

Expanding the Concepts of School Renewal and Change

If we want to improve education, we must look at schools from the inside—and consider the many other institutions that educate, as well.

PAUL E. HECKMAN, JEANNIE OAKES, AND KENNETH A. SIROTNIK

One of the most powerful influences on how a school conducts itself is its culture. This influence is easily understood when we recognize that culture is more than shared tradition; it is essentially the solutions groups of people derive to the survival problems they face. Culture, then, is purposeful. It is the means by which people make sense of their setting. Among the solutions are particular organizational structures, patterns of behavior, and ways of interrelating that constitute a system that has meaning to the group. Included in the solutions, too, are the assumptions and belief systems people hold about the nature of their environment and about themselves. As such, culture is more than a group's way of doing things; it is also the meanings the group attaches to these ways. All of these elements—organizational structures, behavior patterns, underlying beliefs, and meanings—have both manifest and latent effects on the members of the group and on the events that take place in the setting.

This definition of culture provides a useful perspective from which to view schools and their change processes. First, it leads us to see the organizational arrangements and activities of the school as purposeful; they "make sense" in the context. This is not to say that all schooling events can be justified, but they can be *understood* in the setting. Second, this cultural view demands that the school context be approached as complex sets of interrelationships among organizational structures, individual behaviors, and underlying beliefs



rather than a collection of isolated or independent elements. It demands that school characteristics, processes, and outcomes be considered mutually influential phenomena. Third, by considering underlying assumptions and belief

Paul E. Heckman is Assistant Director; Jeannie Oakes and Kenneth A. Sirotnik are Senior Research Associates at the Laboratory in School and Community Education and Center for the Study of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.

systems as well as observable structures and behaviors, we are led to explore not only what school processes and outcomes are like, but also *why* particular organizational alternatives, and not others, evolved as appropriate in a particular setting.

Finally, attention to the latent as well as the manifest effects of events in the school setting broadens our view of what might be considered outcomes of schooling and effects of change. When taken together, the elements of this cultural view of schooling compel us to



approach schools and school change efforts with a sense of the wholeness and integrity of the system; they permit us to take into account both the sources of resistance to change attempts and the broadest range of effects such attempts might have. In short, this view persuades us to look nonsuperficially at schools. Schools and those who are trying to help them need the kind of understanding that comes from this perspective in order to change in fundamental ways.

Anthropological descriptions of cul-

tures may be of two types, "etic" or "emic" views. The "etic" view portrays the culture from the point of view of an outsider looking in; the "emic" portrays it from within. For example, an outsider may see round objects in a setting and describe them accordingly: they have a center hub and wire spokes emanating from the hub to the outside perimeter of the object. The outsider knows about such objects and calls them wheels. The outsider now assigns "wheel" meanings to these objects, but the objects may not have the same meanings to those inside the culture.

Often outsiders ascribe meanings to school events that make sense to the outsider but may not reflect the view of those inside the school. If schools are to be understood from the point of view of those inside, the second type of description—the "emic"—is necessary. You cannot acquire an inside view of a school by observing it from the outside; you have to come to understand what the people there are all about—to think like them—and that requires a great deal of interaction with those inside the school.

We contend that change will more likely occur if schools are viewed as cultures and if "emic" views occupy the attention of those trying to help schools reform. Too often, outsiders do not understand the inside view of the school and try to promote changes without considering conditions as insiders see them. They go into schools believing their outside view to be correct. They do not acquire inside knowledge that would allow them to understand the school's conditions and to suggest solutions to problems appropriate to the culture as they come to know it.

One other point is important here. Despite the considerable sameness among schools—what we might call a general schooling culture—each school has its own particular culture in which organizational arrangements, patterns of behavior, and assumptions have come into being in a unique way. While it is possible to describe cultural patterns likely to be found at all schools, these are abstractions. The local school is where social, political, and historical forces are translated into practice, and at each school that is likely to happen in different ways. Change efforts based only on an understanding of a *general* school culture, and not on its particular form at the local school, will ignore what is most critical: the *particular* structures, behaviors, meanings, and

belief systems that have evolved in that school. These particular cultural elements—what Sarason calls regularities¹—are the local manifestations of the general schooling culture and the accommodation of the school to the social and political pressures exerted by its particular community, both historically and in their contemporary forms. These local school regularities constitute both what must be understood if change is to be achieved and what must be altered if change is to be anything but trivial.

