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2.1 Introduction

The much cited, but widely criticized and dismissed thesis in early school effectiveness literature that schools make no difference to student outcomes as advocated by Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, and York (1966), and Jencks, Smith, Ackland, Bane, Cohen, Gintlis, Heynes, and Michelson (1972) has been replaced by the realisation that schools, classrooms, and education in general impact on the broadest possible range of student outcomes. The research described below has indicated that classroom variables in the main affect cognitive and affective student outcomes, while school variables are more important for student behaviour, attendance, attitudes, and attainment.

Combinations of school and classroom variables have been found to affect student attitudes to school, social development, self esteem, educational progress and attainment, and attendance. Conservative estimates suggest that class and school effects together account for between 8 and 18 per cent of variance in student outcomes (Creemers, 1994, Reynolds, Teddlie, Creemers, Cheng, Dundas, Green, Epp, Hauge, Schaffer and Stringfield, 1994; Stoll and
Moreover, classroom effects account for more variation in student outcomes in all areas than school effects (Creemers and Reezigt, 1999; McGaw, 1997; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997). The identification of class, school, and combination of class and school effects has been described as the most significant breakthrough from more recent school effectiveness research (Creemers, 1994). Some researchers have suggested that while there was no question that student family factors, especially socioeconomic status, impacted on student outcomes and attitudes at school, the more profound impact on student outcomes was related to school and class factors such as school and class climate, leadership, structure, and teaching practices (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Reynolds and Packer, 1992; Sammons, Nuttall and Cuttance, 1993; Teddlie, 1994).

Research regarding specific student outcomes, such as achievement, support this finding. Effective teaching and other class variables, for example, have been identified as accounting for up to 25 per cent of variation in student achievement (Bloom, 1976; Creemers, 1994), while school effects have been estimated to explain 8 per cent of student difference in achievement (Bosker and Witziers, 1996). It has been argued that school and classroom effects may be greatest for non-academic outcomes (Reynolds, 1992).

Importantly, the perception that schools made no difference to student outcomes may have retarded the evolution of school effectiveness research for
an extended period of time (Reynolds, 1992). Others have argued that what is required is to examine how these contexts impact upon the emotional, social, and academic growth of students (Creemers 1994; Davis and Thomas, 1989; Fraser, 1991; McGaw, 1997). Consequently, it would appear that definitions and assessments of school effectiveness that have been developed and implemented during this period are somewhat limited in scope and design.

Perhaps related to the apparent retardation of the development of school effectiveness research, some authors have argued that there is no cross-cultural agreement on a definition of school effectiveness (Chapman and Aspin, 1997; Cuttance, 1992; Reynolds et al., 1994; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997), nor agreement on what makes schools effective (Reynolds and Packer, 1992). Terms such as efficiency, productivity, and the survival power of an organisation are often used as synonyms for effectiveness; however, the appropriateness of their use is questionable (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997). School effectiveness has also been described as "epistemologically problematic and politically promiscuous and malleable" (Slee and Weiner, 1998). Other researchers have, however, attempted to provide some definition of the key components of school effectiveness. These define school effectiveness and efficiency as congruence between objectives and achievements (Cooper, 1993; Madaus, Airasian and Kellaghan, 1980; Townsend, 1994).
With regard to this definition, Madaus et al. (1980) highlighted that assessing school effectiveness in this framework was as vast as the objectives and achievements of schools are vast. Moreover, perhaps mainly due to their ease of assessment, it is feasible that schools and school systems have targeted quantitative assessments of student achievement as measures of school effectiveness. The expansive nature of this definition of school effectiveness does potentially provide some insight into why student academic outcomes are important but only one area of school effectiveness and also only one aspect of the education process (Goodlad, 1984). Other reasons why affective outcomes are not regularly included in studies of school effectiveness include: lack of clear definitions, problems of measurement, and the diverse range of affective domains - behavioural, social, moral, ethical, aesthetic, and attitude to school (Knuver and Brandsma, 1993).

Clearly though, there is some agreement on the importance of incorporating affective measures in school effectiveness measurement. Research has identified that all sections of school communities (including students, parents, teachers, and principals) reported that the criteria used to identify an effective school should incorporate more than achievement by including measures of self concept, personal development, employment skills, and citizenship (Townsend, 1994). A number of other authors have claimed that if school effectiveness is determined primarily on the basis of test scores, then this determination is narrow and impoverished (Creemers, 1994;
Freiberg, 1999; Goodlad, 1984; Reynolds et al., 1994; Rose, 1995; Slee and Weiner, 1998; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997) as social, moral, and aesthetic dimensions of teaching and learning are completely ignored. Slee and Weiner (1988) argued that such narrow definitions and reductionism resonated with the neo-conservative discourse of "performativity", efficiency, and the highly contested notion of academic standards (1998). Creemers (1994) suggested that such a unidimensional approach to school effectiveness is structurally and conceptually flawed. Moreover, Freiberg (1999) argued that affective outcomes are not only important in their own right but also because they have an impact on cognitive outcomes.

The development of an all-encompassing model of school effectiveness, that includes affective measures such as student quality of life, has also been strongly supported by some authors. As early as 1988, Wirth argued that the increasing focus on measurable academic student outcomes and ignorance of other aspects of student development was an extremely negative change in schools that stifled the creativity of both teachers and students. Whilst other work environments had increasingly adopted democratic alternatives to traditional management practices, Wirth (1988) argued that education in contrast had become less democratic and more technically driven. This overemphasis on testing and examination was described as destructive to true learning and, for teachers, these working relations and institutional structures were likely to result in stress, dissatisfaction, isolation, and reduced self-
efficacy (Wirth, 1988). Significantly, it would appear that affective aspects of schooling might have more impact on long term quality of life and later life outcomes than academic aspects. Samson, Graue, Weinstein, and Walberg (1984) identified that only a small percentage (less than 3 per cent) of adult occupational performance was explained by school achievement, hence it may be important that a broad range of personal and social criteria are incorporated into determining school effectiveness.

The importance of process variables within the education context, such as the nature of the classroom and school environment, the standard of facilities and how these facilities and amenities are managed, and how individuals interact with this environment, is also evident in the literature (Madaus et al., 1980). The work of Madaus et al. is of particular importance as it suggests that, as early as 1980, the need for schools to review their model of operation in light of the increasing social demands was advocated. This recommendation also provides an interesting point of reflection with regard to the degree that schools have changed their practices over the last two decades. An increased understanding of the nature of school and classroom environments was described as a key feature of research efforts to address improved school effectiveness, as was assessing student satisfaction and interest along with achievement, and teacher morale, expectations, and attitudes. Madaus et al. and other authors highlighted that changing school practice, along with determining the impact of schools on societal issues,
would be a slow process (Goodlad, 1984; Madaus et al., 1980). It is uncertain whether their expectations extended to the 21st century.

