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I. INTRODUCTION

A recent, extensive review of the literature on school discipline examined 2,150 separate documents (Puckett), 1978). Of these, the author included approximately half that number in his review. Of those, 120 separate articles were themselves reviews of the literature on discipline conducted since 1900. Of those 120 reviews, only five (or about two-thousandths of one percent of the 2,150 original documents) reviewed research literature related to school discipline. None of the five literature reviews discussed the development of instruments to examine the impact of organizational characteristics on school discipline. It is the intent of the current study to examine the organizational aspects of school discipline.

Problem Statement

No valid, reliable instrument to examine the organizational characteristics that impact upon school discipline presently exists. This study sought to develop such an instrument and test its reliability and validity.
Research Objectives

The objectives of this study were to determine:

1. the reliability of an instrument, the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI) developed for this study to examine the organizational design characteristics of schools that impact on school discipline;

2. whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and schools judged to have either above or below average discipline (construct validity); and

3. whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and respondents' judgments of the nature, severity and frequency of occurrence of discipline problems in their schools.

Definitions and Descriptions

Demographic Questionnaire - a twelve-item questionnaire designed to provide information about the respondents (e.g., age, sex).

Organizational Context Inventory (OCI) - a 102-item scale using a Likert-type distribution for responses. The OCI consists of seven subscales:
(1) patterns of communication, problem solving, and decision making;
(2) patterns of status and authority relationships;
(3) procedures for developing, preparing and implementing rules;
(4) physical environment including schedules and work flow;
(5) relationships with parents and community forces;
(6) mechanisms for coping with personal problems; and
(7) curriculum and instructional practices.

Need for the Research

Perhaps the most strongly felt and widely voiced concern in American education is about discipline. In the Eleventh Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools (Gallup, 1979) discipline was the number one concern as it has been for ten of the eleven years the poll has been conducted. The public believed that the lack of discipline in the schools was nearly twice as important (24% versus 13%) as the second-ranked concern about drugs. The public also believed that the second most important way schools could gain more respect was to increase discipline. In the 1976 poll, approximately half of the respondents felt that:

(1) "enforcing stricter discipline" would do the most to improve the quality of public education; and,
test scores had declined because "society is becoming too permissive."

Discipline has not only been an issue with the general public, however.

The executive director of the Kettering Foundation's Institute for the Development of Educational Activities (/I/D/E/A/), Bahner, noted that students "...contend they're not being made to work hard enough, agree with adults that discipline and drugs are major problems, and are significantly more concerned about their own lack of interest in schools than are adults " (Harris, 1980).

Research conducted at Ohio State University on problems of teachers (Cruickshank, Kennedy & Meyers, 1974) indicated that "discipline and control were considered major problems by teachers in all kinds of schools and communities, in all types of classes, and across all age levels and levels of preparation. Other research (NEA, 1977) has suggested that discipline has been one of the chief causes for teachers leaving the profession. More than 60% of the teachers surveyed believed they would not choose to be teachers again, citing "negative student attitudes and discipline" as a major reason for avoiding the teaching profession. Coates and Thoreson (1976) noted, in 12 out of 15 studies they had investigated, beginning teachers reported discipline as a major source of anxiety while experienced teachers in seven other studies reported anxiety about discipline.
Attempting to understand why school discipline is a problem is compounded in part because of a tendency to focus on the headline-capturing nature of violence, vandalism, and extreme disruptive behavior and to attribute such behaviors to a lack of discipline. Bayh's (1978) widely-quoted reports from the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency dramatize the issues of school violence and vandalism. The president of the American Federation of Teachers, Shanker, told the subcommittee at its initial hearings:

Many authorities on education have written books on the importance of producing an effective learning environment in the schools by introducing more effective methods of teaching. None of them, however, seems to understand the shocking fact that the learning environment in thousands upon thousands of schools is filled with violence and danger. Violent crime has entered the schoolhouse, and the teachers and students are learning some bitter lessons. (p. 300)

Harris, a former president of the National Education Association, testified to the subcommittee that "...incidents of physical assault have increased dramatically; vandalism
and destruction of property are even more awesome" (Bayh, 1978, p. 300). The Bayh reports and others like them serve to inflame rather than illuminate and distort rather than distinguish between discipline problems and the problems of violence and vandalism. The net result of such reports tends to highlight the sensational aspects of discipline problems while obscuring both the ordinary, daily disruptions as well as their solutions (Duke, 1978; Wayson and Pinnell, 1978). Wayson and Pinnell (1978) claim that equating violence and vandalism with discipline problems produces numerous negative consequences:

(1) it often leads to policies out of proportion to the real problems;
(2) it creates unnecessary anxiety among parents and educators;
(3) it undermines public confidence in education; and
(4) it prevents schools from taking appropriate, educationally sound action to eliminate the causal elements of school discipline problems.

The last point suggests that discipline problems too often are identified in terms of their symptoms rather than their causes. That is, discipline problems are usually identified as fighting, chewing gum, running in the halls, absenteeism, truancy, and the like. In fact, discipline
reports reflect this categorization of behaviors. Schools, however, generally ignore the basic psychological premise that all behavior is caused, and educators continue to punish the same students for the same offense (Glasser, 1969; Johnson, 1978). It appears, then, that underlying causes for school discipline problems must be addressed if discipline is to improve in schools.

In an article critical of educational research and its tendency to depersonalize blame, Duke (1978) criticized the school system that admits student misbehavior is caused by external influences but punishes the student as if he or she were ultimately responsible. He goes on to criticize all who prefer to place "blame" whether on students, society at large, family background, peer groups, teachers, the school system, or on nobody (assuming that discipline problems are a normal, healthy part of growing up). Indeed, even a well-used text on discipline strategies (Jessup & Kiley, 1971) categorized problems as being caused by teachers, students, administrators, or parents.

The underlying motivation for the current study is that school discipline problems may be understood best by examining how schools are structured and operated as organizations. Lesser (1978), claimed that schools are not significantly affected by educational research that fails to take into account the organizational characteristics of the school, student traits, and societal patterns at large.
The present study was undertaken to investigate relevant organizational characteristics of the school as they impact on discipline. This was accomplished by specifying selected design characteristics of school organizations that the literature suggests are relevant to the ways in which schools carry out their discipline, or as Spady (1964 a, 1964 b) defines it, their custody and control functions.

The design characteristics of an organization are those sets of interacting components - such as size, technology, and authority patterns - that directly affect the ways organizations are structured and operate (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975). Further, as Mintzberg (1979) noted:

> Design assumes discretion, an ability to alter a system....design means turning those knobs that influence the division of labor and coordinating mechanisms, thereby affecting how the organization functions - how materials, authority, information, and decision processes flow through it.

(p. 67.)

In other words, organizational characteristics can be consciously changed to achieve outcomes. If discipline is related to some of those characteristics, educators have at their disposal ways to improve discipline by adjusting appropriate characteristics. Seven design characteristics
of organizations have been identified (Wayson, 1980; Wayson & Pinnell, 1978; also see Howard, 1978) as affecting discipline:

(1) patterns of communication, problem solving, and decision making;
(2) patterns of status and authority relationships;
(3) procedures for developing, preparing, and implementing rules;
(4) physical environment including schedules and work flow;
(5) relationships with parents and community forces;
(6) mechanisms for coping with personal problems; and
(7) curriculum and instructional practices.

The writers suggested that school norms (i.e., the traditions, rules, and habits of the school) relative to discipline are created and evolve from these seven characteristics. Thus, the seven characteristics listed above were selected for the current investigation.

This study was designed to develop an instrument reflecting the seven organizational design characteristics listed above. The instrument, the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI) was tested with intact school staffs in a pilot test and a field test. Data from the two tests were used to determine reliability and validity estimates.
Chapter II investigates the history and philosophy of discipline in American education. In addition, an in-depth examination of the seven characteristics under investigation in this study will be made.

Chapter III discusses the development of the OCI and the rationale for the analyses used with the data.

Chapter IV presents the statistical results of the study.

Chapter V summarizes the study and its results and discusses limitations and implications for future research.
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Discipline, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (1933) is derived from the Latin *disciplina* meaning the instruction of disciples. Archaically, (Oxford English Dictionary, 1933), the antithesis of discipline is *doctrina* which is more concerned with abstract theory while discipline is more concerned with practice and exercise. Discipline was first used in the 15th century to mean the order maintained or observed among students, about 200 years after its initial use implied religious punishment. It becomes evident when reviewing the use of the word "discipline" that it has been intimately tied to religion, students, training, order, and conduct. Its contemporary usage, related to the maintenance of order in academic settings in society for the purpose of instruction is not, therefore, particularly surprising or unusual. What is important for the current study, however, is that discipline in American education continues to be a problem.
Psychology and Education
in Germany and the United States

From the early 1900's through the middle of this century, there were numerous studies conducted on the nature, development, and education of the child (Pechstein & Jenkins, 1972, Preyer, 1914(a), 1914 (b); Redel, 1940 (a), 1940 (b), 1951). The intent of those studies was to assist educators to understand the child in order to facilitate his or her instruction. O'Neill (1934), for example, included in his work forms to be used by teachers in studying the "24-hour-day health behavior of individual children" and an appendix which contained information relative to grouping children according to their home (ethnic) background. The focus of the studies conducted in the first half of the twentieth century was the psychological and intellectual growth of the individual student (O'Shea, 1924). The research tools used were from the emerging discipline of experimental psychology and intelligence testing and were designed to facilitate the "scientific" approach to education (Strang, 1934; Street, 1941). The movement that may have precipitated the rush to use psychological techniques in the classroom may well have begun in Germany in the nineteenth century and came as a reaction to educational rigidity in the eighteenth century universities. As Kerr
By the end of the eighteenth century the European universities had long since become oligarchies, rigid in their subject matter, centers of reaction in their societies—opposed, in large part, to the Reformation, unsympathetic to the spirit of creativity of the Renaissance, antagonistic to the new science. There was something almost splendid in their disdain for contemporary events. They stood like castles without windows, profoundly introverted. But the tides of change can cut very deep. (p. 10)

Kerr goes on to say that it was not until 1809 that von Humboldt, with the founding of the University of Berlin, initiated the sweeping changes that spread throughout the world of education. Emphasis was placed on research, philosophy, science, graduate instruction, Lehrfreiheit (the freedom of professors to teach what they want) and Lernfreiheit (the freedom of students to select their courses.) Throughout the nineteenth century, the Berlin plan became accepted and was adopted internationally.

It was in Germany, however, at the end of the nineteenth century that the growth of intellectual curiosity
was nurtured and applied to the systematic study of individuals. According to Munn (1961), Wilhelm Wundt, a philosopher and physiologist, founded the first laboratory for physiological (later, experimental) psychology in 1879. Wundt developed techniques to guide research into what a subject experienced at any given point in time. His influence was felt in this country chiefly through the work of William James, the American psychologist and philosopher who established a similar laboratory in the United States.

**Education and the Industrial Revolution**

At about the time of the sweeping changes in psychology and education in Germany and America, new techniques for managing people were emerging in France and the U.S. on the heels of the industrial revolution. In France, the famous industrialist, Henri Fayol, while working as a mining engineer for and managing director of the Commtery-Fourchambault Company, realized the possibility of improving company profits through effective management. He argued that there were five functions of management that any general manager performed and that requisite managerial skills could be learned.

If Fayol was the acknowledged father of management (Bobbitt, Breinhalt, Doktor, & McNaul, 1978) then Frederick W. Taylor was the father of scientific management (Copley, 1923).
While Fayol focused on management to improve an organization, Taylor believed that there was one best way to perform any job and the best way to discover how to perform that job was by applying scientific principles of observation in order to help fit the individual to the job. (Bobbit, et. al, 1978).

The political/social upheaval in Europe was reflected in the writings of Marx (1888) who described dialectical processes necessary to achieve a collective morality (Kerr, 1969). Marxism, and the socialist philosophy of education of Russell (1926), may have provided the springboard for wanting to use new ideas in new and untried ways. The United States with its penchant for trying new ideas and with the advent of improved communication and transportation was influenced by the events taking place in Europe and the rest of the world in industry, technology and education.

For American education, by 1900, the uneducated street urchin and lack of universal mandatory education of Dickens' day were gone (Manning, 1959). Publicly supported, mandatory education had surplanted them. America was to be the land of opportunity; anyone could have a piece of the American dream if he worked hard enough and made enough money. For the immigrant poor, the urban dwellers, the migrant farmer, and the working class in general, the only way to improve their lot was through education. Maybe it was too late for
the adults to bite into a piece of the American pie, but it was not too late for their children; however, their children needed an education.

The Transition from Religious to Economic Control

In the early years in America, from the landing of the Pilgrims until about the middle of the nineteenth century, education had as its basic purpose the inculcation of knowledge through the precepts of formal religion. As Edwards and Richey (1947) note, the Protestant revolt was a struggle of middle-class beliefs against traditional aristocracy. The revolt was not against an established class system or even against religion per se. Rather, it was a revolt for the right of the middle class to ascend in social class. Puritans believed in total domination by, and strict imposition of, their beliefs, values, and attitudes on those around them. Consequently, education was dominated by Protestant values and religion.

Corwin (1965), in a cogent discussion of the transformation of schools in America, points out that it was not until labor unrest developed in the middle of the nineteenth century that business began to support public education. Business leaders began to realize that educational institutions could transmit the ideals and values of business enterprise as easily as they had religious values earlier. According to Curti (1959), in 1877 the President of
the National Education Association, Harris, said that schools should teach discipline and respect for the rights of organized industry.

In light of the growing connections between business and education, it was necessary to determine if there were better ways to educate young men and women to take their rightful places using techniques that had been successful in increasing business productivity. Schools were encouraged to use the principles of scientific management, the tools of administrative management theory, the techniques of psychology, and tests of intelligence and ability to structure their control. As Corwin (1965) notes, "Often a school can improve its prestige and its public image by adopting the values of the dominant groups." (p. 105). The values of the dominant groups that influenced American education around the turn of the century were those of business and industry. Business and industry, guided by the profit motive, were influenced by the principles developed by those who could increase worker productivity and control (e.g., Fayol, Taylor). Schools, it is argued, not only became closely associated with the values held in business and industry, but were also influenced by the mechanisms of control used in a capitalistic society. As Corwin (1965) points out, educators "often have been less concerned with humanitarianism and democracy than with securing the support...groups which have dominated
the social order." (p. 105) There is no firmer commitment to a dominant group than to adopt its values, beliefs, attitudes, and tools and use them in another setting. As Callahan (1962) notes, educators in the first half of this century eagerly adopted the notion that education was chiefly an instrument used to promote business and economic interests.

Discipline during this time was also a reflection of the dominant social order. In a long treatise on the nature of discipline in the school, Morehouse (1914) wrote,

It may be said that society at large which authorizes and furnishes the school as an economical way of paying part of its debt to the upcoming generation, expects the school to fit children for social efficiency by:

(1) Furnishing them the information that will enable them to interpret the world about them.

(2) Teaching them a set of skills which they will need in social intercourse — such as reading, writing, etc.

(3) Training in appreciation.

(4) Fitting them for social service by familiarizing them with socially serviceable methods of work and by building up those prejudices, attitudes, and ideals that give the proper bias for such service.
To these, popular opinion has lately added a fifth:
Teaching them a set of skills which will give them economic independence. (p. 5)

For Morehouse, schooling was responsive to the needs of business and industry. The focus of his discipline policy was having something done to the student which was felt to be in the student's best interest.

Orcutt (1871) noted that any system of discipline must be inflexible, earnest, strong and thorough. He went on to say that students must be made to believe that all school laws are based on the authority of the teacher and that the student must subordinate himself to that authority. Evidence of some of the earliest application of psychological principles to discipline may be seen in Morehouse (1914) when he wrote,

The teacher's part is not only to inhibit evil, but to build up tendencies to the right response to stimuli,¹ to form ideals that beckon and prejudices that restrain, all contributing to the making of strong, normal, good boys and girls. This is the disciplinary process. (p.93)

¹ Emphasis added.
Discipline and the Individual

If psychology is the systematic study of the individual (Munn, 1961), then its application to the principles and practices of discipline in American education has reflected an emphasis on the individual.

Writing from the perspective of child psychology, O'Shea (1924) counseled the use of carefully used discipline measures for the individual child. Strang (1934) discussed the theories of development and growth of the individual child and how such theories influence education. Redl (1940, a,b) provided information on what teachers should know about children and guidelines on helping teachers study their students. Wickman (1938) studied the individual "problem child." Redl (1951) focused on the nature of child psychology and learning and suggested that the focus of the educative process is the individual.