But it is exactly these regularities that are overlooked in most change attempts—most likely because of the powerful underlying belief that these regularities are natural. Because they are based on assumptions that are rarely made explicit, regularities are seldom recognized and alternatives to them rarely conceived. Further, as Sarason states, "... here one runs smack into the obstacle of another characteristic of school culture: there are no vehicles of discussion, communication, or observation that allow for ... variation to be raised and productively used for purposes of help and change."²

Changing schools, we conclude, requires breaking through this "natural order" of things as it has evolved for the organization of schooling. The question is, how?

Our answer is that, first, we need to rethink what it means to "know" and how people use what they know to ground their actions. Second, we need a perspective on renewal and change that is compatible with both the cultural view of schooling and this new epistemology.

Knowledge and Inquiry

That there are many ways to "know" and, therefore, many ways to inquire often escapes the attention of researchers and practitioners as they try to acquire knowledge that will be useful in their attempts to improve schooling and education. Quite frequently, for example, we see an overreliance on or exclusive belief in a particular mode of inquiry when, in fact, the complex problems in schooling and education demand a much broader and more flexible perspective on gaining appropriate knowledge.³

Let's first deal with the idea that there is more than one way to know. Many elementary teachers divide their classes into two or more reading groups. Why? What knowledge do they bring to bear

on an instructional practice designed to cope with individual differences in reading skills? Some teachers might hold firmly to this view because they simply "know" it to be the correct teaching technique. Others might have the same view because they believe what they have been told by others "in the know." The philosopher Charles Peirce has labeled these two methods of knowing *tenacity* and *authority*.⁴ These methods require neither empirical/experiential data nor rational thought. Kinder descriptors of them might be "conventional wisdom" or "world views." As another example, many educators simply "know" or believe others' opinions that teaching and learning are best conducted in places we call schools.⁵ These kinds of "knowledge" are so deeply rooted and implicit in our working assumptions that they often go unquestioned.

If we require logical reasoning to prevail, however, we can add the *rational* and *empirical* methods of knowing to our list. An example of the former is the field of pure mathematics, in which assumptions plus reason act to establish knowledge that may or may not be applicable to observable phenomena. But if we take as our point of departure a world of physical and social phenomena that can be better understood through reason, we become, in a very broad sense, empiricists.

There is more than one mode of empirical inquiry. Perhaps the most popular is the traditional scientific approach borrowed from the study of physics. The physical scientist, for example, *knows* the functional relationships among distance, time, and gravity for a falling object. He or she knows this as a consequence of using exacting experimental methods that confirm perfectly (or nearly perfectly) replicable cause-and-effect relationships.

Social scientists (including educational researchers) also use this way of knowing to study objects. But in a very real sense, the objects they study are themselves. And although they attempt to attain the apparent objectivity of the scientific method, the essential subjectivity of their enterprise presents a multitude of uncertainties. Even in the best of controlled social research, the interpretation of cause-and-effect relationships is difficult, primarily because of the need to operationalize and measure complex hypothetical constructs, such as learning, motivation, aspiration, attitudes, and so on. Given the myriad possible definitions of these constructs

and the existence of numerous other interacting variables, the most replicable empirical relationships in the social sciences are invariably the most narrow and the least generalizable. These replicable relationships can be useful so long as they are not overinterpreted, and so long as they are recognized as knowledge based on predictive relationships, with many "exceptions to the rule."

The recent school effectiveness studies are a case in point. By examining a number of particularly effective or ineffective schools (defined by standardized achievement scores), researchers have derived such characteristics as academic emphasis, principal leadership, high expectations, and so forth. But we don't really know if these characteristics are antecedents, consequences, or correlates of a more complex process of ongoing school improvement. In effect, knowledge based on predictive relationships alone is not sufficient to achieve understanding. If we were to immerse ourselves more thoroughly in the process of school improvement from the standpoint of a participant observer, phenomenologist, ethnographer, or the like, however, we could add to our knowledge base a texture of individual and collective meanings on the context and process of the educational experience.

"It becomes clear that value positions are implicit in all forms of knowledge and inquiry."

