

MELISSA BETH LUSKY

Approved:

Major Professor: Richard L. Hayes

Committee: Brian Glaser
Pam Paisley
Rosemary Phelps
Joseph Wisenbaker

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2002

DEDICATION

I dedicate my dissertation to my father, Philip Lusky and my aunt, Sandy Fein, who unselfishly gave of themselves in so many ways, making it possible for me to reach this point.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I feel so fortunate to have had so many incredible people supporting me and encouraging me throughout the dissertation process and my doctoral studies.

I am particularly thankful to my advisor Dr. Richard L. Hayes. Having the opportunity to work with one of the most talented, brilliant, and compassionate people I have ever met is something for which I will be eternally grateful. His wisdom has had a profound impact on me both personally and professionally.

I would also like to thank my committee for their invaluable contributions to this project and my doctoral studies. To Dr. Pam Paisley, for being a phenomenal role model and for helping to make my doctoral program one of the best experiences of my life. To Dr. Rosemary Phelps, whose extraordinary abilities as a mentor, made teaching with her one of the highlights of my doctoral program. To Dr. Brian Glaser, for his continuous support and investment in my personal and professional development. To Dr. Joseph Wisenbaker, for his assistance with this project and his genuine interest in my academic success.

And finally, a very special thank you goes to my family who has also played a very important role in helping me through the dissertation process and through my doctoral studies. I especially want to thank my husband Josh for his endless patience. His love, encouragement, and friendship have enabled me to successfully complete a very challenging process. To my beautiful daughter Rachel, for bringing love, laughter, and joy into my life every day. To my mother Sandy, who has always given so much of herself without ever expecting anything in return. Her love and support throughout my

doctoral studies cannot be measured. To my sister Wendy and brother Simon, for their love and support. To my Uncle Eddie for his willingness to do anything to help me succeed. To my Aunt Beverley, whose thoughtfulness and kindness made it possible for me to complete this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study.....	7
General Hypotheses	8
Assumptions.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	11
Limitations of the Study.....	14
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	14
2 ASSESSING CHANGE IN SCHOOL CLIMATE: HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM.....	16
Review of the Literature	16
History of Reform.....	16
Centralization and Decentralization.....	20
School Restructuring.....	22
School Climate	28
Empowerment	31
Democracy.....	36
Multiculturalism.....	37
Collaborative Action Research.....	39

	Summary	41
3	METHODOLOGY	44
	Research Design.....	44
	Participants.....	46
	Background	48
	Instrument	51
	Validity and Reliability.....	53
	Procedure	55
	Data Analysis	55
4	RESULTS	57
	Findings Concerning Null Hypothesis 1	58
	Findings Concerning Null Hypothesis 2	61
	Findings Concerning Null Hypothesis 3	62
	Additional Analyses	64
	Overall Results	70
5	DISCUSSION	72
	Discussion of Research Findings	74
	Hypothesis One	74
	Hypothesis Two	76
	Hypothesis Three	77
	Additional Analyses	80
	Conclusions	82
	Recommendations for Practice	87

Generalizability.....	89
Limitations	90
Recommendations for Further Research.....	92
Final Summary.....	93
REFERENCES	94
APPENDICES	
A THE VISION STATEMENT.....	108
B THE SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY (1991-1994, 1997)	111
C DATA REFLECTING LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT	134

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Preparing students to meet the challenges of today's multicultural, global, information-oriented, and exceedingly technological society will require a new approach to education. More than any other time in our history, students will need to develop skills and abilities that will enable them to manage complexity, identify and utilize resources, and constantly learn new technologies and occupations (Darling-Hammond, 1993). Responding to these challenges will require high school students to be better educated than ever before (Tucker & Mandel, 1992). Functioning effectively in this future society will require students to think critically, multi-dimensionally, and creatively while actively managing increasing social demands (Darling-Hammond, 1993; In-Sook Lee & Reigeluth, 1994). Given the importance of adequately preparing students for the future, the need for educational reform becomes even more compelling (Tucker & Mandel, 1992).

Educational reform takes on further importance when considering the potential impact of social ills on our youths' abilities to contribute to our national productivity and democratic functioning. Currently, the nation's future is compromised because of the significant number of school age youth (25% to 35%) who start school at risk of failing and whose potential for risk is increased by dated and inadequate approaches to schooling (Tharinger, et al., 1996). Some of the factors that place these students at risk include: "poor nutrition, unsafe sex, drug and alcohol abuse, familial and community violence, teenage pregnancy and parenting, lack of job skills, inadequate access to health care, and

homelessness” (Walsh, Howard, & Buckley, 1999, p. 349). Poverty has become a particularly significant risk factor for children, with 20% of all children living in poverty (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Although schools have not been well equipped to address the educational needs of students dealing with psychological, familial, economic, and/or medical concerns, the new economy will require that all students be well educated (Tharinger, 1996). If our nation expects to be able to compete with other nations that are preparing the majority of their students to succeed in a global economy, we will no longer be able to ignore 25% to 35% of our student population (Marshall & Tucker, 1992).

The changing demographic characteristics of today's society also necessitate educational reform. In particular, the number of students from diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds has grown substantially from 12% of the student population in 1976 to 36% percent of the student population in 1996 (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). The number of students whose primary language is not English is currently 2.7 million and continues to increase (U.S. Department of Education, 2000). Furthermore, the number of children from single-parent homes or homes where both parents work now represents 25% of all families (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). When considering all of the factors that are having an impact on today's school age youth, the need to restructure schools to be more responsive to the needs of the student of the twenty-first century is readily apparent.

Statement of the Problem

Developed for a less culturally diverse population, different family and social structures, and a less complicated information structure and employment situation, the current educational system is not equipped to prepare students to manage in today's highly complex society (Cuban, 1990; Lunenburg, 1992; Reyes & Scribner, 1995;

Sarason, 1990; Whitaker, 1993). Creating schools that are more responsive to learners in today's society will require a reexamination of the way schools are organized and administered (Lieberman & Miller, 1990). Unlike prior attempts to reform education through top-down mandates, redesigning educational institutions to meet the diverse needs of today's students calls for the active involvement of those who are most involved in the day-to-day operations of the school. What is needed is an approach that uses the "rich knowledge base" of administrators, teachers, parents, students, and other stakeholders to generate and implement a site specific vision for schooling (Goodman, 1995). However, a whole school approach is only part of the solution to the complex problem of effective school restructuring.

In order to be effective, restructuring efforts also need to focus on substantive issues that will promote fundamental changes in existing structures. Until recently, there have been many attempts to restructure schooling by "making ongoing practices more efficient and effective" (Goodman, 1995, p. 2). It is argued, however, that true reform can only occur by "confronting the cultural and pedagogical traditions and beliefs that underlie current practices and organizational arrangements" (Goodman, 1995, p. 2). Consequently, efforts to reform schools will need to involve more than simply adding new instructional packages or increasing standards. To be substantive, school restructuring efforts need to focus on the quality of the experiences that teachers and students have with one another (Goodman, 1995). Louis, Marks, and Kruse (1996) echo this sentiment noting that "the structural elements of restructuring have received excessive emphasis in many reform proposals, while the need to improve the culture,

climate and interpersonal relationships in schools has received too little attention” (p. 786).

Although it may be easier to implement individualized programs and strategies than to restructure an entire school climate, school climate appears to be a crucial element of successful reform (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996). According to Haynes, Emmons, and Ben-Avie (1997), the focus on school climate is important because it involves examining the multiple factors that impact student success. “The focus then is not only on student background and motivational factors but also on school context and the quality of interactions among and between students and teachers as explanations of student academic achievement” (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997, p. 322).

Additional aspects of school climate that have been found to support student learning and to enable the implementation of fundamental changes in educational practices are risk-taking, collegiality, and collaboration (Newmann, 1993). Specifically, most students, particularly those from diverse backgrounds, have been found to do well in school communities that rely on collaborative relationships to promote students' social and academic development (Lee & Smith, 1996). Because collaborative relationships rely on empowerment and democratic leadership structures, these are additional factors that need to be considered when establishing a school climate that is conducive to effective reform efforts.

Often, establishing democratic structures and a commitment to collaboration among school community members requires major changes in the way participants envision their roles, relationships, and responsibilities (Wheelan & Conway, 1991). For example, developing the types of relationships that are necessary to facilitate

collaboration is a complex process because it depends on the ability of unique individuals to work effectively as a group. Effective group functioning would be a challenge for any group. It is especially challenging for school groups, however, due to the longstanding emphasis of educational systems on promoting individualism and on management by top-down mandates. Furthermore, school personnel often do not have the time or skills to attend to the multiple issues involved in promoting the level of group development necessary for effective change (Roy, 1995).

One of the primary ways educational systems have been able to establish the level of group development necessary to support the reform process is by using external consultants (Schmuck, 1995; Wheelan & Conway, 1991). Counseling psychologists, in particular, have been found to be ideal consultants for school reform projects (Forrest, Putnam, Narusis, Peeke, 1993; Putnam, Peeke, & Narusis, 1993). Their longstanding connections to schools and departments of education as well as their psychological skills and proficiencies make counseling psychologists especially well suited to facilitate school reform efforts (Forrest, et al., 1993). Some of the areas of expertise that have enabled counseling psychologists to effectively facilitate school reform efforts include “interpersonal communication skills, and a knowledge and understanding of group process, organizational change, and conflict” (Bernstein, Forrest, & Golston, 1994, p. 619).

Although a major role for counseling psychologists in educational reform is to help establish and maintain the group and individual dynamics necessary for effective change, counseling psychologists are also well equipped to assist with many other goals of educational reform. For example, one of the major challenges for educational

reformers is to modify approaches to curriculum, instruction, assessment, and evaluation (Tharinger et al., 1996). Facilitating the development of today's diverse learners calls for schooling approaches that promote the development of students' unique intellectual talents, ways of knowing, academic interests, cultures, and individual learning styles (Darling-Hammond, 1993). Therefore, learning will need to become more active, relevant to the real world, challenging, reflective, collaborative, and will need to occur in empowering and physically comfortable environments (Glickman, 1993). Given their knowledge and understanding of child development, individual differences, evaluation, empowerment, and group development, counseling psychologists have the potential to make significant contributions to the restructuring of curriculum, instruction, and evaluation.

Regardless of the way in which school restructuring efforts are facilitated, the success of such efforts depends ultimately upon their impact on students. After all, what difference do innovations make if school personnel cannot determine their impact on students (Glickman, 1992)? One way the impact of school reform has been measured is through standardized tests. These measures rarely capture the full range of school reform efforts (Shields & Knapp, 1997), however. One of the reasons that standardized measures fall short is that capturing the richness and detail about what students gain from their educational experience necessitates looking extensively at the practices of individual schools engaged in restructuring (Lieberman & Miller, 1990). Utilizing nonstandardized measures also increases the likelihood that educators will be able to identify the specific organizational dimensions that influence students, so that they can gain increased insights into how to manipulate or change those variables (Sabo, 1995).

The best way to obtain the necessary information will be to actively involve students in restructuring efforts (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997). According to Goodman (1995), there is a lack of studies in the literature that significantly involve students in school restructuring efforts. Another limitation of the existing school restructuring literature is that results are often based on entire schools, which are too large to capture differences among the subunits of the school (Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993). Without studies that focus on smaller student subgroups it will not be possible to discern the differential impact of intended reforms. In particular, focusing on students in different grades is crucial if teachers and administrators are interested in effectively addressing the developmental needs of students. Furthermore, in order to identify the impact of school restructuring efforts on today's diverse student population, it will also be important to gain insight into the perceptions of male and female students from different ethnic groups. To ensure an optimal level of success for all program stakeholders, reform efforts must involve all of the key players in the school, including students. After all, if the ultimate goal of educational reform is to prepare students for today's complex society it makes sense that student feedback about the effects of these efforts will be a crucial part of the reform process.

Purpose of the Study

This case study responds to the need for studies that provide information about the impact of school restructuring efforts on different student subgroups. The goal of this study was to identify the impact of a five-year school improvement project on students according to gender, ethnicity, and grade level. The impact of the school improvement

project was determined by assessing changes in which students' views of school climate during the course of the project.

The results of this research will provide information about changes in students' views of school climate based on gender, ethnicity, and grade level. The information provided by this study is anticipated to help future researchers and educators who are interested in creating a school climate that promotes positive student outcomes. Given the role of school climate in promoting overall school effectiveness and the importance of determining the impact of school restructuring efforts, especially on students as viewed by students, this research may be of particular interest to those involved in school restructuring.

General Hypotheses

As indicated, the aim of this study was to track changes in students' views of school climate to determine the impact of school improvement efforts across time. It was expected that students' scores would increase over time, so that for example, freshmen scores on the climate survey for 1994 will be higher than freshmen scores on the climate survey for 1991. This expectation is based on the assumption that views of school climate should become more favorable the longer the school is engaged in school improvement efforts.

Another goal of this study was to determine whether there is a cumulative/developmental effect of efforts to improve school climate based on years of exposure to school improvement efforts. It was anticipated that students who were exposed to school improvement efforts longer would score higher on the school climate survey due to developmental effects and repeated exposure. For example, seniors in 1994

would be expected to score higher than freshmen in 1994 because the seniors would have been exposed to school improvement efforts for four years, whereas the freshmen would only have been exposed to school improvement efforts for one year.

Finally, this study sought to identify the differential impact of school improvement efforts on students based on their gender and ethnicity. It was anticipated that because school improvement efforts are intended to decrease the differences in students' scores on the school climate survey based on gender and ethnicity across time, the differences between students' scores should be less. For statistical purposes the hypotheses examined in this study were operationalized in the following ways:

Null Hypothesis 1. There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for all respondents according to class standing.

Independent variables for hypothesis 1: The 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994 administrations of the School Climate Survey.

Dependent variables: Student body scores on the school climate survey for 1991-1994.

Null Hypothesis 2. There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors

Independent variable for hypothesis 2: Class standing.

Dependent variables: Scores on the school climate survey for freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors in 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Null Hypothesis 3. There will be no changes in overall mean scores on the School Climate Survey for students from one year to the next based on gender and ethnicity.

Independent variables for hypothesis 3: Gender and ethnicity.

Dependent variables: Student scores on the school climate survey in 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994 based on gender and ethnicity.

Assumptions

The general hypotheses were driven by several assumptions about how students might respond to the school climate survey as reform efforts progressed. First, it was assumed that, despite differences in race, gender, educational level, academic success and the like, students would be both forthcoming and honest in their assessment of the effects of intended reforms. Further, it was assumed, that a structured survey, such as that used in the present study, would be adequate to measure their perceptions of these changes. More specifically, it was assumed that those students who were a part of school reform efforts for longer periods of time would respond more favorably to the school climate survey across time. In addition, it was anticipated that if efforts to reform school climate were successful, all students groups would begin to respond similarly to the school climate survey over time regardless of class standing, ethnicity, or gender. It was also anticipated that student responses would become more favorable as they progressed from freshmen to seniors. Finally, it was assumed that changes in format and length of the survey over the course of the study would have no significant effect upon students' assessment of school climate and thereby no significant impact on the results of the survey from one administration to the next.

Definition of Terms

Definitions of several significant terms are provided in this section in order to facilitate a better understanding of this study.

School Restructuring

Although restructuring has been defined in many different ways; however, there are some key themes that can be identified across these definitions (Newmann, 1993; Tharinger, et. al., 1996). In particular, restructuring is commonly referred to as a systemic and comprehensive approach to educational reform designed to make holistic changes by reevaluating the fundamental principles on which schools operate (David, 1989b; Moorman & Egermeir, 1989). Systemic change, which is at the heart of the restructuring movement, is viewed as “an opportunity to link schools to a broad system of social support and return the care and keeping of instructional programs to the professional staff” (Mitchell & Beach, 1993, p. 267). Furthermore, restructuring is complex because it shifts responsibility for policy decisions to local participants (David, 1989a). School personnel not only become primarily responsible for implementing restructuring policy, but for actually creating restructuring policy as they progress.

School Climate

One of the original definitions of climate, still widely used, was espoused by Tagiuri (1968). According to Tagiuri (1968), climate refers to the complete environmental (i.e., ecology, milieu, and culture) quality of an organization. More specifically, climate encompasses the “relatively enduring quality of the total environment that (a) is experienced by the occupants, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in a particular set of characteristics or attributes and is

phenomenologically external to the actor” (Tagiuri, 1968, p. 24). Another of the more commonly used conceptualizations of school climate was put forth by Halpin and Croft (1963). Unlike the environmental perspective utilized by Tagiuri (1968), Halpin and Croft (1963) utilize a personality perspective which contends that “personality is to the individual what climate is to the organization” (p. 1). A third definition, developed by Nwankwo (1979) states that climate is “the general ‘we-feeling’, group subculture or interactive life of the school” (p. 268). Of the three, the definition provided by Tagiuri (1968) is believed to best reflect the views of most school climate researchers who agree that it is necessary to focus on the complete environmental quality of the school (Sabo, 1995).

Empowerment

Empowering organizations are those that provide a substantial amount of autonomy, responsibility, choice, and authority for decision making to the individuals that make up the organization (Lightfoot, 1986). For individuals, empowerment has been defined as individual skill development, an increased awareness of the impact of “power dynamics” on one’s life, development of an individual identity, active participation in the broader community, and the increased potential to facilitate empowerment for others (McWhirter, 1991). Hence, empowerment can take on different meanings according to the person and the situation. Within schools, the provision of information is often a method of empowering others (Hayes, 1991). Another way of empowering school personnel is to give those most directly impacted by decisions the opportunity to make the decisions (Hayes, 1991; Jenkins, 1988). In the League of Professional Schools (a coalition of some 60 public schools throughout Georgia that are dedicated to school wide

renewal and shared governance), empowerment is defined as giving teachers a majority voice in pedagogical decisions and the principal having equal status and worth as any faculty member (Glickman, Hayes, & Hensley, 1992). Subsequently, the challenge for school reformers is to identify ways to “encourage, develop, or promote whatever active relationship is necessary to create a more empowered faculty, as well as students, parents, and staff” (Hayes, 1991, p. 6).

Collaborative Action Research

Collaborative action research combines the talents of researchers and school communities in an effort to understand problems of practice and theory which have been resistant to other research approaches (Lieberman, 1992). According to Hayes and Horne (1994), the productive interaction of theory and practice in a primarily practice-based approach to inquiry is the only way to completely understand practice. In school-wide action research, school faculties and researchers work together to identify an area or problem of interest, analyze and interpret data related to this area of interest, and take action based on this data (Calhoun, 1992; Hayes & Horne, 1994). “The process of collaborative action research is cyclic and can serve as formative evaluation of the effects of school-wide actions taken” (Calhoun, 1992, p. 2). Such an approach relies on a commitment from both university researchers and school communities to the process of collaboration and to a specific vision concerning the role of research (Paisley & Hayes, 1996). “In collaborative action research the fundamental purpose is to improve practice in local schools rather than to generate universal truths” (Paisley & Hayes, 1996, p. 4).

Limitations of the Study

Although this study provides information about different student groups' views of school climate over time, there are some limitations that need to be discussed. First, because this study provides data about a single school it is difficult to generalize the findings of the study to other schools. In order to generalize the findings it will be necessary for the reader to identify similarities between the current school and other schools. Second, tests of reliability were not conducted on the School Climate survey, which was developed to reflect the school's vision statement (Jones, 1997). Furthermore, self-report surveys may not accurately reflect what respondents mean because of the limited response choices. It is also important to note that people's attitudes may not accurately reflect their actual behaviors. Taking these limitations into account, it appears that it is not possible to make a definitive statement about the degree to which the survey actually measures the values and ideals set out in the school's vision statement. Furthermore, when considering survey responses it is necessary to be aware that they are biased due to the limited number of response options and due to a reliance on an accurate correspondence between people's attitudes and behaviors.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

In chapter two, a review of the literature provides information about the history of school reform, school restructuring, and school climate. Chapter three, the methods of the study, includes descriptions of the research design, process of data collection and analysis, and issues of validity and reliability. Chapter four is a presentation of the research findings and contains answers to the research questions. Chapter five contains a

discussion of the research findings, conclusions, and implications for future research and practice.