More recently, Phillips (1972) claimed that the key to discipline is the individual, self-concept and self-control. Madsen and Madsen (1974) recommended that discipline begins with the modification of behavior in individuals. Jessup and Kiley (1971) noted that teachers must communicate with their students as individuals. Kounin's (1970) "ripple effect" research related to the consequences of disciplining an individual student in front of other members of the class.
In the late fifties and early sixties, after the *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* decision and the ravages of Senator McCarthy's crusades, the time and the mood of the country began to change. Inflation began to grow alarmingly; industrial productivity declined substantially; an unpopular war divided the country; political assassinations seemed the order of the day; and the heretofore unquestionable American belief in a government of, by, and for the people was at least partially destroyed. The issues of technological development and geometrically accelerating change were critical to an understanding of the feelings of frustration in America. As Toffler (1971) said,

> Francis Bacon, told us that 'knowledge is power.' This can now be translated into contemporary terms. In our social setting, "Knowledge is change'...and accelerating knowledge acquisition, fueling the great engine of technology, means accelerating change. (p.32)

In reaction to the turmoil and accelerating change of the sixties was Reich's (1971) emerging consciousness of humaneness that sought,

> A new knowledge of what it means to be human, in order that the machine, having been built, may now be turned to human ends; in order that man once more can become a creative force,
renewing and creating his own life and thus giving life back to his society. (p. 4)

This emerging consciousness of humaneness may be seen in the works of Rogers, perhaps the most popular humanist of the day.

Rogers (1969) claimed that a student has a natural desire to learn, discover and grow. He believed that the whole of education ought to be built around that natural desire. Behaviorists such as Skinner (1971), on the other hand, believed that only observable behavior is important in understanding an individual's development and such behavior is totally influenced by environmental stimuli. Adler (1972) believed that the individual could only be understood by looking at the individual in relationship to his or her total environment.

In each of these areas, the classroom teacher has a wealth of materials from which to choose relative to discipline. If the teacher is predisposed to the humanistic views of Carl Rogers, the teacher may choose the approach proposed by Moustakas (1972) in The Authentic Teacher, Gordon (1974) in T.E.T. Teacher Effectiveness Training, or Axline (1969) in Play Therapy. On the other hand, if the teacher is inclined to use the approaches espoused by the behaviorists point of view, he or she may choose Dobson's (1970) Dare to Discipline, Madsen and Madsen (1974) Teaching/Discipline: A Positive Approach for Educational
Development, Axelrod (1977), Behavior Modification for the Classroom Teacher, or Homme, (1970) How to Use Contingency Contracting in the Classroom. Finally, if the teacher decides upon what Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) call the interactionalist approach to discipline, he or she may choose to have the children take responsibility for their actions while the teacher behaves as a clarifier and enforcer. The teacher's choice here would be the work of Dreikurs and Cassell (1972) Discipline without Tears or Glasser's (1969) Schools without Failure.

In all of the approaches just mentioned and in others than can be similarly categorized, the focus is the individual child and teacher in a given classroom. As Wolfgang has noted, only about 10% of school discipline problems occur because of what goes on in the classroom; the other 90% of the problems are related to the way the school as a whole is structured and operates, while Wayson and Pinnell (1978) estimate that four out of five discipline problems are related to the way schools operate. It is a major concern of the current study to begin an investigation into the ways schools are structured and how they operate relative to their impact on discipline.

The Design of Schools as Organizations

As Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975) noted, organizations are individuals and groups who come together to achieve certain goals and objectives by means of differentiated functions that are intended to be rationally coordinated on a continuing basis. Other theorists have discussed organizations from the point of view of: microeconomics or the maximization of profits (McGuire, 1964); scientific management of men and work (Taylor, 1911); administrative management theory (Fayol, 1949); bureaucratic functioning of organizations (Weber, 1957); and numerous other perspectives (e.g., Barnard, 1938; Etzioni, 1964; Simon, 1957).

The intent of the current research has been to uncover relationships between the way schools are structured and operate and their impact on discipline. The concept of organization design was used to investigate the existence of any such relationships.

Organization design refers to arranging the structural factors (both anatomical and operational) of an organization which constitute its basic form and nature (Porter, et al., 1975). It also refers to generating and evaluating alternative organization structure and strategy systems. (Clark, 1972) Other authors (Bobbitt, et al., 1978) refer to organization design as the creating of an organizational system capable of coping with uncertainty and predictability in the
relevant organizational environment. For the current study, organizational design means examining factors "... that (1) are primarily contextual and causal, (2) describe or summarize the structural features that are created, and (3) represent the dependent indices of behavior." (Porter, et al., 1975, p. 222)

The current research investigates the contextual and causal features of school organizations relative to discipline by examining selected design characteristics of schools identified by Wayson (1978) and Wayson and Pinnell (1978). The authors have identified seven organizational factors that impact on school discipline. They are (1) communication, problem solving and decision making; (2) patterns of authority distribution and use; (3) rule making and enforcement; (4) the quality, layout and utilization of buildings and grounds (the physical environment); (5) parent/community/school relationships; (6) mechanisms for coping with personal problems; and (7) the formal curriculum and style of instruction. The discussion which follows is based on Wayson and his associates as well as other authors. Wayson's work was not based on any one formal model or organizational functioning but rather a fusion of various models. His conceptual schema and framework are presented for further research and development.
Organizational Design Characteristics and the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI)

The following sections present seven characteristics of schools as organizations. Each section discusses the relationship of the characteristic to discipline and presents examples of items contained in the OCI that are intended to reflect the characteristic.

Communication, Problem Solving and Decision Making

Communication is the transmission of information from a source to a recipient. Where the intent is to minimize the effects of unanticipated environmental circumstances and achieve a rational coordination of organizational processes, effective communication is essential (Porter, et al., 1975).

Wayson (1980) noted that fewer disruptive behaviors and greater feelings of staff and student responsibility are related to more effective patterns of communication. His thoughts are echoed by others in the field.

Glasser (1978) wrote that communication is essential to his ten-step reality therapy approach to improving discipline. Howard (1978), in suggesting ways to improve discipline, advocated both a formal effort at improving communication skills through group processing and informal communication exchange via an information booth at the school. Smith, Neisworth, and Greer (1978) wrote that open communication is undermined by lack of teacher awareness of student norms and
values. They believe communication is essential to the effective evaluation of the social environment within which the student must operate.

Problem solving is a systematic attempt to move from a discordant state of affairs to one that is more desirable. Wayson (1980) advised that, in order to create in a school a positive environment in which honest attempts are made to truly reconcile differences, adults and students must be able to solve problems. In writing on the development of schools as organizations, Schmuck and Runkel (1972) stated that problem solving is the sine qua non of school organizations. Duke and Meckel (1980) found that problem definition and systematic decision making were contributing factors in the generally haphazard treatment of attendance problems in the schools they observed. Indeed, Bennis (1966) defined the health of any organization by the effectiveness of the problem solving processes within it.

Schmuck and Runkel (1972) wrote that all participants within a school must become involved in collaborative decision making if resource sharing and the distribution of knowledge and skills are to occur. Thus, if schools are conceived as organizations and students within the school as members of the organization, it may be said that students must be involved in the decision making process of the school. In the National Institute of Education (NIE) report, Violent Schools - Safe Schools (NIE, 1978), one of the major
factors related to school violence was a feeling of alienation derived from a sense of not knowing what the social rules are like or how to influence society. As Wayson (1978) noted, effective communication, problem solving and decision making can eliminate many discipline problems.

The design of a school as an organization is affected directly and indirectly by the willingness and the capability to solve problems and make decisions (Porter, et al., 1975).

The OCI was designed to reflect the formal aspects of communication, e.g.,

- Administrators' expectations are clearly communicated

and the informal aspects of communication, e.g.,

- Teachers are not able to communicate ideas to "superiors"

although both aspects are intertwined.

The OCI also reflects the nature of problem solving mechanisms, e.g.,

- The School district expects problems to be solved by the local community

and the extent of collaboration in decision making, e.g.,

- Students do not participate in solving the problems of the classroom and the school.

**Authority and Status Relationships**

Authority is the willingness of a subordinate to accept a decision made for him or her by another without examining
the merits of that decision (Simon, 1957). In terms of organizational design, authority structure refers to where in the organizational hierarchy decisions are made and by whom (Porter, et al., 1975). Since a division of labor in an organization is intended to subdivide work into more achievable tasks (tasks are seen as a horizontal dimension of the organization) a hierarchy of authority (a vertical dimension) is typically imposed on the members of an organization to insure task completion (Bobbitt, et al., 1978). Friendlander (1970) also noted that,

The degree to which the authority structure should be hierarchically differentiated in order to maximize task accomplishment seems in many cases to be a direct function of an appropriate match between the nature of the task and the availability and the dispersion of relevant human skills to accomplish the task. (p. 117)

In a school setting, a match between the task of teaching and the ability to teach occurs in the individual classroom. Teacher authority is at the heart of Tanner's (1978) group dynamics model of discipline in which problems are handled by directions, explanations, cue-giving, correcting mistakes and the like. She also claimed that teaching effectiveness as perceived by the student, invests the teacher with
classroom authority. Howard (1978) noted that in one school district, students are taught to respect authority that is earned by virtue of example, experience or expertise, and is not based solely upon position.

Teacher authority is closely related to rule enforcement and can cause discipline problems when an attempt to exercise that authority infringes on the dignity of students. (Jessup & Kiley, 1971). Students may react by attempting to save face through sarcasm directed at the teacher, "aggressing" or "being cool" (Lasley, 1978). If rule enforcement, i.e., the exercise of authority, is highly structured, a number of negative social conditions emerge (Allman-Snyder, May & Garcia, 1975):

1. an environment is created in which the teacher is seen as dominant and the student as subordinate, thus limiting the perception of students as fully functioning members of the organization;

2. educational functioning becomes dependent strictly upon authority and highly specified rules;

3. communication is discouraged;

4. students are required to ignore their peers and increase their dependency on teacher authority for direction;

5. students must raise their hands for recognition, thus reinforcing the dominance
of the teacher and the subordinate status of the student;

(6) students have little input into decision making regarding what they learn;

(7) rules are adhered to strictly, thus, defining minimally acceptable behaviors;

(8) student participation and interaction is minimized;

(9) success depends upon passivity; and

(10) feelings of submission, vulnerability, and perhaps, fear are created in the student.

The NIE Report (NIE, 1978) identified two characteristics related to school property loss influenced by authority:

(1) schools where the principal works with teachers and is fair and informal in dealing with staff; and (2) schools in which teachers do not express hostile and authoritarian attitudes toward students. As Wayson (1980) pointed out, the fewer the barriers to communication and action in authority relationships, the more involvement by members of the school organization in exercising authority, the smaller the status differences in the hierarchy of authority and the broader the conceptions of what constitutes appropriate role behavior, the more effective the use and distribution of authority will be. Items on the OCI were designed to reflect the locus of authority in school, e.g.,
Status differences are evident and the sense of ownership of authority relationships, e.g., students do not take responsibility for enforcing the agreed upon pattern of relationships with all other persons in the school.

Rule Making and Enforcement

Rules, as discussed in theories of organizations (e.g., Bobbitt, et al., 1978) have three functions: (1) they make an organization independent of any one person; (2) they make individual decisions relevant to organizational functioning consistent throughout the organization; and (3) being impersonal, they free the supervisor from frequent coercive interaction with subordinates (and vice versa) in the accomplishment of tasks during the normal course of the day (Bobbitt, et al., 1978). In thinking of organizations as bureaucratic in nature, Weber claimed that rules are generally stable, exhaustive and capable of being learned (Gerth & Mills, 1958). Stability, however, implies that the organization and the environment are not undergoing any rapid changes. The exhaustiveness of rules assumes nearly all problems and their solutions can be anticipated; and, if stable, sets of rules can be learned. This suggests that an individual does not use his or her own judgment in a given circumstance but rather only applies the company-approved rules. Gouldner (1954) claimed that rules: (1) provide a set of expectations about behavior and performance; (2) can provide a monitoring function so that management
can know what should occur and when; and (3) should make clear and legitimize punishable behavior. Bobbitt and others (1978) wrote that rules ought to be guidelines for minimally acceptable behavior and that rules are further attempts by organizations to rationally control their activities for the purpose of achieving their goals.

In a larger sense, rules are part of a control system about which Lawler (1975) asked some important questions:

1. Who sets the standards?
2. How high or realistic are the standards?
3. How explicit are the standards?
4. Who monitors activities and behaviors?
5. Is the job incumbent involved in monitoring?
6. Which activities and behaviors are being monitored?
7. Who makes comparisons?
8. What methods are used to bring action in line with standards?
9. What kinds of rewards are used to keep performance up to standards?
10. What kinds of penalties are administered?

As Porter and others (1975) wrote,

The ways in which these kinds of questions are answered in specific organizational situations often determine the degree of acceptance or rejection of controls by employees and
the degree to which the controls will increase or decrease their motivation to meet organizational objectives. (p. 263)

In examining schools as organizations, Smith, Neisworth and Greer (1978) noted that to reduce disruptive behavior, adults in a school must be consistent in their behavior. A major part of this consistency involves making and clearly specifying the rules. Bortz (NEA, 1974) for example, felt that children cannot behave responsibly and intelligently when only the teacher knows what is to be done and why. The NIE Report (NIE, 1978) noted that violence and property loss is less in schools where students rated classrooms as well-disciplined and where rules are strictly enforced. The report recommended that schools have systematic school-wide discipline with a lack of arbitrariness in the rules and no unnecessary punitiveness.

Piaget (1950) called one of his levels of morality reciprocity which involves, among other things, a willingness and ability to work with others to improve a situation. Tanner (1978) advised that: (1) children should be involved in the making of rules; and (2) the concept of reciprocity can be used to determine if a child is ready to participate. Wayson (1980) advised that when rules are made by the people involved and when expectations are clearly understood, there are fewer transgressions. The more nearly rules are derived from learning principles and an understanding of rational
behavior, the more effective they are. For the OCI, items were developed to reflect who is involved in making the rules, e.g.,

. Staff generally agree upon what all school staff are expected to do in given circumstances.

how explicit the rules are, e.g.,

. The goals of the school are made explicit, and how they relate to rational behavior, e.g.,

. Many rules apply to matters that are trivial, highly personal, or have no effect upon the school or class.

Physical Environment

If organization design, as defined earlier in this chapter, is the arranging of the structural factors which constitute the organization's basic form and nature, then the physical environment is the arranging of the environmental conditions (including tasks, schedules, and work flow) to optimize the functioning of the organization and its members (Hornstein, Bunker, Burke, Gindes, & Lewicki, 1971). In general organizational theory, there are four basic transactions between the individual and his or her environment: instrumental, symbolic, pleasure and growth (Steel, 1972). Instrumental transactions have to do with the degree to which the physical environment helps or hinders the accomplishment
of tasks. Symbolic transactions communicate what status an individual may hold, how long to stay in one's presence, or where territorial boundaries are located. Pleasure transactions have to do with space that provides a sense of either emotional or physical well-being or both. Growth transactions refer to those environmental aspects of an organization that either spur one on to learn and experiment or allow one to stagnate. All four types of environmental transactions may influence school discipline.

Instrumental transactions occur in school settings when, for example, teachers' lounges are conducive to informal conversation and do not physically separate individuals. Classrooms without noisy, outside distractions may be considered positive places for learning. Schedules that fail to allow for orderly movement of students between classes can be considered to be a negative instrumental transaction. For example, in one study (Crowe, Pesce, Reimer, & Hanes, 1976), one school had students changing classes at the same time while moving through restricted corridor space, causing numerous fights. After changing schedules and movement patterns, thus producing a better separation of students, assaults at the school decreased significantly.

Symbolic transactions are communication mechanisms that serve to tell others who an individual is, what his or her likes and dislikes are, and what status ought to be accorded to the individual. Haase and Di Mattia (1970) found that
administrators prefer to have a certain social distance from others by having a desk separating them while teachers and counselors preferred not having a desk separating them from others. According to Wayson (1980) discipline in the school is affected by the degree to which adults and children in the school feel isolated from others.

Pleasure transactions affect school discipline to the extent that school decorations, colors, and a feeling of "warmth" allow individuals to have a sense of gratification just by being there. The less the school environment reflects students' work, the less the staff and students feel a sense of gratification by being in the school, the greater the discipline problems (Wayson, 1980).

Growth transactions refer to environmental factors that force one to make preference choices, be aware of who one is, and make conscious choices regarding interactions and transactions. Koneya (1976) and Sommer (1969) observed that students are less likely to participate in discussions if they sit on the sides or at the rear of the classroom. Adams and Biddle (1970) wrote that student participation in class is directly related to the size of the group and teacher proximity. Smith, Neisworth, and Greer (1978) reported that in contrived situations, children place figures farther apart in a principal's office (a formal situation) than in a living room (an informal situation). In order to reduce school discipline problems, the NIE Report (NIE, 1978) recommended that class size - thus impersonality - be reduced.
Barker (1968) coined the term behavior setting for those routine, unexceptional occurrences that: (1) form the basic patterns of living for each individual; and (2) structure their behavior. Behavior, he argued, occurs at specific times, in specific ways, and in relationship to specific physical environments.

