Loyola University Chicago

Loyola eCommons

Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1992

An Examination of the Principal's Role in the Implementation of the Concept of Shared Decision-Making and the Extent of Implementation of the Concept at Selected Junior High/Middle Level Schools in Illinois

Kenneth D. Stellon
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

An Examination Of The Principal's Role
In The Implementation Of The Concept of Shared
Decision-Making And The Extent Of Implementation Of
The Concept At Selected Junior High/Middle Level Schools In Illinois

by
Kenneth D. Stellon

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
November
1992

VITA

Kenneth D. Stellon was born in Chicago, Illinois, September 18, 1945. He recieved his elementary education from Saint Mary Incornata School in Chicago and his secondary education from De La Salle High School in Chicago. After graduating from high school in June, 1963, he worked for the Santa Fe Railway and attended Wright Junior College and then Chicago State College from which he graduated in 1969 with a Bachelor of Science in Education. In 1975 he received a Master of Arts in Teaching from Northeastern Illinois University. He also completed course work for administrative certification at St. Xavier College.

He began his teaching career as an English teacher at De La Salle High School in 1969. In 1971 he accepted a position as eighth grade English teacher at Sieden Prairie School in Matteson, Illinois. In August, 1974, he became the principal of Frankfort Junior High School in Frankfort, Illinois. In August, 1977, he became the principal of James Hart Junior High Schol in Homewood, Illinois. In August, 1984, he became the principal of Hadley Junior High School in Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

The author has a daughter Nicole, and a son, Kenneth. He and his wife, Barbara, reside in Frankfort, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Kenneth D. Stellon

Loyola University of Chicago

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE CONCEPT OF SHARED DECISION - MAKING AND THE EXTENT OF
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCEPT AT SELECTED MIDDLE SCHOOLS IN
ILLINOIS

This study examined the principal's role in the implementation of the concept of shared decision - making and the extent of implementation of the concept at selected junior high/middle schools in Illinois.

A search of the literature was made to determine the theoretical background which supports shared decision - making as a management device, the concepts of site - based management and its shared decision - making component, and the principal's role in shared decision - making.

A survey questionnaire served as a screening device to determine which principals were selected for a more detailed interview process. This survey questionnaire was administered to all junior high/middle school principals in DuPage County. Questions developed for this purpose were related to the principal's total administrative experience, length of tenure at the current school, school size, school organization, specific training and preparation regarding shared decision - making, the school district's formality of expectation of shared decision - making, the principal's current utilization of shared decision - making, and the principal's willingness to participate in an on - site interview.

Interviews of selected principals were conducted through on - site conferences. Criteria for inclusion in this sample were a minimum number of years' experience, awareness and interest in shared decision - making as a management device, and the levels, areas, and efficacy of implementation of shared decision making at the school level. The major issues analyzed as a result

· The areas in which shared decision - making is utilized at the school level.
· The efficacy of shared decision - making as a management device.

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

The beginning of the 1980's was a period in our history in which the effectiveness of our educational system was challenged. Former Secretary of Education T.H. Bell created a National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1981. The Commission presented its report <u>A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform</u> in 1983. The report appeared to confirm Secretary Bell's concern about "the widespread public perception that something is seriously remiss in our educational system."[1]

Although the tone of the report attempted to be evenhanded, its message was, nonetheless, a scathing indictment of America's educational performance. "An act of war"[2] was the phrase used to describe how one could view our system if a foreign power had forced it upon us. The risk to our nation was described as being as practical as not being able to compete economically against other advanced societies, and as philosophical as not being able to fulfill the American promise of entitlement to all our citizens. Indicators of risk included comparisons of student achievement, statistics on illiteracy, decline in standardized test scores, and concerns that the business world had to institute costly remedial programs in such basic skill areas as reading, writing, spelling,

---

[1] National Commission on Excellence in Education, <u>A Nation at Risk</u> (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), 1.

[2] Ibid., 5.

and computation. In short, A Nation at Risk painted a dark portrait.

The report, however, also attempted to provide some recommendations on how our nation could improve its educational system. They included strengthening content by raising minimum requirements for high school graduation, adoption of more rigorous grading standards, raising admissions requirements for college, more effective use of time spent in school, and making teaching a more rewarding profession. The recommendations ended with one concerning leadership. It states: " We recommend that citizens across the Nation hold educators and elected officials responsible for providing the leadership necessary to achieve these reforms, and that citizens provide the fiscal support and stability required to bring about the reforms we propose."[3] The report continued with suggestions for how this recommendation could be implemented. "The Commission stresses the distinction between leadership skills involving persuasion, setting goals and developing community consensus behind them, and managerial and supervisory skills. Although the latter are necessary, we believe that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved."[4]

A Nation at Risk can be considered a seminal work for it spawned a number of commissions and reports which analyzed the American educational system even further. Although many studies were conducted at the state level, several nationwide examinations were instrumental in continuing to foster the concept that leadership skills need to be developed in the teaching profession. In 1986, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century was prepared by the Carnegie

---

[3] Ibid., 32.

[4] Ibid

2

Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.[5]
This was developed by the Carnegie Corporations' Council on Adolescent
Development. The report advocated strengthening the leadership role of the
teacher.

A Nation Prepared ... urged state and local policy makers to create schools
that provide a professional environment for teaching. Among its recommendations
is a statement to the effect that discretion and autonomy should be given teachers
in recognition of their status as professionals. Further, teachers should
participate in goal-setting through collegial styles of decision - making. School
districts were exhorted to consider a variety of approaches to school leadership.
The report echoed A Nation at Risk ... in its urgency, claiming that America's
ability to compete in world markets is eroding. It also echoed the concern of
development of leadership skills.

Turning Points Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century was

published by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development in 1989.[6] This study
concentrated on the adolescent years and provided a more specific example of how
to develop these leadership skills. It advocated the establishment of building
governance committees. Shared - decision making was presented as a method
through which teachers could exert creative control over the educational
experiences they were expected to provide. A building governance committee

---

[5] Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared : Teachers
for the 21st Century (New York : Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy,
1986).

[6] Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, Turning Points
Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century (New York : Carnegie Corporation,
1989).

would serve in an advisory role to the building principal. Consensus is required if such an organizational structure were to be successful. The report stated, "the committee coordinates and integrates all activities that occur within the school building and between school and community organizations. As such, the committee can systematically foster interaction among stakeholders . . ., interaction that promotes the trust and respect essential to the processes of change."[7]

These three broad based reports provided educators and the general public with data and ideas that at the same time were both alarming and exciting. They also provided an overview of the development of the current educational emphasis on shared decision - making. The need for educational reform was widely publicized in the early 80's. Subsequent years through the decade saw school districts throughout the nation adopt organizational patterns which allegedly addressed the needs for reform. Reformers looked to examples of organizations that involved workers in their change process. Japan's economic success provided many such examples.

The concept of total organizational change started over 30 years ago in Japan as its industrial leaders applied the beliefs and strategies of W. Edwards Deming to their industrial organizations. Although many of the concepts espoused by Deming and his disciples had been articulated before, the decade of the 80's witnessed an almost spiritual conversion to restructuring America's schools through the application of principles of shared decision - making.

The three afore - mentioned national reports helped create a national educational awareness that if our system were to improve, it would have to be from within. To improve, the system must redistribute its decision - making authority. The Educational Research Service provides a rationale in one of its

[7] Ibid., 56.

4

information folios. "Advocates of site-based management argue that educational decisions will improve and are more likely to be implemented if they are made by those closest to the effects of the decision."[8]

An excellent example of the breadth of support the educational establishment accorded shared decision - making is found in the widely distributed pamphlet "School - Based Management - A Strategy for Better Learning".[9] This pamphlet is a joint publication of the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. It makes a direct connection between increased student achievement and the way educational decisions are made. Discussed in this work are the areas of empowerment, decision - making, roles of various participants and methods of implementation. According to the authors, the specific area of personnel management for which principals are responsible would have as its emphasis shared decision - making.

<u>Statement of the Problem</u>

Principals are expected to foster teacher participation developing programs to meet the educational objectives of the school. A key passage in the pamphlet <u>School Based Management</u> states:

> Teachers will have more input into the educational decisions that are made, including - but not limited to - decisions about

---

[8] Educational Research Service, <u>ERS Information Folio Site-Based Management</u>, (Arlington, Virginia : Educational Research Service, 1990), 1.

[9] American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, <u>School-Based Management</u>, (Arlington, Virginia : AASP, NAESP, NASSP, 1988), 5.

5

school climate, - student attendance; discipline policies; selection of materials in concert with district policy; teaching methods and strategies; staff development; and goal setting at the school level.[10]

It is clear that the concept of school based management and its core element of shared decision - making is being analyzed, implemented, and indeed espoused by the educational establishment. The movement to shared decision - making is pervasive not only in magnitude, but also in essence for it alleges to strike to the core of long established expectations and roles of all school employees. A major question to be asked is, "Will the challenges to the effectiveness of our educational systems which were issued in the 1980's be answered through the implementation of shared decision making at the school level?" The role the principal plays in this implementation warrants investigation.

Justification For the Study

If our education system is to improve and we witness a resultant return of American superiority in the world market place, then educators throughout the nation can discuss their effectiveness with pride. If implementation of shared decision - making is considered a crucial element in effecting these positive changes, then it is necessary to develop a clear understanding of the current level of implementation at the school level. This understanding can be accomplished if the implementation issue is examined in an empirical manner.

---

[10] Ibid., 11.

In her article, "Synthesis of Research on School - Based Management," Jane David wrote:

> ... there is surprisingly little empirical research on the topic. Searches of education indexes yield numerous references for school-based management, but virtually all are conceptual arguments, how-to guides, and testimonials for practitioners. There is nevertheless, an abundance of relevant research. Topics ranging from school improvement to corporate innovation bear directly on school - based management. Their relevance can be seen when we look at why districts are turning to school - based management today.[11]

The lack of empirical research on a topic which impacts every facet of our education system can be attributed to the nature of our "industry" and the forces which play upon it. Education's profile in the mind of our citizenry is very high. The nature of the system includes entanglement with politics at the national, state and local levels. When these elements are then highlighted in the media, our "industry" tends to respond to the market place rather than its own judgment. Is shared decision - making merely a knee jerk response that will go the way of open classroom, new math, metrics, and commemorative holidays? The lack of empirical studies on the implementation of shared decision - making is a concern, especially when one considers the nation wide acceptance of its concepts as a cure for what ails education.

---

[11] Jane David, "Synthesis of Research on School - Based Management", <u>Educational Leadership</u> 46 (May 1989) : 45.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to provide educators with information related to the current level of implementation of the elements of shared decision - making at the school level. Identification of the extent to which principals currently utilize shared decision - making as a management device may provide insights that could influence decision makers in their determination of priorities. An examination of current practices will assist practitioners to determine to what extent restructuring must occur. The current nation - wide call to change may not seem as imperative if an examination of current practices reveals that decisions are currently shared. This information could allow schools to devote their time and resources more directly to instructional performance instead of management.

Research Questions

The major questions to be explored in this study are:

1. To what extent do principals understand the concept of shared decision - making?

2. To what extent do principals utilize shared decision - making in the management of schools?

3. What areas of management are most affected by shared decision - making?

4. When Shared decision - making is utilized as a management device what concrete changes occur?

5. Is there a significant difference in the level of utilization of shared decision making currently practiced those levels advocated in the literature?

6. Do principals believe an emphasis on restructuring the management of their schools enhances or detracts from the effectiveness of direct services provided their students?

Procedures for Analysis of Data

This study is concerned with examining present levels of implementation of shared decision – making at the school level. A survey questionnaire was administered to all junior high/middle schools principals in Du Page County of Illinois to determine each principal's experience, knowledge of concepts, and willingness to participate in this investigation.

The survey was limited to this group to assure that administrative day to day experiences were as similar as possible. Schools in the sample were selected by grade organization as delineated in a listing provided by the Du Page County Educational Service Region. A copy of the list of Du Page County junior high and middle schools is included in Appendix A.

The survey measured each principal's perception of present level of implementation of shared decision – making and how it is affected by:

1. Total administrative experience
2. Tenure at current school
3. School enrollment
4. School organization
5. Specific training and preparation for shared decision – making
6. School district expectations for shared decision – making
7. Current utilization of shared decision – making
8. Willingness to participate in this investigation

This survey provided information which was utilized to determine which principals would participate in the interview process. In essence, the survey was

9

utilized as a screening device.

Interviews of selected principals were then conducted through on - site conferences. Criteria for inclusion in this sample were a minimum number of years' experience, awareness and interest in shared decision - making as a management device, and the areas, of implementation of shared decision - making at the school level. The major issues analyzed as a result of these interviews are those addressed in the previously mentioned research questions. They include the principals' understanding of shared decision - making as a concept and their utilization of shared decision areas most effected by shared decision - making, concrete changes which occur as a result of shared decision - making, a comparison of current levels of shared decision - making and those levels advocated in the literature, and the principals' actions related to the emphasis on restructuring and the effectiveness of the delivery of services to students.

The data collected from these interviews were used to analyze the following:

- Principals' knowledge of shared decision - making
- The extent to which shared decision - making is an integral or peripheral process by which schools are managed.
- The areas in which shared decision - making is utilized at the school level.
- Resultant changes when shared decision - making is implemented.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations for this study have been identified.

1. This study was limited to Illinois public junior high/middle schools in Du Page County. The generalization of the findings of the study to city and rural schools and schools in other locals is questionable.

2. The findings of the study apply only to the elements
   of shared decision making that have been identified
   in this study and should not be generalized to
   other areas of middle level education.

3. The identification of actual implementation of shared
   decision making as a management device is based on
   each principal's perception and may not be a true
   indication of actual practice. This can be minimized by obtaining
   concrete examples of shared decision - making.

Overview of the Remainder of the Study

The remaining chapters of this study are organized in the following manner:

Chapter II presents an overview of the philosophical and theoretical basis
of shared decision - making. Elements of shared decision - making applications at
schools, as presented by researchers and educational writers are reviewed.

Chapter III includes the presentation and analysis of the data collected in
the survey and in the principal interviews and reports the answers to the
hypotheses.

