1995

The Effects of School-Based Management on the Worklife of Elementary Teachers: A Case Study

Frank R. Brandao
University of North Florida

THE EFFECTS OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT
ON THE WORKLIFE OF ELEMENTARY
TEACHERS: A CASE STUDY

by

Frank R. Brandao

A dissertation submitted to the Division of
Educational Services and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

August, 1995

The dissertation of Frank R. Brandao is approved:

(date)

7/31/95

7/31/95

July 31, 1995

July 31, 1995

Committee Chairperson

Accepted for the Division:

8/6/95

Chairperson

Accepted for the College:

8/6/95

Accepted for the University:

8/16/95

Vice-President for Academic Affairs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I think of my decision to start college at a time when I did not yet have mastery of the English language and the courage that it took for me to persevere, this work signifies much effort and achievement in overcoming tremendous intellectual and social challenges. Rather than take pride in my own accomplishments and works, however, I would like to thank some of the individuals who have helped me arrive at this point in my life.

To Dr. Katherine Kasten I extend my sincere appreciation for her patience, understanding, and counsel which saw me through the completion of this project. Her unselfish assistance was a source of inspiration to me throughout this study.

I also recognize Dr. Warren Hodge, Dr. Steve Paulson, and Dr. G. Pritchy Smith who served on my Dissertation Committee and who offered expertise and comments that helped shape this research study.

Finally, the love and encouragement of my family have propelled me to arrive at this point in my studies. Their understanding and sacrifices made it possible for me to reach this personal and professional goal. To my children, Tina, Benjamin, Marcia and Teresa, thank you for all of the times you were quiet so Dad could study. To my wife, Colleen, thank you for your continuous support and unaccountable hours you spent at the computer making sure every typed page looked perfect. You always knew I would someday be "Dr. Brandao!"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT ON THE WORKLIFE OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS: A CASE STUDY

Frank R. Brandao, Ed.D.
University of North Florida, 1995

This case study was a qualitative investigation to describe the nature of teachers' involvement in school based management (SBM), and to describe how this involvement affected teachers' worklives. The review of related literature provided the historical background that led to SBM restructuring, examined what the literature has revealed on SBM, and investigated organizational commitment in the context of SBM.

A semi-structured interview was the instrument used to gather the data. The participants of this case study were a random sample of teachers, a sample of teachers selected by their principals, and the principals currently employed at each of the three elementary schools in a single county school district in Florida. A total of 33 educators were interviewed and their responses were tape recorded to assist in the authentication of the transcribed data. The data were then compiled and analyzed. Themes and patterns were identified and placed into a matrix for purposes of assessing the interrelationships of responses offered in the context of the three elementary schools.

The analysis and interpretation of data revealed that restructuring with SBM was implemented to a minimal degree at the elementary schools of Florida County. The results showed that the effects of restructuring were varied and included both positive and negative findings. For some teachers, involvement enhanced commitment to the organization and spurred them on to further efforts, while for most respondents restructuring activities were perceived as impositions that made it difficult to balance classroom and SBM responsibilities. Respondents also revealed that they doubted the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education at Florida County Schools or as a process for producing significant academic achievements. Recommendations were made for practical application and for future research.

Chapter 1

Introduction

For many years the teaching profession, school reform, and academic standards have been topics of much discussion. In the quest to improve the future of education, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) issued the report A Nation at Risk in 1983. According to Hanson (1991), this report "forced the nation to examine its schools critically" (p. 30). The report converged with economic, political, and educational forces to fuel the pursuit for excellence in education, which had started in the 1970's. Pipho (1986), observed that A Nation at Risk fell in at the head of the parade that had already begun to take shape" (p. K1). It also supported the agenda of the incumbent president who was being challenged to substantially improve schooling in the United States. The report dramatically stated that "our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovations is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world" (NCEE, p. 5). The United States, as noted by Naisbitt and Aburdene (1990), needed "people who can think critically, plan strategically, and adapt to change" (p. 48), in order to meet the challenges posed by increasing economical and technological competition from Asian and European nations.

The pressure caused by the A Nation at Risk and other converging initiatives resulted in an educational reform movement mainly driven by state governments and calling for top-down administrative mandates. As claimed by Hanson (1991),

the 1980's educational reform was "primarily driven by top-down efforts of state governments" (p. 33), whose aim was to turn the tide in the downward spiral of academic standards. Also, it was time to do away with the "well-intentioned or logically justified permissiveness and the laissez-faire ethos of the Sixties and Seventies" (Guthrie, 1986, p. 306). However, by the mid 1980's, the top-down strategies gave way to the recognition that teachers needed to be involved in bottom-up solutions for reforming education. As it was, Hanson contended that the needs of teachers were not being taken into consideration. The potential solution to involve teachers rested with bottom-up decisions that applied "school-based management strategies, appropriately tailored to the circumstances of each state and local school district" (Guthrie, p. 306). Such solutions offered to empower teachers; and as a result, school-based management (SBM) became a logical process for including teachers in the decisions affecting them. In the pursuit of school improvement, "restructuring and site-based management have become the clarion call of educational reformers" (Goldman, Dunlap & Conley, 1993, p. 71).

Meanwhile, the school reform movement is placing considerable pressure on many teachers to commit themselves to school restructuring and to participate in SBM. In the literature, restructuring with SBM is being portrayed as a desirable method to involve teachers in the decision making processes, but it also offers conflicting messages as to its benefits. For example, some reformers claim that SBM can improve morale, communication within schools, student motivation, and provide for better informed teachers and incentives (White, 1992). However, this

statement is countered by the assertion that teachers operate under major

constraints in SBM, among others, "limited time, training, and funding" (White,

p. 71). Constraints posed by SBM are likely to have discouraging effects and

consequences on teachers' work commitment. If this is so, what will we accomplish

with SBM reforms? Firestone and Pennell (1993) observed that "teaching

workloads and nonteaching work requirements put pressure on the amount of time

teachers can spend on preparation, and consequently its quality" (p. 509). Such

pressures continuously challenge teachers in their home court. Therefore, one has

to wonder what impact restructuring with SBM is having on the worklife of

teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The intent of SBM has been to decentralize administration and policy-making

from the district offices to individual school sites and to develop participatory policy-

making and administration at individual school buildings. While SBM has become

a widely talked about concept and a preferred approach to improving education,

"little is known about how school decentralization works, how authority is allocated

and how school decentralization affects teachers" (White, 1992, p. 69). The literature

has revealed positive and negative outcomes of SBM. For example, Smylie (1992)

observed that participation in SBM was "thought to promote commitment to

decisions that are made and to increase motivation to carry them out" (p. 53). In an

early study by Driscoll (1978), it was discussed that teachers "must desire

participation for it to have major effects" (p. 53). On the negative side, the interactions required of SBM may complicate simple relationships, as many teachers do not have the willingness to confront others and speak their own mind, or have the ability to hold their ground. In order to maintain a semblance of unity or agreement, teachers may hide their differences without successfully dealing with what divides them (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyeth, 1992).

Hoping to improve their educational systems, a number of school districts in the state of Florida have been joining SBM arrangements which emphasize decentralization. Dade County School Superintendent Octavio Viziedo (cited in O'Neil, 1994), explained how SBM is working in Florida: (a) principals take responsibility for making key decisions; (b) stakeholders are involved in decision making; (c) schools can request waivers from school board rules, state laws or language in labor contracts; (d) schools decide how to cut costs to meet allocated budgets; (e) principals have authority on how to use the money, and are ultimately held accountable for all decisions; and (f) each school must complete site improvement plans with input from faculty and parents. Florida law makers "think so highly of the logic of SBM that they have incorporated it into the Florida 2000 education program" (O'Neil, p. 5). According to Florida Statutes 229.591 (1993), Florida 2000, better known as Blueprint 2000, refers to clear guidelines for achieving "a system of school improvement and education accountability based on the performance of students and educational programs." Blueprint 2000 has been legislated and requires that Florida school districts have it "fully implemented and

operational by the beginning of 1993-1994 school year" (Florida Statutes 229.592, 1993).

Although the goal of SBM is to involve teachers, administrators, parents, businesspeople and other stakeholders more in decisions that affect them at the school site and to eventually improve the quality of education, there is considerable confusion as to how SBM is affecting teachers' worklife. There are concerns about teachers' desire to participate. Also, SBM has resulted in teachers investing more of their time in nonteaching duties, e.g. meetings for planning and resolving issues. Teachers are being expected to assume new roles during their workday in order to participate and follow through on decision making. These expectations are being implemented through a combination of top-down directives and bottom-up initiatives, which may prove to be the "critical and illusive element of teacher ownership of the restructuring process" (Prestine & Bowen, 1993, p. 313). Therefore, considering the mixed messages in the literature and in the workplace as to the benefits of SBM, the purpose of this study was to describe the nature of teachers' involvement in school-based management and to describe the effects of involving teachers in decision making.

Research Questions to be Answered

The following questions were formulated to give focus to this study:

1. To what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented in selected elementary schools in one Florida county school district?

2. What have been the effects of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of teachers in selected elementary schools?

3. What do teachers and administrators in selected elementary schools perceive as the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education?

Significance of the Study

A need exists in Florida to determine how restructuring with SBM is affecting teachers' worklife. Specifically, educators and policy makers need to find out how teachers' participation in site-based decisions is affecting their existence in the workplace. This study was important because it is expected to make significant contributions toward understanding how teachers perceive their SBM involvement. It will also help determine if teachers perceive their participation in SBM as improving or detracting from the learning environment.

Additionally, restructuring should be approached as a means of providing quality educational programs for students. Therefore, it may also be of help to educational administrators, and to others concerned with the quality of education, to know researched perceptions regarding the involvement of teachers in SBM.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the three elementary schools within a single county in Florida. These county schools are currently involved in their fifth year of restructuring with SBM. This county and its elementary schools were chosen because they offer a unique opportunity to compare all of the elementary schools in

a particular school system, and are structured to allow comparisons of perceptions among teachers and principals who work at the same grade levels, pre-K through fifth grade. The findings may or may not apply to other schools.

Also, this study was limited to the perceptions of currently employed teachers and principals at the county's elementary schools. It will be limited to the researcher's semi-structured questionnaire format, to the interpretations and answers provided by respondents, and to the extent by which the interviewing is comprehensive. And, it will be limited to its descriptive nature, which concerns the discovery of generalities of perceptions as applied to SBM decisions.

Assumptions of the Study

The following factors were assumed to exist for the purpose of this study:

1. Restructuring efforts impact how decisions are made.

2. Teachers and principals will want to talk frankly about their participation and will want to contribute to a better understanding of how restructuring as SBM is perceived.

3. School based management should increase student achievement.

4. School based management should improve the quality of education.

5. School based management should enhance the professionalism of teachers.

6. The educational community will benefit from knowing how restructuring as SBM is perceived by teachers.

Definition of Terms

Specific terms used in this study are defined in order to clarify their meaning and provide consistency throughout the study. These terms are as follows:

Bottom-up management - a management approach which starts with teachers making decisions and submitting them for modification and mutual approval to their administrators. In turn, administrators consolidate and draft their objectives, and then submit them to superiors for discussion and mutual approval. This process is continued until it reaches the top executive of the hierarchy.

Commitment - a psychological bonding to remain affiliated with the institution which causes the individual to put forth considerable effort and involvement for the good of the organization.

Reform - restructuring schools with the intent of making improvements.

Restructuring - activities aimed at reorganizing basic practices and relationships within the school, and between the school and community in ways that lead to improved learning outcomes for all students.

School -Based Management [SBM] - an integral component of school restructuring, which refers to the decentralization of administration and policy-making from the school district office to the individual school building. Indicators of SBM may include the following: (a) management decentralized through a combination of top-down initiatives and bottom-up participation; (b) teachers and administrators collaborating in decision making; (c) administrators perceived as facilitators, delegators and reinforcers of the decisional process; (d) the

empowerment of those working closest to students in the classroom; (e) new roles and responsibilities created for all the players in the system; (f) the transformation of the teaching-learning process in the classroom; (g) participants given collective responsibility; (h) decisions regarding curriculum, budget and personnel made at the school site; (i) various committees obtain input from teachers, parents, students and others; and (j) evidence of school-improvement plans documented.

Top-down management - a hierarchical management approach where mandates are set at the top and are then submitted for adoption downward through the chain of command until they reach the classroom teacher.

Worklife - the activities or actions associated with teaching that account for a teacher's existence in the workplace and society.

Organization of Study

Chapter 2 includes a review of related literature on the background of school reform, school-based management, and teacher commitment in the workplace. Chapter 3 explains the methodology used in the gathering of data for this study and the rationale for choosing a semi-structured interview process to gather the data. Chapter 4 describes the analysis and interpretation of the data acquired from interviews with teachers and principals in Florida County elementary schools. Chapter 5 summarizes the study and offers conclusions and implications pertaining to restructuring with SBM and its effects on the worklife of teachers.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The quality of education in the United States has come under close scrutiny in recent years. The purpose of schools in the education of our nation's youth has been defined repeatedly. As a result, the role of the teacher seems to be in an evolutionary stage and expectations for educators are changing. Current reform movements are driving policy makers to pressure educators to improve the nation's education by anticipating "more rigorous academic standards for students and more recognition and higher standards for teachers" (Pipho, 1986, p. K5). According to Kirst (1988), the assumptions behind this pressure are the "linkage between international and interstate economic competition and education" (p. 319) and the conviction that it is crucial to educate our population in order to adapt to shifting markets worldwide and to reach higher productivity.

A reform initiative, restructuring with school-based management (SBM), may hold the potential resolution to some of the tensions presently facing educators. Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1992) stated that the SBM initiative offers the capability "for a reshaping of the entire educational enterprise" (p. 330). This reshaping may occur through the implementation of SBM strategies, which include the portrayal of "the individual school as the fundamental decision making unit within the educational system" (Guthrie, 1986, p. 306). With SBM educators are allowed to share in the decisions affecting them "by getting teachers and

10

principals to see each other as collaborators in making schools work effectively for students" (Maeroff, 1988, p. 54). However, teachers' participation in SBM requires them to assume duties in addition to usual teaching roles. Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992) claimed that added duties make heavy demands on the teachers' time and call "on teachers to undertake a variety of tasks that they have not previously been responsible for" (p. 351). In view of these new demands, one has to wonder how the interplay between teaching and school management is affecting teachers' worklife.

Considering the significance of SBM within the reform movements, the focus for the review of literature in this section of the report was to explore the historical background that led to restructuring with SBM, to examine what the literature has revealed on SBM, and to investigate teachers' commitment in the workplace within the context of SBM. The exploration of the historical background surrounding SBM will provide a chronological understanding of significant events leading to this reform movement. The examination of the literature on SBM will make known characteristics, definitions, and meanings attributed to restructuring with SBM. The investigation on teachers' commitment will reveal its relationship to the success of SBM. As acknowledged by Smylie (1992), participation in SBM is thought to promote commitment to decisions made and to increase teachers' motivation. The most vital resources for schools "are the contributions of effort, commitment, and involvement from teachers" (Rosenholtz, 1989b, p. 421). Additionally, Rosenholtz has advised that "commitment to the workplace is becoming understood as a

hallmark of organizational success" (p. 421). Therefore, conditions that enhance teachers' commitment in SBM workplaces may determine the success of SBM as a reform initiative and may be at the center of educational improvement.

Background of School Reform

In the early 1970's, standardized test scores revealed student achievement was on the decline and critics led many to believe that education was becoming too lax. Guthrie (1986), pointed out that the "permissiveness and the laissez-faire ethos of the Sixties and Seventies were accompanied by a downward spiral in academic standards" (p. 305). Also, there was an economically driven ideal which tied education to greater productivity. As observed by Kirst (1988), international and interstate economic competition and education possess common linkages because "an educated work force is considered crucial to higher productivity and adaptibility to rapidly changing markets" (p. 319). The growing perception of negligence in education resulted in politically motivated forces for greater state control of education. The outcome was that "a stronger state role in education first became visible in the accountability movement of the early Seventies" (Pipho, 1986, p. K2). This stronger state role was put into effect "through a combination of such measures as curriculum mandates with specified course syllabi and standardized state administered testing programs" (Elmore & Associates, 1991, p. 183). The objective of the accountability movement was to stress "standardization of curriculum and centralized testing of both students and teachers" (Metz, 1988, p. 446).

Excellence in education was being pursued, although the states' greater role in education led to numerous court conflicts over processes for financing schools and managing curriculum. Because of such conflicts, the 1970's accountability movement was followed by an even stronger movement for "increasing state control as a result of the school finance court cases filed in the early Seventies" (Pipho, 1986, p. K2). Still, academic standards made no visible turn upward in the 1970's. The stage was set for the reform movements of the 1980's and beyond.

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) joined the reform movements with the publication of A Nation At Risk report. This report "and a dozen or so other major reports that followed transformed 1983 into a watershed year for American education" (Pipho, 1986, p. K1). According to Hanson (1991), the A Nation at Risk report came together with the "excellence in education" movement that had been started in the 1970's, and also with the educational agenda of the Reagan administration. According to Boyd (1988), the Reagan agenda was a political response to pressures for the government to get involved in the educational crisis. These pressures were based both on concerns that we might lose our standards of living and on fears that "America was losing its technological and productivity edge to foreign competitors" (Boyd, 1988, p. 300). Reagan's response was to maintain that the educational crisis was a problem of local and state governments, but advocated that excellence and improvement in the quality of teaching would be reached through "merit pay so that teachers would be rewarded for outstanding performance" (Boyd, p. 301). As observed, the reform forces were

converging to demand higher quality students and teachers, as well as more productive approaches to educating our nation's youth.

The purpose of A Nation At Risk report was to critically examine education in the United States. Revealed in it were a series of inadequacies in our educational system, and the authors of A Nation at Risk declared that our education was in a poor state of affairs. They noted that "if an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre education performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war" (National Commission on Excellence in Education [NCEE], 1983, p. 5). We had allowed this to occur to ourselves, our students and our teachers. Accordingly, we had "been committing an act of unilateral educational disarmament" (NCEE, p. 5). A Nation at Risk effectively stirred public opinion toward "more rigorous standards for students and more recognition and higher standards for teachers" (Pipho, 1986, p. K1). It also provided the president, state legislators, governors, and other reformers with an agenda that allowed for a "connection between improved schooling and improving a state's economy. Schooling for the first time became a hot and profitable political issue, one linked to the creation of jobs" (Boyd, 1988, p. 302). Furthermore, the report added to the awareness of a "linkage between international and interstate economic competition and education" (Kirst, 1988, p. 319).

The First Reform Wave of the 1980's

The literature generally regards the year 1983 as the beginning of the current cycle of state education reforms. When the NCEE called for educational reform in

<u>A Nation at Risk</u> report, they assumed the lead in the parade of reforms that had

already begun in the 1970's. By doing so, the report gave origin to the first wave of

reforms in the 1980's. As claimed by Hanson (1991), this wave was primarily driven

by top-down efforts of state governments, and "rode on the premise that the

educational problems of the country could be attributed to low academic standards

and poor quality of instruction" (p. 31). As a result, the many legislative mandates

that followed were primarily aimed at subjugating educators. The intent was to

turn a loose educational system into one with stricter roles of engagement and

stiffer standards for academic programs. These top-down mandates were meant to

"weed out incompetent teachers, provide for incentives to attract and retain talented

teachers, establish proficiency tests to keep out the ill prepared and provide alternate

routes to teacher certification" (Hanson, p. 31). The impact of this reform was

tremendous. Pipho (1986), affirmed that "scarcely any aspect of the school

experience has remained untouched" (p. K4). Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, and Cusick

(1986) saw this approach as essentially flawed:

> Reformers have attempted to change public education from the top
>
> down with mandates to address a particular problem; with rules,
>
> procedures, and standards generated to facilitate goal attainment,
>
> and with monitoring and evaluation to assess progress. What has
>
> been missing has been an appreciation of how such programs would
>
> actually affect the daily lives of students and teachers (p. 185).

By the mid 1980's, it was becoming visible that the top-down reform movement had invaded the culture of the school and the ecology of the system but was not reaching the desired goals in the classroom, where teaching and learning were taking place. State governments "began to realize the complexity of the problems and the political wisdom of transferring the improvement to teachers" (Goodlad, 1987, p. 215). As Chance (cited in Passow, 1988) pointed out: "If the reforms do not affect who is teaching and what is going on in the classroom, they can hardly be considered reforms. . . improvements, maybe, but to call it reform is to misuse the vocabulary" (p. 248). Nevertheless, state governments still had a legitimate reason for "continuing educational reform and to shape the nature of policy discussion within many states" (Elmore & Associates, 1991, p. 252). It was clear that states were now committed to restructuring education, in order to prepare students to achieve higher standards and equip them to respond to "economic competition in the global marketplace" (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990, p. 29).

The Second Reform Wave of the 1980's

By 1986, the first reform movement started to lose political effectiveness. It was then "overtaken by a powerful second wave that overlapped the first, causing energies that pulled our educational system in several directions at once" (Hanson, 1991, p. 34). The critics argued that state mandated educational standards and prescribed content were "too rigid, too passive, and too rote-oriented to produce learners who can think critically, synthesize and transform, experiment and create" (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988, p. 7). While the first reform wave identified

teachers as the cause of the ills of education, the second one recognized teachers as the solution in a bottom-up approach to restructure educational systems. This meant that to be truly effective, change initiatives would have to take into consideration the specific local needs of teachers and schools.

The emphasis of the second wave was that by empowering teachers to share in the decision making with management, rather than managing them, they would be encouraged to become more autonomous, trustworthy, collegially minded, and committed to their jobs. According to Whittaker and Moses (1994) "teachers who feel enfranchised and involved are much more likely to use their capabilities to the fullest" (p. 54). Therefore, by empowering teachers school reformers would be stimulating them to become committed, inspired to teach and to look for opportunities for professional growth and renewal. Also, the concept of teacher empowerment suggested the enhancement of teachers' status, and offered "increased teacher empowerment through participation in site-based decisions on scheduling, curricula, teaching techniques, student discipline, and choice of extracurricular activities" (Purnell & Hill, 1992, p. 2).

Presently, the educational reform movement is experiencing a third wave, which is being driven by the concept that the nation needs to establish national educational goals. Under the rubric of Goals 2000, the federal government is providing guidelines for states and school districts to coordinate their efforts in order to meet nationally recognized high academic standards. The standards call for plans to "include development of curriculum-content and student-performance

standards and a complementary assessment system, 'opportunity to learn' standards

or strategies, and ways to integrate technology in the schools" (Pitsch, 1994, p 17).

The federal government is also saying "education policy is a local matter" while

encouraging each community to take its "vision of what education should be and

put it into practice" (United States Department of Education, 1994, p. 1). According

to Murphy and Hallinger (1992), these efforts at reform "promise fundamentally to

alter our conception of education and our understanding of schooling" (p 77).

However, if current reforms are implemented with the idea that there must

be a quick solution to the problems of education, it is suspected the reforms will be

harmful to education. Futrell (1993) warned that these reforms are not to be

implemented from a top-down managerial approach, and "if they [reforms] are

thoughtfully, carefully, and thoroughly developed and implemented they can vastly

improve the quality of education for the children and youth of America" (p. 34).

Perhaps the ultimate success or failure of reforms will rest on the shoulders of our

nation's teachers, and might depend on how well they commit themselves to their

duties through their participation in the implementation of reforms. Will their

involvement "make a true difference in the levels of learning that take place in the

classroom" (Hanson, 1991, p. 37)?

School-Based Management

Restructuring with school-based management (SBM) seeks to include in the

decision making processes teachers and others working closely with students. As

noted by S. Conley (1991), "a promising vehicle for increasing teacher participation

may be school-based management, a form of shared governance and one of the most

active areas of policy experimentation" (p. 248). Within the reform movements,

SBM has become an integral component of school restructuring and calls for

"participatory policy-making and administration at the individual school building

itself" (Goldman, Dunlap & Conley, 1993, p. 72). This movement has been defined

as being both bottom-up and top-down at the same time. Prestine and Bowen (1993)

noted that data strongly suggest that "a combination of top-down participation and

bottom-up initiative was most effective in promoting the critical and elusive

element of teacher ownership of the restructuring process" (p. 313). Fullan and

Stiegelbauer (1991) concluded that "blending top-down initiative and bottom-up

participation is often a characteristic of successful multilevel reforms" (p. 83). Other

SBM advocates claimed that "real improvement in education will come only when

groups coalesce around a common mission and then work at both the grassroots

and policy levels to create positive change" (Whitaker & Moses 1994, p. 6).

Definitions of SBM encompass the need for cooperation among educators and

legislatures, business community, parents, and other stakeholders. School-based

management was defined by D. Conley (1991) "as activities that change fundamental

assumptions, practices and relationships, both within the organization and between

the organization and the outside world in ways that lead to varied and improved

learning outcomes for essentially all students" (p. 1). A significant dimension of

participation in SBM "includes administrators delegating specific decisions to

teachers as well as teachers and administrators making decisions jointly" (S. Conley, 1991, p. 227). In an article by Goldman et al. (1993), SBM was described as a process for teachers' participation in the decisions affecting their schools and their educational programs, and refers to conditions of decentralization of administration from the school district offices to the individual school site. They further added that SBM "has become an integral component of school restructuring and it is difficult to imagine restructuring without school site orientation" (p. 72). While decentralization is perceived as a broad concept in delegating authority, "site-based management is a system of decentralization in which authority over school policy is shared by the central office and the school site" (White, 1989, p. 1). To be perceived as operating under SBM, it seems that the school should meet both decentralization and participation conditions in its definition of SBM.

Under SBM, an aim of restructuring is to search for non-standardized solutions to educational concerns. This search calls for school restructuring that explores (a) increasing the foundation of knowledge of teachers, other specialists, and even clients; (b) seeking involvement of parents and others whose work styles may differ from educators; and (c) developing policy in a more collaborative manner which considers both a growing body of knowledge and broadening external involvements (Goldman et al., 1993). Restructuring may seek to encompass changes in teaching conditions that increase both accountability and professionalism among educators. It may mean changes between the educators on the one hand, and the students and the communities on the other (Elmore &

Associates, 1990). Olson (1988) emphasized the term restructuring is a powerful

concept in which groups manage to find a common cause under its rubric.

The general theory behind SBM efforts was recently clarified by Wohlstetter

and Odden (1992). These authors declared that productivity and effectiveness can be

stimulated through SBM when clear outcomes are set at the top of the system (e. g.,

national education goals), if decentralization is implemented at the school site, and

when "accountability is structured either with rewards for accomplishing goals and

sanctions for not or through parental choice of school" (p. 530). As teachers

participate and collaborate with administrators in the decisions posed by SBM and

administrators' roles shift from directing to facilitating the decisional process, the

collaborative involvement is likely to produce distinctive solutions to SBM

problems. According to the study of Goldman et al. (1993), the more teachers got

involved in the decisional process, the more they began to (1) understand that they

were responsible for the decisions; (2) feel a part of the decision making structure;

(3) have direct responsibility and accountability for developing and implementing

programs; (4) observe principals stepping back from the decision making process to

allow teachers to make their own decisions and mistakes; (5) exercise facilitative

power and behave more politically; and, (6) do more group problem solving. In this

study, teachers perceived that there was not a decision about the school that they

were not actively involved in making. In another study of principals by Hallinger et

al. (1992), it was revealed that eleven of the fifteen participants perceived

restructuring as a good or outstanding idea. These principals "envisioned shared

decision making as leading to increased teacher ownership and school improvement" (p. 333), and as an effective means for SBM problem-solving. Furthermore, the principals contended that "enhanced ownership and responsibility for decision making could lead to increased teacher self-esteem, motivation, and participation and therefore to a more rapid response in meeting students' needs" (Hallinger et al., 1992, p. 335).

In deciding how to involve teachers in SBM, it is important to identify and decide when it is appropriate to engage them in the decisional process. Bridges (1967) suggested that administrators identify whether a particular issue falls within or outside an employee's zone of acceptance. According to Simon (1957), the zone of acceptance refers to administrative directives that teachers will comply with at administrators' request without question. When authority is carried out "beyond a certain point, which may be described as the subordinate's zone of acceptance, disobedience will follow" (Simon, p. 12). Barnard (1979), in addressing this topic, refers to the zone of acceptance as the zone of indifference. He noted that if the orders for actions are unquestionably acceptable, then they lie within the zone of indifference. In such instances, "the person affected will accept orders lying within this zone and is relatively indifferent as to what the order is so far as the question of authority is concerned" (Barnard, p. 169). Ashbaugh and Kasten (1987) pointed out that when employees are asked to engage in decisions that lie within this zone of acceptance, such employees might perceive themselves as being asked to do the administrator's job. According to Bridges, involving subordinates within this zone

of acceptance is asking for opposition and resentment. Therefore, it appears that teachers should be involved in the decision making process if the concern to be acted upon "falls outside those issues that teachers yield to administrative discretion" (Ashbaugh & Kasten, p. 53).

