

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL



Volume 1 Number 2
January - December 1997



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

*Department of Educational Foundations,
Leadership, and Technology*

Department of Educational Foundations,
Leadership, and Technology
College of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36849
334.844.4460

J. R. Llanes, Auburn University

WALKING THE TALK: THE HOLMES GROUP PRINCIPLES IN ACTION

[Tommie Toner](#), Jose M. Aybar, and Nancy Floyd-Finch

©Copyright CARE University of Texas 1996. All rights are reserved by copyright, except that authors retain intellectual property rights to their articles and may re-publish their articles in other publications. The *Continuous Improvement Monitor* may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-profit use for the purposes of education, research, library reference, or stored or distributed as a public service by any networked computer. Any commercial use of this journal in whole or in part by any means is strictly prohibited without written permission. Any use of this journal in whole or in part, including by authors, should include customary bibliographic citation, including author attribution, date, article title, edition, and electronic retrieval instructions.

Reference as (APA style): Toner, T., Aybar, J. M., Finch, N. F. (January-April1996). "Walking the Talk:" The Holmes Group Principles in Action. *International Journal: Continuous Improvement Monitor*, 1:2. Edinburg, TX, The University of Texas-Pan American, Center for Applied Research in Education. Available: <http://llanes.auburn.edu/cimjournal/Vol1/No2/aybar.pdf>

I. INTRODUCTION

The decline in the quality of U.S. education initiated a review process which culminated in the report *A Nation At Risk* (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). This landmark publication outlined the general problem facing U.S. education and made a series of prescriptive recommendations designed to stem the decline. A number of nationwide educational initiatives have come into being for the purpose of operationalizing the suggested reforms. (See [School Reform Networks](#) on this server.)

Unlike its historical predecessors, this new effort at educational reform was framed in an atmosphere of educational probity, .i.e., there was, and continues to be, widespread publicity and public recognition of the extent of the problem. The national impact of the crisis was repeatedly noted by political figures who correlated the decline of the quality of U.S. education with the loss of U.S. world predominance (Carnegie Task Force, 1986). More importantly, public recognition of the crisis placed U.S. education in the limelight, and in so doing the U.S. educational system now has the onus of response with attendant accountability. The new fiscal crisis in education highlights the need for the reforms. Now there is an increased emphasis on quality and there are less monies available to obtain the desired result, all part of the "new contract." The emphasis on decentralization continues a process already in place wherein the bulk of the responsibility for the operationalizing of the reforms is at the local level.

A goal structure was drafted at the federal level utilizing a serial number of reports on the issue of the status of U.S. education (Carnegie Task Force, 1986; Goodlad, 1984; Holmes, 1986, 1993;Sizer, 1983). The initial approach to implementation was of a voluntary nature, .i.e., implementation of the reforms was left in the hands of the state, school district, and ultimately, local schools. General criteria were developed at the state and school district levels, but it was the local school which was to provide the more concrete and measurable curricular outcomes which the public outcry now required.

It is unclear to what extent the “restructuring” process has been successful since there was, and continues to be, a lack of objective criteria against which to measure the success, or failure, of the new methodologies being employed (Toner, 1993). The general corpus of the restructuring effort was perhaps too amorphous. It was voluntary and lacked assessment guidelines. Innovative successful initiatives (pilot programs) were encouraged, and subsidies were made available on a competitive basis. This notwithstanding, there was/is no baseline against which to measure the programmatic success of the restructuring effort. The quasi-voluntary nature of the restructuring effort has caused practitioners/academicians to observe that

...[T]here’s still no consensus on what [restructuring] is, or what it ought to be. States haven’t yet hit upon a means to build up a local capacity to restructure.... We have various people out there selling their medicines, but we don’t know yet what the medicines will do. (O’Neill, 1990, p. 10)

In light of this, a number of independent, and seemingly, comprehensive approaches have come into being with the idea of providing the restructuring process with a more concise program of action. These initiatives were to build on the ongoing restructuring process *and as such were not implemented in isolation*. They each had different emphasis and varying levels of additional support. They have attempted to provide a cohesive overlay of educational principles to the existing restructuring effort. These initiatives have as their primary purpose the refocusing of the restructuring process utilizing a distinct set of educational principles, techniques, and emphasizing current trends in organizational/bureaucratic efficiency.

Three initiatives which have received particular recognition were: the Holmes Group-Professional Development Schools (Holmes, 1986, 1993); The RAND Study-Induction Schools (Levine and Gendler, 1988; Houston, 1990); and John Goodlad-Partner/Key Schools (Goodlad, 1990). The implementation of these initiatives was superimposed on, and theoretically integrated into, existing restructuring efforts. They have also been put in practice without the establishment of an assessment baseline, and further, no assessment protocols have been designed to measure their efficacy.

The issue of assessment runs like a persistent and continuous doggerel through the entire history of U.S. educational reform. The lack of empirical assessment has been noted as a reason why past reforms have failed (Cuban, 1990). The current attempt at restructuring seems to be following the established historical pattern. What follows is an attempt to establish a base of comparison between alternative approaches to the restructuring process, specifically between those belonging to the Holmes Group-Professional Development Schools (hereafter PDS) initiative and those only being serviced by the school districts and the states.