Schools and Their Environment. The study of people interacting with their environment is important for understanding the ways in which organizations are structured and operate. For schools, the environment in which activities take place should provide a setting which is pleasant, is convenient for adults and students to work and reflects the interests, cultures, values and activities in the school. The more the school looks and operates like a library, restaurant, or conference center and the less like a penal institution, the fewer the problems (Wayson, 1980).

For the OCI, items were developed to reflect instrumental transactions with the environment, e.g.,

. Use is made of "nooks and crannies" where individuals may be alone to think, read or work,

symbolic transactions, e.g.,

. The seating in the cafeteria does not permit students to sit in small groupings,

pleasure transactions, e.g.,
Students' work is displayed anywhere and growth transactions.

Students do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.

Parent/Community/School Relationships

The relationship of an organization to its immediate operating environment generally has been considered to have a direct impact on the functioning of the organization (Porter, et al., 1975; Bobbitt, et al., 1978). The most important factors influencing an organization with respect to its environment are the environment's stability or instability and its complexity versus its simplicity. (Porter, et al., 1975).

In one sense, schools must fulfill their societal role or function - as suggested by Spady (1964 a,b) - to transmit the culture of the society and prepare the young for their places in it. In another sense, schools must directly and indirectly interact with society to obtain resources (e.g., teachers, finances), obtain "raw materials" (e.g., students), and produce trained young adults, each ready to take a place in society. How schools adapt to differing environments (i.e., stable/unstable, simple/complex) determine the extent to which they effectively can achieve their goals (Porter, et al., 1975).

Tanner (1978) in discussing home/school relationships, claimed there exists substantial interdependence of home
lives and school lives. In the application of behavior modification techniques to improve discipline, Madsen and Madsen (1974) cited several concrete examples of parent/community involvement in the school to improve discipline. Phillips (1972) advocated schools' have adult education classes called "Understanding Yourself and Your Children." Fantini (1965) advocated strong community participation not only for improved home/school communications but also as the basis for institutional reform and modification of school structure. In the NIE Report (NIE, 1978), 51% of the responding principals said that parents provided them with "very important support" in handling discipline problems. Further, there was less property loss in schools where families support school disciplinary policies. As Wayson (1980) noted, more frequent transactions with parents and other community forces result in better opportunity to improve both achievement and behavior in a school.

Items on the OCI were designed to reflect parent involvement, e.g.,

. A sense of direction and mutual purpose is not shared among a significant number of parents

community participation, e.g.,

. Teachers frequently interact with students' parents

and school involvement in the community,

. Teachers know the neighborhood their students know.
Mechanisms for Coping with Personal Problems

Every social organization is composed of individuals with differing cognitive, affective and psychomotor back­
grounds and capacities. Many texts on organizational be­
havior, (e.g., Porter, et al., 1975, Bobbitt, et al., 1978) begin with a discussion of what individuals are like. Numer­
ous models of behavior, which attempt to describe individuals in terms of their behavior generally are presented: the rational (Edwards, 1954) versus the emotional model (Rice, 1965); the behaviorist (Skinner, 1971) versus the phenomeno­logical model (Rogers, 1969); the microeconomic (McGuire, 1964) versus the self-actualizing person model (Maslow, 1943); the Theory X versus the Theory Y model of McGregor (1960); and the social-psychological (Lewin, 1947) versus the socratic-rational model (Blake & Mouton, 1968). All of these pro­
posed models have at least one element in common: an attempt to understand and predict the behavior of individuals as complete individuals. Each proposed model is an attempt to comprehend the facets of an individual's background and personality, determine underlying motivations, and project those facets and motivations in ways so as to allow prediction of behavior. If behavior can be predicted, the amount of "unexplained variance" (Bobbitt, et al, 1978) in organizations will be reduced or eliminated, thus enhancing organizational functioning.
In school settings, concern with the individual as a whole person in order to improve the functioning of the organization, is no less important.

As Anderson's (1965) research into the behavior of school principals demonstrated,

The importance of emotions, feelings and perceptions was pointed out in this investigation. Some principals...forget that they are forced to deal with these emotions and perceptions....
Demanding the facts in each instance, they refuse to accept emotions, feelings, and perceptions as facts (p.13).

That emotions, perceptions, values, attitudes and beliefs are based on the human being functioning both inside and outside the school is evident in all the models mentioned above but is probably best described by one of the proponents of the phenomenological view of individuals. Hitt (1969) writes,

Man can be described meaningfully in terms of his consciousness;...he is unique alongside millions of other personalities; he can be described in relative (rather than absolute terms; he must be studied in a holistic manner...
(p. 657).

The behaviors of individuals in an organization are influenced by their personal and family situations (Haccoun &
Campbell, 1972). Individuals in a school, as in any organization, also possess a variety of feelings, values, and attitudes that influence and, in turn, are influenced by their behaviors (Hornstein, et al., 1971). Merton (1968) claimed that one of the dysfunctions of a bureaucracy is to ignore non-task related activities. If adults and students in the school are recognized as feeling individuals with problems inside and outside the school and, such recognition is combined with a climate of problem solving in the school, a greater commitment to participate fully in the work of the school will emerge (Wayson, 1980).

The OCI was designed to reflect the differing nature of individuals,

. Individual differences are neither respected nor accommodated
and personal problems which may affect their work
. Teachers do not admit feelings that are causing them to behave inappropriately.

Formal Curriculum and Style of Instruction

Curriculum and instruction is an area that has received wide attention both as a primary function of schooling (Spady, 1964, a,b) and as the focus of discipline strategies (e.g., Tanner, 1978; Howard, 1978). In terms of the design of the school as an organization, curriculum and instructional practices are related to how learning activities are carried out and
what the standards of evaluation are for such activities (Porter, et al., 1975). In a related sense, curriculum and instructional practices provide a prescribed role (Hickson, 1966) for the teacher as a teacher, for the pupil as a pupil, and so forth.

Howard (1978) suggested that discipline problems decrease as morale increases and morale increases as students become more interested in the educational activities of the school. Tanner (1978) noted that formal subject matter and skills and concepts have always been considered a part of the curriculum. What matters, though, is that behaviors, values, and attitudes have been ignored as part of the curriculum to the detriment of discipline programs. Van Til (1974) wrote that "better discipline will prevail when learning is related to the social realities which surround the child." Kvaraceus (1974) discussed curriculum as it related to delinquent behavior. He felt that threatening, misunderstood curriculum causes a defense mechanism to be aroused in students resulting in disruptive behavior. The NIE Report (NIE, 1978) noted that student violence is higher in schools where more students say that teachers are not teaching what they want to learn. Smith, Neisworth and Greer (1978) believed that the curriculum related not only to academic content or teaching methodology but also to the social growth of the students as well. Fantini (1965) claimed that for maximum effectiveness, teaching styles and learning styles must be matched. He noted students came to school with differing
personalities and needs. As the child interacts with the environment, he or she develops coping mechanisms to enable learning to occur. Teaching styles are shaped similarly. Consequently, flexibility in the style of teaching will allow teachers to meet classes of differing composition successfully and to match teaching to learning styles. Wayson (1980) advocated more broadly conceived concepts of curriculum, with content and processes appropriate for the students served, and greater variety and diversity which will tend to reduce discipline problems within the school.

For the OCI, items were developed to reflect the social growth of students,

- The curriculum does not include teaching students how to make choices,

- Teaching methodology,

- A variety of teaching styles are evident within the faculty,

- Students may transfer easily from one subject to another, or one program to another.

**Organizational Climate**

To this point, the discussion has focused on the nature of discipline in American education and the design characteristics of school organizations that define the ways in which
schools are structured and operate relative to discipline. In this section, an examination will be made of the ways in which organizational attributes described above have been assessed as a concept called organizational climate.

In a selective review of the literature, James and Jones (1974) categorized efforts to measure climate into three areas: (1) a multiple measurement organizational attribute approach; (2) a perceptual measurement-organizational attribute approach; and (3) a perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach.

The multiple measurement-organizational attribute approach is so named because of its intent to measure global attributes of climate (e.g., the context, structure, norms, and values inside the organization and physical environment) as relatively permanent features of the organization that influence behavior of individuals in the organization (Forehand & Gilmer, 1964). Unfortunately, such approaches add nothing to existing knowledge because they exclude nothing. Such approaches include work on taxonomies of organizations (e.g., Katz & Kahn, 1966; Blau & Scott, 1962; Etzioni, 1964), studies on organizational context (e.g., Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Pugh, Hickson, Hinings & Turner, 1968, 1969) and organizational structure (e.g., Porter, et al., 1975; Pugh, et al., 1968, 1969). As James and Jones (1974) noted, "organizational climate appears synonymous with organizational situation and seems to offer little more than a semantically appealing 'catch-all' term" (p. 1009).
The perceptual measurement-organizational attribute approach is intended to be a measure of organizational structure and environmental stimuli as perceived by the members of the organization. The climate of an organization, according to this approach, is based on: (1) individual autonomy; (2) the degree of structure assigned to a given position; (3) reward orientation of individuals and (4) consideration, warmth, and support for others (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970). The climate of an organization is thought to be a type of psychological process which moderates the relationships between either individual or situational characteristics and behavior. The climate instruments developed by Fox and his colleagues (Fox, Luszki, & Schmuck, 1966; Fox, Schmuck, Van Egmond, Ritvo, & Jung, 1973) focus upon social processes and are related to feelings, beliefs, and attitudes about how the classroom or school influences behavior. As Guion (1973) pointed out, however, the accuracy of a perceptive measure should be validated against some empirical criteria.

The perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach is considered to be a summary evaluation of the interaction between the organization and the individual. This particular approach to measuring organizational climate has been criticized as replicating work already done in attitude measurement (Johannesson, 1973) or as re-inventing the wheel (Guion, 1973).
Many of the measures of climate contain one or more measures of leadership behavior: managerial support and managerial structure (Schneider & Bartlett, 1968, 1970); leader aloofness, production emphasis, thrust and consideration (Friedlander & Margulis, 1969; Halpin & Croft, 1963); and support from supervisors (Friedlander & Greenburg, 1971). It is not that measures such as the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) of Halpin and Croft (1963) are not useful; it is just that such measures are, as Anderson (1965) claimed, based solely on the perceptions that leaders and followers have of each other's behavior. Such perceptions may be nothing more than attitude measures (Smith & Jones, 1974; Johannesson, 1973). Other instruments of this genre share similar limitations (e.g., Stern, 1970; Trickett & Moos, 1973).

The High School Characteristic Index (Stern, 1970) contains 300 items and is based on student perceptions of the school. However, its length makes it of questionable value (NWREL, 1976). Since Stern began with individual personality characteristics and sought matching environmental characteristics, his instrument may reflect only the characteristics of the individual respondent. The instrument developed by Trickett and Moos (1973) focuses on the classroom level of the school organization and is not tied to any general taxonomy of structure and process. The Learning Environment Inventory
and My Class Inventory (Anderson, 1973; Anderson & Walberg, 1968, 1969) use student judgment to predict learning outcomes. These items measure the "personality" of the classroom and are not tied to the structure or operations of the school organization.

The Class Activities Questionnaire (CAQ) of Steele, House and Kerins (1971) examines the "prevailing patterns of instructional emphasis." Some items on the CAQ are used to evaluate the classroom and how the classroom environment is manipulated to produce optimal learning. The generalized ability of the CAQ to other areas is doubtful since it was designed to evaluate programs for gifted children in the State of Illinois; it also assumed that the class operated as a group. The instrument measures classroom (and not school) characteristics. The work of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL, 1976) involved developing and testing an instrument used to measure Spady's (1964 a,b) five functions of schooling: custody/control; selection; evaluation/certification; instruction; and socialization. The instrument contains items which cut across organizational dimensions, although the items are grouped under each of the five functional categories. That is, items clearly related to communication, extent of rule enforcement, role perceptions, participation in decision making, and the like all may be grouped under one heading. Although this in
itself does not mitigate the effectiveness of the instrument, it does confuse interpretability in terms of measuring the organizational characteristics of schools. That is, if a score on a given scale, say custody/control, is examined, it is not clear whether the score indicates a measurement of communication, rule enforcement, or some other aspect of organizational structure or operation. In addition, the authors fail to indicate how the instrument could be used in a diagnostic fashion to specify problem areas to be addressed.

Other problems with the instrument are:

1. only "face" validity was examined;

2. class and school-level data was gathered only from students with no apparent concern about using the instrument with adults in the school at some future time;

3. items relevant to the category on instruction were thought appropriate only to individual classrooms, not the entire school; and

4. the length of the questionnaire (29 or 30 pages, depending on the form used) and the time of administration (more than one hour) is thought to be overwhelming to the respondent.
Although the instrument was designed around Spady's (1964 a,b) functions of schooling (listed earlier) it does not examine the ways in which schools are structured and operated. The implicit goal for the instrument appears to be an initial attempt to measure whether a school is achieving its function and to what degree. The intent of the current study is to develop a valid and reliable instrument capable of distinguishing between schools with good and those with poor discipline, thus limiting the usefulness of an instrument developed to measure the five functions of schooling.

Problems with Perceptual Measures

If an instrument is to be used in a diagnostic or prescriptive fashion, it must be tied to some empirical criterion. Throughout the discussion of instruments to measure the perceptions of organizational members, James and Jones (1974) repeatedly raised questions of criterion validity. That is, they insisted quite correctly, as did Guion (1973) that such instruments ought to be tied to some observable base in reality.

A methodology which asks those involved in a situation to describe the situation has its limitations. As James and Jones (1974) noted,

Purely perceptual measurement does not permit differentiation between diverse but important different situations: inconsistent or
capricious behavior; behavior adapted to individual needs; differences caused by different opportunities to observe; differences caused by individual characteristics; and instrument error. (p. 1104)

**Advantages of Perceptual Measures**

However, reports of perceptual observations have one distinct advantage that tends to mitigate the objections raised by these authors: they are representative of reality for the members of the organization. Whatever limitations exist in the respondents' perception, whatever the differential observational opportunities are among individuals, and whatever the characteristics of an individual are, perceptual reporting captures all of them as they currently exist in the setting under investigation. To the extent individuals and groups within an organization reflect the impact of the organizational structure and function on its members, perceptual reporting provides a useful method for understanding the nature of an organization and concurrently, the behavior of the people who comprise it.

Although James and Jones (1974) argued forcefully and justifiably for criterion validity for the perceptual measurements they reviewed, they did not note the usefulness of construct validity in initial instrument development. That is, in the development and testing of a mathematics achievement test, for example, the test may be validated against other
valid mathematics tests (criteria). In the development of a new instrument to measure a theoretical construct, the first steps involve items that have content validity, which reflect a common judgment or consensus about the construct to be investigated (Issac & Michael, 1971). The current study investigates, in part, whether the OCI demonstrates construct validity; that is, whether the OCI distinguishes between schools judged to have either good or poor discipline.

Summary

The review of literature has dealt with three areas: the historical role of discipline in American education, the design characteristic of school organizations that impact upon discipline and previous attempts to measure organizational climate.

Discipline, when defined as the control of students for purposes of instruction and socialization, is thought to have its modern roots in the religious beliefs of the Puritans. After American and industrial concerns realized the potential that schools had for inculcating the ideas of American capitalism in children, the age of "scientific" discipline began. Principles of experimental psychology, scientific management, administrative management theory and observation strategies became de rigueur for school discipline. Discipline continued to be directed towards the individual student. Schools, and the adults and children within them are thought of as a
collection of classrooms and not as a social organization
with all the advantages, attributes and disadvantages of
other organizations.

Schools are social entities designed to achieve certain
goals and objectives through rationally coordinated functions
on a continuous basis through time. The literature suggests
examining selected characteristics that define the ways in
which schools are structured and operate in order to deter­
mine the ways in which schools attempt to achieve goals through
coordinated efforts. The characteristics are: (1) com­
munication, problem solving, and decision making; (2) pat­
terns of authority distribution and use; (3) rule making and
enforcement; (4) parent/community/school relationships;
(5) mechanisms for coping with personal problems; (6) the
physical environment including schedules and work flow; and
(7) the formal curriculum and style of instruction.

Previous attempts at simultaneously examining the
design characteristics of organizations from a perceptual
basis have resulted in what has been called the "fuzzy" con­
cept of organizational climate. Instruments purporting to
measure organizational climate have been generally less than
satisfactory. The instruments reviewed, for example, have
been criticized for: lack of selectivity in terms of
attempting to include everything in the organization;
failure to validate against empirical criteria; and measuring
already measurable attitudes of respondents, thus adding nothing new to knowledge about organizations.

The current study was designed to determine the reliability and validity of an instrument, the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI). Ultimately, the OCI is intended for use as a diagnostic tool for pinpointing the causes of discipline problems. The current, initial testing of the OCI however, focused on whether it was able to distinguish between schools known to have either good or poor discipline. A description of how the OCI was developed and tested relative to the questions of reliability and validity is presented in Chapter III.
III. METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate the possible impact of organizational design characteristics on school discipline, it was necessary to construct, test and evaluate an instrument with the capacity of assessing the characteristics of an organization. This chapter will deal with three areas of concern: instrument construction and development; experimental procedures and sample; and data analysis procedures.