Chapter IV presents the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study,
recommendations, and suggestions for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Organization of the Chapter

The review of the related literature is subdivided into four sections. The first section reviews the theoretical background which supports shared decision - making as a management device. The writings of respected authors in the management field are presented in this section. It is not this paper's intent to present a complete overview of all authors. Rather, the intent is to present a limited but representative view of the development of the role of shared decision - making as a management device. The second section reviews current literature related to the concepts of site - based management and its shared decision - making component. Views, both pro and con, and the results of attempts at more empirical examinations are presented in this section. The third section reviews different authors' opinions of how the principal's role in shared decision making is affected. Specific references to expectations for principals are presented in this section. The fourth section is a summary of the chapter.

<u>Section One : Theoretical Background Which Supports Shared Decision - Making as a</u>
<u>Management Device</u>

Over the last ninety years, the science of school administration has evolved in three phases: (1) classical organization thought (1900), (2) human relations approach (1930), and behavioral science approach (1950). These phases overlap and their development continues today. The concept of shared decision - making developed and evolved along with the theories which supported the science of administration. This section of the review of literature presents the thoughts of respected authors in the field of management as they developed or considered the concept of shared decision - making. It provides a selected overview which is limited but representative of the development of the role of shared decision - making as a management device.

In 1911, Frederick Taylor published <u>The Principles of Scientific</u> <u>Management</u>. Admittedly, Taylor's work had a narrow psychological focus and ignored psychological and sociological variables. He did, however, demonstrate that many jobs could be performed more efficiently. Although it could be argued that a teachers' work cannot be compared to that of a bricklayer, shoveler, or pig iron handler, one can discern the beginning of collaboration in decisions in the following passage:

> "In order that work may be done in accordance with scientific laws, it is necessary that there shall be a far more equal division of responsibility between management and the workmen than exists under any of the ordinary types of management. Those in management whose duty it is to develop this science should also guide and help the workman in working under it and should assume a much larger share of the responsibility for results that under usual condition . . . This close, intimate, personal cooperation between the management and

13

the men is the essence of modern scientific or task management."[1]

Raymond E. Callahan's analysis of schools concentrated on the period from 1910 through 1930. His findings indicated that developments in educational administration paralleled those in the broad field of administration. Similar to Taylor's scientific managers, early students of educational administration looked at organizational behavior from the vantage point of job analysis. They observed administrators at work, specifying the component tasks to be performed, determining more effective ways to perform each task and suggesting an organization to maximize efficiency. The concept of sharing decisions, however, was not fostered as this would weaken the "cult of efficiency".[2]

Other theorists continued Taylor's scientific approach, and their focus was also downward from the managers to the workers. Henri Fayol's view of administrative behavior was defined in five functions, Planning, Organizing, Command, Co-Ordination and Control Although he is generally not regarded as a shared decision - maker, one can find elements of shared decision - making in his work. When discussing the precept of "Command", Fayol stated that the manager, "can develop initiative among his subordinates by allowing them the maximum share of activity consistent with their position and capability, even at the cost of some mistakes, whose magnitude, however, may be circumscribed by means of watchful attention."[3]

---

[1] Frederick Winslow Taylor, The Principles of Scientific Management (Westport, Connecticut;Greenwood Press, 1911), 26.

[2] Raymond E. Callagan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago:University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[3] Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management, trans. Constance Storrs (London:Sir Isaac Pitmann and Sons, 1923), 103.

Luther Gulick further developed Fayol's concepts by defining the work of the chief executive. Although organizational in scheme and focus, one can discern a pragmatic reason for shared decision - making in the area which Gulick describes as the "Span of Control".

> "In this undertaking, we are confronted at the start by the inexorable limits of human nature. Just as the hand of man can span only a limited number of notes on the piano, so the mind and will of man can span but a limited number of managerial decisions ... As a result the executive of any enterprise can personally direct only a few persons. He must depend upon these to direct others and upon them in turn to direct still others until the last man in the organization is reached."[4]

A reaction to the formality of the classical approach to management surfaced in the 1930's. This new approach focused on the importance of human relations in management. Concepts such as sharing were moved to the forefront. Dynamic and harmonious relations were stressed. Perhaps the best known advocate of a more humanistic approach to management was Mary Parker Follett. The following statement is indicative of the trend toward inclusion and sharing:

> If you look at business not theoretically, but as it is, you don't find the board of directors controlling the general manager and the general manager the sales manager and the sales manager the salesman. You see that all the time managers are sharing in the control, that they are taking part in the process ... and if control is the process of the inter-functioning of the parts, if the most perfect control is

---

[4] Luther Gulick, Papers on the Science of Administration (New York, Institute of Public Administration, 1937), 168.

15

where we have the inter-functioning of all the parts, then I think the workers should have a share, not from any vague idea of democracy not because of their "rights", but simply because if you leave out one element in a situation you will have just

that much less control.[5]

The Hawthorne studies demonstrated that the importance of social relations had been virtually ignored by those who espoused the classical approaches to management. Likewise, the need for formal structure had been virtually ignored by those advocates of the human relation approach. Behavioral science approaches developed using both these perspectives and added other insights from psychology, sociology, political science, and economics. The focus of the behavioral science approach is work behavior in formal organizations.

Chester D. Barnard originated much of the behavioral science approach with his analysis of organizational life in Functions of the Executive. He provided a comprehensive theory of cooperative behavior informal organizations. He summarized his work in terms of structural and dynamic concepts. Structural concepts which he considered important were the individual, the cooperative systems, the formal organization, the complex formal organization, and the informal organization. His important dynamic concepts were full will, cooperation, communication, authority, the decision process and dynamic equilibrium.

Barnard's belief that, "the efficiency of the enterprise lies in the fact the satisfactions to the individuals involved are more than sufficient to

---

[5] Mary Parker Follett, Papers on the Science of Administration, eds. Luther Gulick and Leonard Vowick (New York, Institute of Public Administration, 1937), 168.

Barnard's belief that, "the efficiency of the enterprise lies in the fact the satisfactions to the individuals involved are more than sufficient to induce their cooperation,"[6] has as its basis the concept of sharing decisions. He further believes that the gratification of intercourse which had at first not been sought eventually becomes desirable. In his analysis of the environment of decision in an organization, Barnard discusses the acts of decision: From this analysis it follows that acts of decision are characteristic of organization behavior as contrasted with individual behavior, and that the description of the processes of decision are relatively more important to the understanding of organization behavior than in the case of individuals. Moreover, whereas these processes in individuals are as yet matters of speculation rather than of science in the various psychologies, they are in organizations much more open to empirical observation. In fact they are themselves matters of deliberate attention and subject to intentional specialization . . . The formulations of organizational purposes or objectives and the more general decisions involved in this process and in those of action to carry them into effect are distributed in organization, and are not, nor can they be, concentrated or specialized to individuals except in minor degree . . . This may be regarded as the essential process of organizational action which continually synthesizes the elements of cooperative systems into concrete systems.[7]

---

[6] Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1938), 92.

[7] Ibid., 186.

Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory further developed Barnard's beliefs concerning individual satisfactions and their impact on motivation.[8] Listed as

motivators or elements which produce job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. Sharing decisions is inherent to all of these. Herzberg makes the following statements concerning participative management and its shared decision - making component:

> One outgrowth of the human relations movement, participative management, is the third contemporary approach used to improve work. Supporters of participative management assume that the overriding need of the worker is to be involved in decisions affecting his work. This primary need for personal involvement can be attained through worker participation and will provide the commitment necessary to motivate him. Thus giving the worker more meaningful job content is seen as secondary to his legitimate needs for being consulted and involved in decisions that affect him. Naturally, some decisions in which he participates will concern his job content, and only in these cases can concrete job design changes happen through participation. Most often, however, the manager is in effect saying to the subordinate, "Since you don't have a responsible meaningful job,

I'll let you visit my job, but you will have to return to yours.[9]

Herzberg continues with an insight which provides a caution to those who may view participative management and shared decision-making as faultless.

---

[8] Frederick Herzberg, The Managerial Choice : to Be Efficient and to Be Human, (Salt Lake City : Olympus Publishing, 1982).

[9] Ibid, 122.

So the difference between participation and enrichment is a difference in kind. Consultation does not give a subordinate the chance for personal achievement that he can recognize as his own, and denies him the chance of self-development to the point where he might become an executive himself."[10]

In an article titled "Conditions of Effective Leadership, " Douglas McGregor addresses the concept of participation in the decision - making process.

"One of the most important conditions of the subordinate's growth and development centers around his opportunities to express his ideas and to contribute his suggestions before his superiors take action matters that involve him. Through participation of this kind, he becomes more and more aware of his superiors' problems, and he obtains a genuine satisfaction in knowing that his opinions and ideas are given consideration in the search for solutions.[11]

Although McGregor acknowledges there are people who insist that proponents of participation at the lower levels of industry are unrealistic, he maintains that genuine collaboration is quite possible.

There is a real challenge and deep satisfaction for the subordinate who is given the opportunity to aid in the solution of the difficult but fascinating problems that arise daily in any industrial organization. The superior who, having provided security for his subordinates, encourages them to accept this challenge and to strive with him to

---

[10] Ibid., 123.

[11] Douglas McGregor, "Conditions of Effective Leadership", Leadership and Motivation, eds. Warren G. Bermis and Edgar H. Schein(Cambridge Mass.:MIT Press, 1966), 61.

obtain this satisfaction, is almost invariably surprised at the fruitfulness of the results."[12]

W. Edwards Deming writing in Out of the Crisis condenses 14 points which he believe are the basis for transformation of American industry. As mentioned in the "Introduction" section of this paper these points were used as lessons for top management in Japan in 1950 and in subsequent years. Deming claims the 14 points can apply anywhere, to small organizations as well as to large ones, to the service industry as well as manufacturing. The 14 points are listed below:

1. Create constancy of purpose toward improvement of product and service, with the aim to be competitive and to stay in business, and to provide jobs.

2. Adopt the new philosophy. We are in a new economic age. Western management must awaken to the challenge, must learn their responsibilities, and take on leadership for change.

3. Cease dependence on inspection to achieve quality. Eliminate the need for inspection on a mass basis by building quality into the product in the first place.

4. End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag. Instead, minimize total cost. Move toward a single supplier for any one item, on a long-term relationship of loyalty and trust.

5. Improve constantly and forever the system of production and service, to improve quality and productivity, and thus constantly decrease costs.

6. Institute training on the job.

7. Institute leadership. The aim of supervision should be to help people and machines and gadgets do a better job. Supervision of management is in need of overhaul, as well as supervision of production workers.

8. Drive out fear, so that everyone may work effectively for the company.

9. Break down barriers between departments. People in research, design, sales, and production must work as a team, to foresee problems of production and in use that may be encountered with the product or service.

10. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the work force asking for zero-defects and new levels of productivity. Such exhortations only create adversary relationships, as the bulk of the causes of low quality and low productivity belong to the system and thus lie beyond the power of the work force.

11a. Eliminate work standards (quotas) on the factory floor. Substitute leadership.
   b. Eliminate management by objective. Eliminate management by numbers, numerical goals. Substitute leadership.

12a. Remove barriers that rob the hourly worker of his right to pride in workmanship. The responsibility of supervisors must be changed from sheer numbers to quality.
   b. Remove barriers that rob people in management and in engineering of their right to pride of workmanship. This means, inter alia, abolishment of the annual or merit rating and of management by objective.

13. Institute a vigorous program of education and self-improvement.

14. Put everybody in the company to work to accomplish the transformation. The transformation is everybody's job.[13]

It is appropriate to include at this point an example of how current Deming's influence is in regard to management of schools. Lewis Rhodes, Associate

_____

[13] W. Edwards Deming, Out of the Crisis Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press, 1991), 23,24.

21

Executive Director of the Association of American Schools, Administrators, claims that Deming's approach refrains what already exists by allowing new perceptions of available solutions. He believes the following must be done if we are to achieve better schools through the application of Deming's principles of sharing decisions.

America must challenge unquestioned assumptions about students teachers, and administrators as individual workers and the connectedness of their

work. A common framework for understanding the interdependence of this work is vital. Without it we cannot maintain simultaneous focus on what must change in the child's work environment to impact the quality of learning, and on what must change in the teacher's work environment to impact the quality of teaching, and on what must change in the work environment of school leaders to impact the quality of the other two.[14]

---

[14] Lewis A. Rhodes, "Thoughts on W. Edwards Deming and School Leadership Beyond Your Beliefs : Quantum Leaps Toward Quality Schools", The School Administrator (December 1990) : 26.

The previously cited pamphlet School Based Management : Rationale, Theory,
and Research provides a general overview of the aspects of site- based
management, including specifics related to the nature of decisions to be made.
Suggested decisions developed by the American Association of School
Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the
National Association of Secondary School principals include:

- Developing new programs to meet the needs of a school's student
population

- Developing scheduling to meet instructional objectives

- Allocating a building's resources to meet the needs of students

- Determining professional development programs to meet faculty
needs

- Selecting supplemental instructional materials

- Selecting applicants from a pool of prescreened candidates [15]

Jane David's article 'Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management
listed the following two propositions as the rationale for school-based
management. Both concern the issue of shared decision - making.

1. The school is the primary decision - making unit, and its corollary,
decisions should be made at the lowest possible level.

2. Change requires ownership that comes from the opportunity to
participate in defining change and the flexibility to adapt it to
individual circumstances; the corollary is that change does not
result from externally imposed procedures. [16]

---

[15] AASA,NAESP,NASSP, School - Based Management:Rationale, Theory,
and Research, (Arlington, Virgnia:AASA, NAESP, NASSP, 1988), 9.

[16] Jane L. David, "Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management",
Educational Leadership 46 (May 1989):46.

David issues a warning regarding decision - making. She found that, in practice, teacher input in decision - making often substitutes for delegated authority and when the authority and resources to act are not provided, district efforts can actually backfire. She writes, "Asking people to participate in decisions about which they have no information is frustrating, not empowering; participation in planning committees, in contrast to action committees with specific agendas, increases alienation because it uses up time and energy with no visible results."[17]

Lawrence Pierce attempted to trace the origins of these allegedly reforming movements. In a historic overview of education he found that these efforts follow a tradition of other proposals to improve education by administrative decentralization. He cited the following as significant events in the evolution of this educational trend:

· New York State Fleischman Commission 1971

· Florida's Governor's Citizens Committee on Education 1973

· California's Early Childhood Education Program 1977[18]

Pierce claims that the failure of much educational reform legislation can be traced to the resistance of those educators who ultimately must implement the reforms, but who have not participated in either defining the problems or designing the solutions. He states:

Thus many reformers are seen by local people as irrelevant to their problems or infeasible, school based management is a system of shared decision making in which principals, teachers, and parents all have a part in making decisions they are ultimately responsible for implementing. By participating in the decision making process they

---

[17] Ibid., 51.