The context specific nature of school effectiveness is also evident in the literature. Hence, a primary outcome of school effectiveness research should be the identification of attributes of effective schools. Such a process needs to be multidimensional and conducted across a broad range of components including: both cognitive and affective student outcomes and progress in all areas across a number of years; quality; equity; educational standards; and, student background variables, such as socioeconomic status (Creemers, 1994; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997). Importantly best practice school effectiveness should not be mandated, but driven by individual school need (Stoll and Reynolds, 1997), incorporate satisfaction measures for all stakeholders, and establish school effects for individuals at the classroom level (Cheng, 1996).

Evidence suggests that all schools are not equally effective in meeting these targets, hence it would appear appropriate to consider, identify, and define the attributes of effective schools.

As described above, reassessment of teaching and learning practices may be required to meet student and societal need in the 21st century. If society requires individuals who can work cooperatively and be active members of this society, new methods of instruction and learning are required as well as new skills, especially social and communication skills. These
developments may not emanate from schools traditionally regarded as effective (Reynolds and Packer, 1992).

The identification of classroom and school practices that are effective in developing new social skills is an important part of this process. The nature of this process relates to identifying differences between apparently similar schools, methods by which schools can improve their organisation to maximize student outcomes, and relationships between school outcomes (educational, behavioural, and social attainment) and school processes (physical and organizational). The need for school effectiveness to be considered from the student perspective rather than a systemic or school perspective has also been advocated (Cooper, 1993). Through this perspective, Cooper suggested, an understanding of the impact of the school environment on students could be determined.

Along with definitions of school effectiveness, definitions and descriptions of effective schools have also been generated. Whilst some authors have argued there is no clear definition of effective schools (Madaus et. al., 1980), others have defined an effective school as one where student progress is greater than what would be expected in light of intake variables (Mortimore, 1991). Mortimore suggested that domains for measuring student progress included academics, behaviour, attendance, attitudes towards school, and self image, along with consideration of the nature of the learning environment and school processes.
Significantly, research has attempted both to identify and evaluate the appropriateness of measures used to assess school effectiveness. Some of this research has indicated that the criteria most often used to assess school effectiveness (such as strong leadership, emphasis on developing student basic skills, high expectations for students, a safe and orderly climate, and frequent monitoring of student progress) may not constitute a completely comprehensive model of effective schools due to the particular focus on academics at the expense of outcomes in the affective domain (Creemers, 1994; Holdaway and Johnson, 1993; Reynolds et al., 1994).

Other research suggests that schools need to select from an extensive list of variables to elicit sophisticated evaluations of their effectiveness as a school (Holdaway and Johnson, 1993). Quality educational programs and curriculum (Bentley, 2000), positive ethos and climate (Mortimore, 1991), effective leadership, communication, and decision making (Stoll and Reynolds, 1997), high quality teaching staff (Maglen, 1997), access to support services (McGaw, Banks, and Piper, 1991), satisfied students (Whitman, Spendlove, and Clark, 1984), and, low student absenteeism (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997) are examples of other variables that have been identified as attributes of effective schools.

In his synthesis of school effectiveness literature in Australia and abroad, Mulford (1985) highlighted that a focus on students and avoidance of bureaucratic structures was significant as bureaucratic structures pervaded
less effective schools and often led to increased student anxiety and dissatisfaction. Significantly, school effectiveness research in Australia had appropriately, Mulford suggested, tended to place greater emphasis on the total development of students rather than basic academic skills, in comparison to research undertaken elsewhere. However, Australian effectiveness literature since Mulford's review appears to have embraced the worldwide trends. Globally it is clear that there is much less research regarding the impact of schools and classrooms on aspects of student schooling such as attendance, attitudes to school, behaviour, and self efficacy than achievement and academics (Knuver and Brandsma, 1993; Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis and Ecob, 1988).

Another interesting perspective on the development of school effectiveness research was provided by Creemers (1994) who highlighted that, at that point of time, research reviews of school effectiveness literature outnumbered actual empirical investigations. Moreover, many of the empirical investigations lacked appropriate conceptual and technical frameworks. A conceptual framework incorporating school and instructional effectiveness may provide a context in which school effectiveness research can drive school improvement.

Other researchers have highlighted some of the inherent difficulties and potential future directions of school effectiveness. Already, as described above, it has been identified that schools traditionally regarded as effective
may not necessarily be effective across the full range of student outcomes (Mortimore, 1991; Reynolds and Packer, 1992) nor for the full student cohort. School is not equally effective for students from all socioeconomic backgrounds (Mortimore et al., 1988), and is generally more effective for students of higher ability level (Aitken and Longford, 1986). Significantly, schools that are ineffective for one group of students are generally less effective for all students (Cooper, 1993). Yet importantly, even student socioeconomic disadvantage can be overcome by effective schools and effective schooling (Rutter, 1979).

Accordingly, affective school outcomes such as achievement orientation, structural and cultural conditions, and opportunity to learn have been advocated as concerns to be investigated at the school and class level (Reynolds et al., 1994). The important role teachers play in determining educational effectiveness and student success at school has also been highlighted (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hill and Rowe, 1996), as has the need to focus on school transitions (for example, primary school to secondary school) as part of the consideration of the effectiveness of an institution (McGaw, 1997; Reynolds and Packer, 1992). Significantly, individual school effectiveness performance can vary as frequently as yearly (Reynolds and Packer, 1992), hence, longer cycles of school effectiveness assessment should perhaps be rejected in favour of more frequent, or ongoing, review similar to that undertaken in many companies and businesses.
Claims for the relevance of business effectiveness criteria for schools are also evident in the literature. It is suggested, for example, that being responsive to customer need, increasing productivity through equitable treatment of all workers, implementing an effective management structure, focusing on quality and reliability, and allowing freedom for innovative practice by workers within the work context, as appropriate business effectiveness criteria for educational institutions (Peters and Walterman, 1984). Importantly, effective organisations were described as being driven by values that were understood by all workers. School communities have a diverse membership including students, parents, teachers, and administrators. The importance of a shared understanding of values would appear to be a key feature of effective schools.