**Instrument Construction and Development**

Instruments used in this study consisted of a demographic questionnaire of 12 items, a 142-item form and a 102-item form of the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI).

The demographic questionnaire asked for the following information:

1. school name;
2. number of years at this school;
3. current position (i.e., teacher, counselor, or administrator);
4. total number of years working as an educator;
5. total number of years of teaching experience;
6. highest degree held;
These first eight items are the independent variables under investigation in this study. That is, they are the conditions that vary because of the nature of things (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973). For example, item seven is age. Respondents recorded their individual ages for this item. This condition (age variable) then represents a condition that varies among respondents. In other words, age is an independent variable in this study. Dependent variables are causally related to independent variables in some real or hypothesized manner. For this study, the dependent variables are scores on the OCI.

The items are based on the earlier work of Wynn and Ransom (1977) and were refined in four separate discussions with Wayson. Each item reflects specific conditions which are presumed to vary and are presumed to be a source of any differences observed. Each item was either of the fill-in-the-blank variety or required a check mark to complete. In addition to the eight items listed above, data was gathered on the beliefs of respondents relative to discipline. Respondents were asked to rate the following

---

conditions in their school by circling one response on a one to six scale:

(1) the number of discipline problems (from 1 = low to 6 = high);

(2) the nature of most of the discipline problems (from 1 = mild to 6 = severe); and

(3) compared with the best school you know about, how would you rate the students in this school relative to discipline? (from 1 = low, worst to 6 = high, best).

These last items on the demographic questionnaire were included:

(1) to serve as a check on judges' classification of schools as having above or below average discipline for the field test (see page 67); and,

(2) as the basis for computing correlation coefficients (see pages 75 through 77 for discussion of validity and page 121 for actual coefficients). The demographic questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.

Item and Scale Development

Work on the CCI began with the initial work by Wayson (1980) on the earlier Discipline Context Inventory (DCI). The DCI is a 100-item scale constructed as a discussion-instrument to indicate organizational problem areas related
to school discipline. Used in training programs, the DCI was intended to focus attention on areas of concern and provide a basis for discussion and problem solving. Items for the DCI employed the Likert (1932) approach to scaling and item development. The Likert technique used (Ferguson, 1952) includes:

1. collect a list of statements;
2. edit;
3. administer the items to a group;
4. evaluate the responses based on number of respondents giving each response;
5. score the data;
6. remove inconsistent items (i.e., those that do not strongly relate to other items in the same set); and,
7. re-administer and rescore the instrument.

Wayson (1980) employed the seven steps listed above to develop and refine the DCI over a period of five years. The instrument was used with teachers, students, administrators and other school staff in workshops and university level courses with approximately 1,500 respondents. Respondents scored and evaluated the instrument after each administration and discussed the items in a group setting. Items inconsistent with others were removed or modified with further administrations.
of the instrument providing a check on earlier administrations. Ultimately, this procedure led to an instrument that respondents agreed reflected the ways in which their schools were structured and operated. Additionally, respondents felt that grouping the items into the seven categories discussed in Chapter II was justified. The DCI is contained in Appendix B.

**Revising the DCI**

The DCI, even though refined by numerous administrations was limited in its usefulness; it could be used only in training sessions where respondents could clarify items verbally. For example, many of the items had more than one stimulus (e.g., "Students, staff and parents...") which respondents could interpret in numerous ways. To administer such an instrument in a research setting where respondents do not interact with a trainer and each other would confound the interpretability of the results.

Wang (1932) suggested that in constructing an instrument used to measure beliefs, each item must be debatable. That is, when initially constructed, each item must reflect opinion, not fact. In addition, he claimed each statement should:

1. be relevant to the area under consideration;
2. be subject to just one interpretation;
3. be simple, not compound;
(4) be short;
(5) contain one complete thought;
(6) be clear-cut and direct; and
(7) be stated in the active, not passive voice.

Using the seven recommendations above and eliminating multiple stimuli, items for the pilot test version of the OCI were constructed, yielding a 142-item instrument. Furthermore:

(1) items were arranged randomly;
(2) fifty percent of the items (71 items) were reversed to eliminate the potential to develop a pattern (i.e., all high or all low) of responses (reversed items were stated in the negative);
(3) the scaled responses were assigned a range from one to six to accommodate computer scoring techniques which do not count zeros.

The last two points, listed above, require some discussion.

In the earlier DCI and the OCI, a six-point scale (zero to five for the DCI and one to six for the OCI) was chosen to eliminate the possibility of selecting an "average" response of the three. Additionally, the reversal of items in the scale reduces the tendency towards the development of a response set, a predisposition to respond in a patterned way.
Experimental Procedures and Sample

The following sections describe the phases of the current research in terms of the initial or pilot test of the OCI and the final field test. Data is presented according to the procedures employed and a description of the sample.

Pilot Test Procedures and Purposes

In February, 1979, two schools - one elementary school and one senior high school - in the Columbus area were contacted for possible participation in the pilot test of this study. Each school had a local reputation for above average discipline and each school principal expressed a willingness to cooperate in the study. Instruments, consisting of the demographic questionnaire and the 142-item OCI, were administered at regularly scheduled faculty meetings at each school. Each principal introduced the researcher who explained that information was being collected to:

(1) determine if the instrument were consistent (reliable); and
(2) help prepare the instrument for analysis to determine if it measured what was claimed (validity).

The researcher encouraged respondents to answer all items (since blanks would necessitate eliminating their instrument
from inclusion in the analysis) and to provide only one response per item. The researcher assured the respondents that all information would be anonymous and reported only as group data. Response rate at the elementary school was 100% \((n_1 = 21)\); at the senior high school it was 98.9\% \((n_2 = 92)\). The time required to complete the instruments ranged from 25 to 45 minutes.

The purposes of the pilot test were to:

(1) determine the reliability estimates of the 142-item OCI;

(2) use those estimates to eliminate inconsistent items; and

(3) determine, by inspection, if scores on each subscale and the total instrument were towards the positive end of the scale (since both schools were considered to have above average discipline and schools with good discipline were expected to rate high on the seven organizational characteristics).

**Pilot Test Sample Description**

Demographic data describing the two school staffs involved in the pilot test of OCI are displayed in Tables 1 and 2.
### TABLE 1

Staff Demographic Data by School for Pilot Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n₁ = 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n₁ = 92)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Held</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n₁ = 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n₁ = 92)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Bachelor's to Bachelor's plus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Master's to Master's</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate or Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n₁ = 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n₁ = 92)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n₁ = 21)</td>
<td>(n₂ = 92)</td>
<td>(N = 113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years at School</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Education</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years Teaching</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 2, it may be observed that the staff in the high school had been at that school nearly twice as long as the elementary school staff had been at their school. The difference may have occurred because the elementary school had been converted to an alternative school and experienced a nearly 100% staff turnover about four years before the current study began. The high school had been in existence for about 12 years; consequently, teachers could have attained longer tenure than at the elementary school. Several of the teachers at the elementary school indicated they had held other positions in education (e.g., counselors, community education specialists) before becoming a teacher. This fact may account for the mean difference between the number of years in education (12.4) and the number of years in teaching (10.8).
Field Test Procedures and Purposes

The final data collection effort involved gaining permission to administer the instruments in this study to as many school staffs as possible, simultaneously categorizing the schools as having either above or below average discipline characteristics. The researcher contacted acquaintances and professional colleagues who provided an entree to talk with central office administration staff, usually the district superintendent or assistant superintendent. In two cases, school principals were contacted directly. These administrators were told that the project was designed to gather data relative to determining the reliability and validity of the instruments.

The researcher contacted administrators from the central offices to provide names of schools in their districts that might be interested in participating in this study. The principal of each school was then contacted and informed that the superintendent or assistant superintendent for the district had given permission to conduct a study in the school if the principal approved. It was made clear that the principal in each case made the final decision. They were told the nature of the study and, if they concurred, were mailed an appropriate number of instruments to be administered during regularly scheduled faculty meetings and returned by mail.
Once central office administrators had provided permission to contact selected schools in their district, they also were asked to categorize each school on the basis of school discipline. They were told that many schools in their district probably had average discipline, but that they were to omit those schools from consideration for inclusion in the current study. The remaining schools in their district, if any, were to be categorized as having either above or below average discipline. A classification of this nature would serve as the basis for examining one of the research objectives of the current study: namely, to determine if the OCI is capable of distinguishing between groups of schools judged to have above or below average discipline.

The purposes of the field test were to:

1. recompute reliability coefficients, assess their comparability to the pilot test coefficients, and determine - on the basis of the two tests - if the OCI is reliable;

2. determine whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and schools judged to have either above or below average discipline; and

3. determine whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI
and respondents' judgements of the nature, severity, and frequency of occurrence of discipline problems in their schools.

**Field Test Sample Description**

Thirty schools in Ohio and western Pennsylvania - twelve elementary, ten junior high/middle, and eight high schools - were used in this study. Of these, central office administrators had classified 24 as having above average discipline and six as having below average discipline. Instruments, consisting of the demographic questionnaire and the OCI, were sent and received in return envelopes in May and June, 1979. Response rates by school level, shown in Table 3, ranged from 56.1% to 86.1% with a mean response rate of 63.0%.

**TABLE 3**

Percent of Instrument Returns by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>No. of Staff</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High/Middle Schools</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High Schools</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 4 and 5 contain demographic data describing the subjects involved in the field test of the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI). Data are presented relative to schools that were categorized as having either above or below average discipline.
TABLE 4
Staff Demographic Data by School for Field Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position (χ²=0.32)</th>
<th>Above Average Discipline (n₁=572)</th>
<th>Below Average Discipline (n₂=106)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=678)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Held (χ²=13.50*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Average Discipline (n₁=572)</th>
<th>Below Average Discipline (n₂=106)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=678)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Bachelor's to Bachelor's plus</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Master's to Master's plus</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate or Specialist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex (χ²=9.06**)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Average Discipline (n₁=572)</th>
<th>Below Average Discipline (n₂=106)</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=678)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01
TABLE 5

Mean Age, Number of Years at School, Years as Educator and Years Teaching Experience by School for Field Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Average Discipline</th>
<th>Below Average Discipline</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($n_1 = 572$)</td>
<td>($n_2 = 106$)</td>
<td>($N = 678$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years at School</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in Education</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years Teaching</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T-tests conducted on the data displayed in this table yielded non-significant results.

As shown in Table 4, the majority of respondents were teachers (88.0%). The majority of respondents also held a Bachelor's degree or a Bachelor's plus additional college coursework (59.0%). It may also be observed that there was not an equal distribution of males (36.7%) to females (61.7%) among the schools under investigation. Chi-square statistics computed on the data shown on Table 4 indicated statistically significant differences between schools having above and those having below average discipline on the variables of "degree held" and sex. Such differences in
the sampling characteristics could account for differences appearing in later analyses of the data.

**Review.** To this point in examining methodological considerations, the discussion has centered around the development of the instruments used, the initial or pilot testing of the instruments, and the final field test. For both the pilot and final field test, the procedures and purposes of the test and a description of the sample population were presented. The next section will discuss the statistical procedures used to examine the data with respect to the research objectives.

**Reliability Analysis**

Variance may be thought of as a measure of the degree of dispersion about a given mean. As is the case with any measure, variance is not completely accurate. It may be thought of, therefore, as having two components: an amount that is an accurate measure of dispersion, called true variance, and an amount that is error. Reliability is logically defined as the amount or proportion of variance that is true variance (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973). Looked at from a more intuitive perspective, reliability is a numerical estimate of the consistency of items in an instrument and their stability over time (Issac & Michael, 1971). Combining these notions, it may be said that the sum of the numerical reliability estimate or coefficient \( R_{tt} \) and the amount of total variance that is error always
equal unity (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973)

\[ r_{tt} + e^2 = 1.00 \]  

[Eq. 1]

Thus, it may be seen that the greater the reliability coefficient, the less the error in the measure under investigation and the greater the confidence that may be placed in the consistency and stability of the instrument.

According to Guilford and Fruchter (1973) there are three general procedures for estimating reliability:

1. the method of internal consistency;
2. the method of alternate forms; or
3. retest reliability.

The latter two methods respectively, have been termed coefficients of equivalence and stability by Cronbach (1947).

Since the instrument under investigation in this study, the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI) is considered to be homogeneous - that is - it is intended to assess the organizational design characteristic of schools that impact on discipline - the most appropriate measure of reliability, and the one hereafter discussed, is a measure of internal consistency (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973; Issac & Michael, 1971). One of the most common measures of internal consistency is the split-half approach wherein the items are divided into two groups and a numerical estimate of their comparability (consistency) is developed. Because an instrument may be split in half many ways and each way may yield a different reliability
estimate, it is argued that a method of estimating the reliability based on individual items rather than two arbitrary subsets of items is more appropriate (Richardson & Kuder 1939). The two commonly used estimates are the Kuder-Richardson 20 and 21 formulas and Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1970). Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha$) provides a more conservative estimate of reliability and is probably the most widely used and available method for estimating reliability coefficients (Hull & Nie, 1979). For these reasons, Cronbach's alpha was used in this study.

Reliability estimates were computed for each of the seven subscales of the OCI as well as the total instrument. In the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program used for this analysis, reliability estimates are generated for each group of items (i.e., each subscale of the OCI). In addition, reliability coefficients (alphas) are presented which show what the alpha value would be if the item were deleted. For example, a coefficient of .50 for the rules administration subscale might be printed along with numerical estimates of what the alpha would be if a given item were deleted from the subscale. Obviously, any item which, by its elimination, would increase the alpha estimate beyond .50 would be considered for elimination.

Correlation coefficient tables between each item and every other item also were generated in this analysis. Those
items that (1) did not correlate highly with other items and (2) also would increase the estimate of reliability if deleted, were dropped from further analysis. This procedure reduced the original 142-item pilot test version of the OCI to a 102-item instrument. Table 6 provides a list showing each subscale together with the number of items in each for the pilot test version of the OCI and the edited, or field test, version of the instrument contained in Appendix C. Appendix D contains a list of the items deleted.

**TABLE 6**

List of Subscales and Numbers of Items in Pilot Test and Field Test Versions of the OCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Subscale</th>
<th>Pilot Test # of Items</th>
<th>Field Test # of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication, Problem Solving, Decision Making</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authority Relationships</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rules Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Environment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parent/Community Relationships</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mechanisms for Personal Problems</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 142 102
Validity

Validity is the determination of whether an instrument measures what is claimed. A national panel, composed of members of the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education (Author, 1974) has described and defined three types of validity: content, construct, and criterion-related. Content and construct validity will be discussed as it relates to the current study; criterion-related validity is beyond the scope of the current study and will be discussed in Chapter Five. All of the following is based on the work of Cronbach (1970), Isaac and Michael (1971) and Noll, Scannel, and Craig (1979).

Content Validity

Content validity is an estimate of how well an instrument represents the class of situations about which conclusions are to be drawn. Content validity is demonstrated by logically concluding that the instrument content comprises an adequate definition of what is claimed that it measures. As an example, the Discipline Context Inventory (DCI) was administered and refined over a period of five years with more than 1,500 respondents. By the end of the five-year period, respondents were in agreement that the items were related to the various organizational characteristics (e.g., communication, problem solving, and decision making) which the items were intended to reflect. Thus it
is claimed that the DCI from which the OCI was drawn satisfactorily demonstrated a type of content validity by logically relating groups of items to various organizational characteristics.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is a determination of the degree to which a theory, or certain explanatory concepts (constructs) account for scores on an instrument. This type of validity is studied generally when the instrument developer wishes to explore a hypothesized relationship between instrument scores and certain beliefs about the reasons individuals or groups respond the way they do.

For the current study, it was predicted that scores on the OCI and each of its seven subscales would be higher in schools thought to have above average discipline than for schools thought to have below average discipline. The difference in OCI scores was expected to be statistically significant. The method of "known groups" of schools was employed to make this determination (Rokeach, 1960). That is, schools were categorized by the superintendent or assistant superintendent in a given district as having either above or below average discipline. It was hypothesized that the OCI, while constructed on the basis of items said to reflect the theoretical underpinnings of how schools are structured and operated, would distinguish between known
groups of schools on the basis of their possessing above or below average discipline. If the hypothesized differences in OCI scores between the pre-categorized groups of schools occurred and was statistically significant, construct validity would have been shown.

**Multiple Regression**

Multiple regression techniques were used to: (1) identify for further study - those independent (demographic) variables that had the most significant effect on OCI scores (dependent variables); and (2) identify - for purposes of elimination from further consideration - those independent variables that had no effect on OCI scores.