[18] Lawrence C. Pierce, "School Based Management", Oregon School Study Council Bulletin 23 (June 1980): 7-8.

learn why the decision was made and have a personal stake in seeing that the decision is carried out effectively. Decentralized decision making, in other words may be a necessary condition
for effective implementation of policy in loosely structured organizations. [19]

Pierce continues his presentation by developing a list of five assumptions which underlie a proposed design of school based management. They are:

1. Public schools are productive and necessary.

2. There are limits to what good schools can do.

3. There is no best way of producing education in all schools.

4. The view that school administration should be hierarchically ordered and responsible to a single center of power should be challenged.

5. Parents can be expected to do a better job of making decisions regarding their children's education than can professional educators. [20]

Anne Lewis' folio, Restructuring America's Schools, contains a chapter titled, "Meanwhile, at the School." In it she lists the decisions that might be made at the school level. They include:

   · Developing educational priorities for the building and the students.

   · Developing new programs to meet the needs of the school's students.

   · Developing scheduling to meet instructional goals.

   · Allocating resources to best meet the needs of students.

   · Determining professional development programs to meet faculty needs.

---

[19] Ibid., 16.

[20] Ibid., 18-20.

Selecting supplemental instructional materials

Selecting applicants from a pool of pre-screened candidates.[21]

Other decisions such as developing district wide priorities, developing educational objectives for each grade level and the curriculum to meet these objectives; supervising capital expenditures, selecting textbooks, selecting principals, and screening applicants for jobs would remained at the district level.

In a pamphlet published by the Tacoma Public Schools, titled School – Centered Decision – Making, the process is defined as one in which those affected by a decision participate, either directly or through a representative of their choosing, in making the decision. This process includes open dialogue in which issues are presented, defined, discussed, and resolved. The following descriptors are listed as what school – centered decision – making is not:

- School – centered decision – making does not mean that every decision is made by a school – level committee.

- School – centered decision – making is not a panacea to any school's problems.

- School – centered decision – making is not a single model

- School – centered decision – making is not replacing the principal with a committee.[22]

Gene Maeroff believes access to the decision – making breaks isolation of teachers while building bonds with other teachers and administrators. He cites a report from the Carnegie Foundation which found teachers felt involvement in only two of ten areas – choosing texts and shaping curriculum. He feels the tendency is generally not to include principals in programs designed to raise the status of teachers. The reasons for this are that principals and teachers have different

---

[21] Anne Lewis, Restructuring America's Schools, (Arlington, Virginia : American Association of School Administrators, 1989), 178.

[22] School – Centered Decision-Making Task Force, School-Centered Decision-Making (Tacoma, Washington:Tacoma Public Schools, 1990), 3.

needs, such involvement may inhibit camaraderies and teachers may feel they are being rated. Maeroff believes unions need to understand that meaningful collaboration means flexibility. Traditional collective bargaining fosters nonshared decision – making interests.[23]

In an essay dealing with the political philosophy of education, Patricia White concerned herself with how different groups in participatory management come to decisions. She believes there is no guarantee for unanimity even through reasoned discussion. After a quick review of possibilities suggests where there is conflict, the most sensible course to follow is the wish of the majority. She lists six problems with the majority principle as a decision making process. They are:

1. Permits the possibility of majority decisions to repeal basic democratic rights

2. Injustice to minority as their preferences are only considered, not implemented

3. Tendency to vote for benefits of particular groups in excess of what is justifiable

4. People do not always agree on what policy is in the public interest

5. There may be times when no alternative receive a majority

6. Voters may favor preferences rather than what is morally correct[24]

White does not provide many details, but suggests devices like constraints to protect civil rights, provisions of a quantum of votes for voters to distribute as

---

[23] Gene Maeroff, "The Principles of Teacher Empowerment, NASSP Bulletin 72(November, 1988):52-60.

[24] Patricia White, Beyond Domination, An Essay in the Political Philosophy of Education, (London : Routledge and Kegan, 1983), 12.

they please so that intensity of preference can be discerned, and the use of a lottery to prevent agenda manipulation.

J. Merrell Hansen believes site - based management will allow individuals in a school to function together in a partnership of decision - making, problem solving, and communication. He suggests the use of quality circles as a process to facilitate decision - making. In contrast to traditional group behavior which was restricted by uncertain goals, limited individual commitment, inadequate impact upon the entire organization, and the burden of responsibility and ownership for activities, quality circles can provide the following characteristics which benefit decision - making:

- The voluntary association of members
- Information gathering and data based decision making
- Formal brainstorming to ensure participation
- Problems identified and defined by the group
- Analysis and interpretation by the group
- Recommendations and presentation by the group
- Involvement in the dissemination, implementation, and adaptation of recommendations and plans
- Evaluation of both the processes and outcomes[25]

The American Association of School Administrators provided a series of questions which school leaders might consider regarding sharing decisions. They are:

- Are you making too many decisions? Are there others in your school or school system who could make some of them?
- What decisions should be the responsibility of the building principal?
- What decisions should be the responsibility of teachers?

---

[25] J. Merrell Hansen, "Site-Based Management and Quality Circles:A National Combination" NASSP Bulletin (October 1990):102.

· How can you begin to change your district's decision - making process?

· How can parents and other community members assume some responsibility for decision making? On What decisions is it appropriate to involve the community?

· What would happen if you turned your school district's organizational chart upside down?

· How effective is your school or school district's communication program in fostering innovation? How can you make it more likely to foster innovation? [26]

James E. Mitchell, superintendent of school District no. 12 in Northglenn, Colorado, compiled a listing of five areas where blocking might occur in shared decision - making. They are:

1. Most policies in the policy manual reflect centralized control.

2. Teachers and staff perceive the principal to be the blocker.

3. Department chairs become blockers when they take power from the principals and do not share it with the people in their respective departments.

4. Master agreements can block.

5. The superintendent and central office are generally perceived as blockers. [27]

Kenneth A. Sirotnik and Richard W. Clark considered the traditional model of school improvement in their article "School - Centered Decision Making and Renewal". They claim the traditional model pits experts against practitioners and suggests that knowledge comes from experts and is to be handed to practitioners. They write, "Educators in the schools are seen not as professionals who can

---

[26] American Association of School Administrators, <u>Challenges for School Leaders</u>, (Arlington, Virginia:AASA, 1988), 34.

[27] James E. Mitchell, "Site-Based Management:Coaxing Staff from Cages for Site-Based Decisions to Fly". <u>The School Administrator</u> 47 (February 1990):24.

reflect on ways in which they might best do their work, but as workers deficient in one or more skills and in need of retraining. Schools are viewed as places in need of repair rather than imperfect institutions that are continually growing and changing. They are looked upon as objects to be changed not as centers of change".[28]

They outline a process of critical inquiry which includes the following decision – making steps:

- Understanding the problem: What are we doing now? How did it come to be that way?

- Understanding the values affected by the problem: Whose interests are being served by the way things are?

- Seeking information: What information and knowledge do we have (or need to get) that bears on the issues? (Get it and continue the discourse)

- Taking action: Is this the way we want things to be? What are we going to do about all of this? (Get on with it) [29]

The authors end with a caution that we reexamine the idea of schools as centers of decision – making and renewal, "or we will find that all our discussions of school – based management will simply propel us further along the path toward unsuccessful efforts at change and renewal".[30]

John J. Mauriel cautions to avoid what he considers "sham participation – that occurs when a group is called together to participation – that occurs when a group is called together to 'participate' in a decision that essentially has already been made . . . People eventually assess what is happening or has happened to them,

---

[28] Kenneth A. Sirotnik and Richard W. Clark, "School – Centered Decision Making and Renewal", Phi Delta Kappan 69 (May 1988):66.

[29] Ibid., 662.

[30] Ibid., 664.

and they resent it. They then become unwilling to engage in important and meaningful participatory exercises in the future, when their impact is honestly sought and needed for success."[31]

Gene Giesert argues that increasing decision makers would create a need for additional procedures and policies, thus increasing the bureaucratic obstacles to school improvement. Even more important, no one would carry the burden of individual accountability. He labels the whole participatory management movement as an "educational bandwagon" which is "a seductive new movement threatening the administration of public education."[32] Giesert further contends that A Nation Prepared serves only the interests of teachers' unions. He feels the following results of sharing decisions would be counter productive:

- Collective accountability would be used for student performance
- Collegial feelings would diminish due to peer evaluations
- Parents might be forced to deal with union officials to resolve building level problems[33]

Giesert uses as a basis for his beliefs the twenty years of effective schools research which shows that successful schools require strong leadership from the principal. Increased decision making serves to weaken the role of the principal.

James Mitchell presented the following suggestions to school boards who are interested in site based management and its resultant shared decision making:

- Commit to action
- Involve administrators

---

[31] John J Mauriel, Strategic Leadership for Schools (San Fransisco : Jossey – Bass Publishers, 1989), 238.

[32] Gene Giesert, "Participatory Management: Panacea or Hoax?", Educational Leadership 46 (November 1988):56.

[33] Ibid.

· Seek outside expertise

· Visit other schools.

· Work closely with unions

· Be aware of time commitments

· Adopt appropriate policies

· Start with a pilot program[34]

Mitchell's concern for the awareness of time commitments centers on the process of sharing decisions. He strongly believes that involving employees in administrative decisions is time consuming and frustrating. Administrators are frustrated by delays involved in making decisions by committee and teachers are pressured by additional work outside the classroom. Decisions are often slow and difficult in the early stages and teachers must be warned of this difficulty or resistance will mount.

In his presentation of a paradigm for decision making, Robert G. Owens presented similar cautions:

"Confusion can be a very real hazard in organizational decision – making. Unless participants know just what procedures the organization is using to arrive at decisions and what their own role and function will be in the procedures, the very advantages ascribed to "democratic" or participatory decision making may be nullified ... In addition to knowing how people are to participate in decision making, that is, what their role and functions will be, they must know just when they will participate."[35]

Owens' paradigm includes a series of steps through which staff and administration define problems, identify alternatives, identify barriers, seek

---

[34] James Mitchell, "Share the Power", <u>American School Board Journal</u> (January, 1990):49.

[35] Robert G. Owens, <u>Organizational Behavior in Education</u> Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice Hall Inc., 1989, 320.

advice and make decisions. The key to the concept according to Owens is that all members have access to initiating decision - making processes.

Van Wilkinson cited concerns that the concept of participatory management will not lead to improvement without including participatory responsibility. He believes that the school administrator is held accountable even in the most carefully planned participatory structures which spread decision making among the teachers. He claims the assumption that somehow before participatory management, no one except top management had a voice in running things is "absurd".[36] Van Wilkinson's view is not positive:

> School administrators who get promoted will be those whose track record within participatory groups shows less friction. Somewhere in this process, individual risk taking, unfretted creativity, and divergent thinking are likely to shrivel as collective unanimity takes the driver's seat. Because there is little self-policing by teachers, management is still laden with the duty to enforce. In theory, participatory management offers, in these times of brutal overseas trade competition, a new avenue to excellence but at the price of promoting professional socialism, and then primarily in the private sector where all participants are themselves as being responsible. In the public sector, especially education, too many of the accountability pieces are missing to build a true participatory mechanism. Where mechanisms have been established, one often hears non - management 'players' in this participatory game commenting, "Yeah, we're meeting again, but they'll do pretty much what they want to anyway - they've got to."[37]

---

[36] Van Wilkinson, "Participatory Management vs. Participatory Responsibility", _Thrust_ (October 1988):20.

[37] Ibid., 21.

Stanly M. Herman likens participative management to a double edge sword. He lists the three basic virtues as:

- The premise that several heads are better than one. Participation can improve the quality of decision making, especially since many of those extra heads are close to the action

- The premise that a consensus decision is likely to be carried out more enthusiastically. In theory people who have a hand in making a decision are better motivated to execute it.

- The premise that participation in decision making is effective on-the-job training that helps develop subordinates.[38]

Herman lists the other edge of the sword claiming there are also situations in which shared decision - making, can be time-wasting and counter productive. It can even reduce people's effectiveness and job satisfaction. He developed five precautions to avoid these problems.

1. Do not introduce participative management when radical changes are needed quickly.

2. It is seldom economical to try to build a participative team out of people who interact only occasionally.

3. Participation is only conversation unless it produces action.

4. Effective employee participation need not always include final decision making.

5. Don't ask for participation in making a decision that has already been made. Ask instead how to make it work.[39]

Robert Heller, Beth Woodworth, Stephen Jacobson, and James Conway conducted a survey of school administrators which focused on school based management and its decision making components. They sent almost 5000

---

[38] Stanly M. Herman, "Participative Management Is a Double - Edged Sword" The School Administrator 45 (March 1989):38.

[39] Ibid.,

questionnaires and received 1500 responses. Listed below are their findings.

- Who should participate?
    - 99% said principals
    - 97% said teachers
    - 70% said superintendent
    - 50+% said central office
    - 50+% said students
    - 50+% said school board
    - 50+% said community

- Do you agree that decisions are best made at the building?
    - 87% Yes

- Of this 87%, 96% of principals responding agreed, and 80% of superintendents agreed.

- Superintendents claiming support for school based management totalled 96%

- 81% of the principals said superintendents showed support

- 25% of the respondents said school based management was in effect.

- 28% said it was in planning stages

- 48% said no plan was in effect

- Those who claimed to work in a school based management situation cited the following decision areas as being impacted:
    - 91% schedule
    - 85% purchases
    - 74% budget
    - 62% staffing
    - 37% building level hiring decisions
    - 10% and less – calendar, length of day, salaries, raises

- Listed as participants in the above decisions are:
    - 99% principal
    - 85% teachers
    - 75% superintendent
    - 50% school board
    - 40% parents

- Accountability for decisions totalled:
    - 63% principal evaluation
    - 53% test scores

46% community surveys

- 75% of teachers and administrators felt school reform had a positive effect. 60% of school board members and support staff held a similar belief.