Unlike the traditional inquiry methods, then, these naturalistic approaches to acquiring empirical knowledge attempt an interpretive understanding of the educational gestalt by reflecting on the meanings that organizational structures and characteristics, human behaviors, and feelings hold for the participants in the setting. This is accomplished through detailed accounts, analysis, and synthesis of events and interactions in the setting and interviews with participants by researchers and (preferably) participants alike.

Yet achieving the depth of knowledge possible using both the traditional and naturalistic inquiry modes is missing yet

a third and most important ingredient. We need to explicitly recognize and logically analyze the knowledge we have in light of prevailing values, beliefs, and sociopolitical interests, since they so clearly affect the use to which knowledge is put. Through what is essentially a process of critical thinking and dialogue, we can examine schooling and education in their social, political, and historical context to gain practical implications for directing change and improvement efforts. One brief example is the critical analysis of recent research on time on task or academically engaged learning time. The research suggests that increasing this time, primarily through concerted but narrow instructional practices such as teacher explanation and student practice, leads to an increase in scores on achievement tests.

Without taking a critical stance, one might accept these findings as scientific "truths" on which pedagogical practice *ought* to be structured. But on reflection it becomes clear that value positions are implicit in all forms of knowledge and inquiry. The time-on-task research values only one of four highly regarded goals of schooling: the academic, or intellectual, goal. Yet virtually all state or district curriculum documents and the expressed sentiments of teachers, parents, and students point to the personal, social, and vocational goal areas as equally important.

Now suppose we could establish outcome measures related to these goal areas—for example, measures of self-confidence, creativity, independent and critical thinking, social and civic responsibility, global awareness, and personal awareness of career choices and alternatives. Suppose, further, we conducted research on how teaching and learning time should be spent to maximize these outcomes. We might well find that instructional practices like discussion, simulation, role playing, and student decision making correlate favorably with these outcomes. But these practices are counterproductive, according to the time-on-task research.

The point, of course, is *not* that we must choose one particular brand of research findings. Rather, we must be continually questioning the knowledge we accumulate so that change is not restricted to narrow conceptions and interests. There is every reason to believe, for example, that creative teaching and learning can maximize outcomes in *all four* goal areas. But we'll never know if we don't inquire into the

larger picture.

In sum, we propose operating out of an acknowledged critical perspective that embraces empirical/experiential knowledge of all types and uses this knowledge toward continued inquiry and change. In effect, the entire process is one of renewal, representing an epistemologically grounded extension of its ancestor—the dialogue-decision-action-evaluation notion developed in the Study of Educational Change and School Improvement (see box).

Contrasting Views of School Change

In light of these views about knowledge and inquiry and about the culture of schools, let's contrast two approaches to school change efforts: the so-called RD&D perspective (for research, development, and diffusion), and another based on the proposition that the culture of a school must become responsive to the needs of those in the school if school change is to be effected. For want of a better name, we shall call this the responsive cultural model.

The RD&D model of school change may begin with school-based development of an innovation that meets the needs of some people in the school. Soon policymakers decide to study the innovation, determine its effectiveness, and make it a matter of policy. The innovation is then disseminated to others as a generalized concept to answer particular problems, and it quickly loses whatever power it had. Clearly an "etic" view of schools is at work here. Usually, a change agent has a list of behaviors and characteristics describing the conditions of the innovation, which become the focuses of implementation in schools. The agent then sets about to have the teachers understand these conditions, and efforts are directed at getting teachers to change in order to put the innovation in place.

Each innovation brought to the school in this way has to come from available research and development outside the school. Different marketing strategies have to be created so that each innovation can be "sold" to individual teachers at the site or district level. Usually only one innovation is introduced at any one time, with the focus on getting teachers to change. Schools, then, become "passive" targets for particular innovations. This means that a single aspect of the school—depending on the nature of the innovation—comes under close scrutiny for a time. When the innovation subsides, the attention to

that aspect diminishes. Because of its focus on changing individual teachers and its consideration of only a small part of the school's functioning, some scholars believe this perspective does not contend with the realities of how schools resist or effect change.⁶ Many of the curriculum reforms of the 1960s and 1970s assumed an RD&D perspective, and many of them did not penetrate beyond the classroom door. As some have argued, much of the research on these innovations approached non-events.⁷

"The RD&D model may begin with an innovation that meets the needs of some people in the school."

