1992

A Study Of School-Based Management In Selected Southern States: Extent Of Implementation And Comparison Of Attitudes, Perceptions, And Concerns Of Principals And Teachers.

Vicki S. Oliver
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Order Number 9312972

A study of school-based management in selected southern states: Extent of implementation and comparison of attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers

Oliver, Vicki S., Ed.D.

University of Alabama at Birmingham, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A STUDY OF SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT IN SELECTED SOUTHERN STATES: EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION AND COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES, PERCEPTIONS, AND CONCERNS OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

by

VICKI S. OLIVER

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Educational Leadership in the Graduate School, The University of Alabama at Birmingham

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

1992

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION
GRADUATE SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM

Degree Doctor of Education Major Subject Educational Leadership

Name of Candidate Vicki S. Oliver

Title A Study of School-Based Management in Selected Southern States: Extent of Implementation and Comparison of Attitudes, Perceptions, And Concerns of Principals and Teachers

The data gathered in this study provided information regarding the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers toward school-based management (SBM) in the selected southern states of Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas. Information was also received from the participating schools concerning the specific SBM procedures being used in those schools.

A principal questionnaire and a teacher questionnaire were developed, critiqued by an expert panel, and field tested in four schools. With superintendent permission, principal questionnaires were mailed; and with principal agreement, teacher questionnaires were mailed to the schools. Questionnaires were returned by 171 principals and 425 teachers in 59 school districts from elementary, middle, and high schools which had implemented SBM.

Percentages, means, and standard deviations were computed to analyze the variables determined to address the procedures used and the indicators of SBM that existed in the schools,

attitudes toward SBM, and perceptions of the outcomes of SBM. Chi-square tests were conducted to determine the differences in frequencies between teachers' and principals' responses and among respondents in the four states.

Results of these analyses revealed that over a third of the principals responding had decentralized decision making in four areas: budget, personnel, curriculum, and staff development. The schools were nearly evenly divided in whether SBM implementation had been voluntary or mandated. Generally, principals perceived support from their school boards, superintendents, and other central administrators. Principals and teachers were overwhelmingly positive in their attitudes toward SBM and perceived positive outcomes of SBM implementation. Some of the most commonly cited problems with SBM implementation included: insufficient time, insufficient training, and lack of hierarchical support.

Abstract Approved by: Committee Chairman Janice L. Herman

Program Director Boyd Rogan

Date 12-1-92 Dean of Graduate School W. A. Sibley

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible only by the help, support, and encouragement of many important people in my life. Without their individual contributions, I would never have been able to complete this task.

First, I want to thank my husband Bill who has been my greatest source of support during this study. He has constantly inspired me with confidence in myself. Also, he tirelessly and without complaint, helped me with endless errands and many tedious tasks. He has been the greatest source of nurturance for our little girl, and he has kept our family stable through turmoil and some emotional times.

My daughter, Abby, who is four at the time of this writing, has also inspired me. Although it was often "her time" that was taken for my work on this study, she was always full of forgiveness and love for her mother. She even helped a little with folding, stamping, and sealing. It is to Abby and Bill that this study is dedicated.

The rest of my family has given me much through the years, and I appreciate their influence on my life. I am grateful to my mother and stepfather, Juanita and Ned Johnson, my grandmother, Dollie Emory, my sister, Sheryl Shropshier, and my brother, Ricky Shropshier for all they have done to help me get to this point in my life.

I am extremely grateful to the chairpersons of my dissertation committee, Dr. Janice Herman and Dr. Jerry Herman. They have been very patient, understanding, and supportive in their guidance throughout this study. I have been fortunate to have had them as advisors during the preparation of my dissertation as they were always available when I needed help.

Special thanks also are extended to Dr. Gypsy Abbott, Dr. Dave Dagley, and Dr. Kenneth Orso for serving on my committee. Their help in developing this study is very much appreciated.

I also wish to express my appreciation to many people with whom I work who have encouraged, reassured, and helped me along the way: my superintendent, assistant superintendent, the entire central office staff in Talladega County, and the teachers in my school. I especially want to thank my assistant principal, Judi Clark. Her support and encouragement have been very important to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

School-based management (SBM), a national trend in school governance, is a shared decision-making process through which decisions are made by the stakeholders, those people who will be most affected by the decisions. This group always includes teachers and principals; it sometimes includes parents; and it occasionally includes others with a vested interest in the school. Planning is conducted from the "bottom up" (school building level) as opposed to the traditional "top down" (central school district level). The basis of SBM is the belief that the local school should be the level at which fundamental decisions are made (Guthrie, 1986).

In response to "A Nation at Risk," sweeping reform efforts were made, most of which were initiated from centralized levels (Clark, 1990). These efforts did not result in dramatic improvements. The emphasis in the second wave of educational reform has been on restructuring at the local school level. The rationale is that there is no one best method for reforming all schools and that there should be a degree of autonomy at the local building level in order for meaningful change to take place.

School governance is a major topic of interest among advocates of restructuring. Cetron and Gayle (1991) predicted specific trends in educational governance:

1. Parents, students, teachers, business leaders, and other stakeholders will continue to demand involvement in the decisions governing education.

2. Decentralization will increase in the areas of school and classroom management; curriculum, teacher training, and achievement standards will continue to fall under centralized control.

3. The principal's role will expand to include acting as a major change agent for the school. SBM will place tremendous leadership responsibility on the principal in sharing governance with the staff of the school.

4. The authority of educational bureaucracies, local school boards, and other regulatory agencies will decrease during the 1990s as the second wave of reforms gains momentum.

Goodlad (1987) has suggested that a "paradigm shift" is occurring:

> One-way directives are replaced by multiple interactions; leadership by authority is replaced by leadership with knowledge; following rules and regulations is replaced by providing more room for decision making; mandated behavior is replaced by inquiring behavior; accountability is replaced by high expectations, responsibility, and a level of trust that includes freedom to make mistakes; and much more. (Goodlad, 1987, p. 4)

According to Corbett (cited in Bredeson, 1991, p. 1), "restructuring involves alterations in a school district's

patterns of rules, roles, relationships, and results. Anything less is not restructuring."

Conversely, Conley and Bacharach (1990) contend that SBM is not a dramatic change in district level management. In a survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators in 1990, one-fourth of the responding school districts were reported to be using SBM, while another one-fourth were considering the implementation (Prasch, 1990). Ideals of democratic administration have been espoused for as long as there have been administrator preparation programs.

Several advantages of SBM have been identified by various organizations and experts of SBM which all supposedly lead to better programs and services for students (American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, & National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1988; English, 1989; Guthrie, 1986; Prasch, 1990). There are some who venture to assert that SBM is the most effective means of school improvement (Herman, 1989c). However, there is very little research available to support the notion that SBM is correlated with increased student achievement. Therefore, one would have to hypothesize that a more open, collaborative environment would have, as a biproduct, some benefits for students.

Although SBM is not a new concept, it has rarely been implemented until recently; thus, there has been little opportunity to study the correlation between SBM and student

achievement. Many school systems and individual schools throughout the nation and the world have experimented with SBM. White (1989) found over 100 school districts in the United States that have experimented with various aspects of SBM. Since 1982, extensive community and staff involvement has been mandated in Victoria, Australia (Chapman & Boyd, 1986).

True SBM includes participation by all involved with the local school (Marburger, 1985). In practice, however, SBM takes many forms. There have been a variety of combinations of areas of authority for those involved in SBM. In Victoria, Australia, community and staff have participated in improvement of schools, management of budget, and selection of principals (Chapman & Boyd, 1986). The powers and make up of the school councils in Dade County, Florida, vary (Raywid, 1990). One school has a council with 32 members representing all of the school's stakeholders, while another council has 10 members, all of whom are teachers and administrators.

Statement of the Problem

To date, little has been done toward identifying which public school districts or individual public school buildings in selected southern states are involved in SBM. Also, insufficient research has been conducted to determine which specific procedures are being used by the public schools that are implementing SBM: representation on the SBM council, decision-making role of the council, areas for

SBM decision making, decision to implement was voluntary or mandated, and the development of goals and objectives.

It is important to determine what the principals and teachers who are involved in the individual school building's SBM structure perceive to be the outcomes of SBM. There has been little research conducted to measure the perceptions of teachers and principals regarding the successes and problems associated with SBM implementation or their perceptions of the value or nonvalue of SBM at their sites.

Purposes of the Study

This study had five purposes all of which were related to SBM implementation in the southern states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. One was to determine the extent to which certain procedures were used and to determine the existence of certain indicators of effective SBM in selected schools from the southern states. Second, the study sought to determine and compare the attitudes toward SBM of selected principals and teachers participating in SBM. A third purpose of the study was to identify and compare the perceptions of teachers and principals concerning possible teacher outcomes, student outcomes, and school outcomes of implementing SBM. Fourth, principal and teacher concerns with the implementation of SBM were identified and compared. Finally, the attitudes and perceptions of selected principals and teachers within individual school buildings

were studied and compared to determine if patterns could be identified.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states in the areas of budget, curriculum, personnel, and staff development.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no meaningful differences among the stakeholder groups that are represented on the SBM council/team in the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states.

The term meaningful was used in this hypothesis in place of significant which was used in the other hypotheses. Since there were eight stakeholder groups used, it was determined that it would not be appropriate to compare the various groups. The information that was desired was the extent to which each group was represented and how they ranked with each other in the frequency of representation.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states in whether the SBM council/team is advisory or has final decision authority.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant differences among the public schools involved in SBM in whether the implementation of SBM was voluntary or mandated in the selected southern states.

Hypothesis 5. There will be no significant differences in the perception of the principals of the public schools participating in SBM in the selected southern states among school board, superintendent, and other central administrators in the degree of support of SBM.

Hypothesis 6. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not adequate training for SBM has been provided.

Hypothesis 7. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not sufficient time for planning is provided.

Hypothesis 8. There will be no significant differences between the attitudes of teachers and principals toward SBM in the public schools that are involved in SBM in the selected southern states.

Hypothesis 9. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding the quality and quantity of community involvement since SBM implementation.

Research Questions

1. To what extent and for what purposes are applications for waivers of school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws made and approval received?

2. How do the perceptions of principals regarding student outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

3. How do the perceptions of principals regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

4. How do the perceptions of principals regarding school outcomes of SBM compare to those of teachers?

5. How do the major concerns of principals regarding the implementation of SBM compare to the major concerns of teachers?

6. How do the perceptions of teachers compare with the perceptions of principals within the individual public schools?

7. What patterns exist in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers in the selected individual schools?

Significance of the Study

Information derived from this research is useful in understanding whether or not the principals and teachers who are participating in SBM in the public schools in the southern states are in favor of continuing SBM and whether or not they perceive positive results from utilizing SBM. Results of the study are also useful in determining the degree to which SBM exists in the public schools of the southern states. They also provide an indication of the concerns of teachers and principals who are implementing SBM. These data are useful to various administrator and

teacher preparation programs at universities, to regional inservice centers, to regional educational laboratories, to the regional professional organizations, and to administrators and teachers in the field.

Methodology

The state departments of education of the southern states (Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia) and the regional educational laboratories (the Southeastern Regional Vision for Education, serving Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina; the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, serving Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas; and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory, serving Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia) were contacted by telephone and requested to provide names of public school districts and/or individual public schools in which SBM was being utilized. The school districts that were identified in this way were then contacted by telephone and requested to provide the names of schools, addresses, and the names of principals of the schools within their districts which were implementing SBM. Those public schools in the southern states which were identified as using SBM through the literature review and through the National Clearinghouse on SBM were also included in the population.

Two questionnaires were developed. One of which measured the attitudes toward SBM of principals who were involved in SBM, their perceptions of the outcomes of SBM

implementation, and their concerns regarding the implementation of SBM. The second instrument measured the responses to the same questions from the teachers' perspective. The principals' questionnaire also measured the procedures used and the existence of selected indicators of effective SBM implementation in the schools. Principals were requested to volunteer to participate in the teacher survey phase of this study. A panel of experts and a field test were used to test validity. An application for exemption was made to the Institutional Review Board for Human Use at the University of Alabama at Birmingham.

The southern states from which 100 or more schools were identified as utilizing SBM were targeted for this study: Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas. A sample of 100 public schools from each of the states of Florida, North Carolina, and Texas were selected by a stratified proportional random sampling design. One hundred schools were selected from Kentucky using a proportional design. Copies of the questionnaires were mailed to the superintendents of all the school districts in which schools from the sample were chosen for their review and approval. Two or more weeks later the principals were sent questionnaires to complete. Ten days after the original mailing to principals, a follow-up postcard was sent to nonresponding principals. A second follow-up, which involved mailing another letter and questionnaire to nonresponding principals, was conducted ten days later. Schools from each of the four states were then selected

using a stratified proportional random sampling design. The principals of those schools were sent questionnaires for all of the teachers in their schools. Nonresponding principals were telephoned after 10 days. The results were tabulated and analyzed.

Assumptions

1. The parties surveyed answered according to their honest attitudes and perceptions.

2. The respondents did not share their responses.

Limitations

1. The study was concerned only with the public schools within the southern states which were identified as utilizing SBM by their state departments of education, by the regional educational laboratories, in the literature, or through the National Clearinghouse on SBM; and it was concerned only with states having 100 or more identified SBM schools--Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas.

2. The information was derived from questionnaires completed by principals and teachers, and the findings were limited to their attitudes and perceptions.

3. Items on the questionnaires were limited to those concerning procedures used in SBM implementation, attitudes toward SBM, perceptions of the outcomes since the implementation of SBM, and concerns regarding SBM implementation.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms were used in this study:

1. Perception--the opinion held by the person responding; his or her personal meaning or feeling.

2. School-based management (SBM)--a process through which the primary decision making authority is at the individual school building level.

3. Component of SBM--any portion, area, technique, strategy, or phase of the SBM process.

4. Indicator of successful SBM--items identified in the literature as indicating some degree of effective SBM implementation.

5. Southern states--Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. The first chapter serves as an introduction and contains the statement of the problem, the purposes of the study, and the hypotheses and research questions for the study. Those who will benefit from the study and how it will potentially benefit them are also identified. An overview of the methodology that was utilized to conduct the research is presented. Assumptions and limitations are stated, and definitions of certain terms are provided.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature related to SBM in five different sections. First, a brief historical background of the SBM movement is presented,

including recommendations from recent reports regarding the various components of SBM. Second, the rationale for SBM as identified in the literature is discussed from a research-based perspective. Third, a description of the key elements of SBM and a compilation of indicators of effective implementation of SBM are presented. Fourth, problems encountered in the early stages of SBM implementation are presented. Fifth, this chapter concludes with a discussion of the legislation in the southern states related to SBM and the implementation of SBM in some selected schools and school districts in the southern states.

Detailed information about the methodology is presented in Chapter III. Provided are descriptions of the population, sample, and the instruments as well as information about the validity of the instruments. This chapter also contains an explanation of the procedures for data collection and analyses.

Chapter IV consists of the findings of the study. It presents analyses, and reports the results of the study. Chapter V includes the conclusions derived from the study, recommendations for further study, and implications for the profession.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Restructuring calls are being advanced by many sources --groups and individuals--both from within and outside the field of education (National LEADership Network, 1991). The major premise which forms the basis for restructuring recommendations is that effective education depends mainly upon teachers and principals having autonomy to do what they know is best and being held accountable for the outcomes (Tewel & Holzman, 1991). School-based management (SBM) has become one of the most widely discussed strategies for restructuring schools (Clark, 1990).

There is no universal definition of SBM. Educators have given the process a variety of names: site-based management, building-based management, school-centered management, decentralized management, school-site autonomy, the autonomous school concept, responsible autonomy, school-based budgeting, school-site lump sum budgeting, school-improvement process, school-based curriculum development, teacher empowerment, shared governance, administrative decentralization, and shared decision making (Clune & White, 1988; National School Public Relations Association, 1989). The importance is not in the name but in the shifts in

authority that are implicit in the process (Kolderie, cited in A. Lewis 1989). According to Murphy (1991, p. 39), "authority and influence are passing from higher to lower levels of the organization."

Lindelow (1981) defines SBM as "a system of educational administration in which the school is the primary unit of educational decision-making" (p. 94). A more comprehensive definition is used by the National Committee for Citizens in Education: "a form of district organization and management in which the school-community is the key unit for educational change and improvement" (Burns & Howes, 1988, p. 8). Rennie (1985) defines SBM as a system of educational management which provides the "appropriate balance of authority and accountability" (p. 64). Herman (1990b) provides a more descriptive definition of SBM:

> a structure and process which allows greater decision making power related to the areas of instruction, budget, policies, rules and regulations, staffing, and all matters of governance; and a process which involves a variety of stakeholders in the decisions related to the local individual school building. (p. 3)

The review of the literature on SBM as it relates to this study may be viewed in six different phases. First, a brief historical background of the SBM movement is presented, including the recommendations from recent reports regarding the various components of SBM. Second, the problems that have been encountered during SBM implementation are identified. Third, the rationale for SBM as identified in the literature is discussed from a

research-based perspective. Fourth, a description of the key elements of SBM as gleaned from the literature review led to a compilation of indicators of effective SBM implementation. Fifth, problems encountered in the early stages of SBM implementation are presented. Sixth, this chapter concludes with a discussion of SBM legislation in the southern states and the implementation of SBM in some of the schools and school districts in the southern states (as defined in Chapter I).