Significantly some research has identified shared values and other conditions that can enhance the effectiveness of schools. Effectiveness enhancing conditions identified by Scheerens and Bosker (1997), for example, were: priorities assigned to factors and components - beliefs, attitudes, goal statements; the factual state of affairs relevant to factors and components; appraisal of and judgement on the degree to which factors and components are realised; and, a problem solving approach - willingness to experiment/look for solutions. Further, a problem solving approach, willingness to experiment, and solution focus appear to be needed more than ever in schools and in the broader context of educational reform in the new millennium. The
associated refinements to methods of school effectiveness analysis and assessment, described below, provide a structure in which educators can pursue the goal of more effective schools.

An emergent feature of school effectiveness research is the expansion and refinement of assessment methodology. The concept of value adding with regard to student enrolment characteristics is increasingly evident in the literature as a method of measuring school effectiveness, as are more refined qualitative and quantitative research methods, longitudinal studies, and multilevel modelling incorporating causal modelling and going beyond simple correlation. The emergence of multilevel modelling in particular and more recent refinements of the multilevel modelling process has had important ramifications for school effectiveness research. A multilevel design that explicitly incorporates the hierarchical organisation of schools, some authors have argued, is required to fully understand education phenomena (Hill and Rowe, 1996; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997) and has progressed research on school and classroom effects (Hill and Rowe, 1996; Reynolds, 1992). Creemers (1994) suggested that multilevel modelling facilitated the pursuit of the goals of educational effectiveness research to identify variables, characteristics, and factors that could be incorporated into education practice or educational policy to improve schools.

Multilevel modelling has shown school and class differences to be greater than those estimated under previous methodologies (Hill and Rowe,
Hill and Rowe also noted that, in general, research designs incorporating multilevel modelling have shown class effects to be greater than school effects, supporting class effects research reported earlier (Creemers and Reezigt, 1999; McGaw, 1997; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997). However, despite the increasing evidence of the importance of class effects on student life at school, there has only been sporadic adoption of multilevel modelling.

Multilevel models with a multifactor design have been advocated in the literature as this type of model provides better conceptual modelling of school effectiveness and better procedures for statistical analysis (Creemers, 1994). Significant examples of school effectiveness research carried out in Australia using multilevel modelling techniques include those carried out by Hill and Rowe (1996), Hill, Rowe, and Holmes-Smith (1995), and Rowe and Hill (1996), who identified substantial class, and to lesser extent school effects, with regard to student learning progress, student perceptions of school, and behaviour. Internationally, Knuver and Brandsma (1993) identified at the student level a link between attitude to school and self concept, while at the school and class levels going beyond teaching basic skills and incorporating teaching and learning related to social, moral and professional skills allowed schools and classes to be effective both cognitively and affectively.

A primary outcome of school effectiveness research should be the identification of attributes of effective schools. Such a process needs to be
multidimensional and conducted across a broad range of components including: both cognitive and affective student outcomes and progress in all areas across a number of years; quality; equity; educational standards; and, student background variables, such as socioeconomic status (Creemers, 1994; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997). Importantly best practice school effectiveness should not be mandated, but driven by individual school need (Stoll and Reynolds, 1997), incorporate satisfaction measures for all stakeholders, and establish school effects for individuals at the classroom level (Cheng, 1996). Evidence suggests that all schools are not equally effective in meeting these targets, hence it would appear appropriate to consider, identify, and define the attributes of effective schools.

Along with definitions of school effectiveness, definitions and descriptions of effective schools have also been generated. Whilst some authors have argued there is no clear definition of effective schools (see for example, Madaus et al., 1980), others have defined an effective school as one where student progress is greater than what would be expected in light of intake variables (Mortimore, 1991). Mortimore suggested that domains for measuring student progress included academics, behaviour, attendance, attitudes towards school, and self image, along with consideration of the nature of the learning environment and school processes.

Significantly, research has attempted both to identify and evaluate the appropriateness of measures used to assess school effectiveness. Some of this
research has indicated that the criteria most often used to assess school effectiveness (such as strong leadership, emphasis on developing student basic skills, high expectations for students, a safe and orderly climate, and frequent monitoring of student progress) may not constitute a completely comprehensive model of effective schools due to the particular focus on academics at the expense of outcomes in the affective domain (Creemers, 1994; Holdaway and Johnson, 1993; Reynolds et al., 1994).

Other research suggests that schools need to select from an extensive list of variables to elicit sophisticated evaluations of their effectiveness as a school (Holdaway and Johnson, 1993). Quality educational programs and curriculum (Bentley, 2000), positive ethos and climate (Mortimore, 1991), effective leadership, communication, and decision making (Stoll and Reynolds, 1997), high quality teaching staff (Maglen, 1997), access to support services (McGaw, Banks, and Piper, 1991), satisfied students (Whitman, Spendlove, and Clark, 1984), and, low student absenteeism (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997) are examples of other variables that have been identified as attributes of effective schools.

Other researchers have highlighted some of the inherent difficulties and potential future directions of school effectiveness. Already, as described above, it has been identified that schools traditionally regarded as effective may not necessarily be effective across the full range of student outcomes (Mortimore, 1991; Reynolds and Packer, 1992) nor for the full student cohort.
School is not equally effective for students from all socioeconomic backgrounds (Mortimore et al., 1988), and is generally more effective for students of higher ability level (Aitken and Longford, 1986). Significantly, schools that are ineffective for one group of students are generally less effective for all students (Cooper, 1993). Yet importantly, even student socioeconomic disadvantage can be overcome by effective schools and effective schooling (Rutter, 1979).

Accordingly, effective school outcomes such as achievement orientation, structural and cultural conditions, and opportunity to learn have been advocated as concerns to be investigated at the school and class level (Reynolds et al., 1994). The important role teachers play in determining educational effectiveness and student success at school has also been highlighted (Hill and Rowe, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 2000), as has the need to focus on school transitions (for example, primary school to secondary school) as part of the consideration of the effectiveness of an institution (Reynolds and Packer, 1992; McGaw, 1997). Significantly, individual school effectiveness performance can vary as frequently as yearly (Reynolds and Packer, 1992), hence, longer cycles of school effectiveness assessment should perhaps be rejected in favour of more frequent, or ongoing, review similar to that undertaken in many companies and businesses.

Significantly some research has identified shared values and other conditions that can enhance the effectiveness of schools. Effectiveness
enhancing conditions identified by Scheerens and Bosker (1997), for example, were: priorities assigned to factors and components - beliefs, attitudes, goal statements; the factual state of affairs relevant to factors and components; appraisal of and judgement on the degree to which factors and components are realized; and, a problem solving approach - willingness to experiment/look for solutions. Further, a problem solving approach, willingness to experiment, and solution focus appear to be needed more than ever in schools and in the broader context of educational reform in the new millennium. The associated refinements to methods of school effectiveness analysis and assessment, provide a structure in which educators can pursue the goal of more effective schools.