A personal example may illustrate. In the late 1960s, one of the authors became assistant principal of a brand new school: the first open-space middle-senior high school in the state of New Hampshire. In New Hampshire it was a momentous event. I had the responsibility of creating a new program and training a new staff. Because I viewed school change from an RD&D perspective, I brought in consultants who were to tell the teachers what to do. Robert Anderson, who at that time taught at Harvard and had coauthored the *Non-graded Elementary School*⁸ with John Goodlad, came to the district to participate in a workshop. A principal and three or four teachers from an open-space elementary school in Texas flew in for the two-week workshop. The teachers who had been selected to teach at this innovative school were bright, youthful, and energetic. They were among the best in New England—all in all, a promising group of people. Given our preparation and the quality of the staff, we expected that on opening day, teachers and students would experience a very different school from the ones we had all attended.

But that was not the case. On the night before the first day of school, I left my office to survey the learning areas. I did not see the vision I had had of an open-space high school; I saw instead that the staff had moved all the beautifully colored portable furniture and walls to construct typical classrooms. Rather than teaching cooperatively in large, flexible learning areas, as they

had been trained to do during the workshop, they had recreated a set of normal classrooms, all neatly lined up.

Now what does a smart administrator do under these circumstances? Remember, I "knew" how open-space buildings were supposed to operate. Consequently, I pushed all the furniture back against the wall that evening, creating open space. What did the teaching staff do the next morning? They put it back again! The next night, I again pushed everything back against the wall, and the next morning the teachers returned it to the classroom positions they had devised.

The clash continued for three weeks, because my thoughts and actions were guided by an RD&D perspective. I reasoned that there were people out there who knew what was good for this school. They had had experience with open-space classrooms. They knew how to run open-space schools. If the experts said it, the school should do it. The problem was that this perspective did not contend with the inside view—the "emic" view—of the teachers.

This experience was typical of the reforms of the 1960s, nearly all of which were guided by the *wrong* perspective of change and the use of knowledge. If educators then had taken a different perspective, many schools and classrooms might look very different today, and they might more readily respond to the problems they presently face.

Following the argument laid out by Goodlad in *The Dynamics of Educational Change*, we have labeled this alternative approach to school change a *responsive cultural perspective*. The contrasts with RD&D are important. First, the purpose of change activities is to create a self-renewing school⁹—a school staff that constantly works together to examine the school's condition, identifies problems, and develops alternatives based on all forms of knowledge. The self-renewing school may use ideas from the outside, but the intention is *not* to make the school a better target for innovations developed outside the school.

Second, the focus is on the dispositions of teachers and others in the school regarding processes and concepts of change, rather than on changing specific structures or behaviors. Variables that research has identified as critical to any change are necessary but not sufficient for implementing innovations. Bringing about solutions to the problems schools face requires that the

"A responsive cultural approach recognizes that changes in one teacher's condition will affect others."

school staff critically examine the assumptions they hold about schooling, together with information about what actually happens in the school.

A "whole school" perspective is central to the responsive cultural model. In attending to the holistic nature of the school, the dispositions of all of the teachers are involved. One way to get this total school perspective is to engage regularly in total staff processes. Contextual appraisal,¹⁰ in conjunction with the expanded view of knowledge and action presented above, can be carried out by collaborators and staff and becomes the vehicle for informed school renewal. Having well-grounded information about their school is essential for helping groups share perceptions and increase their awareness of the relationships between their perceptions and the actual events that take place.

Furthermore, a responsive cultural approach recognizes that changes in one teacher's condition will affect others. If a new condition is desired, not only will the new one have to be cultivated, but others will also have to change. This suggests that multiple changes are likely to proceed simultaneously throughout the school.

Finally, a responsive cultural perspective pushes one to understand the long-term nature of renewal and change. These are concepts that do not give birth after a nine-month gestation. Unfortunately, the school year so closely parallels the gestation period for humans that we expect changes to occur between September and June. We call this the Chinese New Year Syndrome. Each new year, the school faces the "Year of . . ." One year it is the "Year of Assertive Discipline"; the next year, the "Year of Direct Instruction"; and so on. Teachers have observed this phenomenon and tacitly understand its

fruitlessness. They know that if they wait, "this too shall pass." And it does. The year ends, but in September there will be a new focus and new behaviors to hear about. In contrast, a long-term view of renewal promotes problem identification and the generation, creation, and cultivation of alternatives as a process that will take months and, in many cases, years.