- Administrators responding believed school based management had a positive effect on students at these percentages and grade levels:
66% at high school
60% at junior high and elementary
48% at vocational education[40]

Phillip J. Runkie and Richard Schmuck reported the findings of a nation wide survey which studied organizational development in schools. They found the goals of organizational development to be:

- Clarify communication
- Establish goals
- Uncover conflict
- Improve group decisions
- Solve problems
- Make decisions
- Assess Change[41]

Regarding decision – making, organization development almost always disperses influence much more widely throughout the system. Power need not be decreased in one job to be increased in another, although sometimes it is helpful to reduce authority if it is not based on knowledge and competence. The authors felt that schools must learn alternative styles of decision – making to assure commitment from those who must carry out the decisions.

———

[40] Robert Heller, Beth Woodworth, Stephen Jacobson, and James Conway, "Administrator Opinions on School Based Management Executive Educator (November, 1989):15-18.

[41] Philip Runkie and Richard Schmuck, "The Place of Organizational Development in Schools" Alternative Perspectives on School Improvement, eds. David Hopkins and Marvin Wideln (London:The Falmer Press, 1984) 153.

In their review of nearly 200 documents describing attempts to utilize site - based management in the United States, Canada, and Australia, Betty Malen, Rodney Ogawa, and Jennifer Kranz concluded that site- based management does not achieve its stated objectives. They found that evidence about actual operation of site based management is limited in several ways. They found only eight systematic studies of such programs and these rely on the experiences of a relatively small number of schools located in very diverse settings. They also found most writings were either project descriptions, status reports, or advocacy pieces. They found the initial, energizing effects of site-based management and its shared decision - making component often are offset by the following factors:

- Time - consuming character of the process,
- Confusion, anxiety, and contention as site participants and district employees attempt to define their new roles,
- Dissonance created as committee demands compete with teaching responsibilities,
- Complexity of the problems site participants are supposed to solve
- Resentment generated if site participants perceive they leave only modest influence on marginal matters, and
- Frustration produced by fiscal constraints[42]

The author's address the basic premise that site - based management eventually results in instructional improvement when they write:

Moreover, in some cases the move to site - based management impedes the development and installation of instructional improvement. It divertS attention from teaching and learning as site participants take on activities and responsibilities that are only

remotely related to instruction".[43]

diverts attention from teaching and learning as site participants take on activities and responsibilities that are only remotely related to instruction".[43]

[43] Ibid., 55.

Section Three: The Principal's Role in Shared Decision-Making

The principal's role in the process of shared decision-making has been identified by a number of authors as crucial to the success of restructuring America's schools. A task force created by the AASA, NAESP, and the NASSP suggested in its publication "School – Based Management", the following areas in which principals must be proficient:

- Instructional leadership and curriculum awareness
- Business management
- Personnel management
- Facilities, maintenance and property management
- Security
- Counseling
- Communicating
- Community relations[44]

Also mentioned in this pamphlet is the fact that the principals' ability to coordinate efforts of various groups and be held accountable for building – level decisions will make their roles even more important.

Fenwick English's article, "School – Site Management", presents ideas for districts desiring to set the process of decentralization in motion. He lists areas in which principals should act before implementing shared decision – making as a managerial device. They are: .

- Principals should thoroughly acquaint themselves with the literature of school – site management

- Principals should establish a fairly lengthy time line to initiate dialog about school – site management.

---

[44] AASA, NAESP, NASSP, School – Based Management: Rationale, Theory, and Research (Arlington, Virginia: AASA, NAESP, NASSP, 1988),11.

· Principals must have assurance of the necessary autonomy from the central office.

· Principals should feel confident in initiating dialog with the district when conflicts develop.[45]

English also developed a list of possible areas of action which be considers within the sphere of school level decisions. They include:

· School scheduling

· Instructional delivery

· Instructional support

· Curricular alternatives

· Student wellness

· School climate

· Parent / community involvement

· Facility cleanliness and security

· Financial priorities[46]

Robert E. Wentz claims in his article "School Principals: The Emerging Community Heroes as the 1990's Unfold", that principals face the dilemma of knowing what an instructional leader is expected to do and what an effective school looks like while at the same time managing the day-to-day activities of the school. He believes that principals,

> can meet the tremendous expectations placed upon them by having a personal vision of themselves as a hero. Included in that vision is the belief that a hero is a person who leads people to a greater understanding of themselves. A hero is able to see human potential and find ways to help people find themselves. A hero does not do

---

[45] Fenwick English, "School - Site Management", The Practitioner 16 (December 1989):3.

[46] Ibid.

everything for everybody; rather a hero helps each person see that

they can do everything for themselves.[47]

Wentz also likens the principal's role to Malsow's concept of

self-actualization. He believes the visionary qualities of an effective principal

helps define a role whose job is "to create, to facilitate, to encourage, to

motivate, to manage by participation, to share decision making, to encourage

human potential and, yes to believe that all things are possible."[48]

Sandra Strauber, Sara Stanly, and Carl Wagnecht documented the experience

of the faculty at Central-Hower High School in Akron, Ohio, in their article on

site-based management. Included in their comments is the following statement

about the principal's role and how it relates to shared decision - making:

> At Central-Hower, the principal is responsible for all the usual tasks;
> however, as a result of shared decision making, his role vis a' vis the
> educational program has changed. Because our faculty agreed that the
> educational agenda will be determined by consensus, the principal
> facilitates the building of that consensus . . . As he oversees all the
> work, he is helping others. Sharing decision making may imply that
> the principal loses authority. However, since the principal's sphere
> of communication is much greater, our principal's influence has
> actually increased. After all, when a principal decision, he or she is
> also alone in trying to implement it. By contrast when the group

---

[47] Robert E. Wentz, "School Principals: The Emerging Community Heroes as the 1990's Unfold", NASSP Bulletin (September 1989): 41.

[48] Ibid., 42

makes the decision, the group is ready to go to work on it.[49]

In a study of approximately 300 school districts employing school based management as an organizational focus, William Clune and Paula White examined the roles of key players. They determined the key player is the principal who acts as instructional leader, mediator of shared governance, site manager, and the focus of accountability. They further determine that school based management does not operate as a system for teacher governance, although it seems that teachers generally have better access and more influence over decisions about school improvement. Discovered implementation problems revolve around the unfamiliarity of roles. According to Clune and White, principals and teachers may lack the disposition or training for shared decision making, and time and resources may not be available for training and staff development.[50]

Donald E. Beers, also believes the principal is the key to successfully implementing the concepts of school based management. In a review of the Charleston Count School District's school based management programs Beers presents several broad philosophical postures upon which the Charleston project is based. They are:

- Participation is often slower than autocratic models and causes frustration

- Participation in decision making creates ownership and leads to a more positive attitude toward the organization

---

[49] Sandra K. Strauber, Sara Stankey, and Carl Wagen Knecht, "Site-Based Management at Central - Hower", Educational Leadership 47 (April 1990): 65.

[50] William Clune and Paula White, School Based Management: Institutional Variation, Implementation, and Issues for Research (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Eagleton Institute Rutgers University, 1987).

· Participation is not limited to the principal. It includes all of the staff at every level of the organization[51]

The first phase of the Charleston project included development of local school management teams comprised of the principal, teachers, parents and support persons. Principals participated in an intensive training program in management practices which provided a basis for shared decision making. Beers believes that school districts which set the example of participatory management will find that example implemented in the schools.

Joseph Gomez's reflection on the experiences of Dade County, Florida's, restructuring process includes several observations of the principal's role in sharing decisions. He relates how some teacher representatives in their decision - making cadres were unprepared to deal with school wide problems. Their backgrounds provided them with a limited view of school operations. Their initial solutions were often simplistic. However, with experience they developed broader perspectives. This in turn, caused their peers to view them with suspicion. Other teachers said they sounded "like the principal".[52]

Gomez also related pressures felt by principals. Some principals felt if a cadre decision resulted in a major blunder, they would be held accountable - not the cadre. For this reason, some principals retained veto power over cadre decisions. Other principals restricted the cadre to decision areas they considered safe, such as curriculum issues.

Karen Osterman's study of principal and teacher control in six urban middle schools addressed the questions of the possible loss of administrative authority

---

[51] Donald E. Beers "School Based Management" Abstract NAESP (1984) : 22.

[52] Joseph J.Gomez, "The Path to School - Based Management Isn't Smooth, But We're Scaling the Obstacles One by One," American School Board Journal 176 (October 1989). 22.

and the abandonment of principals' role as strong instructional leaders when
decision making is shared. Her findings suggest that, "principal control and
teacher control are not incompatible, that distribution of authority does not
necessarily diminish principal authority nor does supervision necessarily diminish
teacher authority."[53]

The following characteristics were noted in the school identified as most
effective:

- Principal viewed teacher authority as essential
- Principal felt responsible to encourage and enable teacher control
- Teachers evaluated their own progress
- Teachers set their own goals
- Teachers developed and implemented solutions to problems[54]

Joseph F. Lagana believes the nature of our culture prevents principals from
being risk takers. He feels without risk taking little change will occur in our
schools. According to Lagana, one of the conditions that promotes risk taking is
when administrators believe teachers can identify and define their own
professional development needs and can grow into more inquiring and contributing
professionals. Included in a list of start up ideas, Lagana provides the following
related to decision – making:

- Encourage staff members to share their experiences, success, and
  failure
- Encourage staff members to work in pairs to study students and to
  compare / contrast the operation of your school to other schools

---

[53] Karen Osterman, "Supervision and Shared Authority – A Study of
Principal and Teacher Control in Six Urban Middle Schools," Paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Fransisco,
1989):19.

[54] Ibid., 14,15.

· Provide time and opportunities for adventures that free staff members' minds to think

· Seek opinions from staff members.[55]

Allen Van's view of shared decision making between principals and teachers emphasizes the need to asses different situations. Although he recognizes budget, textbook selection, curriculum, instruction, school improvement, and staff recruitment as valid shared decision making areas, he feels there is a point which must be realized. "The point at which principals must assent final decision making power is a moveable point on an axis that will vary with different issues in different school environments, but in every school, a successful principal will involve teachers to some degree in each of the major areas. . ."[56]

Patrick R. Phillips believes that forth coming reforms must do more than increase the influence of teachers in building level and system wide decision - making. Teachers, in many cases, might need and deserve a larger share of authority, but the policy goal should be greater than simply giving teachers more power. A policy on staff involvement in decision making should help school staff-both teachers and administrators effectively meet the needs of all pupils.

According to Phillips, relevant policy should describe the role or the school principal. Also, an effective policy makes principals responsible for student learning in the school and then gives them the necessary authority to realize the objectives. Learning as well as teaching should be top school concerns. He states,

> Actual leadership at the building level is necessary for effective
> staff participation in decision making. The principal must be

---

[55] Joseph F. Lagana, "Managing Change and School Improvement Effectively", NASSP Bulletin (September 1989):52 - 55.

[56] Allen S. Van, "Shared Decision Making for Principals and Teachers", SAANYS Journal 19 (Summer 1988):15-17.

prepared and encouraged to exert leadership on instructional issues
and perspective to resolve problems and to keep reforms focused on

student learning.[57]

Ann Bradley's article "Who's In Charge Here?" focuses on the feelings of
bafflement that many principals experience from the demands of restructuring and
power sharing. Listed as problems are the feeling that teachers and their unions
are pushing too hard and too fast to increase their decision - making authority and
the feeling that new roles and relationships are being forced upon them without
principals' involvement. However, Bradley also cites a study that has shown that
principals who feared they would lose authority to shared decision - making

committees actually feel more powerful in the restructured schools.[58]

A quote from Scott Thomson, former executive director of the National
Association of Secondary School Principals, is cited by Bradley as an argument
that the idea of shared decision - making is troubling only in that it is not a new
notion. Thomson states, "Good management any where involves a lot of
involvement of the staff, I will argue that good principals have always done that.
Where we part company with the teachers union is that they are interpreting
empowerment and restructuring as a committee of teachers in effect managing

the school. "[59]

---

[57] Patrick R. Phillips, "Shared Decision - Making in an Age of Reform",
Updating School Board Policies 20 (March 1989):2.

[58] Ann Bradley, "Who's In Charge Here?". Teacher Magazine (February
1990):22.

[59] Ibid., 22.

Summary

Shared decision - making is a component of the concept of site based management which is espoused by many as a method to reform our nation's educational system. However, little empirical data is available to support this espousal.

A review of theoretical literature does not establish shared decision - making as an intergral management device. It does not assume a prominent role in the writings of Taylor, Fayol, Gerlich, and Barnard. Later theorists, like Herzberg, and particularly Deming, assign more importance to shared decision - making.

Current literature is divided into two basic presentations of shared decision - making. The first is an espousal of shared decision - making as a vital component to site - based management and subsequent reform of schools. The second is a warning that shared decision - making and site - based management are counter productive as implemented in the realm of education.

Literature related to the principal's role in shared decision - making is limited to examples of how principals can implement shared decision - making in their buildings and statements of frustrations experienced when shared decision - making has been implemented. Concerns have been noted regarding time expenditure, diversion of energies, loss of creativity , and reduction of accountability. There is also a noticeable lack of empirical study of how and if shared decision - making as a management device does improve the educational experience for students.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The presentation and analysis of data in Chapter III are divided into two sections. The first section presents data obtained from the administration of a shared decision - making survey to all junior high / middle school principals in Du Page County, Illinois. The second section presents data obtained through interviews with selected principals.

Section One : Shared Decision - Making Survey

A survey questionnaire was administered to all junior high / middle school principals in Du Page County, Illinois. The purpose of this survey was to determine each principal's experience, knowledge of concepts, and willingness to participate in this investigation.

The survey measured each principal's perception of present level of implementation of shared decision - making and how it is affected by:

1. Grade levels served
2. Total administrative experience
3. Tenure at current school
4. School enrollment
5. School organization
6. Specific training and preparation for shared decision - making
7. School district expectations for shared decision - making
8. Current utilization of shared decision - making.
9. Willingness to participate in this investigation

The survey provided information which was utilized to determine which principals would participate in the interview process. In essence, the survey was used as a screening device. The survey was administered to all forty - eight junior high / middle school principals in Du Page County, Illinois.

