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Abstract

The article examines the school's organizational structure from a never-before-examined, unique perspective. Even though there is a great deal of research on the topic, the school's organizational profile has not yet been determined based on the perceptions of the school's faculty, and the importance and interpretation they assign various criteria, such as: teamwork, delegation, feeling of stress and overload, flexibility in study time and curriculum content, and participation in creating the school's policies and vision.

The manner in which these parameters are perceived among people with different roles in the organization is important when we come to understand the managerial-organizational behavior that is derived from the school's organizational profile. Therefore, the central research question for this article is how do the three roles perceive the organizational profile of the school? What is the importance given each of the parameters that comprise its organizational profile?

Analysis of the teachers' responses presented a picture, according to which the criteria they regard as central to the school's organizational structure are: curriculum content and teaching methods, and innovation and changes in the organization. These areas are cornerstones in education and teachers, therefore, attributed significant importance to them. They stressed the need to expose those entering the school to a rich and varied education, to encourage curiosity and challenge in many disciplines with creative means, and the need for constant innovation.

Keywords: school organizational profile, bureaucratic-hierarchical organization, systemic approach.

1 INTRODUCTION

Literature on the subject presents several theories for understanding organizational structures. Beginning with the structural theory that sees the organization as a complex and sophisticated social machine, through newer approaches which perceive it as an open system, constantly learning and developing, which is in interaction with its environment, feeding from it and contributing to it (shachar, 2007; Goldspink & kay, 2003; Chen-Levi, 2016; Shaked & Schechter, 2013; Levin & Schrum, 2013; Senge, 2006).

Organizations appear to be characterized by several common traits: constant fabrication of desired products in order to procure the essential resources to perpetuate the organization's existence and function; systematic work distribution, in which every person in the organization is delegated a set of actions that combine into one well-defined role; activating coordinating processes and control mechanisms in order to achieve best efficiency under given conditions, and institutionalizing organizational processes; behaviors and interactions between components within the organization and between it and its outside environment, and so on. These traits exist in each organization in different amounts, and permit us to describe and characterize each organization's unique profile and distinguish it from other social frameworks (Samuel, 1996).

Despite the common characteristics, organizations are very distinct in their conduct and the manner in which they attempt to achieve their goals. The school is an organization distinguished by pedagogical work and by the unique interrelation within its components (Chen-Levi, 2016; Chen-Levi & Shachar, 2015). In order to understand the school, it is essential to understand its various sub-components, and the interaction between them.

Criteria for Assessing a School's Organizational Profile

Seven of the nine criteria for assessing a school's organizational model were set by Sharan and Shachar (1990) based upon a distinction made by Janowitz (1996) between two organizational models: the specialization model, and the aggregation model. The specialization model is characterized by seeing the organization as a construct of various parts, each of which possesses its...
own distinct specialization and clear professional division. For example, teaching methods, procedures, and school programs fall into this model. This approach is typical of organizations tending toward the Bureaucratic-Hierarchical Model, whereas the second model, the aggregation model, is based on a holistic approach to the organization and all its components, and is more characteristic of a systems thinking model organization.

Based upon Janowitz’s model, criteria for assessing school functionality have been created, and then updated for the changing reality in which schools function. These include the various aspects of school organization: complexity of staff organization, delegation, curriculum content flexibility, teacher compartmentalization, and flexibility during teaching, relating to change, and agreement about the school’s policy and ideology. Each of these moves on a ten-degree scale which, on one end, tends more towards bureaucratic, and on the other towards the systems thinking model. In order to differentiate between the models better, we will show how each of these areas is expressed in the Bureaucratic model, and how it is expressed in the systems thinking model. In a later research, two additional criteria were added: information overload and time pressure (Chen-Levi & Shachar, 2015). These criteria were created from a wide variety of research literature (Eppler & Mengis, 2004; Sutcliffe & Weick, 2008; Jett & George, 2003; Santavirta, Solovieva & Theorell, 2007; Kock, 2000).

The extent to which each of the nine criteria is present was graded on a scale from 1-5, from the bureaucratic-hierarchical model (1) to the systemic model (5).

1 Complexity of staff organization: the existence of a network of teams serving as the basis for creating a multidisciplinary curriculum

2 Delegation of authority: this area is an indication of structural and functional decentralization. Authority delegation allows for identifying problems and solving them, as well as for professional enrichment, mutual support and greater involvement on teachers’ part.