CHAPTER 2

ASSESSING CHANGE IN SCHOOL CLIMATE:

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FEEDBACK ON SCHOOL-WIDE REFORM

Review of the Literature

This chapter includes a review of the literature on school reform, school restructuring, school climate, empowerment, democracy, multicultural education, and collaborative action research. It begins with an overview of the history of educational reform in the United States and continues with a description of current efforts to restructure schooling by using counseling psychologists to facilitate stakeholder involvement in school reform efforts. A review of the literature is also provided to illustrate the importance of including students as primary stakeholders in efforts to improve school climate by establishing school communities that are empowering, democratic, and deeply committed to multicultural education.

History of Reform

The most recent wave of educational reform in the United States has been driven by a variety of factors. In particular, educational reforms have been initiated to promote increased global economic competitiveness and overall commercial productivity (Cohen, 1988; Cuban, 1998; Goodman, 1995; Milstein, 1993; Mitchell, 1990; Tirozzi & Uro, 1997; Tyack, 1990) and to improve the country's social welfare (Berry, 1993; Cohen, 1988; Conley, 1991; Goodlad, 1992; Haas, 1989; Tirozzi & Uro, 1997; Tyack, 1990; Walsh, Howard, & Buckley 1999) and political functioning (Conley, 1991; Haas, 1989; Tirozzi & Uro, 1997). Reform efforts have also been influenced by the necessity to

produce a work force that can function successfully in a technological age (Conley, 1991; Goodlad, 1992; Kohli, 1992).

For decades, Americans have looked to the schools to remedy the country's economic, political, and social problems (Perkinson, 1991). Current reform efforts are no exception. "There is a general consensus that we need changes in our schools to allow students to develop to their highest potential so they can productively participate in our competitive economy and sustain a vibrant democracy" (Tirozzi & Uro, 1997, pp. 247-248). Although Americans have focused on changing the educational system to bolster the country economically, socially, and politically for some time, the focus on educational reform increased substantially in the 1980s in reaction to publicity about the nation's deteriorating global economic status. In response to these concerns, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* in 1983, outlining a plan for improving the nation's educational system.

The publication of *A Nation at Risk* marked what is known as the first wave of educational reform, which has been described as top-down (Heckman & Peterman, 1996; Tharinger, et al., 1996), having been directed by state governments. In the 1980s and early 1990s legislation was passed in an effort to increase academic and testing requirements, to delineate new curriculum models, and to mandate different procedures for managing schools and districts (Darling-Hammond, 1993). The states also mandated guidelines about homework, graduation requirements, and "no pass no play" rules for student athletes (Hanson, 1991). Most of these reforms were applied in a standardized fashion

across schools and districts because state governments viewed all schools as similar (Hanson, 1991).

Although these top-down initiatives were successful in requiring that schools be accountable for achieving specific educational goals (Hanson, 1991), they had major shortcomings. One of these was that top-down initiatives were created by legislators, instead of the school personnel who were more aware of the needs of their particular schools and communities (Hanson, 1991). Furthermore, legislators expected school personnel to be compliant in implementing what were often incongruous initiatives. Another shortcoming of the top-down approach involved legislators' failure to adequately communicate their mission and vision for educational reform to parents and educators (Conley, 1991; Elam, 1990). Additionally, many of the initiatives that were mandated were inadequately funded (Millstein, 1993).

When reformers recognized that increasing state mandates was not producing the desired results, they shifted their focus to a bottom-up approach, whereby teachers would have primary responsibility for guiding educational reforms (Lunenburg, 1992; Tharinger, et al., 1996). The shift from a top-down approach to a bottom-up approach marked the second wave of educational reform. The bottom-up approach also stressed the importance of responding to the unique needs of local schools by having reforms begin locally (Conley, 1991). From the first to the second wave of reform, the focus shifted from "managing" teachers to "empowering" them. Empowering teachers meant that instead of prescribing standardized practices, teachers would have the autonomy, responsibility, opportunities, and authority that would enable them to utilize their knowledge and wisdom to implement school specific reforms.

The 1990s marked the beginning of the third wave of educational reform, which has been referred to as an era of systemic reform (Tharinger et al., 1996). Systemic reform expanded the existing notion of reform, by including a focus on collaboration between communities, school districts, state education agencies, professional development institutions, and national initiatives (Tharinger, et al., 1996). The goal of systemic reform was to transform guiding principles, procedures, and inter- and intra-organizational interactions by incorporating feedback from all parties invested in the educational enterprise (Conley, 1991). A central aspect of the systemic approach involved challenging the beliefs underlying the existing educational system.

Within the past two decades, the education reform movement has resulted in a multitude of legislation, new programs, and changes initiated by states and local school districts. Some of the reforms were driven solely by legislators; whereas, others were created from the bottom-up. There is evidence that many reforms are being implemented as planned. In several states, graduation requirements in math and science have increased, teacher salaries have increased, teacher certification tests have been implemented, and more schools are collaborating with businesses and universities than ever before (Lunenburg, 1992). Bottom-up initiatives designed to improve technology and to restructure the school day and curriculum have also been implemented successfully (Lunenburg, 1992). In spite of the numerous changes in educational practices, there is continued concern about the need for increased involvement of students (Goodman, 1995).

Although there has been a substantial focus on reforming schools to benefit students, young people are represented in only a small fraction of the literature on

reforming education (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a; Nieto, 1994; Soo Hoo, 1993). Even the most recent focus on systemic reform fails to consider issues related to student change (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a). Providing students with a voice in the reform process would seem to be the ideal means for changing education to meet student needs, while also enabling administrators to demonstrate their commitment to bottom-up strategies. Given their role in the educational system, students can often provide inventive and diverse insights regarding the reform process (Reed & Bechtel, 1997). Understandably, students have the best sense of what works best for them, therefore, it stands to reason that if reformers want to increase the probability of getting things “right”, they will include students' voices in efforts to reform schooling (Reed & Bechtel, 1997). After all, it seems reasonable to expect that if empowerment through participation is important for adults that it would be important for students as well.

Centralization and Decentralization

Shifts within the educational system, from centralized to decentralized structures, are apparent throughout the educational reform process (Cuban, 1990, Darling-Hammond, 1988; Mojkowski & Fleming, 1988). During periods of centralization, legislators, school districts, and other large governing bodies claim primary responsibility for guiding educational reform efforts (Cotton, 1992). Hence, centralization is based on the notion that school personnel need to be directed by administrators and legislators in order to successfully identify and implement goals for educational reform. Conversely, decentralization involves a shift of power to schools and school boards (Cotton, 1992). Decentralization is based on the rationale that reforms are more likely to occur if they are

initiated locally instead of being controlled by “bureaucratic restrictions and hierarchical controls” (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993, p. 17).

For many years, advocates of centralization have promoted increased controls and mandates, while more recently, advocates of decentralization have been talking about empowering school personnel to design site specific educational reforms. The interest in decentralized approaches has come about due to concerns about shortcomings in centralized approaches and the recognition that teachers are less likely to be committed to reform efforts that have been mandated by legislators and other officials (Meier, 1987; Corcoran, Walker, & White, 1988). Furthermore, some critics contend that centralized efforts to improve educational outcomes have not succeeded due to a heavy reliance on a model that fails to allow teachers to be creative in delivering education that utilizes their talents and their knowledge of their schools and communities (Darling-Hammond, 1993; Whitaker, 1993).

Decentralization has provided teachers with the opportunity to make meaningful contributions to the change process. It makes sense, therefore, that a crucial step in effecting change for students will be providing students with similar opportunities (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a). In order to provide students with a voice in reform efforts, a climate that encourages student input into the change process will need to be established. Currently, in most adult-student interactions, students are expected to be “passive responders” complying with rules, regulations and directives without questioning what is being asked of them (Corbett & Wilson, 1995b, p. 6). Although some schools have begun to seek information from select groups of student representatives regarding reform activities, these efforts have not significantly altered the way students “learn, feel, behave

or grow” (Corbett & Wilson, 1995b, p. 7). To increase the likelihood that educational reform will promote desired changes for students, educators will need to recognize that students are not necessarily subordinate in every situation and that it is not sufficient to involve only select groups of students in reform efforts (Corbett & Wilson, 1995b). Thus, obtaining student input will entail revising current school structures, roles, and relationships. In order to determine the best way to gain student input, it will also be important to examine the merits of different methods for involving students in each phase of the reform process.

School Restructuring

Within the past decade, the vocabulary used to describe educational reform has shifted from school reform to school restructuring. A primary aim of restructuring has been to improve reform efforts by involving individuals at the grassroots level and to recognize and attend to the complexities of the educational system (Whitaker, 1993). Unlike many prior attempts to reform education, restructuring focuses on renewing the entire system and does not rely on partial and piecemeal initiatives. Whereas individual projects may help to jumpstart the change process, restructuring acknowledges that such projects are insufficient to maintain and establish lasting transformations (Hansen, 1989). What is called for instead is a focus on issues that have the potential to significantly alter the format of school governance, the relationships among school professionals at varying levels, and the culture of schools (Jenkins & Houlihan, 1991). Only an approach that restructures the fundamental design of schools will be able to remedy problems such as poor student achievement, high drop-out rates, an inadequately prepared work force, and social and economic factors that place students at-risk (Hansen, 1989).

Although many schools both nationally and internationally are actively involved in the restructuring process, there is still a substantial amount of confusion about what constitutes restructuring (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). One explanation for the confusion is that restructuring is used as both a political construct to guide reform efforts and as a professional construct to focus educational improvements (Mitchell & Beach, 1993). To further complicate things, the meaning of school restructuring has become so encompassing that it has generally taken on whatever connotation it is given (Goodman, 1995; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Consequently, educators are advocating for restructuring based on considerably divergent principles (Goodman, 1995).

Although the vagueness associated with restructuring makes it a difficult concept to comprehend, the reason for this ambiguity is easily understood (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Using terms with high levels of ambiguity is an established strategy for developing broad based support and providing a driving force for a new construct (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Employing an obscure term also increases the potential for attracting groups of people who otherwise might be opposed to joining together due to conflicting values and ideas (Mitchell & Beach, 1991). In light of the ever changing and school specific nature of restructuring, the lack of a precise definition is not necessarily problematic (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). After all, restructuring should be redefined daily within the local contexts in which it occurs (Goldman, Dunlap, & Conley, 1991), while its meaning should be unique to each school struggling with the process (Mitchell & Beach, 1991).

Restructuring has been defined in many different ways; however, there are some key themes that can be identified across these definitions (Newmann, 1993; Tharinger, et

al., 1996). In particular, restructuring is commonly referred to as a systemic and comprehensive approach to educational reform designed to make holistic changes by reevaluating the fundamental principles on which schools operate (David, 1989b; Moorman & Egermeir, 1989 as cited in Whichard-Morehouse & Elke, 1991). Systemic change, which is at the heart of the restructuring movement, is viewed as “an opportunity to link schools to a broad system of social support and return the care and keeping of instructional programs to the professional staff” (Mitchell & Beach, 1993, p. 267). Furthermore, restructuring is complex because it shifts responsibility for policy decisions to local participants (David, 1989a). School personnel not only become primarily responsible for implementing restructuring policy, but for actually creating restructuring policies as they progress.

School culture, which includes both school climate and interpersonal interactions, is another crucial aspect of school restructuring (Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996). Some even argue that attending to restructuring prior to “reculturing” is akin to “putting the cart before the horse” (Fullan, 1993, p. 67). Whereas the focus of prior reforms was on implementing specific structural changes, school restructuring actually promotes questioning and reevaluating the social and pedagogical ideals that guide overall school functioning. Therefore, restructuring entails a primary change in the “socially shared values and beliefs about what education is and what it ought to be” (Corbett, 1988 as cited in Whichard-Morehouse & Elke, 1991, p. 2). The importance of concentrating on shared values and beliefs is echoed by Fullan (1993) who concludes that “organizations don’t change only individuals change; that systems change when enough kindred spirits coalesce in the same directions” (p. 143). Accordingly, in order to be effective,

restructuring efforts need to achieve a high degree of correspondence between organizational goals and individual needs (Jenkins & Houlihan, 1991). Consequently, efforts to restructure school practices will be in vain if school personnel continue to believe and teach as they always have (Jenkins & Houlihan, 1991).

Restructuring is a long-term activity because it entails challenging firmly established practices. If participants in the restructuring process are aware of what is involved, they will be less likely to become disillusioned and more likely to persevere (Milstein, 1993). Due to the complex nature of restructuring, it is estimated that the process can take anywhere from 3 to 10 years (Fullan, 1991). Restructuring has the potential to take several years because plans that are particularly comprehensive and systemic generally tend to take longer to establish and maintain (Cawelti, 1995). Highly comprehensive and systemic plans not only call for working through complicated issues and expanding responsibilities, but they also require that a “critical mass” of school personnel internalize the new system so that it can be fully incorporated into existing organizational structures (Huberman & Miles, 1984).

Comprehensively and systemically restructuring school systems requires that various stakeholders take on new roles and relationships (David, 1989b). In particular, the roles of the school board and central office need to be reconceptualized (Jenkins & Houlihan, 1991). School board and central office personnel will need to recognize that school personnel will require “leadership”, “nurturing”, and “resources” to successfully implement structural changes (David, 1989a). Furthermore, instead of “controlling” and “regulating” what school personnel do, those at the “top” will need to include school personnel as “full partners” in the restructuring process (David, 1989a). Just as it is

crucial for those at the “top” to include local personnel in the restructuring process, it is equally important for local personnel to coordinate their efforts with those at the district level (Fullan, 1993). Although it is possible for individual schools to successfully implement change without input from those at the district level, it is not likely that the changes will be sustained (Fullan, 1993). What is needed for successful reform is concurrent top-down and bottom-up influence because “change flourishes in a sandwich; things happen when there is consensus above and pressure below” (Fullan, 1993, p. 37).

The changes in roles and relationships that come with school restructuring do not only apply to adults, they pertain to students as well. It makes sense that, similar to educators, students will have the best chance of adapting to and embracing the complex changes inherent in school restructuring if they have the opportunity to participate in the restructuring process (Conway, 1984). Although there has been an increased focus on collaborative efforts to restructure schooling, students have rarely been included in such efforts (Reed & Bechtel, 1997). For the most part, adults view students as “beneficiaries” instead of “participants” in the change process (Fullan, 1991). For school restructuring to have a significant impact on students, they will need to have a voice in helping to shape and influence the face of educational reform (Reed & Bechtel, 1997).

New roles will also necessitate new relationships between adults and students in schools. Specifically, adults will need to view students as having something important to contribute and will need to pay more attention to the struggles students face related to the change process (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a). One way to reconceptualize the relationships between adults and students is to view them as reciprocal, where each party has the opportunity to contribute to a larger shared vision (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a). Similar to

the collaborative relationships between school personnel and district administrators, the relationships between school personnel and students will need to be characterized by “fairness and equity, and an other orientation, which allows for mutual construction of meaning and maximizing the best interests of all” (Noddings, 1992, in Corbett & Wilson, 1995a, p. 15).

Making the necessary changes in roles and relationships among the various stakeholders can be a very involved and intricate process. The process can be especially complex because it requires that people work collaboratively to identify and adapt to new roles and relationships. Therefore, stakeholders not only need to figure out how their new roles should look, but they also need to learn how to adapt these new roles within the context of the larger school community. For most people, adjusting to level of change required for restructuring can be an extremely challenging process because of the need to think differently about schooling, to recognize and attend to the desires of others within the school community, and above all to take on new responsibilities and roles.

One of the ways that reformers have chosen to help stakeholders adjust and adapt to these new roles and responsibilities is by gaining assistance from outside consultants. In particular, some reformers have obtained assistance from counseling psychologists due to their knowledge and understanding of systems, human relationships, and empowerment (Bernstein, Golston, & Forrest, 1994). Counseling psychologists can also utilize their knowledge and understanding of human development to help stakeholders understand the relationship between their personal vision and the greater organizational vision and to provide stakeholders with insights into how to unite the two. Furthermore, counseling psychologists can also use their awareness of individual and group dynamics

to promote the collaborative relationships that are necessary for effective school restructuring.

School Climate

Understanding the complexity of the change process is only one aspect of school restructuring; of equal importance is determining both how to assess the process and which constructs best capture such an intricate operation. One construct that has frequently been used to study the multiple aspects of schooling is school climate (Anderson, 1982). As Sabo (1995) points out, school climate “has become a promising tool for organizational analysis of behavior and attitudes” (p. 150). Attending to the different aspects of school climate is particularly important because reforms are destined to fail unless they can make a significant impact on the overall culture of the school (Fullan & Miles, 1992).

One of the primary factors that has been identified as significantly influencing school climate is the level of collegiality and collaboration among school personnel. In particular, collegiality has been found to significantly influence productivity, instruction, and school improvement efforts (Butler, 1995). Faculty commitment to collegiality and collaboration tends to result in increased communication among educators, which has been shown to enhance student outcomes (Dietrich & Bailey, 1996). In a review of the literature, Firestone and Pennell (1993) found that teachers who had the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers displayed an increased commitment to teaching.

Strong leadership that encourages teacher involvement in decision-making is one of the primary means for establishing and promoting collegiality among teachers (Schweiker-Marra, 1995). Principals and other school leaders who are supportive,

encouraging, reinforcing and are able to facilitate change can have a substantive effect on school climate (Schweiker-Marra, 1995; Winter & Sweeny, 1994). Some of the other things principals can do to improve school climate include consistently illustrating their belief in the schools' mission, empowering teachers, leading by example, and regularly assessing school climate (Grebing, as cited in Peterson, 1997). In their study of two schools undergoing restructuring, Dietrich and Bailey (1996) noted that school climate was positively impacted when principals displayed dedication and fairness, promoted communication and flexibility, treated teachers with respect and showed pride in their accomplishments, and were active participants in the daily functions of the school. School leaders that promote collaboration are also more likely to establish a meaningful vision that attracts widespread commitment from those in the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

To date there are many studies similar to those mentioned above that look extensively at the variables that adults feel are important to schooling (Anderson, 1982; Peterson, 1997; Witcher, 1993); however, there are few studies that examine students' views of school climate. If meaningful school transformation relies on attending to school climate, it would make sense for students to have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding which elements of school climate they feel would maximize their ability to function effectively within the school. After all, if a primary goal of school restructuring is helping students develop the competencies necessary to succeed in the future, it will be important to assess whether or not school climates are conducive to such goals.

For example, achievement levels are influenced by individual students' feelings and attitudes. Therefore, it is crucial to obtain students' perceptions of school climate

when trying to improve student behavior and academic performance (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997). The need for student input is even more compelling in light of the evidence that many students dropout or misbehave because they do not feel respected or valued by their teachers (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997). Furthermore, students respond positively about their school when they perceive their school climate to be nurturing, challenging, and supportive (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997). In addition to nurturing, challenge, and support, other school climate factors that impact student achievement include “collaborative decision making, equity and fairness, order and discipline, strong school-community relations, staff dedication to student learning, leadership, the school building, sharing of resources, student relations, student-teacher relations, and parent involvement” (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997, pp. 326-327).

Phelan, Davidson, and Cao (1992) also found ample evidence that students have definite ideas about what constitutes a positive school climate. In particular, they found that students identified support from school personnel, safety, peer relationships, and the opportunity for students to have input into decisions to be some of the factors that promote a positive school climate (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1992). Based on the studies by Haynes, Emmons, and Ben-Avie (1997) and by Phelan, Davidson, and Cao (1992), it can be concluded that listening to students can produce valuable information about the school conditions that can significantly impact both the design and implementation of reform activities. Nieto (1994) further supports these findings, indicating that adults often find that when they ask students for feedback regarding school climate that students have valuable ideas to contribute and that students’ ideas are often similar to those of adults.

School condition has also been identified by students and faculty as an important aspect of school climate. In Goldman and Newman's (1998) study of high school student leaders, who were responsible for identifying and implementing changes to improve their schools' culture, a substantial amount of effort was made to change the condition of the school to help students feel more connected to the school building. A primary goal of the student leaders was to make changes that would increase students' feelings of ownership and belonging. What they discovered was that things as simple as putting murals in the classrooms and hallways, adding greenery in and around the school, exterminating pests, and putting more garbage cans around the school were enough to increase students' feelings of connection to the school (Goldman & Newman, 1998).

Another factor that students and faculty have identified as contributing to positive school climate is the opportunity to select from a wide variety of extracurricular activities (Goldman & Newman, 1998; Nieto, 1994; Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1992). Availability of extracurricular activities is especially important because it provides all types of students with the opportunity for meaningful school involvement. For example, in a study of students from diverse cultural backgrounds, Nieto (1994) found that through participation in extracurricular activities students gained valuable leadership skills and found interesting and productive outlets for their energy. Therefore, in order to develop a positive school climate, schools must have structures in place that are empowering to students and faculty.