When engaging teachers in decisions that fall outside their zone of acceptance, there are two tests suggested by Bridges (1967) that should be met. These are the test of relevance and the test of expertise. A decision meets the test of relevance when the teacher has a high interest in the decision and wants to be involved. A decision meets the test of expertise when the teacher has acquired knowledge and experience associated with the decision. If both criteria are clearly met, the teacher may engage in the decision with considerable confidence. However, if just one of the criteria is met, such as a decision that is relevant but the teacher lacks expertise, this could result in frustration to the teacher. This type of frustration can be remedied if the organization takes the attitude that it "has an obligation to help develop that expertise, so that employee may be involved" (Ashbaugh & Kasten, 1987, p. 52). In this regard, Hoy and Miskel (1987) noted that such a teacher may help administrators make wise decisions, but to involve them "indiscriminately in decisions of this type is to increase the likelihood of alienation" (p. 339).

The goal of SBM has become associated with a broad effort to improve the overall quality of education. This effort will come about "through changes not only in curriculum and instruction but also in school organization and governance, roles

and relationships, beliefs and understandings" (Prestine & Bowen, 1993, p. 298). As noted by White (1992), many teachers perceive that significant improvements in education will come as a result of their increased authority in their workplaces. This authority will manifest itself as "improved teacher morale, better informed teachers, improved teacher communication within and across schools, improved student motivation, and increased incentives that serve to attract and retain quality teachers" (p. 71). Whether increased teacher authority will improve the overall quality of education and instruction remains undetermined. We still need to study comparisons on the allocation of authority to teachers, and further research needs to be done on the most "effective methods of training for new roles and the degree of school improvement after the implementation of SBM" (White, 1989, p. 7). As long as SBM restructuring remains associated with the improvement of education, an important consideration for educators might be to capitalize on what is known about positive aspects of SBM and to avoid repeating what has been revealed in the literature about negative aspects of school based decisions.

Negative Aspects of School-Based Management

The literature cites various negative aspects to restructuring with school-based management. To start with, restructuring is difficult to define because its meaning varies in different school contexts. As Mitchell and Beach (1993) commented, confusion over the definition results from restructuring being both a political concept as well as a professional concept and, as such, this confusion distorts communication. These authors noted that among politicians it represents a

symbolic label used to focus reform energies and "among professionals, the term is used to identify particular approaches to improved school performance" (p. 250). The confusion over the meaning of restructuring was also apparent to Goldman et al. (1993), who stated that "restructuring is being defined daily as educators translate the concept into programs and behaviors. Studying these behaviors provides insight into the operationalization of the definition" (p. 72). Regardless of its definition, SBM is still viewed by many as an essential component of school reform, and it is unusual to visualize restructuring without the site-based orientation.

The participatory engagement called for in SBM complicates simple relationships. Not many teachers possess "a willingness to speak one's mind without flinching, a willingness to confront other teachers and administrators, and an ability to hold one's ground" (Weiss et al., 1992, p. 354). Instead, what frequently occurs is that teachers withhold concerns, do not want others to talk about them, or are scared to speak up. Besides, participants in shared decision making are colleagues and often do not want to engender bad feelings among their peers. Consequently, teachers "often try to paper over differences without resolving the underlying division or occasionally, they want to bump the issue up to the principal to resolve" (Weiss et al., p. 355).

The allocation of time to participate in SBM seems to be another difficult area for teachers. Often they find themselves already very busy with their teaching duties. In an investigation by Hallinger et al. (1992), all of the participants in the study responded that "some portion of the faculty would have to allocate time for

decision making committees" (p. 333). The principals were concerned that the expectation to get teachers involved in the decision making process during the workday, without allocating time or resources for this function, would decrease teachers' effectiveness in the classroom. White (1992) also reported that the major drawbacks to teachers' participation in school decision making "included limited time, training, and funding" (p. 71). As noted by Chapman (1988), time is the most urgent cost for increasing teacher involvement because "the additional time associated with committee work and the need to balance priorities among administration, teaching, and personal life contribute to increased tiredness and stress" (p. 63). Additionally, Hallinger et al. pointed out in their study that almost half of the administrators argued that teachers do not want decision making responsibility, since "a relatively small percentage wanted the type of extensive involvement in decision making envisioned by reformers. The administrators contended that even fewer teachers would be interested once the time commitment became more explicit and real" (p. 333). As revealed, time constraints on teachers' worklives pose a very serious concern regarding the desirability of SBM.

Restructuring has had its greatest impact on the role of teachers as it requires increased involvement of staff in the decisional process. School-based management involves many time consuming activities for which teachers may feel lack of specific training to participate in matters such as "shared decision making and in-school budget, curriculum, and staffing decisions" (White, 1992, p. 77). Teachers may feel at times that they are crossing the lines into administrative roles without

compensation for increased responsibilities. Hallinger et al. (1992) noted that several administrators "predicted that as teachers played a larger role in the decision making process, they would become more independent thinkers and struggle to break away from union control...[an] effect which they believed would further increase pressure on the teaching corps" (p. 335).

Some school systems throughout the nation have been involved in SBM for many years. Clune and White (1988) investigated one school which had been in operation with school-based management for 34 years. In their study, the genuine power of teachers was questioned. The authors revealed that the overall amount of decision making by teachers was minimal. Generally, teachers who wanted involvement in SBM decisions had little to administer, especially with respect to budget, personnel, and curriculum input. A further analysis of recent literature on SBM has found that little substantive decision making authority has actually been delegated in SBM programs. Lack of substantive decision making in SBM has been attributed to the bureaucratic form of administration, which "suggests that teachers should have little influence in school-level decision making or that participation can be used manipulatively to buy teacher acceptance of decisions that have already been made" (S. Conley, 1991, p. 256). As revealed by Wohlstetter and Odden (1992), "where there is substance, the outcome concern is teacher morale and satisfaction" (p. 537). These authors also concluded that in districts with substantive decision making authority of teachers, the effect on student learning was generally ignored. The result of ignoring student learning is that "connections between student

learning, the real objective of education policy, and SBM are not probed and thus not discovered" (p. 537). Even though SBM has been used for many years, gaps still remain in our knowledge on how SBM may improve educational practice. One such gap is that it has not produced dramatic increases in student achievement or retention. If such increases are to occur, Guthrie (1986) warned, the supporters of reform must attend to matters associated with the dynamics of organizational revitalization, and "unless policies are identified that unleash productive local initiatives, the reform movement seems likely to lose its momentum" (p. 306).

Even considering SBM's negative aspects, SBM might still be the administrative strategy that will release those needed productive initiatives to revitalize education. In pursuing SBM, school administrators are encouraged to seek out classroom teachers in order to gain "access to critical information closest to the source of many problems of schooling"(Smylie, 1992, p. 53). And, the SBM process offers administrators access to this type of information by allowing teachers to participate in shared decisions . However, many teachers simply do not perceive their participation in SBM as a desirable choice, and participation may in fact add to teachers' dissatisfaction. In a significant study by Driscoll (1978), it was found that teachers must desire participation for it to have major effects, and that they "must trust in the organization's decision makers if they are to be satisfied with their level of participation" (p. 54). In a similar finding, it was affirmed by Smylie that teachers are "much less willing to participate in any area of decision making if they characterize their relationships with principals as closed, exclusionary, and

controlling" (p. 63). Furthermore, Driscoll revealed that organizational trust toward the individual "predicts overall satisfaction with the organization better than does participation in decision making; it even adds significantly to the prediction of satisfaction with participation in decision making itself" (p. 54). These findings suggest that, when organizations reveal a sense of trustworthiness and there is justification to believe their administrators walk the road of trust, teachers may commit more readily to SBM.

It is possible that teachers' involvement in SBM may enhance their sense of commitment to the workplace. As observed by Smylie (1992), teachers' involvement in SBM was "thought to promote commitment to the decisions that are made and to increase motivation to carry them out" (p. 53). And Rosenholtz (1989b) acknowledged that "commitment to the workplace is becoming understood as a hallmark of organizational success" (p. 241). Therefore, it seems reasonable to recommend to SBM administrators and other leaders that they investigate the literature pertaining to teachers' commitment and conditions that enhance it. Understanding factors associated with teachers' commitment and how these affect teachers' working lives may determine the success of SBM as a reform initiative, and may be at the root of educational improvement.

Commitment in the Workplace

The participatory nature of SBM may stimulate teachers to become committed to school decisions and to acquire influence over the decisions that affect

them. The influence granted teachers in SBM structures may "enhance a sense of fairness and trust in the organization, both because teachers can defend their own interests and because they get information on the shaping of decisions to which they would not otherwise be privy" (Firestone & Pennell, 1993, p. 501). According to Smylie (1992), when teachers exercise influence over the decisions that affect them in the workplace, they will be stimulated to become committed to those decisions and ultimately to the general organization.

In the literature, teacher commitment has been defined in many ways. It may be perceived as the extent to which teachers invest in their work, encompassing the quality of their performance, levels of satisfaction, attendance, and desire demonstrated to remain in the profession. However, Buchanan (1974) defined commitment as "a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one's role in relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake apart from its instrumental worth" (p. 543). Firestone and Pennell (1993) defined teacher commitment as "a psychological bond or identification of the individual with an object that takes on a special meaning and importance" (p. 491). The committed teacher possesses a psychological bond with the institution in which he/she operates. For this reason, he/she puts forth considerable effort for the good of the organization and strongly wishes to remain affiliated to it, believes strongly in the values and goals of the institution, and complies with orders and expectations voluntarily (Kanter, 1968).

Research on teacher commitment is still lagging. As recognized by Reyes (1990), interest in teacher commitment is growing, but research on teacher commitment has not kept up with the proliferation of information in the literature on effective education. Understanding teacher commitment will continue to be important in understanding effective education, as it is a factor that motivates teachers to perform well in the classroom (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Teacher commitment is linked to intrinsic motivation and committed individuals are usually more productive and internally motivated. Reyes (1990) asserted that "a committed employee is less likely to be absent and more likely to be productive at work" (p. 16). Hackman and Oldham (1980) stated that internal motivation exists when "good performance is an occasion for self-reward which serves as an incentive for continuing to do well. And because poor performance prompts unhappy feelings, the person may elect to try harder in the future" (p. 72). Intrinsic motivation is negatively affected by organizational structures that impose domination and control over its members. Structures that promote freedom, self-control and personal development will assure their own productivity and commitment from members (Clark & Meloy, 1990).

Teachers' commitment to their profession and their sense of efficacy are factors that motivate teachers to perform well in the classroom and to contribute to the overall success of the school (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Without teacher commitment, teachers' motivation to contribute to school decision making becomes a great challenge to administrators and other school leaders. As pointed out by

Rosenholtz (1989b), the ability to motivate teachers to make meaningful

contributions is necessary for a school's academic success. Teacher contributions are

associated with teachers' attitudes and behaviors, which are shaped more by

differing organizational settings and expectations than by the personal characteristics

they possess. Reyes (1990) pointed out that the social setting of the organization

shapes individual commitment. Elements of organizational culture including the

mission, beliefs, values, leadership characteristics, and nature of the reward system

are all related to the level of commitment. These characteristics of organizations

and organizational cultures are viewed "as mediators and influencing factors in the

development of commitment" (Reyes, p. 227). If the organization conveys to the

teachers a sense of mistrust, teachers will be reluctant to participate and be

committed to the goals of the school. On the other hand, "increased participation

tends to be associated with an increase in the level of trust" (Chapman, 1988, p. 69).

Increased participation and commitment may be more successfully fostered in those

schools where the administration has confidence in the teachers' abilities and

motivation. As noted by Rosenholtz and Simpson (1990), principals who share

their authority with teachers they trust, thus empowering them, foster an increase

in teachers' commitment.

Organizational structures can lead teachers to feel dissatisfied, alienated, and

unmotivated. Such feelings may lower the level of commitment and may also lead

to task failure, including poor work, absenteeism and outright defection.

Rosenholtz (1989b) noted that the two most frequently cited reasons for teacher

attrition were workplace dissatisfaction and stress. This author further clarified that "workplace dissatisfaction and burnout were major sources of teacher absenteeism, low work investment and ineffectiveness in helping students gain academically" (p. 423). When organizational settings discourage teachers from feeling competent and productive, they result in very negative consequences to teachers' work commitment. For example, teachers who feel professionally disempowered may become disinterested, avoid going to work, or abandon their profession (Rosenholtz, 1989a). Ideally, organizational arrangements should ensure that teachers remain involved in decision making, which in turn promote improvement in the teaching-learning process (Chapman, 1988) and help ensure teacher commitment.

Teachers may possess multiple commitments. Firestone and Rosenblum (1988) suggested that teachers may be committed not only to teaching, but to their students, their school, and to patterns of commitment that may vary depending on which commitments they stress. Weick and McDaniel (1989) described good teaching as requiring a deep commitment by teachers that reaches beyond monetary purposes such as a love of knowledge and a desire to share that knowledge with students in order for student achievement to improve.

Although there seems to be a relationship between teacher commitment, student achievement, and socio-economic status. Rosenholtz (1989b) and Kushman (1992) revealed relationships in their studies between teacher commitment and student achievement when controlling for socio-economic status. They found that teachers were generally more committed when their students came from higher

socio-economic brackets and were higher achievers. Farber (1984) also observed that the influence of students on teacher commitment is affected by the students' socio-economic status. Teachers who teach more affluent students are usually more committed than those working with students of lower socio-economic status. Further worth noting is that student achievement is reduced by low teacher commitment. As added by Farber, teachers who demonstrate low commitment, such as burned-out teachers, are less tolerant and sympathetic toward students, and generally feel more anxious and frustrated in the classroom. These teachers have less ambition to improve the academic quality of their teaching, and therefore are less likely to challenge their students to achieve academically. Some of these teachers often bargain with their students, reducing their expectations in return for a more orderly classroom and pleasant relations (McNeil, 1988).

The literature described several other conditions associated with teachers' sense of commitment. Among these conditions for promoting teacher commitment were rewards and recognition, task autonomy, opportunities for professional growth, and sense of efficacy. Such conditions may actually reduce teacher attrition and promote productivity. As noted by Johnson (1990) and Lortie (1975), a working environment with intrinsic incentives can be especially important in teaching. Teachers who experience success as a result of their efforts are likely to increase their commitment to their profession and students.

Rewards and Recognition

For teaching to be motivating, teachers must know of the success of their efforts. When teachers know how they are performing, they have a good reason to be self-congratulatory. Sykes (1990), stated that teacher "rewards convey a broad meaning, denoting the pleasure, satisfaction or fulfillment gained from an activity or experience" (p. 104). The rewards for teaching can be extrinsic, intrinsic and ancillary. Extrinsic rewards would include salary and benefits, rank, or power over others. Intrinsic rewards result from the self-satisfaction derived from the work, which will vary from person to person, depending on one's psychological perceptions. Ancillary rewards are those traits of work "that may be perceived as rewarding by some, but not necessarily all, teachers," (Sykes, p. 107). An example of an ancillary reward might be a work schedule that is compatible with family duties .

The intrinsic, or psychic, rewards of teaching are the most important. They induce individuals to the profession out of a desire to work with students and to live out a life of service. According to Kasten (1984), teachers remain committed to teaching "in large part in terms of the personal satisfaction they feel from service to students" (p. 7). Teachers feel most rewarded "when they 'reach' students, have a good day, make a lasting impression on youngsters and produce learning in their students" (Sykes, 1990, p. 107). They feel least rewarded when they have had a bad day. "Regardless of the cause, a bad day was described as leaving the teacher feeling depressed, angry, and upset" (Kasten, p. 4). Without a sense of how one is doing, there is little reason to pat oneself on the back (Rosenholtz, 1989a). Intrinsic rewards

in the work environment are also directly connected to the amount of feedback teachers receive about their job performance. This feedback can result from the work itself or from the approval of others for a job well done. As stated by Ashton and Webb (1986), significant others on the job and in the community must appreciate the importance of our efforts, and acknowledge the quality of our performance" (p. 162). Intrinsic rewards can also come about when people are able to estimate the worth of their performance. Teachers receive their greatest rewards from positive and academically successful relations with students, and from the outer recognition from colleagues, parents and administrators (Rosenholtz, 1989b).

Task Autonomy

The amount of influence and discretion that teachers have over decisions affecting them is task autonomy. The link between autonomy and commitment, according to Deci and Ryan (1985), is based on the theoretical view that task autonomy is central to motivation and commitment. Task autonomy in SBM enhances teachers' responsibility for the results of their work and the understanding that how they perform is directly related to their own efforts. Hackman and Oldham (1980) defined autonomy as the workers' freedom to schedule work and establish the procedures used to carry it out. Rosenholtz and Simpson (1990), in a survey of 1213 teachers in Tennessee, pointed out that the best predictor of commitment was autonomy. Firestone and Pennell (1993) also noted that teachers who feel autonomous "will be more committed to the organization" (p. 500). In another study of national magnitude, Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley and Bauer

(1990) found negative results between decision deprivation in lack of autonomy and both workplace commitment and job satisfaction. LeCompte and Dworkin (1991) concluded that one of the contributors to teacher burnout was loss of teaching autonomy.

Increased autonomy and discretion in decision making through SBM may, in some instances, enhance teachers' sense of personal and political efficacy, and allow them to experience an expansion in their understanding and ability to carry out tasks or influence others. As related by Chapman (1988), the sense of powerlessness and isolation which so many teachers face in massive bureaucracies was considerably reduced because through participation teachers "gained a sense of increasing power and mastery over the destiny of their school and of themselves in that school" (p. 58). The opportunity to participate may give teachers more control over their destinies. As noted by Rosenholtz (1989b), "jobs that give people more autonomy and discretion require that they exercise judgement and choice" (p. 423). In a study by deCharms and Muir (1978) which allowed teachers sensing lack of autonomy in their jobs to change their situations and resources, it was found out that as teachers developed a sense of control for their lives, their work investment , satisfaction, and academic success with students increased considerably.

School-based management will generally promote commitment, if the decisions made by teachers are perceived as making positive contributions to the success of the school. For schools doing well, such assessments "become affirming, positive experiences that spur members on to further effort" (Prestine & Bowen,

1993, p. 315). However, lack of teacher commitment in SBM is also possible. It may be attributable to the loss of professional autonomy and discretion (Chapman, 1983; Darling-Hammond, 1984). If the teacher loses autonomy over how the work is to be done, what the aim of it is, the result is a performance that no longer reflects individual efforts, and therefore alienates the teacher who should have a sense of ownership and responsibility for performance. When teachers feel helpless in decision making due to "constraints, either internal or external to the school, frustration, disillusionment, and at times, cynicism results" (Chapman, 1988, p. 59). Under such constraints, participation is less than harmonious, especially if the decisions are externally imposed. Teachers may feel insignificant when asked to participate in decisions in which they have no autonomy or discretion.

Opportunities for Professional Development

If teachers' performance and commitment in SBM are to be enhanced, they must perceive that their work is meaningful and important within their personal values and beliefs. Also, it is important not to allow work to become monotonous through professional stagnation. In order to maintain or improve their teaching, teachers constantly need new skills that may be applied in a variety of activities. Without professional development, the work of teachers may become routine, tedious, and unchallenging. As stated by Firestone and Pennell (1993), learning opportunities contribute to commitment and provide better mastery of "subject content and instructional approaches that can increase classroom effectiveness and intrinsically rewarding student feedback while providing a sense of competence"

(p. 506). Rosenholtz (1989a) affirmed that professional development allows teachers to learn new instructional strategies, increase their talents, repel professional stagnation, and experience a sense of continuous progress and growth. She also found that people confront new challenges because they want to learn and become better skilled, and these are predictable variables of commitment. Reaching for new knowledge, skills, techniques, and searching for fresh challenges are conditions in the workplace which enable teachers to feel professionally empowered and self-fulfilled.

School based decision making, such as that found in SBM restructuring, may foster professional development of teachers. This decisional process stimulates collegial exchanges, which in turn promote a climate where teachers benefit from each other. In such an environment, teachers look to each other for problem solving, ongoing professional development and support. Little (1990) found that teacher collaboration was viewed as the only useful form of teacher-teacher interaction. Rosenholtz (1989a) noted that teachers' boredom could be a result of not having the opportunities to collaborate in shared decision making. According to Maeroff (1988), teachers who participated in collaborative settings discovered that they "not only felt more knowledgeable but also found intellectual exhilaration of the sort they did not think they could still attain" (p. 43). When teachers infuse new ideas into their network, "alternative and better solutions to classroom problems are found. In essence, good teachers working with other good teachers get even better" (Rosenholtz, p. 380).

Teacher involvement in school committees, as provided by SBM, helps shape one's attitude toward education and provides opportunities for professional growth. Committees offer exchange of ideas, and through idea sharing teachers come to be more aware of educational thinking. They also foster a greater awareness of the relationships among district staff, union people, parents, and knowledge of educational departments. According to Chapman (1988), "the more involved teachers become in decision making, the more aware they become of issues associated with the school" (p. 60). The decisional process in committees stimulates staff to become more dedicated, professionally oriented, and attuned to how the educational system works. Chapman explained that SBM committees which operate in a collegial and trustful environment lead to "the development of trust in the organization and a belief in the individual's ability to influence that organization" (p. 62). This is an important aspect of teachers' professional development, as well as a vehicle to increase self-esteem, confidence and personal growth.

Sense of Efficacy

In SBM organizations teachers' efficacy may be enhanced by the influence they have through participatory decisions. Teacher efficacy refers to the influence that teachers have to bring about desired student learning. Lanier and Sedlak (1989) noted that teacher efficacy means "the extent to which teachers have sufficient power to bring about the higher-order thinking and social learning that empowers students" (p. 131). In referring to teacher efficacy, Ashton and Webb (1986) stated

that classroom challenges rest on teachers' confidence in their professional practices and their beliefs that students can learn. They further stated that "the extent to which teachers feel capable of affecting student achievement influences both the effort they exert in classroom instruction and their willingness to persist" (p. 159). Rosenholtz (1989b) agreed that teachers who feel efficacious about their practices expend more effort with students, bolstering their beliefs of being capable learners. She further stated that teachers "who are confident about their instructional practices and students' capabilities are likely to attribute successful or unsuccessful performance to something they have done rather than to luck, chance or an easy undertaking" (p. 425).

A teacher's sense of efficacy is also enhanced when the teacher experiences intrinsic rewards through conditions that are directly tied to the accomplishment of the teaching-learning situation. These conditions, according to Firestone and Pennell (1993), encompass very important aspects of a teacher's worklife environment, which include an "orderly environment, administrative support, adequate physical conditions, instructional resources, and reasonable work loads" (p. 508). Firestone and Rosenblum (1988) revealed that a disorderly environment was generally a detractor of a teacher's sense of efficacy. They found that a disorderly environment ultimately undermined the rewards that a teacher received from interacting with students. Administrative support is likely to contribute to teacher efficacy when it helps create a clear, consistent internal environment where rules are consistently enforced and fairness is applied. A disciplined, academic

environment reflects positively on learning outcomes and shows administrative considerations for teachers. As noted by Louis (1991), demonstrated administrative respect for the teacher contributed directly to teacher commitment. The condition of physical facilities may suggest the importance that is assigned to teachers, students, and their work. Firestone and Rosenblum noted that poor facilities in urban districts have a direct demoralizing affect on the teachers working in those facilities. In a study by Hansen and Corcoran (1989) it was revealed that schools with better facilities also had higher teacher commitment.

Adequate instructional resources may further contribute to teacher efficacy and commitment, whereas inadequate resources can detract from teacher success. Firestone and Rosenblum (1988) found that urban teachers become frustrated with the lack of textbooks, blackboards, computers, and other essential resources. Hansen and Corcoran (1989) reported that teachers responded more positively when adequate materials were available. Having materials facilitates teachers' work and reduces the distractions of having to find alternative resources on their own, or to find a way around the system to do things a different way. Another condition that may enhance or detract from teacher efficacy is the workload assigned to the teacher. Workloads of teachers refer to class sizes, number of courses taught, and number of preparations involved. As observed by Firestone and Pennell (1993), "teaching workloads and nonteaching work requirements put pressure on the amount of time teachers can spend on preparation, and consequently its quality" (p. 509). Also, nonteaching duties are known for taking time away from professionally relevant

and intrinsically motivating experiences. Johnson (1990) reported that such duties as hall monitoring, supervising buses, lunch duty and the like were mentioned repeatedly as a source of teacher discontent, yet such duties remain an everyday aspect of teachers' worklife.

If teachers are to feel efficacious in SBM schools, they must be granted empowering knowledge and opportunities to participate in decisions that are important to them. When teachers believe that their work contributes to solving important problems, their work takes on greater significance. For this reason, "the relation between teachers' performance efficacy and their psychic rewards become especially crucial" (Rosenholtz, 1989b, p. 425). Teachers may not feel efficacious if they do not have opportunities to be involved in decisions that they care passionately about. They must sense how their efforts contribute to the mission of the school for which they work. Committee discussions about the school budget, physical plant, scheduling, and other organizational details may seem only remotely connected with teaching or with the purpose of schooling. However, what is important in SBM participation is "to make connections with the teachers' lives and their conception of what teaching and learning are all about" (Midgley & Wood, 1993, p. 251). As importantly, Kasten (1984) noted, is the recognition that teachers "must be convinced of the workability of proposed modifications and involved in planning for revisions of the system" (p. 11). As a final reminder, Kasten warned that when asking teachers to be involved in SBM restructuring, school

administrators must consider that teachers are generally known for being

conservative and reluctant to support major modifications of the school system.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of three separate bodies of literature which

provided the framework for this research study. The first body of literature explored

the historical background leading to the restructuring movement with SBM and

offered explanations of events leading to this movement. The second body of

literature examined SBM restructuring in order to establish the meanings,

characteristics and definitions associated with SBM. And, the third body of

literature investigated committment in the workplace, as teachers' committment to

SBM may be critical to the success of this reform initiative.

The literature has revealed that the school reform movements picked up

momentum after the publication A Nation at Risk, and that these movements came

in three distinct waves and brought about conflicting expectations for teachers' in

the workplace. The first wave identified teachers as the culprits of education and

tampered with every aspect of the school experience, but failed to show significant

improvements in the quality of teaching and learning. The second wave reversed

the managerial approach and appointed teachers as the solution to the ills of

education. It empowered teachers to make managerial decisions, in addition to

their usual classroom duties. Unfortunately, the extra time needed for participation

in SBM was not always allocated. The third and present wave of reforms has

surfaced under the rubric of Goals 2000. The federal government has taken the leadership in these reforms by providing the states and school districts with guidelines to develop curriculum content and student performance standards. The objective is to provide guidance while claiming that education policy is a local matter and asking each community to take its vision of what education should be and put it into action. In short, the history on school reform suggests that teachers have had to adjust to emerging role expectations. In view of these changing expectations, one has to wonder how teachers are being affected in their worklife.

The investigation on restructuring as SBM revealed that SBM is a movement that requires participatory policy-making and administration at individual school sites. This movement has been defined as being a blending of top-down initiatives and bottom-up participation. The literature revealed indicators of SBM to include the following: (a) management decentralized through a combination of top-down initiatives and bottom-up participation; (b) teachers and administrators collaborating in decision making; (c) administrators perceived as facilitators, delegators and reinforcers of the decisional process; (d) the empowerment of those working closest to students in the classroom; (e) new roles and responsibilities created for all the players in the system; (f) the transformation of the teaching-learning process in the classroom; (g) participants given collective responsibility; (h) decisions regarding curriculum, budget and personnel made at the school site; (i) various committees obtain input from teachers, parents, students and others; and (j) evidence of school-improvement plans documented. As such, it includes

administrators delegating specific decisions to teachers as well as teachers and administrators making decisions jointly. Also, administrators' roles change from directing to facilitating the collaborative process, and this may lead to more informed decisions. However, when administrators engage teachers in decision making, they should try to determine if what they are asking teachers to do fall within or outside a teacher's zone of acceptance. For example, teachers that are expected to participate in decisions that they would normally yield to administrators, see these decisions as falling within their zone of acceptance and would resent being pressured to do the work of their superiors.