The Du Page County Educational Service provided a list of all county schools identified as either junior high schools or middle schools. The list totalled forty seven schools from thirty six separate school districts. Fifteen of the schools are part of six different unit (k-12) districts. The other thirty - two schools are part of thirty different elementary (k-8) school districts. Twenty nine of the schools are the only junior high or middle schools in their respective school districts.

49

A copy of the survey questionnaire and totals of answers is included in Appendix C. A copy of the list of schools including district identification, addresses, and principals surveyed is included in Appendix A.

A copy of the survey questionnaire and totals of answers is included in Appendix C. A copy of the list of schools including district identification, addresses, and principals surveyed is included in Appendix A. A listing of comparative data including per pupil expenditures, average class size, Illinois Goal Assessment results and average district wide teaching experience is included in Appendix B. This information was gathered to further refine the selection of principals too.

Phone Survey Procedures

Each principal was personally contacted by phone during the month of October, 1991. The surveyor reached eight principals during the first round of phone calls. Nine subsequent rounds of phone calls were required before all forty - seven principals were surveyed.

Question 1. " What grade levels are served in your building?"

Table 3 - 1 reports the grade levels served by the principals who were surveyed. Fifty - nine percent or the principals reported the grade levels served as sixth, seventh, and eighth. Twenty - eight percent reported the grade levels served as seventh and eighth. Five percent served grades five, six, seven, and eight. Four percent served grades four, five, six , seven, and eight. The seven schools serving grades four through eight and grades five through eight are among the smallest school districts in Du Page County.

Table 3 - 1
Grade Levels Served by Surveyed Principals

Grade Level	Number	Percent
4 - 8	2	4.3
5 - 8	5	10.6
6 - 8	28	59.5
7 - 8	12	25.6

Question 2 : "What is your total administrative experience?"

Table 3 - 2 reports the total administrative experience of the principals who were surveyed. Forty percent of the principals reported total administrative experience as over 15 years. Almost thirty percent of the principals reported total administrative experience as between 11 and 15 years. Twenty - one percent reported total administrative experience between 5 and 10 years. Only four principals reported total administrative experience as between 3 and 5 years. No principals reported total administrative experience as less than 3 years.

Table 3 - 2
Total Administrative Experiences of Surveyed Principals

Experience	Number	Percent
Less than 3 years	0	0
3 to 5 years	4	8.5
5 to 10 years	10	21.3
11 to 15 years	14	29.8
15 + years	14	40.4

Question 3 : "What is your length of tenure at your current school?"

Table 3 - 3 reports the length of tenure at the current school of the principals who were surveyed. Thirty - four of the principals reported their length of tenure at their current school as between 5 and 10 years. Twenty - three percent reported their length of tenure at their current school as less than three years. Almost fifteen percent reported length of tenure at their current

school as over 15 years. The same percent was reported for the group who were at their current school between 3 and 5 years. The remaining thirteen percent reported length of tenure at their current school as between 11 and 15 years.

Table 3 - 3
Length of Tenure at Current School

Length of tenure	Number	Percent
Less than 3 years	11	23.4
3 to 5 years	7	14.9
5 to 10 years	16	34
11 to 15 years	6	12.8
15 + years	7	14.9

Question 4: "What is your school enrollment?"

Table 3 -4 reports the enrollments of the schools served by the principals who were surveyed. Almost forty - nine percent of the principals reported their school's enrollment as between 200 and 500 students. Twenty - five percent reported their school's enrollments as between 700 and 900 students. Seventeen percent reported their school's enrollment between 500 and 700 students. Four percent reported school enrollments over 900 students. Four percent reported school enrollments of less than 200.

Table 3 - 4
School Enrollments

Enrollment	Number	Percent
Less than 200	2	4.3
1200 to 500	23	48.9
500 to 700	8	17.0
700 to 900	12	25.5
900+	2	4.3

Question 5 : "How is your school organized?"

Table 3 - 5 reports the organizational pattern of the schools served by the principals who were surveyed. Almost twenty seven percent of the principals surveyed reported their schools' organization as departmental. A similar percent reported their schools' organization as a combination of departments and teams. Seventeen percent reported their schools' organization as a combination of self contained and departments. Only one principal reported the school's organization as a combination of self contained departments and teams. No principals reported a self contained organization.

Table 3 - 5
School Organization

Organization	Number	Percent
Self Contained	0	0
Department	13	27.7
Teams	13	27.7
Self Contained/Departments	8	17
Departments/Teams	12	25.5
Self Contained/ Departments/ Teams	1	2.1

Question 6 : "How would you describe your knowledge of the concept of shared decision - making as presented in current educational literature?"

Table 3 -6 reports the principals' descriptions of their knowledge or awareness of the concept of shared decision - making as presented in current educational literature. Almost sixty percent of the principals surveyed described their knowledge of shared decision - making as medium. Thirty - six percent described their knowledge of shared decision - making as high. Four percent described their knowledge of shared decision - making as low. No principals reported no knowledge of shared decision - making.

53

Table 3 -6
Knowledge or Awareness of Shared Decision - Making

Knowledge / Awareness	Number	Percent
High	17	36.2
Medium	28	59.5
Low	2	4.3
None	0	0

Question 7 : "How would you describe your personal support for shared decision - making as a management device?"

Table 3 - 7 reports the principals' descriptions of their support for shared decision - making as a management device. Seventy percent of the principals surveyed described their personal support for a shared decision - making as a management device as high. Almost thirty percent descried their support for shared decision - making as a management device as medium. No principals described their personal support for shared decision - making as a management device as low or none.

Table 3 -7
Personal Support for Shared Decision - Making

Description	Number	Percent
High	33	70.2
Medium	14	29.8
Low	0	0
None	0	0

Question 8 : " What has been your specific training and preparation for shared decision - making?"

Table 3 - 8 reports the principals' descriptions of their training and preparation for shared decision - making. Thirty - four percent of the principals surveyed reported their specific training and preparation for shared decision - making as seminars/workshops. Twenty - one percent reported their specific

training and preparation for shared decision - making as a combination of seminars / workshops and in house / district experiences. Almost fifteen percent reported their specific training and preparation for shared decision making as in house / district experiences. Eight percent reported their specific training and preparation for shared decision - making as graduate courses. Six percent reported their specific training and preparation for shared decision - making as a combination of graduate courses and seminars / workshops. Four percent reported their specific training and preparation for shared decision - making as none. Two percent reported their specific training and preparation for shared decision making as a combination of graduate courses and in house / district experiences. No principals reported receiving specific training and preparation for shared decision - making in undergraduate courses.

Table 3 -8
Specific Training and Preparation for Shared Decision - Making

Training / Preparation	Number	Percent
Undergraduate	0	0
Graduate	4	8.5
Seminars/Workshops	16	34
In house/District	7	14.9
Graduate and Seminars/Workshops	3	6.4
Seminars/Workshops and In House/ District	10	21.3
Graduate, Seminars/Workshops, and In House/District	4	8.5
Graduate, and In House/District	1	2.1
None	2	4.3

Question 9 : "What are your school district's expectations for shared decision - making ?

Table 3 - 9 reports the principals' descriptions of their school districts' expectations for shared decision - making. Almost forty - nine percent of the

principals surveyed reported their school districts' expectations for shared decision - making as part of their evaluations. Twenty - five percent reported their school districts' expectations for shared decision - making as none. Nineteen percent reported their school districts' expectations for shared decision - making as a combination of their job descriptions and evaluations. Four percent reported their districts' expectation for shared decision - making as a combination of their contracts, job descriptions and evaluations. Two percent reported their school districts' expectations for shared decision - making as part of their job description. No principals reported their school districts expectations for shared decision making as only contractual.

Table 3 - 9
School District Expectations for   Shared Decision - Making

School District Expectations	Number	Percent
Contractual	0	0
Principal's Job Description	1	2.1
Principal's Evaluation	23	48.1
Principal's Job Description and Evaluation	9	19.2
Contractual, Job Description and Evaluation	2	4.3
None	12	25.5

Question 10 : "Do you utilize shared decision - making in the areas of curriculum staff development, hiring, budget, building management ?

Table 3 - 10 reports the principals' description of their utilization of shared decision - making in the areas of curriculum, staff development, hiring, budget and building management. Almost ninety - eight percent of the principals surveyed reported utilization of shared decision - making in the area of curriculum. Almost ninety - six percent of the principals surveyed reported utilization of shared decision - making in the areas of staff development and

building management. Seventy - two percent of the principals surveyed reported utilization of shared decision - making in the area of hiring. Seventy percent of the principals surveyed reported utilization of shared decision - making in the area of budget.

Table 3 -10
Areas of Utilization of Shared Decision - Making

Area	Number	Percent
Curriculum	46	97.9
Staff Development	45	95.7
Hiring	34	72.3
Budget	33	70.2
Building Management	45	95.7

Question 11 : "Are you willing to participate in an in - depth interview?"

Table 3 -11 reports the principals' willingness to participate in an in - depth interview. All principals surveyed reported a willingness to participate in a more in - depth interview regarding the principals's role in the implementation of the concept of shared decision - making and the extent of implementation of the concept in their schools.

Table 3 - 11
Principals' Willingness to Participate in an In - depth Interview

Willingness	Number	Percent
Yes	47	100
No	0	0

Section Two : Treatment of Survey Data

Survey data were analyzed to determine which principals would be asked to participate in an in depth interview concerning implementation of the concept of shared decision - making . It was intended to develop an interview group that had similar situations in terms of grade levels served, total administrative experience length of tenure at current school, school enrollment, school organization, knowledge or awareness of the concept of shared decision - making as presented in current educational literature, personal support for shared decision making as a management device, specific training and preparation for shared decision - making, school district expectations for shared decision - making, and current implementation of shared decision - making. However, responses to the eleven questions from the survey yielded no response pattern which was distinctive enough to identify a group of principals which had similar situations in the areas surveyed.

It was decided to use those principals who identified their school organization as teams as the group of principals to participate in the in depth interviews. An assumption that team organization, by definition, exists to create a situation which places a priority on shared decision - making. It is assumed that a team organization fosters shared - decision making in such areas as curriculum, staff development, hiring, budget, and building management. Appendix D reports the specific descriptors of schools described by principals as having team organization.

The group of principals who identified their schools as having teams as their organizational pattern numbered twelve. The twelve principals represent twenty - six percent of those principals who participated in the survey questionnaire.

The principals were asked to respond to six major questions which constitute the basic exploration of this study. The questions are: To what extent so you understand the concept of shared decision – making? To what extent do you utilize shared decision – making in the management of your school ? What areas of management are most affected by shared decision – making ? When shared decision – making is utilized as a management device, what concrete changes occur? Is there a major difference in the level of utilization of shared decision making currently practiced in your school and those levels advocated in the literature? Do you believe an emphasis on restructuring the management of your school enhances or detracts from the effectiveness of direct services provided your students? A number of sub – questions was developed for each major question. The purpose of the sub – questions was to determine the extent of each principal's understanding of the concept of the major questions and to allow the principals enough flexibility to develop meaningful answers.

All of the interviewed principals were asked the same questions in the same order to standardize the interview format and to facilitate quantifying the data. It was decided to report the data collected from the principal interviews collectively by question. The decision to report data in this manner rather than separately for each interview was based on the general agreement in responses given by individual principals.

Interview Question 1

To what extent do you understand the concept of shared decision – making?
Sub questions:

- What descriptors would you use when defining shared decision – making?
- How many articles or books have you read in the past year which dealt in whole or part with shared decision – making?
- How does the team organization facilitate shared decision – making?
- How are teachers more empowered through the use of shared decision – making?
- As a manager, what type of training have you had in the area of shared decision – making?

Descriptors used by principals when defining shared decision – making included collaboration, trust, ownership, collegiality, staff development, participation, power, consensus, focus, and professionalism. Nine principals mentioned collaboration as a descriptor. Eight principals mentioned trust. Seven principals mentioned ownership. The three descriptors of collaboration, trust, and ownership comprised a common theme in all of the interviews. One principal summarized this theme by stating, "I feel teachers have more ownership in decisions when they believe I trust their abilities. This in turn builds a collaborative feeling in the school which leads to even more ownership on other decisions." The principals' descriptors and their interpretations of the descriptors match those used in the literature related to shared decision – making. None of the principals evidenced hesitation when articulating descriptors.

When responding to the question regarding the amount of articles or books dealing with shared decision – making all of the principals responded in some

manner that they wish they had more time to read even more. One principal responded that he had read over ten articles or books in the last year. Four principals said they had read over five articles or books in the last year. The remaining seven principals said they had read less than five articles or books in the last year. The most frequently cited sources of material were the NASSP Bulletin and Phi Delta Kappan. Although not pressed, none of the principals gave the title of a book which had been read.

All twelve principals were positive in their response to the question regarding how the team organization in their school facilitates shared decision - making. Six of the principals cited the feature of a common planning time as the most important factor in facilitating shared decisions. Four principals mentioned the greater ability of teams to develop cross curricular units of instruction as a facilitating factor in shared decision - making. Five principals claimed that the team concept allows a spirit of collegiality to build which in turn, fosters shared decision - making. Three principals claimed it was easier for them to work with teachers and effect change through shared decision - making because the size of the group was smaller than if they had to work with an entire faculty. One principal stated, "I can't imagine implementing an effective shared decision - making model if our school were not organized by teams. There is no question that the team structure lends itself to sharing."

To a person, all of the principals believed teachers are more empowered through the use of shared decision - making. Eight principals claimed teachers have more input in the instructional area because of shared decision - making. They felt teachers were given more authority of how they teach because they develop their own instructional approaches. Four principals mentioned control over daily activities as the most empowering aspect of shared decision - making. They cited teacher involvement when working with student concerns as providing

teachers with a sense of empowerment. Six principals also mentioned teachers' authority to adapt their daily schedule to team purposes as an example of empowerment which results from a team's shared decision. One principal summarized feeling of teacher empowerment as a "sense that what I believe is right for kids can actually be implemented."