Empowerment

It is asserted that providing substantive decision making power to teachers, individual schools, and local communities has the potential to "bring about fundamental,

even radical changes in how the education system functions” (Hansen, 1989, p. 7). Creating the structures needed to promote empowerment is no easy task, however, it requires that schools and school districts significantly modify the way in which they are organized (Hansen, 1989). Some of the necessary changes include loosening district and state regulations, a willingness on the part of administrators to share their authority with teachers, and professional development to prepare school personnel for their new empowered roles (Hansen, 1989).

Many of the changes that need to occur to facilitate empowerment relate to the roles and responsibilities of teachers. For example, instead of being expected to implement a curriculum developed by someone far removed from their individual classrooms, teachers will need to have the opportunity to design their own curriculum and methods of instruction (Bolin, 1989; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993; Newmann, 1993). Teachers will also need to be given more input regarding overall school goals and policies (Bolin, 1989; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Simply providing teachers with enhanced autonomy and control, however, will not be sufficient. Schools will also need to supply teachers with sufficient amounts of political support, time, and resources (Carr, 1997).

Research on organizational dynamics illustrates that “devolving power from distant central authorities to local organizations” is only one aspect that contributes to teacher empowerment (Newmann, 1993, p. 9). Empowerment is also dependent on the ability of organizations to shift their focus from individualized efforts to collaborative efforts (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993; Newmann, 1993; Renihan & Renihan, 1995).

According to Glickman, “The empowerment movement sends the message that teaching

no longer has to be isolated, routinized, individual, and mindless. Rather, teaching can be a career in which a community of professionals working on behalf of students can engage in critical inquiry and collective dialogue” (1990, p. 75). Opportunities to collaboratively identify school goals and priorities and to make substantive decisions have also been found to increase teacher's awareness regarding their school, school budget, and other human and material resources available at the school (White, 1992). Having the chance to share their expertise with other teachers has also been found to enhance teachers' confidence levels and motivation to become better educators (White, 1992).

Ultimately the degree to which teachers are empowered depends on the degree of administrative support they receive (Hayes & Lunsford, 1994). Specifically, empowerment calls for administrators to support teaching through increased levels of communication, democratic leadership, and teamwork (Bolin, 1989). School administrators who view themselves as “co-equals” are in the best position to promote a school environment where there is mutual respect and a valuing of individual status and worth (Bolin, 1989). Empowering teachers and other school personnel also depends on a leadership style that emphasizes openness and flexibility when solving problems (Bolin, 1989). School leaders should focus on promoting the establishment of shared goals designed to account for and embrace diverse ideas and perspectives (Bolin, 1989). Finally, one of the best ways for school leaders to empower others is by adopting the attitudes and values they want others to emulate (Bolin, 1989; Carr, 1997; Hayes & Lunsford, 1994).

A significant amount of attention has been paid to creating the conditions that empower teachers. The research on whether teacher empowerment results in student

empowerment, however, is less than clear (Marks & Louis, 1997). What is known about teacher empowerment is that those who benefit most from empowerment are those who have an opportunity to provide input into various aspects of schooling (Smylie, 1994). Given that participation is an important aspect of empowerment for teachers, it may also be a key factor in empowering students. Therefore, it is possible that the best way for teachers to empower students is to provide them with increased opportunities to participate in shaping their schooling experience.

Based on what is known about administrators' efforts to provide empowering environments for teachers, it is no surprise that establishing an atmosphere that is conducive to student empowerment calls for major changes in current schooling structures. In particular, teachers must be committed to listening to what students have to say and be willing to take action based on student input and recommendations (Lincoln, 1995). Teachers must also be given institutional support such as time and authority in order to be able to develop a climate that is conducive to new and different student-teacher relationships (Lincoln, 1995). Making the shifts necessary to promote student empowerment is often a difficult process because adults believe that they must give students free reign (Ungerleider & DiBenedetto, 1997); however, this is not and should not be the case. In their study of a youth empowerment initiative, Ungerleider and DiBenedetto (1997) found that students felt empowered when they were given an opportunity to provide input regarding programming. They also found that a key to student empowerment was providing a level of respect for students by recognizing and valuing their decisions and opinions.

Even with the necessary supports in place, empowerment may not automatically occur because students naturally vary in the degree to which they are ready to adopt new roles and responsibilities. It is necessary, therefore, for adults to gain an awareness of the views students had of their roles prior to empowerment efforts and to work from there. For example, many students may feel alienated from school prior to the start of reform efforts and may not be motivated or interested in a more empowered role that simply requires them to do more of the types of things they did not believe were important to begin with.

If approached in a way that encourages feedback from all students, empowerment efforts can provide valuable student insights that can potentially change some of the school structures that have created “roadblocks” for students (Reed & Bechtel, 1997). In addition to encouraging feedback from all students, it is also necessary to provide students with opportunities to make substantive contributions. Empowerment through the opportunity to make substantive contributions makes sense when considering the fact that a significant need is not being met when students do not have any power to influence their learning environment (Goldman & Newman, 1998). If the goal of schooling is to promote student success, then it will be necessary to help students become empowered so that they can contribute to a more satisfying learning environment (Goldman & Newman, 1998). Empowering students also has the potential to increase students’ commitment to the requirements of being a successful and productive student. Instead of simply complying with directives from above when adults are looking, students will be more willing to do what is expected of them when adults aren't looking (Goldman & Newman, 1998). Furthermore, students who are meaningfully involved in school restructuring are

less likely to drop out. Therefore, student involvement cannot only help to produce a more positive school climate, but it can help encourage more positive and productive student behaviors (Goldman & Newman, 1998).

Democracy

Efforts to empower program stakeholders, and students in particular, are especially crucial, not only due to their potential to increase the behaviors that will promote school success, but due to their potential to better prepare students to function in a democratic society. According to Hayes (1982), one major aspect of democracy is that groups have the opportunity to make collective decisions about their goals and ideals. Most schools only provide decision making authority to teachers and school administrators, however. Therefore, if schools want to prepare students to live in a democratic society, they will need to adopt more of a collaborative focus that encourages all stakeholders, including students, to provide input regarding the goals and ideals of the organization.

Involving students in establishing the direction and focus of the overall school organization not only provides a model of how to function in a democracy but increases the likelihood that, once the direction is implemented, it will be readily embraced (Eisner, 1988). Specifically, if students feel as though they are a genuine part of what is occurring within the school community, they will be more likely to accept responsibility for the school and their role within the larger community (Sergiovanni, 1994). Kraft (1996) supports this notion, indicating that when students feel cut off from what is going on in the school, they are more likely to become alienated, whereas if they have an opportunity to participate, they are more likely to develop a sense of responsibility. Therefore, when

students are encouraged to participate in the greater school community, they are given the message that they belong and are needed and are more likely to be committed to what is going on around them (Reed, 1998).

Similar to other efforts to increase student involvement in the larger school community, developing the types of supports necessary to promote such a role for students requires change in the way schools are currently organized (Reed, 1998). In order to establish more democratic school communities, new structures need to be established that foster meaningful student involvement. Teachers and administrators will also need to be committed to encouraging student involvement, not from just a select group of students but from all students. Providing students with the chance to be part of a democratic community is an involved process that requires major changes in the way schools facilitate student involvement. If these changes are implemented, however, they are likely to have far reaching implications for youth who need more opportunities to feel like valuable members of schools and of the greater society.

Multiculturalism

Even though improving school climate, empowering school communities, and creating democratic schools are critical aspects of school restructuring efforts, all of these efforts will fail unless schools substantially change the manner in which they approach multicultural education. According to Nieto (1994), “comprehensive, pervasive and non-racist” multicultural education will need to go beyond the traditional programs that focus on promoting “tolerance” and “cultural sensitivity” (p. 415). Nieto (1994) contends that simply focusing on things like tolerance and cultural sensitivity often result in only superficial changes because they fail to account for and substantially change the

“structural and institutional barriers that reflect and reproduce the power differential in society” (p. 416). Subsequently, Nieto (1994) recommends confronting individual biases, attitudes, and behaviors in an effort to change both the individuals and institutional structures that reflect these biases, attitudes, and behaviors. Therefore, one of the primary factors that will impact whether or not schools can successfully meet the needs of today’s diverse student population is the level of genuine faculty commitment to the learning of all students (Wasley, Hampel, & Clark, 1997).

One of the first steps school personnel will need to take in establishing the level of commitment necessary to effectively educate diverse groups of students is shifting the focus of reform from making changes that are primarily “technical” in nature to making changes that address underlying “moral and political” issues (Nieto, 1994). In particular, school personnel will need to go beyond simply adding new curriculum packages or changing instructional strategies, they must be willing to confront the underlying beliefs, attitudes, and biases that serve to repress and devalue different groups within the school (Nieto, 1994). Thus, school personnel will need to move beyond the traditional attempts to promote multicultural education by focusing on particular holidays or significant individuals, and will need to focus on making transforming educators' hearts and minds (Nieto, 1994).

Similar to other aspects of school reform, the success of multicultural education depends not only on what happens with school personnel, but with what is happening with students as well. According to Reed (1998), one of the best ways to increase everyone’s awareness of the school structures that maintain oppressive practices is to promote efforts that encourage everyone in the school community to listen to what each

other has to say. When educators have taken the time to solicit student input, they have been able to obtain valuable information about how to best empower diverse student groups. For example, the students in Nieto's (1994) study provided information about the positive impact of affirming their individual cultures and languages and the adverse impact of not affirming their individual cultures and languages. Overall, Nieto (1994) found that school personnel benefited significantly from the opportunity to learn about their students' families and experiences. Including student voices in efforts to improve multicultural education is an important consideration because it not only has serious implications for teachers but for students as well. If students are to become co-equal participants in school restructuring efforts, they will need to not only provide educators with information about how to improve multicultural education but will also need to have the opportunity to and be willing to address their own biases, behaviors, and attitudes.

Collaborative Action Research

Ongoing assessment is necessary to keep the restructuring process on target and to ensure that the goals related to establishing a school climate that emphasizes empowerment, democracy, and multicultural education are being achieved. Thus, school communities need regular feedback to determine if they are achieving their goals and to provide both internal and external validation of their efforts. Ongoing assessment is also an optimal way to provide information about whether the changes initiated are impacting various stakeholder groups in the manner anticipated and to guide subsequent changes and/or modifications in restructuring plans.

When assessing restructuring efforts, it is important to employ methods that are compatible with the overall goals of restructuring efforts. Some of the ways in which this

assessment can be achieved is by involving all program stakeholders in identifying the problems to be studied and the methods by which the problems will be studied (David, 1989a; Milstein, 1993). Efforts should also be made to devise ways to capture the complex nature of the changes that are being implemented (Darling-Hammond, 1993). Time frames for assessment will also need to be expanded when considering that most restructuring efforts can take years to come to fruition (David, 1989a). More specifically, Glickman (1992) points out the need to collect data that will reflect the impact of changes on all students and states that this goal can be achieved by “disaggregating” data according to race/ethnicity, gender, and grade. Glickman (1992) also states that “If teachers, students, and administrators are to have the information necessary for further decisions as they move toward goal attainment, the school needs to be a center of action research”(p. 26).

According to Jenkins (1994), what sets action research apart from other research approaches is that it enables program stakeholders to identify whether the actions they are taking are resulting in the desired consequences. Hayes and Horne, (1994) have the following to say about conducting action research in schools: “Such real world research arises from the lived experience of the participants, who share in the definition of the question for study, help formulate alternatives, and are fully engaged in the analysis and interpretation of findings” (p. 6). Therefore, action research can be a highly complex and involved undertaking because it relies on input from such large numbers of people (Calhoun, 1992). In spite of the challenges involved when including program stakeholders in assessment efforts, such methods are highly favored due to their potential to significantly influence daily practice, to respond to the unique circumstances of

individual school settings, and to adjust and adapt to the complexities involved in restructuring efforts.

Summary

Educational reforms have been implemented for years in an effort to improve schooling and to prepare students for the future. What has been learned from these efforts is that all program stakeholders should be provided with the opportunity to make significant contributions to the reform process. Reform should also be systemic and comprehensive, which can be achieved by developing school climates that value and promote multicultural education and are empowering and democratic. Obtaining student input, in particular, has been identified as a positive way to have an impact on reform initiatives (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a, 1995b; Lincoln, 1995; Nieto, 1994; Phelan, Davidson & Cao, 1992; Reed, 1998). Student input is important because it can provide unique insights and information that can contribute substantially to reform plans designed to restructure education to better meet student needs and to produce desired student outcomes.

Despite the recognition that student input can be very valuable, students have not been very involved in reform efforts. Due to her experience in Bechtel and Reed's (1998) project involving students in the reform process, one student enthusiastically advocated that all students in the school be involved in the reform process. Although Bechtel and Reed (1998) supported the student's idea, they had concerns about logistics. These concerns are shared by other researchers who would like to obtain student input regarding reform efforts but don't because they believe that including students would be too

difficult and too expensive and that changing teachers is the best way to change students (Corbett & Wilson, 1995a).

In addition to obtaining student input, it will also be important to determine the impact of restructuring efforts on students. Glickman (1992) states that one of best ways to determine the impact of restructuring efforts on all students is to disaggregate data according to race/ethnicity, gender, and grade. Although disaggregating data is important, it is also important to obtain student input over time. According to Corbett and Wilson (1995a), freshmen and seniors often have different views about their school. Longitudinal studies are also warranted because of the time span (3-10 years) that is often required for restructuring to take hold (Murphy & Hallinger, 1993).

Researchers have also recommended the use of consultants to help facilitate the restructuring process (Roy, 1995; Schmuck, 1995). Other researchers have found that counseling psychologists can make ideal consultants for school restructuring processes (Bernstein, Forrest, & Golston, 1994; Putnam, Peeke, & Narusis, 1993). Counseling psychologists have the potential to make substantial contributions to school restructuring efforts due to their knowledge and awareness regarding education, child development, systems, interpersonal relationships, and research.

The goal of the current study was to assess student involvement in the reform process by obtaining input from all students regarding their perceptions of and ideas about ways to improve school climate. As indicated, there have been several studies that have involved students in the reform process in a limited capacity (Bechtel & Reed, 1998; Goldman & Newman, 1998; Nieto, 1994; Soo Hoo, 1993), but none that have included all students. Another contribution of the current study is that it provides an

increased level of insight about student perspectives over time because student information was gathered over the course of six years and includes information about students' perspectives based on race/ethnicity, gender, and grade. Unlike most prior studies of educational reform, the current study also employs the use of a counseling psychologist to help facilitate the restructuring process. One advantage of using counseling psychologists is that they bring an understanding of the complex organizational, group, and individual dynamics involved in the change process to their work in schools. Furthermore, counseling psychologists' knowledge of evaluation, assessment, and child development make them ideal candidates to help with school reform efforts.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the research methods used in this study. Design of the study, participant and site characteristics, instrument development, and reliability and validity issues are described. Lastly, the chapter concludes with a description of data collection procedures and data analysis approaches.

Research Design

The purpose of the current study was to gain input from all students in the school regarding school climate and to determine how their perceptions vary according to gender, race/ethnicity, and grade. School climate was the primary focus of the study because creating an empowering and democratic school that responds to the demands of a diverse community is highly dependent on the overall culture of the school. It is believed that focusing on school climate would be the best way to assess the school's progress toward meeting the goals outlined in its vision statement. Another important aspect of efforts to evaluate school climate is assessing changes over time. The goal of such assessment is to provide program stakeholders with information about whether they are achieving their stated goals and to validate their efforts. Ongoing assessment also has the benefit of providing insights regarding necessary changes and/or modifications that need to be made in restructuring plans.

Specifically, a collaborative action research approach was used to assess the schools' efforts improve school climate. A collaborative action research approach was chosen because of the desire to perform an assessment that would measure the sites'

unique efforts to improve school climate. It was anticipated that a collaborative action research approach would increase the likelihood of helping program stakeholders identify whether their actions were resulting in desired consequences. In particular, it was hoped that a collaborative action research approach would increase the chances of creating the type of school climate desired and of obtaining the intended impact on students groups.

Additionally, it was hoped that by including all students, key information would be obtained about how school climate improvement efforts were regarded by the student body. Students played an important role in school improvement efforts because they were involved in the formation of the original vision statement, and they have a primary role in shaping the overall climate of the school. Furthermore, in the last few years of the school climate study, students were more actively involved in the empowerment process. Therefore, it was especially important to obtain their feedback about the impact of the empowerment process on them over time.

In order to obtain information about the students' views of their school's climate and to evaluate ongoing efforts to improve school climate, a case study method was employed. A case study method was chosen due to its potential to capture the uniqueness of the individual school and its climate as seen through the eyes of its stakeholders. Another reason for choosing the case study method was that it seemed to be the best approach for capturing the complex nature of the school restructuring process. The case study was also chosen due to its potential to provide both evaluative and descriptive information about school restructuring efforts and, thereby, inform assessment efforts. Thus, unlike most other types of research approaches, the case study has the benefit of

being able to fully capture the restructuring process and to adapt to and capture any changes that occur along the way.

The data obtained were analyzed to determine the answers to the following research hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis 1. There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for all respondents according to class standing.

Null Hypothesis 2. There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors

Null Hypothesis 3. There will be no changes in overall mean scores on the School Climate Survey for students from one year to the next based on gender and ethnicity.

The data were analyzed using an analysis of variance. An analysis of variance was chosen to help determine how students' views of school climate changed over the course of the project and how these views differed based on gender, ethnicity, and grade level. It is also important to note that because the data for individual respondents could not be linked from one year to the next, the statistical analyses conducted did not have as much statistical power.

Participants

The site for this study was a large, urban public high school located in a university town in the southeastern United States with a population of approximately 1100 students and about 100 faculty and staff. School personnel had previously sought out the faculty

of the counseling psychology program in a nearby university for the purpose of working collaboratively to restructure their school. In particular, the school was participating concurrently as one of nine schools selected to participate in a national study of the empowerment process called the Empowered School District Project (Greer & Short, 1988). The facilitator of the empowerment project at the school site is a professor of counseling psychology at the university, and the investigator was a doctoral student in the same program.

Because the unit of analysis in this study was organizational, efforts were made to assess the perceptions of all of the approximately 1,100 students enrolled in the school from one year to the next. The number of students participating in each administration of the survey ranges from 689 (in 1997) to 945 (in 1991). When considering all five administrations of the survey, the mean number of students participating was 852. All surveys were reviewed prior to inclusion in the analysis. Surveys containing incomplete responses, responses that exceeded the total number of questions on the survey, more than one response to a single question, or obviously invalid or incongruous responses (for example, one student indicated being in the 11th grade and also being a faculty member) were eliminated from further review. The break down of useable surveys for each year of administration by class standing, ethnicity, and gender are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Number of Useable Surveys by Year According to Class Standing

Year	Class				Total
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	
1991	224	197	196	160	777 (945)
1992	260	150	209	132	751 (841)
1993	235	182	156	185	758 (874)

Table 1 cont.

Number of Useable Surveys by Year According to Class Standing

Year	Class				Total
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	
1994	276	229	192	160	857 (911)
1997	147	131	133	122	533 (689)

Note. Numbers in parentheses refer to the total number of students completing the survey.

Table 2

Number of Useable Surveys by Year According to Gender and Ethnicity

Year	Gender		Ethnicity	
	Male	Female	African American	Caucasian
1991	310	467	370	407
1992	307	444	289	462
1993	290	468	311	447
1994	275	582	318	539
1997	206	327	231	302

Background

The Empowered School District Projected was initiated in 1988 as an extensive study of the empowerment process in nine schools around the nation. This three-year project was funded, in part, by the Danforth Foundation, and brought together teams of administrators, teachers, and external consultants. In February 1990, the facilitator and consultant for this portion of the original Danforth project, Richard L. Hayes of The University of Georgia, conducted a strategic planning retreat for the high school's administrative faculty. One outcome of the retreat was the development of a plan to study the school's design and culture in order to identify aspects of the school that needed improvement. Once areas for improvement were identified, members of the

administrative faculty sought additional suggestions for improvement from the rest of the faculty and students. These suggestions were discussed during weekly meetings with the administrative faculty (i.e., principal, assistant principal, department heads, directors) and the project facilitator. The project facilitator used the information obtained during the weekly meetings to develop a preliminary vision statement reflecting the values and beliefs of the entire school community. The preliminary vision statement was then modified through a series of discussions with the administrative faculty, the entire school administration, faculty, and student body. After engaging in this process for four months, a finalized statement of the school's vision was created in order to provide the context for developing new program strategies and to guide reform efforts (see Appendix A).