The distinctiveness of the PDS effort relies on the formulation of a specific set of principles whose component variables were/are already part of the restructuring process with varying degree of emphasis and application. The composite set of principles developed by the Holmes Group were:

- * Teaching and Learning for Understanding;
- * Creating a Learning Community;
- * Teaching and Understanding for Everybody's Children;
- * Developing an Understanding for Diversity, equity, and Social Justice;
- * Continuing Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators;

- * Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning, and;
- * Inventing A New Institution (Holmes, 1990)

The PDS effort is further noted by establishing a support mechanism that relies on a “loose” liaison relationship to schools and colleges of education. This liaison to postsecondary educational structures was further strengthened via the integration of designated members of faculty as advisors, coordinators, and thematic facilitators to the PDS. In addition the PDS initiative under the leadership of the Holmes Group has developed a conference infrastructure both regional and national for the purpose of developing the principles and processes which are to conceptually guide the implementation of the PDS effort. The support provided has been jointly subsidized by the member schools/colleges of education and the Holmes Group.

The Holmes Group principles do not *per se* define a new educational philosophy. They are rather a pragmatic summation of state of the art concepts joined together for the purpose of solving a national problem. Not unlike its many reform predecessors, the principles were formulated on ideals, leaving the proof of their validity to researchers and practitioners in the field. In fact, some of the components of the principles lack empirical substantiation (Toner, 1993, p.178). More to the point, and irrespective of the lack of empirical formulation and proof, the Holmes Group Principles were accepted on the strength of the reputation and knowledge “bank” which their developers and founders represented. The subsequent infrastructure of support developed around the principles, i.e., the conference structures and fee structure for institutional membership assured their ad hoc implementation. Foundation giving, based solely on the reputation of the developers knowledge “bank,” further assisted in the implementation of the Holmes Group Principles.

The success of neither the national initiative at restructuring or that of the Holmes Group Principles is assured. The U.S. as it enters the post-Cold War period is undergoing an educational and fiscal retrenchment while simultaneously attempting to maintain its slowly ebbing preeminent world status. Power preeminence has been significantly eroded by emerging power blocs. There is little doubt about the positive correlation between education and the attributes of national and international power, a fact which becomes significantly important as the U.S. enters the 21st Century. The U.S. educational system cannot continue to flounder in splendid isolation without taking due cognizance of proven methodologies. Neither can it ignore the need to rise to the challenge of our society and the 21st Century. The time is at hand when educational practitioners need to base instructional strategies on methodologies that have been empirically validated, while concurrently exploring new educational hypotheses.

Considering that the Holmes Group Principles have been implemented, and that variables subsumed therein are also in effect, i.e., are a part of the nationwide restructuring effort, it is important to establish the extent to which one primary educational cohort, teachers, perceive their implementation and impact. The purpose of this article is to provide an analysis of the perceptions of elementary school teachers at five PDSs and two Non-PDSs with comparable demographic characteristics regarding the implementation and impact of the Holmes Group Principles. This study expands research findings on the perceived congruence of PDS to Holmes Group Principles (Toner, 1993).

II. HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS OF THE HOLMES GROUP PRINCIPLES

The Holmes Group met for the first time in 1982, started meeting on a regular basis in 1984, and became incorporated in 1985. The principles were thereafter codified in *Tomorrow's Teachers* (Holmes, 1986) with widespread input from the faculty of the member institutions.

It is now an educational consortium, organized into five regions for the purposes of communication and institutional support, and is composed of over 100 institutional members. A regional, and national, conference structure provides the bulwark for generating conceptual materials building on the initial principles and addressing the basic question as to how to improve "...the generally low quality of teacher preparation in the United States (Richardson, 1987, p. 1)." However, it is only through the evaluation of outcomes accruing from the implementation of the Principles that empirical validation of this educational strategy can be obtained. Their implementation by the University of South Carolina (hereafter USC), Columbia Campus, School of Education in the Columbia, South Carolina area presents an opportunity for just such a case study.

In 1985 USC's School of Education, a charter member of the Holmes Group, under the leadership of Dean John D. Mulhern began a fledgling attempt to establish the required post-secondary-K-12 liaisons. A modification of the teacher training program was devised, but not implemented, because of administrative changes at USC. In 1990 Dr. R. Ishler, a newly installed Dean, reinvigorated the PDS initiative at USC and began a series of meetings which were to continue until 1991 for the purpose of exploring means of implementing the Holmes Group initiative in South Carolina. An advisory board was formed (Toner, 1993, p. 33). Furthermore, a Professional Task Force was charged with developing a long range strategic plan to outline the qualities of participatory PDSs (Dozier, 1990).

In 1991, as a result of a Goodlad-sponsored conference, it was decided to carry out a credit-bearing, year long, PDS Institute for the purpose of developing operational guidelines (Toner, 1993, p.34). This was carried out during the academic year 1991-2 with the participation of over 10 schools located in the Midlands area of South Carolina. Participating schools were to incorporate PDS goals and objectives into their respective mission statements. A fiscal investiture, beyond the Holmes Group institutional membership, was made by the College of Education in 1992. It created a non-tenured instructional category, Clinical Faculty, for the purpose of "...study[ing] and debat[e]ing questions and concerns related to PDS and the clinical initiative..." (Toner, 1993, p. 36). The Clinical Faculty were *de facto* to become the liaison/ coordinators of the PDS.