The Historical Context of SBM

Prior to 1900, local control of schools existed in the United States with each school having its own board of education (Marburger, 1985). These boards were responsible for maintaining buildings, purchasing textbooks and other materials, hiring personnel, and establishing curriculum. The principalship was a key authority position during this time (Lindelow, 1981). The principalship possessed great autonomy until about 1920, when widespread corruption among board members resulted in the public's demanding the centralization of authority. Around 1970, the pendulum of centralization began to swing back.

Although it is impossible to pinpoint the first idea that led to SBM, the rough outlines appear to have been developed by the New York State Fleischmann Commission in 1971 (Pierce, 1980). Further development of the SBM concept appeared in 1973 in a report to the Florida's Governor's Citizens' Committee on Education. That report advocates a "school-centered organization of instruction" based on the

following principles: allocation of funds to schools based upon the needs of the children in the schools, development of educational objectives by those associated with the school, determination of curriculum at the school level, and participation of parents in decision making. However, the research of Wissler and Ortiz (1986) indicates that the early efforts to decentralize did not result in much increase in power for parents; although parental participation increased, the original decision makers continued to make the decisions. On the other hand, those efforts which granted principals autonomy over budgets were carried out successfully.

A nationwide effort to reform education, called the excellence movement, began more than a decade ago (Raywid, 1990). These efforts, now called the first wave of reforms, were typically done in a sweeping centralized fashion and tended to mostly strengthen standards (Clark, 1990). They did result in some incremental progress in improving education. But, in spite of the many types of reform efforts, the same criticisms of education--poor student achievement, high drop-out rates--continued to be heard. This may be attributed to one fallacy in the reform efforts: the assumption that quality is equated with standards (Noblit, 1986).

In 1986, the direction of the excellence movement changed from "reform" to "restructuring" (Raywid, 1990). Restructuring advocates propose changes in the way education is organized and institutionalized and the way schools are

governed and held accountable. SBM and schools of choice are the two main strategies for directing the changes that have emerged. The SBM movement seeks to improve education through changes in the way schools are governed. This approach recognizes that a single uniform system is not appropriate for reforming all schools and that a certain degree of autonomy must exist at the school in order for meaningful change to take place (Educational Research Service, 1990).

The "second wave" of reforms was ushered in by the recommendations in a new batch of reports by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), the Holmes Group (1986), the National Governors' Association (1986), and the Education Commission of the States (1986). Various reports demanding school reform have continued to be published since that time (Moorman & Egermeier, 1992, cited in Herman & Herman, in press). The second wave reformers advocate providing more autonomy and more opportunities for leadership and shared decision making to teachers. A report by the Committee for Economic Development in 1985 advocates placing school governance at the local level with states providing standards and support for meeting those standards (Timar & Kirp, 1987).

Decentralization of authority and decision making was given as one of the criteria of successful restructuring by President Bush and the governors following the President's 1989 educational summit (Pierce, 1989, as cited in Prasch, 1990). Ernest Boyer (1989, cited in Prasch, 1990),

president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, advocates, "In shaping a national strategy for education, school-based management is crucial" (p. 1). One of the five major goals of the Holmes Group (1986) requires "less bureaucracy, more professional autonomy, and more leadership for teachers" (p. 67).

Goodlad (1984) is also an advocate of SBM. He proposes providing individual schools with the authority and responsibility to develop programs, plans, and budgets within a general framework which assures equity among schools and accountability. He asserts that an approach that allows and encourages schools to deal with their own problems is most likely to be successful.

In America 2000 (United States Department of Education, 1991), the school is viewed as the site of reform. Federal and state agencies are encouraged to dispose of red tape procedures which interfere with local school improvement efforts. This sourcebook cites characteristics of successful school improvement efforts, which include the decentralization of authority and decision making responsibility, and the active, sustained involvement of parents and the business community.

According to Lieberman (1988),

> what we see then, is the coming together of important and disparate social and political forces with a common interest in reforming the nation's schools: governors making education the number one priority in their states, universities calling for massive reform of teacher preparation in their own institutions; business concerned with reform because of the need for better educated workers; and teacher

> associations recognizing that they must play a significant role in restructuring and professionalizing teaching if they are to influence the direction of change. This is an unprecedented, if uncoordinated, coalition of forces calling for structural reforms. (p. 55)

Problems Encountered with SBM

The successes and failures of SBM have not yet been studied sufficiently (Dunlap, 1991), primarily because there has not been sufficient experience with it in the United States to evaluate its impact. Some problems that have arisen from the beginning stages of SBM implementation are (White, 1989): (1) teachers, administrators, parents, and students have difficulty in adapting to new roles; they can become frustrated if they do not know what is expected of them; (2) the various parties struggle for power; and (3) decisions are made which conflict with state mandates, standardized curricula, and state and district budget and personnel constraints. In Kentucky, some confusion exists regarding the actual authority of the school council (Van Meter, 1991). Much of the wording of the new legislation indicates that the local school board retains most of its authority.

From a 1989 survey of practitioners by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, eight barriers to initiating shared decision making were identified: resistance to changing roles and responsibilities, fear of losing power, inadequate or inappropriate resources, lack of definition and clarity, lack of skills, lack of trust, lack of hierarchical support, and fear of taking risks (Mutchler

& Duttweiler, 1989). Prasch (1990) identifies some additional disadvantages of SBM: requires more time and effort, is less efficient than centralization in budgeting, may not use knowledge of specialists to full advantage, may widen the effectiveness gap among schools, increases staff development needs, creates problems if actions are not consistent with words, and is difficult to reverse the process once it has begun. He further notes some actual barriers to the implementation of SBM: resistance to change; turnover of superintendents and principals; increase in costs; existence of controls such as federal and state laws, board policies, and union contracts; misinterpretation of control among staff members; existence of "quick-fix" attitudes; and reduction in necessary administrative positions.

Mitchell (1990) finds that administrators, principals, department chairpersons, board members, superintendents, and central office staff members could act as blocks to successful implementation of SBM. One of the reasons that administrators resist shared-decision making is because it is perceived to be inconsistent with strong instructional leadership (Osterman, 1989). Osterman's findings, however, indicate that the empowerment of teachers enhances the principal's effectiveness as instructional leader. This is in accord with Cunard's (1990) contention that principals who share power are more effective, because there is greater probability that empowered teachers will strive to reach their potential.

In response to principals' perception of a threat to their authority, Troutman (cited in Stover, 1989) asserts that the principal who involves teachers and parents in planning priorities increases his or her authority through building consensus and support for school objectives. He contends that there is much to gain by giving responsibility and power to people: support for goals and missions. SBM will not have much of a chance if principals perceive themselves to be caught in a power struggle (Mahon, 1991). This perception derives from the belief that power is finite.

Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1991) find that the principals in their study are in favor of school restructuring. They conclude, however, that the experience bases, training, and beliefs of the principals might limit their capacity to cause fundamental reform.

Education Secretary Lamar Alexander (cited in Fiske, 1991), in referring to the New American Schools, cites these obstacles to restructuring: not thinking there is a problem, not thinking big enough, the educational bureaucracy, and the never-changing nature of schools.

A study by Duke, Showers, and Imber (cited in Benson & Malone, 1988) finds that teachers are reluctant to participate in decision making when given the opportunity if they perceive that their involvement frequently does not actually influence the decision. Teachers may actually feel resentful if they perceive that they have only slight

influence on rather inconsequential matters (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990).

A common misconception regarding participative management is that if input is obtained from subordinates and partially used, then participative management is being used (Mauriel, 1989). In true participative management, a willingness to be challenged, a respect for the opinions of others, and an ability to remain goal oriented exist.

Wood (1984) identifies four factors which might affect the outcomes of participative decision making. The first concerns the extent to which information sharing occurs in the group. Participants feel more satisfied when they have had the opportunity to share their own ideas. The second factor, called strain towards convergence, refers to a group norm of avoiding conflicts. It also has to do with lower status members not considering ideas that do not originate from or have the support of higher status members. The difference between actions and beliefs of superordinates was cited as a third factor influencing participative decision making. Problems are caused if superordinates behave in ways that are different from the attitudes and values they espouse. A fourth factor involves the difference between participation and participative decision making. They are not synonymous, and subordinates need to understand which will be used.

Perhaps the most important factor contributing to the success or failure of SBM is the school's unique culture. Sometimes the school's personality can be an obstacle to

changes even if the staff is acting in good faith (Henley, 1987). Heckman, Oakes, and Sirotnik (1983) define culture as "the solutions groups of people derive to the survival problems they face" (p. 26). Each school has created its own unique culture which includes the organizational arrangements, patterns of behavior, and assumptions about students and learning. This "natural order" must be broken through in order to implement changes successfully. Schein (1985) asserts that possibly "the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture" (p. 2). Snyder, Anderson, and Johnson (1992) identify four cultural conditions for success: (1) goals and symbols, (2) sharing and networking, (3) rewards and recognition, and (4) empowerment opportunities.

Another reason cited for the difficulty of schools to change is their interconnectedness (Raywid, 1990). One thing cannot be changed without changing many things, since everything is connected to everything else.

Fullan and Miles (1992) present seven reasons for reform failure: (1) having a reform plan that does not accurately represent the path to be traveled, (2) having complex problems for which no real solutions currently exist, (3) accepting symbolic change as opposed to real change, (4) applying superficial solutions, (5) identifying natural responses to change as resistance to change, (6) disrupting the small successes that have been achieved, and (7) misusing knowledge about the change process. They assert that real reform will not occur until the following

principles have been incorporated: (a) change involves learning which involves anxiety and difficulties; (b) problems must not be avoided but willingly accepted; (c) change always requires additional resources; (d) change must be supported by the district office; (e) change must address all areas of the system, including the culture of the organization; (f) and all large scale reform is implemented at the local level.

The Rationale for SBM

AASA, NAESP, and NAESP (1988) identify nine advantages to SBM: (1) utilizes the expertise in the local school; (2) increases input for teachers, other staff members, and the community; (3) improves teacher morale; (4) allows teachers to determine their own professional development needs; (5) focuses accountability for decisions; (6) brings resources in line with local instructional goals; (7) provides better programs and services for students; (8) nurtures and stimulates new leaders at all levels; and (9) increases quantity and quality of communication. Prasch (1990) notes other advantages of SBM: (a) better decisions, (b) a sense of ownership, (c) increase in staff loyalty and commitment, (d) clear organizational goals, (e) support for risk taking, (f) enhancement of public confidence, (g) and improvement of fiscal accountability.

According to Guthrie (1986), the school is the logical unit for decision making for two reasons. First, the faculty and the principal should make a natural team. The second reason is that parents and students usually "give

their allegiance" to a particular school, not to a school system or a state educational system. He also states that SBM could potentially reduce the conflict between state policy makers and local school personnel.

According to Lane (1991), the purpose of SBM is to bring school and community together to discuss what they value in education. This is important since school management is difficult in areas where value consensus in a functional community does not exist (Coleman & Hoffer, 1987, cited in Lane, 1991). Many large urban districts have students coming from dysfunctional communities. Brown (1991) describes decentralization as a "way of adapting schools to their environment" (p. 4).

Proponents of SBM usually see educational organizations as loosely structured with little control existing between the levels (Pierce, 1980). Each level is viewed as autonomous in that each chooses whether or not to comply with the rules and regulations from above. If this is true, then SBM may be the only way to administer schools. Principals and teachers must voluntarily comply with proposed changes, or there will be no real changes.

In the traditional model of school improvement, schools are seen as places needing repair, not imperfect organizations that are continually growing and changing (Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). Sirotnik and Clark emphasize the importance of the school as the center for change. They suggest that educators at the site should not just be given programs to implement, but should be allowed to focus on the

problem and become actively involved in solving it, utilizing the knowledge and talent available in the schools. When educators at school sites use inquiry and discussion, they develop their own understanding which translates into action. Sirotnik and Clark assert that decisions should be made where the action is, since "the ultimate power to change is in the heads, hands, and hearts of educators who work in the schools" (p. 664).

Organizational theory has also begun to recognize that schools and school systems are not closed systems (Sirotnik & Clark, 1988). They interact continuously with surrounding environments. They also develop their own cultures of norms, roles, expectations, symbols, rituals, and ceremonies.

The SBM concept developed, coincidentally, with the effective schools model for school improvement (Taylor & Levine, 1991). With SBM, the reform trend to erode the principal's role is reversed (Prasch, 1990). The principal gains in authority and freedom to make decisions with the assistance of the entire school staff. This is in accord with the effective schools research which includes strong leadership as one of the major correlates of effective schools (Purkey & Smith, 1985).

Purkey and Smith (1985) designed a model of school improvement of which one characteristic is SBM and democratic decision making. Chubb (cited in Wirt & Kirst, 1989) concludes from his national study that school organization contributed more to student achievement than

parental influence, school resources, and peer pressure. The effective schools had democratic leadership in which teachers were involved and cooperation existed between teachers and the principal.

Another reason for viewing local school sites as the center for decisions is the research on successful and unsuccessful innovations. Berman and McLaughlin (cited in Sirotnik & Clark, 1988) found no programs which consistently led to improved student learning over a number of years. They also found that programs that were replicated at other sites generally did not measure up to their success at the original sites.

Key Components of SBM

There is not one best system for the governance of schools (Kirst, 1984). Variation in the implementation of SBM programs is implicit in the definition of SBM (Clark, 1990). Since there are a variety of circumstances in schools, program success will depend upon the extent to which individual schools have the latitude to adapt to policies or develop new solutions to problems (Cohen, 1983). Taylor and Levine (1991) contend that the development of universal guidelines for decision making is impossible; the guidelines should vary depending upon the unique organizational culture and the people involved.

Majkowski and Fleming (1988) made the observation that the volume of literature on SBM is accumulating at a faster rate than knowledge about the practice. Identifying components that specifically constitute SBM is difficult due

to the wide range of practices found among systems claiming to utilize it.

Clune and White (1988) find decentralization of authority and a SBM council to be the two key elements in a SBM program. Other components are identified in the literature on SBM: strategic planning (Herman, 1989c); a decision-making model, which establishes decision areas, groups represented, and how they are represented (Sokoloff, 1990); roles and responsibilities (Harvey & Crandall, 1988); annual plans and performance reports (Guthrie, 1986); and procedures for requesting waivers (Cawelti, 1989).

Decision-Making Authority

The delegation of authority to the school site is the backbone of SBM (David, 1989). Hanson (1990) identifies two elements to be analyzed in order to understand the extent of authority in SBM models: (1) where the redistribution of authority originates and (2) the amount of authority that is redistributed. The source from which the move to SBM originated might be the principal, the school board, the superintendent, teachers, the union, the legislature, or the parents and community. The amount of involvement in or authority for decision making would fall somewhere on a continuum with specific points identified as (1) deconcentration, which refers to a transfer of tasks to subunits with no increase in authority; (2) participation, which involves greater input by subordinates with the right to make the decision remaining with the superordinate; (3) delegation, which is the transfer of decision making

authority to a lower level; and (4) devolution, actually transferring authority to a lower level so that unit can act autonomously.

Vroom and Yetton's decision-making model (cited in Mauriel, 1989) contains three levels of decisions: (1) authoritarian, (2) consultative, and (3) consensual. The type of decision-making style utilized depends upon the amount of time available, the importance of the decision, and whether the support of subordinates is necessary to implement the decision successfully. When one has time, the decision is very important, and collaboration and support are needed, then the consensual style should be used. Lawler (1986) adapts the following list of decision approaches from Tannenbaum and Schmidt: top-down, consultative, consultative-upward communication, consensus, delegation with veto, delegation with policy philosophy guidelines, and pure delegation.

According to Pierce (1980), with SBM, there exists the presumption that decisions will be made locally unless it is more advantageous to have the decision made centrally. He advocates the following types of decisions for the school-site level: resource utilization; resource accountability; selection, training, and transfer of personnel; curriculum planning, development, and evaluation; and most budgeting decisions. Schlecty and Joslin (1984, cited in Stevenson, 1987) would leave two types of authority at the district level: (1) the authority to articulate overall goals, values, and commitments of the school system and (2) the

responsibility for the achievement of the goals and the quality of performance of school personnel. Responsibility for problem solving should be decentralized to the building level. Patterson, Purkey, and Parker (1986) contend that certain decisions should not be delegated: school board policies, direction expected from the superintendent's office, and decisions necessary to maintain consistency and coordination across the district.

Clune and White (1988) find three systems that are typically decentralized: (1) budget, (2) curriculum, and (3) personnel. Even though there is similarity among the various SBM programs, the organization and operation of programs is extremely diverse. They concluded that districts usually decentralize budgeting most readily, then personnel, and curriculum last, and that smaller districts can more easily implement SBM programs. Reavis and Griffith (1992) include the area of staff development with the other three identified by Clune and White. Murphy (1991) adds two other domains of decentralization: (1) goals and (2) organizational structures.

In the case of budgeting, Clune and White (1988) find that in most cases, schools are given a specific allocation for each student enrolled. The schools have the authority to choose educational programs, distribute teachers across programs, and select instructional materials. In some cases, schools also have the authority to shift funds across personnel categories.

