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ABSTRACT

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship that exists between school culture and school safety. The principle school culture subscales measure (1) Collaborative Leadership, (2) Teacher Collaboration, (3) Professional Development, (4) Collegial Support, (5) Unity of Purpose, and (6) Learning Partnerships. The safety subscales utilized were (1) Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, (2) Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety, (3) Stressors and Daily Discomforts, and (4) Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community. This relationship was surveyed using the School Culture Survey (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997) and the Inviting School Safety Survey (Lehr & Purkey, 1997) among seven metropolitan elementary schools in one Southwestern section of the United States.

Procedures. The study included seven elementary schools. Teachers in each school were surveyed on numerous aspects of culture and safety. Teacher data were collected through surveys. Two hypotheses were tested using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation to determine if any of the six subscales of culture from the School Culture Survey correlate with the four safety subscales of the Inviting School Safety Survey. Ordinary Least Squared Regression was used to identify school culture factors that predict school safety factors. The six subscales of culture from the School Culture Survey were used as predictor variables for each of the four Inviting School Safety Scales.

Findings. A high level of correlation was found between teachers' perceptions of school culture subscales with School Safety subscales when controlling for the variables
of SES, percent of special education students, mobility rate, and number of students. A statistically significant predictive relationship was found for the School Culture subscales with each of the School Safety subscales. Low correlation and low predictive relationships was found for the six School Culture subscales with the School Safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety.

If schools are to be safe for all students, school leaders must change the culture of their schools.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

Many studies have been reported on safety in schools. Likewise, many studies have been published on the nature of school culture. Unfortunately, there has not been significant research on a link between the two. This is not to say that these kinds of studies have not been done, but rather that there is still much more that needs to be known. Many of the studies that have been performed in this area show that there is a definite link between the type of culture that a school has and what kind of safety the occupants of the school can expect. As with any research, there are critics of this opinion, and there are studies that would appear to indicate that there is no link between the two.

It is in the spirit of debate and discovery that this study has been undertaken. Children are the future of this planet, and they deserve to attend school where they are free from hostility and danger. There will always be issues with students and individuals disagreeing and arguing. This study is not attempting to show that all violence can be removed from schools, if only researchers would spend more time figuring out why school violence exists.

Violence in schools, like violence in society and life itself, will always be with us (Back, 2001). This researcher hopes to show how school culture affects school safety. Is the culture of a school directly linked to the safety and security of that school? If this can be shown to be valid, then it may open the door to others who can then study not only the
validity of the statements made in these pages, but also work toward a goal of cultural
adjustment and change for schools that seem to spend a large amount of their time
dealing with safety instead of instruction.

This is a quantitative research study on the impact of school culture on school
safety. It is based on the responses of teachers to two surveys. The first is the School
Culture Survey or SCS (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997), which is self-explanatory by its
title, and the second is the Inviting School Safety Survey or ISSS (Lehr and Purkey,
1996), which focuses on issues of safety. Both of these surveys provide insight about the
shared values and beliefs, the patterns of behavior, and the relationships in a school
setting, and are therefore good indicators of the relationship between the culture of a
school and the safety within its walls.

Greenbaum, et al (1989) believe the principal of a school is a critical factor in
developing a positive school culture and a safe school. Greenbaum (1989) also stresses
that principals who have succeeded in creating safe and peaceful schools out of violence-
ridden campuses emphasize the importance of maintaining a high profile. The principal
has difficulty gaining ground from a safety perspective or maintaining ground that has
been gained if he or she is not easily visible. Students quickly forget the rules when there
is no one around to enforce them.

Many teachers and students share this opinion, and those schools that seem to
have the highest safety ratings also have the most interaction between the principal and
the students. This is not to say that the principal is always visible, or that there are formal
assemblies and other events where the principal interacts with the students, although this
may be the case in some schools. Instead, this interaction comes from walking the halls and speaking to students while they change classes, or sitting in classrooms to see what the students are learning (Dewar, 1999). It may also come from attending field trips, knowing many students by name, and projecting a general attitude of caring and support that is recognized by many students (Chang, 1999).

Another important point that is stressed when looking at school culture and safety is the fact that strong leaders generally make an effort to express sincere feelings toward students and their lives, and have a real belief that students have the potential to become successful and productive adults (Kenworthy & O'Driscoll, 2000). Effective leaders create effective schools that are resilient to violence and other risks and promote resiliency in students (School Violence, 1999, p. 4).

Principals, teachers, and other faculty members can work to do this by being active in the lives of students and being open and friendly to parents and guardians when there are questions or problems. Being active in the lives of students is not the same thing as being nosy or prying into the private lives of students. Allowing students to share what they want to share, and not demanding more from them, is one of the ways that effective school leaders help to maintain a relationship with students without making them uncomfortable or driving them away. Being an effective school leader requires a great deal of balance where student thoughts, dreams, and opinions are concerned (Anderman, 1998).

Principals and teachers can remain closer to students if they allow students the space that they need to be themselves. Even though not all adults may see eye to eye
with young people, room to find oneself must exist. Smothering this impulse can lead to safety and violence issues that the schools are already fighting against and trying to avoid. Effective leadership must be able to balance so many things that most people seldom get it right. This does not mean that they should stop trying to find this balance, however. The importance of continued work in this area is evidenced by the results that are seen when this balance is achieved, or at least when the balance is close to where it should be (Wigfield, et al, 1991).

A school is an organization, and although it is not the same as a business organization, some of the principles are the same (Aponik & Dembo, 1983). One of these principles is the need for leaders that can be objective, as well as seeing the vision and commitment that comes with their job. This is especially important for schools, because commitment and vision are vitally important for the future of the country and its children. This is much more true with schools than it is with other businesses, but at the same time, people must be aware of the fact that some aspects of the school life must be operated as a business for the school to survive (Deci & Chandler, 1986).

In Reframing Organizations, Bolman and Deal (1997) discuss the modern organization's need for transformational leaders who have an objective perspective as well as the vision and commitment that wise leadership provides. Without this commitment, and without a vision for the future, leaders have difficulty creating a better organization and making sure that the organization they do create continues to grow and change as the times require. Schools are especially in need of this growth, because the culture of society, as well as technology and a myriad of other things, are all changing
rapidly. Principals that do not keep up with changing times are doing their students a great disservice (Athappilly, Smidchens, & Kofel, 1983).

Bolman and Deal (1997) also believe that transformational leaders affect organizational performance and that they succeed not because of inspiration but because they have the right design for the times and are able to get their changes implemented. Being strong in this area is very important, as a leader who can come up with the ideas for good changes but cannot get those changes implemented will not be effective in transforming their organization's culture.

This is where the value of a successful principal comes through. Many principals see things that need to be changed in their schools, including improving safety. While noticing these things is important, it is only half of the battle, and it is the easy half. From that point, the principal needs to know what to do and who to talk to in order to get things accomplished. Resourceful principals will find a way to accomplish the task, and this is what helps to make a good principal dynamic and important in the culture of the school. It also shows students that the principal cares about their needs, which can help build a more cohesive culture and create a higher level of safety throughout the school for both faculty and students (Ammons, 1999).

According to the National School Safety Center (NSSC, 1995) creating safe schools is about commitment. That does not mean only commitment from the principal, or from the teachers, or from the students. Accomplishing such a goal requires families, schools, and community leaders to talk about the quality of the educational environment
they want to provide for youth and together develop the strategies that will produce the desired results.

This type of cohesive commitment is the only real way that schools can be made safer, as one person cannot do it alone, and communities must express the desire to make schools safer and therefore give students a better school life and more hope for the future. The NSSC also suggests that achieving these goals requires leaders to assess where they are, plan where they want to be, implement a series of strategies to bridge the difference, and evaluate their progress.

Statement of the Problem

Clearly, the violence that has, and continues to occur in the nation's schools is a critical issue, and one that should be dealt with in a timely manner. People who only try to fix the problem without having a real understanding of the issues cannot accomplish this task. Before anyone can actually address the problem at hand, an understanding must be reached about the causes of the problem and the mitigating factors surrounding it. Only then can workable solutions actually be proposed and attempted to determine if they are viable (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992).

The purpose of this study is to examine the existing and significant relationship between school culture and school safety. The Center for Effective Schools (2001) introduced the notion that no two schools are alike. Schools, they point out, just as the people within them, have different characteristics. These characteristics create what is known as the culture of the school. A school that is found in the inner part of a large and
multicultural city will not have the same culture and safety issues as a school found in a rural environment (Eccles & Midgley, 1989).

These differences between schools make the problem particularly difficult to correct, because what works in one school may not work in another. However, when particular ties between culture and safety are identified and studied, correlations can be made between the culture and the issues of safety. With this information, researchers and school officials can move forward with ideas and suggestions for how to change or improve the culture of a school in order to avoid or minimize the associated safety (Eccles, et al, 1993).

The importance of school culture and its importance in creating effective schools are well documented in the work of Edmonds (1979), Sizer (1984), Hersh (2000) and others. All of these studies indicate that the culture of a school is a significant factor in how much safety the school enjoys and whether the students in that particular school are being effectively taught what they need to know to make their way in the world once their schooling has been completed (Willen, 1994).

Research by Sizer (1984), Hersh (2000), and Hargreaves (1997) tie school culture to school safety. There are, however, two very important questions that need to be answered in order to explain exactly how school culture impacts school safety in effective schools, and to uncover the type of culture, which is found in these effective schools. It is possible that there is not one specific element of culture that makes a school safe, but rather several different elements that are all effective in creating a safe school environment. It is likely, however, that there is a correlation between the types of schools
that are safe, because culture and safety in schools seem to be inexorably tied together. While several different types of cultures may work well to promote safety, it is likely that these different cultures will all have certain things in common that will create the safe environment that these schools enjoy (Anderman & Midgley, 1997).

The most important questions that need to be addressed will hopefully be answered throughout the course of this study. These questions are: 1) how do schools create proper environments that are conducive to safety and order; and 2) what behaviors of students and staff work to contribute to a school culture that produces an environment of safety and order where students can succeed? When these questions have been answered, researchers and school officials will be closer to not only detailing what types of cultures are necessary for school safety, but also to determining how these cultures can be obtained in schools that are experiencing significant safety issues (Anderman & Young, 1994).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to identify the relationship that exists between school culture and school safety. Previous research has indicated that this relationship exists, and it now becomes necessary to identify this relationship more specifically and provide details that have previously not been discussed or determined. Doing this will allow continued research and exploration into this topic, while also allowing schools to work toward creating safer environments.

While there is an abundance of research on providing school safety and its impact on student achievement, there is not enough research on the effect of the philosophy of
the principal as a cultural leader, and how, if at all, this impacts school safety and student achievement (Leithwood, 1998). As the importance of school safety points to the fact that no learning can occur if this component is not in place, this study will be of interest to educators that are concerned with creating a culture of safety and order. It is assumed that all schools would be desirous of obtaining a safe and orderly learning environment for their students.

Those schools that are safe and secure provide the best learning environment for their students, and there are important characteristics that make these schools safer than others. Safety can be related to the physical location of the school and the socioeconomics of the community, but this is not always the case. There are also schools in areas where one would think safety would be an issue, that are providing safety and security for their students. How they are doing this becomes interesting, because there must be some formula that works for them (Berliner, 1993).

The interest then lies in finding out what these schools have that sets them apart from the rest. It is because of this interest that researchers are attempting to find the correlation between school culture and school safety. Whether this correlation lies with the principal, teachers, community, or students themselves remains to be determined. It is also a consideration that there could be a combination of factors necessary to create the safe environment found in many of society’s schools (Carnegie, 1989; Cone, et al, 1985).

Research Questions

The following questions are most likely to be of significance where school culture and school safety are concerned. They embody all that is important in this study and also
take into account the perceptions of those that work in schools and are therefore embedded within the atmosphere and culture of a particular school. For these reasons, and undoubtedly for others as well, they are worthy of consideration and will be examined in this study. The following two questions will be posited and analyzed during this particular study:

1. Is there a relationship between school culture and school safety?

2. Are there identifiable behaviors within school culture that contribute to school safety?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will either be shown to be valid or rejected as a result of the literature reviewed and the study conducted, and will hopefully give more insight into the problem of school culture and school safety. The following two hypotheses will be tested in this study:

\( Ho_1 \) There are no statistically significant correlations between school culture subscales and school safety subscales.

\( Ho_2 \) There are no statistically significant predictive relationships for the school culture subscales with each of the school safety subscales.

Assumptions

In general, the assumptions made here are relatively common and logical in their entirety, and will likely not cause any difficulty with the study or invalidate the data collected during the study in any way. The following two assumptions relating to the study will be made:
1. Surveys and questionnaires filled out by subjects are completed honestly and accurately, yielding results indicative of actual teacher perceptions.

2. The teachers who respond to the surveys will be informed about issues of school safety in their school and will therefore be qualified to answer the surveys.

Limitations

The degree of limitation in the study will be rather small and likely not overly significant. The following are limitations of the study:

1. Portions of this study were subject to the same limitations as other questionnaire type studies (i.e. much of the information was based upon the opinions and perceptions of the subjects involved).

2. The teachers who respond to the surveys are representative of metropolitan elementary school teachers in the Southwestern United States, and thus limits the generalizability of the findings to other settings.

Definition of Terms

Climate – The study of the perception of the participants of factors in the organizational environment (including schools as organizations) that is likely to reflect the culture of the organization (Schein, 1992).

Collegial Support – Teachers working together effectively to achieve a common goal or end (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).
Collaborative Leadership – School leaders establishing and maintaining shared relationships with school staff as they work jointly, especially in intellectual efforts such as solving problems and setting goals (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).

Culture – The culture of an organization refers to the values, belief systems, norms, and ways of thinking that are characteristic of the people in the organization. It is the way things are done. These are the stories, myths, and legends that are the glue that holds organizations together (Schein, 1992).

Culture Leader – Leadership through the development of an organization’s culture, such as building behavior norms that exemplify the best that a school or other organization stands for (Schein, 1992).

Leadership – Exercised when persons with certain purposes mobilize in competition or in conflict with institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse and satisfy the motives of followers (Owens, 2001).

Learning Partnership – Teachers, parents, and students working together for the common good of the student (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).

Professional Development – Teachers valuing continuous personal development and school-wide improvement (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).

School Safety – the process schools use to dedicate their attention to creating the safest and most secure environment for learning that is possible in any given situation (Safe Schools America, 2001).

School Reform – A generic term that includes all kinds of efforts to improve the apparent effectiveness of schools (U. S. Department, 1997).
**Teacher Collaboration** – Teachers engaging in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school and working together to achieve common goals and ideals (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).

**Transformational Leadership** – A style of leadership that is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation among leaders and subordinates, and that converts followers into leaders (Leithwood, 1992).

