DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 109   TM 860 199

AUTHOR   Stiegelbauer, Suzanne M.; And Others
TITLE   Adding It All Up: A Checklist Approach to Determining
                 the Influence of Situational Variables. R & D Report
                 No. 3209.
INSTITUTION   Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center
                 for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE   Mar 85
NOTE   42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                 American Educational Research Association (69th,
                 Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
                 Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation
                 Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Case Studies; Change Strategies; *Check Lists;
                 College Environment; College Faculty; Data
                 Collection; *Educational Environment; *Educational
                 Innovation; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods;
                 Faculty Development; High Schools; *Institutional
                 Characteristics; Institutional Evaluation;
                 Microcomputers; *Organizational Climate; Program
                 Implementation; School Community Relationship; Two
                 Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS   *Situational Factors Checklist

ABSTRACT
           The Situational Factors Checklist was developed to
describe variables which influence changes within a school and was
used in two different school settings. In one application, it was
used as a part of a case study method to study implementation of a
microcomputer project, increasing faculty computer literacy, at
different community colleges. The second application was in
describing general influences on change in a study of high schools.
The checklist was designed to provide a means of looking at school
situations, individually or comparatively, for evaluating and
planning for change. It was intended to indicate the way context
influences a particular aspect of the setting, and to provide a means
of quantifying and comparing what would otherwise be qualitative
data. The interaction of factors was also considered. Results
indicated that factors promoting faculty use of microcomputers were
overall access, space, staffing, and training. Problems involved
insufficient access, software, and lack of ideas for applications.
Data from the High School Study were currently being processed. It
was concluded that the benefits of the checklist supported further
exploration. (One blank checklist, as well as one completed by one of
the colleges, are appended.) (GDC)

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

ADDING IT ALL UP: A CHECKLIST APPROACH

TO DETERMINING THE INFLUENCE OF SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

Suzanne M. Stiegelbauer

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Margaret Haddad

Maricopa Community College
Phoenix, Arizona

Sheila C. Murphy

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Adding It All Up: A Checklist Approach

to Determining the Influence of Situational Variables

Suzanne M. Stiegelbauer

Rese   and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Margaret Haddad

Maricopa Community College
Phoenix, Arizona

Sheila C. Murphy

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Introduction

Research in education has long been perplexed by the question of context and its influence on events occurring in schools. While its effects cannot be denied, its variability over different situations in time and space has made context appear largely unmeasurable and unpredictable. Like the blind men and the elephant, a view of context at a single site can b different given the viewer, the time, and the issue under view. Stiegelbauer (1983) and Hall, Hord, Rutherford, Huling & Stiegelbauer (1984) have speculated that it is a focus on the totality of context at any site that creates a methodological problem.

In a study of changes occurring in high schools, research staff at the Research on the Improvement Process Program at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin (Hall et al., 1984) considered all the possible variables within a total context at a school and selected those that more specifically influenced the changes occurring in the school. These variables were called situational factors" because of

3

their impact or influence on a specific "situation," i.e., one change occurring in the school, rather than the school as a whole. Comparison of the influence of these factors across study sites allowed research staff to determine the nature of these factors as they affected change generally (Stiegelbauer, 1984). Combining these selected factors with other contextual influences noted in earlier work (Hall, Hord, Rutherford, Huling, Stiegelbauer, Goldstein & Griffin, 1982; Hall & Griffin, 1982), the authors of this paper refined procedures used to collect data in a study of change in high schools (Hall, et al., 1984) to a checklist/brief description format.

The purpose of this paper is to (1) present information about the checklist including its design and development based on field research in a number of different settings and (2) to present examples of use of the checklist in two of those settings. One application of the checklist concerns a study of microcomputer implementation across a community college system. Here the checklist is used as a part of a case study method for studying the change at each site in the system and assessing which sites were responding more positively to the change. Another application shows its use in describing general influences on change in a study of high schools. The paper concludes with a critique of the checklist's application with suggestions for modification and use by practitioners in other settings.

The goal of the checklist and its explanation in this paper is to provide a means to allow practitioners and researchers to look at "situations" individually or comparatively for the purpose of evaluating and planning for change. The checklist is intended for use as an indicator of the way context is influencing a particular aspect of a setting, and also as a means to begin to quantify and compare what would be otherwise qualitative data. The checklist further is an attempt to consider factors in separation from the

total context without losing sight of the unique character of that context. It has benefits in that it allows users to turn their attention to one factor at a time, determine its influence, and then create a composite that becomes context, rather than be overwhelmed by the context as a whole. The checklist is not intended to be used as a fixed measure, but rather as a gauge of tendencies, and is still under evaluation with an eye to potential revision.

What Is Context? What Is A Situation? What Are Situational Factors?