The role of the Clinical Faculty was developmental in nature since there were no initial guidelines other than the basic tenets of the Holmes Group Principles. Whereas there were numerous meetings of all the PDS participants, the materials generated did not contain a plan for their implementation, nor was a strategy developed for the Clinical Faculty to follow during the first year of operation.

Subsequent national and regional conferences provided a more substantive definition of the principles, and their implementation in South Carolina resulted in the formulation of general parameters for the role of Clinical Faculty. Without delving into the minutiae of the evolution of the role of the Clinical Faculty, and their acceptance by participating schools, it is important to emphasize that their impact during the first year of operation can best be described as *resulting simply from their physical intervention* (presence), and not as a result of a planned approach utilizing the panoply of educational strategies suggested by the Holmes Group for the PDS.

The infrastructure of support for the PDSs has evolved slowly following the pattern of development of the principles and their guidelines. The literature on the PDSs has been sparse and case studies do not abound in part because of the newness of the approach. No assessment, evaluation guidelines, or strategy for their implementation have as yet been noted, and the Holmes Group has been taken to task for their absence (Winitzky, et al., 1991).

This study is predicated on the assumption that there is a commonality of variables present in both PDSs and Non-PDSs, and that the major difference between them is the nature and extent of cohesive and invasive support, and thematic emphasis. Clearly there is a need to establish the perceived efficacy of the Holmes Group approach *vis a vis* that of the services being provided the nation generally by the restructuring effort.

III. METHODOLOGY

The Holmes Group Principles were broken down into component variables. A literature review was carried out to determine the extent of empirical validation for each of the variables. The variables were defined and broken down into component indicators. Appropriate survey questions were developed for each indicator.

Two surveys were developed to obtain information regarding the perception of the implementation and impact of the Holmes Group Principles component variables on PDSs and Non-PDSs. The survey administered to the PDSs made specific references to the Holmes Group Principles. In contrast, that administered to the Non-PDSs addressed the content of the principles without reference to the Holmes Group Principles.

The surveys were validated by a peer group. The first section of the survey was designed to ascertain frequency of practice. The second section honed in on the degree of practice. The fourth section attempted to obtain information regarding the degree to which the principles may have been implemented and their perceived impact. Section five sought to establish the extent of teacher involvement in the restructuring effort and the PDS initiative. A Likert-type scale was used to measure the frequency and degree of performance in the above four sections. In addition, section three contained two open-ended questions designed to ascertain the extent of thematic and operational congruence between the quantitative and qualitative results. The survey also obtained information regarding the demographic characteristics of the cohort being surveyed [and the latter became the independent variable utilized for inferential statistical analysis].

The survey was administered to the teacher cohort of five PDSs and two Non-PDSs at the elementary level with comparable demographic characteristics. Multiple distributions of the survey were carried out so as to obtain the highest possible level of return. A total of 308 teachers working in both PDSs and Non-PDSs were surveyed, and 214 responded for a response rate of 70%. The total number of teachers surveyed in the PDS category was 215, and of these 154 responded for a response rate of 71%. The total Non-PDS teachers surveyed was 93, and of these 60 responded to the survey for a response rate of 65%. Response rates were above the acceptable level of 60% established for this study.

IV. COMPARISON OF TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

A. Quantitative Data

1. Overall Conformity to the Tenets for Restructuring the Holmes Group Principles.

Following the lines of previous research (Toner, 1993) conformity to the Holmes Group Principles, as tenets for restructuring, was established for the totality of the teacher cohort surveyed by category, PDSs and Non-PDSs. The objective of establishing the degree of conformity was to obtain an initial comparative measure of the extent of perceived overall implementation and impact of the Principles by teachers in both categories of schools. The

extent of conformity was determined by assessing the response of PDS and Non-PDS teachers to six survey items respectively addressing the question of the Principles implementation and impact. "Perfect" conformity with the Principles would be obtained when the sum of each set of six items would yield a score of 30 for a given scale, respectively implementation and impact.

One sample *t*-tests were calculated to assess the teachers' perception of the measure of Principle compliance at their respective schools. This was obtained by comparing the average response of the overall sample to the criterion value of 30 and each school's average response to the impact and implementation subscales against the criterion value of 30. The one sample *t*-test determined if the implementation and impact scores (overall and for each school) were significantly different from the criterion score representing conformity (See Table 1).