**Unity of Purpose** – Teachers working together toward a common mission for their school and for their students (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter One included the background information and recognized the need for the study. Also provided during the first chapter was a statement of the purpose of the study, research questions, hypotheses, assumptions, limitations, and definitions of key terms of the study. These components make up all of the background information for the study and indicate why the study is important for the students and educators of today and the future.

Chapter Two will include a comprehensive review of the related research on school culture and a safe and orderly environment. A comprehensive and thorough review of the literature will help to indicate not only what these factors may be, but also how to utilize them to the greatest advantage in schools and in future research into the problems of school culture and safety.

Research and methodology will be addressed in Chapter Three, including specifics about population and sample, data collection and instrumentation, and data
analysis. Building on the information provided in Chapter Three, the results and statistical analysis of the study will be presented in Chapter Four.

Chapter Five will contain a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications for the field, and recommendations for further study. This final chapter will provide a summary of the information and a discussion of how the data collected and analyzed fits in with the research questions asked, hypotheses suggested, and limitation discussed.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

As previously stated in Chapter One, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between school culture and school safety. This chapter deals with the review and analysis of previous studies relevant to this topic.

For purposes of developing an understanding of the available literature and importance of the current work, it is necessary to look at research on school culture, school safety, and the relationship between the two. This entails looking at several different bodies of research. For ease of understanding and to avoid confusion, the literature review has been divided into three sections.

The first section provides an overview of leadership theory with special attention paid to recent research on the leadership role in the culture of a school. Many still debate whether there is a direct correlation between effective and competent leadership and school safety, and this section will help to illustrate the link between the two.

The second section provides a review of literature on school culture. Looking at culture separately is essential as it allows for thought and reflection on what makes up the culture in an effective and safe school.

The third section will discuss the literature on school safety. This is important because it gives a great deal of information into what makes a school safe and its occupants feel secure.
These three sections illustrate the comprehensive research done in this field in recent years. A review of this information will help facilitate an understanding of how safety and culture are interrelated.

Leadership

Owens (2001) introduced the notion that "leadership is a group function - it occurs only in the processes of two or more people interacting. Leaders intentionally seek to influence the behavior of other people" (p. 234). Owens believes that any concept of leadership deals with exercising influence on others through social interaction, and that leaders are the ones that hold societal power over others.

Owens pointed out that although leaders exercise various kinds of power, leaders engage with followers in seeking to achieve not only the goals of the leader but also significant goals of the followers. The leader must hold the goals of the followers in high regard or the followers will become disgruntled and upset, which would lead to problems for the leader.

Without a willingness to help the followers accomplish goals, the leader would not be seen as helpful or needed, and the followers would turn to someone else who would be willing to help them accomplish their tasks. Owens (2001) contends that "leadership over human beings...is exercised when persons with certain purposes mobilize in competition or in conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological and other resources so as to arouse and satisfy the motives of followers" (p. 237).

Howard Gardner (1995) views leadership as:
A process that occurs within the minds of individuals who live in a culture—a process that entails the capacity to create stories, to understand and evaluate these stories and to appreciate the struggle among stories. Ultimately, certain kinds of stories will typically become predominant—in particular, stories that provide an adequate and timely sense of identity for individuals who live within a community or institutions. (p. 22)

Thomas Sergiovanni (2000) believes that schools need special leadership because schools are special places. They are not like large corporations, and dealing with the teaching and shaping of young children and their minds and ideals is not the same as dealing with adults. Schools have unique issues and problems that they must deal with, and leaders in schools must be aware of the difficulties of these issues and how to deal with them in the best and most responsible way.

Sergiovanni (2000) contends that schools must respond to unique political realities. He also contends that schools belong to parents and children and that they interact with the needs of local businesses, churches, and other community groups, and have a unique relationship with state governments. Sergiovanni argues that "these stakeholders don't always agree, and it takes a high level of political skill for school leaders to bring about the necessary consensus and commitment to make schools work well for everyone" (pp. 165-166).

James McGregor Burns (1978) was the first to develop the idea of transformational leadership and later Bernard Bass (1985) and others refine the concept. These authors did not study schools but based their work on political leaders, Army
officers, and business executives. Even though they did not specifically address schools, their results are relevant in this research because the idea of transformational leadership expands outward to all areas of leadership and all kinds of organizations, including schools.

Studies by Leithwood (1992, 1994) point out that although there have been few studies of such leadership in schools, evidence shows there are similarities in transformational leadership whether it is in a school setting or a business environment. This is especially important because it reinforces the work done in previous studies and once again reminds school officials and educators of the kinds of leaders that they need to be and the ways that they need to work toward helping their students (Graham, 1984).

Sagor (1990) believes that finding a way to be successful in defining the essential purpose of teaching and learning and then empowering the entire school community to become energized and focused takes more than just making decisions. Leadership requires much more than decision-making, as no one who objects to a leader's decision is likely to follow it willingly. Leaders must have willing followers, or at the very least, the power to enforce their decisions. Without either one or both of these things, leaders will not be able to get their ideas turned into workable projects that will benefit themselves and others (Harter, Whitesell, & Kowalski, 1992).

Evidence of the effects of transformational leadership, according to Leithwood (1992), is positive. Leithwood cites two findings from his own studies: (1) transformational leadership practices have a sizable influence on teacher collaboration, and (2) significant relationships exist between aspects of transformational leadership and
teachers' own reports of changes in both attitudes toward school improvement and instructional behavior (pp. 8-12).

In *Reframing Organizations* (1991) Bolman and Deal discuss the modern organization's need for transformational leaders who have an objective perspective and also have the vision and commitment that wise leadership provides. This vision and commitment are vitally important to any organization, including schools, as they strive to grow and change as technology and society demands. Leaders also need to have the proper perspective, because they must learn when to be objective about issues, and when their own subjectivity is important.

**How Leaders Influence the Culture of Schools**

Leadership studies by Dinham et al (1995) revealed that the principal's role is complex, ambiguous, and that he or she must attempt to cope with long days punctuated with numerous interruptions, many short-term interpersonal contacts, not always of their instigation, many issues at various stages of resolution being juggled concurrently, and a general perception that he or she arrives late, leaves early, and wanders around the school in between times. (p. 36)

With this perception in mind, how is it that the principal is able to be an efficient and effective leader and incorporate cultural issues into the everyday fabric of school life? Principals must work very hard and diligently to ensure that the students and faculty of the school are treated fairly, and that problems that they may have are handled quickly and properly before they become worse (Jose-Kampfner, 1994).
In a study by Dinham (1995) the author examined student, teacher, and community expectations for education. The study was also concerned with the manner in which these expectations are communicated between the various parties involved in education. The study was undertaken in two stages. The first stage of the study consisted of a survey of teachers, students, parents, and businesses within a representative range of nine comprehensive high schools and communities.

Conclusions from the study indicated that the aspects of the leadership of each school, particularly that of the principal, had influenced school climate, educational performance, and teacher, student, and community satisfaction. However, the authors concluded that leadership is also a two-way process and it was equally apparent that the behaviors of the leaders were also in part a product of the school environment and interactions with others.

The following are several important and worthy implications for school leadership effectiveness from this study by Dinham (1995, pp. 54-57).

- An open-door policy and principal accessibility and approachability are significant, particularly to staff and students.
- Hands-on leadership and attention to detail are also important, but need to be balanced with preparedness to delegate the importance of this against the interruptions and loss of time that being "open" necessarily results in.
- Consultation and collaboration have important symbolic as well as practical benefits.
The principal needs to be a source, facilitator, and conduit for both formal and informal communication within and without the school and to utilize consciously a variety of communication measures.

It is important for the principal to espouse and encourage forward thinking, a sense of purpose, and a collective vision.

A balance needs to be struck between attention to detail, policies, and procedures, and the more symbolic and intangible aspects of school organization, culture, and reputation.

The importance of a school’s physical environment with regard to school climate and staff as well as student and community perceptions of school effectiveness has been underestimated.

Public recognition of student, staff, and school achievement is important, but efforts also need to be made to ensure higher levels of student and staff participation in such “high profile” sporting, academic, and cultural activities which only involved a minority of students and staff at the schools studied.

Extra curricular activities are also important as symbolic “rallying points” in building the perception and reality of a “good” school.

The aim of true, representative, and meaningful student (and to some degree staff) involvement and empowerment in school decision-making processes remains seemingly unfulfilled.

Representative parent and community involvement is important yet was also lacking in those schools studied.
Many of the aforementioned implications focus on the notion of "balance" in a school. The principal of a school needs to be capable of making professional judgments which involve finding a personal position between sometimes opposing ends, e.g. hands-on versus delegation, attention to detail versus big picture, procedural versus symbolic action.

According to Dinham et al (1995), it is difficult to separate the principal from the organizational climate of the school, as there are cause and effect relationships at work, with the principal influencing and being influenced by the school and those involved within and without it (pp. 54-57). The principal often becomes so deeply integrated into the school environment that he or she is not seen as a separate entity with his or her own identity and values.

Overall, it was apparent that in this study; students, parents, and teachers shared a common belief that their school was good. The principal had a strong influence in setting the general tone or climate of the school with a hands-on, open door, positive attitude, being at the center of much that was happening within and concerning the school. The principal, despite the large size of the school, appeared to deal effectively with the fragmentation and brevity of contacts with others that have been found to typify the life of the principal. This is largely what made the school good, as parents and others in the community believed that the principal displayed an attitude of caring and compassion that was necessary to show an interest in the student and faculty and their well being.

This study shows that there is some correlation, at least at the particular school studied, between the principal's beliefs and involvement, the culture of the school, and
the safety of the school in question. Some of the opinions about safety and security can be evidenced by the fact that the parents and teachers, as well as the students, rated their school highly. This is significant as it works to display the suggested correlation between school culture and school safety and indicates that the principal may play a central role in this.

### Safety

According to Rachi (2001) some children are afraid to go to school for fear that someone else will shoot up the student body, and school administrators refuse to acknowledge that school security is their responsibility. This is especially true in schools where crime and violence is a problem, and where there have already been problems with guns and other terrifying issues.

Rachi (2001) also contends that parents ignore the fact that their children can access the Internet to find out detailed instructions on bomb assembly, and watch TV movies and video games that encourage violence. While there are arguments that video games and TV do not cause problems in children that are raised properly, other studies by Kay, et al (2001) show even children who are taught right from wrong at an early age and are brought up properly still have a higher tendency to violent behavior if they watch too much violent television or spend a lot of time playing violent video games.

Rachi (2001) noted that The National Rifle Association (NRA) argues that guns are not the problem—people are. This has, of course, been a point of contention between many individuals for many years, as those who favor banning guns argue about how dangerous they are, and those that think guns should not be outlawed argue that it is
people who kill people. If guns were not available, these people argue, then people would just use some other means to kill or main others, such as knives or blunt instruments. Guns are not the only way to cause injury.

Kavale & Reese, (1992) state that there is no reason that guns should make people violent, it is simply that guns are convenient where crimes are concerned. This is unfortunate, regardless of whether one takes the NRA's position or some other position. Students in schools around the country are being killed by guns, and while it doesn’t happen often, many would say that even one death of this nature is one too many.

In a United States government document (School Violence, 1994) it was reported that approximately 225,000 non-fatal, serious crimes occurred at schools. Reportedly, the tragic events at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado and its aftermath have focused our national attention on this pressing and puzzling issue. Many students and parents are frightened now, and teachers and principals are experiencing the same feelings of fear and frustration as they search for things that they might have missed and that might have prevented the violence that shocked the country (Rimbach, 2000; Clayton & Gordon, 1999).

This report stresses that Congress has a responsibility to address school violence at all levels and to put a stop to as much of it as possible. There are many areas of the country where the crime rate is very high, and many of these crimes happen in schools. Even in areas that seem safe, school safety can still be an issue, and parents are becoming increasingly concerned about sending their children to schools that they feel may be dangerous (Rimbach, 2000; Clayton & Gordon, 1999).
Some of these parents can home school their children or put them in private schools, but many do not have this option or do not see it as a viable suggestion. For these parents, their days at work are overshadowed by the fear that something terrible will happen to their children while they are at school—a place where they should be able to feel secure, safe, and comfortable (Ackerman, Anhalt, & Dykman, 1986).

Sprague, Sugai, & Walker (1998) agree that, “violence and destructive behaviors are major concerns within our society” (p. 235). The ramifications of the widely publicized shootings have ignited great fear and concern for student safety in schools from community members, school staff and students.” The authors point out that this subject appears to be a growing concern for members of the community as they see violence emerging in formerly quiet and reserved neighborhoods.

In March of 1998 The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) issued a report entitled, Violence and Discipline Problems in U. S. Public Schools: 1996-97. This report pointed out that about 100 crimes per 100,000 students were reported in public schools, 950 of these were not serious or violent. The ratio of serious violent crime is lowest in elementary schools, with 13 violent crimes reported per 100,000 students compared with 93 violent crimes per 100,000 students in middle schools and 103 violent crimes per 100,000 students in high schools.

In 1993 a national survey on violence in public schools found that 23 percent of students and 11 percent of teachers have been victims of violence in and around their schools (Kadel et al, 1999). This is indicative of the fact that students who do not get the
proper guidance and leadership at a young age will become more violent as they grow older.

A report by NCES (1998) affirmed that one in ten schools in their sample reported at least one violent crime over the past year. To promote school safety, educators have used traditional law enforcement methods that rely heavily on surveillance, penalties, and punishment. Purkey (1999) believes that these methods applied to schools can be effective but they carry major negative side effects, including a large financial burden. The financial burden is not the only problem that comes with these various methods. Many students feel that the surveillance is too intrusive, and that students who have not done anything wrong are being scrutinized too closely. There are also concerns that punishments are too harsh, too many things are banned from schools because they could be used as weapons, and there is too much of a reminder that the school is unsafe when guards are walking the halls (Seidman, et al, 1994).

Purkey (1999) presents an alternative approach for making schools more exciting, satisfying, and enriching. He calls it ‘Invitational Education’ which centers around the four guiding principles of respect, trust, optimism, and intentionality. These principles are used to show that schools can be made into safe and enjoyable places without employing armed guards and requiring students to submit to searches and other intrusive penalties for minor infractions. There are also five ‘P’s involved in his alternative, and they are designed to make individuals think before they act.

The Five P’s of Purkey’s (1999) Invitational Education concept are people, places, policies, programs, and processes, which are used to provide the means to address
the global nature and symbolic structure of schools. Purkey (1999) argues that it expands the education process by applying steady and continuous pressure from a number of points. Rather than relying on one program, one policy, or one process, Invitational Learning addresses the total spirit within a school. This total spirit is the culture of the school, and is therefore seemingly important where the safety and security of students is concerned.