The principals' general response to the question regarding training in the area of shared decision - making was similar to the "not enough" response to the question about the amount of reading they had been able to accomplish. None of the principals cited course work at the college or university level as part of their training in shared decision - making. Seven principals said they received training through various district level workshops or seminars. Three principals said they received most of their information about shared decision making from reading current literature. Three principals said they had no training in the area of shared decision - making. However, all twelve principals related on the job experience as the most important or effective training in shared decision - making. This feeling was expressed most succinctly by one principal who said, "I don't believe a person could gain a real understanding of how shared decision - making works by taking a class. So much is dependent on the situation in which you work that theory pales when compared to experience."

In summary, the twelve principals interviewed evidenced a basic understanding of the concept of shared decision - making. Their use of descriptors, citations of organizational facilitators, and examples of empowerment evidenced a common understanding of theory and its applicability. Likewise, the twelve principals evidenced commonality in their desire to increase knowledge through reading and their lack of formal training in the area of shared decision - making.

Interview Question 2

To what extent do you utilize shared decision - making in the management of your school?

Sub - Questions:

- What expectations do you have for staff in terms of shared decision - making?
- How are these expectations conveyed to staff?
- Are staff evaluated on the basis of their shared decision - making efforts?
- Do you have procedures for documenting the extent of shared decision - making in building level activities?
- How does team organization impact the extent of your utilization of shared decision - making in the management of your school?

Expectations principals have for their staffs in terms of shared decision - making ranged from general concepts of professionalism to rather specific behavior patterns. Six principals mentioned teacher professionalism as some form of acceptance of responsibilities. Development of cross - curricular units of instruction, participation in development of building or department budgets, and working in collaboration to address the needs of at risk students were cited as examples of expectations fro teachers. Three principals referred to interaction with team members as a basic expectation for their staffs. Only two principals alluded to teacher involvement in district wide activities such as curriculum study committees as one of their expectations for teachers. The most frequently used descriptor related to expectations for teachers was "participation." All twelve principals used this word when describing what each expected of their teachers. Participation of teachers was expected in a number of areas including curriculum, budget, and problem solving. One principal stated, "If teachers expect to have a say in how we do things, then I expect them to participate. Otherwise,

63

they shouldn't complain." Another principal said, "Without participation by the teacher, there can be no sharing of decisions. It's as simple as that." Principals were in less concert when describing how they convey expectations to staff. Three principals claimed to have developed expectations through various memos and other communications. None of these three principals could cite a specific example of a memo or a communication which was developed for the specific purpose of developing shared decision - making expectations. Further questioning revealed that none of these principals intended to establish shared decision - making as a primary focus of their management style through memos and other communications. References to sharing decisions were not specific and did not present defined procedures for implementation. Four principals felt the overall structure of the school somewhat dictated or forced expectations of shared decision - making on their staffs. Five principals said their own behavior was the most important or effective way they used to convey shared decision - making expectations. Several principals felt their use of building wide management teams was another effective way to convey expectations. However, the principals who cited their own behavior as the most important medium of conveyance demonstrated the most emotion when answering the question. One principals' response can be considered typical. She said, "If I don't do what I expect of my teachers, then everything I expect of them can be viewed as hypocritical. You can't expect people to participate and understand what is happening if you are not willing to involve yourself."

None of the twelve principals interviewed evaluated teachers on the basis of their shared decision - making efforts. No one could cite a specific evaluative criterion in their districts' evaluation procedures which was related to shared decision - making. However, all twelve principals who were interviewed could identify some portion of their district's evaluation procedures as having

applicability in the area of shared decision – making. Seven principals cited cooperation with other staff as an example. Four principals mentioned the general area of professional behavior and its expectation of participation as an example. Nine principals said they make a point to mention the extent of teacher involvement in sharing decisions in their evaluations. One principal summarized the group's general response by saying, "It is difficult to zero in on shared decision – making when evaluating a teacher. It is too vague a topic on which to rate a teacher's performance. On the other hand, it is assumed in a number of other areas such as ability to work with colleagues."

In questioning it was found that none of the principals initiated an emphasis on participation by teachers in shared decision – making in their evaluations of teachers. Their lack of initiative in this regard indicated that principals had not assumed a strong leadership position in this area nor did they intend to in the future. It was apparent that principals did not perceive their roles to be catalysts which could or should change or hasten their districts' implementation of shared decision – making as a management device.

Similar responses were gathered for the question regarding procedures for documenting the extent of shared decision – making in building level activities. Although principals were able to supply a number of examples to the extent of shared decision – making such as specific cross curricular units and responses to concerns or problem solving, actual specific documentation was not readily provided. Four principals mentioned activities of building wide governance committees and their minutes or memorandum as examples of documentation. Three principals gave some form of team or department meeting as examples. Several others cited the formal documentation of committee work such as learning objectives which have been approved by their school boards. This statement by one principal summarizes the question of documentation. "I don't

know if it's possible to document the extent of shared decision - making. I think it is so pervasive that it cuts across areas and is difficult to isolate. I don't know if it's worth it to try."

All twelve principals felt team organization has a positive impact on their utilization of shared decision - making in the management of their schools. They all mentioned the nature of their involvement as being somewhat more peripheral as a result of team organization . Four principals made specific reference to teacher creativity in the instructional area as an example of the impact of team organization. Six principals felt shared decisions at the team level allowed their schools to be more personalized for students. Several others said the team organization allowed them to really work with teachers instead of directing teachers. "I could not enjoy my job as much as I do if I didn't have teams. It frees me from having to make all the decisions, "was a typical response.

In summary, principals believe the extent of their utilization of shared decision - making in the management of their schools is somewhat pervasive. Although expectations for teacher involvement in the decision process are clear to the principals, there is no clear documentation of such involvement. All interviewed principals believe team organization has a positive impact in the management of their schools.

What areas of management are most affected by shared decision making?

Sub - Questions:

- How do you utilize shared decision - making in curriculum development?

- How do you utilize shared decision - making in staff development?

- How do you utilize shared decision - making in budget development?

- How do you utilize shared decision - making in hiring?

- How does team organization impact the areas of curriculum, staff development, budget, and hiring?

All interviewed principals mentioned two levels of curriculum development when responding to the question regarding utilization of shared decision - making in curriculum development. Eight principals concentrated their answers on how their staffs are involved through participation in district level curriculum committees. They then mentioned how these teachers either represent other building teachers or how they seek input form their building level colleagues. The other four principals began their answers with examples of how curricular questions are first raised at the building level and then brought to the district level for further consideration and action.

There was not a strong difference in both sets of responses as all principals felt the interaction between district and building level participation in curriculum appropriately involved teachers in the decision - making process. Appropriateness of teacher involvement was considered by the principals to end at the recommendation level. No principal supported a situation in which teachers had the final approval of what was taught throughout their districts. One principal expressed the duality of the curriculum process when he said, "Although it would be simpler to make all curricular decisions at the building level, I feel the

teachers realize that a broader base is needed as curriculum is supposed to reflect the community at large."

Nine of the interviewed principals feel that staff development is an area where shared decision - making is more exclusively a building level function., Although conceding some district involvement, they had established building level committees which made most staff development decisions. Seven of these principals had specific staff development committees in place. The other two said staff development was a responsibility of their building wide governance committees. Three of the twelve principals stated that staff development is primarily a district level activity. Their teachers were involved in the decision - making process through membership on district staff development committees. One principal stated, "Staff development is akin to curriculum development in the sense that although we are expected to keep on top of things at the building level, sometimes district concerns determine the direction we are going."

Budget development provided a more diverse utilization of shared decision - making. Four of the interviewed principals said their staffs preferred to leave budget decisions in the hands of the principals. All four said they relied heavily on input from teachers but final decisions were theirs. The various comments by principals regarding shared decision - making when developing budgets indicate tha principals continue to accept major responsibility for budget decisions. Three of the principals said budget decisions were the responsibility of building level governance committees. They served as resources to the committees when budgets were being deliberated. Three of the principals said they utilized shared decision - making in the budget process by involving teachers by academic departments and then resolving differences by collaboration between departments and the principal. The remaining two principals said budget decisions were permanently the responsibility of the central office. Teachers were involved in

the process through their membership on district committees. One principal stated, "It would be much easier for me to make budget decisions. It certainly would be faster but teacher involvement helps them realize there is an over all picture to be seen."

Utilization of shared decision - making in the hiring process produced a similar variety of responses. Five principals said they used committees to involve teachers in decisions related to all hiring. Four principals said they utilize shared decision - making for classroom teacher hiring but for other specialist positions they either made the decisions themselves or involved others as they deemed appropriate. Three of the interviewed principals did not involve teachers in hiring decisions. One of these principals said, "If I am alone when a teacher has to be fired, then I want to be the one responsible for hiring." A principal who does involve teachers in the hiring process took a different view. He said, "If they are expected to work together as a team, I want teachers to help determine who they will work with."

The variety of responses regarding sharing decisions in the hiring process could be interpreted as an example of how divergent attitudes are towards the concept. The variety of responses can also be interpreted as evidence of the lack of pervasiveness in the implementation of shared decision - making. Shared decision - making is less likely to be utilized or accepted by principals in an area which they consider to have an impact on their own positions. Hiring of teachers is this type of management area.

All twelve principals agreed that team organization has a positive impact on the areas of curriculum, staff development, budget, and hiring. The most common response was that the team structure facilitated staff involvement in decision making because it allows principals some flexibility in how they interact with teachers. One principal summarized this feeling when he said, "If we need a

69

decision made in curriculum, budget or whatever, I can either meet with teachers as a team, as a department, or even as a whole building. It lets me move the process by determining where to begin the decision - making." The high level of agreement regarding team organization and its positive impact on shared decision - making indicates that principals believe organizational structure can assist them in their roles as site based managers.

In summary, shared decision - making affects a number of school management areas. Shared decision - making is used both at the building and district level in curriculum development and staff development. Shared decision - making is utilized in the area of budget development to the extent that individual school districts and principals are comfortable. There is not a consistent application of shared decision - making in hiring procdures. All principals believe that the team organization has a positive impact on utilizing shared decision - making in building management.

Interview Question 4

When shared decision - making is utilized as a management device, what concrete changes occur?

Sub - Questions:

* In the last year can you provide a specific example of a concrete change which occurred as a result of shared decision - making?

* How are concrete changes resulting from utilization of shared decision - making in evidence?

* What are your school district's expectations for you as a principal to employ shared decision - making in your management of your building?

* How is your performance documented in this regard?

* Has there been a change in staff moral as you implemented shared decision - making?

Seven of the twelve interviewed principals cited examples in the area of curriculum as changes which occurred as a result of shared decision - making. All of their responses centered on teacher participation at the team level in the decision - making process. Their emphasis on team interaction was summarized by one principal who said, "I think the most concrete example is one team's development of an ecology unit which involved the areas of geography, writing, and math. The teachers thought of the concept, resolved differences, and developed just about everything in the unit by themselves. The unit would not have existed without their decisions." Three principals mentioned building management activities as concrete examples of shared decision - making. One of these principals said, "I could not have thought of our new way of having students move to and from assemblies by myself. The teachers came up with the idea and made it work." Although their change can be considered minor, the principal felt it had a significant impact on staff morale. Two principals felt the budget process employed in their buildings was the best example of a concrete change resulting

71

from their employment of shared decision - making. They both used departmental committees to develop teacher requests. Each department reached consensus on its needs and then submittted a list to either the building principal or a buildidng wide budget committee. "I wasn't even involved, so no one could complain, " said one principal.

All twelve of the interviewed principals believed evidence of the changes resulting from utilization of shared decision - making could be found in the increased participation of teachers on various decision - making committees. Examples included committees related to staff development, budget, and discipline. Every principal claimed that teachers willingness to become involved at the committee level has increased when teachers feel they are part of the decision process. One principal said, "It is now easy to get volunteers for committees, as long as they really believe their ideas will have some impact." The similiarity of responses by all twelve principals in the area of teacher involvement demonstrates one benefit of empowerment as an element of shared decision - making. According to the principals, participation increased as teachers were empowereed to make decisions.

Similarly, all of the twelve interviewed principals believed their school districts expected them to employ shared decision - making in their buildings. However, none of the principals interviewed said specific criteria related to their employment of shared decision - making in their buildings were used as part of their evaluations. In several districts, principals were expected to use building management committees as part of their building management, however, this was considered just one aspect of a districts' over all commitment to involving as many people as possible in the decision process. One principal said, "I guess it is just considered a normal function of being a principal to involve people in decisions. 'Expectation' might be too strong a term to use in this regard. On the

other hand, I probably would be considered a failure if I didn't involve others." It was clear that all twelve principals were expected to invlove others in the decision making process. However, the specific areas of inviolvement, the extent of inviovement, and the teachers chosen to be invloved remained as decision s made by each principal.

The question regarding documentation of principal performance in regard to shared decision – making elicited similar responses. Again, none could provide specific examples of performance being documented. However, most mentioned that somewhere in their performance appraisals some statement about their ability or effectiveness in the area of shared decision – making would appear. These statements were of a general nature and more often associated with a tone or cultural attitude in a building than specific examples of employment of shared decision – making in building management. One principal said, "Sharing decisions is something that is done generally in almost all aspects of our school. It has been mentioned in my evaluations, but only as a peripheral issue."

The twelve principals were as positive about change in staff morale as they had been in previous questions about the benefits of team organization. To a person they claimed staff morale improved as they incorporated shared decision – making in their building management. However, seven of the twelve principals noted that staff acceptance of increased responsibility in the shared decision – making process was not necessarily as high as the principals would prefer. One principal noted that she believed "staff maturity" was an important factor in acceptance of sharing decisions. She felt morale improved as staff maturity increased. Another principal said it took several years before his staff felt comfortable with sharing decisions. Three principals cautioned that sharing decisions takes much more time and when first implemented could cause some problems until staff felt more comfortable with the process. However, the

general feeling of the principals was summarized by one who said, "I honestly believe my staff's morale has improved because of involving them in decisions. I also feel they need to understand the extent of their involvement, otherwise, things can backfire."