Schooling and Education

Schooling is only part of the educative process. If we want to improve education, then not only schools must improve, but so must the other agencies that educate. This improvement must be viewed ecologically; that is, the improvement of education—the effects of all educating activities—will require acknowledging that these activities interact.

If we were to examine the ecology of educational institutions, we would find large differences between these institutions today and years ago, differences that may account for differences in achievement. For example, by the time they are 18, today's young people have spent approximately 15,000 hours watching television and only 12,000 hours attending school, or about 10 and 8 percent, respectively, of their lives. Moreover, 85 percent of our youth no longer have a chance to learn from job experience outside the home, and 65 percent are not enrolled in 4-H clubs, the Scouts, and the like.

Fifty-one percent of the mothers of school-aged children now work outside the home, as do 40 percent of mothers with children under six and nearly 33 percent of those with infants under three. The problem is not so much that the mothers work, but that there are fewer adults left in the home who might provide educational experiences for children. Extended families have nearly disappeared, and the nuclear family itself has shrunk (one out of every six children lives in a single-parent family).

Consequently, the apparent problem of lower student achievement grows out of a very different society than the one in which most education critics grew up. And the solutions these critics propose are of the past as well. The real answer to the problem rests not just with the school but with all of the agencies that educate.

Therefore, education must be defined much more broadly than it usually is, and the many institutions with educational responsibilities must acknowledge

their educative function. One way to view this broader conception of education is to see it as consisting of formal, nonformal, and informal spheres, as defined by Coombs and Ahmed.¹¹ They define formal education as the "institutionalized, chronologically graded and hierarchically structured educational system, spanning lower primary school to the upper reaches of the university." Informal education is "the life-long process by which every person acquires and accumulates knowledge, skills, attitudes and insights from daily experiences and exposure to the environment." Family and neighborhood interactions are examples of informal education. Nonformal education they see as "any organized systematic, educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particular subgroups in the population, adults as well as children." Community organizations such as churches, Boy or Girl Scouts, and so forth, provide nonformal educational experiences.¹²

With these definitions in mind, it becomes easier to see the importance of all the various activities in which children engage to the education process. These definitions also lead us to expand the number of activities and institutions that must purposefully examine what they do in light of the contribution each makes, and could make, to children and youth.

This broad conception of education may also help resolve two schooling dilemmas. First, while much is expected from them, schools, in fact, have less impact on children's academic progress than does their socioeconomic status. And second, children do not have equal access to all forms of education. The resolution to these dilemmas may require (1) determining the contribution of each source of education to the total educational experience of children and youth; (2) describing the nature of these different experiences for children from different educational ecologies; (3) assessing the continuities and discontinuities that exist across each of these different types of education for different groups of children and youth; and (4) creating alternatives that include different types of education to the end that an equal, balanced, and common education is provided all children and youth. If education is to improve, a great deal of attention must go into these activities for resolving these difficult educational dilemmas.

“Much of what happens in schools is based on only that aspect of knowledge that we have termed conventional wisdom.”

Toward Educative Communities

We have outlined a perspective that sees schools and schooling as cultural phenomena; that views knowledge and inquiry as an active, practical, and enabling process of analyzing and synthesizing information collected in a variety of ways; and that sees renewal as a direct consequence of a practice of inquiry that is compatible with a cultural view of schools and schooling. Further, we have envisioned education in a breadth that requires us to extend the culture of education beyond the traditional realm of schools into the larger community that surrounds them. In other words, we have suggested that, in developing educative communities, the concepts of knowledge and change apply to all aspects of education. The application of these concepts, however, will require a collaboration not only among the traditional educational institutions, but also among the many other agencies and institutions in the community that promote education in this larger sense.

Why do we believe this to be so? First, much of what happens in schools today is based on only that aspect of knowledge that we have termed conventional wisdom. And further, the changes schools usually attempt are simply prepackaged innovations added on to schools as they now are. The environment surrounding schools supports these features as the appropriate way to conduct schools and to bring about educational change. The processes we suggest, however, run quite counter to this view of how schools should be. To walk into a school and

expect to operate successfully in such countervailing ways is unrealistic. Therefore, it is necessary to break through the current social press and begin to cultivate an environment supportive of these new ways.