This model is concerned with more than grades, attendance, academic achievement, discipline, and test scores. It is concerned with the skills of becoming a decent and productive citizen in a democratic society. Many of these skills are not currently taught in schools, and students suffer when they enter the real world of jobs and families. Purkey suggests that the five P’s that are suggested will work to curb some of these problems if they are used properly.

According to Shoffner & Vacc (1999) issues of school safety and student conduct cause greater concern among parents and educators than does mediocre or poor academic achievement. While academics are important for a student’s future, whether the student goes on to accept employment or attend college, safety is something that is a concern for the present. Students who do not have a safe environment in their schools may not do nearly as well academically, and some students may choose to drop out of schools or may not continue their education beyond high school because of issues with safety. This is not only detrimental to the student, but also to the rest of society, as it has lost a potentially productive member (Anderman & Kimweli, 1997).
Very few parents and educators are unconcerned with the safety of their schools, and most students are also concerned with safety, even if they give no outward indication of it. Morrissey (1998) also reports that most parents, teachers, administrators, and students want their schools to be safe. This only makes sense and it is a logical conclusion that those involved with schools would want schools to be a safe place to work and learn.

Effective Schools Research (Levine & Lezotte, 1994) indicates that having a safe, orderly learning environment significantly influences a child’s success in school. Children who are constantly being disrupted by violence, threats, and other problems have a more difficult time concentrating on their work and spend more time worrying about when another problem will arise and how significant that problem will be. Research from the effective schools movement of the last several decades has identified an emphasis on a safe school environment and its relationship to the school’s culture, high achievement scores, and student performance. Schools with poor safety have lower achievement scores than schools where the students consider themselves to be safe and secure.

Research by the Center for the Prevention of School Violence (2001) lists some key issues, such as security, safety, and orderliness in schools, which cannot be assumed but must instead by explicitly addressed. This research views the establishment and maintenance of these conditions in schools as essential in efforts directed at creating effective schools. With these conditions present, students are given the opportunity to perform at their best academically, and teachers are provided with environments that
allow them to perform at their highest level, thus helping their students to achieve even more.

**People – Respect and Caring**

Faculty and staff work as a school family. They often become close to each other and share their thoughts, dreams, and feelings. Many of these center around the students that they teach and how they can provide them with the best educational experience possible. Often this includes the issue of how to make the schools more safe and secure for themselves and their students. Activities include training in stress reduction and conflict management, long-term relationships between faculty and students, courteous staff, and respect for everyone. Special attention is given to personal grooming and professional dress, as this often helps to secure respect (Lindquist & Molnar, 1995).

Noguera (1995) believes the role of the teacher cannot be overlooked in the process of eliminating violence. Often, teachers notice much more about their students than a security guard or school resource officer would notice, so they are the most valuable commodity when it comes to stopping violence before it actually gets started. Many times, issues can be stopped before any actual violence occurs if teachers are aware of what is going on with their students. While many schools have police officers and security guards to enforce school rules and regulations, it is the teacher who still plays the most significant role, as the teacher is the person that is with the students for the greatest amount of time each day (Maehr & Midgley, 1996).

Noguera (1995) provided insight into the manner in which teachers handle situations in the classroom and halls, the influence teachers assert as they handle
situations, and how this plays a significant role in the effectiveness and prevention of violence. The implication is that those teachers' attitudes and perceptions toward their students can lead to a situation in which violence is common. Perceptions made by teachers can greatly affect how students see themselves and others.

Teachers must be aware of how they treat their students, and they must make an effort to avoid showing obvious favoritism to some students, or openly disliking others. Obvious dislike by a teacher often becomes a reason for a student to act out, and this can result in a violent act against the teacher or someone else. This is something that many teachers must work on, because it is difficult for them to remain neutral if one student is obviously more likable in general than another. However, remaining neutral and not showing favoritism can often make a more problematic student feel more accepted, thus possibly averting the violence that could have occurred in the future of that student (Anderman & Maehr, 1994).

Places – Physical Aspect of the School

Careful attention should be given to the physical environment of the school, including seeing that there is adequate lighting, well-maintained buildings and grounds, clean rest rooms, attractive classrooms and cafeterias, and displays celebrating student accomplishments. Ways should be found to enhance the physical environment of the school and make students more comfortable, no matter how old the building (Suarez, 1999).

This is imperative because students that take pride in their schools are less likely to cause violence in that school. Even an old school building that needs some work can
be made into a place of pride with a little bit of attention (Pankratz, 1997). Students, to some degree, can undertake this work, and this will also help to increase the safety and satisfaction that they feel in attending that school.

In their report, the Center for the Prevention of School violence (1999) concluded that if schools are to address the security of a school; attention should focus upon the school’s physical features, layout, and policies and procedures that are in place to handle daily activities as well as problems that may arise. In addition, the buildings and grounds of the school should be assessed. Some school safety issues are directly related to the buildings, such as dark hallways, poor lighting, and areas, such as bathrooms, that are easy to get to but are largely unmonitored. All of these issues should be examined to reduce the places in the school where violence could occur.

Access to the school should be reviewed, as well as policies and procedures to address intrusions that may threaten security because of what is brought to school; i.e., firearms and other weapons. It is often easy for a student to bring a dangerous weapon to school because of the nature and design of schools and the open access that is necessary to allow all students to move about freely and get to their classrooms on time (Lee & Smith, 1990).

In a paper published for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, Atlas (2002) summarized his findings:

Many school buildings in the United States have been constructed to achieve an inviting and open campus style, with multiple buildings, multiple entrances and exits, big windows, and many opportunities for privacy. These design
configurations are not conducive to many current requirements that need to encompass security needs. (p. 7)

Policies – Rules and Regulations

According to Purkey (1999) attendance, grading, promotion, discipline, and other policies should be developed and maintained within a circle of respect for everyone involved. Families need to be kept informed through newsletters, bulletins, phone calls, and meetings. Every school policy should be democratically developed, easy to understand, and made available to everyone involved, so that no concerns arise about favoritism, and no misunderstandings arise about rules and other important concerns.

Purkey notes that rules and policies are vital. Many schools have student handbooks and other information that they give to students. Some schools even require that students and parents sign a statement that says they have read the handbook and understand and agree to all of the rules within. Schools that spell out the rules in this way and ensure that students and parents understand these rules often have less violence because they make sure the rules are clear.

Purkey (1999) believes that not all safety issues can be avoided by providing the students with rules. Some problems will always plague schools, and there is only so much that teachers and others can do. However, anything that can reasonably be done to prevent violence and ensure safety should be utilized by schools and teachers to ensure that the environment created in a particular school is the safest and best for learning.
Plucker (2000) reports on the 1999 conference held at Indiana University on “Positive Approaches to Violence Prevention: Peace Building in Schools and Communities.” The main focus of this conference according to Plucker (2000) was a discussion of the need for positive prevention strategies in order to help curb school violence and promote safety.

The event featured nationally-known speakers from diverse perspectives, including Arun Gandhi, Kevin Dwyer from Columbia University, William Sessions, former director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Chief Judge Sarah Evans Barker of the U S. District Court in Indianapolis, and His Holiness, the 14th Dalai Lama of Tibet. More than 2000 people from 16 states, Japan, and Australia attended and the conference was viewed live on the Internet. The attendants of the conference drew the following conclusions (Plucker, 2000):

- Students need to feel they belong
- Students need opportunities to make real choices
- Communication is the key hurdle to preventing violence
- Students need to know the consequences of their choices
- Solutions need not be complex

Some insights that came out of the conference were: (a) that among the many programs that help to create safe schools are community outreach, wellness, and enrichment opportunities for everyone in the school; (b) programs that involve parents are strongly encouraged; and (c) guidance counselors play a central role in arranging beneficial
programs. Many of these things were already known or suspected by researchers and educators alike, but seeing these conclusions drawn at the conference only helped to reinforce the opinions and beliefs that many school officials already had about safety (Plucker, 2000).

Processes – Values and Attitudes of School Staff

Process is the way in which things are done in the school. It relates to safety and security, but also to many other things that are done throughout the school. A democratic ethos is valued along with an academic orientation. Both are important for effective schools. All activities and procedures are designed to honor and include everyone, including teachers, staff, and all students (Purkey, 1999).

In their study, Saft & Planta (2001) assessed the extent to which teacher perceptions of their relationships with students varied. This study was conducted in a large, demographically diverse population. The sample included 197 preschool and kindergarten teachers and 840 children.

Children were approximately evenly divided between boys and girls. Regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of their relationships with students and their actual relationships. Data were disaggregated by (a) teacher ethnicity, (b) child age, ethnicity, and gender, and (c) the ethnic match between teacher and child.

This study suggests that children’s ethnicity was consistently related to teachers’ perceptions, explaining up to 27 percent of the variance in perception of negative aspects of the teacher-child relationships, specifically teacher-child conflict. When child and
teacher had the same ethnicity, teachers rated their relationships with children more positively. This is often the case with teacher-child relationships and also with relationships between adults. Many people seem to be more comfortable with people of similar ethnic makeup and background. This is often not due to any kind of prejudice, but rather due to the shared and common experiences that these people will have with each other.

The results are discussed in terms of classroom social processes related to children's adjustment and the measurement of teacher-child relationships. This study is important because it points out one area of teacher-child conflict. Valuing each child is important in creating safe schools and teachers need to be aware of some areas of conflict. Children who are not in the same ethnic category as their teacher are often treated differently, and even though many teachers do not even realize that they are doing this, the student is still affected.

This is not to say that all teachers treat children of different ethnic background poorly, or that children cannot respond positively to a teacher that is of a different ethnicity. Sergiovanni (2000) indicates in his research that children are more responsive when they are with a person of their same ethnic background. Whether this is due to genetics and the comfort that children find in someone who is like them or whether it is indicative of the way those of the same ethnicity treat children is not clear. Possibly both are factors, or it varies between the children that are studied.

In their analysis of the Inviting School Safety Survey (ISSS), Shoffner and Vacc (1999) argue that although the influence of family, community, school, and peers is
frequently cited as being related to adolescent delinquent involvement, it is only recently that schools have begun to implement programs of prevention.

Shoffner and Vacc (1999) in their analysis point out that a primary issue that needs attention is concern over the factors that should be addressed in prevention programs to achieve safe schools. It is also important to study whether these factors are being properly addressed and discussed in order to ensure that the best prevention measures are being utilized.

In the Inviting School Safety Survey, Purkey and Lehr (1996) point out that there are five areas of people, places, policies, programs, and process which create the environmental framework in the schools where student behavior is affected. According to Purkey and Lehr (1996) the component of the model related to people assesses respect and caring; places relates to the physical aspect of the school; policies refers to rules and regulations; programs refers to preventive programs that emphasize nonviolent means of negotiation; and process refers to values and attitudes of school staff.

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (1995) NCREL also suggests that the “climate” in the school be addressed. According to the center a school’s climate is often assessed in terms of how safe students, teachers, school staff, and parents perceive the school. Perceptions of safety and feelings about safety reveal important information about a school’s climate and help educators determine where problems exist. The climate is an integral component of a school’s culture.

Effective Schools Research (2000) emphasizes that the orderliness of a school involves how students relate to each other and how they relate to the teachers and school
staff. An environment characterized by respect for others is important, as is a clear explanation of what is expected from students with reference to behavior and conduct. Student behavior is a critical component of the orderliness of a school, and this behavior is regulated mostly by teachers that see the students for several hours every day, but is also somewhat regulated by the principal of the school, by peer pressure placed on a student by other children, and by parents and others adults who teach children what they need to know from an early age.

A school’s safe school plan should include a clear set of such expectations. It cannot be assumed that all students will conform to the rules that have been set forth by the principal, teachers, and others with the authority to do so, but it can be expected that those who break the rules have been made aware of what the consequences would be. It is very important that all students know the punishments for various infractions, just as it is important for them to be aware of all of the rules and regulations that are often included in handbooks that are provided to students and parents (Young & Fraser, 1994).

Sizer (1984) also agrees with research concerning the importance of a safe and orderly environment within a school, which is an important characteristic of effective schools. Most school effectiveness studies, according to Sizer (1984), have focused on academic achievement in terms of basic skills in reading and mathematics or examination results, but there is more to an effective school than this information would indicate. Skills and basics, as well as examination results, are all very important, but there are many other factors that make up a school, and many of them showcase the effectiveness of the school.
Sizer's (1984) research shows evidence that providing a safe and orderly environment increases achievement scores and student performance, which are important components of the most effective schools. This once again indicates that children cannot learn effectively in a school where they must spend time worrying about when the next violent event will occur and if it will involve them or affect their ability to complete their work.

Students in schools that have low safety ratings and high amounts of violence often show poor scores on academic tests. This is presumably because students are worrying about where the next problem will come from and whether they will be a part of it. A school should be a place where everyone can feel safe and secure. This is difficult to provide in a school where violence is rampant and armed guards roam the halls to keep an eye on what kinds of activities are taking place (Midgley, Anderman, & Hicks, 1995).

The Subcommittee on School Violence (1999), in their report to Congress, posed the following questions: (1) What is it that leads a student to commit or even consider heinous acts of violence?, (2) Do our Federal programs accomplish their goals efficiently and effectively?, (3) Is the Federal Government helping or hurting with these programs and policies?

For many decades, the debate has been raging over the quality of public schools in the United States and whether the educational reform efforts that have been attempted have failed or succeeded. Berliner, et al (1997, p. 21) asserts, “the public school system of the United States has done remarkably well as it receives, instructs, and nurtures children who are poor, without health care, and from families and neighborhoods that
barely function.” While this is true to a great extent, there is much more that can be done in order to make schools safer and help them help the students that really need it the most.

Barth (1990, p. 147) notes that public schools are “working, but could work better.” Hill, Foster, and Gendler (1990) agree that, “Unacceptably large numbers of American school-age youth are insufficiently equipped with the skills and knowledge to enable them to acquire additional education or employment or to lead fulfilling personal lives” (p. 40). This is of great concern to parents and educators, as the United States continues to turn out high school graduates that cannot read, and students that cannot hold a job, balance a checkbook, or cook a meal.

Some individuals blame these deficiencies on parents, but many others look to the schools. When these individuals look toward the schools, they are seeing that the educational opportunities that are afforded to today’s children are not what they used to be, nor are they often up to the standards that parents and administrators expect. The process of change, however, is a slow one, and the answers to the problems are not simple. This does not mean that finding a solution should be abandoned, but only that it is a time consuming and important task (Weishew & Peng, 1993).

Effective School Research (2000) also lists a safe and positive environment as one of seven correlates for effectiveness. Their list includes these assertions:

Effective schools have an orderly, purposeful, businesslike environment, which is free from the threat of physical harm. Desirable student behaviors are consistently articulated and expectations are clear. Students help each other and
what is best for all. The environment nurtures interaction between students and teachers that is collaborative, cooperative, and student centered (p. 1).