Since authority goes with the control of money, the budget provides the most obvious source for judging/assessing the extent of SBM in the district (Prasch, 1990). Prasch identifies two aspects of budgeting: (1) determining how funds will be allocated and (2) controlling the allocation. Since there are different needs among schools, it is inconsistent with SBM principles simply to allocate all buildings a prorated share. There should be variable allocations, which do not show capriciousness or favoritism. An important element of control is removed if there is a requirement to spend all funds within a given time frame.

Kowalski (1980) finds that 73% of principals favor school-based budgeting. The most often cited reason was that school-based budgeting provides flexibility to meet individual school needs; second, it provides greater faculty participation; third, it provides greater freedom in the building level administration; and fourth, it reduces arbitrary decisions at the central office.

A 1991 Harris poll found 79% of teachers and principals favor site-based budgeting, while 60% of superintendents and 53% of school board members favor it (Harris, 1991). All of the groups except the superintendent feel that money should be transferred to the classroom, and almost half of the superintendents agree.

Personnel is another area which might be decentralized. Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978) assert that the authority to hire personnel is essential if a principal is to be held

accountable for the school's performance. Goodlad (1984) would give individual schools the authority and responsibility to develop long-term staffing plans. One method for determining personnel from the district level involves allocating points for each building according to the needs (Prasch, 1990). These points could be spent according to salary requirements for personnel requested. Two advantages of this system are that it is equitable and it allows the individual school to control its own staff configuration.

A fourth area in which decisions may be decentralized is the staff development program which should relate to the vision and mission of the school (Reavis & Griffith, 1992). In restructuring schools, staff development should not take the commonly known form of simply offering inservice sessions with consultants. It should involve teachers meeting to discuss problems and possible solutions.

The SBM Council

The National Committee for Citizens in Education (NCCE, 1990) emphasizes that the school council, a body established to make decisions, is the keystone of SBM. It is recommended that all stakeholders be represented on the council (Herman, 1989a; NCCE, 1990). The council should include the principal, teachers, parents, students, and other community members. Jennings (1989) emphasizes the importance of community members who represent society's interests as a whole, since they represent the 80% of the community without children in school. NCCE further

recommends that membership be by self-selection or by election. Appointments can result in favoritism, or, at least, the accusation of favoritism.

Prasch (1990) provided this list of considerations in establishing guidelines for councils: (1) a clear statement of purpose; (2) definition of authority, establishing who can advise, decide, review, and veto; (3) a formal selection process that provides broad-based representation; (4) identification of which issues the council will address; (5) an understanding of the relationship of the council to the board of education, superintendent, and principal and to other advisory groups; and (6) providing a comprehensive orientation for all incoming council members.

Herman (1992) has identified three developmental stages through which SBM teams must pass in order to become effective: (1) infancy, (2) adolescence, and (3) maturity. There are also steps in each phase which are critical to the growth of the team. The infancy stage includes the following steps: establishing procedures for enhancing person-to-person knowledge; defining roles, objectives, and structure; developing pride in the team; creating a collaborative environment; and providing training. The adolescent stage should include the following steps: continuing to strengthen the elements that were established in infancy; establishing processes to be used; developing a mission statement, goals, objectives, and action plans; and conducting a S.W.O.T. (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) Analysis to determine forces within and outside

of the organization that can assist or hinder reaching the goals. The maturity stage has vital steps: monitoring and adjusting the structure and processes; insuring effective communication, decision making, leadership, and followership skills among team members; and insuring the accomplishments of the objectives and development of new objectives.

Strategic Planning

Herman (1989b, 1989c, 1990a) recommends strategic planning as the process for determining the vision for a district or school and planning how to obtain that vision. He has identified nine components of the strategic planning process, the first seven of which are related to vision planning, the next action planning, and the last evaluation procedures: (1) establishing belief statements with the involvement of stakeholders; (2) conducting external and internal scanning (internal involves studying factors related to school climate, school finances, and human resources; external refers to those factors outside of the school related to demographics, finance, attitudes, and political factors); (3) identifying factors that are critical to success; (4) creating the vision of what the school should be like at some future point; (5) drafting a mission statement; (6) analyzing strengths and weaknesses; (7) establishing long-term goals and objectives; (8) developing action plans which include who is responsible for each item, what is to be accomplished, resources needed, how the task is to be accomplished, and how success will be

measured; and (9) establishing monitoring procedures. Herman (1989a) advocates involving all stakeholders in the planning process to assure support of the vision and goals.

Drucker (1992) emphasizes the importance of a clear mission and a definition of desired results for nonprofit organizations such as schools. Nonprofits lack the financial "bottom line," which basically is the mission of business and which clearly demonstrates the results.

Roles

The implementation of SBM will require some role changes for all school personnel. Some of the changes which have been identified from the literature follow.

State roles. Pierce (1980) sees the state as establishing performance standards for schools, establishing conditions for local decision making, and providing examples of change strategies. Kirst (1984) would add resources for site-based decision making, while continuing to eliminate inequities which sometimes arise from funding procedures and providing policies which govern equal access and equal treatment. The state should also be involved in specifying broad curricular parameters and monitoring local efforts so as to provide helpful feedback.

School board. The board of education should make broad policy decisions (Kirst, 1984). They should be involved in establishing visionary mission statements and setting goals that will encourage staff to reach their potentials (Prasch, 1990). The 20th Century Task Force on school governance recommends that boards be responsible for strategic plans

for school systems which would include the curriculum framework (Howell, 1992). It further recommended that the board establish purchasing policies, but not approve specific purchases. Likewise, employment decisions would be based on personnel policies established by the board but only a few senior administrative positions would actually be approved by the board.

Superintendent. The superintendent often is the person who initiates SBM in the district (Clark, 1990). He or she must be willing to delegate authority and responsibility while remaining the chief executive officer of the system. If the superintendent does not take the lead, SBM will not be successful (Frymier, 1987). Lewis (1991) describes the new superintendent as "a visionary, a hands-off bureaucrat, and a coalition builder" (p. 41). The superintendent should consult widely and listen to all (Murphy, 1989). The superintendent who is in tune with SBM principles will play other roles: facilitator, encourager, supporter, conflict manager, and "leader as servant" (Prasch, 1990).

Central office staff. According to Lindelow (1981) "the relationship that will be most changed by the implementation of SBM is that between the central office and the school site" (p. 116). Under SBM, central office staff members will derive their power based only upon their ability to serve the local schools (Prasch, 1990). The central office should become a service agency which is staffed by facilitators and coordinators (Murphy, 1989). The management focus of the central office must shift to the

concept of management by exception, in which intervention occurs only when a school is in trouble. Other roles that must be assumed by the central office staff include providing technical support and access to information (Clark, 1990).

Principal. The principalship will continue as a position for influencing structural, operational, and instructional matters; but it will be expanded to include the roles of creating and supporting a school climate in which responsibilities are accepted and shared collegially among the staff (Bredeson, 1989). In his study, Bredeson identifies five changes that principals found in their roles since implementing SBM: (1) the need for highly developed communication skills, (2) expansion of the principal's role beyond the school site, (3) role perception or misperception by others, (4) clarification of role expectations, and (5) the increased demand for time. The principals in this study perceived the following staff expectations of them: to listen, be supportive, provide feedback, endorse their decisions, model appropriate leadership behaviors, be knowledgeable, promote professionalism, and create nurturing and supportive climates.

Glickman (1991) emphasizes the role of the principal, not as instructional leader, but as "educational leader who mobilizes the expertise, talent, and care of others" (p. 8). He or she is the person who symbolizes, supports, distributes, and coordinates the work of teachers as instructional leaders. SBM gives principals more authority

in the areas of budget, staffing, and developing educational programs (AASA, NAESP, & NASSP, 1988). The importance of the principal's role in establishing a climate for collaboration requires that he or she exercise even stronger leadership than would be necessary in a school where isolation were the norm (Scott & Smith, 1987).

The theory of instructional leadership has outlived its usefulness (Poplin, 1992). What is needed for the 1990s is transformational leadership which involves development of a collaborative culture, encouraging teacher development, and assisting teachers to solve problems collaboratively (Leithwood, 1992). Herman and Herman (1992) identify the following essential knowledge and skills for practicing administrators today: (a) visioning, which involves strategic planning; (b) communicating with and involving a wide variety of individuals and groups; (c) knowledge of instruction; (d) reflective thinking and decision making; and (e) the use of technology.

Teacher. Murphy (1991) has categorized the changes in teachers' roles in restructured schools into these three areas: (1) expanded responsibilities, (2) new professional roles, and (3) new career opportunities. Some new roles for teachers include (a) colleague, (b) decision maker, (c) leader, and (d) learner. Teachers will have more control over curriculum and instruction and the utilization of resources. The responsibilities for supervision and evaluation of teachers shift from principals to teachers themselves (Lane, 1991). Peer review, interschool

visitations among teachers, and cooperation with the principal in preparing a schedule of inservice sessions will be among the activities in which teachers in restructured schools will be involved.

Annual Plans and Performance Reports

The annual plans and performance report would be included as part of the strategic planning process. Each school should prepare an annual report of the school's performance which would cover the following: descriptions of teachers, students, and programs; explanations of educational outcomes, such as test scores, drop-out rate, and curriculum coverage (Kirst, 1984). Other items that should be included in the annual report are parent and staff survey results, future plans, and budget information (Guthrie, 1986). The council and the principal should play major roles in the preparation of these reports which should be sent to parents, newspapers, and community groups.

Waivers

Waivers are sometimes issued to schools participating in SBM programs when their plans are not consistent with a policy or mandate from the board of education, superintendent, state department of education, or state or federal agency. A means of supporting risk taking is through waivers from rules or regulations (David, 1989, cited in Murphy, 1991). Waivers may be productive in systems which are undergoing "conditional deregulation" (Taylor & Levine, 1991). According to Chris Pipho, director of the clearinghouse/state relations at the Education

Commission of the States, at least fourteen states are willing to waive rules upon request (cited in Dunlap, 1991). Some southern states are included in this count: Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Kentucky law requires each district to establish a policy for waivers of district policy (Kentucky State Department of Education, 1990). Collective bargaining procedures for waivers have been approved in some districts utilizing SBM by both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. For example, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the union and the school district allow SBM councils to request waivers in all areas of the negotiated contract except salary, employee evaluation and discipline, and the grievance process (Robinson & Barkley, 1992).

Steps for Implementation

Prasch (1990) offered the following steps for starting a program of SBM: (1) develop school board policies; (2) develop a mission statement and broad goals at the district level and objectives for accomplishing these at the school level; (3) develop budgeting policies, including how funds are allocated and how the allocations are controlled; (4) determine procedures for allocating personnel; (5) clarify the roles of all personnel; (6) provide great flexibility to teachers in experimenting with methods and materials to meet the broad outlines of the curriculum; and (7) clarify and follow the decision-making process, including who has the

delegated authority to act, who has the major responsibility for implementing the decision, and who may/must be consulted.

Indicators of Successful Implementation of SBM

According to Kaufman (1988) "performance indicators specify the measurable evidence necessary to prove that a planned effort has achieved the desired result" (p. 80). They are used to identify what should be accomplished and to provide criteria for success or failure. Kaufman identifies two types of performance indicators: results-oriented and implementation-oriented. Although results-oriented are best, implementation-oriented indicators can provide information about whether methods, resources, and approaches are being utilized appropriately. The criteria for success of SBM programs currently are related to process rather than results (Clune & White, 1988). For example, the percentage of the operating budget that is allocated to the local schools is one simple indicator of the extent to which decentralization has taken place (Brown, 1987). Majkowski and Fleming (1988) identify other variables: the degree of decentralization of decision making, the flexibility of staffing formulas, how personnel selection and assignment decisions are made, the quality and quantity of community involvement, and whether the shift to SBM was voluntary or mandated.

Clune and White (1988) categorize SBM programs according to the types of decisions which were decentralized: (1) comprehensive SBM, in which decisions

were decentralized in three areas (budget, curriculum, and personnel); (2) decentralized budget and staffing only; (3) decentralization of budget only; and (4) containing elements of decentralized management with no structured decentralization. In this last category, there might be increased discretion in the three areas, but lack of complete authority in any. A program is classified as decentralized budget if budgetary allocations were made at the school site. Personnel is considered to be decentralized if the principal or a SBM council participated in the hiring process through interviewing and making recommendations. The system is categorized as a decentralized curriculum if the school staff or council could make decisions regarding course offerings, course content, or selection of textbooks. Comprehensive SBM implementation usually involves all of the schools in the district.

Herman (1989a) provides the following indicators to measure the success of the governance structure: acceptance of recommendations, impact on programs and students, perceptions of empowerment and positive feelings toward the governance structure, desire to continue the structure, volunteers for membership, consensus of strategic goals and objectives, and development of action plans.

J. Lewis (1989) identifies two approaches to measuring SBM: (a) the traditional approach, which involves selecting traditional or standard indicators and (b) the non-traditional approach, which is based on (1) clear vision,

(2) symbolic actions, and (3) recognition. The traditional evaluation indicators can be either "hard" or "soft." Hard indicators are measured quantitatively: reduction in absenteeism, tardiness, parent complaints, turnover, student discipline referrals, and grievances; increase in goal attainment, teachers' suggestions, teachers' and students' expectations of students, student services, and postsecondary school success of students; and elimination of problems and unnecessary reports. Soft indicators are measured qualitatively: the importance placed on SBM by central office administrators and principals, improved communication, improved supervisory behavior, and improved attitudes/morale. Nontraditional items are also indicators: of increased numbers of teachers recognized for exemplary performance, of hours and dollars spent on training, of pilot studies, of teachers involved on varied team configurations and of staff members initiating changes; of increased practice of visible management, constructive defiance of rules, adoption of successful ideas, and constructive visits by parents or citizens; of increased support for innovations and for employees whose experiments have failed; of elimination of restrictive rules and regulations; of increased efforts to equalize the power between teachers and administrators; of increased use of teacher or student evaluation of intangibles such as culture; and of increased attainment of quality-related goals.

The National School Public Relations Association (1989) offers the following criteria for the success of SBM:

1. Clear communications about who will make which decisions and clearly defined accountability standards exist.

2. The principal has faith in others, can delegate responsibility, and can communicate well with all members of the school community.

3. The principal is accepted by teachers as a valued member of the instructional team.

4. All members of the school community have a voice in the process and a stake in the decision.

5. There is school board and superintendent support.

6. Sufficient time for planning must be provided.

7. Adequate training for principals, teachers and members of the advisory or planning groups is provided.

8. Procedures for two-way communication are established.

Cohen (1983) identifies two norms that are found in successful schools: (1) collegiality, which refers to shared work and many interactions involving a large proportion of the staff, and (2) continuous improvement, an expectation that all teachers will continue to analyze, evaluate, and experiment with instructional practices.

SBM in the Southern States

Legislation

Several states, including Texas, Kentucky, and Florida, have legislation or have legislation pending regarding some

type of SBM (Toch, 1991). Kentucky's Education Reform Act of 1990, the state's new restructuring blueprint, requires that every school in the state have SBM by 1995 unless they meet specific performance standards. This law came in response to the Kentucky Supreme Court's ruling in 1989 that the state's system of school governance and finance was unconstitutional (Harrington-Lueker, 1990). Beginning with the 1991-1992 school year, each school district in the state was required to have at least one school using SBM. Almost a fourth of the 176 districts had to designate a SBM school, because they had no schools in which two-thirds of the faculty voted to implement SBM (Goldman, 1992).

Two teacher unions, in Boone and Johnson Counties, have filed legal challenges to the law (Staff, 1992). Their contention is that, under the law, the school boards do not have the authority to approve school improvement plans.

The composition of local school councils in Kentucky is mandated to include two elected parents, three elected teachers, and the school principal (Van Meter, 1991). The principal serves as chairperson, but has no veto power over council decisions. These councils are given authority by law to develop policies and determine matters in several areas of school operation including the following: determining curriculum, assignment of all staff time, assignment of students to classes and programs, scheduling within the parameters of the calendar year and beginning and ending times as established by the local board, development

of discipline plan and procedures, and selection of cocurricular programs.

Kentucky's Commissioner Boysen has reorganized the department of education to make it more service-oriented as opposed to a regulatory agency (Jennings, 1991). There is no longer a school accreditation program. Management-support and learning-support branches have been established to provide assistance upon request. The learning-results branch will measure outcomes and provide intervention, if necessary.

In 1973, Florida, based upon recommendations from a Blue-Ribbon Citizens' Committee on Education, legislated that an annual plan be drawn up by SBM teams (Florida Department of Education, 1988; Taylor & Levine, 1991). This mandate was funded and implemented in 1974, but it had little impact on decentralizing decision making or encouraging substantial school improvement (Taylor & Levine, 1991). Then, in 1982, the Legislature provided incentives by establishing a SBM grant system. Twenty-one different school districts received grant monies over the next 6 years.

In 1989, the Florida Legislature created a School Site Restructuring Program within the Department of Education (Rogers & Ahearn, 1990). Proposals for restructuring were required to include union-board collaboration and participation of teachers, principals, and other interested parties.

In May, 1991, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 2885, which requires each school district to develop and implement a plan for site-based decision making by September 1, 1992 (Texas Education Code, Section 21.931). These plans must be submitted to the commissioner of education for approval. The plans must establish school committees, and define the roles of the committees in the areas of goal setting, curriculum, budgeting, staffing patterns, and school organization. The school committee must include community representatives. Also, the commissioner is required to arrange for training in site-based decision making for school board trustees, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and other members of school committees.