An emergent feature of school effectiveness research is the expansion and refinement of assessment methodology. The concept of value adding with regard to student enrolment characteristics is increasingly evident in the literature as a method of measuring school effectiveness, as are more refined qualitative and quantitative research methods, longitudinal studies, and multilevel modelling incorporating causal modelling and going beyond simple correlation. The emergence of multilevel modelling in particular and more recent refinements of the multilevel modelling process has had important ramifications for school effectiveness research. A multilevel design that explicitly incorporates the hierarchical organisation of schools, some authors have argued, is required to fully understand education phenomena (Hill and
Rowe, 1996; Stoll and Reynolds, 1997) and has progressed research on school and classroom effects (Reynolds, 1992; Hill and Rowe, 1996). Creemers (1994) suggested that multilevel modelling facilitated the pursuit of the goals of educational effectiveness research to identify variables, characteristics, and factors that could be incorporated into education practice or educational policy to improve schools.

Schools directly or indirectly touch on the life of almost everyone in modern society, whether as student, parent, teacher, employer or consumer of the goods and services produced by school leavers. Education is a major undertaking of governments around the world. Schools account for a substantial proportion of public and private expenditure, averaging around 4 percent of GDP in OECD countries. The NSW Department of School Education is one of the largest employers in Australia, and has a budget of well over $3 billion annually. In return for this investment, high hopes are held for education as an instrument of social and economic policy for the betterment of individual, community and national well-being. It therefore should come as no surprise that there is intense interest in knowing whether schools are delivering value for money — how effective schooling is and how it can be improved (Hill, Rowe and Holmes-Smith, 1995).
2.2 Effectiveness: Two Key Issues

1. Different groups may have quite different views of effectiveness

For the education authority, the efficient use of resources may have high priority. A teacher may value a school because its policies support his or her efforts in the classroom. Parents may be concerned mainly about whether their children are happy at school and making progress. We need to clarify and reconcile these different criteria of effectiveness.

2. We do not have enough evidence about how various factors influence school effectiveness

Even when we have identified some schools as being more effective than others, and even if we can identify features common to these effective schools, we cannot assume that it is these features that cause the schools to be effective. The research on effectiveness cannot therefore offer schools a blueprint.

Mortimore's Criterion of Effectiveness

"An effective school is one in which pupils progress further than might be expected from its intake."

Mortimore (1991) added three riders:

- a school can be effective even if its intake is highly disadvantaged
• you cannot guarantee progress for every pupil even in an effective school

• *effectiveness* is not the same as *efficiency* or simple value for money.

A reassessment of teaching and learning practices may be required to meet student and societal need in the 21st century. If society requires individuals who can work cooperatively and be active members of this society, new methods of instruction and learning are required as well as new skills, especially social and communication skills. These developments may not emanate from schools traditionally regarded as effective (Reynolds and Packer, 1992).

The identification of classroom and school practices that are effective in developing new social skills is an important part of this process. The nature of this process relates to identifying differences between apparently similar schools, methods by which schools can improve their organisation to maximise student outcomes, and relationships between school outcomes (educational, behavioural, and social attainment) and school processes (physical and organisational). The need for school effectiveness to be considered from the student perspective rather than a systemic or school perspective has also been advocated (Cooper, 1993). Through this perspective, Cooper suggested, an understanding of the impact of the school environment on students could be determined.
The acute interest in organizational effectiveness is neither a new phenomenon nor unique to education. In the past one hundred years, writers representing both the private and public sectors have expressed concern about the effective and efficient operation of virtually every type of organization.

In fact, the level of public and political interest suggests that the fascination continues to grow. However, many of the arguments or discussions conclude with the generalization that effectiveness cannot be defined and measured. Organizational effectiveness represents a central theme in the theory and practice of educational administration that the difficult questions regarding the concept are no longer to be avoided.

Education is not devoid of effective indicators. Educators and the public recognize that different schools achieve different degrees of success even with similar student population. Based on real or imagined information, parents may decide that a particular school is an effective school. Patrons are invited to art shows, music performance, and athletic events in the school because these activities illustrate school productivity. At the level of practice, effectiveness indicators are known.

At the level of theory, however, controversy about organizational effectiveness becomes intense when specific questions are raised about which criteria, characteristics or conditions are associated with school effectiveness.
Is effectiveness a short-term or long-term phenomenon? Arguments over the correct replies to these questions have raised, but few answers have emerged.

The organizational literature of the last decade and theoretical approaches to organizational effectiveness offer some promises of integrating and focusing future effects to answer the issues regarding characteristics and conditions that are associated with organizational effectiveness.

2.3 Theoretical Approaches to Organizational Effectiveness

To ask a global question about whether a school is effective or ineffective is virtually a useless exercise. Effectiveness is not a single thing. Hence a one-dimensional definition is not adequate. A school or any organization can be both effective and ineffective depending on the criteria used, which may be independent of one another. Without a theoretical model as a guide, it is impossible to state that one school is more effective than another, to say that a given indicator is a measure of effectiveness.

2.3.1 Goal Model of Organizational Effectiveness

Traditionally organizational effectiveness has been defined in terms of the degree of goal attainment. Etzioni’s (1964) widely held definition is that “an organizational goal is a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize”. An organization is effective if the observable outcomes of
its activities meet or exceed organizational goals. While acknowledging several weaknesses in the goal model, a number of scholars maintain that goals and their relative accomplishment are essential in defining organizational effectiveness.

### 2.3.1.1 Goal Types

The three common types of organizational goals are:

(a) Official goals

(b) Operative goals and

(c) Operational goals

Official goals are formal statements of purpose by the board of education concerning the nature of the school's mission. These statements usually appear in board of education publications and faculty and staff handbooks. Typically, official goals can be characterized as abstract and aspirational in nature (for example, students will achieve their full potential). They are usually timeless and serve the purpose of securing support and legitimacy from the public rather than guiding the administrator and teacher behaviour.

In contrast, in the operative goals the intentions are reflected. That is, operative goals mirror the actual tasks and activities performed in the school, irrespective of what it claims to be doing. Hence, official goals in school may
be operative or inoperative, depending on the extent to which they accurately represent actual educational practices. Some operative goals are widely published (for example, recent efforts to place learning disabled students in regular classrooms) while others are not (for example, efforts to provide custodial care of students for six to eight hours per day.)

Operational goals carry approved criteria and evaluation procedures that already delineate how the levels of accomplishment will be measured. For a school the administration can specify, in a reasonable precise fashion, what the operational goals are and how their attainment will be measured. A contemporary illustration is "75 percent of the students will pass the state examination in mathematics held at the end of X standard."