Table 1

Summary of t-Tests, Conformity to the Six Holmes Group Principles				
		Impact		Implementation
School	Mean	t-value	Mean	t-value
PDSs				
School A	23.07	8.40*	23.72	10.36*
School B	20.97	9.27*	23.78	7.56*
School C	19.89	7.86*	20.36	8.77*
School D	21.46	7.93*	22.42	9.45*
School E	22.46	7.40*	23.90	11.69*
PDS Total	21.64	17.68*	22.95	19.78*
Non-PDSs				
School F	21.13	6.23*	22.64	5.33*
School G	23.63	6.19*	24.14	7.10*
Non-PDSs Total	22.61	8.69*	23.52	8.68*

* Denotes significance at p 0.0001

The by-school and school aggregate tests yielded *t*-values different from 30 (*p* 0.0001), i.e., none of the results met the criterion value for implementation and impact of the Principles. The instructional cadre of the five elementary schools surveyed did not perceive their schools as being "perfect PDSs," i.e., in optimal conformance with the Principles as tenets for restructuring. The results show that teachers perceived their schools as being in varying stages of development *vis a vis* implementation and impact of the Principles.

It bears reiteration that there was no significant statistical difference in the total sample regarding the reported perceptions of teachers. Nevertheless, teachers at the Non-PDS did report slightly higher (but not statistically significant) overall score. Teachers at the Non-PDSs perceived a higher degree of implementation and impact of the totality of the Principles as tenets for restructuring, i.e., they perceived their schools to have obtained a higher degree of total conformance.

Considering that an initial level of inquiry yielded results indicating that all seven schools were at different points of development regarding the overall implementation and impact of the Principles, and that none of them could be considered to have obtained complete congruency to full PDS "status" regarding implementation and impact, it became important to establish the extent to which teachers perceived their schools as actually practicing each of the six principles. This is of particular interest in the light of higher overall scores obtained by the Non-PDSs.

2. Reported Perceptions of Teachers Concerning School Frequency of Practice which Reflect the Holmes Group Principles

Means and standard deviations were computed for each group (PDSs and Non-PDSs) and subscale (each Principle) in order to ascertain the extent to which the schools were "walking the talk," i.e., to obtain a measure of the differences in the scores obtained for overall implementation and impact. The numerical scale for each Principle had a range in values from 1, indicating "never," 3, "occasionally," and 5, "always." A higher reported score would indicate that teachers perceived practices in their respective schools as conforming to the Principles, whereas a low score would indicate a perceived lack of conformity. Survey items were summed to obtain subscale scores representing the practice of each of the six Principles. Scores are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Teachers' Reported Perceptions Concerning School Practices which Reflect the Holmes Group Principles						
Schools	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	Subscale 4	Subscale 5	Subscale 6
PDSs						
A	*3.77 (.68)	2.54 (.83)	3.71 (.69)	4.15 (.51)	2.81 (1.02)	3.50 (.68)
	n = 28	n = 28	n = 28	n = 28	n = 28	n = 28
B	3.55 (.59)	2.66 (.80)	3.71 (.58)	4.06 (.74)	2.57 (.97)	3.24 (.82)
	n = 31	n = 31	n = 31	n = 31	n = 31	n = 31
C	3.45 (.53)	2.43 (.63)	3.40 (.68)	3.72 (.76)	2.47 (.68)	3.11 (.68)
	n = 28	n = 28	n = 29	n = 29	n = 29	n = 29
D	3.21 (.60)	2.62 (.83)	3.53 (.58)	4.47 (.49)	3.46 (.65)	3.77 (.58)
	n = 23	n = 23	n = 24	n = 24	n = 23	n = 24
	3.30 (.61)	2.78 (.93)	3.54 (.66)	4.00 (.64)	3.12 (.82)	3.30 (.70)
	n = 40	n = 40	n = 40	n = 40	n = 40	n = 40
PDSs Total	**3.45 (.63)	2.62 (.82)	3.58 (.64)	**4.06 (.67)	2.88 (.90)	3.36 (.73)
	n = 150	n = 150	n = 152	n = 152	n = 151	n = 152

Non-PDSs						
F	3.36 (.66)	2.37 (.68)	3.57 (.69)	3.88 (.72)	1.98 (.71)	3.10 (.70)
	n = 23	n = 23	n = 24	n = 24	n = 24	n = 24
G	3.41 (.56)	2.55 (.62)	3.80 (.63)	**3.93 (.76)	2.53 (.82)	3.40 (.53)
	n = 35	n = 35	n = 35	n = 35	n = 35	n = 35
Non-PDSs						
Total	3.39 (.59)	2.48 (.65)	3.70 (.66)	**3.91 (.76)	2.31 (.82)	3.28 (.62)
	n = 58	n = 58	n = 59	n = 59	n = 59	n = 59

* = Mean; ** = Grand Mean () = Standard Deviation; and n = Number in Group.
Response Scale was: 1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Fairly Often; and 5 = Frequently.

Principle I, Teaching and Learning for Understanding. The perceived practice of this principle obtained a grand mean response of 3.45 for PDSs and 3.39 for Non-PDSs, i.e., the average of teacher responses from both groups indicated an overall frequency of practice regarding the extent of student involvement in decision-making related to the learning process in the interval between “occasionally” and “fairly often.”

Principle II, Creation of a Community of Learning. The statistical response of teacher’s perceptions regarding the practice of this principle obtained a grand mean of 2.62 for PDSs, and 2.48 for Non-PDSs, i.e., the average of teacher responses in both groups indicated an overall frequency of practice specifically regarding collaboration between teachers and students and the use of innovative teaching/active learning techniques to be in the interval between “never” and “occasionally.”