In an effort to facilitate feelings of empowerment among both faculty and students, task committees were established to increase student and faculty involvement in the school. The goal of the task committees was to give students and teachers increased responsibility for decision-making in order to expand their feelings of ownership for the school. The specific committees that were created dealt with the following school-wide issues: school beautification, stress management, and, of significance for the purposes of this study, improving student representation in decision-making.

In Spring 1991, school personnel wanted to assess their progress toward creating an empowered school whose operations reflected the goals and objectives outlined in their vision statement. To help the school with the assessment process, the project facilitator and a counseling psychology doctoral student employed a collaborative action research approach to help the school personnel develop a draft of a School Climate Survey that was based on the school's vision statement. Once the preliminary draft of the

questionnaire was completed, it was reviewed with the department heads and administrators at the school. Following discussions with faculty members and administrators at the school, the questionnaire was revised and subsequently administered to all members of the school community (see Appendix B).

The School Climate Survey was administered to all teachers, administrators, counselors, staff, and students from 1991 until 1995 and again in 1997. From 1991 to 1994 the results of the survey were then presented to the entire faculty and student and parent representatives at a year-end planning retreat. The retreat was also used to examine and analyze the results of the survey so that meaningful findings and recommendations could be presented to the group at large. The results from the survey were also used to guide planning for the following school year.

The results of the school climate survey were instrumental in planning many of the school reform initiatives designed to improve school climate. Some of these initiatives were designed to improve aspects of school climate for students, some for faculty and students, and others for faculty and administrators. During the 1991-1992 school year, for example, some of the changes that were initiated to help improve school climate for students were school-wide monthly assemblies, the designation of class sponsors who planned specific activities for each class, and the election of class officers. For the 1992-1993 school year, some of the initiatives included, Project Success, which was designed to promote the success of entering ninth graders who had been identified as at-risk, a peer mediation program, and Positive About Cedar Shoals, a program designed to actively involve students in shared decision making. Finally, a conflict management program was initiated during the 1994-1995 school year.

As indicated previously, there were also several initiatives designed to improve school climate for faculty and students. Some of the initiatives that were initiated during the 1991-1992 school year included a school beautification project, revisions of discipline guidelines to promote consistency and fairness, a student advisory council designed to improve communication between students and administrators, and a restructuring of the ninth grade program to help with the transition from middle school, registration for classes, orientation, and support services. During the 1992-1993 school year, community open forums were held where a panel of stakeholders, including students responded to questions from members of the school community, a survey was administered to obtain student input about classroom practices that might better address their needs, and a program to address problems with sexual harassment was initiated. For the 1993-1994 school year, the cultural diversity task force was established and a joint planning task force was created to increase parental, student, community, and staff involvement in planning and decision making activities.

Instrument

The School Climate Survey is a closed, fixed response questionnaire that was modified yearly (from 1991 to 1994) by members of the planning committee each year following an analysis of the results of the survey. The School Climate Survey is comprised of three sections. Originally, Part One included 33 items that represented portions of the nine complex sentences in the vision statement. In the first version of the survey (see Appendix B), Part Two consisted of demographic items: participant's role in the school, years spent in the school, gender, racial or cultural background, involvement in school-related projects, religious preference, marital status, employment status,

diploma pursued, academic class standing, and department or position. Part Two also asked respondents to rank their level of involvement in the various school projects designed to promote increased school involvement and that were presumed to lead to increased empowerment of teachers and/or students. In addition, they were asked to estimate the total amount of time spent in these activities since the beginning of the school year. Part Three of the School Climate Survey was comprised of open-ended statements that asked respondents to indicate what changes they observed in the school during the course of the year and what they thought contributed most to these changes. Respondents were also asked to indicate which aspects of school climate included in the survey were most in need of improvement.

The second year it was administered, several changes were made to the survey. Specifically, the role definitions in the demographic section were changed in the following manner: The administrator role was expanded to include directors and department heads. The counselor role was expanded to include social workers, the school nurse, and the school psychologist. The question about religious preferences was deleted from the demographic section and a question about marital status was added.

During the third year the survey was administered, seven items about school practice and governance were added to Part One. Additional changes were made based in response to a pilot study (Jones, 1992) conducted during the 1991-1992 school year. The study revealed that respondents who were more involved in school-related activities regardless of the activity, were more likely to agree with items on the survey. Therefore, the question asking in which specific activity respondents were involved was deleted. A

question asking respondents to indicate their level of involvement and the time they spent in school related activities was inserted in its place.

Several changes were made in the School Climate Survey in years four, five, and six. A question asking students about their level of involvement in making important decisions in the school in the areas of classroom procedures, school environment, extracurricular activities, and school policy and procedures was added. Another question asking teachers how their involvement in the empowerment process had affected their efforts to involve students in making decisions about instruction, budget and staffing decisions, school environment, and school policies and procedures was also added.

The School Climate Survey was administered to all members of the school community for six years from 1991 to 1995, and again in 1997. In 1993, 1994 and 1995 the study was also administered to a subgroup of parents. The survey included a cover letter that informed respondents that their answers would provide information about different groups' views of the school and would provide information to determine the difference between their vision of the school and its current state. Respondents were informed that participation in the study was completely voluntary and anonymous. The completed surveys were coded by number only for the purpose of identifying test sets and were not used to identify respondents in any way. Participants used number 2 pencils to mark their responses on an answer sheet that was later scored using an optical scanner.

Validity and Reliability

Four processes are frequently used to judge the quality of instrumentation: face validity, content validity, construct validity, and reliability. This section discusses these criteria as they apply to the survey instrument used in this study.

The researcher's subjective appraisal of the content the instrument is measuring is referred to as face validity (Leong & Austin, 1996). Face validity is assessed by asking whether the questions in the instrument are going to provide the information intended and about the instrument's utility (whether the length and format are appropriate). The current instrument was judged to have an adequate level of face validity because the questions included information that was directly related to the school's vision statement and because its length and format were reviewed by a representative sample of study participants prior to its administration to the larger population.

Content validity is defined as the degree to which an instrument clearly defines the domain under consideration, samples the types of things about which conclusions are to be drawn, and the precision with which sample items are operationalized into survey items (Leong & Austin, 1996). One way to assess content validity is to have experts in the area being surveyed evaluate the instrument. Because the instrument in the study was based on the vision developed by both school and university personnel and was created collaboratively using the same school and university personnel, it is logical to conclude that the instrument has high content validity. It is also important to note that the instrument was revised regularly using the same process to increase the level of clarity and domain appropriateness.

Construct validity relates to how effectively an instrument operationalizes the constructs of interest in the study. One method used to determine construct validity is the use of multiple measures. In this study, construct validity was strengthened through the use of multiple sources of data. Data sources included documentary data and archival records that originated from several sources including the school's administrative team,

the faculty members organized to address school-wide concerns related to the school restructuring process, various task forces created to implement school initiatives, and several collaborative networks established to promote the restructuring process.

Reliability was assessed to determine the degree to which all 33 items on the School Climate Survey measured the same construct. Combat's alpha reliabilities were .92 for the 1991 data, .92 for the 1992 data, .91 for the 1993 data, .92 for the 1994 and .93 for the 1997 data; therefore, the School Climate Survey demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency each time it was administered.

Procedure

Efforts were made to administer the School Climate Survey to everyone in the school each spring from 1991 to 1995 and in 1997. Students completed the survey in their English classes over the course of a week. Faculty and administrators completed the survey during an after school faculty meeting. The school's head secretary coordinated staff members' efforts to complete the surveys independently. Absent members, work-study students, and students in special programs (e.g., pregnant mothers, disciplinary students in the county alternative high school) were contacted individually to complete the survey. In 1993, 1994, and 1995 a subgroup of parents who were active in various parent volunteer initiatives in the school also responded to the survey.

Data Analysis

During the first year of this study, a pilot study (Jones, 1992) using the School Climate Survey was conducted. A factor analysis was performed on the data from the pilot study to determine if there were individual factors that emerged from the 33 items in Part One of the survey. The six factors that were generated by the analysis were poorly

defined and, therefore, deemed unsuitable for further data analysis. Because there were no redundancies in the different items (all the items in Part One of the survey), it was determined that the School Climate Survey held together as one unit, and, therefore, all subsequent analyses were based on the unit as a whole.

The results of the School Climate Survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Specifically, cumulative frequencies representing responses A (always true for me) and B (usually true for me) were calculated for different groups according to role, race, gender, and involvement in school-related activities. Because the School Climate Survey was revised in the final two years to include items related to involvement in school-related activities, statistics on involvement in school-related activities are only available for 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1997. Similarly, because there were items about instruction and shared governance added to Part One in the third year of the study, there is only data available on those items for 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1997. The results of the School Climate Survey were put into tables and presented to the faculty-at-large as well as a group of student and parent representatives during the school's year-end planning retreats. The results were used to guide the development of the school goals, objectives, and initiatives for the following school year.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The goal of this study was to determine the impact of school restructuring efforts on students' views of school climate. In order to assess the impact of school restructuring efforts on students, a school climate survey was created to measure students' views of school climate over a five-year period (Jones, 1997). The school climate survey was designed to obtain information regarding students' views about the school environment, racial understanding, the attractiveness and cleanliness of the school, communication, shared decision making, and instruction.

Once student responses to the school climate survey were obtained, they were translated into scores from 1 to 4, with higher scores indicating a more favorable view of the school's progress in the areas listed above. Given that the school climate survey included 33 questions with four answer choices, the range of possible scores on the school climate survey was from 33 to 132.

The specific hypotheses that were tested were as follows:

Null Hypothesis 1.

There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for all respondents according to class standing. _____

Null Hypothesis 2.

There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. _____

Null Hypothesis 3.

There will be no changes in overall mean scores on the School Climate Survey for students from one year to the next based on gender and ethnicity.

Findings Concerning Null Hypothesis 1

In order to determine the difference in student scores from one year to the next according to class standing, cumulative school climate survey scores were analyzed using a general linear model analysis of variance (ANOVA) R.A. Fisher's book (as cited in Glass & Hopkins, 1996). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Differences in Student Scores from 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	4.69	.005	<.0029*
Class	3	15.21	.016	<.0001*
Gender	1	16.97	.001	<.0001*
Ethnicity	1	3.87	.016	<.0494
Year*Class	9	4.97	.002	<.0001*
Year*Ethnicity	3	2.14	.005	<.0928
Class*Ethnicity	3	4.97	.003	<.0019*
Year*Class*Ethnicity	9	1.00	.002	<.4408
Year*Gender	3	1.60	.001	<.1874
Class*Gender	3	1.01	.010	<.3857
Year*Class*Gender	9	3.02	.001	<.0014*
Ethnicity*Gender	1	1.66	.001	<.1976
Year*Ethnicity*Gender	3	0.66	.001	<.5737
Class*Ethnicity*Gender	3	0.04	.000	<.9903
Class*Year*Ethnicity*Gender	9	0.97	.003	<.4597

Note. * p<.05.

As displayed in Table 3, results of the ANOVA indicate that there were significant differences between student scores from one year to the next according to class standing. Although these results were significant at the .05 level, there was a three-way interaction between year, class, and gender. In order to make interpretations regarding changes in scores from one year to the next according to class standing, it was necessary to look at individual cell means (see Table 4). Comparisons of individual cell means were calculated using t-tests and are presented in Table 5.

Table 4

Cell Means by Year and Class Standing

Year	Class	N	Mean
1991	Freshmen	224	77.99
	Sophomores	197	79.20
	Juniors	196	86.33
	<u>Seniors</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>87.37</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>777</u>	<u>82.33</u>
1992	Freshmen	260	80.15
	Sophomores	150	80.66
	Juniors	209	84.55
	<u>Seniors</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>87.29</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>751</u>	<u>82.73</u>
1993	Freshmen	235	83.16
	Sophomores	182	85.13
	Juniors	156	86.51
	<u>Seniors</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>87.50</u>

Table 4 cont.

Cell Means by Year and Class Standing

Year	Class	N	Mean
1993	Total	758	85.38
1994	Freshmen	276	85.00
	Sophomores	229	84.48
	Juniors	192	82.26
	Seniors	160	83.21
	Total	857	83.91

Table 5

Comparison of Cell Means by Year and Class Standing

Year Comparison	Scores			
	Freshmen	Sophomores	Juniors	Seniors
91-92	77.99-80.15	79.20-80.66	86.33-84.55	87.37-87.29
91-93	77.99-83.16*	79.20-85.13*	86.33-86.51	87.37-87.50
91-94	77.99-85.00*	79.20-84.48*	86.33-82.26*	87.37-83.21*
92-93	80.15-83.16*	80.66-85.13*	84.55-86.51	87.29-87.50
92-94	80.15-85.00*	80.66-84.48*	84.55-82.26	87.29-83.21
93-94	83.16-85.00*	85.13-84.48	86.51-82.26*	87.50-83.21*

Note. * $p < .05$.

As shown in Table 5, freshmen scores were significantly higher in 1994 and 1993 than in 1992 and 1991. There were no significant differences between freshmen scores in 1994 and 1993 and between freshmen scores in 1992 and 1991. The table also illustrates that similar to the freshmen, sophomore scores were significantly higher in 1994 and

1993 than in 1992 and 1991. Similar to the freshmen, there were no significant differences between sophomore scores in 1994 and 1993 and between sophomore scores in 1992 and 1991. Furthermore, when compared to junior scores in 1993 and 1991, junior scores in 1994 were significantly lower. Table 5 also shows that when compared to senior scores in 1993, 1992, and 1991 senior scores were significantly lower in 1994. Based on these results the null hypothesis was rejected.

Findings Concerning Null Hypothesis 2

To determine the difference in student scores according to class standing, cumulative school climate survey scores were analyzed using a general linear model analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

As displayed in Table 3, results of the ANOVA indicate that there were significant differences between student scores according to class standing. Although these results were significant at the .05 level, there was a three-way interaction between year, class, and gender. In order to make interpretations regarding changes in scores according to class standing, it was necessary to look at individual cell means. Individual cell means are be presented in Table 4. Comparisons of individual cell means were calculated using t-tests and are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Comparison of Cell Means by Class Standing

Class Comparison	Scores			
	1991	1992	1993	1994
Fr-Soph	77.99-79.20	80.15-80.66	83.16-85.13	85.00-84.48
Fr-Jr	77.99-86.33*	80.15-84.55*	83.16-86.51*	85.00-82.26
Fr-Sr	77.99-87.37*	80.15-87.29*	83.16-87.50*	85.00-83.21

Table 6 cont.

Comparison of Cell Means by Class Standing

Class Comparison	Scores			
	1991	1992	1993	1994
Soph-Jr	79.20-86.33*	80.66-84.55*	85.13-86.51	84.48-82.26
Soph-Sr	79.20-87.37*	80.66-87.29*	85.13-87.50	84.48-83.21
Jr-Sr	86.33-87.37	84.55-87.29	86.51-87.50	82.26-83.21

Note. * $p < .05$.

According to the results presented in Table 6, there were changes in scores for different grades across time. Table 6 illustrates that junior and senior scores were significantly higher than freshmen and sophomore scores in 1991. Table 6 also shows that similar to 1991, junior and senior scores in 1992 were significantly higher than freshman and sophomores. Additionally, Table 6 illustrates that junior and senior scores were significantly higher than freshmen scores in 1993, otherwise there were no significant differences between class scores. Table 6 also reveals that there were no significant differences between class scores in 1994. According to the data for all four years, the differences between student scores did decrease across time according to grouping, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected.

Findings Concerning Null Hypothesis 3

The results of the general linear model analysis of variance (ANOVA) presented in Table 3 were used for identifying the differences in student scores across time according to gender and ethnicity. As illustrated in Table 3, results of the ANOVA indicate that there were significant differences between student scores across time according to gender. Although these results were significant, there was a three-way interaction between year, class, and gender and a two-way interaction between class and

ethnicity. In order to make interpretations regarding changes in scores based on gender and ethnicity, it was necessary to compare individual cell means. Comparisons of individual cell means were calculated using t-tests and are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7

Comparison of Cell Means by Gender and Ethnicity

Year Comparison	Scores			
	Male	Female	African American	Caucasian
1991-1992	82.61-84.31	82.07-81.65	82.10-80.81	82.88-83.92
1991-1993	82.61-87.39*	82.07-83.97	82.10-82.88	82.88-87.04*
1991-1994	82.61-85.77*	82.07-82.89	82.10-83.55	82.88-84.03
1992-1993	84.31-87.39*	81.65-83.97*	80.81-82.88	83.92-87.04*
1992-1994	84.31-85.77	81.65-82.89	80.81-83.55*	83.92-84.03
1993-1994	87.39-85.77	83.97-82.89	82.88-83.55	87.04-84.03*

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 8

Differences in Cell Means According to Gender and Ethnicity

Year	Scores	
	Males vs. Females	African American vs. Caucasian
1991	82.61-82.07	82.10-82.88
1992	84.31-81.65*	80.81-83.92*
1993	87.39-83.97*	82.88-87.04*
1994	85.77-82.89*	83.55-84.03

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 7 shows that male student scores were significantly higher in 1993 than in 1991 and 1992 and that male scores were also significantly higher in 1993 than in 1992. Table 7 also illustrates that female scores were significantly higher in 1993 than in 1992,

otherwise there were no significant differences in female scores. According to Table 8, males' scores were significantly higher when compared to female scores from 1992, 1993, and 1994. Table 7 also indicates that African-American students' scores in 1994 were higher than African-American students in 1992, otherwise there were no significant differences in African-American students' scores. Additionally, Table 7 shows that Caucasian students' scores in 1993 were significantly higher than Caucasian students in 1991, 1992, and 1994. Finally, Table 8 illustrates that Caucasian students' scores were significantly higher than African-American students in 1992 and 1993; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Additional Analyses

Additional analyses were conducted to help identify trends contributing to the interaction effects that were found. In particular, analyses were conducted to identify the trends for student scores based on gender and ethnicity, and gender, ethnicity, year, and class combined. Analyses of Variance as well as Scheffe tests were conducted to identify trends in student scores based on gender and ethnicity (Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12), and gender, ethnicity, year, and class (Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17).

Table 9

Differences in Caucasian Female Scores for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	3.24	.011	<.0124*

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 10

Differences in African American Female Scores for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	0.81	.003	<.4886

Note. * p<.05.

Table 11

Differences in Caucasian Male Scores for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	3.37	.014	<.0182*

Note. * p<.05.

Table 12

Differences in African American Male Scores for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	2.77	.018	<.0413*

Note. * p<.05.

Table 13

Caucasian Female Scores by Class Standing for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	3.38	.015	<.0180*
Class	3	2.65	.009	<.0476
Year*Class	9	3.58	.035	<.0002*

Note. * p<.05.

Table 14

African American Female Scores by Class Standing for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	0.46	.002	<.7088
Class	3	9.24	.037	<.0001*
Year*Class	9	3.54	.042	<.0003*

Note. * p<.05.

Table 15

Caucasian Male Scores by Class Standing for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	3.74	.015	<.0110*
Class	3	1.43	.014	<.2316
Year*Class	9	2.09	.028	<.0281*

Note. * p<.05.

Table 16

African American Male Scores by Class Standing for 1991-1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Year	3	1.90	.013	<.1282
Class	3	6.85	.045	<.0002*
Year*Class	9	1.57	.031	<.1224

Note. * p<.05.

As displayed in Table 9, data suggest a statistically significant difference in Caucasian female scores from 1991-1994, however, the results of the Scheffe test that was conducted to identify where the differences in scores occur were not statistically significant. The results of the analysis of African American female scores shown in Table 10, indicates that there was not a statistically significant difference in African American female scores from 1991-1994. Regarding the data for Caucasian male scores illustrated in Table 11, a statistically significant

difference was found from 1991-1994, however, the results of the Scheffe test that was conducted to identify where the differences in scores occur were not statistically significant.

The data analysis of African American male scores displayed in Table 12 reveals a statistically significant difference in scores between 1991 and 1994, however, the results of the Scheffe test that was conducted to identify where the differences in scores occur were not statistically significant. Due to the lack of significant results from the Scheffe tests conducted to identify the differences in scores for Caucasian females, Caucasian males, and African American Males, the individual cell means for each are presented in Table 17.