The literature conveyed that productivity and effectiveness are likely to increase with SBM when goals are set at the top and decentralization is implemented at the school site. Although, it is still undetermined whether teachers' participation in decision making will improve educational quality or instruction. Many teachers simply do not perceive SBM as a desirable choice, and the literature revealed negative aspects of SBM. Among these, it was noted that systems which have been involved in SBM for many years offered teachers little to administer, particularly with regards to budget, personnel and curriculum decisions. This lack of authority in SBM systems has been referred to as a bureaucratic form of administration, which avoids giving teachers much influence or strives to manipulate them into accepting decisions already made.

Administrators are encouraged to seek out information from teachers since they are the closest to the source of many school problems, and SBM seems ideal for

this purpose. However, teachers must want SBM involvement for it to be effective, and must trust their administrators' intentions. If they do not have organizational trust, or do not believe their administrators walk the road of trust, they are less likely to commit to SBM. A major drawback in getting teachers to commit to SBM has been the limited time, training and funding allocated to SBM restructuring activities.

An attractive SBM organization requires teacher commitment, which is linked to intrinsic motivation and greater productivity. The participatory nature of SBM and the opportunities that it offers teachers to influence decisions stimulate them to become committed to their organization. Several conditions that promote an environment for teacher commitment were investigated, and included rewards and recognition, task autonomy, opportunities for professional growth, and teachers' sense of efficacy. Teacher rewards and recognitions were classified as being extrinsic, intrinsic, and ancillary. Teachers feel most rewarded and recognized when they sense they are reaching students, having a good day, and making a lasting impression on children's learning.

Task autonomy requires teachers to feel responsible for the results of their work. Assuming discretion over classroom decisions is likely to induce teachers' autonomy and success. The literature addressed task autonomy as being central to motivation and commitment in the workplace and pointed out that teachers who feel autonomous will be more committed to the organization. Teachers may feel

insignificant if invited to decide on issues over which they have no autonomy or discretion. Also, teachers' loss of autonomy may contribute to teacher burnout.

Teachers feel more fulfilled and motivated when adequate opportunities for professional growth are offered them. Professional growth may occur when educators work together to develop programs, curriculum, or team teach. The sharing that takes place in SBM encourages and contributes to professional growth. Fruitful collegial exchanges and involvement in school committees were shown to be desirable means for enhancing teachers' skills and growth.

Efficacy in teaching requires teachers to feel that they are capable of bringing about desired student learning and that they have the confidence students can learn. In shared decision making, to be efficacious, teachers ought to be granted empowering knowledge and participation in decisions that affect them and the problems they face. In view of these considerations of efficacy, it is important that teachers' involvement in decisions allow them to make connections with their worklives and their conceptions of teaching and learning.

When SBM grants teachers empowerment through its decisional process, it stimulates teachers' commitment and encourages them to believe they are contributors toward the resolution of problems that affect them. The presence of this belief becomes especially real when teachers see their efforts fulfilling the mission of their school. As importantly, teachers must also be convinced that the proposed changes of which they are a part, and are being asked to implement through SBM, are workable and not too revolutionary.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to describe the nature of teachers' involvement in school-based management and to describe how this involvement is affecting teachers' worklife. It investigated the degree to which SBM has been implemented in the elementary schools of a single Florida county school district, including the effects of attempts to implement SBM in teachers' workplaces, and the perceived potential offered by SBM as a means to improve the quality of education in the county elementary schools.

This section of the study describes the epistemological basis for choosing a semi-structured interview process as the instrument to investigate teachers' experiences with school-based management; the selection of participants to be interviewed; the interview process and the collection of data; and interpretation and analysis of the data.

Managing Personal Bias: Author's Statement

My education and experiences have equipped me with some insights on the questions of this research proposal. In reality, my personal values, familiarity and interests with the worklife of the teacher are my sources of motivation for this research. This study was initiated with my recognition of a "vested interest" in its outcome. I fully acknowledge that all scientific investigations start with the

researcher's "biased" curiosities and continue reinforced and supported by the researcher's interests and values. I further recognize that it is not possible to keep one's research totally objective; "measurement is always biased" (Eisner, 1991, p. 239).

In controlling for bias, I followed the guidance of other researchers in the control of data quality. I collected the core of the data with a tape recorder to help authenticate the contents of the written transcripts afterwards. As suggested by Eisner (1991), my focus was on understanding what is described in the instrument used and reporting my interpretations and analysis of what teachers and principals revealed in the investigation. In short, my interest for this study was on documenting observed themes and interrelations as they occurred, not on controlling the research.

Basis for Choosing Semi-Structured Interviews

Because of the problem proposed here, one that investigated how teachers think and feel about the effects of their involvement in SBM, a qualitative methodology to investigate this problem was desirable. As noted by Eichelberger (1989), a qualitative study attempts to identify the important complex relationships among variables. Specifically, a semi-structured interview approach was the instrument used to gather the data on teachers' experiences in the workplace and to assess how they feel and think about their involvement in SBM. This interview method was an appropriate means for acquiring data because it brought me face to

face with the respondents, while permitting me to get as close as possible to knowing what the thoughts and feelings of educators are regarding their participation in site-based managerial decisions. An advantage of this approach, over other methods for studying this problem, was that a semi-structured interview process allowed me to establish the boundaries for the investigation while facilitating the emergence of additional questions, or more relevant questions, during the process of the interview.

During this investigation, patterns which connected teachers' experiences to their feelings and thoughts were sought. These patterns provided interlocking messages to help assemble and form the pieces that supported the theoretical structure of this research. It was anticipated that through the words communicated by the respondents in the workplace, the readers would see some of their knowledge and actions reflected through them. It was also possible that some readers' own experiences would be verified when they learned that other teachers' experiences share commonalities with theirs. Therefore, the information gathered by the interview process provided much needed data for understanding at a close range the life of those teachers who were involved in SBM.

Selection of Participants

The subjects for this study were a random sample of teachers, a sample of teachers selected by the principals, and the principals currently employed at each of the three elementary schools in a single Florida county school district. In order to

preserve confidentiality, this single school district was identified in this study by the fictitious name of Florida County Schools, and the schools were identified as Rose Elementary School, Lily Elementary School, and Fern Elementary School. Rose Elementary School was a suburban school with a total student population of 844 students. Of these, 37% were white males, 33% were white females, and of the remaining students, 14% were males and 16% were females of minority classification. Lily Elementary School was situated in the center of a small town with a total student population of 732 students. Of these, 41% were white males, 41% were white females, and of the remaining students, 10% were males and 8% were females of minority classification. Fern Elementary School was the largest of the three elementary schools with a total student population of 925 students. Of these, 42% were white males, 42% were white females, and of the remaining students, 9% were males and 7% were females of minority classification.

The selected schools were in their fifth year of restructuring activities that required teachers' participation in SBM. These schools provided the names and telephone numbers of all teachers by grade level and assignment (regular or special education), and the combined lists accounted for 164 educators. At Rose Elementary School there was a total of 52 teachers, 2 administrators, and 1 counselor. Of these, 11% were white males, 84% were white females, and of the remaining individuals, 2% were males and 3% were females of minority classification. At Lily Elementary School there was a total of 46 teachers, 2 administrators, and 1 counselor. Of these, 10% were white males, 86% were white females, and of the remaining individuals,

2% were males and 2% were females of minority classification. At Fern Elementary

School there was a total of 56 teachers, 2 administrators, and 2 counselors. Of these,

10% were white males, 88% were white females, and 2% were female of minority

classification. Six teachers from each school were randomly selected. Also, four

other teachers from each school were selected by their principals on the basis of their

cooperation and enthusiasm for SBM activities. In addition, the principals of each

school participated in the interview process. This selection method was chosen

because it provided the researcher "with the miniature mirror with which to view

the entire population" (Sprinthall, Schmutte, Sirois, 1991, p. 28). The names of the

four teachers selected by the principal were set aside and not included in the random

sample. In order to obtain a random sample, the names of the remaining teachers

at each school were individually placed in a receptacle and subjects were then

selected according to a draw. The inclusion of the principals within the variables to

be investigated facilitated the process of data triangulation or structural

corroboration (Eisner, 1991).

All selected participants for this study were contacted in person or by letter,

notifying them of the purpose of this study and requesting them to participate in the

survey with intensive interview. All subjects were given the opportunity to

respond verbally or in writing to the invitation within a two week period. A follow-

up telephone conversation, or a personal contact, was used to make arrangements

for the actual interview. This approach was also used to contact nonrespondents to

inquire about their willingness to participate in the study. In situations where a

teacher declined to participate in the study, another participant was drawn from the pool of names for that school. In all instances, the participants read and signed a statement of informed consent (see Appendix A) agreeing to the procedures of this study and received a copy of the statement.

Interview Process and Collection of Data

A semi-structured questionnaire (see Appendix B) composed of general questions was used to help guide the interview process. The semi-structured method of interviewing was chosen because it helped establish the parameters for the investigation while permitting other questions, or more relevant ones, to surface throughout the questioning process. It also facilitated in the revelation of data that is comparable. The purpose of the interviews was to capture pieces of the teachers' lives regarding their experiences in SBM at their present school. According to Eisner (1991), "interviews with teachers can be a very rich source of information" (p. 81).

This questionnaire was field tested with three teachers and an administrator who were interested in SBM but were not participants in this study. The purpose of the field test was to get a feeling for how educators would respond to the questionnaire, and to gather suggestions regarding the appropriateness of the questions. According to Marshall and Rossman (1989), "questionnaires usually are tested through administration to small groups to determine their usefulness and, perhaps, reliability" (p. 84). As a result of this test, interview questions were

adjusted for sequence, clarity, face validity, or bias. Any problems that the respondents had in understanding or answering the questions were identified and corrected.

Several steps were taken to establish proper rapport with the interviewees. Prior to the actual interview, the teachers and principals selected for this investigation were contacted in person or by phone and asked to participate in this study. They were informed that the purpose of the study was to learn how restructuring affected teachers in the workplace, and that the interview was to ask questions and to listen to what they had to say about their participation in SBM activities. When interviewing "we need to listen to what people have to say about their activities, their feelings, their lives" (Eisner, 1991, p. 183). Respondents were assured that the information provided by them would be kept confidential, and had a full understanding that their contribution toward this study, while greatly appreciated, was strictly voluntary. In encouraging full cooperation from the participants, arrangements were made so that the interviews took place in an informal and nonthreatening setting. Each individual was addressed in a friendly and courteous manner, and in some ways it was "like participating in a good conversation: listening intently and asking questions that focus on concrete examples and feelings" (Eisner, 1991, p. 183).

Because long interviews are difficult to recall fully, the use of a tape recorder was necessary. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) pointed out that "when interviewing is the major technique in the study, we recommend using a tape recorder" (p. 128).

The participants were asked for their permission to tape record the interviews, and were informed that this activity would be helpful afterwards in authenticating the transcription of data. In order to insure the accuracy of transcription, each interview was given a code number that was inscribed on the corresponding cassette tape. This was done to establish a system that would identify the respondents' taped interviews and to insure the complete transcription of all interviews. As pointed out by Fowler (1988), "the most important check is to make sure the data file is complete and in order" (p. 134). A transcriber was used to playback the recorded interviews so that they could be typed into a transcript format (see examples included in Appendix C). The accuracy of the transcription of data was monitored closely so that the transcript reflected "the most accurate rendition of what occurred" (Bogdan & Biklen, p. 131). None of the participants objected to the use of the tape recorder. In addition, notes were taken during the interviews to supplement the recollection of the interactive process.

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Data analysis brought order, structure and meaning to the data collected. As pointed out by Bogdan and Biklen (1992), this is "the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, field notes and other materials" (p. 153) in order to present the results of the research. The procedures for data analysis were organizing the data; generating data categories, themes and patterns; testing the questions to be answered against the data; finding interpretative

explanations of the data; and describing the findings. Each of the procedures of data analysis required downsizing the data into manageable parts and bringing meaning to the words and actions of participants. As suggested by Eisner (1991), this meaning was based on my understanding and interpretation of what teachers and principals revealed in the investigation.

In organizing the data, I began by numbering every transcript from one to thirty three. The transcribed data were separated by school. Then all of the answers given at each school were separated and realigned so that all like numbered answers were compiled together to facilitate the identification of themes and patterns. I reviewed the responses and notes until I became intimately familiar with the data. This was a time to make notations on the data available, and to perform minor editing on field notes. The process of generating categories of data included noting regularities in what the participants said. This caused meaning to emerge, as "words, phrases, patterns of behavior, subjects' ways of thinking, and events stand out" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 166). Here I searched to identify the salient, grounded categories of meaning held by teachers in the study. This was an inductive process that helped me uncover what was really meaningful and significant in the data.

As patterns and themes emerged from the data, these were compiled into a matrix (see Appendix D) which facilitated the process of evaluating this data for adequacy, credibility, and applicability in answering the questions of this study. This was a time to focus on establishing structural corroboration or triangulation of data.

As described by Eisner (1991), "structural corroboration, like the process of triangulation, is a means through which multiple types of data are related to each other to support or contradict the interpretation and evaluation of a state of affairs" (p. 110). The interrelationships of the data were derived from the analysis of interviews with teachers and principals in three separate schools, and from multiple data sources alluded to in the literature. Searching for alternative explanations was another aspect of data analysis. This phase of the analysis required critical examination of the categories and the emergent patterns between them. Here I sought for, described, and then challenged the obvious explanations in search of the most plausible explanations.

Describing the findings was not separated from the analytic process. Instead, it was an integral part of summarizing, interpreting and shaping into meaning the available data in order to answer the research questions (Eichelberger, 1989). The findings reflected the teachers' perspectives and their views of the workplace. They combined the meanings that participants make of their experiences and the meanings that I, as the researcher, encountered in the words of the respondents. In the final form of the analysis, the results of this study are representative of the respondents' answers to the interview questions, and to the interpretation of the themes that emerged within the transcripts as a result of the field research and analysis. It was expected that this qualitative study would make some significant contributions toward a better understanding of implementing restructuring as SBM. Significant findings were also expected to be revealed on the effects of attempts to

implement SBM on the worklife of teachers, and on the potential offered by SBM as a means to improve the quality of education.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

The purpose of this investigation was to describe the nature of teachers'

involvement in school based management (SBM) and to describe the effects of

involving teachers in decision making. The questions that this study investigated

were the following: (1) To what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented

in Florida County elementary schools? (2) What have been the effects of attempts to

implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of teachers in Florida County

elementary schools? (3) What do teachers and administrators perceive as the

potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education in Florida County

elementary schools?

This chapter consists of a report on the analysis and interpretation of the data

gathered by interviewing teachers and principals in Florida County elementary

schools with the purpose of gaining information that would attempt to answer the

research questions. It includes a profile of educators who participated in decision

making, a profile of the types of people involved in decision making, and a profile

of the types of committees in which respondents were involved. Data were

examined to identify themes in the context of the responses offered by the educators

at each elementary school. These themes were transferred to a matrix from which

interrelationships among them could be identified within the context of the three

elementary schools of Florida County. Next, the interrelated themes were re-

analyzed, and the interpretation of the data is discussed along with descriptions that provide for understanding of the relationships. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Profile of Educators Who Participated in Decision Making

Included in the instrument for the data collection were three sets of survey questions. The first is described here and was designed to show a profile of the educators who participated in this study by marital status, gender, race, child rearing responsibilities, job title and years in education. As Table 1 shows, 24 of the 33 educators interviewed were married, 28 were females, 19 had child rearing responsibilities, and 28 were teachers. Only 2 teachers had five or less years experience in education while 13 had 6-10 years experience, and 18 of the 33 individuals had been in education for more than 10 years. As shown, the overwhelming majority of teachers in these elementary schools were married females with 6 or more years of experience in education and with child rearing responsibilities of their own. In addition, all of the teachers interviewed were white, which reflected the underrepresentation of African Americans and other minority individuals in the teaching ranks of this county.

Profile of Types of People Involved in Decision Making

The second set of survey questions was designed to collect information pertaining to the types of people who participated in SBM decisions at the three

Table 1

A Descriptive Profile of Educators Participating in
Decision Making Committees (N = 33)

MARITAL STATUS	f	%	GENDER	f	%
Never Married	6	18	Male	5	15
Married	24	73	Female	28	85
Divorced	2	6	Total	33	100
Other	1	3			
Total	33	100			
JOB TITLE	f	%	RACE	f	%
Teacher	28	85	White	33	100
Principal	3	9	Black	0	0
Other	2	6	Other	0	0
Total	33	100	Total	33	100
YEARS IN			CHILD REARING		
EDUCATION	f	%	RESPONSIBILITIES	f	%
Less than 2	0	0	Responsible	19	58
2 - 5	2	6	No Responsibility	14	42
6 - 10	13	39	Total	33	100
More than 10	18	55			
Total	33	100			

Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number

Table 2

Respondents' Agreement on Types of People Involved in
Decision Making Committees by Elementary School
(N = 33)

	Rose		Lily		Fern		Percent	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Administrators	11	0	11	0	11	0	100%	0%
Teachers	11	0	11	0	11	0	100%	0%
Counselors	11	0	11	0	11	0	100%	0%
Media Specialists	11	0	10	1	11	0	97%	3%
Students	8	3	5	6	7	4	61%	39%
Custodians/Maintenance	11	0	9	2	10	1	91%	9%
School Board Members	10	1	5	6	7	4	67%	33%
Teacher Aides	10	1	11	0	11	0	97%	3%
Parents	9	2	11	0	11	0	94%	6%
Businesspeople	8	3	4	7	8	3	61%	39%
Community Organizations	8	3	7	4	5	6	61%	39%
School Volunteers	8	3	10	1	5	6	70%	30%
County Office Personnel	9	2	9	2	6	5	73%	27%
Other	0	2	2	9	3	8	15%	85%

Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number

elementary schools. An inspection of the data related in Table 2 shows how respondents reported the types of people involved in decision making committees at Rose Elementary School, Lily Elementary School, and Fern Elementary School. As indicated, all respondents agreed that administrators, teachers, and counselors were involved in SBM decision making committees. More than 90 percent of those interviewed agreed that media specialists, custodians, maintenance staff, teacher aides and parents were engaged in SBM committees. Seventy-three percent of the respondents agreed that county office personnel were participants in SBM committees, while 70 percent concurred that school volunteers were also involved in SBM decision making. The percentage of respondents who agreed that school board members engaged in SBM committees was 67 percent. Only 61 percent declared that students, businesspeople and community organizations were engaged in SBM committees. An overview of the data presented in Table 2 suggests that those people who work the closest to students, such as administrators, teachers, counselors, media specialists, teacher aides, and parents, were the most involved in SBM committees.

Profile of Respondents' Committee Involvement

The survey data in Tables 3, 4 and 5 reveal profiles of respondents' committee involvement at each of the elementary schools investigated. The three schools established similar kinds of committees. Rose Elementary School, Lily Elementary School, and Fern Elementary School shared six committees with the same title and

Table 3

A Descriptive Profile of Respondents' Committee Involvement
at Rose Elementary School
(N = 11)

Name of Committee	Respondents Involved	Volunteered	Appointed	Average Years on Committee
Assessment	1	0	1	1.0
Budget **	3	1	2	3.3
Competencies *	1	1	0	1.0
Concerns *	3	3	0	1.3
Curriculum **	4	1	3	2.3
Discipline **	1	1	0	1.0
District Advisory	2	0	2	2.0
Early Intervention	1	1	0	1.0
Guidance	3	2	1	1.3
Head Teacher	2	0	2	3.0
Scheduling	1	1	0	1.0
School Improvement Team **	7	0	7	2.6
Student Image	1	0	1	1.0
Sunshine *	1	1	0	1.0
Superintendent's Task Force	1	0	1	3.0
Survey	1	1	0	2.0
Technology **	2	1	1	1.5
Textbook **	1	0	1	2.0
Whole Language *	1	1	0	5.0

 * Same type of committee existed at one other elementary school
 ** Same type of committee existed at the two other elementary schools

Table 4

A Descriptive Profile of Respondents' Committee Involvement
at Lily Elementary School
(N = 11)

Name of Committee	Respondents Involved	Volunteered	Appointed	Average Years on Committee
Blue Print 2000	1	1	0	2.0
Budget **	5	3	2	1.4
Competencies *	1	1	0	1.0
Concerns *	4	4	0	1.6
Curriculum **	5	4	1	1.8
Discipline **	4	4	0	2.0
Hiring	1	0	1	2.0
Inservice	1	0	1	2.0
May Fest	1	1	0	4.0
Media	2	1	1	1.0
Parent	2	1	1	3.0
School Beautification	2	2	0	1.0
School Improvement Team **	2	0	2	2.5
Technology **	3	2	1	1.6
Textbook **	1	1	0	3.0

* Same type of committee existed at one other elementary school
** Same type of committee existed at the two other elementary schools

Table 5

A Descriptive Profile of Respondents' Committee Involvement
at Fern Elementary School
(N = 11)

Name of Committee	Respondents Involved	Volunteered	Appointed	Average Years on Committee
Budget **	2	1	1	1.5
Cafeteria	3	3	0	1.7
Curriculum **	5	4	1	1.8
Discipline **	3	2	1	1.3
Kindergarten & First Grade	1	1	0	4.0
Mentoring	1	1	0	2.0
Multiage	2	1	1	1.5
New School	1	0	1	1.0
Parent	1	1	0	3.0
Report Card	3	1	2	1.3
School Improvement Team **	3	1	2	2.7
Technology **	2	1	1	1.5
Textbook **	1	1	0	5.0
Volunteer	1	1	0	4.0

* Same type of committee existed at one other elementary school
** Same type of committee existed at the two other elementary schools

purpose, which are indicated by a double asterisk (**). These committees were budget, curriculum, discipline, school improvement team, technology, and textbook. The single asterisk (*) points to four other committees which were identified as being shared by at least one other elementary school. Of the nineteen committees at Rose Elementary, nine were unique to Rose only. The respondents at Lily Elementary identified a total of sixteen committees in which they were involved. Similarly, Fern respondents revealed a total of sixteen committees. The data for Lily and Fern Elementary show that seven committees were unique to each respective school. Among the three elementary schools, respondents were involved in a total of thirty-three different kinds of committees. These findings suggest that SBM committees at the elementary schools of Florida County were created at the discretion of the personnel at each school site. Even though there were commonalities among the identified committees, each school appeared autonomous enough to decide on the types of decision making committees needed for its unique environmental setting.

The tables (Tables 3, 4 and 5) reveal that members were selected to committees by either volunteering or being appointed. Teachers who volunteered described their committee selection as being self-assigned to that committee. However, appointed teachers perceived their selection as an obligation to join. This obligation may have been the result of a vote, or some form of request from other teachers or administrators to join the committee. An overview of the numbers of respondents who volunteered or were appointed to committees is followed by the average

number of years that these respondents were engaged in each of the committees. Of the six committees that the three elementary schools have in common, the School Improvement Team had the highest overall average years of committee participation by the respondents. Respondents from Rose elementary had an average of 2.6 years, Lily averaged 2.5 years, and 2.7 years was the average at Fern for respondents' involvement in the School Improvement Team. At Rose, the seven respondents on the School Improvement Team were appointed, as well as the two respondents at Lily. Of the three respondents on the School Improvement Team at Fern, two were appointed. These findings suggest that participants of the School Improvement Team were appointed as a result of a vote or some form of request from other teachers or administrators, and served on that committee for an overall average of 2.6 years.

Degree of Implementation of Restructuring as SBM

The first research question asked to what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented in Florida County elementary schools? In order to answer this research question, the respondents were asked to define restructuring and to describe current and past budget, curriculum, and personnel decisions. Then they were asked to describe how people in committees related to each other. The focus on these questions was to assess the respondents' perceptions of their SBM experiences in relationship to the review of literature on restructuring with SBM. For example, did respondents define restructuring as being both bottom-up and top-

down at the same time? Were their influences in SBM decisions concerning

budget, curriculum, and personnel substantive, or were they minimal? The

purpose for inquiring about committee relations was to assess how prepared

teachers were to deal with each other in committee processes. Because committees

were a key element bringing teachers together in SBM decision making, the extent

to which committee processes were effective helped determine the degree to which

restructuring was implemented at Florida County elementary schools. Participants'

responses to these questions are identified in the text that follows by quoting their

statements as they were transcribed from the interviews. The source of each

statement is identified by school, random or selected sample, gender, and years of

experience. However, if the participant quoted was one of the three principals who

were a part of this study, he or she is identified by title only for purposes of

preserving anonymity. A discussion of the interrelationships of responses offered

by participants in the context of the three schools is included. This section

concludes with a summary of the findings.

The definition of restructuring

The extent to which teachers perceived the reorganization of basic practices

and relationships within the schools, and between the schools and community,

helped determine if SBM restructuring was implemented in Florida County

elementary schools. Teachers and principals in these elementary schools described

restructuring as a process for changing the district's power structure to one that is

more bottom up. Empowering teachers and giving everyone an opportunity to express their views was an important part of this definition.

> Restructuring is a process of taking things from being top down to being bottom up, where the actual classroom teacher does have some input into decisions that affect the school (Rose, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

Additionally, respondents viewed restructuring as a means of making changes through a process of shared responsibility. They emphasized cooperation at the school site among the staff and parents.

> My definition of restructuring is placing the power to make changes in the education of students in the hands of the administration, the teaching body and the parents of students, and to cooperatively come together with what we feel is the best way of teaching children (Lily, selected, male, 6-10 years experience).

It seems that improving the teaching and learning going on in the schools was at the core of decision making. In analyzing the data in the context of the three schools, it was found that respondents were in general agreement that restructuring means change to improve the quality of education. This change was perceived as being bottom up, as well as a shared process for making decisions.

While the definition of restructuring included the stakeholders in shared decision making, respondents did not suggest that teachers expected to be given control of the schools.

> It is not changing who is in power, it is not a power decision, it is more of a situation where people from all responsibilities have a say in what the input to a final decision is (principal).

> Does the final say still lie on the head of the principal? As long as responsibility lies there, so does the ultimate decision. But I think it gives the principal a basis for knowing where people come from and what their attitudes are (principal).

Restructuring did not mean a change in who is ultimately responsible for decisions made at the school site. As stated above, the principals appeared to still retain the ultimate responsibility for decisions and school operation.

Restructuring at Florida County's elementary schools meant team work for administrators, teachers, and others that were stakeholders in education. In order to determine the degree that restructuring was implemented in the elementary schools, respondents were asked questions on how budget, curriculum, and personnel decisions were made prior to restructuring and after initiation of the restructuring agenda.

Budget decisions

The extent of decision making authority teachers exercised over budget decisions helped determine the degree to which restructuring as SBM was implemented at the elementary schools of Florida County. According to the respondents in this study, teachers were consistently allowed to engage in budget committees at each school, but they found little substance in their decision making authority when it came to actually allocating funds.

> At this school, we currently involve the teachers in making decisions about budgeting, but the county level often times usurps our decisions without notification, so it makes it almost pointless (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

The experience of participating in budget decisions through committee involvement helped teachers become more aware of the intricacies of school finance. It also allowed the principals to identify teachers' priorities and to allocate the funds accordingly.

> When we finally have the little bit that is left over, I meet with the head
> teachers and the SIT team and ask for priorities of this school and place the
> money there (principal).

Even though it was recognized that teachers' input was limited, respondents from

the selected sample at the three schools felt that some input was better than none.

> We have a Budget Committee, in fact, I am on it. Teachers will have input as
> to how the money is spent. There are certain things that have to be paid up
> front. Whatever is left over, at least we will have a say in where it goes
> (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

In the context of the three schools, it was found that teachers had little substantive

decision making power at the school sites in regard to budgets. Their input was

limited because major budget decisions were made at the county level. However,

teachers felt that having little input was preferred to having none at all.

The limited influence that respondents were given in budget decision

making was a result of restructuring. Prior to restructuring five years ago, teachers

were left out of budget decisions as it was the realm of the principals. Financial

matters of the schools were not an area where teachers' input was sought. The

principals all recognized that having this input was helpful. One of them

enthusiastically reported a decision that would have been difficult without teacher

input.

> Prior to restructuring, I made all of the budget decisions (principal).

> Most definitely there has been changes in the past five years. For example, we
> wanted to add a technology person to the school. Through restructuring, the
> recommendation was made that teachers would be willing to take 2 or 3 more
> students in their classes to fund this position because they felt it was so
> important for our technology lab. Prior to restructuring, it was basically the
> principal making these decisions, and whatever he/she said was gospel
> (principal).