Principle III, Teaching and Understanding for Everybody’s Children, obtained a grand mean response for PDSs of 3.58, and for Non-PDSs 3.70. This would indicate that on average Teacher respondents perceived the frequency of practice of equal opportunity for learning in respect to the aggregate of variables (factors) included in the full spectrum of multicultural/gender diversity to be in the interval between “occasionally” and “fairly often.”

Principle IV, Continuing Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators, produced a grand mean response for PDSs of 4.06. The numerical representation noted by the PDSs grand mean is located in the interval between “fairly often” and “frequently” which indicates that on average respondents perceived that appropriate and meaningful inservice and pre-service, and other continual learning opportunities were being made available and implemented in their respective schools. The Non-PDSs grand mean response was 3.91. It was located in the interval between “occasionally” and “fairly often,” and was below that obtained for the PDSs.

Principle V, Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning obtained a grand mean response of 2.88 for PDSs and 2.31 for the Non-PDSs group, i.e., all groups of respondents on average perceived a frequency of practice in the interval between “rarely” and “occasionally” for the activities of planning, research, and collaboration subsumed under Principle V.

Principle VI, *Inventing A New Institution*, produced a grand mean response for the PDSs of 3.36 and for the Non-PDSs of 3.28. Both groups fell in the interval between “occasionally” and “fairly often,” i.e., the average respondent perceived their school to be run according to general tenets of representative democracy wherein all constituent groups (teachers, parents, teacher educators, and administrators) were represented in the decision making process.

Teacher respondents from the PDSs reported the highest grand means for Holmes Group Principles I, *Teaching and Learning for Understanding*, II, *Creation of a Community of Learning*, IV, *Continuing Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators*, V, *Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning*, and VI, *Inventing a New Institution*. Teacher respondents from Non-PDSs reported the highest grand mean in the practice of Principle III, *Teaching and Understanding for Everybody’s Children*.

3. Differences Between PDSs and Non-PDSs Concerning Involvement in School Practices Reflecting the Six Holmes Group Principles.

In order to determine the difference between PDSs and Non-PDSs regarding school practices reflecting the Holmes Group Principles each set of indicator variables was submitted to a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) model utilizing PDS status (yes/no) as the independent variable. The MANOVA was used in lieu of individual univariate tests in order to control for the intercorrelation between the dependent variables due to their common source and to conserve the power of the test against Type I error. The TOMSUB, IMPEM, and IMPACT questions refer to each of the six Holmes Group Principles subscales. The five INV variables refer to the perceived involvement of teachers in the PDS and restructuring initiatives in their respective schools.

Table 3			
Summary of MANOVA on Indicator Variables			
Indicator Set	Wilks' Lambda	F	p > F
TOMSUB 1-6	0.8910	4.078	0.0007***
IMPEM 1-6	0.9762	0.755	0.6060
IMPACT 1-6	0.9813	0.563	0.7598
INV 1-5	0.9958	0.165	0.9752

Editorial Note: Authors contacted about effect sizes explained to us that effect sizes this large are not unusual.

Significant differences between scores on indicator variables between teachers from PDSs and Non-PDSs were found for only one set of variables, the principle subscale scores (Table 3). There were no significant differences for the IMPEM, IMPACT, or INV variables. Mean responses for each of the two groups in questions were further examined in order to determine which of the six subscale scores were significantly different for each group in question (Table 4).

Table 4

Means on Principle Subscale (TOMSUB) Variables PDS/Non-PDS		
Variable	PDS Mean	Non-PDS Mean
	(n = 149)	(n = 58)
Principle I (Items 1-59) (TOMSUB 1)	3.4576	3.3885
Principle II (Items 6-8, 10) (TOMSUB 2)	2.6197	2.4770
Principle III (Items 11, 27-30) (TOMSUB 3)	3.5832	3.6994
Principle IV (Items 12-16) (TOMSUB 4)	4.0630	3.9224
Principle V (Items 17-21) (TOMSUB 5)	2.8789	2.3261
Principle VI (Items 22-26, 31) (TOMSUB 6)	3.3498	3.2914

The mean response for the PDS group was slightly higher than that for the Non-PDS group for Principles I, II, IV, and VI subscales. The difference, .55, was larger for the Principle V Subscale (Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching). This would suggest that teachers in the PDSs perceive themselves to be more involved in inquiry and research than Non-PDS teachers. The Non-PDS group response was slightly higher for the Principle III subscale, Teaching and Learning for Everybody's Children-Diversity, which suggests that the Non-PDS schools view themselves as more diverse in theory and practice than PDS respondents.

The underlying correlations were subsequently examined via a Type III Sum of Squares and Cross Products matrix in order to ascertain if the slight differences shown could adequately account for the significant Principle Subscale (TOMSUB) MANOVA finding (see Table 5).