Overall, the term "context" could be said to describe the universe of variables and factors that can influence any event at a setting, or the site as a whole. It encompasses things, people, and environments and their interactions and influences on each other. For the purposes of this paper, the term "situation" refers to any event or process that may be a large or small part of the total list of events and processes occurring in any site. "Situational factors" are those factors that have an influence on that particular situation. These same situational factors may be a part of context, and usually are. Context then, by comparison, is the interaction of all variables at a site creating a unique environment or ethos at that setting. When a situation arises out of context, some of the factors that are a part of context affect it to greater or lesser degrees, depending on the situation and its demands. One type of situation at a school site is that of a change occurring at that site. In conducting research on that change, or that situation, research staff looked at what situational factors influenced only that. The same factors may influence other types of events or situations differently.

In order to select what factors out of the total context were influential to change, research staff first reviewed interviews and case study reports from earlier work to see what parts of that context were listed there as

3

having an influence on particular events, or "situations," occurring in the research sites. Secondly, a theoretical background for factor nominations was provided through a review of the work of James and Jones (1974; 1979) on factors contributing to organizational change and through discussions that were a part of the PTI study of the principal's role in change (Hall & Griffin, 1982). Third, further suggestions were solicited in interviews with school staff as a part of a 3-year study of changes occurring in high schools (Huling-Austin, 1984). The end result was a list of "situational factors" that appeared to have an influence on the changes occurring in research sites. These factors were described as a part of the High School Study data collection for 1983-84 by field workers at each site in terms of: 1) a general description of each factor at that site, and 2) a description of influence on changes at the site (Huling-Austin, 1984; Stiegelbauer, 1984). On this basis, individual factors could be compared and contrasted across sites, or an overview could be taken of the complete set in terms of the major influences within each site.

The factors selected and viewed in the High School Study included as broad categories: facility (school plant and resources), characteristics of the student body, faculty, department heads, administration (including the principal, assistant principals, deans, or anyone that might be a part of school administration), co-curriculum/extracurriculum, district, community, and other factors nominated after the original field experiences. Data analysis from the High School Study indicated that the factors of facility, co-curriculum/extracurriculum, students, and department heads had a characteristic influence, i.e., one that was similar across schools and with rare exception, did not influence change greatly. The factors of administration, faculty, district, and community, however, were seen by

researchers to have greater variance across all sites in the way and degree in which they influenced the change process (Stiegelbauer, 1984). Each of these factors could, in themselves, be broken down into smaller or more discrete parts in terms of action and effect. For instance, the influence of the community involves both the SES and the stability of the group, and the effect of both on the school, and the degree of interaction the community has with the school -- its nature, its frequency, and to what effect.

Developing the Situational Factors Checklist

The research staff as a part of the High School Study data collection and analysis (Huling-Austin, 1984) wrote both a general description of each nominated factor at each site and a description of its influence on change. These longhand descriptions were reviewed for common elements. As the third year of the High School Study was still to be completed (Hall, Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Stiegelbauer, 1985), this was, in part, an effort to reduce the work load of study staff. Additionally, there was interest in developing a standard format for collection of this ethnographic data in order to strengthen the interrater reliability at each site. Initial experimentation indicated that the factor description write up could be reduced to common elements in a checklist format. The influence of each factor, however, was left descriptive, as it more effectively allowed researchers to cite what made the influence unique to that setting. One researcher noted that, indeed, the checklist format for the factor description reminded him of things he might not have included otherwise.

Further examination of the factors in checklist/brief description format resulted in the nomination of two new factors -- resources (available to support change) and state 'regulations or laws). After the initial field trial, a summary sheet was added. Research staff summarized the influence of

each factor at the site in terms of its influence as supportive, non-supportive, neutral, or unknown relative to change, and then commented on the interaction of these factors as they influenced change overall.

The current form of the checklist, called the "Situational Factors Checklist Form," and directions for its use are included in Appendix A.

A Case Study Example of Use of the Checklist

The goal of developing a shorthand means of viewing the influence of situational factors was to aid both researchers and practitioners. It was used as a research tool as a part of Phase III of the High School Study (1984-85). To begin to test its use for practitioners, it was included as a part of a study of the implementation of microcomputers across a community college system. This study had a dual purpose: 1) to assess what happened in the different colleges that were a part of the system; and 2) to suggest means to enhance implementation based on the results of assessment. The Situational Factors Checklist provided a means to summarize some of the supportive and nonsupportive elements influencing the implementation process. Case studies, Levels of Use interviews (Loucks, Newlove & Hall, 1976) and other data were collected with the same goal. The study was conducted by the district office of the community college system with the intention of supporting and providing feedback to facilitators located in each college in the system.

The following section describes the study in more depth and discusses what the checklist revealed by comparing three schools included in the system.