As observed, teachers' input was desirable to help administrators allocate fairly the small amounts of money left over, after operating expenses, for classroom applications. By gathering feedback from their faculty and staff, the principals got a sense of where priorities lie, and in some cases, adjustments were made to meet some of the needs prioritized by teachers. In all instances, the respondents from the three schools agreed that budget decisions prior to restructuring were the exclusive territory of administrators.

Curriculum decisions

The extent of decision authority that teachers exercised over curriculum decisions helped determine the degree to which restructuring as SBM was implemented at the elementary schools of Florida County. According to the respondents in this study, making curriculum decisions in the county's elementary schools was seen as the function of the state, county, and the individual schools. Some respondents pointed out that curriculum frameworks were established at the state level. However, they noted that incorporating state guidelines into the school's curriculum was more of a local matter.

> Of course, there are always the state guidelines that you are supposed to
> teach, but we are given freedom to incorporate whatever we need to teach in
> the curriculum (Fern, select, female, more than 10 years of experience).

Additionally, teachers viewed curriculum decisions as being the main function of the county's curriculum director, who worked with grade level representatives from each school on changes and implementation of new ideas.

> Decisions on curriculum, pretty much, come from the county office. However, they always have people from all of the schools there representing all of the grade levels (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

At the same time, teachers were given opportunities to engage in curriculum decisions at the individual school sites.

> We have a whole curriculum team in this school. We have decided to do a lot of thematic units, whole language, integrated learning, and the curriculum team supports those with a lot of extra work (principal).

Despite grade level representation in curriculum decisions at the county level and the freedom that some teachers felt in incorporating their own ideas within curriculum guidelines, some teachers were ambivalent about the significance of their input into curriculum decisions.

> For the most part, we do have input at our school level. Personally, I feel that curriculum decisions come down through our Director of Curriculum (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

For these teachers, it seemed that site-based opportunities for curriculum decisions lacked in substance. They perceived such decisions as being primarily top-down initiatives rather than school site decisions.

It was agreed by the respondents that the way curriculum decisions are made changed in the past five years. Some of these respondents saw these changes in a positive light.

> I think the State is giving more leeway to the school districts to allow certain waivers if needed. Certainly the State adopts particular goals and objectives for curriculum, and then the schools are semi-free to figure out what they are going to do to meet those objectives (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Others expressed concern that site based decisions affecting curriculum were detracting from teaching the basics.

> I think some decisions have gone so far away from basics--reading, writing, and arithmetic. . . the kids are not getting the basics. So it causes them to underachieve in all the other areas also (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Yet, others revealed that they were not sure if there were any real changes in the way curriculum decisions were made.

> Well, the curriculum has changed. So, maybe some of the ideas that have come out have changed. But I don't know if the process has changed that much. I think some of the people and some of the ideas have (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

Therefore, not all teachers were happy with curriculum decisions. Some teachers expressed a concern that SBM curriculum decisions yielded inappropriate results, while others questioned if there had been any change at all in the process of making curriculum decisions.

Before restructuring in the county's elementary schools, teachers recognized that curriculum frameworks were set at the state level and that the county office adopted curriculum for the elementary schools based on the guidelines established by the state. Establishing curriculum in the county was seen as the role of the curriculum director.

> Prior to restructuring, I think the decisions were made pretty much at the state level and what wasn't made at the state level was then made at the county level (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Prior to restructuring, decisions came from the county office (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

After restructuring, teachers' input was sought in some curriculum decisions at the

school sites, but the principals figured prominently in decisions made at the schools.

> Teachers have more say so since restructuring. Before restructuring, I did ask
> for a lot of input, but I did make final decisions (principal).

It appears that restructuring has not made significant strides in giving teachers more

power in curriculum decisions, although, it has made teacher input more

customary.

> Respondents suggested that an informal, yet important, aspect of decision

making at the school sites was the opportunity to discuss curriculum ideas and

make suggestions to their principals. Many respondents commented that principals

were generally willing to listen and consider the feasibility of applying their ideas to

the curriculum.

> A lot of the times, if we want things implemented, we can go down and talk
> to the principal about them, and get them done that way (Rose, selected,
> female, 6-10 years of experience).

> The teachers usually bring me a new idea and ask me to look at it. I
> meet with the group that is interested in it. We look at it, and ask
> others if they are interested in the program. We started a pilot program that
> way, and it is still ongoing with more and more teachers getting into it
> (principal).

With the approval of the building principals, the teachers contributed to limited

curriculum decisions.

> In analyzing the data in the context of the three schools, restructuring offered

teachers limited opportunities to make curriculum decisions with the approval of

the building principal. Prior to restructuring, curriculum frameworks were set by

the state, adopted by the county, and administered by the principal. Teachers had

some input, but less than they do now with restructuring.

Personnel decisions

The extent of decision making authority that teachers exercised in making

personnel decisions helped determine the degree to which restructuring as SBM was

implemented at the elementary schools of Florida County. The restructuring

process allowed limited teacher input into this aspect of decision making at the

school sites. The decisions to involve teachers in personnel decisions remained

with the principal.

According to the respondents in this study, personnel decisions were viewed,

for the most part, as the realm of the administration.

> I think personnel decisions are still made by the hierarchy. I think that
> administration at the school site, and administration at the county level, are
> still making personnel decisions, probably together (Rose, selected, female,
> more than 10 years experience).

On some occasions, the principals considered teacher input in the hiring process.

> Last year we had to hire another second grade teacher. We were called in to
> discuss it and it was narrowed down. It turned out that the one we wanted
> got it (Lily, random, more than 10 years experience).

> Personnel decisions were made in a top down administrative style. When
> restructuring came, principals allowed more input from their faculties than
> they did before (Fern, selected, more than 10 years experience).

Respondents agreed that it was principals' responsibility to make personnel

decisions, and to decide to invite input from others as they saw fit.

> I make the decisions on hiring, firing, and moving people around still. I
> have asked teachers if they would like to come in and sit on interviews.
> (principal).

> I don't think personnel decisions have changed in the past five years. And I hope they don't change because there are certain jobs that should be the job of the principal and of the administration (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

The principals also conveyed their reluctance to involve others in the actual hiring, because those who wanted to be involved in the pleasant duty of hiring tended to be excluded from the unpleasant task of firing.

> I don't know if committees work well with selecting people because they are involved with the hiring end of it but not the firing end of it. I feel if the whole process is going to work, then they should be involved in A through Z (principal).

In summary, restructuring brought some faculty input into the process of making personnel decisions. Even though some attempts to include teachers were made, teachers and principals still felt that personnel decisions were a function of administration.

Committee processes

The implementation of SBM required the involvement of teachers in decision making committees. Because committees were a key element bringing teachers together in SBM decision making, the extent to which teachers were prepared to deal with others in committees helped determine the degree to which restructuring was implemented at Florida County elementary schools. This involvement was affected by teachers' perceptions of committee decisions and by numerous other factors. Many of these factors were investigated and their descriptions provide the unique contributions of this section. This section presents an analysis and interpretation of how teachers related to each other on committees.

It explores levels of participation by committee members, as well as factors associated with individual committee members' credibility. Attention levels that members received in committees played a role in the decisional process and were investigated. Members' sense of collective responsibility for committee decisions as well as the levels of comfort that members experienced through committee participation were explored. Also investigated was how members perceived their relationship with the principal as committee member. Finally, a description of how respondents perceived the need for group training was presented.

Perception of committees. Committee decisions were sometimes perceived as either very difficult, difficult, or very smooth. Consensus reaching was often at the center of committee decisions. Easy decisions had common goals. Decisions were difficult when they called for change, seemed adversarial in nature, or when controversial matters required consensus. It was also observed that lack of authority in committee decisions contributed to a sense of futility in the SBM process. Satisfaction with committee decisions was dependent on members feeling professional, empowered, and valued.

Committee participation allowed the exchange of ideas and acceptance of change. Change, at times, was difficult for committee participants.

> Being on the initial SIT team, sometimes decisions were very difficult in that we were changing the way things had always happened (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years).

Decisions were both very difficult or very easy, depending on the acceptance level of the group for the ideas under consideration.

> Sometimes decisions have been agonizing, and sometimes very smooth. It really depends on how the staff feels about them (principal).

Difficult decisions were associated with personnel reduction, issues where consensus had been difficult to reach, or money matters. For some teachers, it was an unpleasant experience to consider staff reductions based on the availability of funds.

> When it comes to cutting teachers, that is difficult! Or, cutting aides! We had to do that (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

When the group had a common goal or need, the process of reaching a decision was greatly enhanced.

> The technology committee had a relatively easy decision determining where the money should be spent. It was easy because we were in need of a lot more computers to meet our goals (Lily, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

A common goal brought people together in support of an idea in which group members found relevant.

Reaching consensus was a demanding aspect of committee participation. Consensus was defined by respondents as a process for reaching solidarity in decisions made by groups or committees. With so many different personalities and beliefs brought to the groups by the various members, priorities were difficult to establish. Therefore, reaching consensus was a very real challenge.

> There were so many aspects of what to include in our restructuring plan. I think we had a lot of narrowing down to do. We had to have our leadership meetings to narrow it down to what we really wanted to address as our school goals. The hardest thing was coming to consensus (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Weighing the pros and cons, and again, coming to consensus as a group of people made the decision difficult (Lily, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Reaching consensus was also a major cause of committee dysfunction.

Sometimes committee decisions are very difficult, very hard. Just to get a consensus, or to get someone to see your point of view takes forever. Sometimes it is easier to take a point of view you know is going to be easily accepted (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

Consensus was easiest to reach on critical issues, while reaching consensus

sometimes required persuading others to get on the band wagon.

Safety issues were easy! We had a situation with cars mixing with children, and we wanted to put up a fence so students could walk from one end of the campus to the other safely. No problem (principal).

To get the whole school working on one thematic unit for an entire month was difficult. That meant a lot of politicking to get some people on board (principal).

Once again, a common goal brought people together in the implementation of an

idea and facilitated acceptance of the resulting change.

Teachers could not control the outcomes of their decisions, neither could they

predict the quality of committee interactions. Committee members became

disappointed when they realized that they did not have authority over the

implementation of decisions.

The budget was cut, so all of our plans were for nothing (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Decision making was further complicated by teachers who found themselves in

confrontational roles in which their interests were opposed by the interests of

others.

It was difficult because it was adversarial and you never know what to expect. However, each time you do something like that, and you find that you have support and feedback, it encourages you (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

As it appeared, collegiality was at stake under such circumstances.

Some teachers remained very positive about committee outcomes and generally found satisfaction in the outcomes of their efforts.

Most of the time I was pretty satisfied. I would really like to think of an incident where we really butted heads, but I can't think of any right now (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

These educators revealed a general optimism for the ability of themselves and others to remain professional.

Pretty much I was very satisfied most of the time. Even at the times we may have had problems and discussions, nothing ever got ugly or hateful. I would say that our professionalism is really high (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Satisfaction in committee outcomes was rooted in people feeling valued for their contributions. Those who felt very satisfied in the results of committee outcomes conveyed that these committees were very important in getting teachers to participate in decisions affecting them.

Most have been very satisfied with outcomes because input is requested on most of the decisions that would really affect their everyday work (Lily, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Well, on the committees that I have sat on, the group was satisfied. I really did not find people who did not feel some achievement in what they were doing (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

As expressed, most teachers at Florida County elementary schools who were satisfied with committee outcomes perceived a relationship between committee

work and what they were doing. There were also many positive attitudes about committee participation and many committee members saw something for everyone in committee involvement.

In contrast, committee outcomes appeared meaningless to other committee members. These respondents experienced a sense of futility in the decisional process of committees. Some teachers disliked feeling useless or unproductive in their contributions to committees.

> You may have a lot of ideas and things to go with, but you may be limited with resources or money. When you feel like your hands are tied behind your back, you are not satisfied (Fern, random, female, 2-5 years experience).

> I think the group basically felt it was a large waste of time (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

In other instances, a sense of powerlessness invaded committees' efforts, while a combination of eroding power and a sense that members were doing the work of others dominated the decisional process.

> I feel like we propose a plan, but it still has to be approved by the administration or school board, and it can still be vetoed (Fern, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

> I just don't think committee decisions are always realistic. We see it more and more where we really don't have any power... We are just doing things to make someone else's job a little easier (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

As observed by respondents, a sense of powerlessness, lack of professionalism, and feelings of insignificance in committee decisions contributed to much dissatisfaction with the restructuring process.

Relationships. How well teachers related to each other in committees helped determine the effectiveness of committee decisions and affected the degree to which restructuring as SBM was implemented in Florida County elementary schools. Teachers felt that relationships varied from one committee to another. No two committees were exactly alike in the way members related to each other.

Committees developed their unique characteristics according to individual personalities, views, and comfort levels in working with others.

> In committees, sometimes people relate better than other times. I think it has a lot to do with personality types and that sort of thing (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

The natural interactions in committees led to the development of relationships, and also helped teachers find support in each other and even contradictory views became valuable.

> For the most part, people in committees establish a rapport with one another. Even if you get people with opposing viewpoints, these are good people to have inside a group because they do allow us to see the other side of issues (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

Even the participants who were reluctant to share their ideas were encouraged to join in the discussion.

> In my committee, if I find people who do not make a comment, I ask them what they think. This has allowed everyone to participate relatively equally (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Encouraging nonvocal members to contribute their views was a means for enhancing positive relationships among committee members, while allowing them to feel a part of the decisional process.

The level of trust committee members felt for each other also had an impact on relationships. Committee relationships were affected by some individuals who thought that their purposes for being there, or their ideas, were the most valuable.

> On any committee, you have people who are very vehement about their reasons for being on the committee and their ideas are the best, and that is the way it is going to be done (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Some members appeared suspicious of others on the committee and would not reveal how they felt on issues. Or, they would only join committees with others they knew and with whom they felt safe.

> If people don't have that sense of trust for each other in committees, then they won't show their cards. This brings a very strong sense of frustration afterwards because these individuals may have wished they had not been afraid (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

> We let them choose who they want to be with. Everybody has to serve on a committee. People that are comfortable together, join up together (principal).

As it appears committee relationships were hindered when a sense of trust and familiarity among members was lacking.

Other factors that assisted members in relating to each other were the length of time the committee had been together and the level of training in group work achieved by committee members.

> When this SIT team first started and we were going to be coming early and staying late, you know you didn't see all kinds of smiles. But, as the committee grew closer and closer together, we started having fun and relationships improved (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

> If they have been trained, it is a little bit easier not to take things personally and a little bit easier to understand somebody's personality. But, if they have not been trained, they really are very uncomfortable sometimes and may back off (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years).

The level of training helped individuals feel more comfortable in committee relationships and leadership roles. It also helped determine the extent to which members were at ease with one another or how willing they were to become involved in the decisional process.

In summary, committees usually developed their unique characteristics around individual personalities, the willingness of members to commit to others on the committee, the sense of trust among members, rapport, and respect members felt for each other. Teachers preferred to join committees with individuals they felt comfortable with and avoided being involved in decision making with others they did not trust. Committees that stayed together for a long time were more likely to develop stronger relationships among members. A factor that aided members' feelings and confidence about committee work was how well they were trained in group work.

Levels of participation. Levels of participation pertain to the degree of involvement that committee processes provided in bringing teachers into contact with each other. These levels were affected in various ways. Some teachers had no desire or motivation to contribute to the sharing of ideas, while others did not engage in discussions to avoid hurting the feelings of others. Still others did not share because they felt intimidated by someone on the committee.

> Some people really don't care so they don't ever say anything. I guess it could depend on how they feel about what is being discussed. Also, I think some members don't like to offend anybody, and some people feel threatened by people on the committee (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Some teachers simply did not want to engage in committee decisions and did what

they could to avoid them.

> There are just some people that don't want to be involved. Those people
> participate as little as possible (principal).

Although there were some committees where teacher representation was relatively

balanced, the respondents expressed a concern that participation in committee

decisions was not always equal.

> I have been on committees where everyone participated very equally, and I
> have been on other committees where perhaps I personally felt some
> individuals dominating the group while others were not allowed to say
> much at all (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

As it seems, respondents felt there were various levels of personal or professional

reasons that affected the willingness of committee members to engage in committee

decisions. In short, some members did not participate because they did not want to

offend others, because some committees were dominated by one or more

individuals, or because some members were not interested in the issues under

consideration. Also, some committee members avoided sharing because they felt

threatened by someone on the committee.

Credibility. Credibility among committee members revolved around several

factors and affected committee outcomes. The teachers cited a number of reasons as

to why some committee members gained more credibility than others. Some

respondents observed that more credible teachers displayed higher standards of

integrity and consideration for committee members.

> I would say there are members with more credibility than others. Those
> people are up front and honest, and do not bad mouth others behind their

backs. These individuals tend to be better leaders (Rose, random, female, 2-5 years experience).

Other committee members acquired their credibility through their years of

experience and longevity in the teaching profession.

> Yes, some members have more credibility. I think anytime you have an experienced teacher who has 25-30 years on board, people are definitely going to look up to that person. These individuals have seen things come and go, and they are not so quick to jump on the band wagon (Lily, selected, male, 6-10 years experience).

While experience and longevity were factors affecting a teacher's credibility, there

were members who acquired more credibility by simply being more knowledgeable

on issues.

> There are people who are seen as having more knowledge in certain areas, or more experience, and I think the group will turn to these people for feedback or input. However, I don't know if that really equates with credibility, or with using our resources within the committee (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Credibility was also granted to individuals who displayed caring personalities, along

with a sense of trustworthiness and positive role modeling.

> Basically, credibility boils down to their personality. They have the type of personality that people listen to what they say. They are not petty and mean, they believe in the children, and people listen because they know that person is saying what he or she believes (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

In short, credibility was affected by a number of personal and professional factors

such as knowledge, expertise, personality, and individual integrity.

> Attention received. The amount of attention that members received in

committees played a role in the decision making process. It was not uncommon for

some committee members to receive more attention than others by being overly

assertive. This type of member was often not in tune with the needs or views of others. Or, it was simply a member's persistence that created more attention.

> I think there are those who receive more attention, and it is not always positive attention. This is the member who always wants to express his point of view and goes on and on, even if nobody cares (Rose, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

> You know, the squeaky wheel gets the oil. They are heard more because they speak up more (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

In some instances, individuals who were overly vocal earned the attention they received from committee members because they were dependable people. These types of committee members were appreciated for following through on what they proposed.

> There are certain people that are more vocal, and the vocal one receives more attention. Some verbal people will also do what they say, so you can rely on them. These tend to get their way more than the ones that say they are going to do something and then never pull it off (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

In order to prevent some members from receiving undue attention in committee interactions, it was suggested that group rules be designed and followed.

> We have some people that are more verbal and more outgoing, and some people that want to take over meetings. You have to set rules to begin with. The rules will prevent some members from getting undue attention (principal).

Therefore, respect for the views and individuality of all committee members is fostered when group rules are followed.

In summary, some members received more attention because they dominated others, because they were "bossy," or because they were demanding. Being overly vocal in a committee "turned off" members, especially if the loud

mouths were unreliable. However, teachers felt that being vocal and dependable

was more favorably perceived than being vocal and not dependable. In order to

prevent individuals from dominating committees and receiving undue attention, it

was suggested that group rules be explained and followed by all members.

Collective responsibility. Committee members felt a strong sense of collective

responsibility for committee decisions made at their schools. Elementary teachers in

Florida County Schools felt a very strong sense of collective responsibility as a result

of committee decisions.

> Yes, I feel the members are collectively responsible, in the sense that we are
> all responsible for the outcomes of the education and our decisions affecting
> the children (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

> I think teachers take things very seriously. They are very responsible when
> given a task to do or a committee to be on (Rose, selected, female, more than
> 10 years experience).

Even the principals were confident that teachers had a sense of a collective

responsibility for the decisions they made in committees.

> Members were very responsible. Once the committee decides that something
> has to be part of our school improvement, unless it is against the law or
> impossible to carry out because of finances, we go with it (principal).

However, principals also perceived that some members did not feel quite as

responsible as others for decisions.

> Overall, yes. Most of our committees run ten members, and out of those ten,
> easily seven or eight are actively involved. There are also a couple of people
> that for whatever reason, just do not want to be involved (principal).

It also appeared that teachers' sense of collective responsibility was enhanced

because their committee work helped administrators make quality decisions.

> I have been very pleased. . . I think all the heads together when people think on how to solve a problem is much better than me sitting here making a decision (principal).

In short, teachers felt responsible for the committee decisions they made and principals appreciated the fact that teachers' participation in decision making contributed to sound administrative decisions.

Levels of comfort. For some teachers, feeling comfortable making committee decisions was not a problem. These teachers claimed that having experience working on committees facilitated their ease in joining others. However, sometimes even teachers who had considerable experience with committee work became uncomfortable when joining a new committee, particularly if that committee was addressing an area where the teacher lacked expertise.

> I am in a lot of them, I am very comfortable (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years).

> I have been comfortable because I have known what was expected of me in the past. This year on the budget committee, I feel very lost. I was not in the preparation of the budget last year for this year so that has make it difficult to step into the committee. Next year it will be easier to follow through with the decisions that we make (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

For other teachers, the level of comfort for committee decisions depended on who they worked with on the committee. And in some cases, teachers deliberately stayed away from committees which they felt would not be productive.

> It depends on the people who are on the committee. There are some people in this school you just don't get along with very well, and there are other people that you do (Lily, random, male, 6-10 years experience).

> I have no problem sitting on committees. I avoid a committee that is going to be too large because just the amount of people is not going to get us

anywhere, or a committee that is going to be dominated by somebody (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

For the most part, teachers were comfortable with committee work if they were experienced or knowledgeable of the issues under discussion, and had positive expectations of the group. On the other hand, teachers felt uncomfortable when they lacked expertise, did not like who they worked with on the committee, the committee was too large, or personalities were too domineering.

Relationship with principal. How members felt about, and related to the principal as a committee member affected teachers' decisions in various ways. When the principal was a committee member, the principal was recognized for his or her position as well as for being part of the committee and as a peer to other committee members.

> I think members relate just great to the principal. . . [the principal] always listens, and then offers an opinion. We need to keep in mind that the principal has the right to an opinion like anyone else. I think more of [the principal] as a peer on the committee than as a principal (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

The principals' presence in committees seemed to complicate the communication flow among some teachers. These teachers felt uncomfortable if they found themselves in a committee meeting with the principal, while the principals recognized that his or her presence was intimidating.

> It can really be a yes man kind of thing when the principal is a committee member (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> I am a very strong willed person, and in order not to sway any committee, I try not to sit on any committee. I would rather receive from the committee ideas after they have done the work (principal).

How members felt about speaking up in front of the principals depended on the individual. Some committee members were not bothered at all by the principal's engagement in committee interactions, while others struggled to find their level of comfort within committees that included the principal.

> It depends on the person, whether you feel comfortable speaking up in front of the principal or not. Some people will do it and some people will not (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

The principals' comments were often taken more seriously, and they received more attention than other committee members.

> Absolutely, oh, absolutely. I do think when EF Hutton speaks everybody listens. When [the principal] says something, we evaluate where [the principal] is coming from, what [the principal] wants. The people that have a stake in it, may say something. The principal's comments are very well weighed, but not out of fear. . . [the principal] has a better handle on everything (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

As observed, the principals were perceived as the executive in charge of the school and someone who knew more about the operation of the school.

Because the principals were known as someone in a position of authority, teachers were reluctant to treat the principal as another peer. Fear and deference to the principal's position were identified as reasons.

> I just feel a lot of teachers are afraid to give their opinions and speak their mind when the principal is present (Fern, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

> I don't think people can completely forget the roles that we play, and it is just against human nature for someone to go against another who you know has control over whether you are hired or fired (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

It was evident that the concept of authority played an important role in the perceptions of the principals, who recognized that commonly accepted ideals of authority were not easily discarded.

> I am sure there are those who pay more attention to my comments. The superintendent evaluates me and I am certainly going to listen to what he says. I evaluate teachers, and I think it goes back to the way we were brought up. You have a boss and you do what the boss says. We are trying to get over that here. There are some things teachers want to have some say on (principal).

In summary, when the principal was a member of a committee, some perceived the principal as a peer, while others felt uncomfortable or intimidated by the principal's presence. However, the principals recognized that their roles as chief executives were intimidating and hard to ignore.

Group training. Generally speaking, the teachers who were selected to participate in this study because they were cooperative and enthusiastic about restructuring felt very strongly that teacher preparation or group training was a necessary experience for any teacher, and that training was especially helpful for teachers involved in committee work. Most of these individuals were involved with the SIT team at some time during the last five years, and had received some form of facilitative training.

> Group training, absolutely! I really think people who have not been trained, even if they are not going to be on the SIT team, need more training. They would understand what goes into decision making and what goes into being part of a group, such as behaving. A lot of people do not know how to behave. They muscle their way through (Rose, select, female, 6-10 years experience).

Similarly, the respondents randomly selected for this study saw a need for all

committee members to receive group training, as did the principals.

> Probably would not hurt. We are so used to doing things our way that I
> think when you get into a committee, especially when we have so many
> diverse cultures and backgrounds and differences in personalities, it sure
> could not hurt to have some training (Lily, random, female, 6- 10 years
> experience).

> They are given group training. All of the SIT team has to go through a
> facilitator training program. The rest of the staff would benefit from this
> training. But, the way we rotate the SIT team, we are aiming so that everyone
> will eventually be on the SIT team (principal).

The importance of group training for all the staff was emphasized and the

respondents recognized that group training enhanced committee work for

everyone and possibly made them better teachers and team members.

Summary of the degree to which restructuring has been implemented

Restructuring as SBM at Florida County elementary schools was defined as a

bottom up approach, as well as a shared process for making decisions and assuming

responsibilities. It was discovered that teachers had a slight increase of influence

over decisions made at the school sites in regard to budget and curriculum. In

respect to personnel decisions, these decisions have remained essentially the

authority of administration.

In the area of budget, teachers' input was sought to help administrators

allocate fairly leftover monies. According to the respondents in this study, teachers

engaged in budget committees at each school, but they found little authoritative

substance in their decision making when it came to actually allocating funds. In

short, the experience gained by participating in budget decisions helped teachers

become more aware of the intricacies of school finance and offered the principals a more popular process by which to identify teachers' priorities and to allocate the funds accordingly.

It was recognized that curriculum frameworks were set by the state, and adopted by the county. At the county level, the curriculum director was responsible for working closely with the various grade levels in the implementation of curriculum. At the school sites, teachers made limited curriculum decisions, which had to meet the approval of the principal. Some teachers expressed a concern that SBM decisions were detracting from teaching the basics, while others questioned if there had been any change at all in the process of making curriculum decisions. It appeared that SBM restructuring did not give teachers more power in curriculum decisions, although it has made teacher input more customary.

Personnel decisions were an administrative responsibility, primarily between the principal and county level, prior to restructuring and still were the responsibility of administration. Limited teacher input was occasionally allowed in personnel decisions. The principals were reluctant to involve teachers in this area because they felt that teachers were not going to be involved in the firing, they should not be part of the hiring. This did not seem to upset teachers. There were no significant changes in the way personnel decisions were made in the past five years.

Committees were a key element bringing teachers together in SBM decision making. The extent to which committee processes were effective helped determine the degree to which restructuring was implemented at Florida County elementary

schools. Committee decisions were sometimes perceived as either very difficult, difficult, or very smooth. Reaching consensus was often at the center of difficult decisions. Decisions that were perceived as difficult ones, were decisions that usually called for change or decisions that were adversarial in nature. Teachers' lack of authority in decision making contributed to a sense of futility, and satisfaction in involvement of decisions depended on members feeling valued, professional, or empowered. Overall, administrators accepted committee decisions as a tool to aid them in making more informed decisions.

Respondents perceived that the levels of committee participation differed among members. The level of participation was affected by different personalities, lack of willingness to commit to others, or lack of trust among members. Some teachers did not participate in committees because they were dominated or threatened by others, or because they were not interested in the topic. Teachers that received group training were more likely to feel confident about committee work. In committees, members' credibility was enhanced when they were perceived as knowledgeable, experienced, or possessing integrity. Some committee members received more attention because they were domineering, demanding, or were very vocal in committees. Being vocal and dependable was preferred over being vocal and unreliable.