Table 5

Principle Subscale (TOMSUB) TYPE III SS/CP** MATRIX						
	TOMSUB 1	TOMSUB 2	TOMSUB 3	TOMSUB 4	TOMSUB 5	TOMSUB 6
TOMSUB 1	*0.1993	0.4116	-0.3352	0.4055	1.5945	0.1685
TOMSUB 2		*0.8498	-0.6922	0.8373	3.2922	0.3478
TOMSUB 3			*0.5637	-0.6819	-2.6814	-0.2833
TOMSUB 4				*0.8249	3.2435	0.3427
TOMSUB 5					*12.7538	1.3475
TOMSUB 6						*0.1424

***Effect Size**

**** Sum of Squares/Cross-Products**

The scores on the diagonal of the matrix represent effect sizes for each individual TOMSUB principle subscale score. The off-diagonal scores represent the pattern of the TOMSUB effect. The slightly larger between group difference in TOMSUB V is evidenced by the coefficients greater than one in any pair with TOMSUB V. The atypical group differences noted by TOMSUB III which produced the highest score for the Non-PDS group is evidenced by the negative sign of the coefficients in any pair with TOMSUB III. Accordingly, the slight differences noted in the scores on the diagonal of the matrix represent effect sizes for each individual TOMSUB (principle subscale) variable.

In general, PDS respondents produced slightly higher scores than Non-PDS respondents to TOMSUB variables I, II, IV, and VI with the notable exception of TOMSUB III, Teaching and Learning for Everybody's Children: Developing an Understanding for Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice. Non-PDS respondents reported scores for TOMSUB III which would tend to indicate that they perceived their schools to be addressing issues of diversity, equity, and social justice more effectively than did their counterparts in PDSs. The higher than average PDS score for TOMSUB V, Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning, suggests that respondents in the PDSs perceived themselves to be more involved in issues of inquiry, and research related to teaching and learning.

B. Qualitative Data

Qualitative data was obtained by including two open-ended questions on each survey (PDS and Non-PDS). This was done in order to carry out a crosscheck for reliability (Oppenheim, 1966), as well as to obtain a further measure of the teachers' internalization of restructuring and the Holmes Group Principles. The questions were designed to obtain a subjective description of the teachers' understanding of the reform and PDS effort being applied to their schools. PDS teachers were further asked to describe what they perceived to be the major differences between PDSs and Non-PDSs. Non-PDS teachers were subsequently asked to state what changes would improve the instructional approach at their school.

The aggregate response rate for the open-ended questions was 67.3%. It is significant that the PDSs had a lower "No Response" rate, 22%, than the Non-PDSs, 43%. Further, teacher respondents having "No Knowledge" of the substance of the question was 7.1% for the PDS, and 16.7% for the Non-PDSs.

PDS teachers in the majority understood the PDS effort to consist of a collaborative relationship between the school and the university. The second largest grouping understood the PDS effort as a means for the University of South Carolina to carry out student teacher training. Another large concentration of teachers perceived the PDS effort in terms of one of its objectives, i.e., to provide them with "state of the art" knowledge and instructional skills and tools. A small number of teachers perceived the PDS effort as a means to "improve the curriculum."

The overwhelming majority of teachers concentrated their qualitative observations on items categorized in Principle IV, Continuing Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators, Principle IV stresses the collaborative relationship between the primary stakeholders with the generalized objective of providing a dynamic, ongoing, structure for educational change and innovation. It is worthy of reiteration that the PDS teachers perceived the essence of the PDS effort to result from the relationship between the university and the schools.

In order to further delineate what teachers perceived to be the strengths of the PDS effort they were asked to state how their school differed in instructional approach from non-

professional schools. The thematic grouping of responses yielded three major clusters. PDS teachers perceived one of the major differences between their schools and Non-PDSs to be found in Principle I, Teaching and Learning for Understanding. They perceived their schools to be on the "cutting edge of education" and "open to new ideas." An equal number of PDS teachers perceived the major difference to be found in Principle VI, Inventing a New Institution. The two key concepts repeatedly mentioned in the responses were: "input into ..." and "freedom to ..." A slightly lesser number clustered around Principle IV, Continuing Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators. These teachers reiterated the involvement of the professors from the University of South Carolina as providing the major difference between their schools and the Non-PDSs. Finally, a small cluster of responses formed around Principle II, Creation of a Community of Learning. This small number of PDS teachers perceived the major difference between their schools and the Non-PDS to be found in "conceptual teaching," "meeting individual needs of students," and "cooperating across grade levels."

A negligible number of teachers highlighted Principle III, Teaching and Understanding for Everybody's Children, as being the major difference between their schools and the Non-PDSs. Finally, there were no PDS teacher responses that could be thematically categorized for Principle V, Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning.

Non-PDS teachers indicated a much lower level of understanding of the restructuring process. The Non-PDSs had a total response rate of 56.7%, and 16.7% of those teacher respondents further stated that they had "No Knowledge" of restructuring. The Non-PDS teachers showed a limited understanding of restructuring. They understood its implementation at their schools in terms of items such as: "new teacher input;" "new program implementation;" "community involvement;" "curriculum integration;" "increased administrative autonomy;" "increased professionalism;" "parallel block scheduling;" and some "collaborative involvement." The Non-PDS teachers did not perceive a central component to the restructuring effort as evidenced by the extent of the wide range of responses. The Non-PDS teacher responses did not form thematic clusters which could be reported.