Senate Bill 2, The School Improvement and Accountability Act, ratified by the 1989 General Assembly of North Carolina, established incentives which serve to encourage school systems to adopt a voluntary performance-based accountability program (North Carolina General Assembly, 1989). According to Murphy (1991), this is the most comprehensive example of statewide deregulation in existence. The law provides for extra funding for differentiated pay for submission of a school improvement plan approved by the State Superintendent. The plan must contain student performance goals for increasing student achievement. Provisions also allow for flexible funding waivers and waivers of state laws, regulations, or policies; there were 1,905 requests in 1991 (Jenkins & Phillips,

1992). According to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (1989), one intent of this bill is to facilitate decentralization of decision making, including the involvement of those closest to the students in making important decisions about instruction. Active involvement of a "substantial" number of teachers, school administrators, and other school staff is required in developing school improvement plans. All 134 school systems in the state provided statements of their intent to participate in this program (North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1989).

In 1977, the South Carolina legislature enacted the Defined Minimum Program Law which combined fiscal reform with new mechanisms for accountability (Marburger, 1985). One part of the accountability component required that a school advisory council be established in every school building. These councils became school improvement councils in 1984 when they acquired greater authority to improve schools. South Carolina utilizes a limited deregulation model, in which only the highest academically achieving schools are released from state requirements on such matters as staffing, class schedules, and class structure.

An ad hoc advisory committee recommended to Alabama's Governor Hunt in March, 1991 an education plan which focused on five key areas, one of which was governance (Alabama Association of School Boards, 1991). One recommendation in this area of governance was to require all schools to be involved in substantive site-based decision making by the

1995-1996 school year. In May, Governor Hunt unveiled the Alabama Education Improvement Act of 1991 (Howell, 1991). A proposal to give school boards more budget flexibility was missing from the plan, as were many of the recommendations dealing with school governance.

Examples of SBM in the Southern States

Dade County, Florida. SBM was introduced in Miami, the fourth largest school district in the country, in 1988. All of the schools in the system were invited to submit proposals which required a two-thirds vote of the faculty (Raywid, 1990). More than 100 schools have become involved in SBM in Dade County within the past 3 years (Glickman, 1991). New schools being built will be SBM from the day they open (Hill & Bonan, 1991). Independent councils include principals and parents but are composed predominantly of teachers (Cetron & Gayle, 1991).

The central office has been drastically reduced, allowing increased funding into the individual schools (Glickman, 1991). The individual schools have discretion over approximately 80 to 90% of their budgets, (Dreyfuss, 1988) as long as they remain within the parameters of state rules (Glickman, 1991). There is, however, a process for requesting a waiver of school-board rules, teacher-labor contract provisions, or state department of education regulations (Raywid, 1990).

Individual schools are also authorized to establish their own governance structures, provided teachers have a significant role in school planning and decision making.

One school had a council with 32 members representing all of the school's constituencies; while another school in the same district had 10 members on its council, all of which were teachers and administrators. Administrative power had not been delegated to the councils or teachers (Hanson, 1990). The administrators are not required to accept all council decisions, but they do approve almost all of them.

Dade County also has Saturn Schools, which are planned from the beginning by teams of teachers and principals (Tornillo, 1992). In addition, the Dade Academy for the Teaching Arts has been established as a staff development and mentoring program. One reason for the success of the SBM programs in Dade County has been attributed to the support they receive from the board of education, the union leadership, and the state government (Dunlap, 1991).

Richardson, Texas. SBM in the Richardson Independent School District utilizes these components: school effectiveness teams, school strategic plans, school-site budgeting, and school performance reports (Carr, 1988). The training of principals includes the following elements: instructional leadership, outcome-based instruction, strategic planning, and team building and group dynamics.

The school effectiveness team is composed of master teachers and the principal. They provide an advisory function to the principal on policy matters, and they are responsible for developing school improvement plans and performance reports.

The principals' authority for school-site budgeting has increased during recent years. The schools receive equitable nonpayroll funds and personnel units, and they may apply for special allotments needed to complete aspects of their action plans.

Jefferson County, Kentucky. One of the largest experiments with SBM in the United States is occurring in Louisville, Kentucky (Cetron & Gayle, 1991). Each school in the Jefferson County Public School System must write a school improvement plan based on school descriptions provided by the district.

Prince William County, Virginia. The Prince William County Public Schools of Virginia initiated SBM in five pilot schools in 1987 and continued with the superintendent's mandate that all schools would move to SBM by July, 1990 (Neal, 1989). The plan gave principals budgetary authority, including hiring of employees, arranging facility cleaning, paying utilities, and allocating instructional funds. Principals are required to adhere to state regulations and accreditation standards, although school board policies and administrative regulations may be waived with prior approval. Changes in the budget can only be made by the superintendent or the director of SBM. Each school must involve teachers, parents, and students on the SBM council (Hill & Bonan, 1991).

Savannah-Chatham County, Georgia. The Savannah-Chatham County Public Schools of Georgia gave 50 principals control

of from $5 million to $10 million each in 1989 (Stover, 1989). In a plan which would be fully implemented over a three-year period, principals began by assuming control of such funding categories as inservice training, instructional supplies, and staff travel. Although the principal retains authority over budget requests, the importance of working with other staff is emphasized.

Sarasota County, Florida. The Sarasota County Public Schools' plan allows for budget requests to be developed by principals, teachers, and parents in all of their 36 schools. A school advisory board, usually composed of parents and a teacher representative, work with the principal in determining school priorities, budget, and staff allocations (Stover, 1989). Another committee, the school management team, is composed mainly of teachers and is charged with assisting the principal in dealing with instructional matters, day-to-day issues, and the development of school improvement plans.

Granville County, North Carolina. Toler-Oak Hill Elementary School in Granville County is one of six pilot sites established by the state of North Carolina for the Lead Teacher Program (Simmons, Webster, Filiatreau, & Bruder, 1991). Two lead teachers work with other teachers, parents, and a representative from the business community in making changes. The program allows schools to waive most state regulations in order to maximize authority at the classroom level. Schools set their own goals and make their own budgets. They are also involved in a merit pay plan

which is based on student achievement. Arkansas is implementing a similar project (Toch, 1991).

Key Largo, Florida. The school system in Key Largo, Florida, has implemented a decentralized management structure which provides more control over decisions to those who will implement those decisions (Caputo, 1980). Teachers participate in decisions regarding budget and curricula.

Knox County and Giles County, Tennessee. School site committees in these districts are made up of the principal and several faculty representatives (National Education Association, 1988). They consider such areas as curriculum, discipline, inservice, and facilities.

Memphis, Tennessee. Governor McWherter's goals for Tennessee's schools of the 21st century include school-based decision making and deregulation (Etheridge, Hall, Brown, & Lucas, 1990). The superintendent of the Memphis schools made a decision to begin the first phase of restructuring efforts in 1989 from the bottom up in seven selected inner-city schools. This was done in collaboration with the National Education Association and the Memphis Education Association. The seven schools were closed, and their staffs resigned. A comprehensive employment process was begun, with the initial screening conducted by the personnel services office. The councils, which were to serve temporarily for the first year, made the final selections. These seven schools are answerable only to the superintendent. Their councils may request waivers of rules

and regulations as needed. The central office staff becomes involved only upon the request of the school and only in a supportive way.

Charleston, South Carolina. Implementation of SBM in Charleston, South Carolina, began in 1982 with 10 pilot schools which were selected through an application process (Beers, 1984). Short and long range plans were required of each school, including needs assessments, goals identification, strategy development, program implementation, and evaluation. Plans were based upon effective schools research. The schools were also required to use local school management teams composed of the principal, teachers, parents, and community support persons. The principal and the management teams received intensive training in management practices. An internal liaison person was assigned to each school and the district to meet with principals monthly to facilitate program development.

Spring Branch, Texas. The Spring Branch Independent School District in Texas has been identified by the National Clearinghouse on SBM as among the top ten school-based management districts in the United States (1991). This district boasts the following accomplishments: increases in students' achievement, SAT scores, and parental involvement; improvement in teacher morale; reduction in dropout rate and mobility rates; and five schools were cited by the United States Department of Education as "Schools of Excellence." Eleven schools in the district received the Texas Governor's Award for Excellence, and the superintendent and assistant

superintendent were voted 2 of the top 100 school administrators in the nation by "School Executive" magazine.

Temple, Texas. The Temple Independent School District in Texas utilized a strategic planning process in 1989, then, in 1990, required individual schools to conduct site planning within the district's strategic context (Psencik, 1991). Each school's planning team was composed of school personnel, parents, and community leaders. During a retreat, these teams defined their beliefs, mission, objectives, and strategies; and then they analyzed strengths and weaknesses of the school's organization.

Site planning was the strategy this district used to decentralize power after the district adoption of a participative management policy. Schools were given local control over budget, curriculum, staff development, assignment of staff, scheduling, program design, and selection and implementation of strategies.

Houston, Texas. Houston's new superintendent, Frank Petruzieto, moved to that position from Dade County where he was an associate superintendent (Dunlap, 1991). He has plans to introduce the Dade County approach to SBM in Houston, even though the SBM regulatory climate in Texas may make SBM implementation more difficult than in Florida.

Pinellas County, Florida. St. Petersburg High School was chosen in 1986 as one of NEA's Mastery in Learning project schools, which involves a site-based decision making (SBDM) process (Tuthill, 1990). With participation of

parents, students, teachers, administrators, and other community members, the school produced a profile, a vision, and a list of needs to achieve that vision. The district's collective bargaining agreement in 1987 took SBDM a step further by providing more flexibility in allocating supplemental salary funds to the administrators and teachers of the 12 schools. Then the 1988 contract provided an agreement between the Pinellas County Teachers Association and the school district to provide resources and support to faculties wishing to participate in SBDM. It also included a provision for waiving contract provisions if necessary. In 1989, a grant program was implemented to encourage SBDM districtwide.

Monroe County, Florida. In 1972, Superintendent Henriquez initiated SBM in the Monroe County School District which was phased in over a five-year period (Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1989). Funds are allocated to schools based upon enrollment and needs. Each school has a decision-making team made up of the principal and professional staff members and an advisory committee composed of parents, teachers, students, and nonparent citizens.

Martin County, Florida. The principals of the Martin County schools make final decisions regarding budget, curriculum, and personnel with input from faculty, staff, and advisory groups (Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1989). The only service that remains centralized in this district is food service.

Springdale, Arkansas. The Springdale Public School District is a member of the State Arkansas Renewal Consortium which is affiliated with the National Consortium under the guidance of John Goodlad (Jones, 1991). Characteristics of renewing institutions which are compatible with SBM include the involvement of all stakeholders and the improvement of the school through shared decision making.

Georgia. Twenty-four public schools in Georgia formed a partnership with the University of Georgia, forming the League of Professional Schools (Allen & Glickman, 1992). Each school developed its own democratic process through which to implement shared governance.

Pasco County, Florida. In Pasco County, all building level administrators and 50 district-level administrators have been trained in "managing productive enterprises" (Snyder et al., 1992). The principals, in turn, train groups of teacher leaders in shared decision-making skills.

Summary

This chapter has provided a brief historical overview of the SBM movement, the major problems that have been encountered in implementing SBM, the major rationales for SBM, key components of SBM, indicators of successful implementation of SBM, legislation related to SBM in the southern states, and examples of SBM implementation in the southern states. Major indicators of effective SBM implementation have been identified through this literature review: the degree of decentralization of decision making;

the quality and quantity of community involvement; extent of voluntary SBM; adequacy of training provided to all stakeholder groups; adequacy of time provided for the responsibilities of SBM; extent of various teacher outcomes; consensus of strategic goals and objectives; implementation of action plans; impact on programs and students; degree of board, superintendent, and central administrator support; and extent of waiver requests. The degree of decentralization is based upon the areas of decentralization (budget, curriculum, personnel, and staff development), the representation of stakeholder groups on the governance councils, and type of authority (advisory or actual) possessed by the governance council. Some of the positive teacher outcomes of SBM include increased collegiality, increased efforts toward continuous improvement, increased freedom to experiment, improved perceptions of empowerment, and increased desire to continue the SBM process. Students are expected to benefit from SBM: higher expectations from both teachers and students; improved discipline, attendance, and punctuality; and improved student performance. Chapter III addresses the study's design, presenting details regarding sample selection, instrument construction, data collection, and data analyses.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the null hypotheses and research questions and the procedures for identifying the population and research sample. It also presents the methodologies used to develop and validate the instruments and the survey procedures for data collection. Finally, it presents the methods that were used to analyze the data.

There were five purposes of this study. The first purpose was to determine the existence of certain procedures and indicators of effective SBM implementation used in the public schools known to be involved in SBM in selected southern states. The second purpose was to determine and compare the attitudes toward SBM of the teachers and principals who were involved in the process in selected southern states. The third was to identify the perceptions of teachers regarding various possible outcomes of SBM implementation and compare them to those of the principals. The fourth was to compare the major concerns of teachers that have arisen since the implementation of SBM to those of the principals. The fifth was to study and compare the perceptions of principals and teachers within each individual school building in order to determine if any

patterns existed. A cross-sectional survey research design was utilized in this study.

Hypotheses

The first five hypotheses and research question 1 were developed to study and compare the various SBM procedures used and the indicators that exist in schools that are implementing SBM. Hypotheses 6, 7, and 8 were tested to determine if a difference exists between the attitudes of teachers and principals toward SBM. Hypothesis 9 and research questions 2 through 4 were used to study the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding the outcomes and benefits of SBM. Research questions 6 and 7 were used to study the responses within the individual schools and to make comparisons among schools.

Hypotheses

H 1. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states in the areas of budget, curriculum, personnel, and staff development.

H 2. There will be no meaningful differences among the stakeholder groups that are represented on the SBM council/team in the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states.

H 3. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states in whether the SBM council/team is advisory or has final decision authority.

H 4. There will be no significant differences among the public schools involved in SBM whether the implementation of SBM was voluntary or mandated in the selected southern states.

H 5. There will be no significant differences in the perceptions of the principals of the public schools participating in SBM in the selected southern states among school board, superintendent, and other central administrators in the degree of support of SBM.

H 6. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not adequate training has been provided.

H 7. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not sufficient time for planning is provided.

H 8. There will be no significant differences between the attitudes of teachers and principals toward SBM in the public schools that are involved in SBM in selected southern states.

H 9. There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding the quality and quantity of community involvement since SBM implementation.

Research Questions

1. To what extent and for what purposes are applications for waivers of school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws made and approval received?

2. How do the perceptions of principals regarding student outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

3. How do the perceptions of principals regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

4. How do the perceptions of principals regarding school outcomes of SBM compare to those of teachers?

5. How do the major concerns of principals regarding the implementation of SBM compare to the major concerns of teachers?

6. How do the perceptions of teachers compare to the perceptions of principals within the individual public schools?

7. What patterns exist in the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers within the selected individual public schools?

Sample

The sampling process involved four steps: (1) identifying schools in the southern states that are involved in SBM, (2) selecting the southern states in which more than 100 SBM schools were identified, (3) selecting a stratified proportional sample of 400 schools from which to survey

principals, and (4) selecting a stratified proportional sample of 40 schools in which to survey all of the teachers. The first step required first identifying schools in the southern states that were involved in SBM.

The state departments of education of the twelve southern states (as defined in Chapter I), the regional educational laboratories, and the National Clearinghouse on School-Based Management were contacted by telephone and were asked to provide the names of school districts and/or schools in their states or service areas which were involved in SBM. Other schools in the southern states were identified as utilizing SBM through the literature review. The school districts were then contacted by telephone and requested to provide names, addresses, and names of the principals of the schools within their districts which were implementing SBM.

A total of 1845 schools representing 229 public school districts in 11 states were identified through these procedures:

State	Districts	SBM schools
Alabama	0	0
Arkansas	4	79
Florida	23	756
Georgia	2	73
Kentucky	176	305
Louisiana	1	79
Mississippi	3	30
North Carolina	6	117
South Carolina	2	83
Tennessee	5	23
Texas	4	214
Virginia	3	86
TOTAL	229	1845

Over 100 schools were designated as utilizing SBM by the above procedure in four of the southern states: Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas. Next, schools were selected from these four states, because it was determined that more information could be gained from states with more experience in the process.

In the third step of the sampling process, 100 schools were selected from each of these four states. The schools in Florida, North Carolina, and Texas were selected by a stratified proportional random sampling procedure based upon the percentage of the state's SBM schools in each district and the proportion of schools that were elementary, middle, and high schools. Since Kentucky has 176 school districts involved in SBM, Kentucky schools were proportionally chosen

based only upon type of schools: elementary, middle, and high schools. Other types of school configurations, such as K-12, vocational/technical, special education, magnet, and adult education, were not included in these samples due to the great diversity of programs.

The fourth step in the sampling process involved selecting 10 schools from each of the four states with 100 or more identified SBM schools for the purpose of surveying teachers. Principals were requested to indicate on their questionnaires their willingness to assist with the teacher survey. Schools were proportionally chosen from among those in which the principals agreed to assist either on their questionnaires or by telephone. Selection was based upon the number of teachers in the building, type of school, and size of the school district. The numbers of teachers in the schools were determined through contacts with the State Departments of Education, state education directories, or contacts to the individual school districts where necessary. All of the teachers in these 40 schools were requested to participate in the survey.