Committee members adopted a sense of collective responsibility for committee decisions made at the elementary schools. Some members, however, did not share this sense of responsibility because they did not wish involvement in

decision making. Teachers who felt comfortable with committees sometimes gained considerable experience in committee work, and were knowledgeable of issues. Lack of expertise was pointed out as a factor that compromised a member's ability to be productive in a committee, as well as involvement on committees that were too large, or run by domineering personalities.

When principals were members of committees, they were perceived for the most part as peers. But still, some members were likely to feel uncomfortable or intimidated by the principal who joined committee meetings or groups. In turn, principals recognized that their authoritative role was hard to ignore.

The Effects of Restructuring on Worklife of Teachers

The second research question asked about the effects of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of elementary school teachers. In order to answer this research question, the respondents were asked about their new roles, readiness to accept these roles, and about their time investment in restructuring activities. How readily teachers accepted these new roles and how prepared they were to handle them were investigated. Respondents were asked if these roles affected their levels of stress, offered more influence over decision making, and if relationships among colleagues were affected by such roles. Teachers were asked if they had become more recognized and better informed as a result of these new roles. The effects of these roles on teacher morale were explored, as well as the way in which the time invested in restructuring activities impacted teachers'

worklife. A discussion of the interrelationships associated with the responses among the three schools is presented. This section concludes with a summary of the findings.

<u>Assuming new roles</u>

An important aspect of implementing restructuring with SBM was the invitation to teachers to assume new roles in addition to what was traditionally expected of them. These roles had a significant effect on teachers worklives at the Florida County elementary schools. The intent of restructuring was that these new roles, somehow, would cause teachers to develop ownership for the decision making at their school sites and would lead to improved commitment.

New roles altered teachers worklives. Just prior to initiating restructuring as SBM, a corps of teachers from the county's elementary schools were asked to assume leadership roles in the restructuring process. These teachers received some leadership training and were expected to bring back to their school sites valuable skills, which were desirable in order to help administrators motivate the entire staff and guide them throughout the new managerial process. These educators felt important for being singled out and were enthusiastic for the opportunity of leading their fellow teachers into restructuring their schools.

The restructuring process produced a great deal of enthusiasm initially among the individuals who were selected to help promote this new managerial approach. Even though these teachers were enthusiastic, their enthusiasm was short lived.

> They sent us to a course, two days before this ever began. They taught us how to be peppy, and how to get people excited about restructuring. But they didn't teach us how to communicate with one another. It wasn't good preparation (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

These initial facilitators felt intimidated by the whole idea of making presentations to their peers and wondered about what they would think of them, or of their presentations.

> I think some teachers had a hard time facilitating if they were on the SIT team. They were a little afraid of their peers and what they would think and say. That was the biggest concern (principal).

Even though these teachers received the leadership training, they lacked in confidence for the newly appointed duties.

At the Florida County elementary schools, roles were a way to involve teachers in SBM decisions and to encourage them to develop ownership for the decisions they made.

> Yes, people are being put into roles that are outside the classroom, which many of them have never had before as far as making decisions for the whole school rather than just the classroom (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Teachers' involvement in SBM decision making and the opportunity to have a voice in decisions at the school site were accepted by some respondents as a logical choice. After all, teachers were perceived as the ones most affected by such decisions.

> I think most of the teachers accepted the roles they were empowered to handle. I think they were the decisions that all along they felt they should be making (principal).

As it appears, most teachers found it easier to adapt to changing roles which they felt should be theirs to begin with. These roles were associated with their discretionary power and fell outside their zone of acceptance, that is, teachers did not perceive these decisions as being within the administrative domain.

Although teachers were given new roles and some accepted them readily, others claimed that some of these roles were not entirely new.

> Well, instead of having head teachers, they are now on the SIT committee (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

For these teachers the new roles were functions that were already performed in the past, but now had new names attached to them. Additionally, some teachers felt that the significance of their contributions to the decision making process remained questionable and appeared inconsequential.

> Their roles are just in shared decision making. Other than that, I think it has just been lip service. I think we all know that. The board makes so many of the decisions, that the decisions teachers get to make are still minimal. Maybe not all over the state, but definitely here (principal).

> Some accepted them readily, and were willing to be on committees. Some grade level people are dying to be head teacher, the SIT team members. . . However, I have a very good friend who declined the SIT team and said "My job is not to be a person to rule the school. . . I don't want to run the school, I want to teach!" (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

For some teachers, accepting decision making roles at the school site was something to look forward to. For others, it was an undesirable activity, which only got in the way of their primary duty, which was teaching.

Restructuring roles were not something that teachers asked for, or initiated. Neither were they something that most teachers felt adequately prepared to handle.

Nevertheless, restructuring went forward.

> No, I don't think they were given the training or the option. It was forced upon them. The whole idea of bottom up rather than top down, if it really exists, is not something anyone really asked teachers if they wanted. I think the administration came up with the whole new thing and thrust it upon teachers (principal).

> I feel that as school improvement has progressed, and there has been more training made available, teachers have become more comfortable with the roles they have to take (Rose, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

As teachers felt their way through the process, they learned from their mistakes and did some adjusting of their own to adapt to the new roles.

> Like anything new, make your mistakes, evaluate what you have done, look at how things are going, get opinions from people, and take all of that stuff together. From the first time we did the SIT team until now, we have come a long way. We have gotten the wheels running smoother (Lily, selected, male, 6-10 years experience).

As its seems, the successes of restructuring Florida County elementary schools were not necessarily a result of strategic design and lofty plans, but were more of a process of trial and error.

Teaching became an even more demanding job as a result of the additional expectations which came with restructuring. Even prior to restructuring, preparing lessons, managing a classroom full of active children, maintaining open lines of communication between home and school, and dealing with related chores left time for little else. The new roles imposed by SBM added considerably to teachers' already busy routines and contributed to increased levels of stress among the faculties.

> Seriously, my stress levels increased dramatically last year. My hair even turned from black to grey very quickly. Besides, I have a very stressful

teaching job. Adding to the stress levels included the time factor and the students that I teach. I was relieved this year when I relinquished responsibilities of department head and SIT team (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

I think we were under a lot of pressure to look good. We felt like we were working for the principal to show off, and we were not getting any credit for it. That is, coming in early, working late, getting these papers and notes together, and all of that. A good school speaks for itself! (Lily, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

The staff members of the schools were more willing to participate in SBM activities

if time was allocated to make and implement decisions.

Not having enough time built into the workday really affects the stress. Sometimes we question the purpose of placing all this pressure on us. I wish they would arrange time for these committee decisions (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

As conveyed by the respondents, the extra work was demanding and did not seem

worth the effort.

In summary, a number of teachers were selected to be trained for initial

leadership roles in order to help administrators implement restructuring with SBM.

Being singled out made them feel important and enthusiastic about restructuring.

But being in leadership roles tested their confidence and caused these teacher-

leaders some concern as to what their peers would think of them. Teachers initially

perceived restructuring as an opportunity to engage in roles that would allow them

a voice in decisions affecting them in the classroom. This perception was initially a

positive one and was especially noticeable among teachers who had a strong desire

to engage in roles which they felt should have been theirs to begin with. However,

the initial enthusiasm was short lived. It appears that most teachers felt

inadequately prepared to handle the roles, were performing roles they had not asked for, and did not welcome the demands of roles on their time. Additionally, other teachers observed that what had been presented as new roles were no more than old roles with new names. These factors became serious constraints to the entire restructuring process.

Roles and recognition

The amount and quality of recognition that teachers received from others for their SBM contributions impacted the effects of restructuring on their worklives. Across the faculties of the elementary schools of Florida County, the interaction caused by restructuring activities gave teachers a sense that they had some influence over the operation of the schools, a form of recognition and something that most teachers were denied prior to restructuring.

> You are put into a position of having a role besides that of teacher, such as that of team leader. You sit down with the administration representing other people, and your influence in that meeting was greater because you were representing other people (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Through representative roles offered in SBM some teachers were enabled to dialogue with the administration on behalf of the staff, and roles gave them a sense of importance and influence.

Participation in decision making helped elementary teachers gain considerable recognition from their colleagues in the wider school community.

> I think they have become more recognized. I am more aware of what other people are doing in their classrooms as a result of restructuring (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Yes, teachers became more recognized because of the new roles. When it first started, it was like "Oooo, you're on that committee." You know, it was a big deal (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience)!

> We try to give laurels to what is working. I don't think enough is done to give teachers a pat on the back (principal).

The fact that some teachers became recognized for their SBM roles also helped them

realize that they were better informed as a result of being involved with these roles.

> Our teacher morale is very good here. I would say, if anything, the roles probably enhanced it. Being able to have a little more input in the decision making has to make your morale higher (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Additionally, involvement in SBM activities helped some teachers acquire a sense

of increased confidence over the direction of their schools and of themselves within

Florida County elementary schools.

> We are all more aware of what takes place at the county level, as well as at the total school level (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> I happen to be the type of person who likes to know what is going on, and I feel that by being on the SIT team and head teacher, I hear things directly as opposed to hearing them third and fourth hand. I like that! (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Yes, they know what is going on in the school. They know how the budget works, where we get our money, and why we can't have money at times, or why we can't do certain things like have 15 to 1 ratio (principal).

The outcomes of teachers' increased recognition and confidence contributed to the

enhancement of mental and emotional conditions among some of the staff at the

elementary schools of Florida County.

On the other hand, the social atmosphere created by restructuring within the

elementary schools detracted from giving recognition to teachers in representative

roles. Because most teachers had been left out of the initial training, prior to restructuring, they might have felt alienated from the process. As an outcome, the relationships that resulted created an environment of inequality and conflict.

> In the beginning, there had been this training for our facilitators. They tried to make it an "us," but they were here and the rest of us were out there (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Sometimes you are in an adversarial position. Eventually, we all seem to work it out, but yes, it does affect relationships (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

There were also impositions from state and county levels and other factors, such as lack of time, financial constraints, and divided interests, that impacted not only teachers' recognition but recognizing the legitimacy of restructuring. These set limits on what site leaders and principals could and could not do to facilitate restructuring, and damaged the social fiber of the institution.

> I don't feel like the comraderie is the same it used to be. It fragmented everybody into groups, and this caused a lot of misunderstandings. I would say it separated us (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

> Sometimes morale is affected negatively because of the feeling of having your hands tied. You can get discouraged because nothing is going to change anyway. If the resources were there you could become enthusiastic (Fern, random, female, 2-5 years experience).

The results of these constraints, probably more than anything else, contributed to a deterioration of loyalties and hurt interpersonal relationships and recognition among some staff. In many instances teachers felt that restructuring was such an imposition that neither recognition nor the desire to be better informed appealed to them.

> It goes back to the teachers having a difficult time with restructuring. Their morale is low (Fern, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

> To begin with, the first year it was a novelty. The second year they were still on the honeymoon period. By the third year, they were tired of all of it. Teachers didn't have the time, and the stress piled up because we met so much (principal).

These teachers considered their time wasted in insignificant decisions, or found themselves in stressful situations. In such instances, restructuring was a disillusionment and a frustrating exercise undeserving of recognition.

In summary, the effects of new roles enhanced recognition for some teachers' efforts in several ways. Some teachers experienced more recognition from colleagues for their representative roles, and for their position on issues and accomplishments. Some other teachers acquired greater confidence in themselves and greater pride in their schools. The recognition offered them a sense of importance and influence, and their involvement enhanced their knowledge of the intricacies that go into running a school. On the other hand, the social atmosphere that grew out of restructuring resulted in an environment of interpersonal suspicion, which detracted from teachers' recognition. Mistrust and suspicion among peers and administrators caused loyalties to deteriorate, hurt relationships, and resulted in a loss of faith for the restructuring movement. Also, impositions from the state and county levels, along with financial and time constraints, were perceived by teachers as delimiters of what could be accomplished with SBM. Some teachers felt that restructuring was a waste of time and remained a process of futility with little or no significance.

Time investment

Attempts to implement restructuring as SBM had various effects on teachers' worklife. Involvement in decision making clearly required teachers to invest additional time in their workdays. This investment often was at the expense of their preparation or personal time. The selected teachers at Rose Elementary School were investing 7 hours and 15 minutes weekly versus 1 hour and 38 minutes by the random group. This suggests that there was an inequitable distribution of restructuring activities. Also revealed in Table 6, in the past four years teachers at Rose Elementary School invested an additional average of 4 hours and 27 minutes weekly to deal with activities related to restructuring. At Lily Elementary School, the teachers invested a weekly average of 2 hours and 27 minutes in the past four years. And at Fern Elementary School, the additional time invested by teachers on a weekly average was 2 hours and 4 minutes. This additional time which teachers had to invest created difficulties with balancing teaching with restructuring activities and caused conflicts and stressful conditions among teachers. Such a workplace situation led administrators to rethink restructuring and use a more casual approach.

Because the time invested by teachers was a source of problems, in the year of this research the time devoted to restructuring activities dropped significantly at all of the elementary schools. At Rose Elementary School, it went from 4 hours and 27

Table 6

Profile of Average Weekly Time Invested in Restructuring
During the Previous Four Years and Current Year

	Rose		Lily		Fern	
	R	S	R	S	R	S
Previous	1 h 38 m	7 h 15 m				
Current	1 h 48 m	1 h 38 m				
Previous			1 h 15 m	3 h 38 m		
Current			0 h 58 m	2 h 45 m		
Previous					1 h 41 m	2 h 26 m
Current					0 h 38 m	2 h 49 m
Previous Avg	4 h 27 m		2 h 27 m		2 h 04 m	
Current Avg	1 h 43 m		1 h 52 m		1 h 44 m	

R = random sample
S = selected sample

h = hours
m = minutes

minutes average to 1 hour and 43 minutes. At Lily Elementary School, the average

weekly hours invested went from 2 hours and 27 minutes to 1 hour and 52 minutes.

And, at Fern Elementary School it dropped from 2 hours and 4 minutes to 1 hour

and 44 minutes. These time averages revealed that teachers at Rose Elementary

School worked almost as many hours in restructuring activities as did the teachers

at the other two elementary schools combined.

> I knew that I could not do the job I needed to do in the classroom and giving
> 15 hours a week to restructuring. I didn't let it affect it, but I don't think in
> the long term I, or anybody else, could have given 15 hours to restructuring
> and be a quality teacher in the classroom. You would burnout! (Rose,
> selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

This difference in time investment helped explain why teachers at Rose Elementary

School admitted they could not continue to be heavily involved in restructuring

and still remain effective teachers.

Negative effects of participation

The additional time associated with SBM committee involvement and other

restructuring activities made it difficult to balance teaching with personal life and

contributed to teachers' levels of stress and fatigue.

> Restructuring affected the stress. After the third year, some were coming to
> me to take everything back because they didn't have the time or the
> energy to do it (principal).

> Sometimes you feel like you are giving so much that you get tired,
> overwhelmed, and abused by it (Fern, random, female, 2-5 years experience).

This feeling of exhaustion, which was felt the most by teachers interviewed from

Rose Elementary School, and was also experienced by the staffs at the other two

elementary schools of Florida County Schools, led the administration to relax their expectations for the time teachers were asked to invest in restructuring activities.

> Now, we are not meeting like we used to. We meet in the spring and get all the decisions made for next year's goals. We don't have to meet as much, and the teachers are not frustrated and stressed out that much. This has been a very smooth year (principal).

It seems evident that the amount of time invested in restructuring developed into a negative force within the staffs, and eventually led to the recognition that it was undesirable to continue to expect teachers to give so much of their time.

An important purpose of restructuring as SBM was to empower teachers and to make them feel that they were contributing to the decision making process. At Florida County elementary schools, teachers experienced little empowerment to make school decisions, nor did they perceive they were real collaborators with administrators in making decisions at the school site. Teachers saw little return on their investment of time. Some were stimulated to feel a part of the process, but the majority experienced frustration with the insignificance of their contributions.

> Sure, sometimes I feel part of a bigger team and part of a greater system. Other times I feel like they are playing games, and I really don't have the power that I perceived to have (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

This situation conveyed to many teachers that their investment of time did not translate into any significant power to make school decisions and that the entire proposition of restructuring was an illusion.

As previously noted, restructuring responsibilities added considerable work to many teachers' busy schedules. This eventually affected their attitudes in the workplace.

> My attitudes were affected. It made me more skeptical of what restructuring is all about (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

> I sometimes feel that I don't have enough time in my classroom, that I keep being asked to give up, give up, and give up! So I feel frustrated with that (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Again, the additional time needed to do the work took a toll on these teachers attitudes, and added to their weariness, stress, and impatience.

> By the third year, they were getting stressed out, and it showed with the discipline referrals that were coming to the office. It showed with the stress level between teachers and with the unrest between them (principal).

As a result, some teachers' attitudes toward their school system became negative or bitter.

> Teachers felt that their participation in SBM was a way to get them to do the administrators' work for free, since they did not receive compensation or recognition for the time they invested in decision making.

> I feel like they are trying to pass the buck. They have a lot to do, so let's have the teachers do the work and we are not going to pay them anymore to do it (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years).

Underneath all of this frustration and stress experienced by teachers at the elementary schools, participants were aware that money might not be available, that time or compensation might not be allocated, and that faith in restructuring was dwindling. For example, there were teachers who became excited about their decisions, but their excitement was short lived due to the lack of funds.

> Like I said you come with ideas and everybody here wants to implement them. Then you take them to the school board and they say no. Sometimes I feel like I have wasted my time. The bottom line is money (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

This lack of support for teachers' decisions caused many teachers to look negatively

upon their investment of time in committee work, and also discouraged teachers

from promoting SBM restructuring.

After all of the time invested in making decisions, the uncertainty of support

resulted in a lack of trust on the part of some teachers toward their peer leaders,

administrators, and anyone who avoided acknowledging their ideas.

> Sometimes I would feel that some of the suggestions I made were declined
> because of personal reasons. I might feel that someone on the SIT team
> didn't particularly like me, so they didn't want to hear anything that I said
> (Lily, random, female, female, 6-10 years experience).

It appears that when teachers' sense of trust is lost in the workplace, their interest

for the organization is likely to decrease as well as their level of participation.

Because teachers became suspicious of peers and the purposes behind restructuring,

this led to a loss of hope in SBM as the vehicle to empower teachers or to cure the

ills of education in the Florida County's elementary schools.

> Trust can affect you negatively. You feel like you are the only one out there,
> or one of a few, giving forth some effort to try to change things (Fern,
> random, female, 2-5 years experience).

> Sometimes people would unload on you a lot, or they would not say things
> to you because they did not want you to know what they were really thinking
> (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

Along with the loss of hope , the loyalty to peers who remained enthusiastic or

supportive of restructuring activities dissipated.

Another cause for considerable concern related to teaching practices at the

County's elementary schools was that participation in SBM activities had a negative

effect on teachers' classroom preparation time.

> Yes, it took preparation time away. I wasn't happy (Fern, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

> I spent many weekends here at school doing a lot of my planning. However, there were some weekends I could not come in, and during that week my kids would suffer. I wasn't able to devote enough planning time to developing lessons (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

> Yes, something has got to give if you spend more time with school improvement. This is why the state has to come up with more time (principal).

However, most teachers and principals maintained that they did not allow time for

restructuring activities to interfere with their student interactions.

> No, I don't think it did. But, I could not have continued on the SIT team. Two years is the maximum amount to give (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> No, I don't think so, other than feeling a lack of time to prepare (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

For the most part, teachers would allow their preparation time at school to be

affected before they would allow restructuring to interfere with the time they spent

interacting with their students. Nevertheless, interaction time with students

became an area of concern because at least one principal and some teachers admitted

that involvement in restructuring activities have detracted from teacher-student

interactions.

> Yes, it did. They did not have as much time to spend with them if they had to hurry to a meeting or if their action group was meeting (principal).

> Yes, I'm sure it did, when I was stressed out, like today (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

As it appears, there was a strong concern over the fact that time needed for

restructuring activities was taking away from teachers' effectiveness.

<u>Positive effects of participation</u>

There were some staff members who remained hopeful and were able to

claim positive experiences with SBM activities. These teachers felt that something

was being accomplished with restructuring committee work, and that their time and

effort was not wasted.

> Sometimes it was positive when some of the things we tried to do came to
> fruition (Lily, selected, male, 6-10 years experience).

It seems that teachers felt satisfied when their contributions of time in SBM led to

the implementation of their decisions.

As a result of the time invested in shared decisions and interacting with

others, some teachers who were enthusiastic about SBM restructuring developed an

enhanced sense of trust for those with whom they worked closely.

> I think those that are involved have learned to rely on and trust each other.
> (principal).

When people have a sense of trust for those with whom they work, their level of

satisfaction with the organization is greatly enhanced.

An unexpected outcome at the county's elementary schools, in view of the

efforts, time, and energy that teachers devoted to restructuring, was that many

teachers did not lose trust in the principal. Trust and confidence in the principals

was felt to contribute to the morale and commitment of this staff and to their

ongoing involvement in decision making at the schools. In some instances,

teachers felt that the involvement experienced in SBM decisions allowed them to

empathize with the role of the principal.

> It has enabled me to see things from the principal's point of view more, not
> just the teachers' point of view (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years
> experience).

In other instances, the principal was perceived as much of a victim of the system as

the teachers were.

> I think it emphasized the fact that they are also victims of the hierarchy
> (Rose, random, male, more than 10 years experience).

Working more closely with the principal allowed some teachers to bond with him

or her, and to learn that the principals were as compelled by superiors to promote

restructuring activities as teachers were compelled by the principal to get involved.

> Another positive impact of teachers' participation in SBM was the effects it

had on their professional knowledge. Being required to address issues in

committees, to find alternative decisions, and to actually decide and establish

positions, were valuable experiences in enabling teachers to gain a wider perspective

of school matters.

> Just understanding better what goes on at Tallahassee, what takes place at the
> county office, and what actually goes into running a school is knowledge that
> I did not have before (Lily, selected, male, 6-10 years experience).

> Not only did I learn more about other teachers' perceptions, but overall,
> about how the school runs (Rose, random, female 2-5 years experience).

For these teachers, time in committee work was perceived as being well invested.

> It has helped me see things in a more global fashion. When you get out of
> your own little classroom, you start looking at things from a broader
> perspective and you realize you are just one little cog in the wheel (Fern,
> selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Teachers know where money comes from and understand the workings of
> everything. They know more about budget, curriculum, technology..., and
> were appalled with how much we spent (principal).

This enhancement of knowledge, professional and operational, came about as a result of teachers having gained a broader perspective of the educational bureaucracy, and for having become more aware of issues facing schools.

Additionally, teachers' involvement in SBM decision making appeared to have some desirable outcomes on teacher effectiveness.

> Possibly by making me stronger. I feel that learning more about what other people are doing helped me feel that what I was doing was good. It gave me a lot of confidence to keep going, that I was on the right track (Rose, selected, female, more than 10 years).

> Just becoming closer to the faculty and staff affected my effectiveness. We talked more education, and I think that benefitted me as a teacher (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

The principals also thought that faculty interactions encouraged by SBM involvement enhanced faculty effectiveness and knowledge.

> It probably made them more effective. Simply because the more you know, the more effective you will be (principal).

With any endeavor, people learn from the positive as well as from the negative. As revealed in this study, teachers and principals felt restructuring offered some teachers opportunities to develop closer relationships, to learn from others and become more knowledgeable. Both teachers and principals felt increased knowledge resulted in increased teacher effectiveness.

Summary of the effects of restructuring on worklife of teachers

Involvement in SBM decision making demanded that teachers give up time from their workday. Initially, the effects of this time investment were greater at Rose Elementary School than at the other two schools. It appeared that Rose

Elementary School was more ambitious or had higher expectations for the potential of SBM. However, about three years into restructuring, it became evident that the staff at Rose Elementary School could not continue to invest so much time in managerial duties. As an outcome of the excessive time invested in SBM, preparation time was affected, personal lives suffered, relationships were stressed, and interactions with students were at risk. At the time this study ended, considerably less time was required for restructuring activities at Rose Elementary School, while at the other two schools a little less time was invested than before. Along with the time-related stress experienced by teachers, problems were created when the system did not fund programs that teachers wanted, and when insufficient time was allocated to make decisions and implement them.

The negative effects of restructuring were noticeable. Some teachers felt cheated when their decisions could not be implemented, especially after they invested so much time and effort. The lack of funding also made those in positions of leadership in restructuring look bad. They often could not deliver the funds to support the implementation of decisions, and their peers lost loyalty for what they represented and were promoting. As a result, teachers recognized that they were not granted significant responsibilities for school based decisions. This realization led to a further loss of credibility in the restructuring process and in anyone attempting to promote it. Confidence in restructuring waned, but trust in the principals was not lost. Teachers empathized with them and saw them victimized by the hierarchy also.

The effects of restructuring were also positive. Some site decisions were implemented as a result of teachers' input, and such decisions made them happy. Also, the levels of trust and bonding among some peers increased as a result of interactions in committee work. Additionally, most teachers' professional knowledge was enhanced. This enhancement was a result of teachers having gained a broader perspective of the educational bureaucracy and having become more aware of educational issues and school operations.

The Potential of SBM as a Means to Improve Education

If restructuring activities are to be evaluated positively by educators, there must be at least some evidence that they will lead to an improvement in the quality of education. The third research question of this study sought to investigate the perception of teachers and administrators regarding the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education. In order to answer this question teachers and administrators were asked if restructuring activities changed instructional practice in the classroom, if restructuring activities affected teachers' sense of dedication, what teachers and administrators thought the purpose of restructuring was, and what they thought would happen to restructuring as SBM in the future.

Instructional practice

When teachers and administrators were asked if participation in decision making changed instructional practice in the classroom, a variety of opinions were offered, but none stated that activities helped academic improvement. Some

teachers commented that it did not significantly alter their classroom teaching.

> I have not seen where restructuring really has changed or affected what I
> have done in the classroom (Fern, random, female, more than 10 years
> experience).

Some other teachers commented that restructuring activities helped a little in the

sense that students were now participating in classroom decisions, too.

> Yes, in the sense that I have given my students a little bit more power in
> making decisions. I have let them have the chance to give me what they
> think is fair punishment, and I see that as being good (Lily, random, female, 6-
> 10 years experience).

A number of teachers suggested that the sharing processes offered by committees in

restructuring had a positive impact in improving collegial dialogue.

> They have helped me by being able to talk more with other teachers about
> methods, to communicate more, and share ideas (Fern, selected, female, 6-10
> years experience).

All of the administrators thought that restructuring activities were helpful to

teachers in the classroom.

> I think it has given teachers a license to experiment, and a comfort zone to
> experiment, and I think that is wonderful. This has allowed teachers to move
> in areas they might not otherwise have moved (principal).

The administrators' perceptions that teachers were helped in the classroom by

allowing experimentation with programs differed from the perceptions of teachers.

In fact, when teachers were asked to name one or more activities that helped them

in the classroom, most could not name an activity that was helpful, and those who

did were inconsistent in the activities they named.

Teacher dedication

At the elementary schools investigated, participation in SBM activities resulted in a wide range of views as to how these activities affected teachers' sense of dedication. About half of the respondents felt that restructuring activities did not affect their dedication to their profession.

> I don't think so, I feel like I am a fairly dedicated person anyway. I don't think restructuring has made me more or less dedicated (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Most elementary teachers that are worth their salt are dedicated. I think they have always been dedicated. I don't think restructuring has made them more or less dedicated (principal).

While not allowing restructuring to affect their sense of dedication, some teachers were annoyed at restructuring for getting in the way.

> I get frustrated easier with restructuring because it's not necessary. We need to go back to what we had before restructuring. It has not affected my dedication because I am here for the kids (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

This mixture of responses reflected a general lack of confidence or belief in restructuring activities as a means to improve teacher commitment or to enhance the quality of education.

The remaining respondents offered a mixture of views in regard to the way restructuring affected their sense of dedication. There were some who felt that participation in SBM had a negative affect on their sense of dedication.

> If anything, it might have caused a decrease in my dedication because of all the extra work that you have to go through (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

A number of teachers responded that they were already very dedicated to their profession. For these teachers, restructuring had only a mildly positive effect on their sense of dedication. There were a number of selected respondents who felt that participation in restructuring had definitely affected them in a positive way.

> Actually I knew what I wanted to be since the time I was five years old, so I guess my dedication to my profession is such that it never waivered at all. If anything it has probably made me more dedicated because it has made me more knowledgeable and given me more direct responsibility (Lily, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

> Yes, it makes me more involved, and the more involved I am, the more dedicated I am (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

As it appears, respondents from the selected samples were more likely to express an increase in dedication as a result of their involvement in restructuring activities.