Tables 13, 14, 15, and 16 indicate that there were differences according to year and class standing for all groups (Caucasian females, African American Females, Caucasian Males, and African American Males). Given the presence of the interaction between year and class (Table 3), however, it was necessary to look at individual cell means. Similarly, due to the interaction between year and class and between ethnicity, gender, year and class it was necessary to look at individual cell means when drawing conclusions about the relationship between the scores for Caucasian females, African American females, Caucasian males, and African American males. The individual cell means for year, gender, and ethnicity are presented in Table 17 and the individual cell means for class, gender and ethnicity are presented in Table 18.

Table 17

Cell Means According to Gender and Ethnicity

Year	Gender	Ethnicity	Mean
1991	Female	Caucasian	81.84
1992	Female	Caucasian	82.14
1993	Female	Caucasian	85.68

Table 17 cont.

Cell Means According to Gender and Ethnicity

Year	Gender	Ethnicity	Mean
1994	Female	Caucasian	82.61
1991	Female	African American	82.68
1992	Female	African American	80.54
1993	Female	African American	81.70
1994	Female	African American	82.40
1991	Male	Caucasian	84.08
1992	Male	Caucasian	85.80
1993	Male	Caucasian	88.80
1994	Male	Caucasian	85.87
1991	Male	African American	80.74
1992	Male	African American	81.63
1993	Male	African American	85.24
1994	Male	African American	85.18

Table 18

Cell Means According to Class Standing, Gender, and Ethnicity

Class	Gender	Ethnicity	Mean
Freshmen	Female	African American	78.87
Freshmen	Male	African American	79.77
Freshmen	Female	Caucasian	82.81
Freshmen	Male	Caucasian	85.23
Sophomore	Female	African American	80.04

Table 18 cont.

Cell Means According to Class Standing, Gender, and Ethnicity

Class	Gender	Ethnicity	Mean
Sophomore	Male	African American	84.71
Sophomore	Female	Caucasian	80.94
Sophomore	Male	Caucasian	84.53
Junior	Female	African American	84.97
Junior	Male	African American	85.84
Junior	Female	Caucasian	83.57
Junior	Male	Caucasian	86.00
Senior	Female	African American	82.40
Senior	Male	African American	85.79
Senior	Female	Caucasian	84.98
Senior	Male	Caucasian	88.09

In reviewing the individual cell means for Caucasian female scores presented in Table 17, it appears that Caucasian females scored higher in 1993, than in 1991, 1992, and 1994. Similarly, Caucasian males scored higher in 1993, than in 1991, 1992, and 1994 (Table 17). African American male scores illustrated in Table 17 indicate that African American males scored higher in 1993 and 1994 than in 1991 and 1992. The mean scores for students according to year, gender, and ethnicity, indicate that the scores for African American males showed the greatest change from 1991-1994 (Table 17). In 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994 when compared to African American males and females and Caucasian females, Caucasian males scored higher. The individual cell means listed in

Table 18 that compare student scores based on class standing, gender, and ethnicity reveal that, for freshmen, juniors and seniors, Caucasian males scored highest when compared to Caucasian females, African American males, and African American females.

Additional analyses were also conducted to identify the trends for individual classes across time (e.g., scores for the freshmen class of 1991 were compared to the scores for sophomores in 1992, juniors in 1993, and seniors of 1994). Class comparisons were conducted using t-tests (Table 19).

Table 19

Comparison of Means by Graduating Class

Class	Scores					
	Fr. vs. Soph.	Soph. vs. Jr.	Fr. vs. Jr.	Fr. vs.Sr.	Soph. vs. Sr.	Jr.vs.Sr.
1994	77.99-80.66*	80.66-86.51*	77.98-86.51*	77.98-83.20	80.66-83.21	86.51-83.21
1995	80.15-85.13*	85.13-82.26	80.15-82.26	missing	missing	missing
1996	83.16-84.48	missing	missing	missing	missing	missing
1997	missing	missing	missing	85.00-78.40*	missing	missing

Note. * p<.05.

According to the results presented in Table 19, scores became increasingly higher from freshman to junior year for the class of 1994 and then decreased senior year. The table also reveals that scores increased from freshman to sophomore year for the class of 1995. Interestingly, the table also indicates that for the class of 1997, climate survey scores were significantly higher during freshman year than senior year.

Overall Results

Freshmen and sophomores scored higher in 1993 and 1994 than in 1991 and 1992, indicating that scores were higher for later classes of freshmen and sophomores.

Juniors scored lower in 1994 than in 1993 and 1991 and seniors scored lower in 1994 than in 1991, 1992, or 1993 indicating that later classes of juniors and seniors viewed school climate less favorably than earlier ones. When comparing classes in any one year, it does appear that for 1991, 1992, and 1993, those who were a part of school improvement efforts for longer periods of time (juniors and seniors) scored higher than those who were a part of school improvement efforts for shorter periods of time. Similarly, when comparing classes it appears that students felt more favorably about school climate as freshmen and sophomores than they did as seniors. Regarding gender, males' evaluations of school climate were significantly higher than females in 1992, 1993, and 1994 indicating that differences based on gender did not decrease over time. Furthermore, Caucasian students' evaluations of school climate were significantly higher than African American students in 1992 and 1993 indicating that differences according to ethnicity did not decrease over time.

Comparisons based on class standing, gender, and ethnicity revealed that, for most years, Caucasian males' school climate scores were highest and African-American female scores were lowest, indicating that differences according to gender and ethnicity did not decrease over time. Regarding student scores based on class standing, gender, and ethnicity, once again Caucasian males' evaluations of school climate were highest and African-American female scores were lowest for freshmen and seniors. For sophomores, African American males' evaluations of school climate were highest and African American females scored lowest. For juniors, Caucasian males' evaluations of school climate were highest and Caucasian females scored lowest.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Preparing students to function in today's highly complex global society will require a reexamination of the current educational system (Cuban, 1990; Lunenburg, 1992; Reyes & Scribner, 1995; Sarason, 1990; Whitaker, 1993). To be optimally successful, the educational system will need to accommodate a culturally diverse population, different family and social structures, and a complex information structure and employment situation. Unlike prior attempts to reform education, which used mechanized and standardized approaches, preparing students to function in today's society calls for approaches that actively involve teachers and students in the reform process. In particular, Goodman (1995) notes that the preferred approach involves those closest to the daily operations of the school. Because of its emphasis on the quality of the experience teachers and students have with one another, this approach increases the likelihood of producing substantive change.

Involving those closest to the daily operations of the school can be highly beneficial to educational reform because it empowers program stakeholders. Empowerment is particularly important to the reform process because the more program stakeholders are empowered, the more they are likely to produce meaningful change (Hansen, 1989). Although empowerment is a key component of the reform process, most of the research on stakeholder empowerment has focused on teachers. Specific findings about teacher empowerment reveal that those who benefit most from empowerment are those who have an opportunity to provide input into various aspects of schooling (Smylie,

1994). If participation is an important component of empowerment for teachers, it may also be a key factor in empowering students. Therefore, it is possible that the best way to empower students is to provide them with increased opportunities to participate in shaping their schooling experience.

An optimal way to involve students in the reform process is to obtain their feedback regarding reform efforts. In the current study, student feedback was used to determine how students viewed various aspects of school climate, which were intended by reformers to be artifacts of the change process. Given that the overall student population was comprised of many different subgroups, the aim of this study was to identify differences and similarities in students' views according to gender, ethnicity, and grade level. It was anticipated that assessing school climate by subgroups of students within the school would provide more specific information about the extent to which intended reforms had been successful in meeting student needs. This study also assessed student responses over time in an attempt to provide information about antecedents to change and cumulative effects of the change process.

Students' perceptions of the effects of school restructuring were obtained by means of a written survey of all students regarding school climate. Students' views of school climate were assessed using a school climate survey (Jones, 1997). This survey was created by a team of school personnel and university researchers to assess the progress of the school community in creating an empowered school whose operations reflected the goals and objectives outlined in the school's vision statement. In addition to assessing overall school climate, the survey also included questions about communication, shared governance, and instruction.

Discussion of Research Findings

The goal of the present study was to answer three hypotheses designed to assess changes in students' views of school climate. The first hypothesis assessed yearly changes in students' views of school climate based on class standing. The second hypothesis examined differences in students' views of school climate based on grade level. Finally, the third hypothesis addressed differences in students' views of school climate according to gender and ethnicity. In addition to discussing the findings, implications for schools involved in restructuring, limitations of the study, and recommendations for further research will be provided.

Hypothesis One

There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for all respondents according to class standing.

The first research hypothesis was designed to evaluate changes in students' overall assessment of reform efforts in meeting intended conditions based on a comparison of the results of the climate survey from year to year and grade by grade. According to the analysis of student scores on the school climate survey, freshmen and sophomores in 1993 and 1994 reported that the school was a more empowering place than had the freshmen and sophomores who responded to the survey in 1991 and 1992. Conversely, when compared to juniors reporting in 1991 and 1993, juniors in 1994 reported that they did not believe that school climate improved. Similarly, seniors responding in 1994 did not report that school climate had improved when compared to seniors who responded in 1993, 1992, and 1991. Based on these findings, it appears that after two years of reform, those who were newer to the school (freshmen and

sophomores) felt that the school was a better more empowering place, whereas, those who has been in the school longer (juniors and seniors) viewed the school as a less empowering place over time.

One possible explanation for these results is that school reform efforts were more responsive to the needs of sophomores and freshmen than to juniors and seniors. For example, whereas freshmen and sophomores are likely to be more focused on finding their places in the high school, juniors and seniors are likely more focused on their plans after high school (Lusky & Hayes, 2001). Although many new programs for students were initiated during the school reform process, freshmen were the only ones who had programs tailored specifically to their needs. It may also be that the scores of juniors and seniors did not improve as much over the same period because their initial scores were so high to begin with. One possible explanation for the trends of scores based on class standing is that the change scores for all classes regressed towards the mean. Therefore, while juniors and seniors felt the school was a good place to begin with, freshmen and sophomores began to view the school as a better place as the reform process progressed.

The different trends for juniors and seniors versus sophomores and freshmen might also be related to level of involvement in school-related activities. According to the previous study by Jones (1997), those respondents who were more actively involved in the school outside of purely academic activities, felt more positively about school climate. According to the data regarding level of involvement in school-related activities (see Appendix C), as school reform efforts progressed, freshmen and sophomore involvement became equal to juniors and seniors who were more involved initially.

Hypothesis Two

There will be no changes in the overall mean score on the School Climate Survey from one year to the next for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors

The second question was intended to identify whether there were differences in students' perceptions of school climate, according to class standing, within the same calendar year. Based on an analysis of students' responses to the school climate survey, it appears that juniors and seniors responding in 1991 and 1992 felt that the school was a better, more empowering place than freshmen and sophomores responding in the same year. Additionally, juniors and seniors responding to the survey in 1993 viewed school climate more favorably than freshmen responding in the same year. Finally, students from all grades who responded in 1994 viewed school climate similar to one another.

The findings for 1991, 1992, and 1993 suggest that those who were a part of the school longer responded more favorably when compared to those who had been a part of the school for a shorter period of time. The findings for 1994, however, suggest that as school improvement efforts progressed, students from all classes began to perceive school climate similarly. Therefore, it appears that efforts to improve school climate had the most positive and a more cumulative effect on those students who were freshmen and sophomores when reform efforts began and that differential effects between classes were washed out over time. The trends for student responses regarding school climate seem to support the conclusion that new students were impacted more heavily by changes than older students. In other words freshmen and sophomores began to view the school as a better place over time, although students from all grades viewed the school similarly in the end. One conclusion that can be made based on these results is that it doesn't matter

what grade you are in during the reform process because eventually all students can see the results of change. These findings support the idea that changes in students scores are more likely to be due to reform efforts than developmental differences because over time students from all classes began to view school climate equally positively.

Hypothesis Three

There will be no changes in overall mean scores on the School Climate Survey for students from one year to the next based on gender and ethnicity.

The third hypothesis was intended to determine the differences in students' views of school climate according to gender and ethnicity. Unlike the prior analyses, which looked at each grade separately, this one combined scores across grades. According to the analyses of student responses, male students reported that the school was a better, more empowering place over time than females did. The analyses also revealed that on average all of the females in the school responded that the school was a better, more empowering place in 1993 than it was believed to be by those females who had responded in 1992. Additionally, on average males reported more positive views of school climate when compared to the average for females responding in 1992, 1993, and 1994. The results also revealed that, when compared to African American students responding in 1992, African American students responding in 1994 reported more favorable views of school climate. By comparison, Caucasian students responding to the survey viewed school climate most favorably in 1993. The analysis of the differences between students' responses by race revealed that, when compared to African American respondents, Caucasian respondents felt the school was a better, more empowering place in 1992 and 1993.

If efforts to improve school climate were successful, it makes sense that later results showed more favorable responses. Moreover, if school climate continued to improve as time went on, then the results for 1994 should have been the most favorable. Additionally, because male respondents reported significantly greater improvement in school climate when compared to females responding in 1992, 1993, and 1994, it appears that efforts to improve school climate were more successful for male students than for female students. A logical conclusion might be that males responded more favorably because they were more involved in the school; however, when reviewing the data (see Appendix C) regarding involvement in school activities, this was not the case. According to the data, males and females appear to be equally involved in school activities and when there were differences for a few of the years, females were actually more involved than males. One possible explanation for these results is that, although males were either equally involved or less involved than females, because the activities in which they were involved were more central to the school (e.g. football, school governance), they felt more empowered (Soderberg, 1997). Whether empowerment leads to greater involvement due to a greater sense of self-efficacy and past experience with success (Soderberg, 1997), or whether increased involvement leads to greater levels of empowerment (Hayes & Lunsford, 1994) remains a question for further research. Moreover, it is possible that the differences in student responses reflected gender differences in the quality, and not merely the quantity, of their involvement in the school. For example, during the course of the school reform project, school personnel implemented sexual harassment training to address the concerns of female students about being harassed by their male peers (Hayes & Horne, 1994). It is understandable that if

female students were being harassed, they would view school climate less favorably than male students prior to implementing sexual harassment training. Moreover, the year that females scored the highest on the school climate survey was the year that the sexual harassment training was implemented.

Analyses of the school climate responses of African American students support the notion that school reform efforts were more successful over time for this group than for Caucasian students. Conversely, the responses of Caucasian students indicate that initially school reform efforts were perceived increasingly favorably. That perception became less favorable over time, however, returning to earlier levels. Part of the explanation for the downward shift in the responses of Caucasian students may be that their evaluations were exceptionally favorable during the third year of the school improvement project, leaving little room for an increase in overall response scores. During the second and third year of the school reform project, Caucasian students' views of school climate were more favorable than those of African American students. During the fourth year of the school reform project, however, Caucasian and African American students' views of school climate were the same. The comparison of African American students' responses and Caucasian students' responses, therefore, indicate that school reform efforts were perceived more favorably by Caucasian students initially, but that any difference in overall scores by race disappeared over time. Based on this analysis, it is clear that reform efforts to improve school climate were effective in achieving the intended changes and they had the greatest impact on African American and male students. It is possible that one of the reasons that reforms had such an impact on African American students was due to the cultural diversity initiative. When reviewing the scores

for African American students it appears that they peaked the same year that the cultural diversity initiatives were put into place.

Additional Analyses

The analysis of scores based on gender and ethnicity combined revealed that Caucasian males and females viewed school climate more favorably during the third year of school reform efforts. One possible explanation for the less favorable views of Caucasian males and females during the last year of the project is that, as the project progressed, these students lost interest. Research on school reform conducted by Fullan (1993) supports this notion, indicating that one of the major obstacles to sustaining school reform is that those involved often tend to lose interest over time due to the slow pace with which changes often occur. The responses by African American males revealed an upward trend throughout the school improvement process. The response by African American females, by comparison, stayed the same across time, suggesting that school reform efforts had a much more positive impact on African American males than they did on African American females. When reviewing all of the responses based on gender and ethnicity combined, it appears that the intervention was most successful in both changing the initial perceptions of school climate for African American males and least successful for Caucasian and African American females. Given that females and African American females in particular, are members of traditionally oppressed groups, it is likely that if there had been an intervention to empower these groups prior to the intervention to improve school climate, they would have responded more favorably to school reform efforts. The comparison of student responses based on gender, ethnicity, and class standing combined revealed that Caucasian males responded more positively than did

African American males, African American females, and Caucasian females during their freshman, junior, and senior years. Overall, the findings for gender and ethnicity combined suggest that efforts to improve school climate were most successful for males, regardless of ethnicity, suggesting that males viewed the school more similarly to the vision statement than did females.

The final analysis compared scores for individual cohorts across time. Due to missing data, the most informative analyses were those for the class of 1994 and for the class of 1997. For the class of 1994, freshmen reported that the school climate improved from freshman to junior year, whereas for the class of 1997, seniors' reported that the school was farther from reaching its vision than they had reported as freshmen. Based on these analyses, it appears that when compared to students who were in the school when school restructuring began, those who entered the school at a later time perceived school climate less favorably over time. Therefore, it appears that those who were in the school when reform efforts began felt the school was a better place across time, unlike those who joined the school when many reforms were already in place, whose views of school climate declined across time. It is possible that students who became involved later in the process came to view school improvement efforts less favorably overtime because they expected the school to continue to change even more than it had already and prior to their involvement. What students who become a part of the school at a later point in time appear to be saying is that even though they initially see the school in the same way as those involved in earlier reform, they want to see more changes. In effect, unless reform continues by involving students in new reforms, the school might be a better place but students don't feel that the vision is being realized (Fullan, 1993).

Conclusions

Not surprisingly, the effects of efforts to improve school climate were perceived more favorably by some students some of the time. In other words, students seemed to believe that the school had shown the greatest improvement in realizing its stated vision when they were freshmen and sophomores, as evidenced by the steady increase in school climate scores for freshmen and sophomore classes over time. Additionally, when broken down according to class standing and gender, the average score for all student groupings showed a steady improvement from freshmen to senior year. When broken down according to cohort, the class of 1994's scores increased over time while the class of 1997's scores decreased from freshman to senior year. The comparison of absolute scores for the class of 1994 and 1997 (this comparison was based on freshman and senior scores only due to missing data) revealed that freshmen from the class of 1997 viewed school climate more favorably than freshmen from the class of 1994 and seniors from the class of 1994 viewed school climate more favorably than seniors from the class of 1997. Furthermore, there were varying patterns based on gender and ethnicity with males reporting higher levels of agreement with the vision statement over time than females and with the initial differences in overall agreement with the vision statement between African American and Caucasian students disappearing over time.

There are several conclusions that can be made based on these data. The trends of scores according to gender and ethnicity combined are supported by the literature that states that it takes time for reform efforts to make an impact (Fullan, 1993; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Another conclusion that can be made based on the data for gender and cohorts is that it is necessary to plan for student differences when designing and

implementing school reform efforts. The fact that males viewed the school as significantly much closer to realizing its vision for school climate than females did, and the fact that the members of the class of 1994 viewed the school as closer to realizing its vision than did members of the class of 1997 support the notion that one intervention may not meet the needs of everyone all the time. To be optimally successful, it may be necessary for school reform efforts to include different interventions for different groups of students at different points in time. For example, during the course of the school reform project, the school was more concerned about males than females due to the larger proportion of male dropouts (Hayes, Nelson, Lusky, Pearson, & Worthy, in press). It is highly possible that the increased focus on male students contributed to their more favorable evaluations of school climate, especially early in the process and as experienced by members of the class of '97, who were the target of these interventions later in the process. The timing of interventions may have also contributed to the difference in trajectories for male and female students. The intervention for at-risk students targeting males was initiated during the 1991-1992 school year and the sexual harassment intervention targeting females was conducted during the 1993-1994 school year. It is possible that because the intervention for at-risk students occurred earlier, it had more of an impact across time.

The data support the idea that any conclusion about the success of the intervention depends on the manner in which the data are analyzed. For example, when looking at change scores across time for African American females or for the cohort of 1997, it could be concluded that school reform efforts were not successful based on the decline in mean scores on the School Climate Survey across time. When looking at the data for the

cohort of 1994, freshmen and sophomores, African American males, and Caucasian males and females, it can be concluded that school reform efforts were successful based on the increase in mean scores on the School Climate Survey across time. What these results do suggest is that progress is elusive, that reform efforts must be ongoing, and that new students need continuously to be introduced to reform efforts and that veteran students must continue to be involved along the way. It appears that full-scale school reform was approached initially by efforts targeted at raising the overall level of school climate but having attained it, school personnel shifted their efforts to targeted reforms, losing sight of the need to continue to involve a wide array of students in their own reform efforts.