According to research by Hough et al (1997), because of the violence in our school systems, teachers and administrators now have to be concerned with maintaining their own physical safety and that of their students, instead of focusing solely on academics. This is stopping many children from reaching their full potential and also keeping teachers from doing all that they can to ensure that students are safe, happy, and successful.

Safe Schools America, Inc. (2001) defines school safety as the process schools use to dedicate their attention to creating the safest and most secure environment for learning possible in any given situation. Because standards for a safe school apply to all issues that contribute to the safety and security of adults and students at the school, the research conducted by Safe Schools stress that all schools are vulnerable to various threats to their safety and security.

However, Safe Schools America, Inc. (2000) reports that these threats can be reduced or eliminated entirely when schools study and adapt safety standards that address their specific needs, such as facilities standards, policies and procedures standards, equipment standards, state certification standards, and safety planning and crisis response training standards, among others.

Culture

Schein (1996) defines culture as:
A phenomenon that surrounds us at all times. Culture implies that rituals, climate, values, and behaviors bind together into a coherent whole. The levels of culture are the artifacts (visible organizational structures and processes, the espoused values (strategies, goals, philosophies – espoused justifications) and basic underlying assumptions (unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings – ultimate source of values and actions). This patterning or integration is the essence of what we mean by culture. (p. 17)

According to Schein, "leaders need to become aware of the critical role an understanding of culture plays in their efforts to stimulate learning and change and how intricately intertwined their own behavior is with culture creation and management" (p. xi). Many people do not realize that the culture shapes what they do. Many of the things that people do can be attributed to culture and they do not even realize it. It is simply an action that is performed because it has always been done that way. This cultural phenomenon happens in schools as well as other organizations, and throughout society itself.

As far back as 1952 Kroeberg and Kluckhorn (1960) referred to culture as:

Patterns of behaviors that are acquired and transmitted by symbols over time, which become generally shared within a group and are communicated to new members of the group in order to serve as a cognitive guide or blueprint for future actions. (cited in Black & Mendenhall, 1990, p. 120)

A study by Wohlstetter (1997) examined schools in search of elements central to the creation of “high-performing learning communities.” This study considered “how school missions were developed and translated into classroom practice; how schools learned
from what they were doing; and what factors were likely to produce high-quality teaching and learning" (p. ii).

Wohlstetter identified four building blocks critical to the development of high-quality learning communities: the school mission, the school instructional program, the accountability system and school leadership (pp. 25-26). It was found that schools' approaches to these building blocks both supported and hindered their development as learning communities.

Given similarities between creating learning communities and creating school cultures, this study covers some of the same ground as Wohlstetter (1997). The building blocks and enabling conditions—and in particular the findings about mission and leadership—overlap to some extent with this exploration of culture and a safe and orderly environment.

In Organizational Behavior in Education Robert Owens (2001) reports on a study by Wilbur Brookover and his associate. The researchers took a random sample of 2,226 Michigan elementary schools and studied school effectiveness and how it relates to organizational culture. The investigators found that "the first and foremost conclusion derived from this research is that some aspect of social environment clearly makes a difference in academic achievement of schools" (p. 161).

The researchers concluded that this concept is clearly related to school achievement. Strong research on the relationship between the culture of the school and outcomes also comes from a study of twelve inner-city London schools (Owens, 2001). These studies continue to enforce the belief that there is a correlation between the safety
of a school and the culture of the school. Owens’s studies noted that there is at least some link between the two, and this link must be studied in order to determine how strong it is and how culture can be improved in schools in an attempt to create more secure environments for children to learn.

Owens also reported on large-scale research in the United States by Rudolf Moos (1997) that supports the mounting evidence in the literature that the learning and development of students is significantly influenced by characteristics of organizational culture. Moos (1997) studied some 10,000 school students in more than 500 classrooms and was able to identify characteristics of classroom organizational culture that facilitated academic achievement, on the one hand, and those that induce stress, alienate students, and inhibit learning, on the other.

Getzels, Lipham and Campbell (1968) also acknowledge that it is important to note that culture is the source of values that people share in a society, school, or organization. Culture can be viewed as having effects on multiple features of the school and its environment, as well as having effects on individuals in the organization. Cultures shape the institutional and community context within which the school is situated by defining predominant value orientations and norms of behavior.

Getzels et al (1968) believe that leaders must respond to and establish a fit between the school and its institutional structure. To provide a culture that supports orderly, safe environment school leaders must be very sensitive to the needs of their specific school. This includes not only the students, but the faculty and staff as well, as they are all part of the culture.
Without sensitivity to students, a school leader cannot be effective, as they do not have the trust and confidence of the teachers and the students. Without this trust and confidence, no one will follow that particular leader for very long, and the leader will not be able to turn the dreams and visions that the school has into a reality that will benefit everyone involved. This is why it is extremely important for the leader, or the principal, of the school to be sure that he or she takes into account the culture of the school and the people that work there, as well as the students and their thoughts and beliefs about the school.

Likert as cited in Ownes (2001) pointed out:

It is the administrator—who has options from which to choose in deciding what the philosophy of management is to be, how communication is to be carried out, and how decisions shall be made in the organization—who bears major responsibility for the culture that develops in an organization. (p. 283)

Collaborative Leadership

Gruenert & Valentine (1997) define collaborative leadership as school leaders establishing and maintaining shared relationships with school staff as they work jointly, especially in intellectual efforts such as solving problems and setting goals.

Frederick (1987) discusses the idea of patterns that have emerged in studying schools as complex social systems that reveal a set of distinct characteristics. These characteristics, among others, include the importance of an orderly, safe environment conducive to learning. The question Frederick poses is, “If we consider the importance
of this characteristic then how does the leader of a school interact with staff to assure that this characteristic is played out?” (p. 41).

Education Reform Studies (1994) point out that the collaboration of leadership with staff is critical. Strong leadership measures the level of strategic interaction between the principal and teachers in areas of mobilizing resources, communicating, serving as instructional resource, and being a visible presence. Understanding how a leader interprets the culture of the community and the institution to his school staff is an important idea. Hargreaves and Fullan (1998) warn against contrived collaboration: Leaders must create the appropriate structures for collaboration that provide opportunities for teachers. Teachers cannot be forced to collaborate. There are many structures and methods that contribute to teachers’ collaboration, such as team teaching, action research teams, peer observations, common planning times, and shared decision-making. The strength of collaboration comes from time structured for teachers to have meaningful discussions about improving their practice, to share their expertise. (p. 4)

Peterson & Deal (1998) in How Leaders Influence the Culture of Schools offer some insights into how school leaders shape culture. First, they read the culture—its history and current condition. Second, leaders uncover and speak about core values, looking for those that support what is best for students. It is important to identify which parts of the culture are destructive and which are constructive.

According to Peterson & Deal, “leaders work to fashion a positive context, reinforcing cultural elements that are positive and modifying or deleting those that are
negative and dysfunctional. Positive school cultures are never oversized or conforming, but core values and shared purpose should be broad and deep” (p. 28-30). Peterson and Deal offer these specific ways school leaders shape culture:

- They communicate core values in what they say and do.
- They honor and recognize those who have worked to serve students and the purpose of the school.
- They observe rituals and traditions to support the school’s heart and soul.
- They recognize heroes and heroines and the work these exemplars accomplish.
- They eloquently speak of the deeper mission of the school.
- They celebrate the accomplishments of the staff, the students, and the community.
- They preserve the focus on students by recounting stories of success and achievement (1998).

Peterson and Deal point out that the roles of school leaders in shaping culture are extremely pervasive. By their words, nonverbal messages, actions, and accomplishments they shape the culture of the school in many ways. In conclusion, they add that without the attention of leaders, school cultures can become toxic and unproductive.

To overcome this, school leaders must pay very keen attention to the symbolic side of their schools. These symbols can be very important, and leaders can easily overlook them if they are not willing to stay in tune with the things that are happening at their school and the thoughts and feelings of the teachers and students. Symbolism often
accounts for much, and school leaders that pay attention to these will keep the trust and confidence, as well as the respect, of their students, teachers, and staff.

Teacher Collaboration

Gruenert & Valentine (1997) define teacher collaboration as teachers engaging in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school and working together to achieve common goals and ideals.

In their report, Tyrrell, Scully, & Hulligan (1998, pp. 30-32) conceived what they term, The Strategic Planning Process. In this process teachers engage in collaboration to renew the values and missions of the district, and to create a vision for the future. This vision is planned together and discusses the premise that real peace in the world must begin with children. The purpose of this program was to foster the values of compassion, respect, and appreciation of others’ differences, to build character, and to strengthen the practice of the nonviolent resolution of conflict. The program helped students and adults better understand and manage the conflicts they encountered in their own lives – in schools, at home, and in the community.

They believe that these life-long skills help people build caring relationships with others and function effectively in our complex, changing society, and that schools are a good place to teach these kinds of skills, because they are turning out the adults of the future.

Information from a study by Shann (1990) is of interest to teachers willing to study and evaluate programs relating to order and safety. This study was conducted in
four urban middle schools in Boston that were serving sixteen hundred students, mostly from low-income minority families, to assess urban public school effectiveness.

School level practices were the primary focus of the study, but self-report of classroom teaching behaviors were also studied in relation to student achievement through interviews with twenty to thirty teachers in each school. Teachers in these schools were well educated and experienced, but their individual caring did not always appear on an institutional level.

Shann (1990) reported that the most effective schools combined emphasis on academic learning with an ethic of caring that went beyond what was required of the faculty and staff. Clarity of purpose and positive relationships among teachers were seen in higher levels of student achievement, lower rates of inappropriate behaviors among students, and lower incidences of antisocial behaviors, indicating once again that the culture of a school and the interactions between teachers and students relates to school safety.

The accountability system that has been implemented in the Dallas (Texas) Independent School District is a three-tier system. The third tier involves school effectiveness indexes. To achieve the necessary improvement in student outcomes, teachers must work together. Individual competition between teachers is not rewarded. This report by Webster et al. (1993) is important because the outcome reports on the impact on the most students affected by the collaboration of teachers working together to increase student learning. Other school districts are trying this system to see if it is beneficial.
Professional Development

Gruenert & Valentine (1997) define professional development as teachers valuing continuous personal development and school-wide improvement. Schiffbauer (2000) in her article, *A Checklist for Safe Schools* suggests that along with information on crisis-response procedures, staff should receive in-service programs that enhance staff members' coping skills. Strategies should be given to staff for dealing with aggressive students or adults, for resolving conflicts peacefully, for managing stress, and for handling discipline problems. Teachers and others are often at a loss for what they can and cannot do to prevent problems in schools or to deal with others that cause difficulties. Clear information on proper procedures goes a long way toward making teachers and students feel safe and protected.

As reported by Callahan in *School Counselors: Untapped Resources for Safe Schools* (2000) the population of students at risk for school violence is growing, and we need new methods and models for assisting students. This report found that teachers and school counselors can play an important part in helping schools address the needs of at-risk youth by becoming proactive. As cited in Callahan researchers have documented the need for comprehensive developmental in-service on guidance and counseling programs, however, many schools are unaware of these needs. Schools that are aware of these needs often do well and this is indicated by student achievement because they spend time developing programs that the students can use to help them later in life.
Paisley and Borders (1995) agree that depending upon the level of training and experience of their schools' teachers and counselors, principals should make seminars on safety and other professional sources available.

In general, their report found that teachers felt good about the changes instituted through the Effective Schools process and about their ability to provide input in the process of identifying problems and solutions. Allowing teachers to have a say in the changes that were being implemented in their schools gave them the chance to talk about some of the things that they were seeing in their classrooms. It also gave them a chance to make suggestions as to how to help the students that they teach perform better and feel better about themselves and their safety.

**Collegial Support**

Gruenert & Valentine (1997) define collegial support as teachers working together effectively to achieve a common goal or end. The Committee on School-based Reform (1995) cited the reforms at South Mission High School that exemplify a successful adoption of the Effective Schools model. Among the reasons cited for the success of their reform efforts was evidence of coordination and collaboration in how the teachers coordinated curriculum planning and issues relating to the welfare of students. The participation of teachers from various disciplines formed correlate committees to stimulate interest in interdisciplinary collaboration.

According to the report, some teachers were not positive about eliminating tracking, but they recognized research supporting the elimination and sought additional training in the teaching of heterogeneous populations. Even though they felt that tracking was
important, they were willing to be open-minded about other ways that they could use to help students do better, feel safe, and achieve. The teachers at South Mission High took responsibility for effective instruction and ongoing improvement.

In addition, teachers worked together to improve South Mission by serving in seven teacher-staffed subcommittees, each of which assessed how well the school was doing regarding that committee's mission. They forwarded their recommended changes to the school council, then to the principal. The first set of reforms addressed safety and school climate. Another vehicle for collaboration had been eight observations of teachers by administrators per year. The result of this collaboration has been that the teachers have opened up communication between the administration and teaching staff as they work to accomplish the tasks of the school organization.

Case studies by Taylor (1990) illustrate that shared decision-making in a collaborative enterprise leads to improved staff and student morale. Another study by the Committee on School-based Reform on Empire High School (1995) indicated there were data to support the positive feelings voiced by teachers in the dramatic changes in the organization of school control. The administrative pyramid was "flattened" by creating a management team. The flattening of the administrative pyramid was beneficial in many ways, including allowing teachers to speak their minds and making them feel more like equals.

The new role of administrators was reflected by their new titles as "coordinators" and their temporary status on one-year contracts. All building administrators knew their jobs were on the line. At Empire, leadership was diffused between an interim principal
and a few teacher-leaders. The elimination of administrative positions and allocation of the funds to team planning further stressed the trend toward collegial support between teachers and management.

The elimination of administrative positions also provided a more equal footing for all teachers and reminded everyone that they must work to do the best job possible or they would be replaced. This was evidenced by the fact that contracts for many people were temporary, and that all of the people who worked at the school were made aware that their jobs could be forfeit if they were found to be ineffective in promoting good relations and a positive school culture for all students.

Unity of Purpose

Gruenert & Valentine (1997) define unity of purpose as teachers working together toward a common mission for their school and or their students. The Committee on School-based Reform at Empire High School also showed the degree to which teachers were willing to work toward a structure of participatory governance, which involved working together with administrators and others to accomplish their new reform goals. In the 1991-92 planning year, a team made up of school staff and administrators took charge of designing the restructuring of both the high school and the middle school, attempting to make schools safer and better for teachers and students alike.