Multiple regression provides a predicted value for the dependent variables (in this case, scores on the subscales and the total OCI) by summing a constant plus the values of each independent variable (in this case, the demographic variables) multiplied by a partial correlation coefficient. The partial correlation coefficient tells how many units of change (increase or decrease) to expect in the dependent variable for a corresponding change in one of the independent variables. This means the larger the coefficient is numerically, the greater the effect that the independent variable (e.g., age) associated with it has on the dependent variable (e.g., score on the OCI.) Stepwise multiple regression techniques were used so as to include relevant variables in the order in which they contributed to the
explained variance. That is, the variable making the most significant contribution appears first, the variable having the second most significant contribution appears second, and so forth.

**Multicollinearity.** One of the necessary assumptions of multiple regression techniques is absence of multicollinearity; that is, the independent variables must not be intercorrelated highly (Nie, et al., 1975). If there are high intercorrelations among the independent variables, the partial correlation coefficients may not be determined uniquely, the effects of the coefficients are confounded - thus limiting interpretability of the regression equations - and the values of the coefficients will fluctuate markedly from sample to sample. To test for possible multicollinearity, a VARIMAX orthogonal factor analysis was applied to the independent variables. One of the products of such an analysis is an estimate of communality. This estimate, also called the squared multiple correlation (SMC), is a coefficient which represents the amount of variance a given item has in common with every other item in a particular group (Rummel, [1967]). The square root of SMC then provides an estimate of the intercorrelation between the independent variables. So, for example, if one of the variables (e.g., years at this school, were to correlate highly with all other variables (r>.80), the interpretability of the results would be confounded.
Another possible source of concern relative to analysis was the possibility of interaction among the variables. That is, if two (second-order) or more (higher order) variables were combining in unsuspected ways to influence the results and this fact was not uncovered, the results could be spurious since the results of stepwise multiple regression no longer would be appropriate (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973). Two-way and three-way interaction terms, therefore, were computed and included in the equations. Results suggested that multiple regression techniques were appropriate in determining those independent variables that make significant contributions to the scores on the OCI and its subscales (dependent variables). Those independent variables identified as having made a statistically significant contribution to the overall predictability of the dependent variables then were subjected to analyses of variance.

**Analysis of Variance**

This study used analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures to: (1) determine the overall relationships between the dependent (OCI) scores and independent (demographic) variables; (2) test for statistical significance; and (3) examine and interpret the patterns of effects between group means.
Due to the unequal cell frequencies in this study ($n_1 = 572, n_2 = 106$) it was necessary to use the most conservative ANOVA available, the full regression model (Kennedy, 1977; Nie, et al., 1975). In this approach to ANOVA, each source of variability is pure; that is, each has removed from it all overlap it shares with the remaining factors. Consequently, there is less chance of the effects being confounded and, due to the conservative nature of this approach, there is less chance of a Type I error - rejecting the null hypothesis of no difference when it is, in fact, true. Since in cases of unequal cell frequencies, the danger of a Type I error is greater than for cases of equal cell frequencies (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973), the choice of the full regression model analysis of variance is the statistic of choice.

Summary

This chapter described the methods used to develop the OCI, the design and implementation of the pilot and field tests, and the types of analyses used to examine the data.

The OCI was developed from the earlier work of Wayson (1980) on the Discipline Context Inventory (DCI) which was developed over a five-year period. Content validity of the items was assured through repeated administrations of the DCI to a total of 1,500 respondents. Several revisions of the DCI, refinement and rewording of the items, elimination
of double-barreled stimuli, and reversal of half of the items from each of the seven subscales resulted in a 142-item version of the OCI.

The pilot test of the OCI was conducted in two local schools: one elementary school and one high school. Data was gathered and subjected to standard reliability analysis techniques (Cronbach's alpha); 40 items were eliminated as inconsistent.

The field test involved 30 schools in Ohio and Western Pennsylvania divided into two groups: those with above average discipline (24 schools) and those with below average discipline (6 schools).

Validity was determined by using the method of "known groups." That is, schools were judged as having either above or below average discipline. The OCI then was examined to determine its capacity to distinguish between the schools.

Multiple regression techniques were used to identify those independent variables that had the most significant effects on the OCI scores. These variables were then subjected to analyses of variance to test for construct validity.

Chapter IV examines results of the study in terms of the research objectives of the study.
IV. RESULTS

The objectives of this study were to determine:

1. the reliability of an instrument, the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI) developed for this study to examine the organizational design characteristics that impact on school discipline

2. whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and schools judged to have either above or below average discipline (construct validity); and

3. whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and respondents' judgments of the nature, severity, and frequency of occurrence of discipline problems in their schools.

This chapter presents the pilot test mean scores on the OCI and mean school discipline ratings, and the results of the study as they relate to each of the research objectives.

**Pilot Test Scores and Ratings**

OCI scores on the pilot test were expected to be in a positive direction because both schools had a local reputation
for having above average discipline. An inspection of the data shown in Table 7 indicates the expectation was generally supported.

**TABLE 7**

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on the OCI by School for the Pilot Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Administration</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Relationships</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for Personal Problems</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI (total instrument)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher also asked respondents to provide data relevant to how they felt about the nature of discipline in their school. As shown in Table 8, respondents in both schools
generally felt that the number of discipline problems in their school was low to average, that the severity of the problems that did exist was generally more mild than severe, and that their students rated high on discipline.

TABLE 8
Mean Staff Ratings of Discipline Problems
by school for the Pilot Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Discipline Problems</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Discipline Problems</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of Students' Discipline</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ratings are based on a one (low, negative) to six (High, positive) scale.*

Assuming that staff perceptions were accurate, the data presented in Table 8 suggests that the local reputation of both schools as having above average discipline is justified. This finding, considered in light of the generally positive subscale scores reported in Table 7, suggests that the pilot test objective (see Chapter III) of determining whether scores for schools in the above average category were positive, has been accomplished.
Table 9

Mean Staff Ratings of Discipline Problems by School for the Field Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Average Discipline</th>
<th>Below Average Discipline</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Discipline Problems</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Discipline Problems</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of Students' Discipline</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ratings are based on one (low, negative) to six (high, positive) scale.

**<.01
***<.001

As may be observed in Table 9, schools rated as having above average discipline were considered by their staffs to have fewer and more mild discipline problems than schools rated as possessing below average discipline. There also was a difference in the ways in which staff members in each school discipline category viewed their
students with respect to discipline: students in the above average category were believed to have good discipline compared to other schools, while students in the below average category were thought to have poor discipline when compared to other schools.

A \( t \)-test conducted on each of the three variables listed in Table 9 showed statistically significant differences between group means suggesting a measurable difference could exist between schools judged to have above and those judged to have below average discipline.

The data do indicate support for the judges' classification of the 30 schools into those with above average discipline and those with below average discipline.

**Research Objective 1: Instrument Reliability**

This study was conducted in two phases: a pilot test phase and a field test phase. The goals of the pilot test were to:

1. determine the reliability estimates of the 142-item OCI;
2. use those estimates to eliminate inconsistent items; and
3. determine, by inspection, if scores on each subscale and the total instrument were towards the positive end of the scale (since both schools were considered
to have above average discipline and
schools with good discipline were ex­
pected to rate high on the seven
organizational characteristics).

The third pilot test goal is related to a discussion of
instrument validity; consequently, results relative to this
goal are presented later. Goals one and two are relevant
to determining instrument reliability and refining the
OCI for use in the field test.

As discussed in Chapter III, the reliability of an
instrument is a measure of the comparability of each item
and a measure of the stability of the items over time.
Using Cronbach's alpha (α), the pilot test reliability
estimates for the 142-item OCI ranged from .40 to .81
suggesting that 60% to 19% of the variance was due to
measurement error (Kennedy, 1977). Although reliability
estimates of this magnitude are not especially low (Downie,
1967), those with the most measurement error were dropped,
both to increase reliability and decrease the length of
the instrument. Using the procedures discussed in Chapter
III, the number of items was reduced from 142 to 102. Items
eliminated based on pilot test data are shown in Appendix
D.
After the field test with the shortened instrument, Cronbach's alpha (α) reliability coefficients again were computed for the remaining 102 items. Table 10 presents the multiple R correlation coefficients by item and alpha for each subscale for both the pilot and field test.

**TABLE 10**

Reliability and Multiple R Correlation Coefficients for the Pilot and Field Tests of the OCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication, Problem Solving and Decision Making - Subscale 1</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. A sense of direction and mutual purpose is shared among a significant number of staff</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students can not describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The school district expects problems to be solved by the local community</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Problems are not identified and resolved</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. No one feels the school belongs to them</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. A sense of direction and mutual purpose is not shared among a significant number of parents</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. A small number of persons in the school are involved in the school's activities.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Teachers do not know the names of students throughout the school organization.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Students do not participate in solving the problems of the classroom and the school.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Faculty meetings are for staff development and for problem solving.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The school district does not expect problems to be solved by local school staff.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Adults in the school fail to recognize their own responsibilities for handling situations.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Adults do not know how to keep from causing discipline problems.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Students do not exhibit a sense of accomplishing something that they feel is important.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Problems are not identified and resolved.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. No one feels the school belongs to them.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54. Parents can not describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha =</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authority Relationships - Subscale 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-certified staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians) participate in faculty meetings.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students are included as members of the school.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People are not possessive about their job, space or materials.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students do not take responsibility for enforcing the agreed upon pattern of relationships with all other persons in the school.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Staff generally agree upon what all school staff are expected to do in given circumstances.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Teachers escalate small problems into larger ones.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. People say &quot;our school&quot; and &quot;our students,&quot; not &quot;mine.&quot;</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Non-certified staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians) do not participate in inservice sessions.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Adult-convenience takes precedence over the educational growth of individual students.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Teachers help one another solve problems.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 2</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79. Administrators' expectations are clearly communicated.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Status differences are evident.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Everyone ignores problems.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Everyone does what needs to be done.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Teachers are not able to communicate ideas to &quot;superiors.&quot;</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Each level accepts criticism from lower levels.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha =</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rule making and Enforcement - Subscale 3

| 10. Disciplinary techniques are used to punish or to teach blind obedience and not to teach positive ways of behaving. | .61        | .52        |
| 28. Many rules apply to matters that are trivial, highly personal, or have no effect upon the school or class.        | .54        | .57        |
| 39. Rules and expectations are not clearly defined.                                                                  | .55        | .60        |
| 44. Students are not involved in rule-making.                                                                        | .61        | .44        |
| 65. Rules are made by the people who must enforce them.                                                              | .47        | .39        |
| 68. Due process is not applied before punishment.                                                                    | .43        | .43        |
| 70. Students are not punished if the punishment has no educational outcome.                                          | .46        | .39        |
| 71. Rules can not be enforced.                                                                                       | .62        | .69        |
### Table 10 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 3</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76. A few good rules are made and enforced.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. A complete description of what transpired during any behavioral sequence is expected.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Students do not take responsibility for their actions.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Everyone is assumed to be innocent until proven guilty of infractions.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha =</strong></td>
<td><strong>.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Environment - Subscale 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 4</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Students do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Materials are not organized for easy access and clean-up.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The seating in the cafeteria does not permit students to sit in small groupings.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The environment is not well-planned to accommodate movement within rooms.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Students are not involved in planning school decorations.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Staff members do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The environment is well-planned to accommodate movement between rooms.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 4</td>
<td>Pilot Test</td>
<td>Field Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Students do not have space and adequate facilities for their work.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Students have a place in the school; they may use the facilities freely as long as there is consideration for other students and for adults.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Individual and cultural differences are not respected and valued.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Students' work is displayed anywhere.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Adequate materials are available.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Meeting and social areas are crowded.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Adults and students are able to analyze &quot;trouble areas&quot; in the environment.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The physical environment is well organized.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. The physical environment fails to permit a maximum of student independence and interaction.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. The environment is well-designed acoustically.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. While eating, students carry on conversations in small groupings.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Use is made of &quot;nooks and crannies&quot; where individuals may be alone to think, read or work.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{Alpha} = 0.82 \quad \text{Field Test}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Par/Com. Relationships - Subscale 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers do not participate in groups in the local community.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>For children with special problems, help is provided in a manner that denigrates them.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teachers frequently interact with student's parents.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Teachers do not know the students' parents, homes, and community.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Teachers neither know nor respect the students' culture.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Teachers recognize the stereotypes they may hold about the students.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Teachers know the neighborhood their students know.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>When necessary, attention is given to meeting basic needs of students from poor families.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Administrators participate in groups in the local community.</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha = .64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coping With Personal Problems - Subscale 6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students try to force adults in the school to behave the way they expect them to behave.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>No one recognizes that even &quot;good&quot; people or &quot;good&quot; teachers have problems.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subscale 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. No one in the school recognizes and celebrates (even in small ways) when someone achieves something good.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Adults have a tendency to see or cause student problems when there are none.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Irrelevant behavior is rewarded by undue attention.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Teachers escalate small problems into larger ones.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Teachers do not see students as individuals.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Teachers do not admit feelings that are causing them to behave inappropriately.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. If a person has a problem with another, he or she discusses it directly with that person.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Teachers are not able to discern when a discipline incident is over.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Teachers are not permitted to make mistakes.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. No one in the school can give tangible examples of positive changes that have taken place in the school.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha =** .81

### Curriculum and Instructional Style - Subscale 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Students are not involved in learning activities outside the classroom.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale 7</th>
<th>Pilot Test</th>
<th>Field Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. The goals of the school are made explicit.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Students may transfer easily from one teacher to another, one class to another, one subject to another, or one program to another.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teachers choose the methods and materials which they can best use to achieve stated goals.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The curriculum does not include teaching students how to make choices.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Students do not have choices in schedules and assignments.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Students believe the school offers what they need.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. School procedures are related to the goals of the school.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Field trips, outside speakers, and disciplinary practices are seen as extraordinary teaching methods.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Instructional materials build on what the student already knows.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. A variety of teaching styles are evident within the faculty.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Failure is not accepted as a natural part of learning and growth.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As may be observed in Table 10, the multiple R correlation coefficients are generally higher in the pilot test than the field test. The greater item intercorrelations may be due to the small sample size (N=113) or to error. Guilford and Fruchter (1973) recommend a correction be applied to the data in cases where the sample size is about 100. Since no comparisons were to be made between pilot and field test data, no statistical corrections were applied to individual items in the pilot test. The overall reliability coefficients (alphas) for each subscale as well as the total instrument ranged from .71 to .96 suggesting the OCI is reliable.
Table 11 presents the correlations of each subscale with every other subscale as well as with the total instrument. Correlations were high, ranging from .50 to .89, indicating a high internal consistency within the instrument as well as reflecting the presence of some common characteristic among the subscales.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Communication, Problem Solving</th>
<th>Authority Relationships</th>
<th>Rules Administration</th>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Parent/Community Relationships</th>
<th>Mechanisms for Personal Problems</th>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>OCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Problem Solving</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority Relationships</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Administration</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Relationships</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for Personal Problems</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher conducted a principal components factor analysis with an orthogonal factor solution to determine what common characteristic might explain the high subscale intercorrelations. The criteria for interpreting the results were: (1) for a factor to be considered meaningful, it was required to have more than three items loaded on it; (2) a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 was used for termination of factor extraction; and (3) for an item to be loaded on a factor, it was required to have a loading of at least .40 on that factor and no loading greater than .30 on any other factor. Table 12 presents the items by factor and their factor loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items**</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one recognizes that even &quot;good&quot; people or &quot;good&quot; teachers have problems.</td>
<td>41* 14 00 18 06 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems are not identified and resolved.</td>
<td>53* 25 -01 29 13 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff generally agree upon what all school staff are expected to do in given circumstances.</td>
<td>40* 14 22 13 10 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many rules apply to matters that are trivial, highly personal, or have no effect upon the school or class.</td>
<td>45* 23 -00 10 08 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 12
Rotated Factor Matrix
| Item** | Factors | I | II | III | IV | V | 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty meetings are for staff development and for problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School procedures are related to the goals of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rules can not be enforced.</td>
<td></td>
<td>53*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A few good rules are made and enforced.</td>
<td></td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Administrators' expectations are clearly communicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers are not permitted to make mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers are not able to communicate ideas to &quot;superiors.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>59*</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. No one in the school can give tangible examples of positive changes that have taken place in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff members do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. No one in the school recognizes and celebrates (even in small ways) when someone achieves something good.</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Adults have a tendency to see or cause student problems when there are none.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item**</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers are tense and afraid with their students.</td>
<td>I 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers do not know the students' parents, homes, and community.</td>
<td>II 55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers escalate small problems into larger ones.</td>
<td>III 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers neither know nor respect the students' culture.</td>
<td>IV 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Individual and cultural differences are not respected and valued.</td>
<td>V 03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers do not see students as individuals</td>
<td>h2 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Adults in the school fail to recognize their own responsibilities for handling situations.</td>
<td>I 10 20 59* -01 04 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Adults do not know how to keep from causing discipline problems.</td>
<td>II 43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. A variety of teaching styles are evident within the faculty.</td>
<td>III 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teachers recognize the stereotypes they may hold about the students.</td>
<td>IV 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Different learning styles are respected and accommodated.</td>
<td>V 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. When necessary, attention is given to meeting basic needs of students from poor families.</td>
<td>h2 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at the .05 level.
### TABLE 12 (continued)
Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item**</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Students do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Students can not describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms.</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Students do not take responsibility for enforcing the agreed upon pattern of relationships with all other persons in the school.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The environment is not well-planned to accommodate movement within rooms.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The physical environment is well organized.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The physical environment fails to permit a maximum of student independence and interaction.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The environment is well-designed acoustically.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The environment is well-planned to accommodate movement between rooms.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalues After Rotation | 21.86 | 3.14 | 2.44 | 1.99 | 1.88 |
| Cumulative Proportion of Total Variance | 47.3% | 54.0% | 59.3% | 63.6% | 67.7% |

* Items with acceptable loadings (see text). Loadings have been rounded to two places with decimal points omitted.
** Items have been grouped according to factors for easy comparison.
Each of the five factors shown in Table 12 are labelled as follows:

**Factor I - "Community."** This factor is composed of items reflecting a sense of common purpose, open communication, problem solving and clear expectations mutually understood.