A collaborative network of educational institutions, including schools, can provide the vehicle for breaking through the conventional state of affairs and beginning to create a new social press that supports the renewal and change efforts we are suggesting here. Networking has at least three attractive features. First, it provides a reasonably manageable arena of critical interests wherein new directions in the dialogue about education can begin. Further, this arena enables the socialization of the collaborating institutions toward new views of education and educational change. And finally, a network provides the necessary supporting organizational structure within which actual change efforts can occur.

The Partnership, an activity of the Laboratory in School and Community Education at UCLA, is an attempt to cultivate such a collaborative network. The Partnership is a confederation of the university, 12 school districts, six community colleges, and four county school offices. While this network is as yet limited to traditional educating institutions, it will be expanded further to include nonformal and informal education resources. A dialogue about new directions in education is occurring both among member institutions and within them at many levels—in the offices of the superintendent and college presidents, among their support staffs, and in local school sites as well. The socialization process occurs as the superintendents and chief executive officers of the educational institutions support each other in looking ahead and keeping their sights on long-range possibilities while, at the same time, encouraging each other to confront current problems and to generate alternative solutions to them. In addition, those in the Laboratory have urged the superintendents to look to a responsive cultural model of school change for accomplishing the purposes, rather than an RD&D perspective.

How do we work at the local school level? Considerable energy is required to help the local school identify its needs and to develop the alternatives that will be necessary to solve problems and create a renewing school. This requires that the superintendent assume a sup-

portive role in working with principals and helping them work with teachers to describe conditions, infer problems, and develop alternatives to the problems identified.

This is a difficult and time-consuming process. For example, two of the school districts and one of the community colleges are collaboratively attempting to move their general school systems beyond the current conventional wisdom to address problems that will confront students in the 21st century. To do this, a group of school board members, central office people, principals, and teachers from several schools have met throughout the last year and a half to discuss possible issues that might emerge in the future and to begin to generate some alternative approaches to them. They have kept in mind that they are not developing an agenda for the schools in their district, but simply trying to stimulate the discussion of possibilities. The hard work still exists at the local school level in these two districts as staff members begin to work through the arduous task of identifying problems and creating solutions appropriate for their settings. After a year and a half, the larger group is now ready to support the efforts of perhaps two or three schools in each of the districts and several departments of the community college involved.

In another district, work has focused on a single high school. Here the superintendent and central office people are lending support, but the department chair and teachers are taking the lead and working through the identification of problems. These problems cluster around three main areas: (1) testing, which includes determining the fundamental concepts a department wishes to teach and ways to assess those concepts that go beyond mere standardized achievement testing; (2) dealing with student variability in ways other than tracking; and (3) stimulating creative thinking in students through writing in all of the subject areas. These two illustrations point out the need to work primarily at the level of the school while not ignoring the conditions that surround schools.

But these illustrations also demonstrate that there is no one way to proceed. No definitive set of steps can be outlined here as the “right” way to create renewing educative communities. Yet it is equally obvious that if this goal is to be reached, a perspective toward schooling and education must be taken that

Pioneering Projects in School Renewal

The preceding article grows directly out of a synthesis of two projects directed by John Goodlad and sponsored by the Institute for Development of Educational Activities. The first, begun in 1966, was the Study of Educational Change and School Improvement (SECSI), a five-year longitudinal project based on three principles: (1) the school is the unit of change; (2) schools need support in their change efforts; and (3) the interventionist perspective in change processes should be replaced by a *peer socialization* perspective. The League of Cooperating Schools was formed to provide the impetus and support for innovation and change in 18 elementary schools in southern California. Working collaboratively, the SECSI staff developed a process of self-renewal in each of these schools. As the work proceeded, renewal came to be defined as *responsible receptivity to change* in a cyclical process of school staff dialogue, decision making, action, and evaluation.¹