3 Flexibility regarding curriculum: planning the curriculum, i.e. the choice and organization of meaningful study areas, constitutes the core of pedagogical activity within a school. It includes defining strategies and educational goals, as well as reflecting the school’s educational approach.

4 Teacher compartmentalization into their subject-matter area: the idea of cooperation among teachers and between disciplines reveals the type of connections existing within a school. The establishment of teacher teams for interdisciplinary learning defines the school’s approach to compartmentalization vs. holism.

5 Flexibility in teaching/learning times: the perception of time and the manner in which it can best be used stem from a school’s ideology and organizational patterns.

6 Relating to change as an all-encompassing institutional process: the view of change as applying to the entire institution indicates that the latter is able to cope more efficiently with pedagogical and technological innovations. The participation of all school staff members in the innovation process indicates its systemic organizational structure.

7 Agreement and clarity concerning the school’s policy and ideology: defining a uniform approach concerning the school’s ideology, policies, and professional outlook among management and teachers is a principle of organization and personal relationships in all ranks of the organizational structure. A school’s ideology and policies contribute to coordination and interaction between all of its subsystems (Daft, 1998; Borgatti & Foster, 2003; Whyte & Ellis, 2004; Wohlstetter, Malloy, Chau & Polhemus, 2003).

8 Time pressure: the need to cope with many tasks and goals within limited time may cause a discrepancy between the system’s demands and teachers’ ability to fulfill them. As a result, the sense of time pressure among faculty members increases, and performance quality may drop at times. Conversely, a low level of time pressure may attest to an organizational structure that enhances participation and encourages communication and distribution of tasks.

9 Coping with information: school faculty are exposed to large amounts of information throughout their work routine, such as curricula, changing regulations, new teaching methods, internal school information, staff meetings and PTA meetings. Due to this abundance of information, very little sorting of information that enters the school is actually done, which may cause a feeling of overload that could damage the management of the system and its subsystems.

Diagnosing a school’s organizational structure on a scale from Bureaucratic-Hierarchical to systems thinking is of great importance, because it allows for describing and understanding the sum total of interpersonal, professional, and group processes between members, as well as the staff organization and work methods.
However, when these nine criteria are examined, the question arises whether the staff sees itself as being responsible for each of these nine criteria in equal measure. For instance, do they perceive the measure of flexibility in teaching times as being as much their responsibility as delegation? If certain areas are perceived as being outside of the teachers’ responsibility, or as being dictated from above, for example by the Ministry of Education, this may affect their assessment of the school’s organizational profile.

Therefore, this research attempts to answer the question of what is the perception of the groups of school faculty members of these nine criteria? The method chosen to answer this question is a qualitative. Additionally, it examined the question of whether the groups differ among themselves in the manner they relate to these criteria, via a loglinear analysis. It presents a complete picture drawn from the experiences and perception of school faculty members.

2 METHODOLOGY

The work method in this paper is qualitative and criterion-focused. It was constructed out of a typology of six methodologies which reflect slightly different approaches (Shakedi, 2011). This methodology is somewhat more identified with the post-positivist approach than other research strategies. Preferring a criterion-focused method was a result of the scope of the research, the teacher populations examined in it, and due to its being a part of a larger, mixed-method research.

This methodology is different from the interpretive or narrative one. It stresses analytical research abilities over intuitive abilities, which means that the research is conducted with close accordance to external criteria (theories, principles, categories) from beginning to end.

Though the criteria-guided principles that underlie the methodology are closer to the positivist approaches of the quantitative traditional research it (and all its components) belongs to the area of qualitative research. In fact, the mere choice of words and language as a means of conducting and setting research criteria is a deviation from an absolute adoption of positivist research approaches. Therefore, despite being presented together with a quantitative research, it shows a verbal-descriptive picture and speaks for itself. Some call this the “positivist-qualitative” research (Guba & Lincoln, 2005: 191-215).

The current sample included 99 teachers from the main research pool who answered the open questions. The teachers were asked to explain in writing what each of the nine parameters means for them. Additionally, they were requested to provide an example from personal experience in school. The nine parameters the teachers were asked to refer to were:


The total of teachers’ statements were derived from their responses about different areas of work, and the way their school is run. A corpus of responses was created for use in content analyses.

3 RESULTS

The teachers’ responses were classified into a detailed schema, which included a distinction between two general categories of statements concerning school organizational structures: the nature of teamwork, authority delegation ladder, nature of teaching methods and curriculum, innovation and change, and feeling of overload and coping with information. The second part of the qualitative analysis constructed a corpus of teacher statement that served for a loglinear analysis which allows for an analysis of variable interactions with an ANOVA.