2.3.1.2 Assumptions and Generalizations

Two assumptions underlie the goal model. First, a rational group of decision makers in the organization have in mind a set of goals that they wish to pursue. Second, the goals are few enough in number to be administered and are defined concretely enough to be understood by the participants. If the assumptions are accepted, it follows that the decision makers should be able to assess organizational effectiveness and to develop measures to determine how well the goals are being achieved. Although it is obvious that the decision makers are not completely rational, the two assumptions and the generalizations that follow from them should not be rejected without careful
consideration. In fact, administrative practices have been developed to enhance goal specification and goal achievement. For example management by objectives, cost-benefit analysis, and behavioural objectives for instruction are used to specify goals in schools. Administrators also use levels of centralization and formalization of the school's bureaucratic structure and guidelines for the scope and sequence of the curriculum to plan for goal attainment. However, several shortcomings of the goal concept and the goal model should be noted.

2.3.1.3 Criticisms About the Goal Model

1. Too often the focus is on the administrators' goal rather than those set by teachers. Researchers tend to ask only the administrators about the content of school goals rather than other constituencies. They fail to account for the diverse expectations that are expressed in the operative goals of a school.

2. In many instances researchers overlook the multiplicity of goals and their contradictory nature. The goal model tends to be logical and internally consistent, but in reality a school's goals are often in conflict.

3. Organizational goals are retrospective. They serve to justify school and educator action not to direct it.

4. Organizational goals are dynamic, while the goal model is static; goals change as contextual factors and behaviour vary, but the model remains the same.
5. The official goals of the organization may not be its operative goals. Since the analysis of actual operations is complex and difficult, a researcher may be unable to identify accurately the operative goals and therefore about what ends are implied by the operational practices. As a result official goals may be given greater emphasis than the important operative goals.

Given these strong criticisms it is argued that the goal model of organizational effectiveness is inadequate. Instead, a system resource model is proposed.

2.3.2 System Resource Model of Organizational Effectiveness

The system resource model defines effectiveness as the organization’s ability to secure an advantageous bargaining position in its environment and to capitalize on that position to acquire scarce and valued resources. The concept of bargaining position implies that specific goals cannot serve as ultimate criteria of effectiveness. Rather the system resource model directs attention towards the more general capacity of the organization to procure assets. Consequently, this definition of effectiveness focuses on the continuous, never-ending process of exchange of competition over scarce and valued resources. According to the system resource model, the effective schools will sustain growth or minimize decline by advantageous bargaining.
with parents and students or legislators. The criteria for effectiveness become
the organization's abilities to acquire resources.

2.3.2.1 Assumptions and Generalizations

The literature dealing with the system resource model contains several
implicit assumptions. First, the organization is assumed to be an open system
that exploits its environment. In other words, a social systems model, with
organizational, individual, and group dimensions and feedback loops, forms
the bases for evaluating organizational effectiveness. Second, before an
organization attains any size at all, the demand it faces become so complex
that it is impossible to define a small number of meaningful organizational
goals.

One generalization emerging from these assumptions is that in more
effective organizations, bureaucratic expectations, informal groups, and
individual needs work together better to produce an impact on the
environment that they do in less effective organizations. All organizations
emphasize the need for adequate resources and avoidance of undue strain.
Educational administrators for instance, place great importance on
maintaining harmony because harmonious actions enhance organizational
effectiveness.

Since there is strong dependency on the environment, the organization
must concentrate on adaptive functions to compete successfully for resources.
From the system's resource perspective, effective organizations are those with sensitive monitoring mechanisms that provide information about new behaviour that can lead to the acquisition of more assets.

The final criterion the researcher must use to assess organizational effectiveness according to the system resource model is internal consistency. The mode predicts that an effective organization will distribute resources judiciously over a wide variety of coping with the monitoring mechanisms.

2.3.2.2 Criticisms of the System Resource Model

The system resource model of organizational effectiveness has several alleged defects, especially when applied to educational organizations. For one thing by placing too much emphasis on inputs, it may have damaging effects on outcomes, when an educational organization becomes consumed by the acquisition of resources, other functions may be neglected.

Critics also allege that since increasing inputs or acquiring resources is an operative goal for the organization, the system resource model is actually a goal model. Thus, the differences between the goal and the system resource approaches may represent an argument over semantics. As Hall (1972) has observed "The acquisition of resources does not just happen. It is based on how the organization is trying to achieve its goal and is accomplished through the operative goals." In other words, the system resource model actually verifies the operative goal concepts. In fact, Steers (1975) has argued that the
two approaches are complementary. Indeed, it is possible, even highly desirable, to conceptualize organizational effectiveness by combining the two perspectives.

2.3.2.3 Integration and Expansion of the Goal and System Resource Models

Both the goal and system resource models share one crucial assumption, namely, "that it is possible, and desirable, to arrive at a single set of evaluative criteria, and thus at a single statement of organizational effectiveness." In the goal model, effectiveness is defined in terms of the relative attainment of feasible objectives having to do with physical facilities and equipment, the human energy of students and employees, curricular technologies, or some commodity, such as money, that can be exchanged for other resources. The resource model, based on the open system concept, places great value on the harmonious operation of the organization's components, the ability to adapt, and the optimization of the leadership, decision-making, and communication processes.

Several theories have attempted to integrate the two approaches and although their ideas differ slightly, they agree that the use of goals cannot be avoided. Behaviour is explicitly or implicitly goal directed. The organizational behaviour is no exception. However, from a system resource framework, goals become more diverse and dynamic, they are not static, ultimate states, but are
subject to change over time. Moreover, the attainment of some short-term
goals can represent new resources to achieve subsequent goals. Thus, there is
a cyclic nature to goals in organizations when a systems framework is used.

In order to convey an understanding of the subtle nuances of
organizational effectiveness, then the integrated model must be expanded to
include four additional characteristics, a time dimension, different
organizational levels, multiple constituencies, and multiple criteria.

2.3.2.4 Multiple Criteria

A basis assumption throughout this discussion has been that
organizational effectiveness is a multidimensional concept. No single ultimate
criterion such as student achievement or overall performance can capture the
complex nature of organizational effectiveness. In the combined goal–system
resource approach, effectiveness indicators must be derived for each phase of
the open system cycle–input, transformation, and output. Virtually every
phase, process, or outcome variable can be and has been used as an indicator
of effectiveness.