Instrumentation

Two researcher-developed questionnaires were used in this study, one of which was completed by principals and one by teachers. After a careful review of the literature, the following 12 items were identified as indicative of effective SBM implementation: (1) the types of decentralization of decision making - budget, personnel, curriculum, and staff development; (2) the representation

and decision-making authority of stakeholders on the SBM council/team; (3) the quality and quantity of community involvement; (4) the reason for implementing SBM was voluntary or mandated; (5) the adequacy of training; (6) the sufficiency of time for planning; (7) the attainment of teacher outcomes of collegiality, continuous improvement, experimentation, perceptions of empowerment, and desire to continue the governance structure; (8) the attainment of consensus of strategic goals and objectives; (9) the development and implementation of action plans; (10) the attainment of student outcomes of higher expectations, improved discipline, decreased absenteeism/tardiness, and student performance; (11) the degree of school board, superintendent, and other central administrator support; and (12) the extent of utilization of waivers. The items on the questionnaires were written to assess the attitudes of principals and teachers toward SBM and the perceptions of principals and teachers toward the 12 items listed above.

Principal Instrument

The principals' questionnaire was developed to examine four areas: (1) procedures used within the school for implementing SBM and the existence of the above indicators of effective SBM implementation, (2) attitudes toward SBM, (3) perceptions of positive outcomes of SBM implementation, and (4) concerns regarding the implementation of SBM.

Items in checklists were developed to measure the procedures used and some of the indicators of effective SBM implementation. Responses regarding the following items

were collected only from principals: types of decentralization of decision making, stakeholder groups represented on the SBM council/team, whether SBM was voluntarily implemented or mandated, whether or not strategic goals and objectives were established through consensus, and whether or not action plans had been developed and implemented.

Thirty items measuring attitude and perceptions of the outcomes of SBM implementation were constructed using a four-point forced-choice scale format. Subjects were asked to respond to statements regarding their feelings and perceptions with one of the following: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), or strongly agree (4). Four open-ended questions were developed to allow participants to respond to questions regarding how the teachers have benefited from the implementation of SBM, how the students have benefited, for what purposes waivers have been requested and approved, and what concerns they had about the implementation of SBM in their schools.

Demographic information was collected on the schools from which responses were received. Sample principals were requested to provide specific information: "nearness to a university," "number of schools in the district," "type of school--elementary, middle, secondary," "per pupil expenditure of the district," "number of years of participation in SBM."

Teacher Instrument

The teacher's questionnaire was developed to determine the following: (a) attitude toward SBM, (b) perceptions of possible outcomes of SBM implementation, and (c) concerns regarding implementation of SBM. The 27 four-point, forced-choice items on the teachers' questionnaire that measured these attitudes, perceptions, and concerns were identical to those on the principals' questionnaire. There were only three items used on the principals' instrument that were not utilized on the teachers' instrument. These three were questions dealing with the superintendent, school board, and other central administrator support of SBM efforts. The teachers' instrument also contained three open-ended questions regarding teacher benefits and student benefits, and concerns of teachers resulting from SBM implementation. Demographic information collected from teachers included the following: the number of SBM inservice sessions attended, number of hours spent in SBM training, who conducted these inservice sessions, whether or not the respondents were serving on the SBM council/team in their schools, and the number of years of SBM implementation in their schools.

Validity of the Instruments

The questionnaires were evaluated for content validity by a panel of experts who analyzed the adequacy and representativeness of the items and the readability of the instruments. Changes were made as indicated by the panel review. The questionnaires were then field tested in four schools: two elementary, one middle, and one high school.

As a result of field testing, a definition of SBM was added to the instrument. Since no items were changed on the questionnaires, it was determined that a retest was not necessary.

Data Collection

Packets containing the following items were mailed to the superintendents of each district in which schools were selected in the sampling process: (a) a letter from Dr. Jerry Herman and Dr. Janice Herman encouraging participation; (b) a letter from the researcher to the superintendent requesting approval to conduct the survey in his/her district; (c) a letter to principals requesting participation; (d) a principal questionnaire; (e) a letter to teachers requesting participation; (f) a teacher questionnaire; and (g) a stamped, addressed postcard on which the superintendent could indicate approval to conduct the survey in his/her district. Two weeks after the mailing to superintendents, the researcher began telephoning the offices of nonresponding superintendents.

Upon receipt of the postcards indicating superintendent approval, the following items were mailed to the principals of the schools selected in the sampling process: (a) a cover letter from the researcher requesting participation; (b) a principal questionnaire; and (c) a stamped, addressed return envelope. Ten days after the original mailing, a follow-up postcard was sent to nonresponding principals in the sample. Then 10 days after the postcards were sent, a second letter requesting participation and a second

questionnaire were sent to principals who still had not responded.

In the second stage of the survey process, the following items were mailed to the principals of the 40 schools in which teachers were surveyed: (a) a letter to the principal, (b) cover letters to teachers requesting participation, (c) a teacher questionnaire for each teacher in the building, (d) plain white envelopes for teachers' use in assuring anonymity, and (e) a stamped, addressed envelope for the principals' use in returning the teacher questionnaires. Follow-up telephone calls were made to nonresponding principals 10 days after the mailing of the teacher instruments.

Data Analyses

The demographic data on the participating schools are reported by state in actual numbers responding and percentages, in chart form. Percentages, means, and standard deviations were computed to analyze the variables determined to address the procedures used and the indicators of SBM that exist in the schools, attitudes toward SBM, and perceptions of the outcomes of SBM. Chi-square tests were conducted to determine the differences in frequencies between teachers' and principals' responses and differences among respondents in the four states. For the open-ended questions, categorical systems were constructed, responses were categorized, and frequency distributions were computed.

Summary

Nine hypotheses and seven research questions were presented for study. A four-step sampling procedure was utilized in which 400 schools in four states were selected for the principals' survey and 40 schools were selected for the teachers' survey. Two instruments were developed to measure the attitudes of principals and teachers toward SBM and their perceptions toward 12 research-based items that are indicative of effective implementation of SBM. Then, a two-step survey procedure was conducted to collect data from principals and then teachers. Finally, the data was analyzed item by item, and comparisons were made between teacher and principal responses and among states' responses.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The data gathered in this study provided information regarding the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers toward SBM in the selected southern states of Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas. Usable responses were received from 171 principals and 425 teachers in 59 school districts. This represents a response rate of 54.6% for superintendents, 68.4% for principals, and 28.3% for teachers. This chapter contains a presentation of the data collected.

Demographic Data

The following demographic information on the schools was collected from the principals: proximity to a university, number of schools in the district, type of school (elementary, middle, or secondary), per pupil expenditure of the district, and number of years of participation in SBM. Descriptions of these data are presented below.

The proximity of a university to the schools of the responding principals is divided into four ranges. The

principals represented 125 schools that are less than 30 miles from a university (74.0% of those responding), 30 schools that are from 30 to 60 miles from a university (20.7% of those responding), 5 schools that are from 60 to 100 miles from a university (3.0% of those responding), and 4 schools that are more than 100 miles from a university (2.4% of those responding). Two principals did not respond to this item on the questionnaire. Frequencies and percentages for the individual states are provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Number of Miles to Nearest University

No. of miles	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
< 30	23 65.7%	19 73.1%	49 39.2%	34 27.2%	125 74.0%
30-60	9 25.7%	7 26.9%	3 5.5%	16 30.2%	35 20.7%
60-100	2 5.7%	0	1 1.8%	2 3.8%	5 3.0%
>100	1 2.9%	0	2 3.6%	1 1.9%	4 2.4%
n	35	26	55	53	169

The number of schools in the districts of the responding principals is reported in four ranges in Table 2. Twenty of the principals were from districts with fewer than 10 schools representing 11.9% of the respondents, 47 from

districts with from 10 to 20 schools representing 28.0% of the respondents, 30 from districts with from 20 to 50 schools representing 17.9% of the respondents, and 71 from districts with more than 50 schools representing 42.3% of the respondents.

Table 2

Number of Schools in District

Number	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
< 10	1 2.9%	3 11.5%	0	16 30.8%	20 11.9%
10-20	5 14.3%	22 84.6%	0	20 38.5%	47 28.0%
20-50	13 37.1%	1 3.8%	14 25.5%	2 3.8%	30 17.9%
> 50	16 45.7%	0	41 74.5%	14 26.9%	71 42.3%
n	35	26	55	52	168

The types of schools included in this survey were elementary, middle, and high schools. Other kinds of schools were not surveyed due to the great diversity of programs. There were 116 respondents from elementary schools which represented 67.8% of the responding principals, 32 from middle schools which represented 18.7%, and 23 from high schools which represented 13.5%. The frequencies and percentages of each of the three types of schools are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Types of Schools Represented

Type	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Elementary	25 69.4%	16 59.3%	37 67.3%	38 71.7%	116 67.8%
Middle	7 19.4%	5 18.5%	13 23.6%	7 13.2%	32 18.7%
High	4 11.1%	6 22.2%	5 9.1%	8 15.1%	23 13.5%
N	36	27	55	53	171

One hundred forty-two of the principals responded to the item regarding school district per pupil expenditure. There were 48 of these principals or 33.8% from districts which spend less than $2500 per pupil, 88 or 62.0% from districts with a per pupil expenditure between $2500 and $5000, and 6 or 4.2% from districts with over $5000 per pupil expenditure. Frequencies and percentages in each of these ranges for the individual states are provided in Table 4.

The number of years that the schools had participated in SBM ranged from 1 to 18. The mean number of years for the total group was 4.48. Florida had the greatest mean number of years in SBM with 7.09, and Kentucky had the smallest with 2.78. The mean for North Carolina was 3.17, and Texas had a mean number of years in SBM of 5.04. The ranges of years of SBM participation for the individual schools are provided in Table 5.

Table 4

School Districts' Per Pupil Expenditure

Expenditure	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
under $2500	13 41.9%	5 23.8%	12 27.3%	18 39.1%	48 33.8%
$2500-$5000	17 54.8%	14 66.7%	30 68.2%	27 58.7%	88 62.0%
over $5000	1 3.2%	2 9.5%	2 4.5%	1 2.2%	6 4.2%
n	31	21	44	46	142

Table 5

Number of Years of SBM Implementation

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
M	7.0882	3.1667	5.0377	2.7843	4.4815
Range	1-18	1-8	1-12	1-11	1-18
n	34	24	53	51	162

Teachers were requested to respond to demographic items regarding the number of SBM or related topics inservice sessions attended, approximate number of hours spent in training for SBM, who conducted the inservice sessions, whether or not the respondents currently serve on the SBM council/team in their schools, and the number of years SBM has been used in their schools. The first three of these

items are related to Hypothesis 6 and thus will be treated in that section.

Of the 409 teachers responding to the item regarding membership on the SBM council/team, 220 or 53.8% indicated that they were currently serving on the SBM councils/teams in their schools. The remaining 189 or 46.2% indicated that they did not currently serve on the councils/teams in their schools. The frequencies and percentages of teacher respondents who served on SBM councils/teams from the four individual states are provided in Table 6.

Table 6

Respondents Serving on SBM Councils/Teams

Yes/no	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Yes	30 34.1%	77 72.0%	87 64.9%	26 32.5%	220 53.8%
No	58 65.9%	30 28.0%	47 35.1%	54 67.5%	189 46.2%
n	88	107	134	80	409

Chi-square = 50.21, df = 3, p < .001

Among the teacher respondents, the Texas group had the greatest mean number of years of participation in SBM with 3.41. The Florida and North Carolina groups were very similar on this item with means of 2.59 and 2.56, respectively. The Kentucky group had the lowest mean number of years of SBM implementation with 1.56.

Table 7

Number of Years of Teacher Participation in SBM

No. years	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
M	2.5909	2.5588	3.4052	1.5625	2.6154
n	66	102	116	80	364
sd	2.9403	1.0203	1.0793	1.3202	1.6148

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in selected southern states in the areas of budget, curriculum, personnel, and staff development.

The largest number of principals indicated having decentralized decision making at the local school building level in the area of staff development in all the states except Kentucky where staff development was the least frequently cited area. Personnel was the least often cited area for decentralized decision making in the states of Florida, North Carolina, and Texas. However, 83.0% of the responding principals in Kentucky indicated personnel was an area in which they made decisions. Curriculum was the most frequently indicated area of decentralized decision making for Kentucky with a 90.6% response rate. Table 8 provides frequencies and percentages by states for each of the four areas of decentralized decision making.

There was no statistically significant difference among the states in the area of budget when the chi-square

statistic (chi-square = 1.38, df = 3, p > .05) was used. Thus, for these states, the rates at which budget decisions were decentralized to the local school level were similar. Three-fourths of the responding principals indicated that they have budgetary decision making.

There was a significant statistical difference among these four states in whether or not personnel decisions were decentralized to the local school level when the chi-square statistic was used (chi-square = 14.02, df = 3, p < .01). Inspection of the frequencies reported in Table 8 would indicate that the respondents from Kentucky have a much greater capacity to make decisions at the local level in the area of personnel than the respondents from the other three states. North Carolina and Texas had just over half of the principals indicating personnel decision making authority, followed by Florida with 66.7%, while 83.0% of the Kentucky principals indicated personnel decision making.

There was also a significant statistical difference among the states (chi-square = 19.69, df = 3, p < .001) in the area of curriculum. Much greater percentages of the respondents from North Carolina (96.3%) and Kentucky (90.6%) reported using decentralized decision making in the area of curriculum than those from Florida (72.2%) and Texas (63.6%).

There was a significant statistical difference among the states (chi-square = 12.91, df = 3, p < .05) in the area of staff development. Greater percentages of respondents from Florida (88.9%), North Carolina (100%), and Texas

(90.9%) reported using decentralized decision making in the area of staff devleopment than Kentucky (73.6%).

Table 8

Frequencies, Percentages, and Chi-Square Analyses of Areas of Decentralized Decisions

Area	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Budget	28 77.8%	18 66.7%	43 78.2%	40 75.5%	129 75.4%
Chi-square = 1.38, df = 3, p > .05					
Personnel	24 66.7%	14 51.9%	29 52.7%	44 83.0%	111 64.9%
Chi-square = 14.02, df = 3, p < .01					
Curriculum	26 72.2%	26 96.3%	35 63.6%	48 90.6%	135 78.9%
Chi-square = 19.69, df = 3, p < .001					
Staff development	32 88.9%	27 100%	50 90.9%	39 73.6%	148 86.5%
Chi-square = 12.91, df = 3, p < .05					
N	36	27	55	53	171

Further data that is included in Table 9 suggest that about one-third of the schools in the states of Florida, North Carolina, and Texas utilize decentralized decision making in all four areas. Nearly half of the principals from Kentucky indicated use of decentralized decision making in all four areas. Only three principals from among all of the respondents indicated that they have decentralized decision making in only one area. Two areas for

decentralized decision making were cited by 22.8% of all of the responding principals, and three areas by 34.0%.

Table 9

Combinations of Areas of Decentralized Decision Making: Budget (B), Personnel (P), Curriculum (C), Staff Development (SD)

Areas	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
No areas	1 2.8%	0	3 5.5%	0	4 2.3%
B only	1 2.8%	0	0	0	1 0.6%
P only	0	0	0	0	0
C only	0	0	0	0	0
SD only	0	1 3.7%	1 1.8%	0	2 1.2%
B & P	2 5.6%	0	1 1.8%	4 7.5%	7 4.1%
B & C	0	0	1 1.8%	1 1.9%	2 1.2%
B & SD	1 2.8%	0	7 12.7%	0	8 4.7%
P & C	0	0	0	4 7.5%	4 2.3%
P & SD	1 2.8%	0	3 5.5%	0	4 2.3%
C &SD	2 5.6%	4 14.8%	3 5.5%	5 9.4%	14 8.2%
B, P, & C	0	0	0	5 9.4%	5 2.9%
B, C, & SD	7 19.4%	8 29.6%	11 20.0%	3 5.7%	29 17.0%
B, P, & SD	4 11.1%	0	5 9.1%	1 1.9%	10 5.9%

Table 9 (continued)

Areas	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
P, C, & SD	4 11.1%	4 14.8%	2 3.6%	4 7.5%	14 8.2%
B, P, C, & SD	13 36.1%	10 37.0%	18 32.7%	26 49.1%	67 39.2%
N	36	27	55	53	171

Hypothesis 2: There will be no meaningful differences among the stakeholder groups that are represented on the SBM council/team in the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states.

All of the responding principals indicated that administrators served on the SBM councils/teams, and over 96% of the principals from each of the four states indicated that teachers served. Parents are considered a vital part of the SBM council/team in all states except North Carolina. North Carolina was the only state in which fewer than 96% of the respondents indicated that parents serve on their councils/ teams where the inclusion rate was 70.4%.

Nonprofessional staff, however, were not considered as important, because they were included only at a rate of 57.2%. Interestingly, though, North Carolina included nonprofessionals at a higher rate (81.5%) than they included parents. There appeared to be a great deal of variability among the four states in whether or not nonprofessional staff members served on the SBM councils/teams.