Implementing Microcomputers Across A Community College System

The project for faculty computer literacy was initiated by the College District Office during the summer of 1983. The project had two goals: 1) to encourage faculty use of microcomputers for instructional purposes and to

provide faculty with the basic skills necessary for educational applications of microcomputers. Fifty Apple IIE microcomputers were purchased by the College District for loan to interested faculty for up to a period of 3 months. During the 3-month period of loan, faculty participants attended a 10-week course. This course provided information and hands-on training in tne use of microcomputers and made available professional and technical support personnel to assist users. Software packages and demonstrations of their use were also provided. The project accommodated 50 faculty at a time for each 3-month cycle. As of spring 1985, 250 faculty had completed the project. Between 1983 and the present time while faculty were being trained in the use of microcomputers, individual college administrators and computer planning committees were planning for and acquiring microcomputers for classroom and faculty use. As their involvement in microcomputer use on their campuses was not a District mandate, individual colleges had a choice in how they wished to approach computer use.

The study reported in this paper was designed to look at the degree to which the individual colleges supported the implementation of microcompute?r use. A second purpose was to aid implementation by getting a perspective on elements that might help or hinder it. The role of the College District in implementation was in training the first sets of teachers. Ideally, it was up to the individual colleges to take up the project from there. The study showed that they did this with unequal success. As the project was not a mandate, it may not have been clear to many of them what was expected of them or how they might approach it.

Comparing Situational Factors in Three Impiementing Colleges

The following section gives a brief description of implementation at three of the colleges in the community college system. Each description

includes the completed summary page from the situational factors checklist as a figure. The section ends with a comparison of the three colleges. The total checklist for College B is included as a sample in Appendix B.

College B is one of the largest colleges in the system. New buildings and increased space allotments are indicators of continuing growth. The President had set "computer literacy and use for faculty and students" as a major college priority and appointed a Dean as lead administrator for computer related affairs. The Dean, in turn, created a planning council and conducted a formal needs assessment. All available resources were tapped to support the college plan. Space and equipment was allocated to serve specific purposes--a microcomputer lab was established and a microcomputer literacy course instituted. Though they spoke highly of the Dean and his work, the faculty at College B were the oldest and in many ways resistant to innovation. Non-users of computers seemed aware that the College had placed a priority on microcomputer use but had limited information about how the priority was being translated into practice and were skeptical of computer use in areas such as humanities.

The factors facilitating faculty use of microcomputers were overall access, space, staffing, and training. The barriers to microcomputer use for users were insufficient access for students and faculty, unsuitable or unavailable software, lack of time and support for programming, lack of knowledge of applications to specific teaching fields, and limited idea sharing among District faculty as to use. Non-users mentioned lack of ideas for use, fear of the technology and change, lack of planning for microcomputer use, and the unnecessary complication of the machine. Lack of time and problems related to communication were most frequently mentioned as barriers. Some problems expressed by faculty were actually being addressed but these

Figure 1: College B

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Non-supportive	Neutral	Unknown
State	X			
District	X			
Community	X			
Facility		X		
School Administration	X			
Department Heads			X	
Faculty	X			
Students	X			
Co-curriculum			X	

2. Overall the context at this school is generally (X) Supportive, ( ) Nonsupportive, ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize interaction of factors described above.)

    (WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

Brief Explanation:

In this case the contextual factors were supportive to the change effort. In fact, for this college, it seemed that everything important to the success of microcomputer implementation was in place except the facilities which presented costly obstacles to overcome.

faculty seemed unaware of events and people designated to serve supportive roles.

Overall, however, the factors contributing to faculty use of microcomputers had greater strength. Use was supported by the community, the college administration, faculty and students. Problems concerned with physical access to equipment slowed use, but had potential to be resolved given continued support.

College C is a small college with a major emphasis on occupational preparation. The college is going through a process of adjusting to relocation to better facilities, though for the moment the change meant that some student services were shared with other, nearby colleges. The administration left decision-making to the department chairpersons for microcomputer purchase and distribution. The chair of the business department was given the responsibility for purchase decisions. A policy was established that priority classrooms would be equipped first and labs would have open-access hours. The staff development committee set computer related training as a priority and dedicated a few days each year to the topic. Both students and faculty for the moment had access to a computer lab in the business department.

The faculty as a whole were aware of a need for microcomputers for student use but were concerned about costs. Reliance on departmental budgets left some departments at the mercy of resistant department chairpersons and limited department resources. Except for business department faculty, faculty using microcomputers expressed considerable frustration in gaining access. Users and non-users alike could name knowledgeable and helpful faculty, though non-users seemed skeptical and fearful of computers despite available help. Limited access for all faculty, tight budgets, lack of training in computer skills, and lack of help for both students and faculty, especially in evening

hours, served as barriers to college wide implementation. The school was seeking donations for equipment, however. As the college was located close to the District office, the faculty at this college relied to a much greater extent than faculty at other colleges on the District office for information, training and other types of support. The District office, however, was limited in its ability to supply support indefinitely. As a result the situation for College C was problematic.