The development of a multidimensional index or composite measure of
organizational effectiveness requires the selection of key concepts. Choosing
the most appropriate and representative effectiveness variables can be an
overwhelming task. For instance, Campbell (1983) used thirty categories to
come up with a comprehensive list of organizational effectiveness indicators.
Similarly, Steers (1975) found fifteen different criteria in a sample of only seventeen studies of effectiveness. To bring some order and direction to the study of organizational effectiveness, a theoretical model is needed to guide the choice of effectiveness indicators.

An excellent model to help in the selection of specific criteria is provided by Talcott Parsons (1961). He has postulated that a social system's survival depends on the exercise of four critical functions. These functions are fundamental to resource acquisition and can be considered organizational goals. All social systems must solve the four functional problems of adaptation, goal achievement, integration and latency.

1. Adaptation - The problem of accommodating to the environment
2. Goal attainment - The problem of setting and achieving goals
3. Integration - The problem of maintaining solidarity among elements of the system
4. Latency - The problem of creating and maintaining the systems motivational and value patterns.

Adaptation is concerned with the system's need to control its environment. Schools accommodate themselves to the basic demands of the environment and their constituencies by attempting to transform the external situation and changing their internal programmes to meet new conditions.
Goal achievement is the gratification of system’s goals. The system defines its objectives and mobilizes its resources to achieve these desired ends. Typical indicators of goal attainment for educational organizations are academic achievement, resource acquisition and the quality of students and services.

Integration refers to a social solidarity within the system. It is the process of organizing, co-ordinating and unifying social relations to a single structure.

Among the primary social concerns of the school are employee job satisfaction, interpersonal conflict, student absenteeism, and morale.

Latency is the maintenance of integrity of the value system (that is, the systems motivational and cultural patterns). Effective schools require a high commitment and appropriate behaviour on the part of educators and students to reinforce the organization’s norms and values. Typical indicators that a school is effectively performing for the latency function include loyalty, a central life interest in school work, a sense of identify with the institution, individual motivation to work and role-norm congruence.
Table-2.1 Dimensions, Indicators and Added Perspectives of Organizational Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Effectiveness Critical Functions of Social Systems</th>
<th>Multiple Indicators for each Dimension of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Added Perspectives for each Indicator of Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Adaptability/ Flexibility Innovation Growth Development Control over Equipment</td>
<td>Time: Short term Intermediate Long term&lt;br&gt;Level: Individual Classroom School District Division District&lt;br&gt;Constituencies: Students Teachers Administrators Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment</td>
<td>Achievement Productivity Resource acquisition Efficiency Quality</td>
<td>Time: Short term Intermediate Long term&lt;br&gt;Level: Individual Classroom School District Division District&lt;br&gt;Constituencies: Students Teachers Administrators Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dimensions of Effectiveness Critical Functions of Social Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Multiple Indicators for each Dimension of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Added Perspectives for each Indicator of Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integration | Satisfaction  
Employee turnover  
Student absenteeism  
Conflict-cohesion  
Climate  
Open communication | Time: Short term  
Intermediate  
Adaptation  
Long term  
Level: Individual  
Classroom  
School  
District Division  
District  
Constituencies: Students  
Teachers  
Administrators  
Public |
| Latency     | Loyalty  
Central life Interests  
Sense of identity  
Motivation  
Role and norm congruency | Time: Short term  
Intermediate  
Adaptation  
Long term  
Level: Individual  
Classroom  
School  
District Division  
District  
Constituencies: Students  
Teachers  
Administrators  
Public |


#### 2.3.2.5 An Integrated Model

Specific criteria to measure each of these can be drawn from Campbell and Steers (1977). A model merging the general goals, specific criteria or indicators, and other perspectives on effectiveness is presented in Table 2.1.
Consequently, an integrated goal system resource model of organizational effectiveness can be derived by having the four necessary functions of social system act as the operative goals. By adding specific indicators of achievement of the four goals and by considering the time frame, organizational level and constituencies applicable to each indicator, the model can be completed.

The result is a more comprehensive theoretical formulation for guiding future research efforts. Researchers who use this model to study the organizational effectiveness of schools would precede in three steps. First, they would determine the constituencies who define the important operative goals. The researchers themselves may do the defining or it may be some other social group. Second, they would specify a time dimension, focusing on short-medium, or long-term goals. Third, they would identify several criterion variables. To make a comprehensive evaluation of school effectiveness, they would have to include indicators of each of the four critical goals, for example, a comprehensive study of short-term and intermediate term school effectiveness from the perspective of the students could use innovativeness of the curriculum, academic achievement, students satisfaction with instruction, and students sense of identify with the school. Although few studies have used such a comprehensive approach and several criterion variables.

The current state of development of school effectiveness theory is aptly described by Snow (1973) as being a relatively simple summarization of
empirical relationships. At the same time, quite a few causal models of school effectiveness exist that are really causal models of educational achievement (Clauset and Gaynor, 1982, Oakes 1989, Bossert 1988, Scheerens, 1989).

An Integrated Model of School Effectiveness Propounded by Scheerens (1990):
Framework for Research on the Effectiveness of Schooling

The four alternative framework for the study of the effects of schools that have achieved some prominence in the literature are:

i. The Input-output Framework
ii. The Organizational Framework
iii. The Institutional Framework
iv. The Exemplary Framework
v. The School Improvement Framework

2.4 The Input Output Framework

The early focus in school effects research was on differential effects between schools. The studies typically attempted to account for differences in between school outcomes using economic and policy oriented resource variables, such as average level of teacher training, average expenditure on text books, etc., after controlling for influences attributable to the racial and social background of individual pupils in the school. Economic resources which were found to have little influence on pupil outcomes included those associated with teacher-pupil ratios, teacher education, teacher experience, teacher salaries, average expenditure per pupil, quality of facilities and quality of administrators.
It has been evident all along that there are large differences in schooling outcomes between individual pupils. In the input-output model most of the variation was attributed causally to prior home background influences with a maximum of one quarter of the variation being attributable to differences between schools (Coleman, 1976). As evidence accumulated that school inputs, at least as they were then measured, seemed to have little impact on the variation in outcomes between schools, the validity of the model began to be questioned. It was argued that the school related factors responsible for the differential effects that schools were believed to have on individual outcomes had not shown up because of the methodological and conceptual inadequacies of the input-output model. This led to two significant developments in research on school effects, first, there was a shift towards the view that schooling was not a uniform experience in the social and cultural background of pupils and secondly, there was the emergence of new frameworks which viewed schools not as production units, but as organizations or institutions which were linked closely into the wider or as small administrative and social systems in themselves.