The general categories were divided according to content: the nature of teamwork (team composition, roles and responsibilities, perception of teamwork within the school), authority delegation ladder (administrative team areas of authority, centralization of authority by the principal, teacher subordination – duty to know and report, role flexibility, loneliness in the role, delegation, nature of teaching methods and curriculum (permanent curriculum, set schedule, flexible or changing schedule, flexibility and accommodation in teaching and learning, integration of subjects, teacher cooperation, separation between subjects), innovation and change (cooperation in setting goals and policies,
The classification system was such that each category was given a number (nature of teamwork = 1,000; delegation of authority = 2,000; type of teaching methods and curriculum = 3,000; innovation and change = 4,000; overload = 5,000; coping with information = 6,000), and the subcategories were decimally numbered. For example, team composition = 1.100, team responsibilities = 1.200 and so on. The classification of statements by category was done according to the nature of the statement. Classification into categories was done twice, at different times, in order to reach high agreement ratios.

A total of 1630 statements were classified. Figure 1 shows the percentage distribution of all teachers’ statements (1630) concerning school organization according to the above six categories.

3.1 Nature of Teamwork (9.81% or 160 statements)

Finally, 16.25% or 26 statements concerned the amount of teamwork. For example it is possible to find statements that ranked teamwork: “there is a medium level of decision-making teams in school”; “there are small problem-solving teams but they are not always used.” The statements in this category dealt mostly with the human organization within the school. Teachers’ answers related to organization in teams according to subject-matter or content, the composition of the team, and its tasks and responsibilities. 53% or 85 of statements concerned the existence of working teams in the school. For example, “the school has guidance teams for various subjects: treatment teams, procedural teams, pedagogical teams (for language and math).” 30.62% or 49 of statements in this category concerned the team’s tasks, responsibilities and composition. For example: “the teams have a great deal of authority to decide on various subjects, events and procedures”; “there is an administration-staff member in every team”. Finally, 16.25% or 26 statements related to the amount of teamwork. For example, it is possible to find statements ranking teamwork, such as “there is a medium level of decision-making teams in school”; “there are small problem-solving teams but they are not always put to work.”

3.2 Ranking of authority delegation ladder (19.26% or 314 statements)

Teachers’ responses in this category touched upon four central themes:

- 42.36% or 133 statements concerned authority centralization by the principal the responsibilities of the administrative staff and to teacher subordination and reporting duty. For example: “there is authority delegation mostly on class coordinators and homeroom teachers;” “most decisions are made at the top of the hierarchy;” “the teachers view the decision as landing from above or something that just has to be carried out.”

- 44.27% or 139 statements concerned role flexibility and delegation. For example: “teachers are somewhat flexible based on the complexity of the class and the level of the students;” “the teachers have authority in the central areas of their work;” “the principal delegates, doesn’t interfere in work and trusts the teachers.”

- Another theme was the teacher’s loneliness in his job (10.83% or 34 statements). For example “every teacher or homeroom teacher deals alone with discipline problems in class;” “I feel more like
one teacher in front of one class and one counselor;” and “there are decisions made by the system when you feel like you’re alone in the system.”

- The fourth and last theme concerned the authority of school faculty, from a more general point of view. For example “the school is a hierarchic authority that also delegates;” there is a hierarchy in school: principal, class coordinators, goal-oriented teams, and more.

3.3 Characterization of teaching methods and curriculum (29.39% or 479 statements)

This category was divided more or less evenly into two different realms of content: flexibility and cooperation versus control and constancy. 49.69% or 238 statements concerned flexibility in teaching and cooperation among different subjects. For example “the curriculum content changes throughout the year based on the needs of the school;” “teachers change lesson times;” “there is a schedule but it can be changed based on professional considerations;” and “flexibility is necessary and improves students’ educational state based on their needs and their advancement.”

Conversely, 48.43% or 232 statements were concerned with control and systemic rigidity concerning schedules and curricula. According to these statements the schedule and curriculum are preset and a clear distinction exists between study subjects. For example: “the schedule, rooms and number of teaching hours for each subject are preset, because of the obligation to adhere to guidelines from the Ministry of Education as well as physical limitations in school;” and “what’s been established is absolute.”

Additionally, nine statements (1.88%) discussed the subject in general, such as: “there is no option to be flexible in school because of the crowded conditions and classroom sizes,” or “of course if changes take place they have nothing to do with students’ reactions, they’re form the ministry of education.”