College F is a small, newly built but rapidly growing facility. The Academic Dean set a priority on microcomputer use and speaks with pride about the advances the college has made in that area. With other college administrators he had drawn up a plan that called for "access for everyone on a ratio of one piece of equipment for every two people within 5 years." The faculty were very aware of the College's priority for microcomputer use and spoke highly of their administration. Despite heavy loads the faculty were making every attempt to learn about and use microcomputers: 60% of them were computer literate. Good communication existed between faculty and administration. Both saw the "burden" of learning about microcomputers as essential.

The factors that facilitated faculty use of microcomputers included the availability of both space and money for microcomputer-related purposes. Access for faculty was good and, as noted, both faculty and administration had made a commitment to the effort. Faculty could have a microcomputer to take home with them if they were 'computer literate' and working on a computer project. The barriers to implementation were less obvious -- time for faculty to devote to learning about microcomputer use, access to training, adequate supervision and help in labs, lack of contact with other faculty in the District about microcomputers, pressure and anxiety felt by faculty to be

Figure 2:   College C

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Non-supportive	Neutral	Unknown
State	X			
District	X			
Community				X
Facility	X			
School Administration		X		
Department Heads		X		
Faculty	X			
Students				X
Co-curriculum			X	

2. Overall th⸱ ⁚ ⸱ᴧᴄ at this school is generally ( ) Supportive, (X) Nonsupport. , ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize interaction of factors described above.)

   (WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

Brief Explanation:

In the case of this school, contextual factors indicate problems. I would say that the overall balance is against change. There is too much dependence in the District Office to really allow significant change at the college level.

knowledgeable in computers despite other obligations, and reliance on the District and University for information not available at the College, which placed an added burden on faculty already pressed for time. Despite all, commitment to use was stronger than other pressures.

Microcomputer Comparison Summary

The major points of comparison as shown in the checklist data between the three implementing colleges involve the support of administration for microcomputers and the commitment of the faculty as to the value of and involvement with the innovation. Both College B and College F had those factors in support of the innovation, despite other pressures. College C had no centralized plan for implementation, the involvement of department heads across the different departments in the College was dependent on departmental time, interest, and money, and access to microcomputers was difficult for the faculty as a whole. The success of implementation there appears problematic.

A sample Situational Factor checklist for College B, providing information on individual factors as they were for that college is shown in Appendix B.

A Sample of Checklist Use in the High School Study

In the study of microcomputer implementation just presented, the Situational Factors Checklist was used to record and compare factors at each college site that influenced the use of a specific innovation. The end result was a hypothesis as to why some campuses had better results with the implementation than others. Data collection for the High School Study was not focused on a specific innovation as it was for the microcomputer study, but rather on the process of change in general and the factors that were

Figure 3: College F

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Non-supportive	Neutral	Unknown
State	X			
District	X			
Community	X			
Facility	X			
School Administration	X			
Department Heads	X			
Faculty	X			
Students	X			
Co-curriculum			X	

2. Overall the context at this school is generally (X) Supportive, ( ) Nonsupportive, ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize interaction of factors described above.)

   (WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

Brief Explanation:

The size, newness and spirit of this college coupled with bright, enthusiastic faculty and administration makes this context highly supportive of change.

supportive or nonsupportive to it. Personnel at the schools visited were
interviewed as to what changes were occurring in the school and how they were
occurring -- who facilitated change, what was the normal channel for change,
was change ongoing or occasional? The checklist in this context was used to
summarize the factors present that had an influence on the process of change
in each school site.

The High School Study had a number of different goals. The schools were
selected for participation by their districts on the basis of whether they
were involved in many changes or were "typical", i.e., involved in a moderate
amount of change. One goal of the study then was to see if there were
differences in the changing versus typical schools in terms of the factors at
play in those schools. Schools were also selected on the basis of the
principal's hypothesized facilitation style (Hall & Rutherford, 1984). As
much as possible, schools in one district represented one principal of each
style -- responder, manager, and initiator. Another goal of the study was to
look at the influence of the principal on the school and to gather more
information about "style" as part of an ongoing research interest (Hall, Hord,
Rutherford, Huling & Stiegelbauer, 1983, 1984). A third goal of the study was
to view the role of the Central Office in initiating or facilitating change.
The Situational Factors Checklist requires research staff to consider the
principal, administration, and the district among other factors in completing
the form.