For the four remaining stakeholder groups, business representatives were included most frequently; they were included on 33.7% of the councils represented according to principal responses. The business community was closely followed by students and nonparental community members who were included at a rate of 29.5% each. The least often cited group of participants on SBM councils were the college people who served on 5.4% of the councils represented by the principals' responses.

The profiles for the states in Table 10 looked somewhat different regarding the inclusion of the various groups of stakeholders on the SBM councils/teams. Kentucky appeared to be much different from the other three states in this area in that they had much lower frequencies of inclusion of all stakeholder groups other than administrators, teachers, and parents except for North Carolina's rate of parental inclusion. The composition of the Kentucky councils is prescribed by law: two elected parents, three elected teachers, and the principal.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences among the public schools in the selected southern states implementing SBM in whether the SBM council/team is advisory or has final decision authority.

When the chi-square statistic was used (chi-square = 43.27, $df = 6$, $p < .001$), there was a significant statistical difference among the states in whether the SBM council/team was advisory or had actual decision-making authority. Inspection of the frequencies of responses would

Table 10

Stakeholder Groups Represented on Governance Councils

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Administrators	35 100%	27 100%	52 100%	52 100%	166 100%
Teachers	34 97.1%	27 100%	50 96.2%	51 98.1%	162 97.6%
Students	19 54.3%	9 33.3%	15 28.8%	6 11.5%	49 29.5%
Parents	35 100%	19 70.4%	52 100%	50 96.2%	156 94.0%
Nonprofes-sional staff	26 74.3%	22 81.5%	31 59.6%	16 30.8%	95 57.2%
Nonparental community	13 37.0%	2 7.4%	31 59.6%	3 5.8%	49 29.5%
Business represen-tatives	27 77.1%	7 25.9%	20 38.5%	2 3.8%	56 33.7%
College people	3 8.6%	0	4 7.7%	2 3.8%	9 5.4%
Number of respondents	35	27	52	52	166

indicate that Florida had a much higher percentage of councils which were advisory (62.9%), while Kentucky had a much higher percentage which had actual decision-making authority (84.3%). The Kentucky law provides the councils with authority to develop policies in several areas. Although the principal serves as chairperson, he does not have veto power.

It was indicated that over one-half of the councils of North Carolina and Texas have decision-making authority. Although both was not a response choice on the questionnaire, nearly 12% of the respondents wrote in that their councils served as both advisory and decision-making bodies.

Table 11

Advisory or Decision-Making Authority of SBM Council

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Advisory	22 62.9%	8 29.6%	10 19.6%	5 9.8%	45 27.4%
Decision-making authority	13 37.1%	14 51.9%	30 58.8%	43 84.3%	100 61.0%
Both	0	5 18.5%	11 21.6%	3 5.9%	19 11.6%
Number of respondents	35	27	51	51	164

Chi-square = 43.27, df = 6, p < .001

Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant differences among the public schools involved in SBM in the selected southern states in whether the implementation of SBM was voluntary or mandated.

There was a significant statistical difference among the states when the chi-square statistic (chi-square = 76.30, df = 9, p < .001) was used to test this hypothesis. The data in Table 12 shows that the decision to implement

SBM was mandated for the great majority of schools in Florida (62.9%) and Texas (86.3%) that are represented by this study, while it was voluntary for the great majority in North Carolina (70.4%) and Kentucky (88.7%) as indicated by the responses of principals. At the time of this survey, the Kentucky schools had been given the opportunity to voluntarily participate in SBM in many districts. However, all schools in Kentucky not meeting performance standards will be mandated to implement SBM by 1995.

Table 12

Voluntary or Mandated SBM Implementation

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Voluntary	13 37.1%	19 70.4%	7 13.7%	47 88.7%	86 51.8%
Mandated	22 62.9%	8 29.6%	44 86.3%	6 11.3%	80 48.2%
Number responding	35	27	51	53	166

Chi-square = 76.30, df = 9, $p < .001$

Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant differences in the perception of the principals of the public schools participating in SBM in the selected southern states among school board, superintendent, and other central administrators in the degree of support of SBM.

Three items were used to gather data for this hypothesis. There were no significant statistical

differences among the states on the items regarding superintendent support (chi-square = 12.81, df = 9, p > .05) and other central administrator support (chi-square = 14.43, df = 9, p > .05) when the chi-square statistic was used. The great majority of respondents agreed that the superintendent (91.0%) and other central administrators (90.9%) support their SBM efforts. There was, however, a significant statistical difference among the states on their responses to the item regarding school board support of SBM (chi-square = 18.72, df = 9, p < .05).

In viewing the frequencies of responses for this item in Table 13, it was noted that only one respondent (representing 4.0%) from North Carolina disagreed with the statement about school board support, while 10 respondents (19.6%) from Kentucky disagreed with the statement. Another difference appeared to be in the degree to which respondents agreed with the statement. For example, 70.6% of the Florida respondents agreed and 17.6% strongly agreed; and among Texas respondents, 41.5% agreed and 47.2% strongly agreed. When the agree and strongly agree responses were combined, the percentage rate of agreement for these two states was very similar.

Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not adequate training has been provided.

There were significant statistical differences between the perceptions of teachers and principals (chi-square =

Table 13

School Board, Superintendent, and Other Central Administrator Support of SBM

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
School board:					
SD	1 (2.9%)	0	0	0	1 (0.6%)
D	3 (8.8%)	1 (4.0%)	6 (11.3%)	10 (19.6%)	20 (12.3%)
A	24 (70.6%)	15 (60.0%)	22 (41.5%)	19 (37.3%)	80 (49.1%)
SA	6 (17.6%)	9 (36.0%)	25 (47.2%)	22 (43.1%)	62 (38.0%)
Mean	3.0294	3.3200	3.3585	3.000	3.2454
Std. dev.	.6269	.5568	.6820	.7639	.6646
Chi-square = 18.72, $p < .05$					
Superintendent:					
SD	1 (2.8%)	0	0	2 (3.9%)	3 (1.8%)
D	3 (8.3%)	0	4 (7.5%)	5 (9.8%)	12 (7.2%)
A	20 (55.6%)	14 (53.8%)	19 (35.8%)	22 (43.1%)	75 (45.2%)
SA	12 (33.3%)	12 (46.2%)	30 (56.6%)	22 (43.1%)	76 (45.8%)
Mean	3.1944	3.4615	3.3636	3.2549	3.3077
Std. dev.	.7099	.5084	.9101	.7961	.7792
Chi-square = 12.81, $p > .05$					
Other central administrator:					
SD	1 (2.9%)	0	0	0	1 (0.6%)
D	5 (14.3%)	0	2 (3.8%)	7 (14.0%)	14 (8.5%)
A	21 (60.0%)	18 (69.2%)	30 (56.5%)	29 (58.0%)	98 (59.8%)
SD	8 (22.9%)	8 (30.8%)	21 (39.6%)	14 (28.0%)	51 (31.1%)
Mean	3.0286	3.3077	3.3585	3.1400	3.2134
Std. dev.	.7065	.4707	.5580	.6392	.6144
Chi-square = 14.43, $p > .05$					

13.23, df = 4, $p < .05$) and among states (chi-square = 34.84, df = 9, $p < .001$) when the chi-square statistics were used. Of the responding principals, 34.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that adequate training had been provided; while 24.0% of the responding teachers either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The principals responded with agreement in 65.3% of the cases, and 76.0% of the teachers either agreed or strongly agreed.

The Kentucky respondents had the highest percentage of agreement that adequate training for SBM had been provided with 76.3% of them agreeing or strongly agreeing that adequate training had been provided. North Carolina respondents had the lowest rate of agreement with 67.4%. There were also differences in the degrees of agreement and disagreement. For example, no principals from Florida strongly disagreed, while four (7.3%) of the Texas principals strongly disagreed. Among the Texas respondents, 24.6% strongly agreed, but only 5.2% of the North Carolina respondents strongly agreed.

In general, the principals appeared to feel more strongly than teachers that more training in SBM was needed, except in Florida, where the principals and teachers had very similar perceptions. The Kentucky teachers, as a group, apparently felt the least dissatisfied with the degree of training they had received in SBM implementation. Data regarding principal and teacher perceptions of adequate training for SBM are shown in Table 14.

Table 15 shows that there were large differences in the mean number of hours spent in training sessions for SBM among the states and between teachers and principals. The Florida principals had spent the greatest mean number of hours in SBM training with nearly 72 hours, but the Florida teachers had the smallest mean number of hours of training at less than 9 hours. The responding principals from North Carolina had spent on the average nearly 22 hours in training for SBM. The largest mean number of hours of training for teachers was for Texas respondents with just over 17 hours. The principals had spent many more hours in training sessions for SBM than teachers, while they felt more strongly that more SBM training was needed.

There was some variability among the groups of respondents in the number of SBM inservice sessions attended. Frequencies and percentages are provided in Table 16 for the following possible responses: none, one, two to five, and more than five. In general, greater percentages of teachers reported attending both zero SBM inservice sessions and more than five inservice sessions than principals. The Florida teachers group had the greatest percentage who indicated that they had attended no SBM inservice sessions with 31.8%, while the Texas teacher group reported attending more than five inservice sessions at a rate of 55.9%. The Kentucky teachers reported attending from two to five inservice sessions at the rate of 60.8%. It appeared that less importance is placed on SBM training in Florida than the other states by the fact that 18.1% of

Table 14

Perceptions of Adequate Training in SBM Process

		FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD	principal	0	2 8.0%	4 7.3%	2 3.9%	8 4.8%
SD	teacher	4 5.5%	3 2.7%	8 5.9%	3 3.8%	18 4.5%
D	principal	11 30.6%	9 36.0%	14 25.5%	16 31.4%	50 29.9%
D	teacher	17 23.3%	30 27.3%	21 15.4%	10 12.5%	78 19.5%
A	principal	18 50.0%	12 48.0%	24 43.6%	21 41.2%	75 44.9%
A	teacher	41 56.2%	72 65.5%	73 53.7%	42 52.5%	228 57.1%
SA	principal	7 19.4%	2 8.0%	13 23.6%	12 23.5%	34 20.4%
SA	teacher	11 15.1%	5 4.5%	34 25.0%	25 31.3%	75 18.8%
Principal *M*		2.8889	2.5600	2.8182	2.8431	2.8084
Teacher *M*		2.7808	2.7182	2.8897	3.0750	2.9023
State *M*		2.8165	2.6889	2.8691	2.9847	2.8428
Principal *sd*		.7082	.7681	.9248	.8336	
Teacher *sd*		.8036	.5925	.8492	.7920	
State *sd*		.7718	.6285	.8697	.8132	.7904
n principal		36	25	55	51	167
n teacher		73	110	136	80	399
n total		109	135	191	131	566

By state, chi-square = 34.84, *df* = 9, *p* < .001
By teacher/principal, chi-square = 13.23, *df* = 4, *p* < .05

Table 15

Hours Spent in SBM Training

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
M principal	71.79	21.78	27.64	31.50	36.90
M teacher	8.61	13.31	17.30	10.91	12.90
Ranges					
principal	0-50	0-75	4-100	0-70	
teacher	0-132	0-100	0-50	0-36	
n principals	29	23	45	46	143
n Teachers	80	95	100	68	343

the principals and 48.8% of the teachers had only attended one or no inservice sessions on SBM. It was indicated, however, that training is very important in the states of Texas and Kentucky where over 85% of principals and teachers have attended two or more inservice sessions on SBM or related topics.

According to teacher responses, the largest proportion of presenters of SBM inservice sessions for teachers in North Carolina, Texas, and Kentucky have been their principals and other teachers; however, the most frequently cited group of presenters by Florida respondents were central office persons. As noted in Table 17, Kentucky and North Carolina had much larger percentages of inservice sessions for teachers conducted by their state departments of education than those from Florida and Texas. There

Table 16

Number of SBM Inservice Sessions Attended

No. Attended	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
0 attended					
Principal	3	2	2	2	9
	9.0%	7.7%	3.9%	3.8%	5.6%
Teacher	28	11	14	9	62
	31.8%	10.2%	10.3%	11.4%	15.1%
1 attended					
Principal	3	3	3	2	11
	9.1%	11.5%	5.9%	3.8%	6.8%
Teacher	15	4	5	1	25
	17.0%	3.7%	3.7%	1.3%	6.1%
2-5 attended					
Principal	12	13	27	32	84
	36.4%	50.0%	52.9%	61.5%	51.9%
Teacher	32	49	41	48	170
	36.4%	45.4%	30.1%	60.8%	41.4%
> 5 attended					
Principal	15	8	19	16	58
	45.5%	30.8%	37.3%	30.8%	35.8%
Teacher	13	44	76	21	154
	14.8%	40.7%	55.9%	26.6%	37.5%
n principals	33	26	51	52	162
n teachers	88	108	136	79	411
n total	121	134	187	131	573

appeared to be a great deal of variance among the states in the percentages of sessions conducted by the various groups.

Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of

Table 17

Presenters of SBM Inservice Sessions For Teachers

Presenters	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Teacher	18 15.5%	56 24.3%	83 31.7%	28 17.4%	185 24.1%
Principal	24 20.7%	80 34.8%	82 31.3%	47 29.2%	233 30.3%
C. O. person	50 43.1%	29 12.6%	59 22.5%	24 14.9%	162 21.1%
State Dept.	3 2.6%	19 8.3%	2 0.8%	27 16.8%	51 6.6%
University	8 6.9%	29 12.6%	10 3.8%	16 9.9%	63 8.2%
Other	13 11.2%	17 7.4%	26 9.9%	19 11.8%	75 9.8%
Total	116	230	262	161	769

teachers regarding whether or not sufficient time for planning is provided.

Two items were used to gather data for this hypothesis, one regarding whether sufficient time for the additional SBM responsibilities was provided and one regarding whether additional planning time had been provided since SBM implementation. There was no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of teachers and principals (chi-square = 8.53, $df = 4$, $p > .05$) on the item dealing with additional planning time since SBM implementation. However, there were significant statistical differences among the states on this item when the chi-

square statistic was used (chi-square = 32.46, df = 9, p < .001). Also, there were significant statistical differences both among the states (chi-square = 36.59, df = 9, p < .001) and between teachers and principals (chi-square = 13.78, df = 4, p < .05) on the item dealing with sufficient time for SBM responsibilities.

The majority of respondents from each of the four states indicated disagreement with the statement that additional time for planning had been provided since the implementation of SBM. The percentage of respondents that disagreed or strongly disagreed, however, varied among the states. The Kentucky group had the highest rate of disagreement with 79% of respondents indicating that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. The Texas group was lowest with 55% of respondents indicating that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. Frequencies and percentages for each group of principals and teachers are provided in Table 18.

The great majority of respondents from each of the four states indicated disagreement with the statement that sufficient time was allotted for SBM responsibilities, again with the percentage of disagreement varying from 67% in Texas to 81% in North Carolina. Inspection of the data in Table 19 indicated that the differences between teacher and principal responses were largely due to degree of agreement or disagreement.

Hypothesis 8: There will be no significant differences between the attitudes of teachers and principals toward SBM

Table 18

Sufficient Time for Planning: Additional Planning Time

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	5 (14.7%)	7 (26.9%)	9 (16.7%)	17 (32.2%)	38 (22.8%)
SD teacher	22 (30.6%)	24 (22.4%)	33 (24.4%)	26 (32.9%)	105 (26.7%)
D principal	18 (52.9%)	14 (53.8%)	22 (40.7%)	23 (43.4%)	77 (46.1%)
D teacher	33 (45.8%)	54 (50.5%)	40 (29.6%)	38 (48.1%)	165 (42.0%)
A principal	10 (29.4%)	2 (7.7%)	21 (38.9%)	9 (17.0%)	42 (25.1%)
A teacher	15 (20.8%)	28 (26.2%)	48 (35.6%)	11 (13.9%)	102 (26.0%)
SA principal	1 (2.9%)	3 (11.5%)	2 (3.7%)	4 (7.5%)	10 (6.0%)
SA teacher	2 (2.8%)	1 (0.9%)	14 (10.4%)	4 (5.1%)	21 (5.3%)
State *M*	2.0377	2.0526	2.3122	1.9470	2.1125
Principal *M*	2.2059	2.0385	2.2962	2.0000	2.1437
Teacher *M*	1.9583	2.0561	2.3185	1.9114	2.0992
State *sd*	.7798	.7619	.9126	.8499	.8500
Principal *sd*	.7298	.9157	.7922	.8987	.8379
Teacher *sd*	.7950	.7247	.9593	.8195	.8558

By state - Chi-square = 32.46, *df* = 9, *p* < .001
By T/P - Chi-square = 8.53, *df* = 4, *p* > .05

Table 19

Sufficient Time for Planning: Adequate Time for SBM Responsibilities

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	5 (15.2%)	6 (23.1%)	13 (24.5%)	23 (45.1%)	47 (28.8%)
SD teacher	12 (17.4%)	19 (17.9%)	40 (30.3%)	25 (32.1%)	96 (24.9%)
D principal	17 (51.5%)	15 (57.7%)	25 (47.2%)	16 (31.4%)	73 (44.8%)
D teacher	35 (50.7%)	67 (63.2%)	36 (44.9%)	30 (38.5%)	178 (46.2%)
A principal	11 (33.3%)	3 (11.5%)	12 (22.6%)	9 (17.6%)	35 (21.5%)
A teacher	21 (30.4%)	20 (18.9%)	40 (30.3%)	21 (26.9%)	102 (26.5%)
SA principal	0	2 (7.7%)	3 (5.7%)	3 (5.9%)	8 (4.9%)
SA teacher	1 (1.4%)	0	6 (4.5%)	2 (2.6%)	9 (2.3%)
State M	2.1667	2.0152	2.0919	1.9380	2.0511
Principal M	2.1818	2.0385	2.0943	1.8431	2.0245
Teacher M	2.1594	2.0094	2.0909	2.000	2.0623
State sd	.7048	.6536	.8705	.8728	.7960
Principal sd	.6826	.8237	.8381	.9246	.8385
Teacher sd	.7200	.6094	.8863	.8374	.7781

By state - Chi-square = 36.59, df = 9, p < .001
By T/P - Chi-square = 13.78, df = 4, p < .05

in the public schools that are involved in SBM in selected southern states.