Non-PDS teachers were further asked to state how they would improve the instructional approach at their schools. The largest grouping of Non-PDS responses was to be found around Principle III, Teaching and Understanding for Everybody's Children. Specifically, Non-PDS teachers wanted "smaller class size" and "flexible scheduling." A second, and numerically much smaller cluster of responses, formed around Principle II, Creation of a Community of Learning. Specifically, Non-PDS teachers noted that "curriculum integration" would improve the instructional capability of their schools. Finally, a slightly smaller grouping was found around Principle V, Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning. Non-PDS teachers noted that "planning time" followed by assistance in the form of "aides" would improve the instructional approach at their school.

It is indeed striking that an overwhelming number of teachers identified the essence of the PDS effort to be the collaborative relationship between the university and the school. Again, the adjectival modifiers utilized by PDS teachers are indicative of a commonality of information and purpose resulting from the PDS effort. In contrast, the much smaller number of Non-PDS respondents that attempted to reply to this question did not have a central theme or conceptual schema that they could correlate with restructuring. A response that best captures the Non-PDS teacher respondents' knowledge of restructuring was noted in the statement: "I have no earthly idea. It's just another bureaucratic term to me that has little to do with living, breathing classroom environment."

It is important to reiterate the fact that PDS teachers identified the bulwark of the difference between PDSs and Non-PDSs to be found in the implementation of Principles I, II, IV, VI. Principles III, and V did not evidence similar PDS teacher responses. Non-PDS teachers also felt that instruction at their schools would benefit from a decrease in classroom size and more flexible groupings, items which are subsumed under Principle III.

C. Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

The qualitative findings generally substantiate the overall results of the quantitative analysis. The qualitative findings add a further dimension to those results obtained in the analysis of the quantitative data. First, and foremost, the primary quantitative finding is that PDS teachers did not perceive their schools as being "perfect PDSs," i.e., they saw their schools as being in the process of implementing, and feeling the impact of, the Holmes Group Principles. Second, Non-PDS teachers perceived their schools as implementing, and being impacted by, the Holmes Group Principles at a slightly higher level than that obtained for the PDSs. The qualitative findings give increased support to the quantitative analysis in that it suggests that there is no clear understanding among PDS teacher respondents as to what constitutes a PDS within the comprehensive definition of the Holmes Group Principles. There is also no consensus as to what "restructuring" means according to the Non-PDS respondents.

The findings regarding the actual practice of the concepts underlying the indicators subsumed under each of the Holmes Group Principles also highlight the extent of teacher internalization of both the PDS effort and restructuring process. The results of the quantitative data showed higher scores for Principles I, II, IV, and VI, with Principle V yielding the highest score, i.e., PDS respondents saw themselves as doing more in these areas than did Non-PDS respondents. Quantitative data also highlighted the fact that Non-PDS teachers felt that they were doing slightly more than did the PDS teachers regarding Principle III. The qualitative findings showed a high level of PDS groupings for Principles I, IV, and VI, a limited response for II, an almost negligible response for III, and no thematic clustering for Principle V. Non-PDSs had a high level of clustering around Principle III.

There is a seemingly major inconsistency between the quantitative and qualitative results in that the quantitative findings show a higher score (MANOVA and Type III SS/CP Matrix) for PDS teacher involvement in Principle V, Thoughtful Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning, whereas the qualitative results indicated that PDS teachers did not see this as a major activity being carried out at their schools. This seeming inconsistency can be explained by the fact that the initial mean scores reported by PDS teachers regarding the practice of Principle V were in the interval between "rarely" and "occasionally," and those for Non-PDS teachers were even lower. The PDS teachers exhibited a practice which was quantitatively slightly higher than that reported for Non-PDS teachers. The lack of a thematic cluster regarding Principle V gives further evidence to the fact that the indicators under "inquiry" were highlighted as a result of their low evidence in the Non-PDSs.

There is also a seemingly minor inconsistency to be noted regarding Principle II insofar as the quantitative data yielded a higher score for this principle in contrast to the qualitative findings which indicated that very few PDS teachers focused on the issue of "a learning community." The quantitative findings show a higher score (MANOVA and Type III SS/CP Matrix) or PDS teacher perceived involvement in Principle II, Creation of a Community of Learning, whereas the qualitative results indicated that PDS teachers saw this as a limited activity being carried out at their schools. This seeming inconsistency can be explained by the fact that the initial mean scores reported by PDS teachers regarding the practice of Principle II were in the interval between "never" and "occasionally," and those for Non-PDS

teachers were slightly lower. Again, in comparison to the Non-PDSs, PDS teachers perceived the practice of Principle II to be more in evidence at their schools.