The methodology of data collection used in the High School Study placed
two researchers in each school and required the same reports or research forms
from each. As much as possible, these forms were completed prior to
debriefing between the research staff at the school site. Use of the
checklist by both researchers at the same school provided a means to check
perceptions within a school, as well as to compare factors across schools.

Figures 4 and 5 show the summary analysis page completed by two researchers at the same school. The school in this case is an elementary sch. As can be easily noted, researchers were in consensus about which factors were supportive, nonsupportive, neutral, or unknown. Both also agreed that the most significant factor influencing the changes occurring in that school was the school's initiator principal, a woman who "takes a highly optimistic, enthusiastic posture" on everything and believes it can be done (Figure 5). Some of the factors left blank in the figures reflect the fact that the researcher had not talked to someone in that role or had not collected enough information to make a judgment.

Data analysis from this phase of the High School Study is currently in process.

Summary and Conclusion

At this point in its development, the Situational Factors Checklist is one means to begin to quantify and explore the factors contributing to change in schools. It certainly is not yet a perfect instrument. Data collection has indicated that many of the factors may still be too large to understand their workings in real depth. As noted in the section on the development of the checklist, it is essentially a modified ethnographic method. True to that form, it demands at least some longhand description to catch the subtleties of the factor's working in the total context.

The benefits of the checklist, however, do support further exploration of it as an instrument. The checklist does allow for some comparison of the influence of factors across and within sites. It allows for an interrater reliability check. It can act as an indicator of what are the major influences at work in a change process and as such be a tool in developing facilitative aids to increase the likelihood of effective implementation. The

16

18

Figure 4: Situational Factors Summary Analysis

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Non-supportive	Neutral	Unknown
State				X
District	X			
Community	X			
Facility			X	
School Administration				
Principal	X			
Vice Principal(s)				X
Others				X
Department Heads				N/A
Faculty	X			
Students				X
Co-curriculum				X

2. Overall the context at this school is generally (X) Supportive, ( ) Nonsupportive, ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize interaction of factors described above.)

    (WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

Brief Explanation:

The principal's influence is clearly the strongest element in the recipe for change. She guides faculty into believing that they truly have input into decisions coming from without and within.

Clearly the principal is the primary mover and shaker. She is the "glue" of this school. Yet, she operates in such a way that <u>all</u> the teachers perceive that they are truly involved with decisions. Sne is supportive of any reasonable requests they make. She is perceived as being a curriculum and instructiona! expert. She was consistently named as the person to turn to for instructional aid.

Her own philosophy is one of establishing a supportive, caring, professional atmosphere for teachers so that they may be encouraged to provide quality instruction for students. She is an energetic individual who articulates <u>and</u> acts acts on her philosophy of establishing a positive atmosphere.

2U

Figure 5: Situational Factors Summary Analysis

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Non-supportive	Neutral	Unknown
State				X
District	X			
Community	X			
Facilit_			X	
School Administration Principal	X			
Vice Principal(s)	X			
Others				
Department Heads				
Faculty	X			
Students				
Co-curriculum				

2. Overall the context at this school is generally (X) Supportive, ( ) Nonsupportive, ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize interaction of factors described above.)

   (WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

21

Brief ьxplanation:

The major factor that is unique to this school is the principal's broad based participation program of action, problem solving and decision making. Everyone feels "professional" (She has told them they are professional) and is involved in   planning aɪd activities and changes.

The leadership process/tone/type/style behavior sets the contexts (most significant context factor). The principal has terminated or moved teachers she doesn't think measure up. The principal is highly energetic (talks incessantly), tells teachers how professional and strong they are. She "encourages" them (Some teachers say she pushes.) in all school endeavors. The principal takes a highly optimistic, enthusiastic posture -- everything is "exciting."

She does not appoint permanent leaders but identifies various teachers to head up committees and working parties -- and rotates the leadership.
Her approach: Here is some opportunity, or what the Central Office wants
                What do you think? How shall we do this? Do you want to
                be involved?

Her vision of the schoc. is to have everyone in action, on a equal level of involvement. Thus, teachers buy in to a change that is their creation. As a result, the change occurs.

22

microcomputer study is one case in point. The study was conducted by a representative of the District Office who had the task of planning for the further development of the computer project across other schools in the district. As a result of the study, the district did increase its communication with college administrators about ways administrators might make implementation occur more easily.

Further, the checklist alerts research staff to be aware of the action of different factors in the sites visited. This is especially valuable when the site visit is brief. Completing the form systematically promotes a shared view of the site by field staff, though other methods should be used in tandem with it for a "rich" data base.