When the chi-square statistic was used (chi-square = 16.10, df = 9, $p > .05$), there was no significant statistical difference among the states in responses to the item regarding attitude toward continuing SBM. However, there was a significant statistical difference between the responses of the principals and teachers on this item (chi-square = 22.30, df = 4, $p < .001$). Of the total number of principal respondents, only 4.2% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement; while 13.5% of the teacher respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed.

There were significant statistical differences both among the states (chi-square = 20.25, df = 9, $p < .05$) and between the teachers and principals (chi-square = 32.94, df = 4, $p < .001$) on the item which was used to gather data regarding perceptions of positive outcomes of SBM. There were also significant statistical differences both among the states (chi-square = 20.83, df = 9, $p < .05$) and between principals and teachers (chi-square = 25.92, df = 4, $p < .001$) on the item regarding perceptions of whether or not SBM was worthwhile. A larger percentage of teachers (15.8%) than principals (3.6%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with both of the statements concerning whether there had been positive outcomes of SBM implementation and whether SBM is worthwhile relative to the amount of time and responsibility required. On both of these items, the respondents from

Florida and Kentucky had higher percentages of agreement than those from North Carolina and Texas. In no state was there less than 77% agreement on either of these two statements.

Data regarding teacher and principal perceptions of positive outcomes of SBM are provided in Table 20. Data regarding teacher and principal perceptions of whether or not SBM is worthwhile relative to the amount of time and responsibility required are shown in Table 21. Table 22 shows data regarding principal and teacher desire to continue the SBM process.

Hypothesis 9: There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding the quality and quantity of community involvement since SBM implementation.

Three items were used to gather data for this hypothesis. On two of those three items, there was no significant statistical difference among states when the chi-square statistic was used. There was a significant statistical difference among the states on the third item, and there were significant statistical differences between teachers and principals on all three items.

On the item dealing with a decrease in parent complaints, there was no significant statistical difference by state (chi-square = 11.13, df = 9, $p > .05$). In Florida, 67.4% of all respondents agreed that there had been a decrease in parent complaints; 59.0% in North Carolina; 55.8% in Texas; and 52.3% in Kentucky. However, 69% of all

Table 20

Teacher and Principal Attitudes Toward SBM: Positive Outcomes

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (2.9%)	0	0	0	1 (0.6%)
SD teacher	2 (2.6%)	4 (3.7%)	5 (3.7%)	2 (2.5%)	13 (3.3%)
D principal	1 (2.9%)	1 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (4.0%)	5 (3.0%)
D teacher	7 (9.0%)	16 (15.0%)	22 (16.4%)	5 (6.3%)	50 (12.5%)
A principal	15 (42.9%)	18 (69.2%)	33 (61.1%)	25 (50.0%)	91 (55.2%)
A teacher	45 (57.7%)	67 (62.6%)	79 (59.0%)	45 (56.3%)	23 (59.1%)
SA principal	18 (51.4%)	7 (26.9%)	20 (37.0%)	23 (46.0%)	68 (1.2%)
SA teacher	24 (30.8%)	20 (18.7%)	28 (20.9%)	28 (35.0%)	100 (25.1%)
State M	3.2478	3.0150	3.0798	3.3077	3.1492
Principal M	3.5122	3.2308	3.3519	3.4200	3.3697
Teacher M	3.1667	2.9626	2.9701	3.2375	3.0602
State sd	.7016	.6740	.6930	.6452	.6873
Principal sd	.6753	.5144	.5197	.5746	.5762
Teacher sd	.6916	.6994	.7249	.6796	.7099

By state - Chi-square = 20.25, df = 9, p < .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 32.94, df = 4, p < .001

Table 21

Teacher and Principal Attitudes Toward SBM: SBM Worthwhile

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (5.6%)	0	0	1 (1.9%)	3 (1.8%)
SD teacher	6 (7.7%)	3 (2.8%)	17 (12.9%)	3 (3.8%)	29 (7.3%)
D principal	0	0	3 (5.6%)	9 (17.3%)	12 (7.1%
D teacher	7 (9.0%)	22 (20.4%)	23 (17.4%)	6 (7.6%)	58 (21.9%)
A principal	14 (38.9%)	19 (73.1%)	34 (63.0%)	29 (55.8%)	96 (57.1%)
A teacher	47 (60.3%)	68 (63.0%)	67 (50.8%)	46 (58.2%)	228 (57.4%)
SA principal	20 (55.6%)	7 (26.9%)	17 (31.5%)	13 (25.0%)	57 (33.9%)
SA teacher	18 (23.1%)	15 (13.9%)	25 (18.9%)	24 (30.4%)	82 (20.7%)
State M	3.1316	2.9552	2.8877	3.1184	3.0088
Principal M	3.4444	3.2692	3.2000	3.0385	3.3313
Teacher M	3.0256	2.8796	2.7576	3.1519	2.9144
State sd	.8148	.6473	.8757	.7617	.9559
Principal sd	.7725	.4523	.7045	.7129	
Teacher sd	.7203	.6658	.9090	.7177	.7994

By state - Chi-square = 20.83, df = 9, p < .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 25.92, df = 4, p < .001

Table 22

Teacher and Principal Attitudes Toward SBM: Desire to Continue

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (5.6%)	0	0	0	2 (1.2%)
SD teacher	2 (2.6%)	2 (1.8%)	9 (6.8%)	3 (3.9%)	16 (4.0%)
D principal	0	0	1 (1.9%)	4 (7.8%)	5 (3.0%)
D teacher	6 (7.7%)	19 (17.3%)	14 (10.5%)	5 (6.5%)	44 (11.1%)
A principal	11 (30.6%)	17 (65.4%)	22 (41.5%)	25 (49.0%)	75 (45.2%)
A teacher	42 (53.8%)	49 (44.5%)	75 (56.4%)	26 (33.8%)	192 (48.2%)
SA principal	23 (63.9%)	9 (34.6%)	30 (56.6%)	22 (43.1%)	84 (50.6%)
SA teacher	28 (35.9%)	40 (36.4%)	35 (26.3%)	43 (55.8%)	146 (36.7%)
State M	3.3246	3.1912	3.1720	3.3906	3.2651
Principal M	3.5278	3.3462	3.5472	3.3529	3.4518
Teacher M	3.2308	3.1545	3.0602	3.4156	3.1759
State sd	.7347	.6613	.7783	.7234	.7355
Principal sd	.7741	.4852	.5394	.6269	.6185
Teacher sd	.7011	.6932	.8235	.7839	.7802

By state - Chi-square = 16.10, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 22.30, df = 4, p < .001

the principals agreed or strongly agreed that parent complaints had decreased since SBM implementation, while only 53% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with that statement.

There was no significant statistical difference among the states on their responses to the item dealing with an increase in constructive visits by parents/community members (chi-square = 10.48, df = 9, $p > .05$). The respondents from Florida agreed that there had been an increase in constructive visits by parents/community members since SBM implementation at a rate of 76.2%; respondents from North Carolina agreed at a rate of 66.9%; Texas respondents agreed at a rate of 66.9%; and Kentucky respondents agreed at a rate of 59.8%. However, 64% of the teachers overall agreed or strongly agreed that there had been an increase in constructive visits, while 74% of the principals agreed or strongly agreed.

On the item dealing with parents enjoying serving on the school council, there were significant statistical differences both among states (chi-square = 20.71, df = 9, $p < .05$) and between teachers and principals (chi-square = 17.44, df = 4, $p < .01$). Of the responding principals, 89% agreed or strongly agreed that parents enjoy serving on the council, while 79% of the responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed. Among the respondents from Kentucky, 89% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while 71% of those from North Carolina agreed or strongly agreed. Texas and Florida had 83% and 87% agreement rates respectively.

Table 23 provides information regarding principal and teahcer perceptions of whether or not parental complaints have been reduced since SBM implementation. Data regarding principal and teacher perceptions of whether or not there has been an increase in constructive visits by the community are included in Table 24. Data regarding principal and teacher perceptions of whether or not parents enjoy serving on the council are given in Table 25.

Research Question 1: To what extent and for what purposes are applications for waivers of school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws made and approval received?

Of the total number of respondents to the item regarding whether or not the school had requested waivers, only 29% of the principals responded affirmatively. When the chi-square statistic was used (chi-square = 20.64, df = 9, $p < .05$), there was a significant statistical difference among the states in the number of responding principals whose schools had requested waivers. It was noted from the frequencies and percentages reported in Table 26 that North Carolina had a much higher percentage of requests for waivers with 59% indicating that their schools had requested waivers. The percentage rate of the affirmatively responding principals from the other states were: Florida, 21%; Texas, 26%; and Kentucky, 21%.

The greatest number of requests for waivers reported by the responding principals was for matters dealing with the school calendar or scheduling. These made up 37% of the

Table 23

Quality and Quantity of Community Involvement: Fewer Complaints

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	0	0	0	1 (2.2%)	1 (0.7%)
SD teacher	5 (8.6%)	4 (4.2%)	10 (9.1%)	2 (3.1%)	21 (6.4%)
D principal	5 (14.7%)	10 (38.5%)	13 (24.5%)	20 (43.5%)	48 (30.2%)
D teacher	20 (34.5%)	36 (37.5%)	49 (44.5%)	30 (46.2%)	135 (41.0%)
A principal	26 (76.5%)	12 (46.2%)	35 (66.0%)	22 (47.8%)	95 (59.7%)
A teacher	30 (51.7%)	54 (56.3%)	48 (43.6%)	27 (41.5%)	159 (48.3%)
SA principal	3 (8.8%)	4 (15.4%)	5 (9.4%)	3 (6.5%)	15 (9.4%)
SA teacher	3 (5.2%)	2 (2.1%)	3 (2.7%)	6 (9.2%)	14 (4.3%)
State M	2.6848	2.4590	2.5460	2.5766	2.5943
Principal M	2.9412	2.7692	2.8491	2.5870	2.7799
Teacher M	2.5345	2.5625	2.4000	2.5692	2.5046
State sd	.6782	.6447	.6868	.6816	.6716
Principal sd	.4887	.7104	.5683	.6524	.6126
Teacher sd	.7307	.6124	.6933	.7064	.6813

By state - Chi-square = 11.13, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 30.20, df = 4, p < .001

Table 24

Quality and Quantity of Community Involvement: More Constructive Visits

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (2.9%)	1 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (4.0%)	5 (3.0%)
SD teacher	4 (6.1%)	5 (4.9%)	10 (8.2%)	3 (4.2%)	22 (6.1%)
D principal	3 (8.6%)	6 (23.1%)	11 (20.8%)	17 (34.0%)	37 (22.6%)
D teacher	16 (24.2%)	27 (26.5%)	36 (29.5%)	27 (37.5%)	106 (29.3%)
A principal	27 (77.1%)	16 (61.5%)	29 (54.7%)	24 (48.0%)	96 (58.5%)
A teacher	36 (54.5%)	59 (57.8%)	63 (51.6%)	34 (47.2%)	192 (53.0%)
SA principal	4 (11.4%)	3 (11.5%)	12 (22.6%)	7 (14.0%)	26 (15.9%)
SA teacher	10 (15.2%)	11 (10.8%)	13 (10.7%)	8 (11.1%)	42 (11.6%)
State M	2.8515	2.7578	2.7486	2.6803	2.7548
Principal M	2.9714	2.8077	2.8077	2.7200	2.8720
Teacher M	2.7879	2.7451	2.6475	2.6528	2.7017
State sd	.7125	.7071	.7766	.7415	.7398
Principal sd	.5681	.6939	.6939	.7570	.7019
Teacher sd	.7749	.7132	.7812	.7346	.7513

By state - Chi-square = 10.48, df = 9, $p > .05$
By T/P - Chi-square = 13.25, df = 4, $p < .05$

Table 25

Quality and Quantity of Community Involvement: Parents Enjoy Serving on SBM Council

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (2.9%)	0	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (1.9%)
SD teacher	2 (3.1%)	2 (2.2%)	6 (5.0%)	3 (4.2%)	13 (3.8%)
D principal	3 (8.8%)	3 (16.3%)	4 (7.7%)	5 (9.8%)	15 (9.4%)
D teacher	7 (10.9%)	27 (30.3%)	19 (15.7%)	5 (7.0%)	58 (16.8%)
A principal	24 (70.6%)	15 (68.2%)	30 (57.7%)	35 (68.6%)	104 (64.4%)
A teacher	42 (65.6%)	52 (58.2%)	76 (62.8%)	46 (64.8%)	216 (62.6%)
SA principal	6 (17.6%)	4 (18.2%)	17 (32.7%)	10 (19.6%)	37 (23.3%)
SA teacher	13 (20.3%)	8 (9.0%)	20 (16.5%)	17 (23.9%)	58 (16.8%)
State M	3.0306	2.8018	3.0000	3.0738	2.9802
Principal M	3.0294	3.0455	3.2115	3.0588	3.1006
Teacher M	3.0313	2.7416	2.9091	3.0845	2.9246
State sd	.6494	.6441	.7153	.6577	.6789
Principal sd	.6269	.5755	.6668	.6136	.6284
Teacher sd	.6659	.6489	.7188	.6917	.6947

By state - Chi-square = 20.71, df = 9, $p < .05$
By T/P - Chi-square = 17.44, df = 4, $p < .01$

Table 26

Waivers Requested

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Yes	7 21.2%	16 59.3%	13 26.0%	11 20.8%	47 28.8%
No	26 78.8%	11 40.7%	37 74.0%	42 79.2%	116 71.2%
No. responses	33	27	50	53	163

Chi-square = 20.64, df = 9, p < .05

responses. Other categories of requests for waivers reported in Table 27 included teacher evaluation (18.4%), additional or improved programs or services (5.3%), class size (15.8%), student assessment and retention (7.9%), teacher supplements (5.3%), and time lines (2.6%).

In responding to the item concerning whether or not their waivers had been approved, 55% of the responding principals indicated that their waivers had been granted, 12% that their waivers had not been granted, 20% that some of their waivers had been granted, and 12% were awaiting the decisions. When the chi-square statistic was used for this item (chi-square = 20.43, df = 9, p < .05), there was a significant statistical difference among the states. A review of the percentages of responses in Table 28 indicated that 50% of the requests for waivers from the Florida group had been denied, 33% approved, and 17% were pending. North

Table 27

Categories of Waiver Requests

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Calendar/ scheduling	1 16.7%	3 33.3%	8 61.5%	2 20.2%	14 36.8%
Teacher evaluation	1 16.7%	2 22.2%	3 23.1%	1 10.0%	7 18.4%
More/improved programs and services	0	1 11.1%	1 7.7%	0	2 5.3%
Class size	0	3 33.3%	0	3 30.0%	6 15.8%
Student assessment/ retention	1 16.7%	0	1 7.7%	1 10.0%	3 7.9%
Teacher supplements	2 33.3%	0	0	0	2 5.3%
Time lines	0	0	0	1 10%	1 2.6%
Currently developing requests	1 16.7%	0	0	0	1 2.6%
Other	0	0	0	2 20.0%	2 5.3%
Total	6	9	13	10	38

Chi-square = 35.85, df = 24, $p > .05$

Carolina, Texas, and Kentucky each indicated a greater than 50% approval rate.

Research Question 2: How do the perceptions of principals regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

Table 28

Approval of Waivers

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Yes	2 33.3%	9 56.3%	8 66.7%	8 80.0%	27 61.4%
No	3 50.0%	2 12.5%	0	1 10.0%	6 13.6%
Some	0	4 25.0%	0	1 10.0	5 11.4%
Pending	1 16.7%	1 6.3%	4 33.3%	0	6 13.6%
Total	6	16	12	10	44

Chi-square = 20.43, df = 9, p < .05

There were eight items on the questionnaires dealing with the perceptions of teachers and principals regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM implementation, seven four-point, forced-choice format and one open-ended question. When chi-square statistics were used, there were no significant statistical differences among the states on four of the seven forced-choice items. There were significant statistical differences between the perceptions of teachers and the perceptions of principals on all seven items.