**Factor II - "Isolation."** In some ways the opposite of Factor I, the items comprising this factor show a separation between teachers and students, isolation among adults, a lack of community, and no feeling of belongingness.

**Factor III - "Caring."** This factor is composed of items reflecting the interrelationships among teaching and learning styles and feelings about respect for differences among individuals.

**Factor IV - "Belongingness."** Items subsumed under this factor relate to the students' sense of belongingness to the school and its mission.

**Factor V - "Environment."** This factor is composed of items reflecting the nature of the physical environment of the school.

Factor I is a generalized factor or one which may be considered to be the single best summary of the data (Nie, et al., 1975). Factor II is the second best summary of the data, and so forth.
The five factors do suggest that the items reflect some common characteristics among the data - namely, a sense of community or lack of it (isolation), caring, belongingness, and the nature of the physical environment. However, because of the non-randomness of the sample (i.e., respondent schools represented a dichotomy of above versus below average discipline), further conclusions are unwarranted. Chapter V deals with recommendations for future studies utilizing factor analytic techniques.

Research Objective 2: Construct Validity

Construct validity, as discussed in Chapter III, is a determination of the degree to which certain explanatory constructs - namely, the seven organizational design characteristics described in Chapter II - account for scores on an instrument. For the current study, if scores on the OCI were to indicate a statistically significant difference between schools with above average and those with below average discipline, construct validity would be claimed. Two steps were used to examine the data: first, multiple regression equations were developed to identify those independent variables (e.g., age, sex) that made significant contributions to the results; and, second, an analysis of variance was used to test for group mean differences between schools on OCI scores.
incorporating all relevant independent variables identified in the regression equations.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

Multiple regression analysis was used for two reasons: (1) it readily identifies the independent (demographic) variables of interest; and (2) it provides a numerical estimate (partial correlation) of the strength of the relationships between the independent variables. Identifying the independent variables having the greatest effect on the results is necessary since those variables that do not make a significant contribution to OCI scores can be dropped from further analysis. Obtaining partial correlation coefficients in the regression equations helps provide an intuitive understanding of the effects of the independent variables on OCI scores. That is, a partial correlation coefficient of .40 suggests that the variable associated with it makes a greater contribution to the results than the variable having a partial correlation coefficient of .20.

For the current study, the independent variables examined were: (1) above versus below average discipline rating; (2) years at the school; (3) years in education; (4) years of teaching experience; (5) position (teacher, counselor, administrator); (6) degree held; (7) age; and (8) sex.
Test for multicollinearity. The interpretability of a multiple regression equation will be confounded if extremely high intercorrelations \((r > 0.80)\) exist between the independent variables under investigation (Nie, et al., 1975). This effect, known as multicollinearity, may be tested for in a straightforward manner by conducting a factor analysis of the independent variables (Nie, et al., 1975).

The SPSS factor analysis program produces an estimate of communality or squared multiple correlation (SMC) for each variable with every other variable. For example, the SMC for the variable "number of years as an educator" was 0.88, the square root of which is 0.94. Since 0.94 exceeds the recommended maximum intercorrelation value of 0.80 and since its significantly correlated companion variable "number of years in teaching" was to remain in the equation (88% of all respondents were teachers), the variable "number of years as an educator" was dropped from further analysis.

The best estimation of a score on the OCI was obtained from the relation shown in Equations 2a and 2b,

\[
Y_o = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_5X_5 \quad \text{[Eq. 2a]}
\]

\[
Y_o = 5.00 + 0.20X_1 - 0.21X_2 - 0.16X_3 - 0.20X_4 - 0.17X_5 \quad \text{[Eq. 2b]}
\]

where,

\(Y_o\) = Predicted score on the OCI

\(B_0\) = Intercept (point on the Y-axis at which the regression line crosses)
\[ B_{1,2,3,4} = \text{Beta-weights (partial regression coefficients)} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{"Above Average Discipline" variable} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{"Position" variable (teacher)} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{"Position" variable (counselor)} \]

\[ X_4 = \text{"Degree Held" variable (specialist)} \]

\[ X_5 = \text{"Sex" variable (male)} \]

**Discussion.** At first glance, Equation 2 looks rather formidable, but the de-mystification process is fairly straightforward.

The constant 5.00 is a factor used to insure the mean estimated scores on the OCI coincide with the mean observed scores. The partial regression coefficients are the amount of change in any independent variable which corresponds to a one unit change in the dependent variable while holding the effects of all other variables constant. For example, assume one of the independent variables found to be significant was age and the beta-weight associated with it were .15. This would mean that for the score on the OCI to increase by one point, the mean age would change by a factor of .15 while all other variables in the equation (if any) remained constant. Since Equation 2b contains only non-metric (representing nominal level data) independent variables (e.g., teacher or counselor) a slightly different interpretation is in order.
When a non-metric independent variable is found to make a significant contribution to the results, only individuals associated with the class represented by the independent variable (group membership) will have an effect on the dependent variable. That is, if an individual is a teacher, it would be predicted that the mean score on the OCI would be reduced by a factor of .21 (thus the minus sign in Equation 2b). Since membership in the group called teachers ($X_2$) and the group called counselors ($X_3$) are both in the equation and since membership in either group is mutually exclusive, a respondent who is either a teacher or a counselor could be expected to rate the school lower on the OCI than an administrator. Similar reasoning suggests that someone holding a specialist's certificate would rate the school lower than someone with another degree. In all cases, however, membership in the category "above average discipline" produced a score significantly higher than the score for membership in the below average category and, as may be seen in Equation 2b, schools rated as having "above average discipline" made the greatest positive contributions to scores on the OCI. Finally, males scored lower than females on the OCI.

There are two notable items in this analysis: (1) only non-metric independent variables were found to make significant contributions to OCI scores; and (2) the same variables
appeared in regression equations computed for each subscale of the OCI. Equations 3 through 9 display the variables having a significant effect on the results.

**Communication, Problem Solving, Decision Making**

\[ Y_1 = 5.03 + .15X_1 - .16X_2 - .19X_3 \]  
*Eq. 3*

where,

- \( X_1 \) = "Above Average Discipline" variable
- \( X_2 \) = "Sex" variable (male)
- \( X_3 \) = "Position" variable (teacher)

**Authority and Status Relationships**

\[ Y_2 = 4.97 + .13X_1 - .27X_2 - .18X_3 - .58X_4 - .64X_5 \]  
*Eq. 4*

where,

- \( X_1 \) = "Above Average Discipline" variable
- \( X_2 \) = "Position" variable (teacher)
- \( X_3 \) = "Position" variable (counselor)
- \( X_4 \) = "Degree Held" variable (Master's)
- \( X_5 \) = "Degree Held" variable (Master's plus)

**Rule Making and Enforcement**

\[ Y_3 = 4.90 + .14X_1 - .23X_2 - .18X_3 - .11X_4 \]  
*Eq. 5*

where,

- \( X_1 \) = "Above Average Discipline" variable
- \( X_2 \) = "Position" variable (teacher)
- \( X_3 \) = "Position" variable (counselor)
- \( X_4 \) = "Sex" variable (male)
Physical Environment

\[ Y_4 = 4.96 + .14X_1 \]  
where,
\[ X_1 = "\text{Above Average Discipline}\" \text{ variable} \]

Parent/Community/School Relationships

\[ Y_5 = 5.27 + .19X_1 - .17X_2 - .22X_3 \]  
where,
\[ X_1 = "\text{Above Average Discipline}\" \text{ variable} \]
\[ X_2 = "\text{Position}\" \text{ variable (teacher)} \]
\[ X_3 = "\text{Sex}\" \text{ variable (male)} \]

Mechanisms for Coping with Personal Problems

\[ Y_6 = 4.93 + .18X_1 - .55X_2 - .21X_3 \]  
where,
\[ X_1 = "\text{Above Average Discipline}\" \text{ variable} \]
\[ X_2 = "\text{Degree Held}\" \text{ variable (Master's)} \]
\[ X_3 = "\text{Sex}\" \text{ variable (male)} \]

Formal Curriculum and Style of Instruction

\[ Y_7 = 4.95 + .24X_1 - .17X_2 - .19X_3 - .11X_4 \]  
where,
\[ X_1 = "\text{Above Average Discipline}\" \text{ variable} \]
\[ X_2 = "\text{Position}\" \text{ variable (teacher)} \]
\[ X_3 = "\text{Degree Held}\" \text{ variable (specialist)} \]
\[ X_4 = "\text{Sex}\" \text{ variable (male)} \]

As may be observed in Equations 3 through 9, the only variables appearing are those also appearing in Equation 2b,
the regression equation for the overall score on the OCI. There are several notable points in the equations: (1) in every case, schools rated as having above average discipline scored higher than those having below average discipline; (2) the "Above Average Discipline" variable made the greatest positive contribution to the results; (3) teachers and counselors (when appearing in an equation) consistently rated the school lower than administrators, possibly indicating differing perceptions between superiors and subordinates; and (4) although "degree held" and "sex" appeared in most equations, the effect on OCI scores may be due to the statistically significant sampling difference between above and below average schools on these two variables (see Table 4, page 69.)

In summary, it may be said that although the same non-metric variables were not distributed in the same way for each equation (e.g., the only variable appearing in the equation for the physical environment scale was the school groupings variable) it is useful to note that only the variables of "above average discipline", "position held," "degree held," and "sex," appeared in any of the equations. Since the regression analysis conducted indicates that only the four independent variables discussed above make any difference in OCI scores, these four variables will be investigated more fully to determine their contribution to
the explained variance. That is, statistical procedures (ANOVA) will be employed to determine if the OCI (and each of the seven subscales) can distinguish between groups of schools known to have above or below average discipline. The variables "position held," "degree held," and "sex" also will be analyzed to determine the degree to which they contribute to any observed differences on mean OCI scores between schools with above average discipline and those with below average discipline.

**Test for Construct Validity**

As discussed in Chapter III, the method chosen to determine whether the OCI can distinguish between groups of schools judged to have above or below average discipline is the method of known groups. That is, staffs in schools known to have either above or below average discipline were asked to complete the OCI. Mean scores on the OCI and its seven subscales were then examined and compared using analyses of variance to test for significant differences among group means. Average scores to be examined are shown in Table 13.
Table 13
Means and Standard Deviations of Subscales and OCI by Above and Below Average School Discipline Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Above Average Discipline</th>
<th>Below Average Discipline</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Problem Solving</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority Relationships</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Administration</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Relationships</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for Personal Problems</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Table 13 indicates there are differences between those schools having above and those having below average discipline on scores for each of the seven subscales and the total instrument. Data presented in Table 13 were subjected to four-way, fixed effects analyses of variance to: (1) determine the overall relationships between the dependent and independent variables; (2) test for statistical significance; and (3) examine and interpret the patterns of effects between group means. Results are summarized in Tables 14 through 21.
### TABLE 14

ANOVA of OCI Scores by Above/Below Average Discipline, Position, Degree, and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.981</td>
<td>20.615**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>6.793**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>1.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.206</td>
<td>18.615**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** *p < .01

### TABLE 15

ANOVA of Communication Subscale Scores by Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.486</td>
<td>12.683***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.437</td>
<td>5.823**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.815</td>
<td>16.628***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** *p < .01

*** *p < .001
TABLE 16
ANOVA of Authority Relationships Subscale Scores by Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position, Degree and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>7.777**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.945</td>
<td>9.271***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>2.165*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.295</td>
<td>6.177*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05  
** P < .01  
*** P < .001

TABLE 17
ANOVA of Rules Administration Subscale Scores by Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position, Degree and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.756</td>
<td>10.304***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.542</td>
<td>8.130***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>7.990**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < .01  
*** P < .001
TABLE 18
ANOVA of Physical Environment Subscale Scores by Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position Degree and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.893</td>
<td>9.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.176</td>
<td>4.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>3.85C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \)  
** \( p < .01 \)

TABLE 19
ANOVA of Parent/Community Subscale Scores by Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position Degree and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.651</td>
<td>20.577***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>3.549*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>2.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.459</td>
<td>32.601***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \)  
*** \( p < .001 \)
### TABLE 20

ANOVA of Personal Problems Subscale Scores by
Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position, Degree and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.073</td>
<td>18.372***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>2.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.675</td>
<td>27.668***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p < .001$

### TABLE 21

ANOVA of Curriculum and Instruction Subscale Scores by
Above/Below Average Discipline Category, Position, Degree and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below Average Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.467</td>
<td>30.221***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>3.872*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>1.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>8.144**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$
Discussion. As stated earlier in this chapter, construct validity would be claimed for the OCI if the instrument were to distinguish between groups of schools known to have either above or below average discipline. As may be observed in each of the ANOVA tables, the OCI and its seven subscales distinguish between schools with above or below average discipline. Consequently, it may be concluded that the OCI does possess a form of construct validity.

The second function of the ANOVA was to determine if any other variable had a significant impact on the scores. It may be observed that the position held in the school (teacher, counselor, or administrator) and sex also show a statistically significant impact on OCI scores. It is possible that mean scores on the OCI when comparing schools with above average discipline to those with below average discipline generally are influenced by the position held by and the sex of the respondent. However, since a statistically significant difference existed between the two groups of schools on the sex variable (see Table 4, page 69), it is more likely that the result for the sex variable is an artifact of a sampling difference than a true difference between schools. Further research - matching schools on the variables of position and sex, studying only one group (e.g., male teachers only), or an in-depth analysis in one
school utilizing various research strategies (e.g., ethnographic and quantitative methods) - clearly is in order. Nevertheless, OCI scores do vary systematically between males and females and between administrators and other school staff. The variability between groups of respondents in schools has a basis in current research and theory (e.g., Anderson, 1965; Ellett, 1976) and suggests a need for further research to examine whether the OCI can be strengthened to measure organizational characteristics more powerfully. Yet, there is still evidence that the OCI differentiates between schools judged to have good or poor discipline.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the degree held by respondents does influence scores on the OCI subscale for the way authority and status relationships are used and distributed throughout a school (see Table 16). This finding may suggest that a hierarchial arrangement of authority relationships (e.g., principals are superiors, teachers are subordinates) is related to the degree held by the respondents or to the statistically significant differences between school group means in the variable degree held. Further research investigating possible relationships between the role of school administrators, the degree held by respondents, and the OCI subscale of authority and status relationships is indicated.

Conclusions. The ANOVA's have shown the following relative to group mean differences on the OCI: (1) schools
having above or below average discipline are distinguished by the OCI and each of its seven subscales as well as the total instrument; and (2) scores on the authority and status relationships subscale are influenced by the degree held by respondents, suggesting a need for further research. The variables "position held" and "sex," while systematically affecting the results, require additional research, as suggested above.

**Research Objective 3: Relationship between OCI Scores and Discipline Ratings**

In order to determine if a relationship existed between scores on the OCI and how respondents felt about discipline in their schools, zero-order correlation coefficients were computed. If significant correlations existed between OCI scores and beliefs about discipline, the issue of construct validity would have received additional support. That is, if discipline ratings of schools provided by respondents correlated significantly with OCI scores, additional support would have been gained for the belief that the OCI could distinguish between schools with above average discipline and those with below average discipline.

The specific questions asked of respondents were:

1. compared with all other schools you know about, how would you rate this school in terms of the number of discipline problems?
(2) compared with all other schools you know about, how would you rate this school in terms of the nature of most of the discipline problems?; and

(3) compared with the best school you know about, how would you rate the students in this school relative to discipline?

Table 22 displays the correlation coefficients between the questions above, each subscale of the OCI and the total instrument.