In the end, the Situational Factors Checklist form is primarily a descriptive tool, but one that aims to capture some of the unique chemistry of each site while at the same time to determine the building blocks of that chemistry. Whether it is used for research, for planning, or for assessing needs relative to change or implementation, further information about a setting can only enhance understanding of the site. To quote from Corbett, Dawson, and Firestone (1984, 181), ". . . field agents can more effectively provide assistance to schools if they understand the nature and potential influence of local contextual conditions and adjust their strategies . . . accordingly." While there are many ways information about a field site might be collected, use of the Situational Factors Checklist offers the beginnings of one systematic approach to increasing such knowledge.

23

References

Corbett, H. D., Dawson, J. A., & Firestone, W. A. (1984). School context and school change: Implications for effective planning. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling, L. L., Stiegelbauer, S. M., Goldstein, M. & Griffin, T. (1982). Quantitative and qualitative procedures for studying interventions influencing the outcomes of school improvement efforts (R&D Rep. 3140). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling, L. L. & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983). Leadership variables associated with successful school improvement (R&D Rep. 3164). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling, L. L. & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1984). The improvement process in high schools: Form, function, and a few surprises (R&D Rep. 3188). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G. E., Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L. & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1985, April). Changing the American high school: Descriptions and prescriptions. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hall, G. E., & Griffin, T. H. (1982). Analysis of the context/climate in school settings--Which is which? (R&D Report 3139). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Hall, G. E. and Rutherford, W. L. (1983). Three change facilitator styles: How principals affect improvement efforts (R&D Rep. 3155). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Huling-Austin, L. L. (1984). Collecting data in high schools: Methods and madness (R&D Rep. 3183). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 81(12), 1096-1112.

Jones, A. P., & James, L. R. (1979). Psychological climate: Dimensions and relationships of individuals and aggregated work environment perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 201-250.

Loucks, S. F., Newlove, B. W., & Hall, G. E. (1976). Measuring levels of use of the innovation: A manual for trainers, interviewers, and raters (R&D Rep. No. 3013). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1984). Community, context, and co-curriculum;
    Situational factors influencing school improvements in a study of
    high schools (R&D Rep. 3186). Austin: Research and Development Center
    for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin.

Appendix A

Appendix A

SITUATIONAL FACTORS CHECKLIST FORM

SCHOOL _____   DISTRICT _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS __   ____   NUMBER OF TEACHERS _____

YEAR SCHOOL WAS FOUNDED _____   DATE _____

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the following categories:

1. Check ( ) any factors that you know are present in the situation.
2. If the factor offers options (as in "high, low"), circle the appropriate option.
3. If the factor has a positive influence on change in the situation, place a "+" next to the check.
4. If the factor has a negative influence on change in the situation, place a "-" next to the check.

After completing each factor check at the end whether that factor OVERALL has a positive, negative, neutral, or unknown influence on the changes occurring in the school and write a brief paragraph explaining why.

To summarize the effect of all factors, briefly answer the questions on the summary analysis page.

STATE: Influence overall on change is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                       ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___initiating new policies now directly influencing schools
___planning new policies
___initiating statewide programs
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

SCHOOL:_____

DISTRICT OFFICE: Influence overall on change is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                                  ( ) neutral, ( )unknown.

___initiating many new programs
___undergoing staff reductions
___allows schools to interpret policy and program directives
___actively works in schools
___involvement with school is supportive
___involvement with schools is directive
___monitors schools
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

COMMUNITY: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                           ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___parents participate in school
___parents unaware of school activities
___ethnic composition
___SES: low, medium, high
___community is mobile
___professional parents
___non-professional parents
___high expectations expressed by parents
___parents are uninterested or unsupportive of academic achievement
___involvement in school by other community organizations
   identify: _____
   _____
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

FACILITY: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___large size
___changes in rize
___structure influences in-school communication
___segmented structure of building
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive,
( ) negative, ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

Characteristics of Principal in role
___1. style: responder, manager,
        initiator
___2. does traditional administrative
        (business office) tasks
___3. provides instructional
        leadership
___4. participant management with
        other staff
___5. delegates effectively
___6. works with staff
___7. not easily accessible
___8. able to translate vision
        to goals
___9. establishes supportive climate
___10. monitors
___11. intervenes
___12. plays a role

Administration of school
___principal is major
    administrator
___leadership by administrative
    team (3 deans)
    list characteristics of team
    from principal list above
    (list #'s)
    _____
___primary leadership by person
    other than principals:
    list #'s of characteristics
    from above:
    _____
    position: _____
___school leadership has under-
    gone frequent changes
___control of school issues is
    internal
___control of school issues is
    external
___school leadership sees them-
    selves as having flexibility
    to interpret district/state
    directives
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____   _____