The data from this report lists an important finding regarding the unity of purpose of this staff. It is important to have a participatory management structure in place for a few years, so there is a cadre of teachers that exist to act as coaches in the decision making progress while working toward a common mission. Unifying behind the school
mission of safety is a major concern especially when schools are being required to educate a more diverse range of students.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1997) set forth the premise that all students are to be educated in the least restrictive environment with a preference given to the general education setting. Therefore, students with serious emotional disabilities who have previously been schooled in alternative settings are being educated in the public schools.

The inclusion of all students has challenged the ability of schools to meet the needs of all students. The diversity of student populations with problem behaviors poses the largest threat to the safety and success of the public school (Todd, Horner, Sugai, & Colvin, 1999). Not only are students with disabilities often harder to teach, they are also more vulnerable to school violence because they are seen as different and they may be unable to defend themselves, making them an easy target for bullies and troublemakers.

According to Sprague et al. (1998) variables that influence student behavior are similar to and consistent with factors associated with creating safe schools. An important variable that has been shown to influence safety is strong teacher commitment and unity of purpose. Sprague argues that all staff must understand and support effective programs that offset patterns of increased destructive behavior.

In order to work with these kinds of programs, teachers must understand that many different factors go into making students who they are and shaping them into what they will become as they get older. Because of this, there are many different ways teachers can reach students and help them benefit as much as possible
Learning Partnerships

Gruenert & Valentine (1997) define learning partnerships as teachers, parents, and students working together for the common good of the students. Creating safe environments for schools is only one part of a multi-faceted total prevention strategy. Student problems are often reactions to stressors in their daily lives (poverty, inadequate health care and/or nutrition, physical and/or emotional abuse, homelessness, etc.). These stressors can distract students from their schoolwork and their ability to cope with conflicts at school, thereby causing inappropriate and violent reactions that impede their ability to learn. They could be avoided if teachers were made aware of the problems that the students are facing (Office of Special Education Programs, 2001).

The research conducted by OSEP reveals the importance of parental partnerships to prevent violent or inappropriate behavior. Parents are one of the main lines of defense against this kind of behavior, and it is important that they pay attention so that they can work with the school to curb this behavior before it becomes dangerous. Classroom and school-wide supports are usually not enough; therefore, schools also need to serve as a pathway to family and community service partnerships. This pathway will help the schools work with the community to improve the safety of students (Office of Special Education Programs, 2001).

Chency, (1998) and Watson & Rangel (1996) suggest that schools develop solutions that involve the home environment as well as the school environment. The authors point to the benefits students derive from messages that are consistent between home and school. Parents and educators should work together closely to build student
behavioral skills and competencies, and much more is accomplished when they do so willingly and thoroughly. They must also work together to stop aggression before problems develop, as problems of this nature can be hard to stop or control once they have gotten started. Levine & Lezotte (1994) also agree, and the effective school correlates include a productive school climate that reflects a culture of shared values between school and parents.

The report on *Prevention Strategies that Work* (Key et al., 2001) suggests the following prevention strategies:

1. Family-teacher planning around student problems
2. Action research teams of teachers and parents facilitated by a parent liaison
3. Referral of students who show signs of emotional and/or behavioral problems
4. Time for teachers to meet with families; access to trained parent liaisons
5. Classroom instruction in social skills; parent liaisons to support families

This report also stresses the importance of conducting action research, which involves the systematic investigation of a specific problem by those most closely concerned with it, such as parents and/or teachers. The authors go on to explain that action research in education is usually carried out by teachers, or in collegial groups.

Parent-teacher action research combines the benefits of parent-teacher teaming with the systematic and democratic structure of action research. Using the support of parent liaisons, parents can participate as equal partners in student behavior plans, thus providing the student involved with the best help available in his or her particular
situation. Action research conducted by parents and teachers involves the following steps:

- Choose the research question.
- Collect the data. Information is gathered from interviews, observations, etc. Teams often collect both types of data.
- Reflect on the data and share thoughts with one another.
- Analyze the data, making sure that both parents and teachers participate.
- Formulate a practical theory.
- Use the practical theory to guide a new plan of action.
- Brainstorm ideas and choose those upon which there is mutual agreement.
- Plan a course of action and implement it (Key et al, 2001).

A critical point made by the report on *Prevention Strategies That Work* is that parents and teachers should work together to establish and set mutual goals for student progress during the school years. Setting mutual goals and carrying out joint action plans ensures greater consistency between home and school, and helps students avoid the mixed messages they may get when the school says one thing and parents say something else.

The Midwest Regional Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities (1995) lists the following factors that can have a protective and positive influence on the lives of children. Factors are listed to a specific group the student may be involved with. Peers can be a positive influence if they:

- Are involved in drug-free activities.
- Respect authority.
• Bond together in conventional peer groups.
• Appreciate the unique contributions and talents of individuals.

School can positively influence youth if:
• Teachers express high expectations.
• The staff encourages goal setting and self-mastery.
• Staff members view themselves as nurturing caretakers.
• Teachers encourage pro-social development.
• The staff provides leadership and decision-making opportunities.
• The staff attends development programs in the areas of social development and cooperative learning.
• Parents are involved in school activities and programs.
• It provides alcohol, tobacco, and other drug-free alternative activities.

The community can be a good influence on youth if:
• Norms and public policies support non-use among youth.
• There is access to resources (housing, health care, job training, employment, recreation, and so on).
• Youth are involved in community service programs.

The family can have a positive influence on the child if:
• The parents seek prenatal care.
• The parents develop a close bond with the child.
• Education is valued and encouraged.
• Stress is managed well.
• Parents spend quality time with their children.
• Parents use a high-warmth/low-criticism parenting style.
• Parents express clear expectations.
• Parents encourage supportive relationships.
• Family responsibilities are shared.

Equally important is the landmark report *Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General* that was published on January 17, 2001 by David Satcher, MD, then United States Surgeon General. In this report the Surgeon General focused on the topic of youth violence with a summary of the state of the science about this problem and how to address it. It asserts that youth violence, particularly that violence which occurs in schools, has become especially significant to the government in recent years because this violence has been on the rise and many communities have seen it first hand.

Furthermore, this report confirms that to be most effective, approaches to youth violence require action at the school, family, and community levels. The report clearly indicates that this problem does not belong to a specific group, but rather to everyone in the community. It will, therefore, take everyone’s help to correct it and make the schools safe again.

The drive for this report emerged from the April 1999, Columbine High School tragedy that resulted in the deaths of 14 students. The usefulness of this report is significant because the Surgeon General affirmed the importance of evidence-based youth prevention programs by utilizing a regional planning approach and convening a series of community-based forums in four cities across the country: Atlanta, Georgia;
Chicago, Illinois; Los Angeles, California; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. These forums provided a medium to report and help shape future directions in youth violence prevention.

As a result, in January of 2002, President Bush amended Title IV of No Child Left Behind Act to include Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (2002). The purpose of Section 4001 is to support programs that prevent violence in and around schools. These programs must also prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs. In addition, these programs must involve parents and communities, and be coordinated with related Federal, State, school, and community efforts. Federal resources will be provided that support a safe and drug-free learning environment and which improve student academic achievement. It is important to note that the Act gives assistance to:

1. States for grants to local educational agencies and groups of such agencies to establish, operate, and improve local programs of school drug and violence prevention and early intervention;

2. States for grants to, and contracts with, community-based organizations and public and private entities for programs of drug and violence prevention and early intervention, including community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities;

3. States for development, training, technical assistance, and coordination activities; and
4. Public and private entities to provide technical assistance; conduct training, demonstrations, and evaluation; and to provide supplementary service and community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities for the prevention of drug use and violence among students and youth (U. S. Department of Education (2002).

Monetarily the federal government was authorized to appropriate $650,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years, for state grants under subpart 1. Also such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2002, and for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years, for national programs under subpart 2.

Conclusion

Creating and sustaining an organizational culture that contributes to high academic achievement is frequently a problem in schools, as can be seen from the review of available literature on the subject. Effective School Research (1997) points to the fact that the key to creating and sustaining high academic achieving schools is using a comprehensive approach to creating a culture of safety and order.

Children do not learn well when they perceive their environment to be dangerous, and this applies whether they are very young children or high school age young adults. In order to help students learn better and achieve more, the amount of violence that they face in schools must be reduced, and the level of safety that they feel while they are at school must be raised. This is a difficult, but not impossible, task that must be undertaken by virtually everyone in a particular community if it is to be successful and achieve safety and security for the students.
The problem does not just belong to children. Adults that work on the staff and faculty of schools often feel that they are not safe in some of the more dangerous and problematic schools in this country. These individuals are worried about much more than just whether the students are getting a good education, and this can cause them to neglect much of what they need to be accomplishing in favor of worrying about the safety of the students and themselves.

In some of these schools, safety takes priority over education. As a result of this, students do not learn what they should and are therefore unprepared when they complete school and end up out in the world where they must get jobs and survive on what they have learned.

Safe schools integrate designs for school safety into their plans for school improvement, restructuring, and reform efforts, among other things. Schools, families, and communities must work together to assess students' and schools' needs; reduce factors that place students at risk of committing violence or becoming victims, and promote strategies that increase students' abilities to reduce or overcome the risks they face (Kadel et al., 1999, p. 2).
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Problem and Purposes Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact that school culture has on school safety and order, and ascertain whether there is a direct correlation between the two. Through background information in the first chapter, and review of relevant literature in the second chapter, this impact has been looked at from virtually every angle, and a great deal of information from many other researchers has been supplied for consideration.

The chapter also contains a description of the instruments that will be used to collect data, how the data will be organized, and the means by which it will be statistically analyzed. This information will provide an understanding for those who look at this research in the future, and also for those who wish to replicate this research.

Research Questions

The following research questions were created, analyzed, and ultimately examined as a result of this study:

1. Is there a relationship between school culture and school safety?
2. Are there identifiable behaviors within school culture that contribute to safety?
Research Hypotheses

To study the research questions, two quantitative hypotheses were developed. These hypotheses were:

$H_0_1$ There are no statistically significant correlations between school culture subscales and school safety subscales.

$H_0_2$ There are no statistically significant predictive relationships for the school culture subscales with each of the school safety subscales.

Population and Sample

The population available for this study was limited to seven elementary schools from one metropolitan school district in the Southwestern United States. Participating schools were chosen using convenience sampling. The participating district and schools were known to the researcher, and therefore were accessible to use in the study.

The decision to participate in this particular research study was ultimately made by district administrators, site administrators, and school faculty. Even though teachers were not specifically asked in the initial phase of obtaining permission, they were assured that they could end their participation at any time or choose not to participate if they did not wish their information to be given or were concerned about the confidentiality of the study. All of the schools chose to participate and completed the required information.

Participants

Subjects in the study were certified instructional staff from seven elementary schools selected by convenience sampling. Teachers and principals were advised that
their participation was strictly voluntary, that they were free to withdraw at any time during the study, and that confidentiality was assured.

There was no pressure for those that began the study to complete it if they chose not to or if data collection became uncomfortable or difficult for them, nor would their information be released to anyone, including others who participated in the study. Any teachers who did not wish to participate in the study could decline without concern for any kind of retribution.

Race, gender, ethnicity, and any other demographic characteristics of the subjects involved in the study were determined by the composition of the school, and therefore were beyond the control of the researcher. No special effort was made on the part of the researcher to attempt to find specific demographic information or characteristics, or to exclude schools that have specific demographics.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in this study to collect data. The School Culture Survey (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997) was used to provide insight about the shared values and beliefs, the patterns of behavior, and the relationships in the school. The Inviting School Safety Survey (Lehr and Purkey, 1996) was used to evaluate how teachers perceive the relative safety of their school.

School Culture Survey (SCS)

Gruenert and Valentine developed the School Culture Survey in 1997 for the Middle Level Leadership Center (MLLC) at the University of Missouri. The School Culture Survey provides insight about the shared values and beliefs, as well as the
patterns of behavior and the relationships in the school environment. Each factor of the survey measures a unique aspect of the school's culture. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the culture subscales are: (1) Collaborative Leadership .910, (2) Teacher Collaboration .834, (3) Professional Development .821, (4) Collegial Support .867, (5) Unity of Purpose .796, and (6) Learning Partnerships .658.

The School Culture Survey is used to measure six aspects of school culture. The instrument is composed of six subscales, which measure the following:

1. **Collaborative Leadership** measures the degree to which the school leaders can establish and maintain various collaborative relationships with the school staff.

2. **Teacher Collaboration** measures the degree to which teachers engage in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school.

3. **Professional Development** measures the degree to which teachers value continuous personal development and school-wide improvement.

4. **Collegial Support** measures the degree to which teachers work together effectively.

5. **Unity of Purpose** measures the degree to which teachers work toward a common mission for the school and,

6. **Learning Partnerships** measures the degree to which teachers, parents, and students work together for the common good of the student (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997).
Respondents were asked to rate the degree that the 35 items posed describe the conditions at their school. Each statement was rated on the following Likert scale:
1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, and 5=Strongly Agree.

Inviting School Safety Survey (ISSS)

The Inviting School Safety Survey (ISSS) (Lehr and Purkey, 1996) is a 50-item instrument. The items chosen focus on issues of safety and the absence of fear in the school. It is believed that the degree of fear that students have is directly related, in most cases, to the actual level of danger that they are facing when they attend school. This study of safety is conducted by the use of subscales that measure fear levels and comfort feelings. The ISSS contains five of these subscales.

According to Lehr and Purkey, the ISSS focuses on identifying school staff (people) and practices (places, policies, programs, and processes). The Inviting School Safety Survey centers on four guiding principles of respect, trust, optimism, and internationality. The Inviting School Safety Survey proposes that the five areas of people, places, policies, programs, and processes create the environmental framework in the schools in which student behavior is affected, and therefore are related to how safe the school is and what kind of culture the students perceive their school to have.

For each of the four identified factors, reliability was computed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The Cronbach alphas for each subscale are: (1) Valuing influence of teachers and staff [people] (alpha = .73), (2) Feelings of fear and lack of safety [places, people] (alpha = .61), (3) Stressors and daily discomforts [policies] (alpha = .64), and (4) Positive attitude toward school environment and school community [processes] (alpha =
.66) (Shoffner & Vacc, 1999). This instrument is composed of five subscales that measure the following:

1. The component of the model related to people assesses respect and caring
2. Places relates to the physical aspect of the school
3. Policies refers to rules and regulations
4. Programs refers to preventive programs that emphasize nonviolent means of negotiation and,
5. Processes refers to values and attitudes of school staff

A Likert-scale was used to record the range of response choices from 1 (strongly agree to 5 (strongly disagree).

Context of the Study

This study was conducted in a metropolitan school district in the Southwestern section of the United States. The sample is restricted to schools serving students in Kindergarten through 5th grade, and cannot be used to generalize in middle and high schools.