When answering the question to name one or two activities that affected their dedication, respondents' answers were varied and inconsistent. Among the most common activities listed were involvement in the SIT team, technology, thematic teaching, and committee work.

Purpose of restructuring

The teachers of Florida County elementary schools were also asked to provide what they thought the purpose of restructuring with SBM had been, now that they were in the fifth year of restructuring. Some of the responses to this question were similar to what was offered earlier as the definition of restructuring. For example, some teachers thought it had been a grassroots approach of involving them in the decisions that affected their school.

> To try to give the people in the trenches and who have seen what works and what doesn't work a more vocal input and to have some control over what decisions are made or the direction the school should go to make it the most effective educational system for children (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

Other teachers thought the purpose of restructuring had been to introduce a process

that stimulated teachers to broaden their thinking and to approach teaching in a

renewed way.

> To get teachers who are in the same school year after year in the same classroom to open up, to sweep out the cobwebs, to create some new ways of thinking and processing (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

However, there were a few teachers who remained unclear about the purpose of

restructuring. Some felt exploited by management.

> I'm not sure about the purpose of restructuring. Maybe to get teachers to work two jobs for the same pay. I don't know what they had in mind. This is my latest decision about it. Originally, I thought "How nice, and I'm important!" Now, I've just decided it is the easiest way of emptying out their big building up there and keep me working very hard down here for the same pay. Especially when they say we're not getting a raise this year! (Rose, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

Two of the principals thought that the purpose of restructuring had been to create a

site based process that would allow everyone to have a say in the decision making.

> I think the purpose was for everyone to have a say in decision making, and I think we have accomplished that (principal).

The third principal was not convinced that SBM had been implemented, rather

teachers only had the power of suggestion.

> We have site based suggestion. Site based management is when you are given a pot and you are left alone to do with that pot of money as you choose to do for the best interest of the children. We have not gotten anywhere near that in this county (principal).

As it appears, the principals' perceptions of the purpose of restructuring was to allow teachers a voice in decision making.

<u>Future of restructuring</u>

It appears that the experience of the last five years has created considerable confusion and doubts regarding the potential of SBM restructuring as a means to improve the quality of education. As a result, the future of restructuring as SBM at Florida County elementary schools does not appear very bright. Many respondents revealed that restructuring was not a viable solution to the problems that confront education today.

> What I hope will happen is that somebody will finally wise up and see that it is not what is really going to cure our problems, and that we can go back to what it was like when morale was good and everybody was doing a whole lot better (Rose, random, female, more than 10 years experience).

Some other teachers suggested that the future of restructuring was "up in the air." In order for restructuring to succeed, teachers must seriously commit themselves to making it work.

> I think it is either going to completely fall through and disintegrate because of frustrations, or it is going to really take off and teachers are going to become really assertive and demand answers (Lily, random, female, 6-10 years experience).

It was noted by some teachers that restructuring, like so many other fads, is something that would soon be out of fashion. To these educators, restructuring was not considered a permanent change, but a temporary one soon replaced by another.

> I think whatever happens to SBM will be a direct reflection as to what happens at the state level. Historically, the pendulum swings in education from one extreme to another, so I imagine that SBM will be in vogue for

awhile and then it will slip away (Fern, selected, female, more than 10 years experience).

To a few teachers at the elementary schools, restructuring was perceived as a positive change. To them, restructuring was good for teacher morale and would likely continue to improve with time.

> I think it will continue to get better. Change is always a scary thing, but to see that change has been for the better, is a motivating factor (Fern, selected, female, 6-10 years experience).

With so many different perceptions regarding the potential of SBM, it seems that the future of restructuring at Florida County elementary schools is unclear.

Summary of the potential of SBM as a means to improve education

Teachers and administrators had various perceptions regarding the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education. Some teachers, as a result of restructuring, gave their students a little more decision making power in classroom matters. Also, some teachers claimed enhanced collegial dialogue as an outcome of committee work. Administrators revealed they thought that restructuring activities were helpful to teachers in the classroom, particularly in experimenting with new programs and implementing curriculum ideas. Most teachers could not name one or more activities that helped them in the classroom, and those that could seemed to focus on areas of curriculum, discipline and group problem solving.

About half of the respondents declared that restructuring activities did not affect their sense of dedication to teaching. Of the remaining respondents, a few said their sense of dedication was negatively affected, while others were mildly affected

in a positive way. A few respondents claimed no change in their sense of dedication at all. However, respondents showed no consensus when asked to name one or two activities that affected their dedication. Some of the respondents strongly suggested that their dedication was positively affected by SIT team participation, technology, thematic teaching, and committee work.

The purpose of restructuring was perceived by most teachers as a grassroots approach to involve teachers in school based decisions and to assist them in broadening their thinking and rejuvenating their teaching. Teachers became confused over the purpose of restructuring as SBM. Some respondents sensed the purpose of restructuring was to exploit teachers by getting them to do more for the same pay. The principals noted that the purpose of restructuring was to allow teachers more say in decision making, but also noted that teachers merely have the power of suggestion and not necessarily the power of decision making.

As to what will happen to restructuring in Florida County elementary schools, nobody had a clear answer. However, restructuring was not seen as the solution to educational problems. If it was to become the solution, teachers must work hard at making it succeed. Restructuring was seen by some respondents as a fad that is here today and may be gone tomorrow. For some other teachers, restructuring is here to stay and will continue to improve.

Summary of the Analysis and Interpretation of Data

This chapter discussed the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered by interviewing teachers and principals at the three elementary schools of Florida County. The data provided answers to the three research questions that drove the focus of this study.

The presentation of the data was initiated with a description and profile of the types of people involved in decision making at all the elementary schools. This included descriptions of educators participating in SBM decisions, descriptions of the types of people involved in decision making committees at each school, and descriptions of the types of committees that respondents were involved in and how they were selected to participate on these committees.

The interpretation of the data was discussed in the context of the interrelated responses offered by the educators of the three elementary schools, along with a description that provided for visualization of the relationships. A summary of the findings for each question was presented at the end of the section in which the data were discussed. The discussion of the data pertaining to the first question included respondents' definition of restructuring, and their views on curriculum decisions, personnel decisions, committee decisions, and committee relations. The discussion of the data related to the second question encompassed the teachers perceptions on new roles and investment of time. And, the discussion of the data associated to the third question examined the potential of SBM as a means to improve education.

The final chapter of this study will present a summary of the research study and conclusions. The implications of this study will be offered, and the recommendations for further study and program development will be offered in the context of their related implications.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

The purpose of this case study was to describe the nature of teachers'
involvement in restructuring with school based management (SBM) and to describe
the effects of involving teachers in decision making. This case study was expected to
make important contributions toward the understanding of teachers' perceptions in
relation to SBM involvement. It investigated the degree to which restructuring as
SBM has been implemented in the elementary schools of a single Florida county
school district (Florida County Schools). The study also examined the effects of
attempts to implement SBM on the worklife of teachers. Furthermore, this case
study investigated the degree to which teachers and administrators perceived the
potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education provided in the
elementary schools of Florida County.

Considering the significance of this case study, the review of literature
focused on exploring the historical background that led to restructuring with SBM.
It also examined what the literature has revealed on school based management. In
addition, the review of literature presented an investigation of teachers'
commitment in the workplace within the context of SBM.

Restructuring as SBM was described in the literature as a reorganizational
process which blended top down initiatives and bottom up participation. It was
further described as the decentralization of administration and policy making from

the school district office to the individual school site. The literature included other

indicators of SBM such as (a) teachers and administrators collaborating in decision

making; (b) administrators perceived as facilitators, delegators and reinforcers of the

decisional process; (c) the empowerment of those working closest to students in the

classroom; (d) new roles and responsibilities created for all the players in the system;

(e) the transformation of the teaching-learning process in the classroom;

(f) participants given collective responsibility; (g) decisions regarding curriculum,

budget and personnel made at the school site; (h) various committees obtain input

from teachers, parents, students and others; and (i) evidence of school-

improvement plans documented. The negative aspects of SBM were

acknowledged, however, shared decision-making was still perceived by

administrators as the tool that might lead to school improvement.

Since SBM offers teachers influence over decisions, which might also

stimulate them to become committed to the organization, the review of literature

also investigated teacher commitment and conditions that might promote it.

Among the areas investigated were teacher rewards and recognition, task

autonomy, opportunities for professional growth, and teachers' sense of efficacy.

When teachers feel empowered through SBM, their sense of commitment might be

stimulated. This condition becomes especially real when teachers have seen their

efforts fulfill the mission of the school. As importantly, teachers must also be

convinced that the proposed changes of which they are a part, and are being asked to

implement through SBM, are workable and not too revolutionary.

A semi-structured interview approach was the instrument used to gather the data. This approach was an appropriate means for doing this investigation because it dealt with how teachers felt and thought of their involvement in restructuring. Also, by bringing me face to face with the teachers who were involved in restructuring, it allowed me to get as close as possible to the thoughts and feelings of the educators. The participants for this study were a random sample and a selected sample of teachers from each of the three elementary schools in Florida County. In addition to the 30 teachers, the 3 principals were interviewed for a total sample of 33. This selection method provided a miniature mirror to view the entire population of the three schools. All participants were initially contacted in person or by telephone, and everyone was interviewed either at their place of work or at another place that offered privacy. All of the interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed for inclusion and analysis in this study.

The data analysis required organizing the data by school, generating sample categories, identifying themes and patterns found in the responses, and then testing the questions to be answered against the data. Interpretative explanations were provided and the findings were described. The findings of this case study reflect the teachers' perspectives and their views of the workplace. They combined the meanings that participants found in their experiences and the meanings that I, as the researcher, encountered in the words of the respondents. In the final form of the analysis, the results of this study are representative of the respondents' answers

to the interview questions and to the interpretation of the themes that emerged

within the transcripts as a result of the field research and analysis.

Conclusions

This section of the study presents three sets of conclusions pertaining to the

effects of restructuring with SBM on the worklife of elementary teachers in Florida

County Schools. The conclusions were reached in response to three research

questions and are offered in the context of the interrelationships of responses given

by teachers and principals at the three elementary schools of the district. The first

question asked to what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented in the

elementary schools of Florida County. The second question asked about the effects

of restructuring on the worklife of the teachers in the selected elementary schools.

The third research question investigated what teachers and principals perceived as

the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education in the selected

elementary schools. Conclusions pertaining to the first research question follow

and include an explicit answer to this question. These conclusions will be succeeded

by conclusions relating to the second and third research questions.

The Florida County elementary schools that participated in this case study

were staffed by an overwhelming majority of white, married females with 6 or more

years of experience in education with the majority having child rearing

responsibilities of their own. This reveals an experienced staff and possibly one that

can relate first hand to students by virtue of the fact that most teachers are still

parents themselves. All respondents interviewed were white, including the 5 males who participated in this study. The disproportionate numbers of females may be typical of most elementary schools in Florida, however, none of the respondents were African Americans or individuals of other minority groups. This lack of cultural diversity suggests a skewed representation among the teaching staffs of the elementary schools.

School based management at the Florida County elementary schools included in the decision making processes those individuals who worked the closest with the students, such as teachers, counselors, media specialists, teacher aides, and parents. These individuals participated mainly through their engagement in SBM committees which were formed independently at each school site. Restructuring had a common goal in these Florida schools which was to implement SBM at each school site in an autonomous manner. This autonomy was reflected in the creation of committees that were common at all the schools and in the various committees that were unique to each school site. Even though there were commonalities among the identified committees, each school had the freedom to decide on the types of decision making committees needed for its unique environmental setting. By encouraging teachers to create the committees they felt were needed, a sense of ownership and self determination was fostered.

The degree of SBM implementation

The conclusions pertaining to the first research question are presented next. This question asked to what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented in

Florida County elementary schools. In order to answer this question, respondents were asked to define restructuring and to describe current and past budget, curriculum, and personnel decisions. Then they were asked to describe how people in committees relate to each other. The aim of these questions was to assess the respondents' perceptions of their SBM involvement in relationship to the review of literature on SBM restructuring.

The respondents of this study revealed similarities with what the literature claims on SBM and with how they defined restructuring at the elementary schools of Florida County. Teachers' perceptions echoed the literature in that restructuring meant change to improve the quality of education. This change was conceptualized as being bottom up, as well as a shared process for making decisions and assuming responsibility for their implementation. For the most part, teachers understood the ideals of restructuring and found them desirable. Nevertheless, their understanding of restructuring was later compromised when teachers learned that adequate time and authority were not allocated for decision making and that training and funding available to implement SBM were far from sufficient.

The case study revealed that the way budget decisions were made changed as a result of SBM restructuring in the elementary schools. Teachers became more aware of school finance and went from having no input prior to restructuring to having limited input. Their input helped principals allocate fairly monies left over after operating expenses. This limited authority and influence had little value

among the teachers and became a factor in the diminishing faith in restructuring and in those promoting it.

Curriculum decisions made at the school sites by teachers were considerably restricted. Teachers who participated in this study related that curriculum frameworks were set at the state level and that the county office mostly adopted curriculum based on the state's guidelines. Establishing curriculum at the county level was seen as the role of the curriculum director, who might seek input from representatives of the various grade levels in curriculum implementations. Teachers made limited curriculum decisions at the school sites with the approval of the building principal, but they were doing that prior to restructuring. Curriculum was another area of limited authority and influence for teachers. As with budget decisions, the teachers' realization that they did not carry much substantive influence in curriculum decisions also contributed to dwindling faith in restructuring and for those promoting it.

Respondents of this case study recognized that throughout the restructuring of the past five years personnel decisions remained the responsibility of administration, primarily between the principal and the county office. When restructuring started teachers were allowed some input into personnel decisions, but this input was short lived. There was reluctance on the part of principals to involve teachers in this process because teachers tended to be around for the hiring but not for the firing. Principals felt that if teachers were going to be involved, they needed to be engaged in the entire process. The principals' perceptions that teachers

should not be granted substantive power in personnel decisions might have been appropriate; nevertheless, it was another factor that contributed to the weakening of teachers' support of SBM restructuring. Teachers were granted no significant decision making power in personnel practices within the past five years.

Teachers' involvement in committees should be at the center of restructuring with SBM. Committees were a key element in bringing teachers together. The extent to which teachers were prepared to deal with each other in committees helped determine the degree to which SBM was implemented at Florida County elementary schools. Committees also offered administrators access to important information related to many concerns of schooling. In this study, restructuring at the elementary schools offered many committees through which teachers could participate in the SBM decisional processes and from which administrators could gather valuable teacher input. A glance at these committees may even give the impression that restructuring at the elementary schools was successfully implemented. However, the invitation to teachers to share in decisional processes had some shortcomings. Mainly, the support given to decisional processes did not reveal sufficient organizational confidence in SBM nor a clear commitment to its success. Teachers are unlikely to trust administrative mandates when (1) they are asked to make decisions that are not going to be implemented due to budget cuts; (2) they become concerned that their ideas could easily be disregarded by administrators or the board; (3) they feel compelled to withhold their participation because they do not want to engage in confrontational roles; (4) they perceive themselves being

exploited into doing the work of others or to make the administrator's job easier. One or more of these factors can stimulate commitment-related conflicts within the staff. Such factors contributed to teachers' perceptions that their participation did not offer the value, empowerment, and professionalism they expected from SBM at Florida County elementary schools.

In summary, it may be concluded that teachers understood the definition of SBM restructuring as being both bottom-up and top-down. They found restructuring ideals desirable; however, the lack of adequate time, training, funding, and inadequate responsibility that teachers were granted in key committee decisions limited the degree to which SBM was implemented at Florida County elementary schools. In budget decisions, teachers had only limited authority to help principals allocate leftover monies. Teachers had limited opportunities to make curriculum decisions, and these were subject to the approval of the principal. In personnel decisions, teachers were granted insignificant authority. Therefore, as a result of this study it may be explicitly stated that the degree to which restructuring with SBM was implemented in the elementary schools was minimal. The effects of negative factors encountered in SBM led to a loss of teacher commitment toward most of the restructuring activities.

The effects of SBM implementation

The second research question sought to investigate the effects of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of teachers. In order to answer

this question, teachers were asked about their roles in restructuring and about the consequences of the time invested in these roles.

New roles were added to teachers' already busy workdays as a result of restructuring with SBM at the elementary schools of this case study. The intent of these new roles was to cause teachers to develop ownership for the decision making at the school sites and hopefully to lead the staff to improved morale, organizational commitment, and quality of education. However, teachers did not perceive an increase in commitment as a result of restructuring, and there was no evidence to indicate that morale and quality of education improved as a result of SBM. Most teachers felt they were committed prior to restructuring and that their commitment to teaching had simply remained there. But, the effects of the roles led to a major loss of commitment toward most of the restructuring activities.

Respondents of the study acknowledged that significant drawbacks to the introduction of new roles were that they clearly required teachers to invest time in SBM activities at the expense of their preparation or personal time. Roles led to stressful situations among teachers, and offered no significant responsibilities or benefits for school based decisions. Therefore, new roles became impositions on teachers' worklives, while the negative effects of roles caused the benefits of SBM participation to blur among the staffs. This situation set the course for a diminishing commitment to most of the new roles, and eventually brought the administrators' recognition that they could not continue to expect teachers to be engaged as extensively in SBM decision making.

On the positive side, the effects of new roles in restructuring enhanced ownership and offered recognition for teachers' efforts. In this case study, some elementary teachers received more recognition from colleagues for their position on issues and accomplishments and gained greater confidence in themselves and greater pride in their schools. Their involvement enhanced their knowledge of the intricacies in running a school and made them feel more a part of it. For these teachers the roles of SBM resulted in improved morale, commitment, and knowledge. Therefore, when teachers develop a sense of increased ownership for the organization they are likely to perceive SBM restructuring as an effective means of management.

In contrast, some teachers at the elementary schools of this case study did not crave the recognition and did not have the desire to feel better informed of school operations. For these individuals, the process of restructuring their schools remained one of futility with little or no significance. These teachers did not perceive their involvement as a desirable alternative, and the required participation may have added to their dissatisfaction. When teachers are required to participate in SBM roles that they do not desire, as was the case in many instances at the three elementary schools, the effects of their involvement will not demonstrate a satisfactory level of participation.

The relationships among teachers, as a result of time invested in restructuring activities, enhanced a sense of trust among a number of teachers who worked closely with each other. For the most part it was selected members of this

case study, mainly members of school improvement teams, who worked closely with each other and with the principal. These findings suggest that when administrators and teachers make decisions jointly there is a SBM orientation in place. This case study also conveyed that administrators delegated specific decisions to teachers in a collaborative sort of involvement. The effects of administrators working collaboratively with teachers are greater responsibility for SBM implementation among teachers and the stimulation for teachers to exercise more direct responsibility for the implementation of programs at the school site. In short, positive relationships based on trust among teachers and administrators usually led teachers to an increased sense of ownership of school programs.

But the opposite was also evident in this case study. More teachers revealed that it was hard to trust peers, particularly those in leadership roles. Sometimes participants would withhold information from these teacher-leaders or principals because they might have felt intimidated by them, did not want to risk their ideas being criticized, did not want to hurt anyone's feelings, or did not want to cause a conflict. These individuals might have felt alienated from participation or suspicious of others' intentions and might have perceived themselves as not having equal rights in the SBM process. These findings suggest that colleagues generally avoid creating bad feelings between each other, even among peers that they dislike. Teachers that did not trust SBM partners were much less willing to get involved in areas of decision making, and teachers that did not trust leadership were more likely to become dissatisfied with SBM roles.

Most teachers who participated in this case study did not allow restructuring roles to affect interactions with their students. However, some teachers and a principal did observe that roles detracted from teacher-student interactions. For this principal and these teachers it appeared logical that roles robbed teachers of their planning time and placed additional pressure on them. These factors played a role on how teachers related to students. Besides, most teachers felt that SBM roles had a negative effect on classroom preparation time and that they had to use their personal time or devote less time to lesson plans. These factors had some effect on teachers' effectiveness. Therefore, unless more is done to reduce the demands on teachers in relation to SBM roles, the effects of restructuring roles on student interactions are a decrease in teachers' effectiveness, difficulties balancing teaching priorities, and a very serious concern regarding the desirability of SBM.

In summary, it may be concluded that there were various effects on the worklife of teachers as a result of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM. For teachers who desired involvement, roles were able to provide enhanced ownership, recognition, and greater self confidence. Besides, these teachers perceived SBM as an effective means of management. Also, the effects of trusting relationships between teachers and principals led teachers to experience increased ownership of school programs. On the other hand, the effects of untrustworthy relationships resulted in teachers who were much less willing to get involved in areas of SBM decision making. For teachers who felt compelled to participate in SBM, the effects of their involvement revealed an unsatisfactory level of participation. Roles took away

from teachers' planning time, teacher-student interactions, personal time, and other activities. Therefore, difficulties in balancing priorities resulted in a perceived decrease of teachers' effectiveness and eventually led to a major loss of teacher commitment toward SBM restructuring.

The potential of SBM to improve education

The third and final research question of this case study asked teachers and principals what they perceived as the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education. In order to answer this question, the respondents were asked how restructuring had helped or affected them and to describe the purpose of restructuring, as well as its future in this county.

None of the respondents of this case study felt that restructuring activities helped academic improvement in the county's elementary schools. However, restructuring stimulated some teachers to give students a little more decision power in classroom matters, some teachers claimed improved collegiality among peers, and principals claimed teachers were able to experiment with new programs and curriculum ideas. Also, most teachers were unable to name one or more activities that helped them in the classroom. Therefore, SBM restructuring as implemented in the three elementary schools did not serve as a means to improve the quality of education or as a process that will produce significant increases in student academic achievements.

In this case study, about half of the teachers interviewed reported that their involvement in SBM activities did not affect their dedication. These teachers

generally felt they were dedicated prior to restructuring and after restructuring remained so. The other half had a mixture of views: a few felt the extra work had taken some of their dedication away, a number felt that having been given more responsibilities had made them a little more dedicated and knowledgeable, and a few knew they had become more dedicated as a result of restructuring activities. Those who knew they were more dedicated felt that being involved in activities had a positive effect on their sense of dedication. Therefore, it may be concluded from this study that for the most part restructuring activities did not affect teachers sense of dedication, but some individuals became more dedicated to teaching as a result of restructuring with SBM.

It was revealed by this case study that into the fifth year of restructuring the purpose for restructuring with SBM had not yet been clearly conceptualized and appeared confusing to educators. Some teachers thought it had been an approach to allow teachers a voice in school decisions. Some thought the purpose had been to assist teachers in broadening and rejuvenating their thinking and teaching. Still some others felt unsure about the purpose of restructuring, and wondered if it had been a way to get teachers to work two jobs for the same pay. The principals stated that restructuring had been implemented to create a site process that would allow teachers a say in decision making. One of the principals qualified this statement by observing that teachers had site based suggestion, not restructuring with SBM. This evidence suggests that teachers of these elementary schools have been crossing the lines into administrative roles without compensation for the additional

responsibilities. In these roles, teachers were granted a misleading and minimal influence in SBM restructuring. As a result, they mistrusted the restructuring process, the system, and each other. Furthermore, these teachers were channelled into a position of providing administrators with critical information, yet they were powerless to defend their own interests. Therefore, when restructuring leads teachers into feeling used and unable to have a significant influence in decisions affecting them, they are discouraged from becoming committed to decisions and ultimately to the organization.

The study suggests that the future of restructuring with SBM does not appear bright for the elementary schools of the district. Most respondents felt restructuring affected attitudes negatively, and was not the solution to the problems of education, and that frustrations might cause it to disintegrate. But there were a few teachers who participated in this study who felt enthusiastic about restructuring. However, taking into consideration most teachers' attitudes toward restructuring, one has to conclude that when organizational structures lead teachers to feel dissatisfied, alienated, incompetent, and/or unproductive, they result in very negative consequences to teachers' levels of satisfaction and commitment.

In short, at the elementary schools that were included in this case study, restructuring was not perceived as a means to improve the quality of education nor as a process that will cause students to produce significant academic achievements. Restructuring activities annoyed many teachers. Activities did not offer them significant influence over decisions that affected them. With such prevalent

perceptions among educators, it is very unlikely that restructuring will be promoted as a means to improve the quality of education in Florida County.

Implications

The review of related literature in this case study and the findings and conclusions of this investigation led the researcher to make recommendations for practical application and for future research. The recommendations may or may not be applicable to other school systems experiencing restructuring with SBM. Various recommendations were stated following the implications to which they related.

Group training

This case study suggests that the staffs of Florida County elementary schools recognized that group training for every teacher could enhance the overall quality of SBM decisions. Teachers who have received group training and have been enthusiastic about their involvement demonstrated greater expertise in the decisional processes. According to a study by Goldman et al. (1993), the more involved teachers understood their responsibilities better, exercised facilitative power better, and recognized the benefits of training as enhancing a sense of greater self confidence and professional efficacy in committee work.

As a result of this case study, it is recommended that all teachers who want to be involved in SBM committee work and related activities be offered either group leadership or group facilitative training. Such training is needed to enhance teachers' sense of political efficacy, which includes increased levels of confidence

with interpersonal relationships and committee participation. In support of training, Chapman (1988) noted that teachers who lack a sense of efficacy are hindered in their participation in group decisions at the schools. She also noted that teachers "who have a sense of political efficacy are more likely to be involved and, in turn are more likely to gain from involvement" (p. 69).

Lack of trust in process

Trust for administrators, colleagues, and for the system has been associated in the literature with elements that help teachers determine their readiness to commit to SBM activities. As revealed by Driscoll (1978), organizational trust "predicts overall satisfaction with the organization better than does participation in decision making; it even adds significantly to the prediction of satisfaction with participation in decision-making" (p. 54). This case study suggests that teachers' sense of trust for the system and for the leadership's pursuits toward restructuring were lost when they realized that the system was incapable of delivering the type of restructuring that would solve educational problems. Teachers' perceptions of restructuring as a grassroots approach to offer them influence and a process for shared responsibility did not fit their perceptions of what was actually happening in Florida County's elementary schools. Teachers found themselves quite limited in all types of decision making capabilities, including curriculum decisions. They saw little changes, but nothing radical or extensive. As in recent literature on SBM restructuring, it was "found that little substantive decision making authority has actually been delegated in SBM programs" (Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992, p. 537). In

short, this study revealed that teachers realized restructuring would not solve educational problems, so most teachers lost their enthusiasm for restructuring and withdrew their support for those promoting restructuring efforts at the Florida County elementary schools. In the final analysis many of the teachers' contributions were insignificant and teachers found it difficult to place their trust in a process that did not deliver what it promised.

At the time of this investigation, teachers at Florida County Schools did not see SBM as a desirable choice to improve the quality of education or as having the potential to improve their life in the workplace. Participation in restructuring without the feeling of being professionally empowered, properly compensated, or duly recognized might have in fact added to teachers' dissatisfaction with SBM and administrative mandates. In a study by Driscoll (1978) it was pointed out that teachers "must trust in the organization's decision makers if they are to be satisfied in their level of participation" (p. 54). According to the literature, dissatisfaction with administrative mandates promotes conditions that discourage teachers from feeling valued, competent and productive.

As a result of this investigation it is recommended that unless school reformers are willing to make fundamental changes, they should stop conveying to teachers that restructuring with SBM is associated with a broad effort to improve the overall quality of education. It is better to do nothing at all with restructuring, than to fail to deliver what is promised. The elementary teachers of Florida County have felt increased skepticism for the ability of restructuring to resolve the concerns that

plague education. It may be that in order to improve the quality of education, we need some revolutionary thinking. As suggested by Prestine and Bowen (1993), we need "changes not only in curriculum and instruction, but also in school organization and governance, roles and relationships, beliefs and understandings" (p. 298). Unless restructuring delivers on its basic assumptions that it is a process of shared decision making, not only for empowering teachers but also to improve the quality of education, teachers will not identify strongly with the importance of restructuring. Therefore, they will not place their trust in it.

Lack of Time

This case study strongly suggests that many teachers viewed the additional time invested in decision making as a burden which imposed on their preparation and personal time and detracted from teaching. The problem of lack of sufficient time was addressed by Chapman (1988) as the most urgent cost for increasing teacher involvement because "the additional time associated with committee work and the need to balance priorities among administration, teaching, and personal life contributed to increased tiredness and stress " (p. 63). Unless teachers can come to perceive that there are more benefits than costs from their involvement in SBM, they will remain dissatisfied with opportunities to become involved. Besides, "it would need to be more clearly evident that participation does in fact directly relate to improvement in the teaching learning process" (Chapman, p. 70).