As indicated, one of the overriding themes that emerges when reviewing the data is that different student groups view school climate differently at different times. Based on this finding, it can be concluded that what is empowering for one student may not be empowering for another. It is also highly likely that empowerment is a highly individualized experience that depends as much on individual power as collective power. Although improving school climate may help to create some of the conditions necessary for empowerment, success is ultimately up to the individual. If enhancing student empowerment and the success of school reform efforts are dependent, at least in some substantial measure, on the inclusion of individuals in school reform, it makes sense that, similar to teachers (Jones, 1997), students need to be active participants in reform efforts. It is simply not enough to empower teachers; students too must be actively involved as important participants in the change process.

Some additional insights about the impact of school reform efforts on students can be gleaned from the information about the schools' efforts to prevent dropouts. As mentioned previously, females reported lower levels of agreement on the climate survey yet they were more successful in graduating. It is possible that this discrepancy is related to the higher dropout rates of male students (Hayes et al., in press). If it is assumed that the males who dropped out were the ones who were less satisfied with the school, then it makes sense that the males who were left in the school viewed school climate more positively. The discrepancy also might be due to the fact that males dropout at higher rates than females, supporting the notion that the school is actually becoming a less empowering place for males over time. Another possibility is that school reform efforts would have been equally empowering for all males if given an opportunity to fully participate in reform efforts. According to the study by Hayes et al. (in press) most students tend to drop out during the first 3 semesters of school. Understandably students who dropout early in the school year would not have a chance to benefit fully from school reform efforts that span the entire school year.

When considering the trends for dropouts it is important to note that the results of the school climate survey may have been quite different if the students who dropped out had participated. If the students who dropped out had participated in the survey it would be possible to more fully assess the views of males and African American males, in particular. Had the students who had dropped out of the school (and, necessarily out of the sample) been retained in school, it is difficult to determine how their answers may have contributed to the overall scores for each class from one year to the next. Recognizing that their retention would likely have meant that their experience in the

school had been different, it is difficult to assess what their contribution to the changes would have actually been. Alternatively, assessing those students who actually dropped out (were that even possible under the circumstances) would have complicated any interpretation of the results given that by definition they had not participated in many or possibly any of the intended reforms. Given that most students dropout either freshmen or sophomore year, it is also likely that the scores for freshmen and sophomores would have been most likely to have been affected by their participation.

Another conclusion that can be made when considering the results from this study and the retention study simultaneously is that in general, survey scores may be of limited use in assessing the success of reform efforts. As indicated, although male respondents viewed the school as closer to realizing its vision, males also were graduating at a disproportionately lower rate. In effect, future dropouts were being deselected from the overall population of both males and African Americans available to respond to later surveys. Ironically, these results suggest that just because students feel positively about the school climate, they will not necessarily benefit to the fullest extent from school reform efforts. Moreover, those who remain in school and (presumably) benefit from reform efforts may be among the most critical. Corollary evidence on graduate education, suggests that academically more qualified, socially more aware, and interpersonally more competent students are also more critical of instruction (Weitzman-Swain, 1995). Although extremely speculative, it may be that one of the consequences of student empowerment is increased dissatisfaction with present institutional conditions. Alternatively, continued disempowerment may result in the removal of the least

empowered from further participation in the system, and create increased satisfaction when sampling the impressions of those who remain.

Recommendations for Practice

Recognizing that student subgroups responded differently to school reform efforts, the first recommendation is that reform efforts need to focus on the specialized needs of different student groups. The fact that students responded differently according to gender and race suggests that to achieve the optimal level of success, reformers need to attend to the unique needs of different student groups when planning and implementing school reform efforts. Not only would it be beneficial to tailor specific interventions to specific subgroups, but it is also important that the interventions be changed as student needs change.

Given that different student groups have different needs, it is important to involve students from a variety of groups in the planning and implementation of school reform efforts. Involvement can take a variety of forms, including assistance in developing a school wide vision, creating survey instruments, and participation in ongoing assessment and intervention activities. One of the keys to student involvement is to provide students with opportunities to participate in reform efforts in larger and smaller groups. Giving students the opportunity to participate in different size groups helps to ensure that all students have a chance to participate and increases the likelihood that different voices will be heard. Furthermore, student participation should be ongoing, unlike in the current study where later students were recipients of a vision created at a much earlier point in time.

Additionally, if school restructuring efforts are going to have an impact on students, it will also be necessary for “bottom up” approaches to reach all the way down into the system to include students. Similar to the adults in the school, students can also benefit from reform efforts that provide them with ample opportunities, power, and resources to help effect change. One way to acknowledge the importance of student input is to include them in meetings involving personnel from all levels in the district. Students should be included in as many facets of the decision making process as possible and as developmentally appropriate. Similar to adults, students have negative reactions when efforts to include them are either piecemeal or superficial or if they are not fully informed about changes that are likely to affect their lives in the school. If true empowerment is to occur, the involvement of students will need to be taken just as seriously as that of other major program stakeholders.

One way to involve students from the “bottom up” is to base reforms on student concerns instead of teacher concerns, unlike in this study where reforms were teacher driven. Basing reforms on student concerns would also necessitate a different approach to the change process. Instead of focusing on organizational issues, reforms might take on more of a classroom based focus. Furthermore, reforms might be designed to meet the needs of groups of students or even individual students. Determining what issues to address could also be done by simply asking students what their concerns are and then prioritizing their concerns based on perceived urgency and/or expressed need. Alternatively, these concerns might then be addressed based on grouping students with similar needs rather than designating reforms based on student characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, or class standing.

Generalizability

The process used in this study is highly generalizable to other schools, whereas the content is unique to this particular school. The process that included a collaborative action research approach is highly generalizable to other schools interested in including students in the restructuring process. Much can be learned from the approach used in this study because it involved working with program stakeholders to identify their vision of an empowered school and subsequently developing an instrument to assess their progress toward realizing that vision. Instead of imposing a preset agenda on the school, program stakeholders were collaborators in the process of creating an intervention that would meet the unique needs of their individual school. Too often schools are forced to adapt standardized procedures because they have been shown to work in other locations or because they will save time and money. Using an approach that met the needs of this particular school was especially crucial given the unique make up of the student body.

Obviously the portion of the study that cannot be generalized is the portion relating to the specific content. As a part of the school reform process, the program stakeholders created a vision statement and subsequently a school climate survey to assess changes in the school's efforts to realize the ideals embodied in their vision for an empowered school. Although the vision statement and survey were appropriate for this school, it is highly unlikely that they would be appropriate in their exact form for any other school. Even for this specific school, it was necessary for the survey and school reform activities to change as the school changed over time. It is also important to note that both the content and the process would look very different for students in a middle school or elementary school. Due to developmental differences, the nature of middle

school and elementary students involvement in school reform efforts will take a form distinct from that of high school students. Specifically, survey instruments for middle and elementary school students should use developmentally appropriate language and even possibly symbols like smiley faces. Middle school and elementary school students would also likely need more direction and structure from adult stakeholders. Moreover, the specific elements of empowerment to be found in the resulting vision should realistically reflect both the developmental realities and the developmental aspirations appropriate to students in different grade levels.

Limitations

A primary limitation of this study is that student responses were restricted by the instrument. Although the survey was created to reflect the uniqueness of the school, the closed-ended nature of the survey questions that were analyzed naturally limited the amount of and type of information that could be gathered. If the open-ended responses from the survey would have been included in the analyses it would have been possible to get more specific ideas about which aspects of school climate were viewed more positively by different student subgroups. Alternatively, a more open format doesn't lend itself to clear comparisons from one respondent or from one respondent group to another.

It is also important to note that despite the statistical significance of many of the findings, the practical significance of these findings is limited. For example, even though males' scores on the school climate survey were significantly higher than females in 1992, the real difference in their scores was only 3 points, suggesting no real difference in their overall reports on the survey. When interpreting the findings for within and

between group differences, therefore, the actual point differences should be taken into account.

Another limitation of the current study is that student involvement in the reform effort itself was limited. For example, only small groups of students were involved in the planning stages of reform efforts, although all students were initially involved in reviewing and revising the vision statement that guided reform efforts. Nonetheless, fewer and fewer students were involved directly in implementing reform over time and as noted above, those entering the school later in the process were least involved in determining the course of reform initiatives. In order to get a better idea of the impact of student involvement on school restructuring, students should be involved in greater numbers and over the full period of reform activities.

Finally, when linking the results of the current study with the retention study (Hayes et al., in press), it appears ironic that those who felt most empowered initially did not graduate in as high numbers as those who felt less empowered. Taken together, the results of both studies suggest a complex relationship between the school's vision and its written statement, and reform initiatives based on the vision statement. How making the school a more empowering place for teachers and students, for instance, might be related to increasing graduation rates remains unclear. What is clear is that the current study could have been improved if the retention study data, as well as other data regarding the preparation of students for today's society, had been gathered in a form that lent itself to ready comparison across student groups to the data generated by the climate survey.

Recommendations for Further Research

Studies of this type should be undertaken in different schools with different student groups to further identify trends and to gain insights into the benefits of involving students in the restructuring process. Another recommendation is that the qualitative data obtained from the climate survey be included in the analysis to pinpoint specific ways to meet the needs of different student groups. Analyzing the individual survey questions would have also provided more specific information about the needs of different student groups. Assessing the importance of attending to the needs of different student groups could also be achieved by comparing student reactions to school restructuring efforts in a school that includes specific interventions for all student subgroups.

It is also likely that using different methods to gather student data, increasing student involvement in restructuring efforts, and tailoring restructuring efforts to the unique needs of different student groups may require a reconceptualization of school reform from a student perspective. In the present study, teachers initiated the changes that occurred in the school. It is possible that if students had initiated the changes, there would have been a greater focus on changing individual classroom functioning than on changing school climate. For example, Sabo (1995), notes that when assessing student satisfaction, it is more important to look at individual classroom dynamics than at overall school functioning. Similarly, other researchers have advocated for the need to ask about mental health, self-concept, behavior, and achievement when assessing students' perceptions of school functioning (Haynes, Emmons, & Ben-Avie, 1997). Taking these findings into account, , action research on students' perceptions of changes in school climate might best start with the students. Instead of focusing on teacher initiated reforms, action

research should begin by asking students about their most pressing concerns and focus reform efforts on addressing those concerns directly.

Additional research also needs to be done to promote a better understanding of the trajectories of students' reactions to school reform over time. The specific reason for the different perceptions of divergent student groups is another issue that should be studied. For example, in the present study, student assessment of the school's efforts to realize its vision increased over time for the graduating class of 1994 while it decreased over time for the graduating class of 1997. Further research can be done to determine why some interventions (e.g., student retention or sexual harassment) were successful with one group at one point in time and were less successful with another group at another point in time. Similarly, further research might help to elucidate the rationale for the differences between the scores of freshmen and sophomores and those of juniors and seniors, whose assessment of the school climate was generally significantly higher.

Final Summary

Educational reform is an ongoing process that has seen many incarnations over the past four decades. Initially beginning as a top down process dictated by individuals far removed from the school site, then shifting to a bottom up process dictated largely by school personnel, to a process that has become both top down and bottom up. Despite the number of years and the number of evolutions in the reform process, questions remain unanswered about the success of educational reform efforts. Additionally, when success has been found, it has been based primarily on feedback from teachers or other school personnel. The current study included student feedback on the intended outcome of

school-wide reform in an attempt to determine its effectiveness in changing school climate.

The findings from this study illustrate that students can provide valuable feedback about the reform process. The data also demonstrate that school reform efforts have varying effects on students according to differences in gender, ethnicity, length of experience with the intervention, and class standing. Clearly, efforts to assess the effectiveness of school reforms must be based on more than teacher feedback alone. School reform efforts should be school-wide and individualized to address the unique needs of different student groups. Ultimately school restructuring is a complex issue that demands comprehensive and sustained efforts to maximize its impact in creating schools that are empowering for every one.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 52*, 368-420.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Bros.
- Bernstein, B. L., Forrest, L., & Golston, S. S. (1994). Current practices of counseling psychology faculty in K-12 schools: A national survey. *The Counseling Psychologist, 22*, 611-627.
- Bernstein, B. L., Golston, S., & Forrest, L. (1992, April). *Current practices of counseling psychologists in the schools: Reporting on a national survey*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Berry, G. L. (1993). Psychological services providers, the opportunity to learn, and inter-city students: Beyond mere curricular reform. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*, 355-361.
- Bolin, F. S. (1989). Empowering leadership. *Teachers College Record, 91*, 81-96.
- Butler, D. (1995). *Improving school learning environments: A resource manual of knowledge and strategies*. Memphis, TN: Memphis University Center for Research in Educational Policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED386787)

- Calhoun, E. (1992). *A status report on action research in the league of professional schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Cawelti, G. (1995). The missing focus of high school restructuring. *School Administrator*, 52, 12-16.
- Carr, A. A. (1997). Leadership and community participation: Four case studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12, 152-168.
- Cohen, D. K. (1988). *Teaching Practice: Plus ca change* (Issue paper 88-3). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.
- Conley, D. T. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Educators adapt to a changing world*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. (ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management No. EZ022625)
- Conway, J. (1984). The myth, mystery, and mastery of participative decision-making in education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20, 41-68.
- Corcoran, T. B., Walker, L. J., & White, J. L. (1988). *Working in urban schools*. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (1995). Make a difference with, not for students: A plea to researchers and reformers. *Educational Researcher*, 24, 12-17.
- Corbett, D., & Wilson, B. (1995). *Restructuring for student success*. Philadelphia: PA: Research for Better Schools (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED387883)

- Cotton, K. (1992). *School-based management*. (School Improvement Research series, Topical Synthesis No. 6). Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 3-13.
- Cuban, L. (1998). How schools change reforms: Redefining reform success and failure. *Teachers College Record*, 99, 453-477.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). Accountability and teacher professionalism. *American Educator*, 12, 38-43.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing the capacity for school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74, 753-761.
- David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 46, 45-53.
- David, J. L. (with S. Purkey & P. White). (1989). *Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering district*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association.
- Dietrich, A. P., & Bailey, E. L. (1996). School climate: common-sense solutions to complicated problems. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80, 16-25.
- Eisner, E. W. (1988). The ecology of school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 45, 24-29.
- Elam, S. (1990). The 22nd annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 41-55.
- Firestone, W. A., & Pennell, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 489-525.

- Forrest, L., Putnam, J., Narusis, E. M., & Peeke, P. (1993). *Win/Win restructuring: Counseling psychology collaboration with teacher education in Professional Development Schools*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370889)
- Fullan, M. (with S. Stiegelbauer). (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M., & Miles, M. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73, 745-752.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D. (1990). Pushing school reform to a new edge: The seven ironies of school empowerment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 68-75.
- Glickman, C. D. (1992). The essence of school renewal: The prose has begun. *Educational Leadership*, 49, 24-27.
- Glickman, C. D. (1993). Restructuring policy for America's schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76, 87-97.
- Glickman, C. D., Hayes, R., & Hensley, F. (1992). Site-based facilitation of empowered schools: Complexities and issues for staff developers. *Journal of Staff Development*, 13, 22-26.
- Goldman, G., & Newman, J. B. (1998). *Empowering students to transform schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1993). Facilitative power and nonstandardized solutions to school site restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 69-92.
- Goodlad, J. (1992). On taking school reform seriously. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74, 232-238.
- Goodman, J. (1995). Change without difference: School restructuring in historical perspective. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65, 1-29.
- Greer, J., & Short, P. (1988). *The empowered school district: A grant request of the Danforth foundation*. Georgia State University, Atlanta.
- Haas, J. (1989). School reform advocates and professional educators- Stand on common ground. *NASSP Bulletin* 73, 23-28.
- Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Hansen, K. M. (1989). *The anatomy of "restructuring": Strategies for re-forming American education*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED310504)
- Hanson, E. M. (1991). Educational restructuring in the USA: Movements of the 1980's. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29, 30-38.
- Hayes, R. L. (1982). Democratic schools for a democratic society. *The Humanist Educator*, 20, 101-108.
- Hayes, R. L. (1991). *What does it mean to be empowered?* Unpublished manuscript, University of Georgia, Athens.

- Hayes, R. L., & Horne, A. (1994, August). *Collaborative action research: Re-newed roles for counseling psychologists in schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Hayes, R. L., & Lunsford, B. (1994). Elements of empowerment: Enhancing efforts for school renewal. *People and Education, 2*, 83-100.
- Hayes, R. L., Nelson, J., Tabin, M., Pearson, G., & Worthy, C. (in press). Using school-wide data to advocate for student success: Systemic intervention for drop-out prevention. *Professional School Counseling*.
- Haynes, N. M., Emmons, C., & Ben-Avie, M. (1997). School climate as a factor in Student Adjustment and Achievement. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 8*, 321-329.
- Heckman, P. E., & Peterman, F. (1996). Indigenous invention: New promise for school reform. *Teachers College Record, 98*, 307-327.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1984). *Innovation up close: How school improvement works*. New York: Plenum.
- In-Sook L., & Reigeluth, C. M. (1994). Empowering teachers for new roles in a new educational system. *Educational Technology, 34*, 61-72.
- Jenkins, K. (1988). Metaphor and a mindset for educational leadership. *The Educational Forum, 52*, 143-151.
- Jenkins, K. D., & Houlihan, G. T. (1991). A comprehensive view of school restructuring. *Planning and Changing, 22*, 191-207.
- Jenkins, J. (1994). Action research: School improvement at the grass roots. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 3*, 470-473.

- Jones, M. E. B. (1992). *Strategic planning for school empowerment: Assessing vision*. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Georgia, Athens.
- Jones, M. E. B. (1997). *A strategic planning approach to improve school climate: A case study in school restructuring*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens.
- Kohli, W. R. (1992). To what ends our reform? Reclaiming the ethical in education. *Educational Researcher*, 21, 32-34.
- Kraft, L. (1996). Student power in American higher education. *The Educational Forum*, 60, 200-204.
- Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1996). Collective responsibility for learning and its effects on gains in achievement and engagement for early secondary students. *American Journal of Education*, 104, 103-147.
- Leong, F. T., & Austin, J. T. (Eds.). (1996). *The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants*. London: Sage.
- Lieberman, A. (1992). The meaning of scholarly activity and the building of community. *Educational Researcher*, 22, 5-12.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71, 759-764.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68, 9-28.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1995). In search of students' voices. *Theory Into Practice*, 34, 88-93.
- Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33, 757-798.

- Lunenburg, F. C. (1992). The current educational reform movement- History, progress to date, and the future. *Education and Urban Society, 25*, 3-17.
- Lusky, M. B., & Hayes, R. L. (2001). Collaborative consultation and program evaluation. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*, 26-38.
- Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19*, 245-275.
- McWhirter, E. H. (1991). Empowerment in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 222-227.
- Meier, D. (1987). Success in East Harlem: How one group of teachers built a school that works. *American Educator, 11*, 36-39.
- Miles, M. B. (1993). 40 years of change in schools: Some personal reflections. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29*, 213-248.
- Milstein, M. M. (1993). *Restructuring schools: Doing it right*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Mitchell, B. (1990). Children, youth and educational leadership. In B. Mitchell & L.L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools (Eighty-Ninth NSSE Yearbook, Part II, pp. 19-68)*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mitchell, D. E., & Beach, S. A. (1993). School restructuring: The superintendent's view. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29*, 249-274.

- Mojkowski, C., & Fleming, D. (1988). *School-site management: Concepts and approaches*. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED307660)
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Newmann, F. M. (1993). Beyond common sense in educational restructuring: The issues of content and linkage. *Educational Researcher*, 22, 4-13.
- Nieto, S. (1994). Lessons from students on creating a chance to dream. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64, 392-426.
- Nwankwo, J. I. (1979). The school climate as a factor in students' conflict in Nigeria. *Educational Studies*, 10, 267-279.
- Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages, United States Department of Education. (1999). *Today's Students*. Retrieved May 8, 2000, from <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OBEMLA/aboutus.html>
- Paisley, P. O., & Hayes, R. L. (1997). Research in school counseling. In L. Loesch & N. Vacc (Eds.), *Research in Counseling and Therapy* (pp. 7-9). Greensboro, NC: ERIC/CASS.
- Perkinson, H. J. (1991). *The imperfect panacea: American faith in education 1865-1990* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Peterson, A. M. (1997). Aspects of school climate: A review of the literature. *ERS Spectrum*, 15, 36-42.