The basic formulation of the input-output model thus led to two significant developments in research on school effects, first, there was a shift towards the view that schooling was not a uniform experience for all, even after taking account of differences in the social and cultural background of pupils and, secondly there was the emergence of frameworks which viewed
schools not as production units, but as organizations or institutions which were linked closely into the wider educational system and other social institutions or as small administrative and social systems in themselves.

The basic formulation of the input-output model specified that the average level of resource inputs available to the school attended by each individual pupil, plus the social, racial and ability background characteristics of a pupil were the essential policy manipulated factors in determining individual pupil outcomes. Some of the developments which arose from the criticism of the model have been taken on board in later research. For instance the change of view about the non-uniformity of the effects of schooling led to a re-specification of the functional form of the relationship between individual pupils and the resource inputs to schooling.

Another adaptation of this model was to include factors which measured the average compositional characteristics of the intake of schools. In particular, the social background, race and ability of the pupils in schools were found to vary systematically with the between school outcomes of pupils, even after control for individual level measures of these characteristics.

The main question behind school effect research has shifted away from that of asking which economic and direct policy related variables could be manipulated to equalize or raise outputs, to one of asking what would explain the pattern of differences in the effects of schooling, in terms of the social
processes and educational practices which take place in the process of schooling. This redirection has emphasized a different set of educational resources to those output framework. In particular, the new frameworks count instructional variables and social psychological inputs, such as pupil motivation, attitudes and behaviours, among the resource inputs to schooling and more emphasis is placed on the social, organizational and historical context of schools (Rutter, 1979; Gray, McPherson and Reffe, 1983, Mortimore, 1985).

These frameworks view schools, not as an autonomously managed production unit in which all pupils receive a uniform input of resources which then have the same productive effect, but rather as a unit which is constrained by the organizational and institutional structure in which it is set and by its own internal social organization and structure. The question asked in these frameworks is, where in the schooling system one should expect to find the most significant differences.

2.4.1 The Organizational Framework

In this model the social actions of individuals are viewed as being constrained by the organizational structure of schooling. Schools consist of a set of administrative levels of organization, each of which is hierarchically nested within the one above it (for example, pupils within teaching groups, teaching groups within classes, classes within year groups, year groups
within schools (Barr and Dreeban 1983; Bidwell and Kasarda, 1983; Bidwell 1983). The description of this model given by Bidwell and Kasarda (1983) also includes levels of organization which are beyond that of the school (for example, local authority administrative divisions). For Bidwell and Kasarda the main features of the organization of schools are those relating to the production processes of schooling, such as, materials and technology and their configuration, decision-making structures and administrative processes of production management. School effects are thus attributable to the effect of the form and operation of the organizational structure of schools on individual outcomes.

In the organizational model of schooling, resources stocks comprise: (i) the instructional and managerial resources of teachers and school administrators, (ii) materials (iii) time (length of school day/year). This tripartite formulation of resource inputs to schooling rejects or excludes school inputs since it also treats the compositional attributes of schools relating to family, neighbourhood and peer groups as a resource input to the process of schooling. Differential school effects are thus the result of differences in the contingent conversation between pupil and school resource inputs under differing conditions of unit organizational structure.

This model goes some way towards offering an alternative which avoids the principals criticisms leveled against input-output models. In
particular, it recognizes the role of organizational structures in conditioning the social actions of individuals.

British research by Rutter (1979) and Reynolds (1982) can be located within the framework of the organizational model, although it has usually focused on just the two levels of schooling, classrooms and schools. This research has, however, taken seriously the idea that organizational and managerial processes within the school are significant determinants of pupil outcomes.

2.4.2 The Institutional Framework

The institutional model of schooling takes the social institutions which cut across schools to be the principal units between which the effects of schooling are to be found. Different institutions within the system are thus seen as the categories of schooling which have differential effects across schools. The institutional categories appeal to system-wide criteria for their definition. Examples of categories include: each grade level of schooling, different curriculum tracks, and denominational education. Since each institutional category is not bound by the individual school, but rather by the system as a whole, schools may have differential effects across institutional categories. The development of this model of schooling has been principally associated with Meyer (1970; 1977; 1980; Meyer and Rown, 1977; 1978). Meyer argues that schooling is essentially the institutional process by which
individuals from particular institutional social (background) categories are sponsored to take up particular adult institutional positions. Institutional categories of education are defined by more or less consensual views of the roles, rules and definitions of each category in society at large. The institutional categories so defined control definitions of what it means to be a pupil and the framework within which pupils make decisions and take actions with respect to their social futures.

In this model the pupil is viewed as a rational actor who is cognizant of the institutional structure of schooling and who more or less, consents to the authority of that structure. Continued success and participation in the system are necessary for survival and for, gaining the credentials which give access to valued social positions as an adult. Meyer (1980) portrays the pupils as rational and informed by a variety of consultants (peers, teachers, parents, counsellors, etc.). In order to achieve their goals, pupils must also develop a commitment to the pupil role in a situation which presents a conflicting variety of options with respect to how to proceed and of the actual range of social and educational futures available.

The institutional model recognizes the qualitative nature of differences within the school system, although quantitative differences are also important in determining the variation in pupil responses. Qualitative differences are to be found in the different institutions across schools but quantitative variation may occur in pupils' responses within each institution.
2.4.3 The Exemplary Schools Framework

Largely due to the failure of earlier researches to provide a satisfactory explanation of the effects of schools there has developed a little on effective schools base on exploratory empirical studies of effective and ineffective schools. Essentially, these studies have employed the analytical model of the input-output approach to locate exceptional schools by remaining variation in individual level. Schools which have high or low adjusted outcomes are described as being particularly effective or ineffective schools, respectively. A measure of the (in) effectiveness of schools is usually calculated as the differences between the actual and the predicted outcome for pupils in a school. The predicted outcomes is computed from a regression model across all schools, thus the effectiveness score is the deviation of pupils in a school from the regression line through all schools. The relationship between the effectiveness scores and other information on the schools are then explored or, a small number of schools are chosen for closer study by ethnographic methods of investigation. This method of searching for effective schools is premised on the assumption that the marginal effect of social and family background, and ability, is the same for all pupils and are affected in the same (constant) way by the factors omitted from the model. The organizational and institutional models outlined above suggest that the main effects of schools are to be found in their effects for different subgroups of pupils. That is they explicitly allow for a variation in effects across groups within the school. This
means that they can conceive of defining the effects of schools as the differential effects for group who are drawn from different organizational levels within schools or, who belong to different institutional categories in the education system. Thus, the model described above for locating effective and ineffective schools may not be appropriate. The designation of a school as an outlier is critically dependent upon the specification of the model. As indicated above, the methodology for choosing the outlier schools is based on a statistical model which specifies that within school relationships are constant across schools. Further, the regression slopes representing these relationships are estimated from the data for all schools in the analysis, but the effects of the non-random clustering of pupils within schools is not taken into account in the interpretation of the residual in the regression model. Since the estimates of residuals in the model may be non-reliable, and since the estimates of the effectiveness scores are computed from the residuals, they may also be unreliable. Thus, schools chosen as effective may be an artifact of the model and data employed in a particular situation. If the model is not correctly specified, further intensive study of schools so chosen may be misleading.