Enrollment for the last five years in this metropolitan district has grown from 14,503 in 1999 to 15,491 in 2003. Ethnicity totals for this district are as follows: (1) Hispanic 85.4%, (2) White 7.5%, (3) Native American 4.3%, (4) Black 2.1%, and (5) Asian 0.6%. Special Education enrollment has increased from 12.6% in 1999 to current enrollment of 14.6% in 2003. The mobility rate for this district is between 37.1% and 34.9%.
The ethnicity of certified instructional staff is: (1) Hispanic 78.9% (2) White 19.7%, (3) Native American 0.6%, (4) Black 0.6%, and (5) Asian 0.2%. Seventy-Seven percent of students in this district qualify for the federal Free/Reduced Meals Program.

As can be seen from the data, the makeup of both students and certified instructional staff in this district is mainly Hispanic. Research by North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (1986) suggests that schools with higher minority percentages may have more trouble with school violence and other safety issues, although this does not hold true in all cases. In cases where this information has been found to be accurate, it has often occurred in inner-city schools where crime is an issue and not in suburban areas where crime and violence have traditionally not been as large a problem.

Data Collection

The researcher submitted a request to conduct research to the school district’s Research, Development, and Assessment department and a human subjects’ approval from the University of Arizona. This request detailed the nature and purpose of the study and the methodology to be used. When approval was granted, the researcher attended a staff meeting at each school, and described the nature and purpose of the study and obtained consent from the teachers to participate. The researcher advised the teachers, both verbally and in writing, that their participation was strictly voluntary, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

The researcher distributed copies of the School Culture Survey (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997), the Inviting School Safety Survey (Lehr & Purkey), and an unmarked envelope to each teacher. The teachers were instructed to complete the surveys, place
them into the envelope and seal the envelope. Teachers not willing to participate were advised that they could withdraw by placing their unmarked surveys into the envelopes and sealing them. Confidentiality of the participants was reasonably assured throughout this process.

Data Analysis

For Ho₁, Pearson-Product Moment correlation analysis was used to determine if any of the six subscales of culture (collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, collegial support, unity of purpose, and learning partnerships) from the School Culture Survey correlate with any of the five Inviting School Safety Scales (people, places, policies, programs, and processes) as measured by the Inviting School Safety Survey.

For Ho₂, ordinary least squares regression was used to identify school culture factors that may predict school safety factors. The six subscales of culture (collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, collegial support, unity of purpose, and learning partnerships) from the School Culture Survey were used as the predictor variables for each of the five Inviting School Safety Scales (people, places, policies, programs, and processes) as measured by the Inviting School Safety Survey.

The independent variables controlled for include: (1) free/reduced lunch, (2) percent of special education students, (3) total number of students, and (4) student mobility rate. These variables were used because they are constants at each of the elementary schools used in the study.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact that school culture has on school safety. As reported by Leithwood (1999) there is very little research on how the leader of the school impacts the culture of the school and in turn how this impacts school safety.

The principle culture subscales were: (1) Leader Collaboration, (2) Teacher Collaboration, (3) Unity of Purpose, (4) Professional Development, (5) Collegial Support, and (6) Learning Partnerships. These culture subscales were measured using the School Culture Survey (SCS). This survey utilizes a Likert-scale to measure teacher perceptions of school culture.

The school safety descriptors utilized include: (1) Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, (2) Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety, (3) Stressors and Daily Discomforts, and (4) Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community. The school safety descriptor subscales were measured using the Inviting School Safety Survey.

Research Questions

The following research question was addressed in the completion of this study

1. Is there a relationship between school culture and school safety?
2. Are there identifiable behaviors within school culture that contribute to school safety?
Hypothesis Testing

This chapter presents the data from the two surveys in table and narrative form. Both forms are utilized to give a complete understanding of the data collected and what it represents. Before this information is presented, however, some background information on the surveys sent out and the data collected will be provided in order to give all necessary and relevant information.

A total of 210 surveys were sent to seven different elementary schools in a southwestern metropolitan United States school district. Of the 210 surveys administered 194 were completed. The remainder of the surveys were either not returned, or returned unanswered, presumably because the selected teachers chose not to participate in the study. Two of the returned surveys were discarded because only one of the two surveys sent to the subjects had been answered or completed properly. All items were categorized on the surveys. After the initial screening process, the items were combined into different subscales.

Study Design

The purpose of the study was to identify the relationship that exists between school culture and school safety. The principle school culture subscales measure (1) Collaborative Leadership, (2) Teacher Collaboration, (3) Professional Development, (4) Collegial Support, (5) Unity of Purpose, and (6) Learning Partnerships. The safety subscales utilized were (1) Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, (2) Feeling of Fear and Lack of Safety, (3) Stressors and Daily Discomforts, and (4) Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community. This relationship was surveyed using the
School Culture Survey (Gruenert & Valentine, 1997) and the Inviting School Safety Survey (Lehr & Purkey, 1997) among seven metropolitan elementary schools.

The School Culture Survey was administered in this study to attain descriptors of these schools. The responses given by the subjects were used as a measure to determine the level of agreement to certain aspects of the school culture. Participants marked the extent to which they agreed, or disagreed to statements organized under five categories of questions.

To address the research questions 2 hypotheses were tested in this study.

$H_{01}$. There are no statistically significant correlations between school culture subscales and school safety subscales.

$H_{02}$. There are no statistically significant predictive relationships for the school culture subscales with each of the school safety subscales.

The first research question: Is there a relationship between school culture and school safety is linked with a corresponding hypothesis: There are no statistically significant correlations between school culture subscales and school safety subscales. For $H_{01}$, a Pearson-Product Moment correlation analysis was used to determine if any of the six subscales of culture (collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, collegial support, unity of purpose, and learning partnerships) from the School Culture Survey correlate with the five Inviting School Safety subscales (Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety, Stressors and Daily Discomforts, and Positive Attitude Toward School Environment).
Pearson-Product Moment correlation coefficient was utilized and a .05 level of significance was established for all correlations. A correlation matrix was developed to show the relationships. To describe the degree of relationships, a correlational coefficient of .50 represents a large Effect Size, a .30 represents a medium Effect Size, and a .10 small Effect Size (Cohen, 1988).

Results of the analysis are provided below. The results illustrate the teacher’s p-scores on each of the six categories.

Table 1

| Correlational Relationship Between School Culture Subscales and School Safety |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                | Valuing Influence | Feelings of Fear and Lack | Stressors and Daily Discomforts | Positive Attitude Toward School & Environment |
| Collaborative                  | .614            | -0.213          | -0.320          | .430           |
| Leadership                     | p=.000**        | p=.030*         | p=.000**        | p=.000**       |
| Teacher                        | .412            | -0.037          | -0.259          | .386           |
| Collaboration                  | p=.000**        | p=.585          | p=.001*         | p=.000**       |
| Professional                   | .618            | -0.141          | -0.249          | .285           |
| Development                    | p=.000**        | p=.246          | p=.000**        | p=.000**       |
| Collegial                      | .582            | -0.181          | -0.268          | .398           |
| Support                        | p=.000**        | p=.038*         | p=.000**        | p=.000**       |
| Unity of Purpose               | .583            | -0.342          | -0.304          | .354           |
|                                | p=.000**        | p=.002**        | p=.000**        | p=.000**       |
| Learning                       | .594            | -0.389          | -0.278          | 0.428          |
| Partnerships                   | p=.000**        | p=.000**        | p=.000**        | p=.000**       |

*p<.05  **p<.01
Collaborative Leadership correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .614 (p<.01). Collaborative Leadership measures the degree to which the school leaders can establish and maintain various collaborative relationships with the school staff.

Teacher Collaboration correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a medium Effect Size of .412 (p<.01). Teacher Collaboration measures the degree to which teachers engage in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school.

Professional Development correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .618 (p<.01). Professional Development measures the degree to which teachers value continuous personal development and school-wide improvement.

Collegial Support correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a small Effect Size of -0.181 (p<.05). Collegial Support measures the degree to which teachers work together effectively.

Unity of Purpose correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .583 (p<.01). Unity of Purpose measures the degree to which teachers work together effectively.

Learning Partnerships correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .594 (p<.01). Learning Partnerships measures the degree to which teachers, parents, and students work together for the common good of the student.
Collaborative Leadership and Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety had a small Effect Size of $-0.213$ ($p<.05$). In schools where teachers gave a high rating to the culture subscale of Collaborative Leadership the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety decreased.

Teacher Collaboration did not correlate with Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety.

Professional Development failed to correlate with the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety and had a small Effect Size of $-0.141$.

Collegial Support and Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety had a small Effect Size of $-0.181$ ($p<.05$). In schools where teachers gave a high rating to the culture subscale of Collaborative Leadership the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety decreased.

Unity of Purpose had a medium Effect Size of $-0.342$ ($p<.01$). Where teachers rated the culture factor of Unity of Purpose high, the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety decreased.

The culture subscale of Learning Partnerships had a medium Effect Size of $-0.389$ ($p<.01$) on the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety.

Collaborative Leadership had a medium effect Size of $-0.320$ ($p<.01$) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

Teacher Collaboration had a Small Effect Size of $-0.259$ ($p<.05$) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

Professional Development had a Small Effect Size $-0.249$ ($p<.01$) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.
Collegial Support had a Small Effect Size –0.268 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

Unity of Purpose had a Medium Effect Size –0.304 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

Learning Partnerships had a Small Effect Size –0.278 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

Collaborative Leadership had a Medium Effect Size .430 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

Teacher Collaboration had a Medium Effect Size .386 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

Professional Development had a Small Effect Size .285 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

Collegial Support had a Medium Effect Size .398 (p<.05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

Unity of Purpose had a Medium Effect Size .354 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

Learning Partnerships had a Medium Effect Size .428 (p<.01) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

The second research question was: Are there identifiable behaviors within school culture that contribute to safety? The corresponding hypothesis was: There are no statistically significant predictive relationships for the school culture subscales with each of the school safety subscales.
For $H_0^2$ (Ordinary Least Squares Regression) was used to identify school culture factors that may predict school safety factors. A regression analysis allows the control of variables and then can be generalized to other populations. The subscales of questions are collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, unity of purpose, professional development, collegial support, and learning partnerships. A five-point Likert scale was chosen and used to determine the level of agreement each participant selected on the survey’s 35 statements covering the six categories mentioned previously. Each of the choices of answers on the Likert-scale utilized was given a numerical value. A mean score was tabulated on each of the five categories of questions as well as each statement within the six categories. The closer the mean score was to 1.00 on each category, the higher the level of the participant’s agreement with the item presented to them. The survey was used to substantiate data collection. The six subscales of culture: (Collaborative Leadership, Teacher Collaboration, Professional Development, Collegial Support, Unity of Purpose, and Learning Partnerships) from the School Culture Survey were used as the predictor variables for each of the five Inviting School Safety Scales (Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety, Stressors and Daily Discomforts, and Positive Attitude Towards School Environment) as measured by the Inviting School Safety Survey. Ordinary Least Squared Regression was used to create data tables and analyze the data.
Table 2

Adjusted R Square for Culture Factors on Safety Factors Controlling for: Free/Reduced Lunch, Special Education, Number of Students, Transfer out of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Factor</th>
<th>Valuing Influence of Teachers</th>
<th>Feelings of Fear &amp; Lack of Safety</th>
<th>Daily Stressors and Daily Discomforts</th>
<th>Positive Attitude Towards School Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Support</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Purpose</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used.

When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 44.1% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership.
Table 3

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collaborative Leadership on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>10.128</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-8.335</td>
<td>-4.254</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-1.917</td>
<td>-.2328</td>
<td>.021 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>-1.196</td>
<td>.233 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>12.196</td>
<td>4.780</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.700</td>
<td>6.067</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .441

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 38.3% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration.
Table 4

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of 
Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuing Influence of Teacher and Staff</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>8.828</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-6.160</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed. Students</td>
<td>-3.530E-02</td>
<td>-4.117</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.305E-03</td>
<td>-3.364</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>7.364</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.760</td>
<td>8.828</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square  .383
N  194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 36.3% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose.
Table 5

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Unity of Purpose on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Purpose</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>3.197</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free /Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-4.401E-02</td>
<td>-1.978</td>
<td>.049 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed. Students</td>
<td>-1.333E-02</td>
<td>-1.487</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>-5.365E-04</td>
<td>-1.397</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out of School</td>
<td>7.790E-02</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>.008  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.254</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.002  **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square .363

* p<.05 ** p<.01

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the Culture Factor of Professional Development on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 50.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional Development.
Table 6

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Professional Development on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>11.714</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-8.567E-02</td>
<td>-4.638</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed. Students</td>
<td>-2.64E-02</td>
<td>-3.424</td>
<td>.001  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.013E-03</td>
<td>-2.956</td>
<td>.004  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>5.921</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.438</td>
<td>6.175</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .500

N 194

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collegial Support on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teacher and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 42.9% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support.
Table 7

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collegial Support on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Support</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>9.821</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-9.489E-02</td>
<td>-4.821</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-2.140E-02</td>
<td>-2.579</td>
<td>.011  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-3.927E-04</td>
<td>-1.079</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>5.106</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.539</td>
<td>6.886</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.05  **p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .429

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Learning Partnerships on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 35.8% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships.
Table 8

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Learning Partnerships on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>8.049</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-4.866E-02</td>
<td>-2.193</td>
<td>.030 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-1.975E-03</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.710E-04</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>6.058E-02</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>.045 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.071</td>
<td>3.932</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05    ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square  .358

N  194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 12.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership.
Table 9

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collaborative Leadership on the Safety Factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-2.184</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Free/Reduced Lunch         | 7.606E-02 | 2.982 | .003  **
| % of Spec. Ed.             | 2.988E-02 | 2.785 | .006  **
| Total Number of Students   | -3.308E-04 | -.705 | .481  |
| Student Mobility Rate      | -.112   | -3.372| .001  **
| Constant                   | -.1.743 | -1.213| .227  |

* *p<.05  **p<.01

**Adjusted R-Square**  .125

**N 194**

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 10.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration.
Table 10

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Teacher Collaboration
on the Safety Factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>-3.601E-02</td>
<td>-.547</td>
<td>.585 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>8.482E-02</td>
<td>3.304</td>
<td>.001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>3.360E-02</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>.002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-2.369E-04</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-3.796</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.666</td>
<td>-1.923</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .105

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 15.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose.
Table 11

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Unity of Purpose on the Safety Factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Purpose</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>-3.208</td>
<td>.002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>5.223E-02</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>.052 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>2.486E-02</td>
<td>2.303</td>
<td>.022 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-3.024E-04</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-8.266E-02</td>
<td>-2.374</td>
<td>.019 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.405E-02</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square .150

N 194

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the culture factor of Professional Development on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 11.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional Development.
Table 12