- Phelan, P., Davidson, A. L., & Cao, H. T. (1992). Speaking up: Students' perspectives on school. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93, 695-704.
- Putnam, J., Peeke, P., & Narusis, E. M. (1993). *Rethinking educational reform: The inclusion of counseling psychologists on the Professional Development School (PDS) Leadership Teams in the PDS schools*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370892)
- Reed, C. J. (1998). *Student leadership and restructuring: A case study*. Auburn, AL: Auburn University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED424638)
- Reed, C. J. & Bechtel, D. (1997). We have ideas: Students' voices in restructuring. In J. Boccia (Ed.), *Students taking the lead: The challenges and rewards of empowering youth in schools: No. 4. New directions for school leadership* (pp. 47-57). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Renihan, F. I., & Renihan, P. J. (1995). Responsive high schools: Structuring success for the at-risk student. *The High School Journal*, 26, 1-13.
- Reyes, P., & Scribner, A. P. (1995). Educational reform, students of color, and potential outcomes. *The High School Journal*, 78, 215-225.
- Roy, P. (1995). Participatory decision making: A tool of reform or an empty promise? *Journal of Staff Development*, 16, 18-22.
- Sabo, D. J. (1995). Organizational climate of middle schools and the quality of student life. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 28, 150-160.
- Sarason, S. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Schmuck, R. A. (1995). Process consultation and organization development today. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 6*, 207-215.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Shields, P. M., & Knapp, M. S. (1997). The promise and limits of school-based reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*, 288-294.
- Smylie, M. A. (1994). Redesigning teachers' work: Connections to the classroom. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of research in education (Vol. 20, pp. 129-177)*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Soderberg, M. B. (1997). Student leadership and participation in independent school activities: Culture created in schools. New York, NY: Columbia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED410635)
- Soo Hoo, S. (1993, Summer). Students as partners in research and restructuring in schools. *The Educational Forum, 57*, 386-393.
- Schweiker-Marra, K. (1995). The principal's role in changing school culture and implementing school reform. *ERS Spectrum, 13*, 3-11.
- Tagiuri, R. (1968). The concept of organizational climate. In R. Tagiuri, & G. H. Litwin (Eds.), *Organizational climate: Exploration of a concept*. Boston, MA: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Talbert, J. E., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). Understanding teaching in context. In D. K. Cohen, M. W., McLaughlin, & J. E. Talbert (Eds.), *Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice* (pp. 167-206). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Tharinger, D. J., Bricklin, P. M., Johnson, N. F., Paster, V. S., Lambert, N. M., Feshbach, N., Oakland, T. D., & Sanchez, W. (1996). Education reform: Challenges for psychology and psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 27, 24-33.
- Tirozzi, G. N., & Uro, G. (1997). Education reform in the United States: National policy in supports of local efforts for school improvement. *American Psychologist*, 53, 241-249.
- Tucker, M., & Mandel, D. (1986). The Carnegie report-A call for redesigning the schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68, 24-27.
- Tyack, D. (1990). Restructuring in historical perspective: Tinkering toward utopia. *Teachers College Record*, 92, 170-191.
- Ungerleider, J., & DiBenedetto, A. (1997). Empowering students to address current issues: The Vermont governor's institute on public issues and youth empowerment. In J. Boccia (Ed.), *Students taking the lead: The challenges and rewards of empowering youth in schools: No. 4. New directions for school leadership* (pp. 59-78). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Walsh, M. E., Howard, K. A., & Buckley, M. A. (1999). School counselors in school-community partnerships: Opportunities and Challenges. *Professional School Counseling*, 2, 349-356.
- Wasley, P. A., Hampel, R. L., & Clark, R. W. (1997). *Kids and school reform*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Weitzman-Swain, A. C. (1995). *The influence of interactive journal writing on the self-development, self-reflective ability, and empathy ratings of counselors in training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, Athens.
- Wheelan, S. A., & Conway, C. (1991). Group development as a framework to understand and promote school readiness to engage in an organizational development project. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 2*, 59-71.
- Whitaker, K. S. (1993). Going beyond rhetoric: The realities of school restructuring. *Educational Planning, 9*, 13-19.
- White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under “ideal” school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14*, 69-82.
- Winter, J., & Sweeny, J. (1994). Improving school climate: Administrators are key. *NASSP Bulletin, 78*, 65-69.
- Whichard-Morehouse, J. A., & Elke, DL. (1991). *Restructuring: What is it and how is it done?* Unpublished manuscript.
- Witcher, A. E. (1993). Assessing school climate: An important step for enhancing quality. *NASSP Bulletin, 77*, 1-5.

APPENDIX A
THE VISION STATEMENT

Vision Statement of Cedar Shoals High School

Our Vision for Cedar Shoals High School

I want to have ownership of and responsibility for an inviting school that is clean, healthy, safe, and attractive where exciting, interesting, and fun things are happening.

I want to work and study in a school where rules are followed consistently and where policies are fair and clear.

I want to work and study in a school where the faculty treat one another with dignity, where the faculty treat the students with dignity, and where the students treat one another and the faculty with dignity in return.

I want to be part of a community of learners who respect one another, who are enthusiastic, motivated to learn, spirited in their approach, who cooperate with one another, who are self-disciplined, and who are responsible for themselves and to all other members of this community of which they are a part.

I want to be involved in making decisions that have a direct bearing upon my activities in the school, and I want to know that I will be held accountable for the consequences of my actions.

I want to know that what I do makes a difference in my life and in the lives of those around me.

I want my school to have the support of the citizens of the community and especially the parents who send their students to my school.

Finally, I want to be part of a school whose programs and practices accurately reflect the diversity to be found in the community.

Above all, I want to work and learn in a school that graduates students who have clear personal and vocational goals and the skills necessary to achieve them.

APPENDIX B

THE SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY (1991-1994, 1997)



College of Education
Department of Counseling and
Human Development Services

May 1, 1991

Dear Students, Faculty, Staff, and Administrators:

The attached questionnaire has been designed from the vision statement that was created last year as a part of the Danforth Empowered School District Project. Your answers will provide important information about how you view your school. Your responses will help evaluate the difference between your vision of the school and its current state as viewed by various groups within the school.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. The materials are coded by number only to help identify test sets and cannot be used to identify you in any way. *Please do not put your name on the answer sheet.*

Carefully read the directions. In order for the results of this project to be valid, your honest and candid responses are needed. Please use a number 2 pencil to mark your responses on the answer sheet in order to make sure they are readable by an optical scanner. It will require about 30 minutes for you to complete the School Climate Questionnaire. Thank you for participating in this important project.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Hayes, Ed.D.

Mary Emma Jones, Ed.S.
Project Evaluators

Research at The University of Georgia which involves human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to Ms. Heidi L. Roof, Coordinator, Human Subjects Research; or Dr. C. Michael Moriarty, Director, Institutional Review Board; Office of V. P. for Research; The University of Georgia; 604A Graduate Studies Research Center; Athens, Georgia 30602; Telephone (404) 542-6514 or 542-5988.

402 Aderhold Hall • Athens, Georgia 30602 • (404) 542-1812 • FAX (404) 542-2321
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

SCHOOL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please do not put your name on the answer sheet. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Part I. Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me
B. Usually true for me
C. Seldom true for me
D. Never (almost never) true for me

1. I feel a sense of responsibility for this school.
2. Exciting, interesting, and fun things are happening here.
3. This school is an attractive place.
4. The rules of the school are followed consistently.
5. School policies are fair.
6. Faculty members treat one another with dignity.
7. Members of the faculty treat students with dignity.
8. Students treat one another with dignity.
9. Students treat members of the faculty with dignity.
10. This school is a community of learners who respect one another.
11. The people in this school are enthusiastic.
12. School policies are clear.
13. The people in this school are self-disciplined.
14. I am involved in making decisions that have a direct bearing upon my activities in the school.
15. I know that I will be held accountable for the consequences of my actions in this school.
16. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in my life.
17. This school is a healthy place.
18. This school has the support of the citizens of this community.
19. The programs in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
20. This school graduates students who have clear personal goals.
21. The people in this school are responsible for themselves.
22. The people in this school feel a responsibility for the members of this community.
23. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in the lives of the people around me.
24. This school has the support of the parents who send their students to this school.
25. The practices in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
26. This school graduates students who have clear vocational goals and the skills to achieve them.
27. I feel a sense of ownership for this school.
28. This school is a clean place in which to work.
29. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their vocational goals.
30. This school is a safe place.
31. The people in this school are motivated to learn.
32. The people in this school are spirited in their approach to learning.
33. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their personal goals.

Part II. From the alternatives provided below, select the one response that is the most appropriate for you. Please mark your responses on the answer sheet provided.

34. I am a/an:

- A. student
- B. teacher
- C. administrator
- D. counselor
- E. other

35. I have been in this school:

- A. less than one year
- B. one to five years
- C. six to ten years
- D. eleven to fifteen years
- E. more than fifteen years

36. I have lived in the Athens area:

- A. more than twenty years
- B. eleven to twenty years
- C. five to ten years
- D. one to five years
- E. less than one year

37. Sex:

- A. male
- B. female

38. Racial or cultural background:

- A. Black or African-American
- B. Oriental or Pacific Islander
- C. Hispanic, Mexican-American or Chicano
- D. White or Caucasian
- E. Other

39. Religious preference:

- A. Protestant
- B. Catholic
- C. Jewish
- D. No preference
- E. Other

40. Marital Status:

- A. never married
- B. no longer married
- C. married
- D. re-married

For students only:

41. Part-time employment:

- A. none
- B. 1-5 hrs/wk
- C. 6-10 hrs/wk
- D. 11-15 hrs/wk
- E. more than 15 hrs/wk

42. Type of diploma I am pursuing:

- A. Vocational
- B. College
- C. General
- D. Undecided

43. Academic class standing:

- A. freshman
- B. sophomore
- C. junior
- D. senior

For teachers, staff and administrators only:

Below is a list of departments. Please indicate your department/position by marking response A next to the one item number that most closely corresponds to your choice.

- 44. Science
- 45. Math
- 46. English
- 47. Social Studies
- 48. Physical Education
- 49. Media
- 50. Vocational Education
- 51. Fine Arts
- 52. Foreign Languages
- 53. ROTC
- 54. Counseling
- 55. Special Education
- 56. Administration
- 57. Staff

For everyone:

Below is a list of school empowerment projects. Please indicate your level of involvement, if any, in each case using the following scale:

- A. not at all; B. little; C. somewhat
- D. quite a bit; E. a great deal

- 58. Danforth Empowered School Project
- 59. A-team
- 60. Faculty task forces
- 61. Jagwire
- 62. Jagfast
- 63. Staff development planning
- 64. League of Professional Schools
- 65. Charter Winds retreat
- 66. Student advisory council
- 67. Cooperative meetings with Clarke Central High School

In addition, please estimate the total amount of time you have spent in each of the listed activities since school began this year using the following scale:

- A. none; B. 1-5 hours; C. 6-20 hours;
- D. 21-50 hours; E. more than 50 hours.

- 68. Danforth Empowered School Project
- 69. A-team
- 70. Faculty task forces
- 71. Jagwire
- 72. Jagfast
- 73. Staff development planning
- 74. League of Professional Schools
- 75. Charter Winds retreat
- 76. Student advisory council
- 77. Cooperative meetings with Clarke Central High School

Part III. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. Write your answers on this sheet.

78. Looking back over this questionnaire, please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the better since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

79. Please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the worse since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

80. Identify up to three items in Part I by number for which you believe there is the greatest need for improvement: _____, _____, and _____.

What are some things that you believe need to be changed? Please be specific in writing your answer below.



The University of Georgia

College of Education
Department of Counseling and
Human Development Services

April 13, 1992

Dear Students, Faculty, Staff, and Administrators:

The attached questionnaire was designed to assess the school's progress in realizing its vision statement. Your answers will provide important information about how you view your school. Your responses will help us to evaluate the difference between your vision of the school and its current state as viewed by various groups within the school.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. The materials are coded by number only to help identify test sets and will not be used to identify you individually. *Please do not put your name on the answer sheet.*

Carefully read the directions. In order for the results of this project to be valid, your honest and candid responses are needed. Please use a number 2 pencil to mark your responses on the answer sheet in order to make sure they are readable by an optical scanner. It will require about 30 minutes for you to complete the School Climate Questionnaire. Thank you for participating in this important project.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Hayes, Ed.D.

Mary Emma Jones, Ed.S.
Project Evaluators

Research at The University of Georgia which involves human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding these activities should be addressed to Ms. Heidi L. Roof, Coordinator, Human Subjects Research; or Dr. C. Michael Moriarty, Director, Institutional Review Board; Office of V. P. for Research; The University of Georgia; 604A Graduate Studies Research Center; Athens, Georgia 30602; Telephone (404) 542-6514 or 542-5988.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

SCHOOL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please do not put your name on the answer sheet. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Part I. Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me
- B. Usually true for me

- C. Seldom true for me
- D. Never (almost never) true for me

1. I feel a sense of responsibility for this school.
2. Exciting, interesting, and fun things are happening here.
3. This school is an attractive place.
4. The rules of the school are followed consistently.
5. School policies are fair.
6. Faculty members treat one another with dignity.
7. Members of the faculty treat students with dignity.
8. Students treat one another with dignity.
9. Students treat members of the faculty with dignity.
10. This school is a community of learners who respect one another.
11. The people in this school are enthusiastic.
12. School policies are clear.
13. The people in this school are self-disciplined.
14. I am involved in making decisions that have a direct bearing upon my activities in the school.
15. I know that I will be held accountable for the consequences of my actions in this school.
16. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in my life.
17. This school is a healthy place.
18. This school has the support of the citizens of this community.
19. The programs in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
20. This school graduates students who have clear personal goals.
21. The people in this school are responsible for themselves.
22. The people in this school feel a responsibility for the members of this community.
23. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in the lives of the people around me.
24. This school has the support of the parents who send their students to this school.
25. The practices in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
26. This school graduates students who have clear vocational goals and the skills to achieve them.
27. I feel a sense of ownership for this school.
28. This school is a clean place in which to work.
29. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their vocational goals.
30. This school is a safe place.
31. The people in this school are motivated to learn.
32. The people in this school are spirited in their approach to learning.
33. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their personal goals.

Part II. From the alternatives provided below, select the one response that is the most appropriate for you. Please mark your responses on the answer sheet provided.

34. I am a/an:

- A. student
- B. teacher, instructional staff
- C. administrator, director, dept. head
- D. counselor, social worker, nurse, psychologist
- E. staff, secretary, custodian, cafeteria worker

35. I have been in this school:

- A. less than one year
- B. one to five years
- C. six to ten years
- D. eleven to fifteen years
- E. more than fifteen years

36. I have lived in the Athens area:

- A. more than twenty years
- B. eleven to twenty years
- C. five to ten years
- D. one to five years
- E. less than one year

37. Sex:

- A. male
- B. female

38. Racial or cultural background:

- A. Black or African-American
- B. Asian or Pacific Islander
- C. Hispanic, Mexican-American or Chicano
- D. White or Caucasian
- E. Other

39. Part-time employment:

- A. none
- B. 1-5 hrs/wk
- C. 6-10 hrs/wk
- D. 11-15 hrs/wk
- E. more than 15 hrs/wk

FOR STUDENTS ONLY:

40. Type of diploma I am pursuing:

- A. Vocational
- B. College
- C. Diploma
- D. Undecided

41. Academic class standing:

- A. freshman
- B. sophomore
- C. junior
- D. senior

FOR EVERYONE:

Below is a list of school empowerment projects. Please indicate your level of involvement, if any, in each case using the following scale:

- A. not at all; B. little; C. somewhat
- D. quite a bit; E. a great deal

- 42. School Council for Improvement (SCI)
- 43. A-team
- 44. Faculty task forces
- 45. Jagwire
- 46. Jagfast
- 47. Staff development planning
- 48. League of Professional Schools
- 49. Liaison groups
- 50. Student advisory council

In addition, please estimate the total amount of time you have spent in each of the listed activities since school began this year using the following scale:

- A. none; B. 1-5 hours; C. 6-20 hours;
- D. 21-50 hours; E. more than 50 hours.

- 51. School Council for Improvement (SCI)
- 52. A-team
- 53. Faculty task forces
- 54. Jagwire
- 55. Jagfast
- 56. Staff development planning
- 57. League of Professional Schools
- 58. Liaison groups
- 59. Student advisory council

Part III. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. Write your answers on this sheet.

60. Looking back over this questionnaire, please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the better since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

61. Please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the worse since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

62. Identify up to three items in Part I by number for which you believe there is the greatest need for improvement: _____, _____, and _____.

What are some things that you believe need to be changed? Please be specific in writing your answer below.



The University of Georgia

College of Education
Department of Counseling and
Human Development Services

April 16, 1993

Dear Students, Faculty, Staff, and Administrators:

This survey was designed to assess the school's progress in realizing its vision. Your answers will provide important information about how you view your school. Your responses will help us to evaluate the difference between your vision of the school and its current state as viewed by various groups within the school.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. The materials are coded by number at the upper right-hand corner of this page only to help identify test sets and will not be used to identify you individually. Please be sure to enter this identification number on your answer sheet. *Please do not put your name on the answer sheet.*

Carefully read the directions. In order for the results of this project to be valid, your honest and candid responses are needed. Please use a number 2 pencil to mark your responses on the answer sheet in order to make sure they are readable by an optical scanner. It will require about 30 minutes for you to complete the School Climate Survey. Thank you for participating in this important project.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Hayes, Ed.D.

Mary Emma Jones, Ed.S.
Project Evaluators

Research at The University of Georgia which involves human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding your rights as a participant should be addressed to Heidi L. Roof, M.S., or Dr. C. Michael Moriarty, Institutional Review Board; Office of V. P. for Research; The University of Georgia, 604A Graduate Studies Research Center; Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514.

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

Please do not put your name on the answer sheet. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Part I. Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me**
- B. Usually true for me**

- C. Seldom true for me**
- D. Never (almost never) true for me**

1. I feel a sense of responsibility for this school.
2. Exciting, interesting, and fun things are happening here.
3. This school is an attractive place.
4. The rules of the school are followed consistently.
5. School policies are fair.
6. Faculty members treat one another with dignity.
7. Members of the faculty treat students with dignity.
8. Students treat one another with dignity.
9. Students treat members of the faculty with dignity.
10. This school is a community of learners who respect one another.
11. The people in this school are enthusiastic.
12. School policies are clear.
13. The people in this school are self-disciplined.
14. I am involved in making decisions that have a direct bearing upon my activities in the school.
15. I know that I will be held accountable for the consequences of my actions in this school.
16. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in my life.
17. This school is a healthy place.
18. This school has the support of the citizens of this community.
19. The programs in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
20. This school graduates students who have clear personal goals.
21. The people in this school are responsible for themselves.
22. The people in this school feel a responsibility for the members of this community.
23. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in the lives of the people around me.
24. This school has the support of the parents who send their students to this school.
25. The practices in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
26. This school graduates students who have clear vocational goals and the skills to achieve them.
27. I feel a sense of ownership for this school.
28. This school is a clean place in which to work.
29. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their vocational goals.
30. This school is a safe place.
31. The people in this school are motivated to learn.
32. The people in this school are spirited in their approach to learning.
33. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their personal goals.

34. I understand how decisions are made in this school.

35. Teaching practices in this school are appropriate to students' levels of interest.

36. Teachers present materials in a way that students can understand.

37. Teachers present materials in ways that encourage student success.

38. Students in this school find the content and activities of their classes to be relevant.

39. I am well-informed about what is going on in this school.

40. I understand how to get the information I need to make decisions that have an effect on my activities in this school.

Part II. From the alternatives provided below, select the one response that is the most appropriate for you. Please mark your responses on the answer sheet provided.