3.4 Innovation and change within the organization (27.48% or 448 statements)

47.10% or 211 statements in this category concerned involvement in policy and goal setting, as well as striving for cooperative action. For example: “school policy and its ideology are being examined from time to time throughout the year;” “there are discussions in our school aiming to set its policies, goals and ideologies;” and there is an effort to make professional innovation and improvement generally available.

36.61% or 164 of the statements concerned resistance to change. For example; “with all the best intentions in the world to change, teachers work by habit, try to accept changes but without success;” “there is a tendency and a drive to implement professional changes in the entire school, but not all faculty internalizes them for various reasons;” or “there is a school policy but there isn’t necessarily agreement about it amongst teachers or absolute clarity on the subject.”

Also, 16.08% or 72 statements concerned themselves with changes and innovation in the organization in general. For example: “changes are a way of life in school;” or “the faculty learns to accept changes with good grace more and more.”

3.5 Feeling of overload in school (8.04% or 131 statements)

These statements touched upon three central themes:

- 17.56% or 23 statements discussed the feeling of overload in school in general. For example: “work is often done under time pressure,” or “there is cooperation but sometimes there’s pressure to get things done;” or “we are constantly handed projects on top of the curriculum;” “the workload in school is very high;” and “the load in the education system is big.”

- 29% or 38 statements concern teachers’ personal experience with the workload and the reactions (positive and negative) it causes. For example: “despite the load there’s good organization;” “there’s organization on the teachers’ end to deal with tasks but it isn’t always possible to cope with all the requirements;” “every teacher does their best and of course sometimes performance gets hurt.”

The third theme included multiple tasks in a set time or sharing the load (52.67% or 69 statements). For example: “usually the tasks I have to carry out don’t fit the time framework;” “I dedicate many hours at home to tasks I should be doing at work;” “all the teachers note that they feel they have many tasks they have to do on their own;” and “there isn’t enough time to do anything.”
3.6 Coping with Information in the School (5.95% or 97 statements)

This area of coping with information had the lowest number of statements. 38.14% or 37 statements concerned the organization’s coping with information in general. For example: “the school is exposed to new information about teaching methods, curriculum contents and management strategies;” “schools in general and our school in specific are exposed to a lot of information.”

46.39% or 45 statements concerned classification and sharing of information. For example: “processing new information that enters a school is done in discussion groups;” “information is transmitted to teachers in leaflets, staff meetings and professional seminars;” “usually the information is put in a cell and stays there;” and “there exists in the school a classification of information according to positions.”

17.52% or 17 statements concerned the responses new information elicits from teachers. For example: “it’s difficult for us to deal with new information we don’t understand;” “most of the incoming information causes feelings of overload and pressure;” and “any new information whatsoever easily creates feelings of pressure among the staff.”

3.7 Loglinear Analysis results

The responses concerning school organizational patterns were sorted into three groups according to the job position of the responder: homeroom teachers, subject-matter teachers, and administrative staff. Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of the three groups in the total parameter of perception of school organization as well as the six categories of statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The categories derived from statement analysis</th>
<th>Administrative staff (n=35)</th>
<th>Homeroom teachers (n=35)</th>
<th>Subject-matter teachers (n=29)</th>
<th>Total (n=99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of teamwork</td>
<td>N 74 (61)</td>
<td>51 (42)</td>
<td>35 (138)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 11.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority delegation ladder</td>
<td>N 111 (92)</td>
<td>112 (93)</td>
<td>91 (276)</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 16.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of curriculum and teaching method</td>
<td>N 194 (161)</td>
<td>175 (145)</td>
<td>110 (416)</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 29.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational innovation and change</td>
<td>N 193 (160)</td>
<td>171 (142)</td>
<td>84 (386)</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 28.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation of overload</td>
<td>N 51 (42)</td>
<td>45 (37)</td>
<td>35 (141)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with information</td>
<td>N 45 (37)</td>
<td>26 (22)</td>
<td>26 (65)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 6.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute total</td>
<td>N 668 (533)</td>
<td>580 (481)</td>
<td>381 (1415)</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the numbers in parentheses express the frequency of perceptions after adjusting for a standard group size. Calculated relativity 29/35=.83

The data was analyzed using a loglinear model in accordance with Schoonen and de Glopper’s (1996) research this is a method of analyzing categorical variables similar to the ANOVA. Like the ANOVA the analysis allows for determining the interaction between two or more variables and determining the size of several distinct parameters. In the statement analysis there were 18 cells created from the tested variables: position (3) x categories (6). The position variable served as the independent variable and the categories served as dependent or explained variables.