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Professional Development on the Safety Factor of Feeling of Fear and Lack of Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>-8.397E-02</td>
<td>-1.164</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>8.025E-02</td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td>.002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>3.260E-02</td>
<td>3.039</td>
<td>.003 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-2.338E-04</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-3.651</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.193</td>
<td>-1.1516</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05    ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .110
N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collegial Support on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 12.4% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support.
Table 13

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collegial Support on the Safety Factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Support</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-2.085</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>7.918E-02</td>
<td>3.119</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>3.064E-02</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-3.373E-04</td>
<td>-.718</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-3.474</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.954</td>
<td>-1.405</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square .124

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Learning Partnerships on the safety factor of feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 17.5 of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships.
Table 14

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Learning Partnerships on the Safety Factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>-4.053</td>
<td>000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>4.678E-02</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed</td>
<td>1.592E-02</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>.156 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-5.209E-04</td>
<td>-1.136</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-6.142E-02</td>
<td>-1.735</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted R-Square .175

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 17.8% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomfort can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership.
Table 15

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collaborative Leadership on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>-4919</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>1.547E-02</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed</td>
<td>-1.685E-02</td>
<td>-2.165</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.468E-02</td>
<td>-4.317</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-1.386E-02</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>3.244</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05   **p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .178
N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 12.3% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership.
Table 16

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-3.303</td>
<td>0.001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>3.342E-02</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>0.080 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-9.914E-03</td>
<td>-1.246</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.149E-03</td>
<td>-3.194</td>
<td>0.002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-4.456E-02</td>
<td>-1.803</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>1.891</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05 ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .123
N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 19.6% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose.
Table 17

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Unity of Purpose on the Stressors and Daily Discomforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Purpose</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>-5.385</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-1.052E-02</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-2.157E-02</td>
<td>-2.748</td>
<td>.007 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.419E-03</td>
<td>-4.221</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>1.689E-02</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.195</td>
<td>4.464</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05   **p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .196

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Professional Development on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 13.1% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.
Table 18

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Professional Development on the Stressors and Daily Discomforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-3.552</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>2.028E-02</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-1284E-02</td>
<td>-1.621</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.271E-03</td>
<td>-3.616</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-2.651E-02</td>
<td>-1.082</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.954</td>
<td>2.764</td>
<td>.006 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05    ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .131

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collegial Support Leadership on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 14.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support.
Table 19

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collegial Support on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Support</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-3.845</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>2.173E-02</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-1.490E-02</td>
<td>-1.879</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.467E-03</td>
<td>-4.218</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-2.115E-02</td>
<td>-.863</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>.008 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.05  **p<.01

Adjusted R-Square . 140

N  194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the Culture Factor of Learning Partnerships on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 25.4% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships.
Table 20

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Learning Partnerships on the Stressors and Daily Discomforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>-6.795</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-1.611E-02</td>
<td>-.866</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>-3.198E-02</td>
<td>-4.028</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>-1.679E-03</td>
<td>-5.149</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>4.1000E-02</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.396</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square  .254

*p<.05   **p<.01

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 25.7% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership.
Table 21

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collaborative Leadership on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Leadership</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>7.364</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>2.153E-02</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>2.089E-02</td>
<td>2.424</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>1.452E-03</td>
<td>3.855</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-5.870E-02</td>
<td>-2.125</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square .257

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the Culture Factor of Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 15.6% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration.
Table 22

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>4.996</td>
<td>.000  **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>-8.642E-03</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>9.300E-03</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>9.039E-04</td>
<td>2.197</td>
<td>.029  *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-5.042E-03</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.762</td>
<td>2.354</td>
<td>.020  *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05    ** p<.01

Adjusted R-Square .156

N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 20.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose.
Table 23

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Unity of Purpose**
on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Purpose</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>5.214E-02</td>
<td>2.313</td>
<td>.022 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>2.535E-02</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>.006 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>1.367E-03</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>.001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-9.103E-02</td>
<td>-3.104</td>
<td>.002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.529</td>
<td>-1.134</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted R-Square .205
N 194

* *p<.05 **p<.01

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Professional Development on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 11.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional Development.
Table 24

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Professional Development on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>1.042E-02</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed.</td>
<td>1.359E-02</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>1.184E-03</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility Rate</td>
<td>-3.252E-02</td>
<td>-1.126</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.562</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adjusted R-Square .110

* N 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collegial Support on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 24.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support.
Table 25

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collegial Support on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegial Support</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>6.986</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free /Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>1.312E-02</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed. Students</td>
<td>1.886E-02</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>.031 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>1.470E-03</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out of School</td>
<td>-4.890E-02</td>
<td>-1.822</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square: .240

* p<.05 ** p<.01

N = 194

Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Learning Partnerships on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 36.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships.
Table 26

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Learning Partnerships on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnerships</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>9.786</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free /Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>6.910E-02</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>.001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Spec. Ed. Students</td>
<td>4.371E-02</td>
<td>5.121</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>1.772E-03</td>
<td>5.055</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out of School</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-5.153</td>
<td>.000 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.570</td>
<td>-2.210</td>
<td>.028 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R-Square .365

N 194

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 was rejected because a statistical significant correlation was found among the school culture subscales and the school safety subscales. Hypothesis 2 was rejected because there were significant predictive relationships for the School Culture Survey with the Inviting School Safety Survey when controlling variables.
Summary

The next chapter will further elaborate on the varied and important themes emerging from the data collection and analysis. Chapter Five presents the conclusions and recommendations resulting from this study. The information presented in Chapter Five will be of particular interest to future researchers because it ties all of the provided information together and gives the researcher's interpretations of the data that were collected and analyzed as well as what the researcher would recommend for future studies into this area or related areas of school safety and school culture.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

Culture is an essential ingredient in an educational environment that helps school leaders better understand their own school’s unwritten rules and traditions, norms, and expectations that seem to permeate everything (Deal & Peterson, 1999). School cultures are complex webs of traditions and rituals that have been built up over time as teachers, students, parents, and administrators work together and deal with crises and accomplishments (Schein, 1992).

Sergiovanni (2000) addressed school culture by noting that schools with character have unique cultures. Schools with unique cultures have developed a common understanding of their purposes. Sergiovanni contends that schools need leadership that is sensitive to the unique values, beliefs, needs, and wishes of their school, which define their schools as special places.

Studies by Purkey (1999) contend that safety for everybody and everything in and around schools is also a core ingredient in an educational environment. A report by School Violence (1999) contends that effective leaders create effective schools that are safe and resilient to violence and other risks and promote resiliency in students.

School culture is often reflected in the realities that drive the daily business of school life. Although school seems to be only a place for learning, there is a varied and fascinating culture to the school environment, and often much of the learning that takes place does not come from textbooks.
This culture can vary from school to school, as the makeup of the people in each school is certainly different. However, it appears that all schools do have some environmental factors in common and this is indicative of the fact that there is a culture that is tied into schools alone and not to other businesses that also deal with large numbers of people on a daily basis.

Although every aspect of school life cannot be examined, a vast number of elements were considered in this study. According to Schein (1992), “every facet of a group’s life produces artifacts, creating a problem of classification...different [cultural] observers choose to report on different sorts of artifacts” (p. 18). Data collection has been a major tool in the development of this study, as the collection of data from the schools is the only way to help the researcher validate past research and work to develop new ideas and information that others can build upon.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the existing and significant relationship between school culture and school safety. The Center for Effective Schools (2001) introduced the notion that no two schools are alike. Schools, they pointed out, just as the people within them, have different characteristics. These characteristics create what is known as the culture of the school.

These differences in characteristics between schools make the problem particularly difficult to correct, because what works in one school may not work in another. However, when particular ties between school culture and school safety are identified and studied, correlations can be made between school culture and school safety
issues. With this information, school leaders can move forward with interventions on how to change or improve the culture of a school in order to impact school safety issues (Eccles, et al., 1993).

The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship that exists between school culture and school safety. Since it has been suggested that this relationship exists, it now becomes necessary to identify this relationship more specifically and provide details that have previously not been discussed or determined. Doing this will allow continued research and exploration into this topic, while also allowing schools to work toward creating safer environments.

The principle culture factors in this study are: (1) collaborative leadership, (2) teacher collaboration, (3) professional development, (4) collegial support, (5) unity of purpose, and (6) learning partnerships. These principle school culture factors were measured using the School Culture Survey (SCS). This survey utilized a Likert-scale to measure school culture as well as other factors important to the success of a school.

The school safety factor descriptors employed in this study include: (1) valuing influence of teachers and staff, (2) feeling of fear and lack of safety, (3) stressors and daily discomforts, and (4) positive attitude toward school environment. The school safety factors were measured using the Inviting School Safety Survey (ISSS). This survey utilized a Likert-scale to measure school safety.

Research Questions

The research questions posed were:

1. Is there a relationship between school culture and school safety?
2. Are there identifiable behaviors within school culture that contribute to safety?

**Hypotheses**

To address the research questions the following hypotheses were tested in this study:

- **H01.** There were no statistically significant correlations between school culture subscales and the school safety subscales.
- **H02.** There are no statistically significant predictive relationships for the school culture subscales with each of the school safety subscales.

**Summary of Findings**

The following is a list of findings from this study.

1. Collaborative Leadership correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .614 (p > .05). In schools where teachers rated Collaborative Leadership high it correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a high Effect Size of .614 (p < .05). Collaborative Leadership measures the degree to which the school leaders can establish and maintain various collaborative relationships with the school staff.

2. Teacher Collaboration correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a medium Effect Size of .412 (p < .05). Teacher Collaboration measures the degree to which teachers engage in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school.
3. Professional Development correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .618 (p< .05). Professional Development measures the degree to which teachers value continuous personal development and school-wide improvement.

4. Collegial Support correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .582 (p< .05). Collegial Support measures the degree to which teachers work together effectively.

5. Unity of Purpose correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect Size of .583 (p< .05). Unity of Purpose measures the degree to which teachers work together effectively.

6. Learning Partnerships correlated significantly with Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff, at a large Effect size of .594 (p< .05). Learning Partnerships measures the degree to which teachers, parents, and students work together for the common good of the student.

7. Collaborative Leadership and Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety had a small Effect Size of -0.213 (p<.05). In schools where teachers gave a low rating to the culture subscale of Collaborative Leadership the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety failed to correlate.

8. Teacher Collaboration had a small Effect Size of -0.037 (p< .05). Where teachers rated the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration low, the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety failed to correlate.
9. Professional Development failed to correlate with the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety and had a small Effect Size of \(-0.141\) (p< .05).

10. Collegial Support failed to correlate with the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety with a small Effect Size of \(-0.181\) (p< .05).

11. Unity of Purpose had a medium Effect Size of \(-0.342\) (p< .05). Where teachers rated the culture factor of Unity of Purpose low, the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety decreased.

12. The culture subscale of Learning Partnerships had a medium Effect Size of \(-0.389\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety.

13. Collaborative Leadership had a medium Effect Size of \(-0.320\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

14. Teacher Collaboration had a small Effect Size of \(-0.259\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

15. Professional Development had a small Effect Size \(-0.249\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

16. Collegial Support had a small Effect Size \(-0.268\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

17. Unity of Purpose had a medium Effect Size \(-0.304\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.

18. Learning Partnerships had a small Effect Size \(-0.278\) (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Stressors and Daily Discomforts.
19. Collaborative Leadership had a medium Effect Size .430 (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

20. Teacher Collaboration had a medium Effect Size .386 (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

21. Professional Development had a small Effect Size .285 (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

22. Collegial Support had a medium Effect Size .398 (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

23. Unity of Purpose had a medium Effect Size .354 (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

24. Learning Partnerships had a medium Effect Size .428 (p< .05) on the safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community.

25. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 44.1% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership. If school leaders use their energy on the Culture factor of Collaborative Leadership (school leaders establish and maintain shared relationships with school staff as they work jointly, especially in
intellectual efforts such as solving problems and setting goals) they can impact the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff (relates to respect and caring).

26. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 38.3% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration. If school leaders use their energy on the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration (teachers engaging in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision) they can impact the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff (relates to respect and caring).

27. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 36.3% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose. If school leaders use their energy on the culture factor of Unity of Purpose (teachers working together toward a common mission for their school
and for their students) they can impact the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff (relates to respect and caring).

28. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the Culture Factor of Professional Development on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 50.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional Development. If school leaders use their energy on the culture factor of Professional Development (teachers valuing continuous personal development and school-wide improvement) they can impact the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff (relates to respect and caring).

29. Ordinary Least Squares Regression of the Culture Factor of Collegial Support on the Safety Factor of Valuing Influence of Teacher and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 42.9% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support. This indicates that if school leaders use their energy on the culture factor of Collegial Support (teachers working together effectively to achieve a
common goal or end) they can impact the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff (relates to respect and caring).

30. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Learning Partnerships on the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 35.8% of the variance in the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships. If school leaders use their energy on the culture factor of Learning Partnership (teachers, parents, and students working together for the common good of the student) they can impact the safety factor of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff (relates to respect and caring).

31. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 12.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership.

32. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership (school leaders establishing and maintaining shared relationships with school staff as they work jointly especially in intellectual
efforts such as solving problems and setting goals) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety (relates to how safe staff feels at school).

33. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 10.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration (teachers engaging in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school and working together to achieve common goals and ideals) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety (relates to how safe staff feels at school).

34. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 15.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Unity of
Purpose (teachers working together toward a common mission for their school and for their students) because they cannot impact the safety factor Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety (relates to how safe the staffs feels at school).

35. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Professional Development on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 11.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional Development. School leaders should not use their energy on the culture factor of Professional Development (teachers valuing continuous personal development and school-wide improvement) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety (relates to how safe staff feels at school).

36. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collegial Support on the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 12.4% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Collegial Support (teachers working together effectively to achieve common
goal or end) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety (relates to how safe staff feels at school).

37. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Learning Partnerships on the safety factor of feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 17.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Learning Partnerships (teachers, parents, and students working together for the common good of the student) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety (relates to how safe staff feels at school).

38. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 17.8% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomfort can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership. If school leaders invest some energy in the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership (school leaders establishing and maintaining shared relationships with school staff as they work jointly, especially in intellectual efforts such as
solving problems and setting goals), they can have some impact on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts (relates to the school’s rules and regulations).

39. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 12.3% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration (teachers engaging in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school and working together to achieve common goals and ideals) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts (relates to the rules and regulations of the school).

40. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 19.6% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose. If school leaders invest some energy in the culture factor of Unity of Purpose
(teachers working together toward a common mission for their school and or their students) they can impact the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts (relates to the school's rules and regulations).

41. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Professional Development on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 13.1% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional Development. School leaders should not invest energy in the culture factor of Professional Development (teachers valuing continuous personal development and school-wide improvement) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts (relates to the schools rules and regulations).

42. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collegial Support on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 14.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support. School leaders should not use much energy in the culture factor of Collegial Support (teachers working together effectively to achieve a common goal or
end) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts (relates to the school’s rules and regulations).

43. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the Culture Factor of Learning Partnerships on the Safety Factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted $r$-square indicates that 25.4% of the variance in the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships. If school leaders invest some of their energy in the culture factor of Learning Partnership (teachers, parents, and students working together for the common good of the student) they can have some impact on the safety factor of Stressors and Daily Discomforts (relates to the school’s rules and regulations).

44. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted $r$-square indicates that 25.7% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership. If a school leader invests energy in the culture factor of Collaborative Leadership (school leaders establishing and
maintaining shared relationships with school staff as they work jointly, especially in intellectual efforts such as solving problems and setting goals) they can impact the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community (the pride that staff show toward school and community).

45. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the Culture Factor of Teacher Collaboration on the Safety Factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 15.6% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration. School leaders should not invest energy in the culture factor of Teacher Collaboration (teachers engaging in constructive dialogue that furthers the educational vision of the school and working together to achieve common goals and ideals) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community (relates to the pride staff show toward their school and community).

46. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Unity of Purpose on the Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the
adjusted r-square indicates that 20.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Unity of Purpose. If a school leader invests energy in culture factor of Unity of Purpose (teachers working together toward a common mission for their school and for their students) they can impact the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community (relates to the pride staff show toward their school and community).

47. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Professional Development on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 11.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Professional. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Professional Development (teachers valuing continuous personal development and school-wide improvement) because they cannot impact the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School and Community (relates to the pride staff show toward the school and community).

48. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Collegial Support on the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and
Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 24.0% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community (relates to the pride staff show toward the school and community) can be attributed to the culture factor of Collegial Support. School leaders should not use their energies on the culture factor of Collegial Support (teachers working together effectively to achieve a common goal or end), because they cannot impact the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School and Community.

49. Ordinary Least Squared Regression of the culture factor of Learning Partnerships on the safety factor of Staff Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community was used. When controlling for free and reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, total number of students, and student mobility, the adjusted r-square indicates that 36.5% of the variance in the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community can be attributed to the culture factor of Learning Partnerships. If school leaders invest energy in the culture factor of Learning Partnerships (teachers, parents, and students working together for the common good of the student) they can impact the safety factor of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community (relates to the pride staff shows toward school and community).
**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis 1 was rejected because a statistically significant correlation was found to exist between the school culture subscales and the school safety scales. To establish this relationship a correlation analysis (Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Analysis) was used. The findings from this analysis suggest that a relationship does exist.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected because a significant predictive relationship was found to exist between the school culture subscales and the school safety scales. To identify school culture factors that predicted school safety factors an ordinary least squares regression was used.

**Discussion of the Findings**

Analyzing the data and substantiating this relationship is essential because of the increase of school shootings, metal detectors in some schools, and other instances that indicate school violence is on the rise. Many teachers, parents, and students are still highly concerned that they or their child might be the next aggressor or victim.

Concern over this problem will not go away, and it would appear that teachers and students alike would like to find some way of alleviating the stress that most of them feel when they arrive at school and are concerned that they might be in danger. The analyses from this study suggest that there are ways of making schools safer and ways of working to ensure the safety and protection of students and teachers everywhere.

The analyses from this study indicate that there are specific behaviors within the culture of schools that do contribute to the safety of the students and teachers within.
From the regression analyses in this study it would appear that most teachers and administrators believe that school culture and school safety are directly tied together. These same individuals would also seem to agree that school violence is more prevalent in schools where the culture tends to be unstable. Other information indicated by surveys of teachers and administrators show that there are many factors that make up the culture of a school, and any one of these factors can become a problem for a school where violence is concerned.

This research and the answer to these research questions can not only specify the predictive factors between school culture and school violence but can also give future researchers an idea of the most important and deciding factors that make the strongest ties between violence and culture.

**Hypotheses**

Ho1 There were no statistically significant correlations between school culture subscales and school safety subscales.

This first hypothesis was rejected. The research prepared in this study, as well as the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 illustrate the correlation between violence and culture in schools. This appears to be an issue that is not limited to one school, or to one type of school. Rather, it seems to be widespread, affecting all schools.

For Ho1, the correlational relationship among teachers' perceptions of school culture subscales with school safety subscales shows a high level of correlation. The correlation among the school culture subscales of Collaborative Leadership, Teacher Collaboration, Professional Development, Collegial Support, Unity of Purpose and
Learning Partnership and the school safety subscales of Valuing Influence of Teachers &
Staff, Stressors and Daily Discomforts, Positive Attitude Toward School Environment
and Community correlated at a high level (p<.01). This high level of correlation would
suggest that school leaders should invest their energies in these areas if they want to
improve the safety of their school.

Correlation analysis of the school safety subscale Feelings of Fear and Lack of
Safety with the six school culture subscales indicate a low correlation: .609 for Teacher
Collaboration, .049 for Professional Development, and .011 for Collegial Support. This
low correlation may be, as some literature suggests, because students and staff are
equating community safety issues with school safety issues. The analysis from this study
indicates that more research needs to be conducted into the safety issue of Feelings of
Fear and Lack of Safety.

Research and literature reviews indicate that schools with the best, most relaxed,
and most cohesive culture seem to have the least violence. Conversely, schools that do
not have a cohesive culture are more prone to violent acts by their students. This seems
to be true for schools full of young children, as indicated by the surveys and research.
Both the review of the literature and the information collected during this study would
indicate that school culture and safety are linked, and that one will affect the other. This
should be of interest to researchers because it helps to give insight into behavioral
problems in schools, and it helps to awaken awareness into what some possible causes
and cures might be. This information will be helpful for present and future researchers,
and also for those that work in the school environment and are interested in finding some ways to make their school a safer place.

H02 There are no statistically significant predictive relationships for the school culture subscales with each of the school safety subscales.

This hypothesis was rejected. There are statistically predictive relationships that work to contribute to the safety of a school. These contributing factors are all part of the culture that makes up a school, and this culture, as has been mentioned, has a direct effect on the safety that the faculty and students feel. These predictive relationships are apparent in the regression summary.

For H02, ordinary least squares regression was used to identify school culture factors that could predict school safety factors. Ordinary least squares regression was used to assess the amount of variance that could be attributed to each subscale. This resulted in 24 analyses (see Tables 3 through 26). The predictive relationship between teachers’ perceptions on school culture subscales with school safety subscales, when controlling for SES, percent of special education students, mobility rate and number of students show a high level of predictability. Of the twenty-four regression analyses that were run, the six school culture subscales with the school safety subscale of Valuing Influence of Teachers and Staff show a significant predictive relationship accounting for variances from 50% to 35.8%. The six school culture subscales show a significant predictive relationship with the school safety subscale of Positive Attitude Toward School Environment and Community at .365 to .257. Six school culture subscales with the school safety subscales of Stressors and Daily Discomforts show predictive
relationships of .254 to .123. The school safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety show a very low level of predictive relationship.

If school leaders want to improve the school safety of their schools they would be wise to use their energy in the areas that show the greatest predictive relationships. Since the school safety subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety do not show predictive relationships, it is suggested that further research needs to be conducted in this area. According to this study, investing energy in the subscale of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety would not impact safety factors. This might indicate, as some research suggests, that students and staff bring these feelings from the surrounding community.

Some larger schools in high crime areas have metal detectors and armed guards, who are often called school resource officers. Whatever their title, these men and women are charged with protecting children and adults from violence while they attend school. Having these individuals, as well as metal detectors and other safety plans, often do not make students and faculty feel any safer than they did before measures were taken (Purkey, 1999).

This may be due to the fact that having these kinds of safety measures in place is indicative that there is a definite safety problem in the school, and it can no longer be overlooked. This can work toward making students and teachers feel less safe in their schools because they are constantly reminded of the problems that the school faces.

Specific factors in schools are often linked to safety issues or problems with violence. These factors include drugs, alcohol, weapons, and racial, gender, or other prejudices among students and even faculty.
There is evidence to support the belief that culture and safety are related when it comes to schools, and many of the participants of the study seem to echo that sentiment in their answers to the surveys. This information is important because it correlates with some of the past research done on the subject.

It is also helpful for those that work in school settings now, to know that they are not alone. Perhaps this research will give some indications of how these individuals can work toward changing the culture in their schools and promoting a safe environment. It is realized that not all of a school’s culture can be changed. There will always be some measure of tension between individuals that are different from one another, but a more cohesive culture should be the goal. This culture would lower the rate of violence in the school and promote an air of safety and responsibility that many students and faculty would find much more comfortable.

Violence, according to Hill, et al. (1990) is prevalent and pervasive in our culture. Schools offer a perfect target for random violence for several reasons: (1) schools have heavy concentrations of people, (2) school employees are generally trusting, helpful and open people, (3) elementary schools especially, have many defenseless children and often few adult males, (4) schools are commonly wide open to the public, (5) schools have many doors, with access in many directions, (6) campuses are often expansive, with many square feet of hallways, (7) landscaping around buildings is often advantageous to concealment, and (8) security guards and systems are reserved for evenings, or only for schools in “tough” neighborhoods.
Creating safe schools begins with principals who are willing to address the problem before tragedy occurs. According to Hill, it is the leader of a school who sets the expectations and behaviors that reject violence. This information is important if school leaders are interested in a safe and secure environment for students.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study provides a framework for studying school safety variables and their impact on school culture factors. The results indicate where school leaders should invest their energy to have the most positive effect on school safety.

This study includes quantitative data indicating the high correlation and predictive power that school culture has on school safety. This study affords an opportunity for future researchers to find school culture issues that will affect the school safety issue of Feelings of Fear and Lack of Safety. How can one separate community fears from the safety that can be provided in school? If schools and communities work together, can they find solutions to reduce the feelings of fear and lack of safety that staff and students bring into the school?

How does leadership fit into the picture? Sergiovanni (2000) contends that leaders in effective schools are sensitive to the needs, values, beliefs, and wishes of their communities. Effective School Research (1997) points to the fact that the key to creating and sustaining high academic achieving schools is by using a comprehensive approach to creating a culture of safety and order. This study should provide some insight into this critical issue of how culture relates to safety.
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I certify that I have carefully explained the nature and purpose, the demands, benefits, and risks involved with participating in this research study to the person who is signing this consent form, and that his/her signature is legally valid. I have answered any questions that have been raised and to the best of my knowledge, he/she understands fully. No medical problem, language or emotional barrier precludes this understanding.
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APPENDIX F

SCHOOL CULTURE SURVEY
To what degree do these statements describe the conditions at your school?

Rate each statement on the following scale:

1=Strongly Disagree  2=Disagree  3=Neutral  4=Agree  5=Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teachers utilize professional networks to obtain information and resources for classroom instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Leaders value teachers' ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teachers have opportunities for dialogue and planning across grades and subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teachers trust each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Teachers support the mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Teachers and parents have common expectations for student performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Leaders in this school trust the professional judgments of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Teachers spend considerable time planning together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Teachers regularly seek ideas from seminars, colleagues, and conferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Teachers are willing to help out whenever there is a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Leaders take time to praise teachers that perform well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The school mission provides a clear sense of direction for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Parents trust teachers' professional judgments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Teachers are involved in the decision-making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Teachers take time to observe each other teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Professional development is valued by the faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Teachers' ideas are valued by other teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Leaders in our school facilitate teachers working together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Teachers understand the mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Teachers are kept informed on current issues in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Teachers and parents communicate frequently about student performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My involvement in policy or decision making is taken seriously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Teachers are generally aware of what other teachers are teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Teachers maintain a current knowledge base about the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Teachers work cooperatively in groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Teachers are rewarded for experimenting with new ideas and techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>The school mission statement reflects the values of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Leaders support risk-taking and innovation in teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Teachers work together to develop and evaluate programs and projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The faculty values school improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Teaching performance reflects the mission of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Administrators protect instruction and planning time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Teaching practice disagreements are voiced openly and discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to share ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Students generally accept responsibility for their schooling, for example they engage mentally in class and complete homework assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

SCHOOL SAFETY SURVEY
To what degree do these statements describe the conditions at your school?

Rate each statement on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Everyone has pride in this school.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are hidden areas in the school where students hang out.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classrooms in this school are ugly.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Certain students are not included in activities at this school.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student suspensions are very rare in this school.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parents are actively involved in school events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers use a lot of rewards, such as prizes and tickets, to get</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers have reasonable goals for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rules in this school are fair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School counselors play an important part in this school's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students dread coming to this school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students know how to solve conflicts nonviolently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Guidance counseling is available to help all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students in this school are afraid to go to the restroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In-school suspensions (ISS) are common in the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Assembly programs are very rare in this school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There are no after-school programs for students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers put too much stress on testing of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Students help to make school policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There is equal opportunity for all students to be involved in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There are places in this school where students do not feel safe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Gangs are a problem in this school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Vandalism is a problem in this school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lehr & Purkey, 1997 - Use by written permission only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Teachers use a variety of methods to help students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>There is too much competition in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Teachers maintain discipline by getting students interested in learning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Teachers value student effort rather than ability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Students are often bored in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Students in this school try to stop vandalism when they see it happening.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>People help each other in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Differences among people in this school are honored.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Racism is a problem in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>A lot of things get stolen in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Students get along well in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Adults respect students' feelings in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Teachers develop caring relationships with students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>All the students are valued in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Teachers grade students' work unfairly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Teachers spend a lot of time with grade books and averaging grades.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>The restrooms in this school are clean.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Many students receive failing grades in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>There are a lot of classroom interruptions in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Everyone takes pride in the appearance of this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>There are lots of warning signs posted around this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Students sometimes bring weapons to school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Fighting is a way some problems are solved in this school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>The school grounds look nice.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Teachers yell at students a lot.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Signs in this school are positive.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>The school is well-lighted for afternoon and evening activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PERMISSION TO USE THE SCHOOL CULTURE SURVEY
December 8, 2001

Ms. Bass:

As a research associate affiliated with the Middle Level Leadership Center, I grant you permission to use the School Culture Survey in your dissertation research.

Sincerely,

David M. Quinn, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
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PERMISSION TO USE THE SCHOOL SAFETY SURVEY
December 11, 2001

Ruth Bass
P.O. Box 32272
Tucson, AZ
85751

Dear Ms. Bass:

You have my permission to use the Inviting School Safety Survey in your research for your dissertation.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Dr. William Purkey, Professor
Dept. of Counselor Education
School of Education
P.O. Box 26171
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