41. I am a/an:

- A. student
- B. teacher, instructional staff
- C. administrator, director, dept. head
- D. counselor, social worker, nurse, psychologist
- E. staff, secretary, custodian, cafeteria worker

42. I have been in this school:

- A. less than one year
- B. one to five years
- C. six to ten years
- D. eleven to fifteen years
- E. more than fifteen years

43. Sex:

- A. male
- B. female

44. Racial or cultural background:

- A. Black or African-American
- B. Asian or Pacific Islander
- C. Hispanic, Mexican-American or Chicano
- D. White or Caucasian
- E. Other

45. How involved are you in school-related activities that are not part of regularly scheduled classes.

- A. not at all
- B. little
- C. somewhat
- D. quite a bit
- E. a great deal

46. How much time do you spend overall in school related activities that are not part of regularly scheduled classes.

- A. none
- B. 1-5 hours
- C. 6-20 hours
- D. 21-50 hours
- E. more than 50 hours

FOR STUDENTS ONLY:

47. After school employment:

- A. none
- B. 1-5 hrs/wk
- C. 6-10 hrs/wk
- D. 11-15 hrs/wk
- E. more than 15 hrs/wk

48. Type of diploma I am pursuing:

- A. Vocational
- B. College
- C. Diploma
- D. Undecided

49. Academic class standing:

- A. freshman
- B. sophomore
- C. junior
- D. senior

Please check to be certain you have entered your identification number on your answer sheet.

Then please answer the questions on the following page.

Part III. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. Write your answers on this sheet.

50. Looking back over this questionnaire, please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the better since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

51. Please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the worse since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

52. Identify up to three items in Part I by number for which you believe there is the greatest need for improvement: _____, _____, and _____.

What are some things that you believe need to be changed? Please be specific in writing your answer below.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.



The University of Georgia

College of Education
Department of Counseling and
Human Development Services

April, 1994

Dear Students, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, and Parents:

This survey was designed to assess the school's progress in realizing its vision. Your answers will provide important information about how you view your school. Your responses will help us to evaluate the difference between your vision of the school and its current state as viewed by various groups within the school. As you may be aware, the results of these surveys have been used annually to guide the school's planning process in making the school a more empowering workplace.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and anonymous. The materials are coded by a number at the upper right-hand corner of the School Climate Survey. This number will only help identify test sets and will not be used to identify you individually. Please be sure to enter this identification number on your answer sheet. *Please do not put your name on the answer sheet.*

Carefully read the directions. In order for the results of this project to be valid, your honest and candid responses are needed. Please use a number 2 pencil to mark your responses on the answer sheet in order to make sure they are readable by an optical scanner. It will require about 45 minutes for you to complete the School Climate Survey. Thank you for participating in this important project.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Hayes, Ed.D.

Mary Emma Jones, Ed.S.
Project Evaluators

Research at The University of Georgia which involves human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board. Questions or problems regarding your rights as a participant should be addressed to Heidi L. Roof, M.S., or Dr. C. Michael Moriarty, Institutional Review board; Office of V.P. for Research; The University of Georgia, 604A Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-6514.

402 Adcerhold Hall • Athens, Georgia 30602-7142 • (706) 542-1812 • FAX (706) 542-4130
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

Cedar Shoals High School

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

Please do not put your name on the answer sheet. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Part I. Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me
- B. Usually true for me

- C. Seldom true for me
- D. Never (almost never) true for me

1. I feel a sense of responsibility for this school.
2. Exciting, interesting, and fun things are happening here.
3. This school is an attractive place.
4. The rules of the school are followed consistently.
5. School policies are fair.
6. Faculty members treat one another with dignity.
7. Members of the faculty treat students with dignity.
8. Students treat one another with dignity.
9. Students treat members of the faculty with dignity.
10. This school is a community of learners who respect one another.
11. The people in this school are enthusiastic.
12. School policies are clear.
13. The people in this school are self-disciplined.
14. I am involved in making decisions that have a direct bearing upon my activities in the school.
15. I know that I will be held accountable for the consequences of my actions in this school.
16. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in my life.
17. This school is a healthy place.
18. This school has the support of the citizens of this community.
19. The programs in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
20. This school graduates students who have clear personal goals.
21. The people in this school are responsible for themselves.
22. The people in this school feel a responsibility for the members of this community.
23. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in the lives of the people around me.
24. This school has the support of the parents who send their students to this school.
25. The practices in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
26. This school graduates students who have clear vocational goals and the skills to achieve them.
27. I feel a sense of ownership for this school.
28. This school is a clean place in which to work.
29. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their vocational goals.
30. This school is a safe place.
31. The people in this school are motivated to learn.
32. The people in this school are spirited in their approach to learning.
33. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their personal goals.

Part I (cont.): Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me
- B. Usually true for me

- C. Seldom true for me
- D. Never (almost never) true for me

- | | |
|--|---|
| 34. I understand how decisions are made in this school. | 39. I am well-informed about what is going on in this school. |
| 35. Teaching practices in this school are appropriate to students' levels of interest. | 40. I understand how to get the information I need to make decisions that have an effect on my activities in this school. |
| 36. Teachers present materials in a way that students can understand. | 41. The results of the previous School Climate Surveys have been communicated to me. |
| 37. Teachers present materials in ways that encourage student success. | 42. I use the results of this survey in planning my activities in this school. |
| 38. Students in this school find the content and activities of their classes to be relevant. | 43. Changes have been made in this school that are helping us achieve our vision for the school. |

FOR STUDENTS ONLY:

We are interested in the extent to which students are involved in making decisions in this school. Please respond to the following items by using the stem: **I AM INVOLVED IN MAKING IMPORTANT DECISIONS ABOUT...**

- | | |
|--|--|
| 44. ...the selection of materials, books, and resources to be studied in my classes. | 49. ...improving the social environment of the school. |
| 45. ...topics to be studied in my classes. | 50. ...improving the physical environment of the school. |
| 46. ...developing homework assignments. | 51. ...planning extracurricular activities. |
| 47. ...creating or modifying classroom rules. | 52. ...developing/changing school policies, procedures, and rules. |
| 48. ...developing grading procedures. | |

FOR TEACHERS ONLY:

We are interested in the extent to which the use of this survey as part of the empowerment process has had an effect on the various practices in this school. Please respond to the following items by using the stem: **AS A RESULT OF THE EMPOWERMENT PROCESS, I AM MORE INVOLVED IN...**

- | | |
|--|--|
| 53. ...creating or modifying rules in my classroom. | 57. ...budget decisions within my department. |
| 54. ...developing grading policies and procedures in my classroom. | 58. ...staffing decisions within my department. |
| 55. ...the selection of materials, books, and resources to be studied in my classroom. | 59. ...developing/changing school policies, procedures, and rules. |
| 56. ...the choice of topics to be studied in the classroom. | 60. ...the social environment of the school. |
| | 61. ...the physical environment of the school. |

Part I (cont.): Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:
 A. Always (almost always) true for me C. Seldom true for me
 B. Usually true for me D. Never (almost never) true for me

FOR TEACHERS ONLY:

Please respond to the following items by using the stem: **AS A RESULT OF THE EMPOWERMENT PROCESS, I HAVE MADE GREATER EFFORTS TO INVOLVE STUDENTS IN MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT ...**

- | | |
|---|--|
| 62. ...the selection of materials, books, and resources to be studied in the classroom. | 66. ...developing grading procedures. |
| 63. ...the choice of topics to be studied in the classroom. | 67. ...the social environment of the school. |
| 64. ...developing homework assignments. | 68. ...the physical environment of the school. |
| 65. ...creating or modifying classroom rules. | 69. ...planning extracurricular activities. |
| | 70. ...developing/changing school policies, procedures, and rules. |

Part II. From the alternatives provided below, select the one response that is the most appropriate for you. Please mark your responses on the answer sheet provided.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 71. I am a/an:
A. student
B. teacher, instructional staff
C. administrator, director, dept. head
D. counselor, social worker, nurse, psychologist
E. staff, secretary, custodian, cafeteria worker | E. a great deal |
| 72. I have been in this school:
A. less than one year
B. one to five years
C. six to ten years
D. eleven to fifteen years
E. more than fifteen years | 76. How much time do you spend overall in school related activities that are not part of regularly scheduled classes.
A. none
B. 1-5 hours
C. 6-20 hours
D. 21-50 hours
E. more than 50 hours |
| 73. Sex:
A. male B. female | FOR STUDENTS ONLY:
77. After school employment:
A. none B. 1-5 hrs/wk
C. 6-10 hrs/wk D. 11-15 hrs/wk
E. more than 15 hrs/wk |
| 74. Racial or cultural background:
A. Black or African-American
B. Asian or Pacific Islander
C. Hispanic, Mexican-American or Chicano
D. White or Caucasian
E. Other | 78. Type of diploma I am pursuing:
A. Vocational B. College
C. Diploma D. Undecided |
| 75. How involved are you in school-related activities that are not part of regularly scheduled classes.
A. not at all
B. little
C. somewhat
D. quite a bit | 79. Academic class standing:
A. freshman B. sophomore
C. junior D. senior |

Please check to be certain you have entered your identification number on your answer sheet.

Then please answer the questions on the following page.

Part III. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. Write your answers on this sheet.

80. Looking back over this questionnaire, please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the better since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

81. Please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the worse since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

82. Identify up to three items in Part I by number for which you believe there is the greatest need for improvement: _____, _____, and _____. What are some things that you believe need to be changed? Please be specific in writing your answer below.

83. As a result of the school's efforts at increasing empowerment, I have changed in the following ways (e.g., attitude, activities, feelings about self, others, school, etc). Please be specific as possible.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY 1997

Cedar Shoals High School

SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY

Please do not put your name on the answer sheet. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Part I. Please mark the answer that best describes your personal feelings:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me
- B. Usually true for me

- C. Seldom true for me
- D. Never (almost never) true for me

1. I feel a sense of responsibility for this school.
2. Exciting, interesting, and fun things are happening here.
3. This school is an attractive place.
4. The rules of the school are followed consistently.
5. School policies are fair.
6. Faculty members treat one another with dignity.
7. Members of the faculty treat students with dignity.
8. Students treat one another with dignity.
9. Students treat members of the faculty with dignity.
10. This school is a community of learners who respect one another.
11. The people in this school are enthusiastic.
12. School policies are clear.
13. The people in this school are self-disciplined.
14. I am involved in making decisions that have a direct bearing upon my activities in the school.
15. I know that I will be held accountable for the consequences of my actions in this school.
16. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in my life.
17. This school is a healthy place.
18. This school has the support of the citizens of this community.
19. The programs in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
20. This school graduates students who have clear personal goals.
21. The people in this school are responsible for themselves.
22. The people in this school feel a responsibility for the members of this community.
23. I know that what I do in school makes a difference in the lives of the people around me.
24. This school has the support of the parents who send their students to this school.
25. The practices in this school accurately reflect the diversity to be found in this community.
26. This school graduates students who have clear vocational goals and the skills to achieve them.
27. I feel a sense of ownership for this school.
28. This school is a clean place in which to work.
29. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their vocational goals.
30. This school is a safe place.
31. The people in this school are motivated to learn.
32. The people in this school are spirited in their approach to learning.
33. This school graduates students who have the skills necessary to achieve their personal goals.

Part I (cont.): Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

A. Always (almost always) true for me
B. Usually true for me

C. Seldom true for me
D. Never (almost never) true for me

- | | |
|--|---|
| 34. I understand how decisions are made in this school. | 39. I am well-informed about what is going on in this school. |
| 35. Teaching practices in this school are appropriate to students' levels of interest. | 40. I understand how to get the information I need to make decisions that have an effect on my activities in this school. |
| 36. Teachers present materials in a way that students can understand. | 41. The results of the previous School Climate Surveys have been communicated to me. |
| 37. Teachers present materials in ways that encourage student success. | 42. I use the results of this survey in planning my activities in this school. |
| 38. Students in this school find the content and activities of their classes to be relevant. | 43. Changes have been made in this school that are helping us achieve our vision for the school. |

FOR STUDENTS ONLY:

We are interested in the extent to which students are involved in making decisions in this school. Please respond to the following items by using the stem: I AM INVOLVED IN MAKING IMPORTANT DECISIONS ABOUT...

- | | |
|--|--|
| 44. ...the selection of materials, books, and resources to be studied in my classes. | 49. ...improving the social environment of the school. |
| 45. ...topics to be studied in my classes. | 50. ...improving the physical environment of the school. |
| 46. ...developing homework assignments. | 51. ...planning extracurricular activities. |
| 47. ...creating or modifying classroom rules. | 52. ...developing/changing school policies, procedures, and rules. |
| 48. ...developing grading procedures. | |

FOR TEACHERS ONLY:

We are interested in the extent to which the use of this survey as part of the empowerment process has had an effect on the various practices in this school. Please respond to the following items by using the stem: AS A RESULT OF THE EMPOWERMENT PROCESS, I AM MORE INVOLVED IN...

- | | |
|--|--|
| 53. ...creating or modifying rules in my classroom. | 57. ...budget decisions within my department. |
| 54. ...developing grading policies and procedures in my classroom. | 58. ...staffing decisions within my department. |
| 55. ...the selection of materials, books, and resources to be studied in my classroom. | 59. ...developing/changing school policies, procedures, and rules. |
| 56. ...the choice of topics to be studied in the classroom. | 60. ...the social environment of the school. |
| | 61. ...the physical environment of the school. |

Part I (cont.): Please respond to the statements below by marking the answer sheet as follows:

- A. Always (almost always) true for me
B. Usually true for me
C. Seldom true for me
D. Never (almost never) true for me

FOR TEACHERS ONLY:

Please respond to the following items by using the stem: **AS A RESULT OF THE EMPOWERMENT PROCESS, I HAVE MADE GREATER EFFORTS TO INVOLVE STUDENTS IN MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT ...**

62. ...the selection of materials, books, and resources to be studied in the classroom.
63. ...the choice of topics to be studied in the classroom.
64. ...developing homework assignments.
65. ...creating or modifying classroom rules.
66. ...developing grading procedures.
67. ...the social environment of the school.
68. ...the physical environment of the school.
69. ...planning extracurricular activities.
70. ...developing/changing school policies, procedures, and rules.

Part II. From the alternatives provided below, select the one response that is the most appropriate for you. Please mark your responses on the answer sheet provided.

71. I am a/an:
A. student
B. teacher, instructional staff
C. administrator, director, dept. head
D. counselor, social worker, nurse, psychologist
E. staff, secretary, custodian, cafeteria worker
72. I have been in this school:
A. less than one year
B. one to five years
C. six to ten years
D. eleven to fifteen years
E. more than fifteen years
73. Sex:
A. male
B. female
74. Racial or cultural background:
A. Black or African-American
B. Asian or Pacific Islander
C. Hispanic, Mexican-American or Chicano
D. White or Caucasian
E. Other
75. How involved are you in school-related activities that are not part of regularly scheduled classes.
A. not at all
B. little
C. somewhat
D. quite a bit
E. a great deal
76. How much time per month do you spend overall in school related activities that are not part of regularly scheduled classes.
A. none
B. 1-5 hours
C. 6-20 hours
D. 21-50 hours
E. more than 50 hours
77. After school employment:
A. none
B. 1-5 hrs/wk
C. 6-10 hrs/wk
D. 11-15 hrs/wk
E. more than 15 hrs/wk
78. Type of diploma I am pursuing:
A. Vocational
B. College
C. Diploma
D. Undecided
79. Academic class standing:
A. freshman
B. sophomore
C. junior
D. senior
80. If you are a parent of a present Cedar Shoals student, bubble A. If not, leave this question blank.

FOR STUDENTS ONLY:

Please check to be certain you have entered your identification number on your answer sheet.

Then please answer the questions on the following page.

Part III. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. Write your answers on this sheet.

81. Looking back over this questionnaire, please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the better since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

82. Please identify by number the item in Part I for which you think there has been the greatest change for the worse since school began this year: _____. In the space below, write what you think has contributed most to this change.

83. Identify up to three items in Part I by number for which you believe there is the greatest need for improvement: _____, _____, and _____. What are some things that you believe need to be changed? Please be specific in writing your answer below.

84. As a result of the school's efforts at increasing empowerment, I have changed in the following ways (e.g., attitude, activities, feelings about self, others, school, etc). Please be as specific as possible.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

APPENDIX C

DATA REFLECTING LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

Table 21

Scores for Level of Involvement by Gender and Ethnicity

Scores		
Year	Males vs. Females	African American vs. Caucasian
1991	11.49-11.24	12.16-10.86*
1992	14.05-15.27	15.15-14.82
1993	2.77-2.80	2.65-2.89*
1994	2.65-2.76	2.60-2.77*
1997	2.80-2.81	2.66-2.94*

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 22

Scores for Time Spent in School-Related Activities by Gender and Ethnicity

Scores		
Year	Males vs. Females	African American vs. Caucasian
1991	10.33-10.46	10.45-10.40
1992	10.91-12.09	12.29-11.26
1993	2.52-2.43	2.10-2.75*
1994	2.42-2.41	2.15-2.61*
1997	2.61-2.28*	2.23-2.59

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 23

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Level of Involvement for 1991

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	.697	.001	<.404
Race	1	.185	.000	<.667
Gender*Race	1	.454	.001	<.501

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 24

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Level of Involvement for 1992

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	.017	.000	<.897
Race	1	9.123	.047	<.003*
Gender*Race	1	.004	.000	<.950

Note. * p<.05.

Table 25

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Level of Involvement for 1993

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	.005	.000	<.942
Race	1	4.899	.007	<.027*
Gender*Race	1	5.737	.008	<.017*

Note. * p<.05.

Table 26

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Level of Involvement for 1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	3.056	.004	<.081
Race	1	3.435	.005	<.064
Gender*Race	1	.240	.625	<.265

Note. * p<.05.

Table 27

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Level of Involvement for 1997

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	.080	.000	<.777
Race	1	5.044	.009	<.025*
Gender*Race	1	1.060	.002	<.304

Note. * p<.05.

Table 28

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Time Spent in School-Related Activities for 1991

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	2.137	.003	<.144
Race	1	29.00	.037	<.000*
Gender*Race	1	1.906	.003	<.168

Note. * p<.05.

Table 29

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Time Spent in School-Related Activities for 1992

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	1.398	.007	<.239
Race	1	3.041	.016	<.083
Gender*Race	1	.744	.004	<.389

Note. * p<.05.

Table 30

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Time Spent in School-Related Activities for 1993

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	.374	.001	<.541
Race	1	47.11	.063	<.000*
Gender*Race	1	1.125	.002	<.289

Note. * p<.05.

Table 31

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity Time Spent in School-Related Activities for 1994

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	.005	.000	<.942
Race	1	27.13	.038	<.000*
Gender*Race	1	.257	.000	<.613

Note. * p<.05.

Table 32

Comparison of Scores by Gender and Ethnicity for Time Spent in School-Related Activities for 1997

Source	df	F	η^2	p
Gender	1	12.31	.023	<.000*
Race	1	10.79	.020	<.001*
Gender*Race	1	1.217	.002	<.270

Note. * p<.05.

Table 33

Comparison of Scores for Level of Involvement by Class Standing

Class Comparison	Scores				
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1997
Fr-Soph	11.14-11.46	14.55-16.38*	2.86-2.63	2.66-2.63	2.68-2.67
Fr-Jr	11.14-11.67	14.55-17.48*	2.86-2.98	2.66-2.74	2.68-2.84
Fr-Sr	11.14-11.38	14.55-16.67*	2.86-2.69	2.66-2.85	2.68-2.80
Soph-Jr	11.46-11.67	16.38-17.48	2.63-2.98	2.63-2.74	2.67-2.84
Soph-Sr	11.46-11.38	16.38-16.67	2.63-2.69	2.63-2.85	2.67-2.80
Jr-Sr	11.67-11.38	17.48-16.67	2.98-2.69	2.74-2.85	2.84-2.80

Note. * p<.05.

Table 34

Comparison of Scores for Time Spent in School-Related Activities by Class Standing

Class Comparison	Scores				
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1997
Fr-Soph	10.29-10.47	12.19-11.54	2.52-2.29	2.30-2.29	2.29-2.32
Fr-Jr	10.29-10.51	12.19-11.91	2.52-2.69	2.30-2.62*	2.29-2.53
Fr-Sr	10.29-10.75*	12.19-11.81	2.52-2.39	2.30-2.48	2.29-2.54
Soph-Jr	10.47-10.51	11.54-11.91	2.29-2.69*	2.29-2.62	2.32-2.53

Table 34 cont.

Comparison of Scores for Time Spent in School-Related Activities by Class Standing

Class Comparison	Scores				
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1997
Soph-Sr	10.47-10.75	11.54-11.81	2.29-2.39	2.29-2.48	2.32-2.54
Jr-Sr	10.47-10.75	11.54-11.81	2.69-2.39	2.62-2.48	2.53-2.54

Note. * $p < .05$