Based upon the similarity of responses by all twelve principals in regard to staff morale and the previously cited area of teacher participation, the principals believe shared decision - making has a positive impact on their schools. However, principals cite the need for involving teachers in a sincere and meaningful manner. If teachers do not see the results of their efforts they will not participate and the process could have a negative impact. The involvement of as many staff as possible only insures that the opportunity to participate has been afforded all teachers. Lack of involvement by teachers results in meaningless decisions for them. The number of teachers involved in the decision making process and how they are selected is dependent on the circumstance in individual schools. However, principals do not use established procedures to limit or prohibit participation as this is counter productive.

In summary, principals provided specific examples of changes in the areas of curriculum, budget, and staff development when shared decision - making was utilized as a management device. Although specific expectations for principals to employ shared decision - making in their management were not in evidence, there exists a general expectation that principals' performance is considered positive if they do employ shared decision - making in their management. All principals felt staff morale improves as shared decision - making is implemented.

Interview Question 5

Is there a major difference in the level of utilization of shared decision - making currently practiced and those levels advocated in the literature?

Sub - Questions:

- Do you believe that as a manager you can raise the level of shared decision - making in your building?

- In what areas can the implementation of shared decision - making be increased?

- How do you envision utilizing shared decision - making in the future?

All twelve of the interviewed principals believed they could raise the level of shared decision - making in their buildings. Of all the questions asked in the interview process, this question about potential increase in shared decision making reached the highest level of consensus in terms of response. No principal felt he or she had achieved as high a level of shared decision - making as possible. Seven principals cited teacher reluctance as the greatest barrier to increasing shared decision - making. They went through some lengths to explain their answers as none wanted to imply their responses should be construed as negative toward entire staffs. However, all mentioned the reluctance of some of their staffs to become involved on what they considered even the most basic areas of shared decision - making. One principal said, "There are times I feel guilty because it seems that it is always the same people who get involved. While others might not complain, I know the concept of sharing decisions means involvement of all." Another principal remarked that she believes the level of shared decision - making in her building is raised with each new teacher she hires. She works to help new teachers understand the concept of sharing decisions and the expectations that teachers are to participate in the decision making process.

When pressed, principals cited a number of different steps they had taken to

involve more staff. Five principals worked with either school governance groups or ad hoc committees to define expectations for teacher involvement in the decision - making process. Four principals claimed to use evaluations to increase participation. Two principals said they really could not force or even guide their teachers to more participation. They said that they had to wait to hire new staff before significant changes in the level of teachers' participation could be accomplished. One principal used staff development funds and opportunities to increase teacher participation. None of the principals cited district level support or activities as a step to be taken to increase teacher involvement in the decision - making process.

The twelve interviewed principals mentioned virtually all areas of building management when asked to provide examples of areas in which shared decision - making could be increased. Five principals cited curriculum and related instruction is always an area for increasing shared decision - making. One of these five principals said, "If you think about it, teachers need to share instructional decisions in a team situation. Otherwise, why have teams?" Other principals in team schools did not refer to teams in their answers. None of the team school principals elaborated on the team concept when answering questions about increasing implementation of shared decision - making. Four principals mentioned budget as an area in which the implementation of shared decision - making could be increased. One said, "I know it might sound somewhat self - serving, but teachers need to know how limited our resources are. I think this will make them feel better when decisions are made."

The interviewed principals varied in their responses to the question about how they envisioned utilizing shared decision - making in the future. Three principals envisioned a greater participation by parents in the decision - making process. Four already include parents as part of a building wide governance team,

76

but felt parents could be even more involved. Principals who mentioned parents in their responses did not relate parental involvement as an outcome of the reform movement. Their responses were accepting on an individual principal basis. None were threatened by the concept. None cited the reform movement or the possibility of governmental mandates as the basis for their acceptance of parental involvement. Three principals mentioned the possibility of forming building wide teams or committees which would oversee virtually all decisions in a building. The most common factor in all responses was a sense that utilization of shared decision – making as an evolutionary process which develops naturally. An element of the evolutionary development of shared decision – making is time in which to experience the process. Principals felt development exists on a natural continuum. Each school exsits in a different environment, and principals realized that each school and each principal will by necessity react differently to the implementation of the concept of shared decision – making. This belief was summarized by one principal who said, "Obligation of shared decision – making is dependent on too many variables such as finances and staff attitude to just say this is where we will be in two years. I do think, though, that it will increase because in concept it is hard to fault."

In summary, principals believe the level of shared decision – making can be raised in their buildings. They believe implementation of shared decision – making can be increased in virtually all areas of school management. The principals also believed it is a process which can increase with time and experience.

Do you believe an emphasis on restructuring management of your school through shared - decision making enhances or detracts from the effectiveness of direct services provided your students?
Sub - Questions:

- Is there an effort in your district to restructure management of your school?

- If so, how is it occurring ?

- If not, should there be an effort to restructure?

- Can you provide examples of how students would be better served if your school management were restructured?

- Can you provide examples of how direct services to students would suffer if management were restructured?

- Do you feel a school organized by teams should be restructured?

None of the twelve principals interviewed indicated an effort by the various districts to restructure the management of schools. Several cited general movements by their districts to form more collaborative relationships with teachers' unions at the district level. However, none mentioned any overt actions by districts to dictate the manner in which principals had to operate. One principal summarized the general sentiment when he said, "You couldn't say I have been told to do anything differently. I think we at the school level are trusted to do the best job possible. I suppose if serious problems developed there might be some efforts by the district to change things, but, then again, I probably would be out of a job."

Principals did not indicate a need for efforts to restructure. In their responses six principals questioned the meaning of "restructure." One said, "Just how does a person restructure an already successful school? I can't think of how

we could do things better unless we were given more resources and I don't see that happening." Another said, "If you mean by restructuring a total change in how I interact with teachers, then you would have to dismantle things like our contract, tenure laws, and state mandates. Why go through the motions if you can't change these basic elements?"

The questions regarding examples of how students would be better served or would suffer if school management were restructured provided no clear consensus of responses from the twelve interviewed principals. Several answers echoed responses to previous questions in the sense that performance and effectiveness could always improve. Again, the answers depended on what was meant by restructuring. Different principals had different ideas of just what was meant by restructuring. Three principals saw restructuring as providing more resources and services such as counselors and lower class sizes. Four principals saw it as providing more opportunities for greater involvement in the decision - making process for teachers and parents. One principal said, "Maybe students would be served better if we were able to restructure in a way that made quicker responses to whatever needs they have, but I can't give you a clear example of how we could do that any better than we are now doing given our current resources."

Nine principals mentioned time as a factor that could have a negative effect on students if management were restructured. The element of time was considered by the principals in the sense that restructuring by its nature takes time away from current initiatives which are intended to help students. One principal summarized this general feeling when he said, "You can't restructure anything without having a delaying or negative impact on what you are currently doing. This includes the good things you are doing. It would be almost impossible to move things you know you are doing and simultaneously restructure everything."

None of the twelve interviewed principals believed schools organized by

teams should be restructured. The principals' answers were very similar in their positive feeling about team organization. They cited research and personal experience when explaining their answers. One principal said, "Why change something that has been proven to work? All the literature says teams are the way to go at the middle school level. We know the developmental needs of our kids are better served by teams. Everything we talked about before like sharing decisions is facilitated by teams. Why change?"

In summary, none of the interviewed principals felt an effort was being made by districts to restructure school management. None felt a strong need to restructure. Providing examples of how students would be better served or would suffer as a result of restructuring was difficult for principals to do as they questioned just what is meant by restructuring. All twelve principals felt strongly that schools organized by teams should not be restructured. This apparent difference between principals not having a clear meaning of restructuring and their strong advocacy of not restructuring schools organized by teams indicates a problem exists with definition of terms. Each school's unique situation presents each principal with a unique perspective of how educational trends apply to him or her. Those principals in schools organized by teams apparently believe their organization has already met the nation wide call for restructuring.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Chapter IV presents a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the interview date, and recommendations for further study.

Summary of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to provide educators with information related to the current level of implementation of the elements of shared decision - making at the school level. The intent was to identify the extent to which principals currently utilize shared decision - making as a management device. An examination of current practices will assist practitioners determine what extent restructuring management of school should occur. This study sought to determine:

1. To what extent do principals understand the concept of shared decision making?

2. To what extent do principals utilize shared decision - making in the management of schools?

3. What areas of management are most affected by shared decision - making?

4. When shared decision - making is utilized as a management device what concrete changes occur?

5. Is there a significant difference in the level of utilization of shared decision making currently practiced and those levels advocated in the literature?

6. Do principals believe an emphasis on restructuring the management of their schools through shared - decision making enhances or detracts from the effectiveness of direct service provided their schools?

Procedures

The procedures followed in the study included:

1. A search of the literature was made to review the philosophical and theoretical basis of shared decision - making and to describe elements of shared decision - making applications at schools as presented by researchers and educational writers.

2. A survey questionnaire was administered to all junior high/middle schools principals in Du Page County of Illinois to determine each principals experience, knowledge of concepts and willingness to participate in this investigation. This survey provided information which was utilized to determine which principals would participate in the interview process.

3. Interviews of principals who had identified their schools as being organized by teams were conducted. The team organization descriptor provided an interview base of similar organizational patterns which incorporate shared decision - making as part of the organization's philosophy.

4. Conclusions from the interviews were made relative to the principals' answers to the major research questions.

5. Recommendations were made based on the conclusions drawn from the interviews.

6. Suggestions for further research were made based on the recommendations.

Conclusions

Interview Question 1: To what extent do principals understand the concept of shared decision - making?

The interviewed principals evidenced basic understanding of the concept of shared decision - making. However, principals knowledge of the concept of shared decision - making could be increased.

Interview Question 2: To what extent do principals utilize shared decision - making in the management of schools?

Principals utilize shared decision - making to the extent of their own expectations. There is no clear documentation of teacher involvement in shared decision making.

Interview Question 3: What areas of management are most affected by shared decision - making?

Shared decision - making affects the areas of curriculum development, staff development, budget, and hiring. However, levels of implementation of shared decision - making in these areas varies widely among different schools.

Interview question 4: When shared decision making is utilized as a management device, what concrete changes occur?

Increased teacher participation and improved staff morale occur when shared decision - making is utilized.

Interview question 5: Is there a major difference in the level of utilization of shared decision - making currently practiced and those levels advocated in the literature?

The level of utilization of shared decision - making currently practiced is not as consistent nor pervasive as those levels advocated in the literature.

Interview question 6: Do you believe an emphasis on restructuring management of your school enhances or detracts from the effectiveness of direct services provided your students?

Principals have not emphasized restructuring of schools through shared decision - making.

Recommendations

1. Principals should increase their knowledge of the concept of shared decision - making as a management device through course work leading to administrative certification, district sponsored in services, and personal reading.

2. Documentation of the utilization of shared decision - making in management of schools should be increased to provide evidence of how its use benefits a school's performance.

3. Evaluations of principals should include clear descriptors of expectations regarding a principals' ability to implement shared decision - making in school management.

4. Principals should determine the extent of implementation of shared decision - making based on their assessment of the culture in their building and their staffs' receptivity and ability.

5. Team organization of junior high/middle schools needs to be supported at the district, state, and national levels to facilitate implementation of shared decision - making.

6. Restructuring of schools should occur at the building level and only if a need for restructuring exists.

7. Studies of current implementation of shared decision - making at building levels must be conducted before district initiatives are launched.

8. The principal's responsibilities must be defined as shared decision - making is implemented.

Suggestions for Further Study

1. Schools not having team organization were not addressed in this study. Inclusion of such schools in further research can provide data to determine if one type of organizational structure is more effective than another when attempting to implement shared decision – making.

2. This study did not survey the perceptions of teachers regarding implementation of shared decision – making. Such data could provide a basis for a comparative analysis of different notes in the shared decision – making process.

3. This study did not address the inclusion of parents in the process of shared decision – making. A study of parent involvement could provide data to determine if their involvement increases or decreases a school's effectiveness.

4. A national study similar in nature to this study would provide data indicating the levels of implementation of shared decision making on a nationwide basis.

5. This study concentrated on junior high /middle schools. A study including elementary and secondary schools would provide information on the differences in the application of shared decision – making as determined by the grade levels served in a building.

6. A case study approach would yield specific data to evaluate overall operational effectiveness using exemplary schools that implement shared decision – making in their organizational procedures.

7. A study of evaluation of principals would provide data indicating the relation between district expectations and implementation of shared decision – making as a management device.

8. Additional research is needed correlating the implementation of shared decision – making with outcome objectives such as school climate and student achievement.

REFERENCES

Books.

Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Massachusets: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bermis, Warren G. and Edgar H. Schein, eds. Leadership and Motivation. Cambridge, Massachusetts : MIT Press, 1966.

Callagan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Deming, W. Edwards. Out of the Crisis. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1991.

Fayol, Henre. General and Industrial Management. trans. Constance Storrs. London: Sir Isaac Pitmann and Sons, 1923.

Gulick, Luther and Leonard Vowick, eds. Papers on the Science of Administration. New York : Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

Herzberg, Frederick. The Managerial Choice : to be Efficient and to Be Human. Salt Lake City, Utah : Olympus Publishing, 1982.

Hopkins, David and Marvin Wideln, eds. Alternative Perspectives on School Improvement. London : The Falmer Press, 1984.

Lewis, Anne. Restructuring America's Schools. Arlington, Virginia : American Association of School Administrators, 1989.

Mauriel, John J. Strategic Leadership for Schools. San Francisco, California : Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1989.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice Hall Inc., 1989.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. The Principles of Scientific Management. Westport, Connecticut : Greenwood Press, 1911.

87

White, Patricia. Beyond Domination, An Essay in the Political Philosophy of Education. London : Routledge and Kegan, 1983.

Journals.

Bradley, Ann. "Who's In Charge Here?" Teacher Magazine (February 1990) : 22.

David, Jane. "Synthesis of Research on School - Based Management." Educational Leadership 46 (May, 1989) : 45.

English, Fenwick. "School - Site Management." The Practitioner 16 (December 1989) : 3.

Giesert, Gene. "Participatory Management : Panacea or Hoax?" Educational Leadership 46 (November 1988) : 56.

Gomez, Joseph J. "The Path to School - Based Management Isn't Smooth, But We're Scaling the Obstacles One by One." American School Board Journal 176 (October 1989): 22.

Hansen, J. Merrell "Site-Based Management and Quality Circles : A National Combination." NASSP Bulletin (October 1990): 102.