Table 22
Correlation Coefficients between School Discipline Rating, the OCI, and Each Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Discipline Rating of Students</th>
<th>Number of Discipline Problems</th>
<th>Severity of Discipline Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Problem Solving</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority Relationships</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Administration</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Community Relationships</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms for Personal Problems</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI (total)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All coefficients shown are significant (i.e., p < .05).
As may be observed in Table 22, the coefficients generally were moderate and all were significant statistically (p<.05). It may be noted that the correlations between the discipline rating of students and the OCI scores - even though significant generally were lower than the other coefficients. It is hypothesized this occurred because staffs were asked to compare students in their school with those in the best school they knew about in making a judgment on this question. It is conceivable they may have taught in their current school for an extended period and consequently have no basis for comparing students in other schools. (Indeed, the average number of years at school was 6.2 while the average number of years teaching was 10.1). It also seems probably they know the failings of their students much more intimately than those in other schools.

The two questions on the number and severity of discipline problems in respondents' school were open to empirical verification and casual observation by respondents. It may be that staffs had more realistic perceptions of the number and severity of school discipline problems in their schools than of how their students' compared to students outside their school in terms of discipline.

Conclusions. In reviewing the data presented in Table 22 it appears that the statistically significant correlation coefficients add support to the construct validity issue - namely that the OCI is capable of distinguishing between
groups of schools on the basis of above or below average
discipline.

**Summary and Discussion**

Reliability coefficients computed for both the OCI
and each of its subscales were high and ranged from .71 to
.96 suggesting the OCI is reliable. In addition, high inter­
correlations between subscales (.50 to .89) suggested the
subscales as well as the total instrument were measuring one
or more common characteristics or constructs. Factor analysis
data indicated the common characteristics may be labelled
"community," "isolation," "caring," "belongingness," and
"environment."

Multiple regression techniques were used to evaluate the
independent variables for their contributions to the pre­
dictability of OCI scores. The independent variables under
investigation were: (1) discipline rating of the school;
(2) number of years experience at the school; (3) position
held at the school; (4) number of years in education; (5)
number of years of teaching experience; (6) degree held;
(7) age; and (8) sex. The variables of discipline rating
of the school, position held, degree held, and sex each had
a significant effect on scores on the OCI. These four
variables then were examined using analyses of variance
to determine which variables made significant contributions
to the explained variance.
Based on the categorization of schools into "known groups," that is, those with either above or below average discipline, the ANOVAs demonstrated that OCI and each of its subscales successfully distinguished between groups of schools, thus suggesting construct validity.

Finally, correlation coefficients were computed showing a statistically significant correlation between OCI scores and respondents' judgments concerning the number and severity of discipline problems and how their students ranked in terms of discipline. It is claimed these correlation coefficients, since they are positive and significant, lend support to the earlier hypothesis of construct validity: namely, that the OCI distinguished between groups of schools on the basis of their classification into above or below average discipline categories.

A summary of this study, the results, conclusions, limitations and recommendations for future research are discussed in the next chapter.
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In reflecting on the nature of this study, its conduct, and its results, one major consideration occurs to the researcher: a need existed and continues to exist to explore and conduct research in the field of school discipline. The general public, students, and teachers alike agree that discipline is a significant problem. But "good" discipline is an elusive quality; what works for one school may or may not work for another.

Summary

Classrooms and individual students have been almost universally the focus of attention for discipline strategies and studies. Perhaps this occurs in American education and America in general, because the individual and the individual's freedom are recognized as significant. Apparently in contradiction to the nature of individual freedom, however, is the primary function of the school to assume custody and control of students.

Discipline has been and continues to be focused on the individual student seen as a member of a given academic class. Although not without its usefulness, such a concept of discipline is limited in its scope in that it fails to address
discipline as an organization-wide issue. For purposes of the current study, it was claimed that discipline problems are caused chiefly by the way a school is structured and operated which influences and, in turn, is influenced by the behavior of individuals and groups both inside and outside the school. It also was claimed that a useful way of studying the characteristics of a school organization that impact on discipline is to ask the members of the school about their perceptions concerning such organizational characteristics. This study was designed to determine:

(1) the reliability of an instrument, the Organizational Context Inventory (OCI) developed for this study to examine the organizational design characteristics that impact on school discipline;

(2) whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and schools judged to have either above or below average discipline (construct validity); and,

(3) whether there is a systematic relationship between scores on the OCI and respondents' judgments of the nature, severity, and frequency of occurrence of discipline problems in their schools.
Data for the study was gathered in two phases: a pilot test and a final field test. The pilot test was designed to test reliability estimates for the OCI and to determine if - given schools acknowledged to have above average discipline - scores on the OCI would be found to be towards the positive end of the scale. The pilot test was conducted with staffs in one elementary ($n_1 = 21$) and one senior high school ($n_2 = 92$) in the central Ohio area. Both schools had a local reputation for having above average discipline. The staffs in both schools had an approximately equal distribution of teachers, counselors, and administrators; both also had an approximately equal distribution of individuals holding bachelor's, master's, specialist's, and doctoral degrees. There were significantly more males in the high school (54.3%) than in the elementary school (19.0%); however, since no comparisons were made between schools on group mean data, the distribution of males and females would not affect results. Further, the total sample contained 54 males and 59 females.

Staff in both schools described their schools as having: (1) a low to moderate number of discipline problems; (2) more mild than severe types of discipline problems; and (3) students who rated high on discipline when comparing them to other students in other schools. Scores on the
OCI supported their beliefs, and averaged 3.97 on a one (low, negative) to six (high, positive) scale. One objective of the pilot test - namely, to determine if OCI scores would be more towards the positive end of the continuum - was achieved.

Reliability analyses were conducted on the original 142-item OCI using Cronbach's alpha as an estimate of reliability. Through systematic elimination of inconsistent items, reliability estimates initially ranging from .40 to .81 were increased to a range of .63 to .96 which indicated that the selected items were comparable to each other. The final version of the OCI consisted of 102 items. The second pilot test objective - namely, to develop initial reliability estimates and to use those estimates in eliminating inconsistent items - also was achieved.

The final field test, using the edited 102-item OCI, was conducted using 12 elementary, 10 junior high/middle, and 8 senior high schools in Ohio and western Pennsylvania. These schools were judged by the district superintendent or assistant superintendent as having either above or below average discipline which resulted in 24 schools ($n_1 = 572$ respondents) in the above average category and 6 schools ($n_2 = 106$ respondents) in the below average category. As
a check on the judges' ratings, respondents were asked to provide data regarding their feelings about discipline in their schools. Schools rated as having above average discipline were thought to have fewer and more mild discipline problems than schools rated as having below average discipline. School staffs in the above average schools believed their students had good discipline when compared to other schools; students in schools in the below average category were thought to have poor discipline when compared to students in other schools.

Staff demographic data showed a nearly equal percentage distribution of teachers, counselors, and administrators between the two groups of schools. However, there was a higher percentage of staff with master's degrees (40.7%) in schools thought to have above average discipline than in schools thought to have below average discipline (26.4%). Also, there were more males in the above average category (39.2%) than in the below average category (23.6%). Chi-square statistics computed for the variables "degree held" and "sex" showed the above differences to be statistically significant.

Reliability coefficients again were computed for the data from the final field test using Cronbach's alpha. The coefficients ranged from .71 to .96 indicating the OCI is reliable and the pilot test coefficients were not due
to error or chance. High subscale intercorrelations suggested that the seven subscales may have measured one or more common characteristics or traits. A principal components factor analysis was conducted and indicated five common factors accounting for 67.7% of the explained variance. The common factors were identified as "community," "isolation," "caring," "belongingness," and "environment."

To determine which of the independent (demographic) variables in the current study had statistically significant effects on the results, multiple regression analyses were used. Regression equations computed for each subscale and the total instrument, demonstrated that only the variables "above average discipline," "position held," "degree," and "sex" had significant effects on OCI scores. Of these variables, the "above average discipline" variable was the single most positive variable. These four variables were examined further using analyses of variance to determine which (if any) had significant effects on group mean OCI score differences.

A four-way, fixed effects ANOVA conducted on subscale scores and scores on the total instrument revealed that the OCI distinguished between schools judged to have above and those judged to have below average discipline thus suggesting construct validity for the instrument. In
addition, the variable "degree held" appeared as a significant main effect in the subscale for Authority and Status Relationships; the variable "position held" appeared as a significant main effect in all but one ANOVA. The variable "sex," while appearing as a significant main effect in each ANOVA, may be considered to be the result of sampling error. A chi-square statistic, as noted earlier in this summary, indicated statistically significant differences between respondents in each group of schools on the variables of "degree held" and "sex." All these variables however, require additional research to determine their true effects on OCI scores.

Finally, correlation coefficients computed between respondents' beliefs about the number and nature of discipline problems in their school and scores on the OCI were computed. All coefficients were significant at or beyond the .05 level adding additional support to the construct validity issue.

Conclusions

The results of this study clearly indicate that the OCI is a reliable instrument. We may affirm the first research objective; that is, items on the OCI are internally consistent and measure one or more qualities that are stable.

The second research objective, involving the determination of the construct validity of the OCI, also
may be affirmed. That is, the OCI and each of its seven subscales successfully distinguished between schools known to have above and those known to have below average discipline.

The third research objective, involving the investigation of possible systematic relationships between the number and nature of school discipline problems and OCI scores also may be affirmed. Correlation coefficients were positive and significant lending additional support to the construct validity issue.

In sum, all three research objectives were affirmed thus leading to the overall conclusion that the OCI and each of its seven subscales are reliable and are capable of distinguishing between schools known to have good or poor discipline.

Limitations and Implications

The most obvious limitation of this study is the lack of criterion-related validity. Ultimately, the researcher believes that the most effective use of the OCI will be as a diagnostic tool to identify the organization-wide causes of school discipline problems. To that end, Issac and Michael (1971) suggest the use of criterion-related validity studies. One such study could identify selected criterion variables (e.g., suspension rate date) and examine the correlation between such variables and the OCI.
However, for purposes of generalizability, such variables should be universally accepted as a measure of good or poor discipline. For example, it has been the researcher's personal experience that at least one school administrator does not see high suspension rates as indicative of poor discipline. In fact, the administrator felt discipline in the school was quite good since "hard-core trouble-makers" were gone leaving only students that were teachable!

Statistically, the method of choice for criterion-related validity studies is to factor analyze the data correlating the factors with the external criteria, thus producing what Guilford and Fruchter (1973) call factorial validity. For such studies a random selection of schools from a group containing schools with average as well as above and below average discipline is in order. The current research did not attempt such studies for several reasons: (1) a more general validity study investigating the capability of the OCI to distinguish between known groups of schools appeared to be a better "second step" after content validity had been established; (2) criterion-related validity studies in the absence of construct validity may run the risk of being criticized for assessing the obvious (i.e., correlating suspension rate data with the OCI could indicate the OCI is a sophisticated way of measuring suspension rates); and (3) from the outset
the researcher intended the current investigation not to be the final effort in development of the OCI but, rather, an intermediate step with widespread generality and generalizability to other settings and more narrowly focused research.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

For the future, several studies are recommended:

1. replication of this study;
2. replication of this study with modifications, e.g.,
   -- use of more than one judge per school
   -- data collection at one school level, such as middle schools, only
   -- observational and interview data to supplement results on the OCI;
3. developing acceptable criteria for measuring school discipline and correlating the OCI with such criteria;
4. studies involving in-depth examination of one school district;
5. studies comparing and contrasting the OCI with other instruments such as Willower's (Willower, Eidel & Hoy, 1967; 1973) work on Pupil Control Ideology;
(6) studies comparing and contrasting the OCI with Likert's (1967) Profile of the Organizational Characteristics;
(7) studies comparing responses on the OCI between groups (e.g., parents and staff, staff and students);
(8) studies using the OCI as an instrument to measure perceptions of organizational change as part of an organization-wide change effort; and,
(9) modification of the OCI for use in settings other than schools.

Clearly, the above recommendations do not exhaust the possible uses of the OCI in additional research efforts; they are meant simply to be illustrative. In fact, since use of the OCI as a diagnostic tool is unwarranted until rigorous criterion-related validity studies are conducted, the next research effort should involve such criteria. However, there is one final caveat to be discussed.

The OCI is intended to be used as a diagnostic and prescriptive tool by school staffs concerned about improving discipline. Whatever form the OCI ultimately evolves into, scoring and interpretation of the OCI must be straightforward and unambiguous. The researcher
believes school staffs, students, and parents need less complexity in their lives. Keeping the use and understandability of the OCI simple will produce what this researcher has hoped for: a tool developed to improve an important facet of American education, an instrument designed to pinpoint the causes of problems in discipline.
APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The requested information is to provide a background for the study being conducted and is necessary for interpreting the results. You will not be identified as individuals in any way. The results will be presented only in the form of grouped data (e.g., the average number of years of teaching experience). Also, once the information is collected, schools will not be identified by name but will be referred to in the results as School A, School B, etc.

Please respond as best you can to all items. When you have finished this page, please continue with the Organizational Context Inventory and the attitude scale furnished.

Thank you for your time and help.

1. School ____________________________

2. Number of years (to nearest whole year) at this school ________

3. Your current position __Teacher__ Counselor __Administrator

4. Total number of years working as an educator (including teaching) both here and elsewhere ________

5. Total number of years of teaching experience both here and elsewhere ________

6. Highest degree held (PLEASE CHECK ONE)

   ____ Less than Bachelor's

   ____ Bachelor's

   ____ Bachelor's plus

   ____ Master's

   ____ Master's plus

   ____ Specialist's Certificate

   ____ Doctorate

7. ____ Age

8. ____ Male ____ Female

Compared with all other schools you know about, how would you rate this school in terms of:

9. The number of discipline problems

   LOW 1 2 3 4 5 6

   HIGH

10. The nature of most of the discipline problems

    MILD 1 2 3 4 5 6

    SEVERE

11. On most days, how do you feel about your job?

    LOW, NEGATIVE 1 2 3 4 5 6

    HIGH, POSITIVE

12. Compared with the best school you know about, how would you rate the students in this school relative to discipline?

    LOW, WORST 1 2 3 4 5 6

    HIGH, BEST

Copyright 1980 by George A. Wynn
APPENDIX B
DISCIPLINE CONTEXT INVENTORY
THE DISCIPLINE CONTEXT INVENTORY*

The inventory is not a "score card" or an objective test. It is a working guide that can be useful for school personnel, students, and parents to analyze programs, to identify problem areas on which they wish to work, and to take actions to reduce disruption or lack of discipline in their schools.

DIRECTIONS: Circle a number to rate your school on a scale of 0 to 5 relative to the following criteria. A rating of 0 indicates that the statement is not at all true of your school. A rating of 5 indicates that the statement is clearly true of your school.

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Patterns of communication, problem-solving, and decision-making. Generally, more open, multidirectional, widespread and effective patterns are related to fewer disruptive behaviors and greater feelings of responsibility among teachers and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Faculty meetings are for staff development and for problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Faculty members communicate concerns about district policies to central administration and modify those policies for their students' benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>A sense of direction and mutual purpose is shared among a significant number of staff, students, and (to some extent) parents. (They can describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Students participate in solving the problems of the classroom and the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>The school district expects problems to be solved by local staff and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>The school district provides time and consultants to aid in solving problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Adults in the school recognize their own responsibilities for handling situations or for solving problems that affect themselves or the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>A large number of the personnel (staff and students) are involved in the school's activities—in planning and in implementing. Participation is high and widely distributed. Nearly all members feel that the school belongs to them, and each feels he can make a difference in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Staff and students exhibit a sense of accomplishing something that they feel is important, giving a positive tone to the climate of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Adults recognize their own problems rather than taking them out on the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Adults communicate clearly with one another about significant educational matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Teachers are relaxed and unafraid with their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Teachers know the names of their students not only those in their classrooms but others in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Adults know how to keep from causing discipline problems caused by adults, by school procedures or by the school organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Problems do not fester; they are identified and resolved. The question, &quot;What can we do?&quot; replaces the sentiment, &quot;It can't be done.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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2. Patterns of authority relationships. Generally, fewer barriers to communication and action, more involvement in exercising authority, smaller status differences, and broader conceptions of what constitutes proper professional behavior are related to a more responsive system, more widespread sense of responsibility and greater commitment among staff and students to meet duties and carry out decisions.

2.1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Status differences that imply inferiority or superiority of one group over another or lead to closed or limited communications are eliminated.

2.2 0 1 2 3 4 5 No one ignores problems, refuses to do what needs to be done, or says "it's not my job."

2.3 0 1 2 3 4 5 Administrators' expectations are clearly communicated.

2.4 0 1 2 3 4 5 Staff generally agree upon what principals, teachers, aides, etc., ought to do or are expected to do in given circumstances--no misconceptions and wrong impressions.

2.5 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers are able to communicate concerns, questions, or constructive ideas to "superiors."

2.6 0 1 2 3 4 5 Each level accepts criticism from lower levels.

2.7 0 1 2 3 4 5 School secretaries, aides, custodians, and other school staff (including bus drivers whenever possible) participate in faculty meetings and inservice sessions.

2.8 0 1 2 3 4 5 Parents participate in classrooms and school activities and are represented in most faculty meetings and inservice sessions.
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2.9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Students take responsibility for enforcing the agreed upon pattern of relationships with their peers and with teachers and administrators.