DEPARTMENT HEADS: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                                 ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.
   ___formal role
   ___informal role
   ___see themselves as instructional leaders
   ___see themselves as paperpushers or budget managers
   ___interacts on curriculum decisions with ___principal
                                             ___district
                                             ___other DHs
                                             ___deans
   ___diversity of leadership styles (in DHs) exists
   ___staff meetings deal with things other than administrative tasks
   ___other: _____
   ___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

FACULTY: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                           ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

   ___age: younger, medium, older, mixed
   ___staff change/stability
   ___resistant to change
   ___open or flexible to change
   ___whole school communication
   ___in-department communication only
   ___many years of experience
   ___other: _____
   ___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

STUDENT BODY: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                              ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___change in numbers
___ethnic composition
___population is currently changing in composition
___lack of English language skills
___SES: high, medium, low
___parental pressure for success in curricular or extracurricular areas
___interest in academic achievement
___composed of diverse groups (SIGs)
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

CO/EXTRACURRICULUM: Influence overall on change is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                                  ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___detracts from academics
___important for school spirit
___school is uninvolved
___is major emphasis in school
___teachers compensated
___teachers reluctantly involved
___other: _____
___other: _____

31

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

RESOURCES (available): Influence on change overall is:
                                        ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                        ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___aides (parental or other)
___funding
___resource or curriculum specialists
___help from district office
___space
___time
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

OTHER FACTORS: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
                                        ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___source of new program: external, internal
___source: ___district office
             ___independent program developer
             ___school administration
             ___department
             ___teachers
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

_____

32
32

SCHOOL:_____

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Nonsupportive	Neutral	Unknown
State				
District				
Community				
Facility				
School Administration Principal				
Vice Principal(s)				
Others				
Department Heads				
Faculty				
Students				
Co/Extracurriculum				
Other: (Names)				

2. Overall the context at this school is generally ( ) Supportive, ( ) Nonsupportive, ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize inter-action of factors described above.)

    (WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

    BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

3. How does leadership mediate, influence, or affect the context at this school?

Please use the back of this sheet or another sheet to explain further.

Appendix B

Appendix B

SITUATIONAL FACTORS CHECKLIST FORM

SCHOOL _College B_   DISTRICT _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS _____   NUMBER OF TEACHERS _____

YEAR SCHOOL WAS FOUNDED ____   DATE _____

_____

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the following categories:

1. Check ( ) any factors that you know are present in the situation.
2. If the factor offers options (as in "high, low"), circle the appropriate option.
3. If the factor has a positive influence on change in the situation, place a "+" next to the check.
4. If the factor has a negative influence on change in the situation, place a "-" next to the check.

For each factor check at the end whether that factor OVERALL has a positive, negative, neutral, or unknown influence on the changes occurring in the school and write a brief paragraph explaining why.

To summarize the effect of all factors, briefly answer the questions on the last page.

_____

_____

STATE: Influence overall on change is (x) positive, ( ) negative,
                                     ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

     _x_ initiating new policies now directly influencing schools
     ___ planning new policies
     ___ initiating statewide programs
     _x_ other: _funding_ _____
     ___ other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

     State Education Office promoting computer literacy, demanding that graduating high school seniors have it. State vocational education grants tied to computer-related activities. Governor's economic development thrust to attract high tech industries means community colleges must be able to train labor force.

_____

DISTRICT OFFICE: Influence overall on change is (x) positive, ( ) negative,
( ) neutral, ( )unknown.

    _x_initiating many new programs
    ___undergoing staff reductions
    ___allows schools to interpret policy and program directives
    _x_actively works in schools
    _x_involvement with school is supportive (at times)
    _x_involvement with schools is directive (at times)
    ___monitors schools
    ___other: _____
    ___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

The district office intervened in many ways to cause changes: offered
the training to faculty, gave microcomputers as bonus to faculty,
bought large computers and placed them on campuses-centralized decision-
making on la computers and computer networks--allowed decentralized
decisions regarding micros; offered incentive grants.

_____

COMMUNITY: Influence on change overall is (x) positive, ( ) negative,
( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

    ___parents participate in school
    ___parents unaware of school activities
    ___ethnic composition
    ___SES: low, medium, high
    ___community is mobile
    ___professional parents
    ___non-professional parents
    ___high expectations expressed by parents
    ___parents are uninterested or unsupportive of academic achievement
    ___involvement in school by other community organizations
    ___identify: _____

    ___other: _____
    ___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

For colleges, this is less meaningful than business/industry, high
school/college relationships might be. We also tend to respond to our
communities' demands for courses/programs when there has been a great
deal of interest in short term training, like workshops on home
computers.