As a consequence of this case study it is recommended that, if teachers are expected to participate in SBM activities, adequate time be set aside on a daily basis

for the purposes of planning, implementing and following up on their SBM decisions. In addition to time, appropriate considerations for staff development and its financial support must be provided. White (1992) reported that the major drawbacks to teachers' participation in SBM "included limited time, training, and funding" (p. 71). It seems unreasonable and contrary to sound educational practices to expect teachers to work all day managing and teaching a classroom full of students and still require them to participate in the management of the school.

Impact on teaching

The data gathered in this case study suggests that teachers experienced considerable negative consequences from SBM restructuring activities at Florida County elementary schools. Restructuring activities affected preparation time, personal lives, work relationships, and placed at risk student-teacher interactions. Teachers were also disappointed when they realized that there were many restrictions that affected the implementation of their decisions. Overall, respondents felt that restructuring had no significant impact on their teaching practices. In fact, most of them could not name one activity that helped them in the classroom and observed that restructuring had no effect on their sense of dedication. Teachers must believe in what they are being asked to commit themselves to if restructuring is to be successful. As observed by Rosenholtz (1989b), "commitment to the workplace is becoming understood as a hallmark of organizational success" (p. 241). If teachers' involvement is not perceived as improving their workplace

situation and quality of education, then teachers might actually avoid opportunities to engage in SBM, thereby disconnecting themselves from the process.

As a result of this investigation it seems reasonable to recommend that administrators look carefully into conditions of restructuring that enhance teacher commitment. Teachers need to feel a significant influence over the decisions in which they have been asked to participate. According to Smylie (1992), when teachers exercise influence over the decisions that affect them they will be stimulated to become committed to those decisions and eventually to the general organization. As importantly, the structures that support SBM should "enhance a sense of fairness and trust in the organization, both because teachers can defend their own interests and because they get information on the shaping of decisions to which they would not otherwise be privy" (Firestone & Pennell, 1993, p. 501). Furthermore, teachers who believe there is a sense of fairness in shared authority in the workplace experience improved morale, become better informed, display improved communication skills, and are more able to enhance student motivation (White, 1992).

Inadequate preparation

Respondents suggested that many teachers in the elementary schools did not feel they were adequately prepared to participate in the decision making process and that only a selected few had actually received training prior to restructuring. Furthermore, many teachers became unenthusiastic about their contributions to the decisional processes because they felt SBM was being imposed on them and they

were inadequately prepared to handle restructuring roles. The respondents also suggested that they were asked to make decisions that crossed the lines into administrative roles for which they lacked specific training. As noted by White (1992), a drawback of SBM is to involve teachers in decisions that they do not have the expertise to make, such as "in-school budget, curriculum, and staffing decisions" (p. 77). Teachers' lack of preparation to satisfactorily handle some key decisions also contributed to the challenge that administrators and other school leaders experienced in motivating them to become committed to SBM restructuring. In view of this lack of preparation, it was unreasonable to expect teachers to trust that the real purpose of SBM was educational improvement when they were suddenly expected to assume important decisions without the proper information, skills, or adequate time to do things appropriately.

Therefore, as an outcome of this study it seems appropriate to recommend to the school district's administrators to proceed with greater caution when involving teachers in SBM decisions. Institutions have an obligation to provide their teachers with adequate preparation prior to engaging them in the processes of SBM. In turn, teachers would likely be more receptive to involvement in shared decisions if they felt adequately prepared or if they knew the training was available to help them acquire the needed preparation. As suggested by Ashbaugh and Kasten, "institutions and institutional members have obligations to develop expertise where it is lacking, and to insure the involvement of teachers in all steps of the process" (p. 53). Another consideration for administrators is that they make an

effort to involve first individuals with acquired expertise or knowledge about the decisions under consideration. This will help them make more informed decisions. Besides, not to include such individuals might be a waste of human resources and might also be a way of alienating them from organizational processes.

<u>Influence of the principal</u>

In this case study, teachers initially were under the impression that they would be empowered to make significant decisions and they were disappointed to find out that they did not have the power they perceived. The influence of the principals remained quite important in controlling the extent to which elementary teachers participated and assumed responsibility for decision making. It was still within the realm of the principal to approve or disapprove committee decisions, and it appeared that teachers were essentially allowed the power of suggestion. This realization that their power was insignificant fostered in many teachers a feeling that they were being used. It seems that the principals' influence might be associated with the bureaucratic form of administration sugggested in the literature. It points out that "teachers should have little influence in school-level decision making or that participation can be used manipulatively to buy teacher acceptance of decisions that have already been made" (S. Conley, 1991, p. 256).

On the other hand, the principals also displayed a considerable lack of influence over decisions. For example, teacher decisions would be turned down due to the lack of funding and the principals were powerless to help implement teacher decisions. Experiences such as these revealed loss of credibility for the restructuring

process and anyone promoting it. However, in a final analysis these experiences also led teachers to empathize with principals and to see them as hierarchical victims, just like they were.

Therefore, as an outcome of this study it seems appropriate to recommend that more attention be given to the role of the principal in SBM schools. The principals' abilities to make decisions, as well as the teachers', would be greatly enhanced if everyone was clear about the credibility of proposed changes and why educators should engage in shared decision making. When teachers learn through indirect methods that much of their time and effort in decision making are not highly regarded or needed, they lose trust in the promoters of SBM, the system and the purposes of restructuring. The entire process becomes demoralizing and reflects negatively on education as a whole. As observed by Guthrie (1986), supporters of reform must attend to matters associated with dynamics of organizational revitalization that "unleash productive local initiatives" (p. 306). Besides, if principals are to remain accountable for decisions at the school site, their appropriate responsibilities need to be communicated clearly so that everyone understands the parameters of the principals' authority, as well as the teachers'.

An additional recommendation is that the corps of educational leaders engage all faculties in developing stronger collaborative and accepting environments for decision making. Communication networks must become more attuned to individual differences, interests, and values, in order to establish respectful settings where differences are sincerely appreciated and professionals are

free to express their thoughts and ideas. If educators fail to move in a clearer

direction to promote such acceptance in decisional processes, professional settings,

or social circles, it appears that no form of educational reform will do much to

promote or enhance truly effective collaboration, relationships, or education. As

pointed out by Reyes (1990), the social setting of the organization shapes individual

commitment. Elements of organizational culture including the mission, beliefs,

values, leadership characteristics, and nature of the rewards system are all related to

the level of commitment. These elements are perceived "as mediators and

influencing factors in the development of commitment" (Reyes, 1990, p. 227). In

short, if educational leaders and organizational members convey a sense of mistrust

for other individuals' culture, values, interests, or beliefs, the affected persons will

feel uncomfortable or alienated, and will be reluctant to collaborate and be

committed to the total mission of the organization.

Recommendations for Future Research

The potential of SBM as a means to improve teacher commitment and the

overall quality of education was left undetermined by the findings of this study. On

the basis of these findings, it is recommended that future research focus on the

extent to which administrators, teachers, counselors, students, maintenance staff,

board members, parents, and others should be involved in SBM decisions. A

quantitative or qualitative study could be designed to investigate and compare how

different individuals perceive the allocation of authority and their willingness to

participate in SBM decisions. Such a study could provide valuable information on how to proceed with SBM restructuring and could offer needed insights to better assess the potential of SBM as a means to improve the worklife of teachers and quality of education.

Most teachers had difficulties naming restructuring activities that were helpful in the classroom while principals thought that activities were helpful to teachers, particularly with curriculum ideas and establishing new programs. On the basis of this dilemma, it is recommended that an investigation of quantitative student-assessments on file prior to restructuring and after restructuring be conducted as soon as possible to assess if academic achievement at Florida County elementary schools improved, decreased, or remained unchanged since the implementation of SBM restructuring. Along with this investigation, a qualitative assessment is recommended to determine parents', teachers' and administrators' perceptions about the educational value of new programs and ideas since SBM restructuring. The information provided by these investigations could offer valuable information on how the quality of education is being affected by SBM restructuring and further insights into the real potential of SBM.

For the most part, respondents felt that new roles resulting from restructuring were imposed on them, offered insignificant responsibilities, and that the activities required of these roles took away from their preparation and personal time. In order to improve on the assignment of new roles for teachers in the future, it is recommended that research be conducted to investigate more appropriate ways

to prepare teachers to assume new roles, and to allocate time and training to assume such roles. A qualitative study could be designed to conduct this investigation, which might include an inquiry addressing the extent to which educators think school and district administrators should maintain authority. For the immediate future, it is recommended that educators capitalize on what has been revealed in this study about positive aspects of SBM and that they avoid repeating the revealed negative factors.

Leadership approaches to SBM restructuring placed many teachers in stressful situations. Respondents observed that preparation time, personal lives, relationships, and interactions with students were negatively affected by leadership expectations. In consideration of individual leadership approaches and differences, it is recommended that research be conducted to identify teachers' and administrators' preferred leadership approaches at Florida County Schools. A qualitative study can be designed to investigate such individual characteristics as well as more effective approaches for working with the complexity of individuals that make up an educational organization. The aim of such a study would be to gather data on teachers and administrators leadership styles, which would encompass structural, human resource, political, and symbolic perspectives of leadership. Such data could then be used to educate interested leaders about their own preferred leadership frameworks as well as about more effective ways for working with different personalities. Armed with such knowledge, individual leaders would be in a better position to adjust their own leadership approaches to

work more effectively with individuals who are expected to adjust to new role situations.

It is recommended that this study be replicated at other elementary schools and higher level institutions experiencing SBM restructuring in the state of Florida and other states. It is important to gather data from other schools experiencing SBM restructuring to compare, learn, and improve from the revelations of others. As importantly, replicated studies of this nature should be conducted from time to time to help maintain a pulse on how roles performed by teachers are affecting their worklives and very possibly the quality of education at school sites. These studies allow educators a wide angle view revealing that, perhaps, they should not rely solely on their own ideas and expertise for decision making. Such studies present multiple perspectives and are humbling means through which educators become strong servants in the delivery of quality education for children.

Conclusion

The findings of this investigation reveal how teachers of Florida County elementary schools were affected in their workplace by SBM restructuring and these findings are echoed in this study's review of literature. Teachers generally understood the concept behind SBM restructuring and had various reactions to opportunities to get involved in SBM.

Some teachers welcomed the opportunities to get involved. For these teachers, SBM was perceived in a positive way. Involvement in SBM was a means

for gaining individual recognition, provided a sense of organizational ownership, was perceived as an autonomous and effective management approach, rendered opportunities to enhance self confidence, and opened a way to develop closer relationships with the principal. These positive experiences promoted commitment and spurred these individuals to further efforts. They also reflected the review of literature in claiming that teachers must desire participation for it to be effective.

Most respondents in this study, however, either felt compelled to participate or simply did not desire the type of involvement required of SBM. For these teachers, restructuring was an imposition and participation in restructuring activities invited conflict. The roles required of them detracted from their planning time, teacher-student interactions, personal time, and other duties. It became difficult to balance restructuring activities and other priorities, so teaching effectiveness suffered and commitment to SBM restructuring was compromised. Dissatisfaction with SBM restructuring was also a result of the limited influence teachers felt over decisions they were called to make and over the insufficient time, training, and funding provided to implement SBM decisions.

Restructuring was associated in the literature with a broad effort to improve the quality of education, yet most teachers of this study felt that restructuring had not improved academics. It appears that teachers' views of the SBM process were not carefully considered because many teachers simply did not perceive SBM as a desirable choice and that imposing participation on them actually added to their dissatisfaction. Workplace dissatisfaction, as pointed out in the literature, may lead

teachers to low work investment and ineffectiveness in helping students gain academically. Furthermore, the difficulties and frustrations experienced by most respondents of this study led teachers to distrust restructuring pursuits and added to the prediction that SBM would be unsatisfactory in improving teachers' worklife. At Florida County Schools, restructuring seems to have lost its momentum and practices need to be adjusted with a general understanding that only a small percentage of teachers want to be significantly involved.

References

Ashbaugh, C. R., & Kasten, K. L. (1987). Should teachers be involved in teacher appraisal? NASSP Bulletin, 71(500), 50-53.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.

Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., Conley, S. C., & Bauer, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organizations: The value of a multi-domain evaluative approach. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(2), 126-167.

Barnard, C. I. (1979). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bogden, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyd, W. L. (1988). How to reform schools without half trying: Secrets of the Reagan Administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24, 299-309.

Bridges, E. M. (1967). A model for shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 49-61.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.

Chapman, D. W. (1983). A model of the influences on teacher retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 43-48.

Chapman, J. D. (1988). Decentralization, devolution and the teacher: Participation by teachers in the decision making of schools. The Journal of Educational Administration, 26, 39-72.

Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1990). Recanting bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools. In A. Lieberman (Ed.). Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now (pp. 3-24). New York: Falmer Press.

Clune, W. H., & White, P. A. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for future research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Conley, D. (1991). Restructuring schools: Educators adapt to a changing world. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Conley, S. (1991). Review of research on teacher participation in school decision making. In G. Grant (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 225-265). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in the teacher workforce. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). The evolution of teacher policy. Los Angeles: Rand Center for Policy Research in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 599)

deCharms, R., & Muir, M. F. (1978). Motivation: Social approaches. Annual Review of Psychology, 29, 91-113.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Driscoll, J. W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 44-55.

Dworkin, A. G. (1991, November). Teacher burnout in the face of reform: Some caveats in breaking the mold. Paper presented at the America 2000 Conference, Cincinnati.

Eichelberger, R. T. (1989). Disciplined inquiry: Understanding and doing educational research. New York: Longman.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). The enlightened eye. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Elmore & Associates (Eds.). (1991). Restructuring Schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Farber, B. (1984). Stress and burnout in suburban teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 77, 325-331.

Firestone, W. A., & Pennell, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. Review of Educational Research, 63, 489-525.

Firestone, W. A., & Rosenblum, S. (1988). Building commitment in urban high schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10, 285-299.

Florida Statutes § 229 (1993).

Fowler, F. J. (1988). Survey research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Futrell, M. H. (1993). National education reforms: Is America moving toward a national curriculum? National Forum, 73, 30-34.

Goldman, P., Dunlap, O., & Conley, D. (1993). Facilitative power and nonstandardized solutions to school site restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 69-92.

Goodlad, J. I. (1987). Toward a healthy ecosystem. In J. Goodlad (Ed.), The ecology of school renewal (pp. 210-221). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 305-309.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (1992). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental educational reform. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28, 330-349.

Hansen, B. J., & Corcoran, T. B. (1989). Working in New Jersey public schools: The conditions of teaching. Trenton: New Jersey School Boards Association.

Hanson, E. M. (1991). Educational restructuring in the USA: Movements of the 1980s. Journal of Educational Administration, 29(4), 30-37.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1987). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Random House.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools. New York: Basic.

Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: Study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. American Sociological Review, 33, 499-517.

Kasten, K. L. (1984). The efficacy of institutionally dispensed rewards in elementary school teaching. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17(4), 1-13.

Kirst, M. W. (1988). Recent state education reform in the United States: Looking backward and forward. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24, 319-328.

Kushman, J. W. (1992) The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28, 5-42.

Lanier, J. E., & Sedlak, M. W. (1989). Teacher efficacy and quality schooling. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow (pp. 119-147). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

LeCompte, M. S., & Dworkin, A. G. (1991). Giving up on school: Student dropouts and teacher burnouts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. Cazden (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (Vol. 16, pp. 297-352). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S. (1991, April). The effects of teaching quality of work life in secondary schools on commitment and sense of efficacy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. New York: Teachers College Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McNeil, L. (1988). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge.

Metz, M. H. (1988). Some missing elements in the educational reform movement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24, 446-460.

Midgley, C., & Wood, S. (1993). Beyond site-based management: Empowering teachers to reform schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 245-252.

Mitchell, D., & Beach, S. (1993). School restructuring: The superintendent's view. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 249-274.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. Journal of Educational Administration, 30, 77-88.

Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1990). Megatrends 2000: Ten new directions for the 1990's. New York: William Morrow and Company.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Olson, L. (1988, November 2). The restructuring puzzle: Ideas for revamping egg crate schools abound, but to what ends? Education Week, pp. 7, 11.

O'Neil, J. (Ed.). (1994, September). Taking stock of school-based management. ASCD Update, 36(7), pp. 4-5, 8.

Passow, A. H. (1988). Whither (or wither?) school reform? Educational Administration Quarterly, 24, 246-256.

Pipho, C. (1986). States move reform closer to reality. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, K1-K8.

Pitsch, M. (1994, September 21). States seek Goals 2000 aid for existing efforts. Education Week, p. 17, 19.

Prestine, N. A., & Bowen, C. (1993). Benchmarks of change: Assessing essential school restructuring efforts. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15, 298-319.

Purnell, S., & Hill, P. (1992). Time for reform. Los Angeles: Rand Center for Policy Research in Education. (RAND Report No. R-4234-EMC).

Reyes, P. (Ed.). (1990). Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989a). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989b). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 420-439.

Rosenholtz, S. J., & Simpson, C. (1990). Workplace conditions and the rise and fall of teachers' commitment. Sociology of Education, 63, 241-257.

Sedlak, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D. C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American highschool. New York: Teachers College Press.

Simon, H. A. (1957). Administrative behavior. New York: Macmillan.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14(1), 53-67.

Sprinthall, R. C., Schmutte, G. T., & Sirois, L. (1991). Understanding educational research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sykes, G. (1990). Teaching incentives: Constraint and variety. In A. Lieberman (Ed.). School as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now (pp. 103-126). New York: Falmer Press.

United States Department of Education. (1994, July/August). How good is good enough? Goals 2000: Community Update, p. 1.

Weick, K. E., & McDaniel, R. R. (1989). How professional organizations work: Implications for school organization and management. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reforms to issues that count (pp. 331-354). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Weiss, C., Cambone, J., & Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28, 350-367.

Whitaker, K. S., & Moses, M. C. (1994). The restructuring handbook: A guide to school revitalization. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

White, P. A. (1989). An overview of school-based management: What does the research say? National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 73 (521), 1-8.

White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under "ideal" school-site autonomy. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14(1), 69-82.

Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, A. (1992). Rethinking school-based management policy and research. <u>Educational Administration Quarterly,</u> <u>28,</u> 529-549.

APPENDIX A

Informed Consent Letters

Informed Consent
Randomly Selected Participants

Through the process of random selection, you are being asked to participate in a research study that will help determine how restructuring is affecting teachers' worklife.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the nature of teachers' involvement in school-based management. Your input will give valuable and much needed insight as to the effects of involving teachers in decision-making.

You will be interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire. The interview should last approximately 45 minutes. Your responses will be tape recorded to help authenticate the transcription of data. All information will be kept confidential and participation is strictly voluntary. Your consent may be withdrawn and participation discontinued at any time without prejudice.

This study poses no risk of social, physical, or psychological injury to you. The immediate benefit of participating in this study is the knowledge that you are contributing to a worthwhile study regarding teachers' worklives. No monetary compensation will be awarded for your participation in this study, however, your help is greatly appreciated.

Any questions you might have regarding the purpose or procedures of this study may be asked at any time.

"I have read and I understand the procedure described above. I agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description."

_____   _____   _____   _____
Subject   Date   Witness   Date

                                                                     Frank R. Brandao
_____   _____   _____   _____
Relationship if other than   Date   Principal Investigator's Name   Date
Subject

For additional information regarding this study, you may contact the following:

Frank R. Brandao   or   Dr. Katherine Kasten, Dean
                                                     College of Education & Human Services
                                                     University of North Florida
                                                     4567 St. Johns Bluff Road, South
                                                     Jacksonville, Florida

Informed Consent
Selected Participants

You have been selected to participate in a research study that will help determine how restructuring is affecting teachers' worklife.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the nature of teachers' involvement in school-based management. Your input will give valuable and much needed insight as to the effects of involving teachers in decision-making.

You will be interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire. The interview should last approximately 45 minutes. Your responses will be tape recorded to help authenticate the transcription of data. All information will be kept confidential and participation is strictly voluntary. Your consent may be withdrawn and participation discontinued at any time without prejudice.

This study poses no risk of social, physical, or psychological injury to you. The immediate benefit of participating in this study is the knowledge that you are contributing to a worthwhile study regarding teachers' worklives. No monetary compensation will be awarded for your participation in this study, however, your help is greatly appreciated.

Any questions you might have regarding the purpose or procedures of this study may be asked at any time.

"I have read and I understand the procedure described above. I agree to participate in the procedure and I have received a copy of this description."

_____   _____   _____   _____
Subject   Date   Witness   Date

                                          Frank R. Brandao
_____   _____   _____   _____
Relationship if other than   Date   Principal Investigator's Name   Date
Subject

For additional information regarding this study, you may contact the following:

Frank R. Brandao   or   Dr. Katherine Kasten, Dean
                                  College of Education & Human Services
                                  University of North Florida
                                  4567 St. Johns Bluff Road, South
                                  Jacksonville, Florida

APPENDIX B

Semi-Structured Questionnaire

Semi-Structured Questionnaire

Marital Status: ☐ single ☐ married ☐ divorced ☐ other

Do you have primary or shared responsibility for the care of children?
☐ No ☐ Yes, ages _____

Gender/Race: ☐ male ☐ female ☐ White ☐ Black ☐ Other

Job Title: ☐ teacher ☐ principal ☐ other

Yrs in Education: ☐ < 2 ☐ 2-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ > 10

A. To what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented at your school?

1. How would you define restructuring?
    a. How does this definition compare to restructuring at your school?

2. How are budget decisions currently made at your school?
    a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?
    b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?

3. How are curriculum decisions currently made at your school?
    a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?
    b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?

4. How are personnel decisions currently made at your school?
    a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?
    b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?

Notes:

5. What types of people have participated in decisions at your school?

	Yes	No	Comments
Administrators			
Teachers			
Counselors			
Media Specialist			
Students			
Custodians/Maintenance			
School Board Members			
Teacher Aides			
Parents			
Businesspeople			
Community Organizations			
School Volunteers			
County Office Personnel			
Other			

6. What decision-making groups have you been involved with?

Group	Purpose	Yrs	Selected By

7. Think about the groups or committees you have been involved with:
   a. How difficult have committee decisions been?
   b. Describe one relatively easy decision?
   c. Describe one difficult decision?
   d. What made the decision difficult?
   e. How satisfied were you personally with the outcomes?
   f. How satisfied was the group with the outcomes?
   g. How responsible are committees for decisions made at your school?

Notes:

8. How do people in committees relate to each other?

    a. Do all members participate relatively equally in committee decisions? If not, explain.
    b. Are there members with more credibility than others? If so, explain.
    c. Are there members who receive more attention? If so, explain.
    d. How do members relate to principal as committee member?
    e. Do members pay more attention to principal's comments? If so, explain.
    f. Is there a sense of collective responsibility? If so, explain.
    g. How comfortable are you with committees?
    h. Do teachers need group training? If so, explain.

Notes:

B.   What have been the effects of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of elementary teachers ?

    9. Have teachers been given new roles? If yes, explain.
        a. Did teachers readily accept these roles? Explain.
        b. Were teachers prepared/trained to handle these roles? Explain.
        c. Did these roles affect levels of stress? If so, how?
        d. Did these roles offer more influence over decisions? If so, how?
        e. Did these roles affect relationships with colleagues? If so, how?
        f. Did teachers become more recognized as a result of roles? If so, how?
        g. Are teachers better informed as a result of roles? If so, how?
        h. Did new roles affect teacher morale? If so, how?
        i. Can you think of other ways these roles impacted teachers? Explain

Notes:

10. How much time on a weekly average have you invested in restructuring activities in past years, and this year?

    a. Did investment affect your attitudes toward your job?   If so, how?
    b. Did it affect your attitudes toward your school system? If so, how?
    c. Did it affect your sense of trust toward your peers? If so, how?
    d. Did it affect your sense of trust toward administrators? If so, how?
    e. Did the activities increase your professional knowledge? If so, how?
    f. Did it affect your knowledge of school operations? If so, how?
    g. Did it affect your classroom preparation time? If so, how?
    h. Did it affect your interactions with students? If so, how?
    i. Did it affect your teaching effectiveness? If so, how?

Notes:

C.   What do teachers and administrators perceive as the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education?

    11. Have restructuring activities helped you in the classroom? If so, how?

        a. Name one or two activities that helped.

    12. Have restructuring activities affected your sense of dedication? If so, how?

        a. Name one or two activities that affected your dedication.

    13. What do you think the purpose of restructuring as SBM has been?

    14. What do you think will happen to restructuring as SBM at your school?

Notes:

APPENDIX C

Samples of Interview Transcripts

Interview Transcript #9

Marital Status: ☐ single ■ married ☐ divorced ☐ other

Do you have primary or shared responsibility for the care of children?
☐ No ■ Yes, ages ___18___

Gender/Race: ☐ male ■ female ■ White ☐ Black ☐ Other

Job Title: ■ teacher ☐ principal ☐ other

Yrs in Education: ☐ < 2 ☐ 2-5 ☐ 6-10 ■ > 10

A. To what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented at your school?

1. How would you define restructuring?
Restructuring is giving more empowerment to teachers and school based management.

1a. How does this definition compare to restructuring at your school?
I think it mirrors it. I think my definition is really based upon my experience in restructuring at this school, so it mirrors it.

2. How are budget decisions currently made at your school?
In reference to budget, I still think that is done at the county office more than in the school based management.

2a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?
No, there is a budget committee, but I still think that the budget committee must work under the umbrella of the county office restraints, under the state restraints.

2b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?
Maybe because I've never worked on the budget committee, one of the committees I haven't, maybe that's why my perception is what it is. I don't think that they have changed because I still think that budgetary issues are made at a higher level than at the school base.

3. How are curriculum decisions currently made at your school?
This is where the restructuring comes in. I think on curriculum issues the teachers have great empowerment in small group committees, whether it be committees, or in the large faculty as we saw happening last spring with everybody having input on issues. I would like to see more curriculum issues brought before

faculty than we have now. But I think this is where probably we have the largest empowerment.

3a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?

Prior to 5 years ago, the framework or skeleton of the school was already in place and there were no questions. This is the way we run the school. This is the way we teach, these are the books that we use, this is the curriculum that we use. I think now there is a lot of questioning, how can we make it better? How can we make it more student friendly? What is best for children? And whether we agree with the present trend or not, decisions are being made for what is good for children. Teachers' points of view are being taken into account more than 5 years ago.

3b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?

I think in the last 5 years there has been a lot more training of a variety of curriculum techniques and issues. I think prior to 5 years ago, it was this is the way...these are the books we use...these are the standards we have, and then we want you to teach. I think restructuring brought about a lot of the whole language issues, the multiage issue, and what is good for children. Let's look at the research on how and in what setting do children learn best in. What curriculum will best meet the needs of the majority of the students. I think through the training that we have been allowed to have that it has helped teacher to questions maybe the more traditional type of teaching.

4. How are personnel decisions currently made at your school?

I think personnel decisions are still made by the hierarchy. I think that administration at the school base and administration at the county level are still making personnel decisions, probably together.

4a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?
I don't know that its changed.

4b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?
I don't think there are any differences.

5. What types of people have participated in decisions at your school?

administrators, teachers, counselor, media specialist, students, custodians and maintenance, school board members, teacher aides, parents, businesspeople, community organizations, school volunteers, county office personnel

6. What decision-making groups have you been involved with?

Superintendent's Task Force--to train people in restructuring, two or three years administrative appointment/faculty vote; SIT Team--to restructure the school and to make it a better place for all students, teachers and staff, two years administrative appointment; Curriculum Committee--it was a spinoff of the SIT

Team and to deal with curriculum issues that were pertinent at the time, two years chair as a requirement of being on SIT; Concerns Committee--to address the issues of concern to all teachers and to try to solve those concerns, one year volunteer; Survey Committee--to rewrite the teacher survey and the parent survey, two years volunteer; Student Positive Self Image Committee--to educate students in a positive way and to share materials among teachers, one year result of SIT team; Teachers of Whole Language Group--to have groups of teachers share ideas, 5 years (started committee with another teacher and it has grown into county wide committee)

7. Think about the groups or committees you have been involved with:

7a. How difficult have committee decisions been?

Being on the initial SIT team, sometimes they were very difficult in that we changing the way things had always happened. So they weren't perceived by me as being difficult, they were perceived by other people as being difficulty. So then it made it somewhat difficult.