Researches by Rutter (1979), Madares (1979), Steedman (1983) and Gray, McPerson and Raffe (1983) had explored the relationship between the effectiveness of schools and aspects of the organization of schools, Rutter focused on the social organization of schools and studied the way in which
school ethos was related to schooling outcomes. Gray McPherson and Raffe (1983) investigated the influence of school organizational histories on pupils outcome. Evaluations of the performance of pupils in selective and comprehensive schools (Gray, McPherson and Raffe 1983, Steedman, 1983) also provide evidence that the organizational features of schooling have an influence on pupil outcomes.

2.4.4 School Improvement Framework

The application of school effectiveness knowledge in schools to improve their educational practice has been difficult in the past. Then the conclusion must be that the school effectiveness and school improvement communities need to be linked together on this same task. However, the school effectiveness research paradigm has, of course, a very different intellectual history and has exhibited a very different set of core beliefs concerning operationalisation, conceptualization and measurement by comparison with the approaches of most school improves. It has been strongly quantitative in orientation, with researchers arguing that the dominant, psychologically oriented beliefs in the importance of outside school factors had to be destroyed by utilization of a different, more qualitatively oriented one (Coleman et.al. 1966, Jencks et.al. 1971). Linked to this position on the importance of quantitative measurement has also been a view that sees the elite knowledge produced by research as potentially highly valid accounts of school life, which are of considerable use to practitioners within schools.
Adherents to the school effectiveness paradigm are primarily concerned with pupil outcomes, which are not surprising, given the political history of school effectiveness research in the United States where it has grown and built on the beliefs of Edmond (1979) and his associates that “all children can learn”. Processes within schools that so interest school improvers have an importance only within the school effectiveness paradigm to the extent that they affect outcomes, indeed; one back-maps within the paradigm from outcomes to processes. Furthermore, the school effectiveness paradigm regards pupils and school outcomes as fundamentally unproblematic and as given; indeed, in the great majority of the North American effectiveness research, the outcomes used are derived from only the very limited official educational definitions of the school as a purely academic institution. School effectiveness researchers often talk of a ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ school as if the definition of good or excellent is unproblematic, in ways unusual for school improvers. Lastly the school effectiveness paradigm is organizational rather than process based in terms of its analytic and descriptive orientation, preferring to restrict itself to the more easily quantifiable or measurable. As an example, Fullan’s (1991) process factors, such as a ‘feel’ for the process of leadership, ‘a guiding value system’ or ‘intense interaction and communication’ are largely eschewed in favour of organizationally and behaviourally oriented process variables such as ‘clean goals and high expectations’ or ‘parental involvement and support’. Additionally, the focus within school improvement on the attitudinal and on personal and group
inner states is replaced within school effectiveness research by a focus on the more easily measured behaviour of persons.

The school improvement paradigm, by contrast, has clearly believed in 'bottom up' school improvement, in which improvement attempts are 'owned' by those at school level, although outside school researchers, consultants or experts are allowed to put their knowledge forward for possible utilization. It celebrates the importance of the 'lore' or practical knowledge of practitioners rather than of the knowledge base of those who conduct research. It wishes to change educational processes, rather than the school management or the organizational features, which it sees as verified constructs. It wants the outcomes or goals of school.

2.5 Attributes of Effective Schools

Joyce (1983) and others in their book "The Structure of school Improvement" list out two sets of attributes associated with effective schools.

The attributes suggested by Joyce et.al. are summarized and presented in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2: Attributes of Effective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Organization</th>
<th>Instruction and Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear academic and social behaviour goals</td>
<td>High academic learning time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order and discipline</td>
<td>Frequent and monitored homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High expectations</td>
<td>Frequent monitoring of student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher efficacy, pervasive caring</td>
<td>Coherently organized curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rewards and incentives</td>
<td>Variety of teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative leadership and community</td>
<td>Opportunities for student responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Dimensions of Effective Schools and Schooling

Mackenzie (1983) had evolved the dimensions of effective schools in his article 'Research for School Improvement'. He contended that the 1970s, in contrast with the preceding decade of research, saw a confluence of findings. The studies of the 1970s, supported relationships between people variables and school outcomes, and the conclusions what was known about effective schools was considerably more interesting in 1983 than it was in 1970. Mackenzie's summary of the dimensions of effective schooling is presented in Table 2.3. The distinction he has drawn between the 'core' and 'facilitating'
elements reflects simply the frequency with which each element was reported in the school effectiveness literature.

**Table 2.3: Dimensions of Effective Schools and Schooling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Elements</th>
<th>Facilitating Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive climate and overall goals.</td>
<td>Shared consensus on values and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-focussed activities toward clear, attainable and relevant coordination of objectives.</td>
<td>Long-range planning and co-ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-directed classroom management and decision-making</td>
<td>Stability and continuity of key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service staff training for effective teaching</td>
<td>District level support for school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High and positive achievement expectations with a constant press for excellence.</td>
<td>Emphasis on homework and study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible rewards for academic excellence and growth</td>
<td>Positive accountability, acceptance of responsibility for learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative activity and group interaction in the classroom.</td>
<td>Strategies to avoid non-promotion of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff involvement with school improvement.</td>
<td>De-emphasis of strict ability grouping interaction with more accomplished peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Autonomy and flexibility to implement adaptive practices
Appropriate levels of difficulty for learning tasks.
Teachers empathy, rapport and personal interaction with students.
Efficacy
Effective use of instructional time, and intensity of engagement in school learning.
Orderly and disciplined school and classroom environment.
Continuous diagnosis, evaluation and feedback.
Well-structured classroom activities
Instruction guided by content coverage
School wise emphasis on basic and higher order skills.

Opportunities for amount of individualized work
Number and variety of opportunities to learn.


For nearly two decades educational research on effective schools has focused on identifying the characteristics of effective schools and on establishing specific criteria for defining and measuring school effectiveness.
Potentially effectiveness can be determined by a wide variety of indicators and strategy-studies have been conducted abroad to identify perception about appropriate indicators defining effectiveness.

The succeeding chapter deals with details of the previous studies.