Heller, Robert, Beth Woodworth, Stephen Jacobson, and James Conway, "Administrator Opinions on School Based Management." Executive Educator (November, 1989): 15.

Herman, Stanly M. "Participative Management Is A Double - Edged Sword." The School Administrator 45 (March 1989): 38.

Laragana, Joseph F. "Managing Change and School Improvement Effectively." NASSP Bulletin (September 1989): 52.

Maeroff, Gene "The Principles of Teacher Empowerment." NASSP Bulletin 72 (November 1988): 52.

Maler, Betty, Rodney T. Ogawa, and Jennifer Kranz. "Site-Based Management : Unfulfilled Promises." The School Administrator 47 (February 1990): 54.

Mitchell, James E. "Site-Based Management : Coaxing Staff from Cages for
　　　Site-Based Decisions to Fly." The School Administrator 47 (February
　　　1990): 24.

_____. "Share the Power." American School Board Journal (January 1990): 49.

Pierce, Lawrence C. "School Based Management. " Oregon School Study Council
　　　Bulletin. 23 (June 1980): 7.

Phillips, Patrick R. "Shared Decision - Making in an Age of Reform. "Updating
　　　School Board Policies. 20 (March 1989): 2.

Rhodes, Lewis A. "Thoughts on W. Edwards Deming and School Leadership
　　　Beyond Your Beliefs : Quantum Leaps Toward Quality Schools. "The
　　　School Administrator (December, 1990): 26.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A. and Richard W. Clark. "School - Centered Decision Making
　　　and Renewal." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (May 1988): 66.

Strauber, Sandra K., Sara Stankey, and Carl Wagen Knecht. "Site-Based
　　　Management at Central - Hower." Educational Leadership 47 (April 1990):
　　　65.

Van, Allen S. "Shared Decision Making for Principals and Teachers." SAANYS
　　　Journal 19 (Summer 1988): 15.

Wentz, Robert E. "School Principals: The Emerging Community Heroes as the
　　　1990's Unfold." NASSP Bulletin (September 1989): 41.

Wilkinson, Van, "Participatory Management vs. Participatory Responsibility."
　　　Thrust (October 1988): 20.

Other Sources

American Association of School Administrators. Challenges for School
　　　Leaders. Arlington, Virginia : AASA 1988.

American Association of School Administraters, National Association of
    Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary Principals.
    School - Based Management. Arlington, Virginia : AASA, NAESP, NASSP, 1988.

Beers, Donald E. "School Based Management" Abstract : NAESP 1984.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. Turning Points Preparing American
    Youth for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1989.

Clune, William and Paula White. School Based Management: Institutional
    Variation, Implementation, and Issues for Research. New Brunswick,
    New Jersey: Eagleton Institute Rutgers University, 1987.

Educational Research Service. ERS Information Folio Site-Based Management.
    (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1990.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk (Washington D.C.:
    U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Osterman, Karen. "Supervision and Shared Authority - A Study of Principal and
    Teacher Control in Six Urban Middle Schools." Paper presented at the
    Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San
    Fransisco, 1989.

School - Centered Decision-Making Task Force. "School-Centered Decision-Making"

    Tacoma, Washington: Tacoma Public Schools, 1990.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared:Teachers for the 21st
    Century. New York : Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy,
    1986).

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCEPT OF SHARED DECISION MAKING (SDM)

SURVEY QUESTIONNNAIRE

Principal's Name:

School:

District:

1. Grade levels served :	4 - 8	2
	5 - 8	5
	6 - 8	28
	7 - 8	12
2. Total administrative experience:	Less than 3 years	0
	3 to 5 years	4
	5 to 10 years	10
	11 to 5 years	14
	15 + years	19
3. Length of tenure at current school:	Less than 3 years	11
	3 to 5 years	7
	5 to 10 years	16
	11 to 15 years	6
	15 + years	7
4. School Enrollment:	Less than 200	2
	200 to 500	23
	500 to 700	8
	700 to 900	12
	900 +	2
5. School Organization:	Self Contained	0
	Department	13
	Teams	13
	Self Cont'd/Dept.	8
	Dept./Teams	12
	Self Cont'd/Dept./Teams	1

	High	17
	Medium	28
	Low	2
	None	0
	High	33
	Medium	14
	Low	0
	None	0
SDM:	Undergraduate	0
	Graduate	4
	Seminars/Workshops	16
	In house/District	7
	Sem/Wkshps-In House/District	2
	Graduate-Sem/Wkshps/- In House/District	4
	Graduate-Sem/Wkshps	3
	Graduate-In House/District	1
	None	0
DM:	Contractual	0
	Principal's job description	1
	Principal's evaluation	23
	job description/ evaluation	9
	contract/job description/ evaluation	2
	None	12
	Curriculum	46
	Staff Development	45
	Hiring	34
	Budget	33
	Building Management	45
	dule, movement, discipline, maintenance)	
view.	Yes	47
	No	0

93

APPENDIX B

Appendix B

DUPAGE COUNTY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

DIST.	SCHOOL	ADDRESS	PRINCIPAL
2	Blackhawk Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	250 S. Church Rd. Bensenville, IL. 60106	Bob Barr Sue Liechti
4	Indian Trail Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	222 N. Kennedy Dr. Addison, IL. 60101	Douglas McFarland 828 - 2555
7	WoodDale Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	6n655 WoodDale Rd. WoodDale, IL. 60191	Lorenz Hartwig 766 - 6210
10	Peacock Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	301 E. North St. Itasca, IL. 60143	E. Anthony DeGrazia 773 - 0335
11	Medinah Middle (6 - 8)	700 E. Granville Ave. Roselle, IL. 60172	Richard Ganek 893 - 3636
12	Roselle Middle (6 - 8)	500 S. Park Roselle, IL. 60172	Robert Wulffen 529 - 1600
13	Westfield Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	149 Fairfield Way Bloomingdale, IL. 60108	Charles Swangren 529 - 6211
15	Marquardt Mddle (7 - 8)	1912 Glen Ellyn Rd. Glendale Hts., IL. 60139	James Seyers 260 - 6112
16	Glenside Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	1560 Bloomingdale Rd. Glendale Hts., IL. 60139	Dr. J. Wolff 260 -6112 20
20	Spring Wood Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	5540 Arlington Dr, East Hanover Park, IL. 60103	Charles Crissey 893 - 8900
25	Benjamin Jr. H.S. (5 - 8)	28W300 St. Charles Rd. West Chicago, IL. 60185	Greg Kane 293 - 5080
33	West Chicago Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	238 E. Haze St. West Chicago, IL. 60185	David Burton 293 - 6060
34	Winfield Middle (5 - 8)	0S 150 Park St. Winfield, IL. 60190	Joe McHaley 668 - 6052
44	Lombard Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	150 W. Madison Lombard, IL. 60148	Kim Perkins 620 - 3785
45	Jackson Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	301 W. Jackson Villa Park, IL. 60181	Brooks Wagner 530 - 6240

45	Jefferson Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	255 W. Yermont Yilla Park, IL. 60181	David Youpick 530 - 6250
48	Albright Middle (5 - 8)	1110 S. Yilla Ave. Yilla Park, IL. 60181	William Hermann 279 - 6160
53	Butler Jr. H.S (6 - 9)	2801 York Rd. OakBrook, IL. 60521	Dennis Lonstine 573 - 2760
58	Herrick Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	4435 Middaugh Ave. Downers Grove, IL. 60515	Dr. Robert Paolichi 719 - 5810
58	O'Neill Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	635-59th St. Downers Grove, IL. 60515	Rick Russell 719 - 5815
60	Westview Hills Middle (6 - 8)	630-65th St. Clarendon Hills, IL. 60514	Greg Ostrowski 963 - 1450
61	Eisenhower Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	1410 75th St. Darien, IL. 60559	Joseph Pedersen 964 - 5200
62	Gower Middle (4 - 8)	7941 S. Madison St. Burr Ridge, IL. 60521	Bill Snyder 323 - 8275
63	Cass Jr. H.S. (5 - 8)	8502 Bailey Rd. Dairien, IL. 60559	Harry Bohn 985 - 1900
66	Lakeview Jr. H.S. (5 - 8)	701 Plainfield Rd. Downers Grove, IL. 60516	William Ward 985 - 2700
68	Thomas Jefferson Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	7200 Janes Ave. Woodridge, IL.	John Peterson 852 - 8010
69	A. Hefty Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	2200 Haddow Ave. Downers Grove, IL. 60516	Cynthia Boudreau 968 -2094
89	Glen Crest Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	725 Sheehan Ave. Glen Ellyn, IL. 60137	Dr. C. Roesner 469 - 5220
93	Stratford Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	251 Butterfield Dr. Bloomingdale, IL. 60108	Bob Ballenger 980 - 9797
180	Pallisades (4 - 8)	15W451 91st St. Burr Ridge, IL. 60521	Jane Thompson 325 - 4678
181	Hinsdale Jr. H.S. (7 - 8)	100 S. Garfield Hinsdale, IL. 60521	James Yoris 887 - 1370
200	Edison Middle (6 - 8)	1125 S. Wheaton Wheaton, IL. 60187	Larry Fox 682 - 2050

200	Franklin Middle (6 - 8)	211 E. Franklin Wheaton, IL. 60187	Egil Anderson 682 - 2060
200	Wheaton - Warrenville (6 - 8)	1920 S. Wiesbrook Rd. Wheaton, IL. 60187	Dr. C. Miller 682 - 2160
201	Westmont Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	944 N. Oakwood Dr. Westmont, IL. 60559	Keith Becker 654 2188
202	Lisle Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	5207 Center Ave. Lisle, Il. 60532	Roger Wanic 971 - 4350
203	Kennedy Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	1150 F Muirhead Ave. Naperville, IL. 60565	Russ Bryan 420 - 3220
203	Jefferson Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	1525 N. Loomis Naperville, IL. 60540	Paul Schmidt 420 - 6363
203	Lincoln Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	1320 S. Olympus Dr Naperville, IL. 60565	Robert Raynett 420 - 6370
203	Madison Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	100 River Oaks Dr. Naperville, IL. 60565	Jerry Virgo 420 - 6400
203	Washington Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	102 N. Washington St. Naperville, IL. 60540	Dr. T. Crandall 420 - 6390
204	Thayer Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	1325 Brookdale Rd. Naperville, IL. 60540	Mike Pederson 369 - 6767
204	Gregory Middle (6 - 8)	2621 Springdale Cr. Naperville, IL. 60564	Gregory Fischer 416 - 0600
205	Bryan Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	111 W. Butterfield Rd. Elmhurst, IL. 60126	Richard Stahl 834 - 7040
205	Churchville Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	155 Victory Pkwy Elmhurst, IL. 60126	Dennis Hatt 832 - 8682
205	Sandburg Jr. H.S. (6 - 8)	345 E. St. Charles Rd. Elmhurst, IL. 60126	George Jacobs 834 - 4534

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

COMPARATIVE LISTING OF JUNIOR HIGH / MIDDLE SCHOOLS IN DU PAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

(1989 90)

School	Per Pupil Expenditure	8th Grade Average Class size	8th Grade Illinois Goal Assesment Reading / Math / L.A.			District Average Teacher Experience
Blackhawk	4069	21.3	237	241	268	14.7
Indian Trail	4094	17.1	261	261	281	16.1
Wood Dale	4676	19.1	263	272	247	14.0
Peacock	4745	20.3	295	310	361	11.7
Medinah	5800	16.7	288	282	302	13.4
Roselle	4507	24	289	269	337	12.0
Westfield	4110	24.3	277	287	314	11.3
Marquardt	3859	28.9	235	263	240	13.6
Glenside	3447	23.3	276	271	279	11.5
Spring Wood	4257	29.2	278	262	330	13.2
Benjamin	3461	19.0	300	283	326	11.2
West Cicago	4004	18.9	251	259	277	12.3
Winfield	3916	17.5	284	295	301	12.3
Hadley	4469	24.3	307	280	294	16.1
Lombard	5005	30.7	281	269	264	16.8
Jackson	4725	25.8	281	282	271	18.5
Jefferson	4725	25.3	269	297	275	18.5
Albright	7088	19.7	275	341	293	15.4
Butler	5572	19.3	321	347	331	13.1
Herrick	4154	26.1	292	303	343	14.9
O'Neill	4154	24.7	293	307	321	14.9
Westview	3617	27	301	309	329	12.5
Eisenhower	3670	26.1	284	289	261	11.6
Gower	4958	21.5	312	336	298	13.2
Cass	4758	21.3	306	330	297	14.5
Lakeview	3247	23.4	307	325	331	10 0
Jefferson	3426	23.4	270	265	270	14.9
Hefty	5218	15.5	325	340	336	13.8

School	Per Pupil Expenditure	8th Grade Average Class size	8th Grade Illinois Goal Assesment Reading / Math / L.A.			District Average Teacher Experience
GlenCrest	4130	25.5	309	297	283	14.4
Stratford	3321	26.4	283	296	286	8.0
Palisades	3672	19	285	275	298	9.8
Hinsdale	6146	19.6	315	328	361	16.0
Edison	4438	22.5	298	315	257	15.4
Franklin	4438	27.0	307	295	285	15.4
Wheaton-Warrenville	4438	22.9	291	287	284	15.4
Westmont	5046	13.8	265	308	221	14.3
Lisle	6026	21.8	270	337	312	15.9
Kennedy	4232	28	310	311	290	13.4
Jefferson	4232	25.9	311	312	292	13.4
Lincoln	4232	28.1	308	318	270	13.4
Madison	4232	25	302	302	282	13.4
Washinton	4232	21.6	312	317	283	13.4
Thayer Hill	4268	26	296	291	299	9.1
Gregory	4268	23.9	289	284	286	9.1
Bryan	5437	24.7	305	314	274	17.9
Churchville	5437	20.7	272	296	297	17.9
Sandburg	5437	21.1	312	324	292	17.9
MEAN	4407.6	22.4	277	291	287	13.5
MEDIAN	4268	23.4	292	295	292	13.4
STATE AVERAGES	4519	22.5	254	248	250	15.8

100

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Kenneth D. Stellon has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Mel Heller, Director
Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. L. Arthur Safer
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Ed Rancic
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

_____November 9, 1992_____
Date

_____Mel Heller_____
Director's Signature