Content analysis of the qualitative data yielded findings which substantiated those obtained via the quantitative analysis, and also provided additional insights that described in more detail the perception of the practice of the Holmes Group Principles in both the PDSs and the Non-PDSs.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

After three years of effort, planning, and attendant fiscal expenditure for the application of the Holmes Group Principles, and an even longer time span for the restructuring process, this study has found no significant statistical difference resulting from the comparison of the two approaches regarding their implementation and impact. The efficacy of the PDS model vs that of the generalized restructuring approach is thereby called into question. Nevertheless, the findings of the teacher perceptions of the practice of the Holmes Group Principles suggest that the continuous intervention of the university in selected site-based management schools, PDSs, has had an effect, particularly when compared to Non-PDSs who have not had a systematic, invasive thematic introduction of the tenets of the Holmes Group Principles into their schools.

There is little doubt that the 'loose' intervention of the university has caused a ripple effect. The teachers from the PDSs in the qualitative data consistently alluded to the collaborative relationship with the university as the mainstay of the new reform effort. The intervention of the university's clinical faculty in the development and delivery of elementary instruction in combination with the "participatory role" of the teachers Group Principles as could be expected given the short duration of actual application. In three years the PDS teachers have developed an overlay of the essence of the Holmes Group Principles which was particularly visible in the adjectival modifiers and thematic components in the qualitative data.

At the very center of the university's intervention is the concept of participation and autonomous development. Attitudinally, the PDS teachers have internalized the rudiments of cooperative participation in educational reform, and parenthetically this was noted by such phrases as "freedom to," "input into," "... ability to take risks ...," and at the same time have raised the question as to university responsibility for outcomes. Teachers, in general, have been the object of various attempts at educational reform, have had to bear the onus of untried methodologies while being held responsible for educational outcomes, and are now being "subjected" to yet another such effort. PDS teachers evidenced a concern for the lack of university shared responsibility in the implementation of the Holmes Group Principles. Some went so far as to categorize the PDS effort as a means "... for the university to obtain a training ground for student teachers." The role of the university is indeed pivotal if carried out in the spirit of the tenets purported by the Holmes Group.

The PDS effort in the five elementary schools examined is in its incipient stages of development. Three years is a very short time in the bureaucratic life of educational structures in which to obtain significant change. Nevertheless, both the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study give indications that such a change is indeed in process. However, in order for the Holmes Group Principles to achieve fuller implementation the participation of all the stakeholders in the educational process need to be actively included. Inter alia, PDS teachers perceived only two stakeholders in the process: the university and their respective schools. The district office, business sector, and parents have equally important roles to play in the development of a comprehensive PDS, as outlined in the Holmes Group Principles.

It cannot be gainsaid that the "loose" liaison of the university to the schools has had some effect. The extent of Principle internalization as evidenced by degree and frequency of practice shown by the PDS teachers is indicative of the current "success" of the program. Evidence of a "restrained" excitement on the part of PDS teachers gives credence to the incipient momentum of the PDS effort in the five elementary schools studied. An expectancy has been created and the promoters of the process have a responsibility to continue the invasive support thus far provided. The ultimate success of the PDS effort is dependent on the extent to which each of the stakeholders share in the responsibility for achieving clearly established objectives and outcomes. And second, the successful implementation of this reform effort needs to be empirically documented so that the stakeholders can take appropriate, and timely, remedial action to the benefit of the entire educational community.

REFERENCES

- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19(1), 3-13.
- Dozier, T. (Ed.). (1990). *PDS Proceedings*. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McKay.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.
- Holmes Group (The). (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Holmes Group (The). (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Holmes Group (The). (1993). *Tomorrows schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Houston, W. R. (Ed.). (1990). *Handbook of research on teacher education*. New York: MacMillan Press.
- Levine, M., & Gendler, T. (1988). Professional practice schools: Building a model. Background paper: Professional practice schools. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers. (ERIC, ED 313 344)
- O'Neill, J. (1990). Piecing together the restructuring puzzle. *Educational Leadership*, 47(7), 4-10.
- Oppenheim, A. (1966). *Questionnaire design and attitude measurement*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Richardson, P. J. (1987). In pursuit of professionalism: Teacher education reform and the Holmes Group. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.
- Sizer, T. (1983). *A celebration of teaching: High schools in the 1980s*. Paper presented at the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and Commission on Educational Issues of the National Association of Independent Schools, Reston, VA.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Toner, T. C. (1993). Teacher, administrator, and university faculty reported perceptions of Professional Development Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina.

U.S. Department of Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Press.

Winitzky, N. (Ed.). (1991). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah and Salt Lake City School District. (SP 033 354)

NOTES

Dr. Tommie Toner is a Clinical Assistant Professor in the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education, College of Education at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina. Dr. Toner is the Director of Graduate Regional Studies and Continuing Education for the University of South Carolina in the Low Country, Beaufort, South Carolina. Her e-mail address is: ibftr51@univscvm

Dr. Jose M. Aybar de Soto has a Ph.D. in International Relations from the Claremont Graduate School. Dr. Aybar is a Management Consultant specializing in higher education administration. In addition, he has done an extensive amount of pro bono work in the K-12 system of Dade County, Florida. Dr. Aybar is currently based in Columbia, South Carolina.

Ms. Nancy Floyd-Finch is a Consultant in the Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning at Midlands Technical College. Ms. Finch is ABD in the Department of Educational Psychology in the College of Education at the USC, Columbia, South Carolina.