_____

37

FACILITY: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, (x) negative, ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

    _x_ large size
    _x_ changes in size
    _x_ structure influences in-school communication
    ___ segmented structure of building
    _x_ other: __age__
    ___ other: __adaptability__

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

To accommodate computer labs (space) and computer-related wiring, etc., the college had to go to great expense and trouble. New space had to be provided and other space "bootlegged" causing dislocations. Departments are housed in separate buildings, some at great distance from one another, hindering communication.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: Influence on change overall is (x) positive, ( ) negative, ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

Characteristics of President in role
    _x_ 1. style: responder, _manager_, initiator
    ___ 2. does traditional administrative (business office) tasks
    _x_ 3. provides instructional leadership
    ___ 4. participant management with other staff
    _x_ 5. delegates effectively
    _x_ 6. works with staff
    ___ 7. not easily accessible
    ___ 8. able to translate vision to goals
    _x_ 9. establishes supportive climate
    ___ 10. monitors
    ___ 11. intervenes

Administration of school
    ___ principal is major administrator
    ___ leadership by administrative team
        list characteristics of team from principal list above
        (list #'s)
        _____
    _x_ primary leadership by person other than principals:
        list #'s of characteristics from above:
        __3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11__
        position: __Dean for Occupational Education__
    _x_ school leadership has undergone frequent changes
    ___ control of school issues is internal
    _x_ control of school issues is external
    ___ school leadership sees themselves as having flexibility to interpret district/state directives
    ___ other: _____
    ___ other: _____

38

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

This case was a new dean who probably was able to take advantage of his
"newness." His planning process was widely representative, participative
and greatly appreciated. He was able to garner funds from a variety of
sources (grants left over from building monies, etc.), purchase micros
and give them away like Santa Claus.

DEPARTMENT HEADS: Influence on change overall is ( ) positive, ( ) negative,
(x) neutral, ( ) unknown.

    x formal role
    ___informal role
    x see themselves as instructional leaders
    ___see themselves as paperpushers or budget managers
    x interacts on curriculum decisions with ___principal
                                               ___district
                                               ___other DHs
                                                x deans
    ___diversity of leadership styles (in DHs) exists
    ___staff meetings deal with things other than administrative tasks
    x other: turfmanship
    x other: teaching field

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

Here I would have to say that initially department heads had a negative
influence because they tended to protect their turf and fend off
administrative intrusion. Faculty in occupational programs were more
amenable than those in academic areas. After turf and other issues were
resolved, they were positive influences.

FACULTY: Influence on change overall is (x) positive, ( ) negative,
( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

    ___age: younger, medium, older, mixed
    ___staff change/stability
    x resistant to change (some)
    x open or flexible to change (most)
    x whole school communication
    ___in-department communica' on only

_x_ many years of experience
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

Because faculty are eager to learn about computers and are willing to
undergo training (they are fairly independent), they create their own
opportunities. They bring pressure on administration for hardware or
other types of support. They are also willing to tap business and
industry for support.

_____

STUDENT BODY: Influence on change overall is (x) positive, ( ) negative,
                                              ( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___change in numbers
___ethnic composition
_x_population is currently changing in composition
___lack of English language skills
___SES: high, medium, low
___parental pressure for success in curricular or extracurricular areas
___interest in academic achievement
_x_composed of diverse groups (SIGs)
_x_other: job-oriented _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

Student demand for computer-related learning experiences which they
expect will lead to high paying jobs has been an impetus for change.
Also, students coming to the college.

_____

CO/EXTRACURRICULUM: Influence overall on change is ( ) positive, ( )
negative,

                                        (x) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___detracts from academics
___important for school spirit
_x_school is uninvolved
___is major emphasis in school
___teachers compensated

___teachers reluctantly involved
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY: (comment in paragraph)

Community colleges are commuter campuses.

OTHER FACTORS: Influence on change overall is (x) positive, ( ) negative,
( ) neutral, ( ) unknown.

___source of new program: external, internal
_x_source: _x_district office
            ___independent program developer
            _x_school administration
            ___department
            ___teachers
___other: _____
___other: _____

WHY· (comment in paragraph)

41

SITUATIONAL FACTORS SUMMARY ANALYSIS

1. Check factors in following grid according to their relation to change efforts.

	Supportive	Nonsupportive	Neutral	Unknown
State				
District				
Community				
Facility				
School Administration Principal				
Vice Principal(s)				
Others				
Department Heads				
Faculty				
Students				
Co/Extracurriculum				
Other: (Names)				

2. Overall the context at this school is generally (x) Supportive, ( ) Nonsupportive, ( ) Neutral to change efforts. (Summarize inter-action of factors described above.)

(WORKING DEFINITION: Context is the interaction of all factors and their different strengths and weaknesses relative to change.)

BRIEFLY EXPLAIN how interaction of factors influences change.

In this case the contextual factors were supportive to the change effort. In fact, for this college, it seemed that everything important to the success of microcomputer implementation was in place except the facilities which presented costly obstacles to overcome.

4ż