2.10 0 1 2 3 4 5 When decisions are made and procedures established, the educational growth of individual students takes priority over concerns such as adult convenience, pleasing superiors, saving face, or maintaining tradition.

2.11 0 1 2 3 4 5 Responsibilities and "territories" are shared and respected; people are not possessive nor are they fearful that someone will "take over" their job, space, or materials. They say "our school" and "our students" not "mine."

2.12 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers help one another solve problems rather than criticizing teachers or students.

3. Procedures for developing, preparing and implementing rules. Generally, when rules are made by the people involved and when expectations are clearly understood, there are fewer transgressions. The more nearly rules are derived from principles of learning and understanding of normal human behavior, the more effective they are. The more the school operates like a community as opposed to a prison or army, the fewer the problems.

3.1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Rules and expectations are clearly defined, stated, and communicated so that people know what to do.

3.2 0 1 2 3 4 5 Students are involved in rule-making.

3.3 0 1 2 3 4 5 Rules are made by the people who must enforce them.

3.4 0 1 2 3 4 5 Disciplinary techniques are used to teach positive ways of behaving, not to punish or to teach blind obedience.

3.5 0 1 2 3 4 5 A few good rules are made and enforced; too many rules cannot be enforced.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Rules are enforced in a way that will reinforce the behavior that is desired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Rules can be enforced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Due process is applied before punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Students and others are assumed to be innocent until proven guilty of infractions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>A complete description of what transpired during any behavioral sequence is expected from adults and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Teachers are not assumed to be &quot;right&quot; all the time but are accepted as human beings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Students are not punished if it is obviously unnecessary (i.e., it has no educational outcome).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Students take responsibility for their actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Rules apply only to relevant behavior and not to matters that are trivial, highly personal, or have no effect upon the school or class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Rules and disciplinary techniques are examined and revised to prevent negative educational outcomes such as lower self-respect, dislike for school, lack of responsibility for own behavior, sense of helplessness, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Students are included as members of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Physical environment. Generally, the environment in which school activities take place provides a setting which is pleasant; is convenient for adults and students to work; and reflects the interests, culture, values, and activities of students. The more the school environment looks like a workshop, a library, a restaurant, or a conference center and the less like a prison or institution, the fewer the problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Meeting and social areas are not crowded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Adequate materials are available and they are organized for easy access and clean-up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The physical environment is well organized to permit a maximum of student independence and behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Necessary space and adequate facilities are available for student work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The environment is well-planned to accommodate movement within and between classrooms and large group areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>The cafeteria has places where small groups can sit, eat, and talk quietly together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Use is made of &quot;nooks and crannies&quot; where individuals may be alone to think, read or work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Places are designed where small groups can work together without having to talk loudly to be heard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Students' work is displayed in classrooms, display cases, corridors, and cafeterias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.10 0 1 2 3 4 5 Students are involved in planning school decorations.

4.11 0 1 2 3 4 5 Students and staff members feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.

4.12 0 1 2 3 4 5 Students have a place in the school; they may use the facilities freely as long as there is consideration for other students and for adults.

4.13 0 1 2 3 4 5 Adults and students are able to analyze "trouble areas" in the environment and make provision to solve problems.

4.14 0 1 2 3 4 5 The environment is well-designed acoustically.

4.15 0 1 2 3 4 5 Traffic patterns are analyzed to eliminate causes for discipline problems.

5. Relationships with parents and community forces.
Generally, more open transactions with parents and other community members result in better opportunity to improve achievement and behavior within the school. This stipulation has little to do with the "neighborhood school concept" (since many so-called schools exhibit poor relationships) but is a product of interaction with whatever parents and other agencies are served by the school regardless their geographic locations.

5.1 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers and administrators frequently participate in groups, institutions, and organizations within the community which can offer support to students and to the school. (Ex., churches, clubs).

5.2 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers know the students' parents, homes, and community and frequently interact with them.
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5.3 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers know the neighborhood, the street names, the stores, and the places of entertainment their students live with.

5.4 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers recognize the stereotypes they may hold about the students and the community and work to see students and parents as individuals; the school community works in various ways to break down stereotypes.

5.5 0 1 2 3 4 5 When necessary, attention is given to meeting basic needs of students from poor families through whatever resources are available without "spotlighting" them.

5.6 0 1 2 3 4 5 Children with special problems are diagnosed and help is provided in a manner that does not denigrate them or separate them from normal school activities.

5.7 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers know and respect the students' language, culture, and idiosyncrasies.

5.8 0 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers and other school personnel visit students' homes frequently.

5.9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Each teacher visits the home of every homeroom student (or advises) early in the school year (before any problems can arise).
Discipline Context Inventory (page 9)

6. Processes for dealing with personal problems. Generally, greater recognition that people within the school are complete persons who have lives outside the school and problems that are not directly related to school matters combined with responsive school processes stimulate greater commitment to participate fully in the work of the school.

6.1 012345 Before rushing to solve a problem, people make it clear that there is a problem and define what it is.

6.2 012345 Individual and cultural differences are respected and valued and are evident in the schools.

6.3 012345 Adults and students recognize that even "good" people or "good" teachers have problems.

6.4 012345 Students are permitted to have "low days"; teachers permit themselves to feel angry, to have "low days" or to make mistakes.

6.5 012345 Adults see students and student behavior clearly without the tendency to see or to cause problems when there are none.

6.6 012345 Adults do not force students to behave the way they think they are going to.

6.7 012345 Students do not try to force adults to behave the way they expect.

6.8 012345 Irrelevant behavior is not rewarded by undue attention.

6.9 012345 Teachers are able to discern when a discipline incident is over.

6.10 012345 Adults keep their "eyes on the ball"--that is, on what they want the student to do.

Discipline Context Inventory (page 10)

6.11 012345 Teachers keep from escalating small problems into larger ones.

6.12 012345 People express and discuss problems as they arise rather than tucking them away.

6.13 012345 If a person has a problem with another, he or she discusses it directly with that person.

6.14 012345 Both students and staff can speak about growth that has taken place, giving tangible examples of changes that have occurred in both adults and students.

6.15 012345 All people in the school recognize and celebrate (even in small ways) when one of them achieves something good.

6.16 012345 People help one another in ways that help them to become independent.

6.17 012345 Teachers and students admit feelings that are causing them to behave inappropriately, but do not blame others for their own feelings.

6.18 012345 Each student has a definite contact, preferably an advocate, on the faculty.

6.19 012345 While discontented with the way things are, they focus on growing and do not punish themselves for being short of perfection.
Discipline Context Inventory (page 11)

7. Curriculum and instructional practices. More broadly conceived concepts of curriculum, with content and processes appropriate for the students served and greater variety and diversity tend to reduce discipline problems within the school.

7.1 012345 The curriculum is seen as more than the content to be taught in subject matter classes.

7.2 012345 Practices and procedures are related to the explicit goals of the school.

7.3 012345 Field trips, outside speakers, and disciplinary practices are seen as ordinary teaching methods which teachers may utilize without extraordinary administrative procedures.

7.4 012345 A variety of teaching styles are evident within the faculty.

7.5 012345 Individual differences and a variety of learning styles are respected and accommodated.

7.6 012345 Students may transfer from one teacher to another, or one program to another, depending upon their learning styles and the particular educational goals they seek.

7.7 012345 Teachers choose the methods and materials which they can best use to achieve stated goals.

7.8 012345 Teaching methods and instructional materials build on what the student already knows.

Discipline Context Inventory (page 12)

7.9 012345 Students have choices in schedules and assignments.

7.10 012345 The curriculum includes teaching students how to make choices.

7.11 012345 Teaching methods provide for active learning and are neither boring nor frustrating.

7.12 012345 Students believe the school offers what they need and find it interesting.

7.13 012345 The student/teacher ratio is reasonably low.

7.14 012345 Playgrounds, school buses, cafeterias, hallways, and lavatories are seen as places where students learn; teachers design and implement positive curriculum for those areas.

7.15 012345 Students are frequently involved in learning activities outside the classroom and in the community.

7.16 012345 Failure is accepted as a natural part of learning and growth.

7.17 012345 All students are actively included in classroom and school activities, regardless of sex, race, religion, socio-economic status or academic ability.

7.18 012345 Counterproductive practices are changed or eliminated as speedily as alternatives can be developed.
ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT INVENTORY

William W. Wayson and George A. Wynn

DIRECTIONS: Rate your school on a scale of 1 to 6 relative to the following criteria. A rating of 1 indicates that the statement is not at all true of your school. A rating of 6 indicates that the statement is clearly true of your school. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to this instrument. Please respond to all items by circling only one number for each item.

1. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers do not participate in groups in the local community.
2. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Non-certified staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians) participate in faculty meetings.
3. 1 2 3 4 5 6 A sense of direction and mutual purpose is shared among a significant number of staff.
4. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students try to force adults in the school to behave the way they expect them to behave.
5. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students are included as members of the school.
6. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.
7. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students cannot describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms.
8. 1 2 3 4 5 6 People are not possessive about their job, space or materials.
9. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Materials are not organized for easy access and clean-up.
10. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Disciplinary techniques are used to punish or to teach blind obedience and not to teach positive ways of behaving.
11. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The seating in the cafeteria does not permit students to sit in small groupings.
12. 1 2 3 4 5 6 For children with special problems, help is provided in a manner that denigrates them.
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13. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The school district expects problems to be solved by the local community.

14. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not take responsibility for enforcing the agreed upon pattern of relationships with all other persons in the school.

15. 1 2 3 4 5 6 No one recognizes that even "good" people or "good" teachers have problems.

16. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Problems are not identified and resolved.

17. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students are not involved in learning activities outside the classroom.

18. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The goals of the school are made explicit.

19. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The environment is not well-planned to accommodate movement within rooms.

20. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students may transfer easily from one teacher to another, one class to another, one subject to another, or one program to another.

21. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers frequently interact with student's parents.

22. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students are not involved in planning school decorations.

23. 1 2 3 4 5 6 No one feels the school belongs to them.

24. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Staff generally agree upon what all school staff are expected to do in given circumstances.

25. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers choose the methods and materials which they can best use to achieve stated goals.

26. 1 2 3 4 5 6 A sense of direction and mutual purpose is not shared among a significant number of parents.

27. 1 2 3 4 5 6 A small number of persons in the school are involved in the school's activities.

28. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Many rules apply to matters that are trivial, highly personal, or have no effect upon the school or class.
29. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Staff members do not feel responsible for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.

30. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The curriculum does not include teaching students how to make choices.

31. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers do not know the names of students throughout the school organization.

32. 1 2 3 4 5 6 No one in the school recognizes and celebrates (even in small ways) when someone achieves something good.

33. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Adults have a tendency to see or cause student problems when there are none.

34. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers are tense and afraid with their students.

35. 1 2 3 4 3 6 Irrelevant behavior is rewarded by undue attention.

36. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not have choices in schedules and assignments.

37. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The environment is well-planned to accommodate movement between rooms.

38. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not participate in solving the problems of the classroom and the school.

39. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Rules and expectations are not clearly defined.

40. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers do not know the students' parents, homes, and community.

41. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers escalate small problems into larger ones.

42. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The educational growth of individual students takes precedence over tradition.

43. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers neither know nor respect the students' culture.

44. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students are not involved in rule-making.
45. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not have space and adequate facilities for their work.

46. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students believe the school offers what they need.

47. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students have a place in the school; they may use the facilities freely as long as there is consideration for other students and for adults.

48. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Individual and cultural differences are not respected and valued.

49. 1 2 3 4 5 6 People say "our school" and "our students," not "mine."

50. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Faculty meetings are for staff development and for problem solving.

51. 1 2 3 4 5 6 School procedures are related to the goals of the school.

52. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Field trips, outside speakers, and disciplinary practices are seen as extraordinary teaching methods.

53. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students' work is displayed anywhere.

54. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Parents can not describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms.

55. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Adequate materials are available.

56. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Instructional materials build on what the student already knows.

57. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers do not see students as individuals.

58. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The school district does not expect problems to be solved by local school staff.

59. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Meeting and social areas are crowded.

60. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Non-certified staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians) do not participate in inservice sessions.
Adult convenience takes precedence over the educational growth of individual students.

Adults and students are able to analyze "trouble areas" in the environment.

Teachers help one another solve problems.

A variety of teaching styles are evident within the faculty.

Rules are made by the people who must enforce them.

Teachers do not admit feelings that are causing them to behave inappropriately.

If a person has a problem with another, he or she discusses it directly with that person.

Due process is not applied before punishment.

Failure is not accepted as a natural part of learning and growth.

Students are not punished if the punishment has no educational outcome.

Rules can not be enforced.

The physical environment is well organized.

The physical environment fails to permit a maximum of student independence and interaction.

Teachers are not able to discern when a discipline incident is over.

The curriculum is seen as more than the content to be taught in subject matter classes.

A few good rules are made and enforced.

Adults in the school fail to recognize their own responsibilities for handling situations.
78. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers recognize the stereotypes they may hold about the students.
79. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Administrators' expectations are clearly communicated.
80. 1 2 3 4 5 6 A complete description of what transpired during any behavioral sequence is expected.
81. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Status differences are evident.
82. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers know the neighborhood their students know.
83. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers are not permitted to make mistakes.
84. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teaching methods do not build on what the student already knows.
85. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Everyone ignores problems.
86. 1 2 3 4 5 6 The environment is well-designed acoustically.
87. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not take responsibility for their actions.
88. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Everyone does what needs to be done.
89. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teachers are not able to communicate ideas to "superiors."
90. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Everyone is assumed to be innocent until proven guilty of infractions.
91. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Adults do not know how to keep from causing discipline problems.
92. 1 2 3 4 5 6 While eating, students carry on conversations in small groupings.
93. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Use is made of "nooks and crannies" where individuals may be alone to think, read or work.
94. 1 2 3 4 5 6 No one in the school can give tangible examples of positive changes that have taken place in the school.
95. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Teaching methods do not provide for active learning.
96. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Individual differences are neither respected nor accommodated.

97. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students are not permitted to make mistakes.

98. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Different learning styles are respected and accommodated.

99. 1 2 3 4 5 6 When necessary, attention is given to meeting basic needs of students from poor families.

100. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Students do not exhibit a sense of accomplishing something that they feel is important.

101. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Administrators participate in groups in the local community.

102. 1 2 3 4 5 6 Each level accepts criticism from lower levels.
APPENDIX D
LIST OF DELETED ITEMS
Communication, Problem Solving, Decision Making

24. Adults recognize their own problems rather than taking them out on the students.

25. Staff exhibit a sense of accomplishing something that they feel is important.

27. Teachers know the names of their students in their classes.

54. Staff can describe some goals and achievements in specific, understandable terms.

94. A sense of direction and mutual purpose is shared among a significant number of students.

95. Problems do not fester.

98. The school district does not provide outside help to aid in solving problems.

111. Everyone feels they can have an effect on the school.

121. Adults communicate clearly with one another about significant educational matters.

142. Participation in school activities is high and widely distributed.

Authority and Status Relationships

30. Parents do not participate in classrooms and school activity.

63. Parents are represented in most faculty meetings.

76. Parents are not represented in most inservice sessions.

Rules Administration

41. Teachers are not assumed to be "right" all the time.

70. Rules are enforced in a way that will reinforce the behavior that is desired.

109. Rules and disciplinary techniques are revised to prevent negative educational outcomes.
Rules Administration

116. Rules and expectations are widely understood.

136. Counter-productive school procedures are not related to the goals of the school.

Physical Environment

19. Traffic patterns are not analyzed to eliminate causes for discipline problems.

60. Places are designed where small groups can work together without having to talk loudly to be heard.

Parent/Community/School Relationships

8. Children with special problems are not properly diagnosed.

53. Teachers do not visit student's homes frequently.

82. Teachers know the neighborhood their students know.

128. Each teacher visits the home of every homeroom student early in the school year.

Mechanisms for Coping with Personal Problems

1. Adults keep their "eyes on the ball" - that is, on what they want the student to do.

16. Everyone in the school focuses on growing.

17. Before rushing to solve a problem, people make it clear that there is a problem and define what it is.

22. Students are permitted to have "low days."

23. Teachers are not permitted to have "low days."

43. People help one another in ways that help them to become independent.

58. Adults do not force students to behave the way they think they should.

85. Teachers are permitted to feel angry.

88. Each student has a definite contact with the faculty.
Mechanisms for Coping with Personal Problems

90. Both students and staff can speak about growth that has taken place.

93. People express and discuss problems as they arise rather than tucking them away.

131. Students admit feelings that are causing them to behave inappropriately.

138. Students are permitted to feel angry.

Curriculum and Instructional Practices

12. Regardless of sex, race, religion, socioeconomic status or academic ability, all students actively participate in school activities.

104. The student/teacher ratio is reasonably low.

126. Playgrounds, school buses, cafeterias, hallways and lavatories are seen as places where students learn.
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