Since the division into groups by job position is not equal in size the main effect may be an artifact. To avoid that the frequencies were adjusted for a standard group size. The smaller group size was
The frequency of statements of the larger groups was therefore proportionally decreased. \(^1\) Of an effect is found among the groups it will therefore be interpreted as a real result of a difference in statements by job description. The analysis was carried out via a saturated model that contained four parameters: the constant term; two variables for “role” and “different categories” and a parameter for the interaction between these variables. The model allows for a reliable description of the investigated variables. All observed statement frequencies can be described with a constant (C): a main effect to the role variable (R); type of category (P); and an interaction effect between the variables (RxP). This interaction is especially interesting since it fits the question “is there a difference in the frequency of statements in the different categories between school faculty members in different roles?” the existence of an interaction between the “role” variable and the categories indicates that different roles made different amounts of statements in categories about a school’s organization.

The parameters R and P fit the following questions, respectively:
- Are the teachers in different roles differ in the frequency of statements they make concerning school organization?
- Are the various categories different in terms of their frequency?

The effect size can be expressed in standardized values (Z). An effect with absolute corrected values higher than 1.96 is significantly different (p<0.05). Frequencies higher than expected are predicted with a positive value; frequencies lower than predicted are expressed with negative values; a lack of effect is expressed with the value 0 or with values close to 0. Table 2 presents the standardized values (Z) for the main effects and the interaction effect of the two valuables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect type</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role x Category</td>
<td>Administrative staff x teamwork</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff x authority</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff x curriculum contents</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff x change and innovation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff x overload</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff x coping with information</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers x teamwork</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers x authority</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers x curriculum content and teaching methods</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers x change and innovation</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers x overload</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers x coping with information</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers x teamwork</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers x authority</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers x curriculum content and teaching methods</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers x change and innovation</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers x overload</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers x coping with information</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Administrative teams</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teachers</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-matter teachers</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.25***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category types</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>4.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation of authority</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum content and teaching methods</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>14.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational innovation and change</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of overload</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-6.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coping with information</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-17.0***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .05, ***p<.001

Note: the minus [-] sign expresses frequencies that were lower than predicted in the mean

\(^1\)Proportion calculation 29/35=0.83
The data in table 2 shows that in the standardized values (Z) the size of the role effect (R) is 4.30 for administrative staff, -0.40 for homeroom teachers and -4.25 for subject-matter teachers. The main significant effect of R for the administrative staff and subject-matter teachers indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in the frequency of statements between the different roles. That means that among administrative staff the frequency of statements about the organizational nature of a school is higher compared to the mean. In contrast, among subject-matter teachers the frequency is significantly lower compared to the mean. The frequency of statements of administrative staff was 553 in adjusted values, whereas the frequency of statements among subject-matter teachers was 381.

However, no significant difference was found between the frequency of statements made by homeroom teachers (481 in adjusted standardized values) and the numbers made by administrative staff and subject-matter teachers.

The main effect on category type (P) indicates that statements from different categories appears with different frequencies. In the three categories: authority delegation ladder, curriculum content and teaching methods, and organizational change and innovation the effect of P was significantly positive (range: 5.98–12.06). In the three categories: teamwork, feeling of overload and coping with information, however, P was found to be negative (range: -4.70 to -17.0). That is, in the three categories: authority delegation ladder, curriculum content and teaching methods, and organizational change and innovation the frequency of statements was above the mean, and in the three categories: teamwork, feeling of overload and coping with information it was lower than the mean (Fig. 1).

It’s interesting to note the differences in the three role groups and the statements they make. This can be demonstrated in the size of the effects shown in Table 2. It shows a clear interaction between administrative staff x authority delegation ladder (Z=2.28) homeroom teachers x organizational change and innovation (Z=2.06), homeroom teachers x coping with information (Z=2.44) subject-matter teachers x authority delegation ladder (Z=2.0) and subject-matter teachers x organizational change and innovation (Z=3.14).

The findings mean that among administrative staff there is a low frequency of statements concerning authority and delegation, whereas among subject-matter teachers there is a high frequency of statements.2 Which means that administrative teams focus less on the authority delegated to them in their job, whereas subject-matter teachers are more focused upon them.