7b. Describe one relatively easy decision?

One relatively easy decision having gone through the training for SIT team members 5 years ago and I guess it happened because of who the principal selected to be on the original SIT team, people who thought a lot alike, and so decisions within the framework of that first SIT team were easy. They were time consuming and they were hard to get other people to buy in, but they were easy because the main majority of the group thought the same way. If you need a specific. I think one thing that we really felt in the beginning was that all people should have their turn and buy in of this restructuring purpose and we never wanted it to look like an elitist group or a self-selected group in that everyone will have their turn. We tried to make it very equitable where you work for two years and then somebody else steps in for two years.

7c. Describe one difficult decision?

One difficult decision was sometimes sitting at the table with people who, in the beginning, took things personally. I think because some of these people hadn't had the training the initial SIT team members had, it was difficult to discuss or argue facts or come to an agreement. What made it difficult was that sometimes you felt like people were being angered at decisions being made and not friendly.

7d. What made the decision difficult?

I think sometimes decisions aren't supposed to be easy. If they were then that same SIT team would probably be the restructuring body but that's not the purpose of it, so I think decisions are supposed to be hard. Two people or eight people are not supposed to always agree on something, but you are supposed to come to agreement on what is best for the school, the children, the teachers, and I don't think those decisions are always easy.

7e. How satisfied were you personally with the outcomes?

Very satisfied because in the two years I worked on SIT team it was long hours, I think I grew a lot in that I did not personalize every decision. When I left I was happy because of the hours, but I was happy leaving knowing I had made a difference and I had grown also.

7f. How satisfied was the group with the outcomes?

I think very satisfied because we knew we had started the ball rolling.

7g. How responsible are committees for decisions made at your school?

I think very responsible, prior and present. I think teachers take things very seriously. I think they are very responsible when they are given a task to do, or a committee to be on.

8. How do people in committees relate to each other?

It goes back to that old thing, I don't think they should always be in agreement, but I think last year our spring whole faculty meetings where we came to so many decisions about what should happen showed that this school could work together. I think they work in a very friendly atmosphere. I think they work very well.

8a. Do all members participate relatively equally in committee decisions? If not, explain.

No. I think this is one of the things I did learn on the initial SIT team. I can understand why there are democracies in the world and why there are other kinds of governments because it is easier to be on the outside blaming one person than to be on the outside blaming a whole group of people who have made a decision. That is, when committees started making more decision making, I think it was harder for your colleagues to start blaming you that it was happening. It was much easier to blame one focal point, but when you started making the decisions to verse, its like you didn't know who to blame. Its easier for people to live within dictatorship than it is democracy and I saw it through the SIT team. Because when decisions had to be made by groups of people who went out and asked other groups of people then nobody knew who to blame. Whereas, under the old form of structure when the principal made the decision, based upon whatever, then if you didn't like it you knew that one person to blame all the time. And you didn't have to get involved as a teacher, and I think that's very easy. If you liked what was going on you just went about your merry way, and if you didn't like what was going on you had one person to blame and you knew who that was, and life was easier.

8b. Are there members with more credibility than others? If so, explain.

Sure, that's life. I think some people put their whole heart in it and some people its either just a committee to be on, or its some way I have to spend 20 minutes a month, and I think that's in anything that you do.

8c. Are there members who receive more attention? If so, explain.

There are some people who are more vocal. So I guess they do receive more attention.

8d. How do members relate to principal as committee member?

I think very well in this school. Our principal is very open to listening to different viewpoints, whether you are mirroring her viewpoint or not.

8e. Do members pay more attention to principal's comments? If so, explain.

In the initial SIT team, no. I think the principal sat there and was just a member. Today, I see it slipping back and I think today what the principal says is heard more strongly, more loudly, more clearly. But I think in the first two years, the principal was a member. In some instances I feel bad that we have slipped back because I think of the blood, sweat and tears that was put into it the first two years. I see things possibly slipping back to six years ago. Maybe its just the pendulum swinging or something. The only thing I feel bad about is that we worked so hard the first two years in getting lots of people's input, and I don't see that happening as much now.

8f. Is there a sense of collective responsibility? If so, explain.

Sure. I think last spring's open faculty meeting were proof of that.

8g. How comfortable are you with committees?

I'm on a lot of them, I'm very comfortable.

8h. Do teachers need group training? If so, explain.

Sometimes, it depends on the committee. I think they need training in anything and I think that's part of the problem. People or resistent to any kind of change, be it curriculum, restructuring, anything. I look at computers. I'm one o the most illiterate people when it comes to computers. We have upgraded computers, but we have not upgraded teachers. And so here I am, the archaic using something that has been upgraded that I can't use. And I think that follows through in everything. I think that it can be carried through to restructuring and to curriculum decision or whatever.

B. What have been the effects of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of elementary teachers ?

9. Have teachers been given new roles? If yes, explain.

If they wanted them, I think the roles were open.

9a. Did teachers readily accept these roles? Explain.

Some. I think it depends on the personality. Some people accepted readily and were willing to be on committees. I'm thinking of my grade level. Some grades levels people are dying to be head teacher, the SIT team members. The grade level I

work with people are saying "no thanks, I don't want to do it." Sometimes, and I
have a very good friend in another school, who declined SIT team and said "my job
is not to be a person to rule the school, I don't want to run the school, I want to
teach." So it depends on the personalities.

9b. Were teachers prepared/trained to handle these roles? Explain.
Most of the roles they have had to take on, I think they have. But training is
always good.

9c. Did these roles affect levels of stress? If so, how?
Sure. I'll go back to the original SIT team. There were 3 teachers chosen to be
on that original SIT team, of those teachers, two of us had student teachers at the
time, and it was a Godsend. We were spending every free moment that we had in
meetings. It was tough. And now I look at my department head, my SIT team
representative, having a lot of duties to do that are more than teaching. Sure, I
think the stress level is there.

9d. Did these roles offer more influence over decisions? If so, how?
Sure. I think because right now presently our SIT team, which is department
heads, are our representatives to school based management, so they do have a lot of
decisions. Hopefully we hope they represent us and they come back and ask us what
we want done or said, but when the door closes it is their responsibility.

9e. Did these roles affect relationships with colleagues? If so, how?
Sure. Because the people that I spoke about who like to live within the
hierarchy of blaming one person, now they have to blame their colleagues and
that's harder to do. Its easier to blame a principal than it is to blame your colleagues.
They were conflicts. I think that there were more conflicts in the first two years than
there are now. And I think maybe because of this slip back.

9f. Did teachers become more recognized as a result of roles? If so, how?
Recognized, yes. Respected, not necessarily.

9g. Are teachers better informed as a result of roles? If so, how?
Yes. Because you are on the inner circle. You are on the decision making. One
thing that I remember happening is that you know about dates and times of things
happening but other people are like not. The communication level, because you are
there, and you know some things others don't know. Its not because you haven't
shared them or administration hasn't shared them, or hasn't wanted to share them,
its just they have not been shared yet.

9h. Did new roles affect teacher morale? If so, how?
Sure, they did, both positive and negative. They affected positively those people
who wanted to start doing more and then they did it and then they got the accolades

and the pat on the back and that was find and wonderful. In the negative, the people that were sitting back in the grandstand who wished they were running out front. In the negative, that's where they wished they were but they weren't, and so that's the negative. And some people didn't care, they were just happy teaching, and that's not so bad either.

9i. Can you think of other ways these roles impacted teachers? Explain.

I really do believe when you are on a SIT team you grown. You have to become a better decision maker and you have to learn not to take things as personally. You learn that I can disagree with another person, it just means I can disagree with them. It took me into my second year to be able to do that. People grow because of it. You just can't sit there as an amoeba, you have to get involved. For me personally, I grew so much and as I said before, I can disagree with a person and it doesn't mean I don't like them, it just means I can disagree with them. You can leave a meeting and be able to say "I hated that decision" but we can still be friends. The people that I see who get into the SIT team who have maybe a different viewpoint who get out after one year have missed out on the opportunity to grow. I think you really need that second year to feel comfortable. The first year you are new and do a lot more listening, and then the second year you have learned to be more confident and that your opinion really does matter.

10. How much time on a weekly average have you invested in restructuring activities in past years, and this year?

In the initial year, I am going to take into account that I had a student teacher and count those as hours given. I bet we were giving 10 to 15 hours in the first year. I would say today, I am probably giving 3 hours.

10a. Did investment affect your attitudes toward your job? If so, how?

In the beginning, I knew that I could not do the job I need to do in the classroom and continue giving 15 hours a week. Yes it did affect it. Because of the person I am, I did not let it affect it, but I don't think in the long term that I could or anybody else given 15 hours to restructuring and be a quality teacher in the classroom. You'd have burnout.

10b. Did it affect your attitudes toward your school system? If so, how?

Yes, because you have ownership. I have a great deal of ownership to this school. And sometimes when I see things that are not in my own view, that are not things that I believe in with my whole heart, I have such ownership in this place that I feel very at ease to voice my opinion. I think that's because I have invested these years, its like family.

10c. Did it affect your sense of trust toward your peers? If so, how?

Sure, there are some people on staff that I trust immensely, that I didn't even know before I was on the SIT team and probably would not have got to know. I

don't trust less or more, I mean I don't trust less, I just think some people choose not to be involved so they're just like the uninvolved people. Not that you don't trust them, they just don't care.

10d. Did it affect your sense of trust toward administrators? If so, how?

I think so. When you sit at the table and you are all equal, yeah, it does affect. I think you do trust them more, and I think that is why every teacher in the school needs to be on the SIT team at some point in time. And I feel very strongly that people would not take a second term when there's other people out there who have not have a first term.

10e. Did the activities increase your professional knowledge? If so, how?

Oh, sure. I think being on the Superintendent's Task Force, being on Curriculum Committee, being on SIT team, really drove me specifically to learn more about whole language, to be a person who has presented throughout this county and out of the county. It also gave me the confidence to do all those things.

10f. Did it affect your knowledge of school operations? If so, how?

Sure. Sometimes positively and sometimes negatively. As the first couple questions you asked about budget, well I thin in school based management, we're supposed to say yes we are making all the decisions at the school base, when I think it really isn't happening, that it is still coming from the county office down. And though we are pretending that it is happening at the school base, it really isn't. So I guess I've had some knowledge of it.

10g. Did it affect your classroom preparation time? If so, how?

It didn't because of the person I am. But, I could not have continued at that rate. I could not have felt that I was giving quality classroom education and kept giving 10 hours a week to sit. I could not have done it. I think burnout would have really hit big time. Because I live education, education is my life. I mean also my family is important to me, but it is like three things. Myself is just a little bit, and my family and education is a big part of my life. And it is very important to me and so I invest a lot of time.

10h. Did it affect your interactions with students? If so, how?

No. I don't think that it did. But I go back to that thing. I could not have continued. Two years is the maximum amount of time to give.

10i. Did it affect your teaching effectiveness? If so, how?

No.

C. What do teachers and administrators perceive as the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education?

11. Have restructuring activities helped you in the classroom? If so, how?

Yes. Starting the Teacher of Whole Language group, which really is a spinoff of being on the SIT team, its a wonderful organization of teachers from our three elementary schools. We get together, its group therapy, we talk about the positives of whole language, we talk about the negative of whole language, we share, and that has had an impact in the classroom. I have gathered things from teachers that I probably would not have spoken to or had interaction with.

11a. Name one or two activities that helped.

Probably being on the curriculum committee, its the most important to me, reading the research and basing what you do upon research that you have read what is good for children, that has to have impact.

12. Have restructuring activities affected your sense of dedication? If so, how?

Yes, because of the issue of ownership, ownership of your school environment. And not just own it in that sense, but respect for other people in your school, like ownership in a family. You can say something about somebody on the outside but don't attack one of our own. I'm a member on a team.

12a. Name one or two activities that affected your dedication.

I think the whole initial SIT team. And I think when we started it off and when we tried to change the atmosphere by doing some cross grade kinds of things. I think that is what is missing now, and we need to go back and we need to look at the atmosphere, because its not been looked at, and the camaraderie has not been looked at lately. It is more than having a Christmas dinner, it is more than that.. There are other little things that I think we need to be doing, cross grade level, not the same group always together. I am a perfect example. When I go to a meeting, I sit with the same group of people and you can pretty much predict it. Now, we pretty much think alike, not always though, but it is predictable. I think sometimes we need to break down that predictability and to do some crossing. So I don't always sit with those people, that I sit with people who don't always think like me and I don't always think like them. I think that atmosphere thing has died and that is what we are missing. I think that is why I have the ownership feeling and other people don't have the ownership feeling. They haven't had the opportunities yet to do some of those things that we did five years ago.

13. What do you think the purpose of restructuring as SBM has been?

I don't know what else to say, empowerment of teachers, more empowerment of community and parents. I see there is a lot more empowerment of parents than I saw five years ago. I think that is probably the greatest change that I have seen. To empower teachers, that is the core of it.

14. What do you think will happen to restructuring as SBM at your school?

I think that it has changed from the initial two years and I see it slowly becoming more dictatorial again even though we are calling it restructuring. I think we have moved back. I think we hit a peak about two and a half to three years ago, and it got very difficult, and I think its because that initial group got out and the group that got trained left and that new group found it very, very difficult. I think that is when things started moving back to the old traditional ways.

Interview Transcript #19

Marital Status: ☐ single ▦ married ☐ divorced ☐ other

Do you have primary or shared responsibility for the care of children?
☐ No ▦ Yes, ages __9__

Gender/Race: ☐ male ▦ female ▦ White ☐ Black ☐ Other

Job Title: ▦ teacher ☐ principal ☐ other

Yrs in Education: ☐ < 2 ☐ 2-5 ▦ 6-10 ☐ > 10

A. To what degree has restructuring as SBM been implemented at your school?

1. How would you define restructuring?
Giving the teachers a little more power to make decisions within the school.

1a. How does this definition compare to restructuring at your school?
Well, we do have quite a bit going on here with our SIT team and the other types of committees going on.

2. How are budget decisions currently made at your school?
We don't know. We really haven't been able to find out much about budget. Whenever we do ask, we don't ever get a real clear answer. There is a lot of confusion about budget. Sometimes we are told about how much money there is there, but we never know where it is spent. I used to be on the budget committee about 3 or 4 years ago, and even then we would plan, plan, plan, and then we never found out if those plans were implemented or anything. As far as the budgeting goes, I don't foresee teachers making a lot of headway. Truthfully, I think some things need to be kept at the administrative level.

2a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?
Only to the point where we are allowed to talk about where the money should go, that has changed. Before we never knew what was going on, where the money came from, how it was delegated. We are involved to the point where we are allowed to talk about it, but I personally don't see where it has changed.

2b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?
I never had a clue as to what happened with budget. We have a clue now. We know how the money comes in and how it is split up, which account it is placed in, but we still don't know what is in that account or what has been decided what to spend from that account.

3. How are curriculum decisions currently made at your school?

There's curriculum committees, like social studies, science. There are committees that help formulate curriculum.

3a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?

I've been here about 5 years, before that I really don't know. Hearing people talk though, I think it has changed with the teachers getting their little two cents put in. I think a lot of the decisions are still ultimately decided at the county level. I know with the textbook selection, we told them what we wanted, and then they got whatever they wanted. Ultimately, they have full power and they definitely use that power to get what they want. I think they are getting our opinion but they are not really listening completely to our opinions otherwise we would have different textbooks. The last book that we purchased was the math book. We were grossly misled. I don't know of any teacher in this school who is happy with the math textbook. It is not what we wanted. But it is what Phyllis wanted. It made me furious. I spent time going through every textbook selections, doing the evaluations, and I am curious to see what is going to happen with the social studies. I know when it goes down to the end, they are going to pick whatever they want.

3b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?

Before restructuring, I would think they probably do much more than just survey the teachers' ideas, if that.

4. How are personnel decisions currently made at your school?

If a teacher is hired in the middle of the year, we have a committee that will sit upon the hiring of that person. However, if a position comes up close to the end of the year, I've seen procrastinations take place so that the principal can do the hiring during the summer. Once again, I really think there are some jobs that are just for the principal to do. We are not there for the firing of any personnel, so really why should be there for the hiring. I don't think it is all bad.

4a. Has the way they are made changed in the past 5 years? If so, how?

Most definitely. I think when I first got my job, I interviewed with the principal. I never had a panel I went to.

4b. Can you describe briefly how they were made prior to restructuring?

The principal had ultimate say, there was no asking teachers for their input.

5. What types of people have participated in decisions at your school?

administrators, teachers, counselor, media specialist, custodian and maintenance, teacher aides, parents

6. What decision-making groups have you been involved with?

Concerns Committee--to hear complaints or concerns from teachers and to direct them into getting them answered, one year volunteer; Budget Committee--to develop and implement a budget during the big budget crunch a couple of years ago, one year volunteer; Curriculum Committee--trying to decide upon a subject matter textbook, one year volunteer; Discipline Committee--trying to decide upon what was the best course of action to take in handling discipline problems, one year volunteer

7. Think about the groups or committees you have been involved with:
7a. How difficult have committee decisions been?

It is pretty hard to get everybody to agree on something, especially when you get eight or nine people in a committee. Some were easy, and some took a long time.

7b. Describe one relatively easy decision?

A questions came up recently about how teachers were selected for the extra jobs after school. They just decided to direct that questions back to ____ and let him put out a memo explaining that jobs were applied for and were filled on a first come, first served.

7c. Describe one difficult decision?

The hardest one is trying to decide on what should be done with these kids who continually misbehave. They really wanted to do things like have Saturday school. We have been hearing about Saturday school for a year and haven't really had anything done about it. We have been told we are going to have Saturday school, even had teachers sign up to be in charge of it, but we have yet to have a Saturday school for kids who don't get their work done or who grossly misbehave. They were going to take them to the cafeteria to make them work, do homework, or whatever, but it hasn't come about. They were supposed to start it in January and here it is March.

7d. What made the decision difficult?

I don't know why it is such a difficult thing. I don't know why it has not been implemented unless it is a matter of money. That has been a problem in the past.

7e. How satisfied were you personally with the outcomes?

Kind of torn in the middle. Some things I think are good. Some things we are only getting lip service with. They are saying this is what is going to happen and then it doesn't happen. It is very frustrating to go sit in these committees and then see what was decided upon not come about. It happens way too much.

7f. How satisfied was the group with the outcomes?

I think they are very frustrated with it most of the time.

7g. How responsible are committees for decisions made at your school?

I think they feel that way at the time. I just don't think it is always realistic. We know that they're not going to happen, we have seen it not happen enough. When restructuring first cam out, I think teachers were really gungho, that we were going to have power. As it comes about, I think we see it more and more where we really don't have any power. We are just doing things to make someone else's job a little easier. We are doing the research, we really don't have the say in what really happens with it.

8. How do people in committees relate to each other?

Usually pretty good. There are occasions when there is bickering or little hard feelings, but for the most part I think the members are pretty much friendly and in agreement.

8a. Do all members participate relatively equally in committee decisions? If not, explain.

Yeah, I think so.

8b. Are there members with more credibility than others? If so, explain.

Yeah, I would say that would be true. There are just some people who are going to be out there saying things. There are those who really will push to see things get done. Those are the ones we go to get our questions answered, rather than somebody who is just...some will go the extra mile to investigate why some things are not happening while others who blow you off.

8c. Are there members who receive more attention? If so, explain.

Probably. If they are the ones who are always talking then they are the ones who are getting all of the attention. Some people are always quiet because they think it is not going to make a difference.

8d. How do members relate to principal as committee member?

I think they related to him very well. He is very well liked, he is very popular. I think that he is very easy to talk to. He has never ever disregarded anyone's opinion or whatever. He may not always do what you want, but he is always listening. He is perceived as just another member of the committee.

8e. Do members pay more attention to principal's comments? If so, explain.

I haven't been on too many committees with him yet. I'm going to be next year. I would think that he would be treated as an equal.

8f. Is there a sense of collective responsibility? If so, explain.

Yes. It is true we all think we are in this together.

8g. How comfortable are you with committees?

I don't mind the committees. I think that they have a good purpose. I guess I have become a little cynical over the years not seeing a whole lot done with them. For the most part, I think they are good. If nothing else, they do delegate and spread around some of the responsibilities that were ultimately handled by one area. I think overall that I've seen good come out of the committees. I just think that it could be a whole lot more.

8h. Do teachers need group training? If so, explain.

Probably would not hurt. Because teachers, like children, are taught how to work together. We are so used to doing things our way that I think when you get into a committee, especially when have so many diverse cultures and backgrounds and differences in personalities, it sure couldn't hurt to have some training.

B.   What have been the effects of attempts to implement restructuring as SBM on the worklife of elementary teachers ?

9. Have teachers been given new roles? If yes, explain.

Oh, yeah, we definitely have a different role because in the past we were just here to teach. Now we're supposed to make decisions about what textbooks do we get, what is going to be on our curriculums, even the hiring of a principal, these are definitely new roles.

9a. Did teachers readily accept these roles? Explain.

I think they accepted them. There were complaints because of the extra work the was involved. I mean it definitely involved more work for us. I think that in itself caused grumbling. I did my share of it at first, like on the half days, it would be so nice to just sit in your room and do lesson planning rather than go to committees. And then if you do go to committees, you want to see something come out of them. I don't mean to be negative, there has been a lot come out of the committees. It is just frustrating when it takes so long and then you don't see any results.

9b. Were teachers prepared/trained to handle these roles? Explain.

No. It was dumped on us. I mean we were told we were going to be part of restructuring. We didn't even know what restructuring meant. It was too much, too fast. They dumped the whole bag on to the schools, and I felt like they should have just given us little bits and pieces, and gotten us used to it, rather than trying to expect us to take the whole thing. It should have been divided up a little bit slower.

9c. Did these roles affect levels of stress? If so, how?

Yeah, I would say it did, does. Anytime you add more responsibility on somebody....there are times we have to do a lot of extra reading or researching on

our off time. That in itself causes stress if you don't get it done, you feel guilty or pushed for a decision.

9d. Did these roles offer more influence over decisions? If so, how?

Like I said, I think it did to a slight degree but I think the ultimate decision still comes down....I think that county level and the administrative level know just what they want to do and they're going to do what they have in mind no matter what anybody else says about it. But they are letting us think they we're having an input in it, but we don't. It is like a big snowjob. They may be fooling somebody, but they are not fooling me.

9e. Did these roles affect relationships with colleagues? If so, how?

I'm sure it does. I have heard people complain about so and so, and how she really got on their nerves in that last committee because she wouldn't shut up. Yeah, I think it does cause some negative, but then again it could cause some bonding to take place too. If you get some people there agreeing with you, it is nice to know that somebody is agreeing with you and listening to your concerns.

9f. Did teachers become more recognized as a result of roles? If so, how?

I think so. I think you can pick out people...we know who is on certain committees and we can go to those people and ask what has been done about this.

9g. Are teachers better informed as a result of roles? If so, how?

Some are better informed, some are still in the dark...a lot of not informed.

9h. Did new roles affect teacher morale? If so, how?

Actually, morale is pretty good around here. It is hard to say because we have had some pretty radical changes in our personnel. I would hate to say it was restructuring that had a change in morale, but I do see it changing, drastically, for the good. I do think it had to do with our new principal, actually. I do think the restructuring committees have helped some people feel better about things. And I definitely think it has gotten teachers talking that never talked before. Its hard to get kindergarten teachers to talk with fifth grade teacher, they don't have anything in common. But throw them on a committee, make them sit by each other, and they are going to talk. In that sense, it definitely has bridged some gaps. I feel like I know other teachers a lot better, where I wouldn't have had the chance to talk to them before. In that sense, it has been good.

9i. Can you think of other ways these roles impacted teachers? Explain.

10. How much time on a weekly average have you invested in restructuring activities in past years, and this year?

I'd say at least an hour a week. This year maybe an hour and a half.

10a. Did investment affect your attitudes toward your job? If so, how?

No, it gets to be a little bit stressful with all the meetings you have to go to. I think that you really have to keep your attitude good, because it could get overwhelming. But I don't think it has really affected my attitude.

10b. Did it affect your attitudes toward your school system? If so, how?

No, I don't think so.

10c. Did it affect your sense of trust toward your peers? If so, how?

Only when I don't see things happening. That is the only time the trust gets a little strained is when you decide on something and you never see it come true. That tend to place a burden on trust.

10d. Did it affect your sense of trust toward administrators? If so, how?

Yeah, it does, most definitely. You are told this is what is going to happen, like with the Saturday school, you are told that you have a tool over those kids, that's a great deterrent, but it never happened. That in itself is very, very frustrating. If they are not going to do it, then don't tell us you are going to do it.

10e. Did the activities increase your professional knowledge? If so, how?

Oh, yeah. It makes you more aware of what is going on. I never, ever had a clear idea of where the lottery came into play in the school systems until I got on the budget committee. When I got on budget I realized this is where the money really goes, and it enlightened me greatly.

10f. Did it affect your knowledge of school operations? If so, how?

Yeah, I realized how bureaucratic it is.

10g. Did it affect your classroom preparation time? If so, how?

Yes, it takes away from there. You take more home to do because you just don't have enough time at school to do it all.

10h. Did it affect your interactions with students? If so, how?

I can't say that it did there, no.

10i. Did it affect your teaching effectiveness? If so, how?

No, I don't think it had any kind of impact there. You still do the job that you always did, you just keep that part of your life separate.

C. *What do teachers and administrators perceive as the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education?*

11. Have restructuring activities helped you in the classroom? If so, how?

In the sense that I have given my students a little bit more power in making decisions. I have let them have their chance to give me what they think is fair punishment, and I see that as being good.

11a. Name one or two activities that helped.

The brain storming ideas, I like that. Let's brainstorm on possible problems and possible solutions.

12. Have restructuring activities affected your sense of dedication? If so, how?

A little bit it has, in the negative sense. You are asked to do an awful lot, and they keep asking. It is not enough to be on one committee, they want you on two or three committees. In that sense, it tends to make you a little pessimistic.

12a. Name one or two activities that affected your dedication.

The budget committee was pretty stressful because we didn't have much time to make these decisions. The discipline was the most stressful to agree on.

13. What do you think the purpose of restructuring as SBM has been?

We were told it was to give the teachers more insight and more hands on type power to make these decisions. Once again, I think it is happening to a certain point and then it is cut off, it is taken away from us, we really don't have the power we though we had. We are doing it because we are told to do it. I think it is helping the administrators because they are doing a lot less work. We are doing the research and then we take the data back to them, yeah, I think it is helping them a lot. Especially at the county level. I just don't really see it yet helping the teachers.

14. What do you think will happen to restructuring as SBM at your school?

I think it is either going to completely fall through and disintegrate because of frustrations, or it is going to really take off and teachers are going to become really assertive and demand answers. I hope it takes the latter, but it has to do one or the other. It is going to be hard on administrators because they have always had the control. On some things they should have the control, but if we are going to be in restructuring then we need to really have it all, at least the answers, if not the power to say something we at least need answer to our questions.

APPENDIX D

Sample Matrix of Patterns and Themes

Matrix of Patterns and Themes
A Guide to Assess Interrelationships Among Site Respondents
Questions 11-13: Teachers thoughts on potential of SBM to improve education

Rose Respondents	Lily Respondents	Fern Respondents
11. R No (#5) * ?Yes. Brainstorming in class	R A little (#19), Recognition *	R Yes (#24, 26, 27) No (#30) *
S Yes. Whole language (#9)	S A little. Discipline * (#20) (#15)	S Yes. Talk with others (#28)
P Yes. Multiage *	P Yes. Teaching and learning	P Yes. Technology *
12. R No. Decreased (#7) * Most did not name. . .	R No. Negatively (#19) Recognition (#18) Most did not name. . .	R No Most did not name. . . * Themes (#30)
S Yes. Comraderie (#9) * No	S Yes/No (#11) * Negative Technology	S Yes/No (#21) (#29) Collegiality (#23) *
P No. Not more, not less	P Yes. Frustrating * No. Less lounge grumbling	P No *
13. R To mandate (#2) Voice (#15) *	R Broaden mind (#15) *	R Ownership of decisions (#28)
S To work 2 jobs (#4) * Return to tradition (#10) *	S Meet needs (#20)	S People in trenches. . . (#29) *
P Everyone to have a say *	P To place principal at bottom	P SBM is suggestions only *

R = Random Sample   P = Principal   # = Respondent's number
S = Selected Sample   * = Reflects site view; include in interrelationships