The SECSI project made it clear that schooling cannot be treated independent of its context. Improving schools requires knowledge about what is going on in and around them. But what are the features of this knowledge? Are they accessible? And can they be used to form reasonably accurate descriptors of schooling ecologies? "A Study of Schooling" was launched in the early 1970s to explore these questions. During the 1976-1978 school years, this cross-sectional study collected survey, interview, and observational data in a small but representative sample of 38 elementary and secondary schools across the nation. Comprehensive data were obtained from teachers, administrators, parents, and students in four contextual domains: the individual or personal, the classroom or instructional, the school or insti-

tutional, and the schooling or societal domains.²

The results of "A Study of Schooling" have clearly illustrated the descriptive use of contextual information from a research standpoint with a number of interesting implications and recommendations for practice.³ But in a broader sense, the study has also successfully tested the viability of assessing the context of schooling and, in effect, of establishing an empirical grounding of an "ecology of education."⁴ We can now begin to think and operate in terms of a process that merges relevant data and renewal—in other words, a process of *informed and responsible receptivity to change*.

Finally, if we take full advantage of the ecology of schooling concept and broaden our concept of education beyond the walls of the school, it becomes clear that the peer socialization model inherent in networking schools must be extended to include educational institutions and agencies beyond schools. The logical extension, then, of these two projects is the establishment of *educative communities* by recognizing and networking educational resources that can interact with schools.

¹Further details can be found in M. M. Bentzen, *Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principal* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974).

²More information on the conceptualization and design of ASOS can be found in an earlier series of *Phi Delta Kappan* articles: J. I. Goodlad, K. A. Sirotnik, and B. C. Overman, "An Overview of a Study of Schooling," 61 (1979): 174-178; M. F. Klein, K. A. Tye, and J. E. Wright, "A Study of Schooling: Curriculum," 60 (1979): 244-248; B. J. Benham, P. Geisen, and J. Oakes, "A Study of Schooling: Students' Experiences in Schools," 61 (1980): 337-340; and M. M. Bentzen, R. C. Williams, and P. Heckman, "A Study of Schooling: Adult Experiences in Schools," 61 (1980): 394-397.

³See J. I. Goodlad, *A Place Called School* (New York: McGraw-Hill, in press).

⁴This concept is developed more fully in J. I. Goodlad, *The Dynamics of Educational Change* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

includes certain essential concepts: (1) the notion of schools as cultures that exist within larger educational cultures; (2) the concept of multiple sources of knowledge and understanding as essential to direct change efforts; (3) an approach to the change process that centers on the response to local school conditions by those who are at the school; and finally (4) a view of a supporting structure of educative institutions that creates a climate that nurtures the change efforts schools make. Without these elements, it appears likely that the record of failure in significant and sustained school renewal and change will remain unbroken. □

¹S. B. Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982).

²Ibid., p. 109.

³A more comprehensive presentation of the relationship between knowledge, inquiry, and the process of change can be found in K. A. Sirotnik and J. Oakes, *Contextual Analysis and School Renewal: A Liberation of Method Within a Critical Theoretical Perspective*, Occasional Report No. 4 (Los Angeles: University of California, Laboratory in School and Community Education, 1983, in process).

⁴F. N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973), pp. 5-6.

⁵S. B. Sarason, personal communication.

⁶Sarason, *Culture of the School: Goodlad, Dynamics of Educational Change*.

⁷W. W. Charters and J. E. Jones, "On the Risk of Appraising Non-Events in Program Evaluation," *Educational Researcher* 2 (1973): 5-7.

⁸J. I. Goodlad and R. H. Anderson, *The Non-Graded Elementary School* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1959).

⁹For an expanded discussion of the concepts of culture and self-renewal, see P. E. Heckman, *Exploring the Concept of School Renewal: Cultural Differences and Similarities Between More and Less Renewing Schools*, A Study of Schooling Technical Report No. 33 (Los Angeles: University of California, Laboratory in School and Community Education, 1982).

¹⁰K. A. Sirotnik and J. Oakes, "A Contextual Appraisal System for Schools: Medicine or Madness?" *Educational Leadership* 39 (1981): 164-173.

¹¹P. Coombs and M. Ahmed, *Attacking Rural Poverty* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), p. 8.

¹²Another useful discussion of those concepts can be found in T. J. La Belle and P. S. White, *Nonformal Education for Children and Youth: Bridging Educational Modes*, Occasional Paper No. 3 (Los Angeles: University of California, Laboratory in School and Community Education, 1982).

Copyright © 1983 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.