Additionally, findings show that among homeroom teachers and subject-matter teachers there is a high frequency of statements concerning innovation and change, as well as coping with information. That indicates that subject-matter and homeroom teachers attribute importance to innovation and change that impacts them directly and homeroom teachers attribute importance to coping with information.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Organization of Teamwork

Teachers’ responses indicate that there were differences in their regard of teamwork in school. Administrative staff had the largest number of statements concerning teamwork within a school, but their treatment of the subject mostly was on a very general level, sometimes in terms of slogans. The statements tended towards the theoretical rather than providing actual descriptions of team organization in their school, for example; “the organization is one that deals with people not with a product.” Or “the school always strives to achieve excellence.” Their description of the school’s organization lacked the personal aspect, and their statements described an overview of school reality rather than an insider’s one, for example: “the school’s aspiration is teamwork, work in sub-groups, and cooperation amongst all faculty and staff.”

A possible explanation for administrative workers’ view of teamwork can be found in Glicksman’s (2008) research, stating that the school’s administration is the spotlight and compass that is supposed to illuminate the path of the entire school. The administrative staff needs to have vision and guide all school processes. Shachar (2007) adds that the school’s administrative staff usually determines its social and educational policies and as a result see themselves responsible for setting goals and leading change and innovation. All these have a direct effect on their very wide, general views.

The number of cases in a cell is compared to the expected number of cases in a cell based on the frequency of the line and the column independently.
Possibly, these statements also stem from the administration’s constant need to market the school, and marketing is often based on clichés and slogans.

4.2 Hierarchy and authority delegation in school

The administrative staff told of a clear need for control and order in the school’s systems. They viewed the school as a hierarchic organization, with clearly defined areas of authority and subordination; “the teachers don’t have full autonomy, there’s a hierarchy of principal, administrative staff, and teachers in the school.” Due to that the approach that is transferred to the teachers is that “every teachers know what is expected of him or her and what the goals are,” as well as “every meeting is summarized and given to the principal” and “every move that is being led by a staff member has to be known to the principal.” Their reference to this world was direct, for instance; “in our school there is delegation from the side of the administrative staff,” or “there is almost no delegation in the school.”

It seems that the rigidity displayed by the administrative staff concerning the matter of authority and delegation stems from their need to for order and control within the organization, and the duty of reporting; “previously changes in school were made by the staff, this year any changes are done by the principal and vice principal only,” and “most decisions and authority are in the hands of the principal.”

However, when it comes to a teacher's authority within his class, the picture is completely different; “Teachers in school have authority in their class, both as homeroom teachers and as subject-matter teachers.” As stated, there is a marked difference between the responsibilities and authority of the administrative team, which has to do with leading the school in general terms, managing the staff and making policy decisions, and the authority of teachers who are subordinate to the administration on the one hand, and enjoy authority in their class on the other.

4.3 Organizational Change and Innovation

The administrative staff referred, on the one hand, to general statements such as "change is a way of life in school" and "we have the ability to change and influence," as well as "the school always welcomes innovation in study." On the other hand they also referred to difficulties and that implementing changes in a school involves, like, for example, recruiting all teachers to participate; "It's impossible to implement change without the partners," and "implementing changes in a school is a process and there has to be some openness from the teachers' end to accept them."

Just like the administrative staff, the homeroom teachers also raised problems in implementing changes within the school. They noted that “there is no constant organization,” and “there is no set time in the schedule where we sit down to check and test the goals.” They also said that “there is no real meaning to new ideas,” and “there is no constant teamwork and the mutual generation of ideas is lacking.”

4.4 Feeling of Time Pressure and Workload in School

The administrative staff referred in their answers to the importance of good teamwork, sharing the load and high motivation in decreasing stress and workload; "in a good team where the workload is shared the stress and overload is easier.” However, the content analysis also found that administrative staff experience a very significant feeling of pressure and overload in their jobs. "Work at school is often under time pressure," and “there is a large number of tasks in addition to the running management.” The administrative staff expressed a great deal of empathy towards the stress and overload experienced by teachers. "More than once teachers express discontent because of the task load," and “there’s too much load on some of the teachers.” They tried to explain the pressure and load; “it means there’s a problem bridging between the demands from teachers and their ability to carry these tasks out.”

4.5 Coping with Information

Analyzing teachers’ responses shows that the areas perceived by the three groups as central are: curriculum contents and teaching methods, as well as organizational change and innovation. These areas are the cornerstones of education. Teaching varying content, by creative means, allows the acquisition of better tools for social function, for creating a more moral, educated, better society. The fact that all three groups address these areas extensively in their responses shows the importance for
the need to expose the students entering the schools to a varied and rich education to raise curiosity, and to innovate and improve constantly.
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