The items for which there was no significant statistical difference among the states were those concerning teachers' improving attitudes/morale (chi-square = 12.44, df = 9, p > .05), teachers' feeling involved in

problem solving and improving the school (chi-square = 14.18, df = 9, p > .05), teachers' striving for continuous improvement in their performance (chi-square = 11.41, df = 9, p > .05), and teachers' increasing cooperation and collegiality with each other (chi-square = 14.59, df = 9, p > .05). For every item, the greatest percentage of teacher and principal respondents agreed or strongly agreed. The percentages of agreement were greater for responding principals than for the responding teachers on all items except the one dealing with teachers striving for continuous improvement in their performance; teachers had a four-point higher percentage rate of agreement than principals. Data regarding principal and teacher perceptions of teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM implementation are reported in Tables 29-35.

Each response to the open-ended question concerning teacher benefits of SBM was placed in one of the following nine categories: (1) feeling a sense of control, (2) participating in decisions and increasing of ownership, (3) developing and utilizing leadership skills, (4) increasing creativity and experimentation, (5) improving collegiality, (6) being better informed, (7) adding resources, (8) none or too early to tell, or (9) other. Participation and ownership received the largest percentage of responses from both principals (70.1%) and teachers (49.2%), but principals cited this as a benefit for teachers much more frequently than the teachers did. The second highest percentage of responses from teachers fell into the category of

Table 29

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Improved Morale/Attitudes

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	3 (8.6%)	0	0	2 (3.8%)	5 (3.0%)
SD teacher	3 (3.9%)	5 (4.6%)	15 (11.2%)	4 (5.0%)	27 (6.8%)
D principal	3 (8.6%)	5 (20.0%)	9 (17.0%)	13 (25%)	30 (18.2%)
D teacher	27 (35.5%)	30 (27.5%)	37 (27.6%)	27 (33.8%)	121 (30.3%)
A principal	21 (60%)	16 (64.0%)	38 (71.7%)	29 (55.8%)	104 (63.0%)
A teacher	42 (55.3%	68 (62.4%)	75 (56.0%)	43 (53.8%)	228 (57.1%)
SA principal	8 (22.9%)	4 (16.0%)	6 (11.3%)	8 (15.4%)	26 (15.8%)
SA teacher	4 (5.3%)	6 (5.5%)	7 (5.2%)	6 (7.5%)	23 (5.8%)
State M	2.7297	2.7347	2.6631	2.7121	2.7057
Principal M	2.9714	2.9600	2.9434	2.8269	2.9152
Teacher M	2.6184	2.5688	2.3881	2.5750	2.6190
State sd	.7255	.6827	.7250	.7155	.7041
Principal sd	.8220	.6110	.5340	.7335	.6754
Teacher sd	.6525	.6290	.7649	.7252	.6983

By State - Chi-square = 12.44, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 44.58, df = 4, p < .001

Table 30

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: More Involved

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (5.7%)	0	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	4 (2.4%)
SD teacher	3 (3.8%)	5 (4.5%)	14 (10.4%)	3 (3.8%)	25 (6.2%)
D principal	2 (5.7%)	1 (3.8%)	2 (3.7%)	7 (13.2%)	12 (7.1%)
D teacher	12 (15.4%)	29 (26.4%)	39 (28.9%	14 (17.5%)	94 (23.3%)
A principal	20 (57.1%)	18 (68.2%)	37 (68.5%)	32 (60.4%)	107 (63.7%)
A teacher	46 (59.0%)	62 (56.4%)	66 (48.9%)	48 (60.0%)	222 (55.1%)
SA principal	11 (31.4%)	7 (26.9%)	14 (25.9%)	13 (24.5%)	45 (26.8%)
SA teacher	17 (21.8%)	14 (12.7%)	16 (11.9%)	15 (18.8%)	62 (15.4%)
State M	3.0354	2.8603	2.7831	2.9925	2.9444
Principal M	3.1429	3.2308	3.1852	3.0755	3.1488
Teacher M	2.9872	2.7727	2.6222	2.9375	2.7965
State sd	.7432	.7115	.8059	.7017	.7030
Principal sd	.7724	.5144	.5852	.6751	.6441
Teacher sd	.7296	.7252	.8274	.7177	.7716

By state - Chi-square = 14.18, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 38.01, df = 4, p < .001

Table 31

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Experimentation

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (5.7%)	0	0	1 (1.9%)	3 (1.8%)
SD teacher	2 (2.6%)	5 (4.5%)	6 (4.4%)	3 (3.7%)	16 (4.0%)
D principal	1 (2.9%)	0	8 (15.1%)	15 (28.8%)	24 (14.5%)
D teacher	8 (10.4%)	23 (20.9%)	36 (26.5%)	13 (16.0%)	80 (19.8%)
A principal	28 (80.0%)	23 (88.5%)	28 (52.8%)	24 (46.2%)	103 (62.0%)
A teacher	48 (62.3%)	67 (60.9%)	76 (55.9%	45 (55.6%)	236 (58.4%)
SA principal	4 (11.4%)	3(11.5%)	17 (32.1%)	12 (23.1%)	36 (21.7%)
SA teacher	19 (24.7%)	15(13.6%)	18 (13.2%)	20 (24.7%)	72 (17.8%)
State M	3.0536	2.8897	2.8889	2.9699	2.9404
Principal M	2.9714	3.1154	3.1698	2.9038	3.0360
Teacher M	3.0536	2.8364	2.7794	3.0123	2.9010
State sd	.6554	.6630	.7318	.7582	.7089
Principal sd	.6177	.3258	.6718	.7736	.6596
Teacher sd	.6554	.7107	.7272	.7499	.7254

By state - Chi-square = 22.26, df = 12, p < .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 12.30, df = 4, p < .05

Table 32

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Continuous Improvement

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (5.7%)	0	0	0	2 (1.2%)
SD teacher	3 (3.8%)	1 (0.8%)	4 (3.1%)	1 (1.2%)	9 (2.3%)
D principal	4 (11.4%)	2 (7.7%)	6 (11.1%)	11 (21.2%)	23 (13.8%)
D teacher	6 (7.7%)	7 (6.4%)	19 (14.5%)	3 (3.7%)	35 (8.8%)
A principal	24 (68.6%)	20 (76.9%)	37 (68.5%)	30 (57.7%)	111 (66.5%)
A teacher	51 (65.4%)	74 (67.3%)	78 (59.5%)	52 (64.2%)	255 (63.8%)
SA principal	5 (14.3%)	4 (15.4%)	11 (20.4%)	11 (21.2%)	31 (18.6%)
SA teacher	18 (23.1%)	28 (25.5%)	30 (22.9%)	25 (30.9%)	101 (25.3%)
State M	3.0265	3.1544	3.0432	3.1504	3.0917
Principal M	2.9143	3.0769	3.0926	3.0000	3.0240
Teacher M	3.0769	3.1727	3.0229	3.2469	3.1200
State sd	.6874	.5562	.6662	.6215	.6364
Principal sd	.7017	.4836	.5586	.6568	.6107
Teacher sd	.6794	.5724	.7067	.5816	.6455

By state - Chi-square = 11.41, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 10.86, df = 4, p < .05

Table 33

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Collegiality

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	3 (8.6%)	0	0	3 (5.8%)	6 (3.7%)
SD teacher	1 (1.3%)	5 (4.5%)	12 (9.1%)	4 (5.1%)	22 (5.6%)
D principal	2 (5.7%)	4 (16.0%)	6 (11.5%)	13 (25.0%)	25 (15.2%)
D teacher	24 (32.0%)	39 (35.5%)	38 (28.9%)	24 (30.4%)	125 (31.6%)
A principal	23 (65.7%)	18 (72.0%)	38 (73.1%)	28 (53.8%)	107 (65.2%)
A teacher	34 (45.3%)	60 (54.4%)	66 (50.0%)	39 (49.4%)	199 (50.3%)
SA principal	7 (20.0%)	3 (12.0%)	8 (15.4%)	8 (15.4%)	26 (15.9%)
SA teacher	16 (21.3%)	6 (5.5%)	16 (12.1%)	12 (15.2%)	50 (12.6%)
State M	2.9000	2.6741	2.7609	2.7634	2.7679
Principal M	2.9714	2.9600	3.0385	2.7885	2.9329
Teacher M	2.8667	2.6091	2.6515	2.7468	2.6995
State sd	.7657	.6560	.7592	.7729	.7421
Principal sd	.7854	.5385	.5225	.7755	.6750
Teacher sd	.7593	.6649	.8101	.7757	.7585

By state - Chi-square = 14.59, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 25.43, df = 4, p < .001

Table 34

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Satisfaction of Nonparticipating Teachers

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (3.2%)	0	0	2 (3.9%)	3 (1.9%)
SD teacher	1 (1.5%)	4 (4.2%)	14 (11.9%)	4 (5.1%)	23 (6.4%)
D principal	4 (12.9%)	4 (16.7%)	8 (15.6%)	5 (9.8%)	21 (13.4%)
D teacher	13 (19.4%)	26 (27.1%)	43 (36.4%)	14 (17.7%)	96 (33.1%)
A principal	23 (74.2%)	18 (75.0%)	40 (78.4%)	36 (70.6%)	117 (74.5%)
A teacher	47 (70.1%)	64 (66.7%)	54 (45.8%)	50 (63.3%)	215 (59.7%)
SA principal	3 (9.7%)	2 (8.3%)	3 (5.9%)	8 (15.7%)	16 (10.2%)
SA teacher	6 (9.0%)	2 (2.1%)	7 (5.9%)	11 (13.9%)	26 (7.2%)
State *M*	2.8776	2.7167	2.5917	2.9077	2.7544
Principal *M*	2.9032	2.9167	2.9020	2.9804	2.9299
Teacher *M*	2.8657	2.6667	2.4576	2.8608	2.6778
State *sd*	.5791	.5824	.7271	.6870	.6702
Principal *sd*	.5975	.5036	.4585	.6478	.5560
Teacher *sd*	.5746	.5923	.7806	.7113	.7014

By state - Chi-square = 30.93, *df* = 12, *p* < .01
By T/P - Chi-square = 38.04, *df* = 4, *p* < .001

Table 35

Teacher Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: School as a Whole Involved in Decisions

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	0	0	0	0	0
SD teacher	7 (9.1%)	9 (8.2%)	23 (16.8%)	3 (3.7%)	42 (10.4%)
D principal	4 (11.4%)	1 (3.8%)	5 (9.4%)	9 (17.0%)	19 (11.4%)
D teacher	19 (24.7%)	29 (26.4%)	44 (32.1%)	10 (12.3%0	102 (25.2%)
A principal	23 (65.7%)	15 (57.7%)	30 (56.6%)	28 (52.8%)	96 (57.7%)
A teacher	33 (42.9%)	50 (45.5%)	54 (39.4%)	51 (63.0%)	188 (46.4%)
SA principal	8 (22.9%)	10 (38.5%)	18 (34.0%)	16 (30.2%)	52 (31.1%)
SA teacher	18 (23.4%)	22 (20.0%)	16 (11.7%)	17 (21.0%)	73 (18.0%)
State M	2.9018	2.8824	2.6789	3.0597	2.8601
Principal M	3.1143	3.3462	3.2453	3.1321	3.1976
Teacher M	2.8052	2.7727	2.4599	3.0123	2.7210
State sd	.8270	.8438	.9068	.6911	.8399
Principal sd	.5827	.5616	.6172	.6804	.6232
Teacher sd	.9038	.8637	.9076	.6981	.8780

By state - Chi-square = 22.76, df = 9, p < .01
By T/P - Chi-square = 57.46, df = 4, p < .001

collegiality with 21% of the responding teachers indicating this as a benefit of SBM. Collegiality was the third most frequently cited teacher benefit by principals, with 11% of the responding principals indicating this. The second highest category cited by the principal respondents was sense of control with 22% of the principals giving this as a benefit for teachers. The third highest percentage of teacher responses was in the category of being more informed with 16%, while principals cited collegiality third most frequently.

Other benefits were cited: developing and utilizing leadership skills by 4.7% of the principals and 1.5% of the teachers; increasing creativity and experimentation by 4.7% of the principals and 6.2% of the teachers; being better informed by 5.5% of the principals and 15.9% of the teachers; adding resources by 7.1% of the principals and 2.6% of the teachers; and other benefits that did not fall into one of the above cited categories by 7.1% of the principals and 2.6% of the teachers. Principal responses that there had been no teacher benefits or that it was too early to tell comprised 7.1% of the total responses; while for teachers, these types of responses comprised 2.6% of the total responses. Frequencies and percentages of teacher and principal responses in the various categories are reported in Table 36.

Research Question 3: How do the perceptions of principals regarding student outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

Table 36

Teacher Benefits of SBM Implementation

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Sense of control					
Principal	2 8.0%	4 18.1%	11 25.0%	1 2.8%	18 21.7%
Teacher	2 5.7%	6 9.9%	4 7/5%	7 15.5%	19 9.8%
Participation/ ownership					
Principal	19 76.0%	17 77.3%	29 65.9%	24 66.7%	89 70.1%
Teacher	14 40.0%	34 55.7%	32 59.6%	16 35.6%	96 49.2%
Leadership					
Principal	0	0	4 9.1%	2 5.6%	6 4.7%
Teacher	0	2 3.3%	1 1.9%	0	3 1.5%
Creative/ experiment					
Principal	1 4.0%	1 4.5%	1 2.3%	3 8.3%	6 4.7%
Teacher	2 5.7%	2 3.3%	2 3.7%	6 13.3%	12 6.2%
Collegiality					
Principal	3 12.0%	3 13.6%	5 11.4%	3 8.3%	14 11.0%
Teacher	6 17.1%	13 21.3%	17 31.5%	5 11.1%	41 21.0%
More informed					
Principal	1 4.0%	2 9.1%	2 4.5%	2 5.6%	7 5.5%

Table 36 (Continued)

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Teacher	4 11.4%	12 19.7%	7 13.0%	8 17.8	31 15.9%
Additional resources					
Principal	1 4.0%	1 4.5%	2 4.5%	5 13.9%	9 7.1%
Teacher	1 2.9%	1 1.6%	2 3.7%	1 2.2%	5 2.6%
None/too early					
Principal	0	0	0	3 8.3%	3 2.4%
Teacher	8 22.9%	8 13.1%	2 3.7%	10 22.2%	28 14.4%
Other					
Principal	3 12.0%	1 4.5%	4 9.1%	1 2.8%	9 7.1%
Teacher	3 8.6%	1 1.6%	1 1.9%	0	5 2.6%
Number of responses					
Principals	30	29	58	44	161
Teachers	40	79	68	53	240
Number of different respondents					
Principals	25	22	44	36	127
Teachers	35	61	54	45	195

* Percentages total more than 100.0%, because some respondents gave more than one benefit.

There were six items on the questionnaires dealing with student outcomes and benefits of SBM, five of which were of the four-point, forced-choice format and one of which was open-ended. When the chi-square statistic was used for the forced-choice items, there were no significant statistical differences among states on two of the student outcomes: higher student expectations of students (chi-square = 14.39, $df = 9$, $p > .05$) and a decrease in student discipline referrals to the principal (chi-square = 16.05, $df = 9$, $p > .05$). There were significant statistical differences among the states on the items dealing with teacher expectations of students (chi-square = 27.98, $df = 9$, $p < .001$), reduced student absenteeism/tardiness (chi-square = 36.01, $df = 9$, $p < .001$), and improved student performance as measured by achievement tests (chi-square = 32.28, $df = 9$, $p < .001$). There were significant statistical differences between teacher and principal perceptions on all five items.

On the item regarding teachers' expectations of students, only 20% of the North Carolina respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement; while Florida had 42% to disagree or strongly disagree, Kentucky had 38%, and Texas had 36%. However, for the item dealing with reduced student absenteeism/tardiness, North Carolina had the highest percentage of disagreement with the statement, where 78% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Florida, Kentucky, and Texas had disagreement rates of 65%, 64%, and 51%, respectively, on the reduced student absenteeism/tardiness item.

On the item concerning improved student achievement, North Carolina again had the lowest frequency of disagreement among the four states with 22% of the respondents indicating that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. The other states had much higher frequencies of disagreement with the statement: 53% of Kentucky respondents, 47% of Texas respondents, and 43% of Florida respondents.

On all five of these items, the principals had a higher frequency of agreement with the statements than teacher respondents. The item with the greatest difference between teacher and principal responses was the one dealing with higher students' expectations of students. On this item, 60% of the principals indicated that they agreed with the statement, while only 42% of the teachers indicated agreement. Data regarding principal and teacher perceptions of student outcomes and benefits of SBM are reported in Tables 37-41.

The responses to the open-ended question on student benefits from SBM implementation were placed in the following categories: (1) more time on learning, (2) improved self esteem/discipline/attendance, (3) more or improved programs or services, (4) increased input into decisions, (5) higher teacher expectations, (6) more decisions based upon student needs, (7) increased funding, (8) improved achievement, (9) increased parental involvement, and (10) none/too early to tell/other. Frequencies and percentages for each of these categories are

Table 37

Student Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Higher Teacher Expectations

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (6.1%)	0	1 (1.9%)	0	3 (1.8%)
SD teacher	2 (2.7%)	3 (2.8%)	10 (7.6%)	3 (3.8%)	18 (4.6%)
D principal	7 (21.2%)	3 (11.5%)	14 (26.9%)	16 (30.8%)	40 (24.5%)
D teacher	34 (45.9%)	21 (19.3%)	41 (31.1%)	31 (39.2%)	127 (32.3%)
A principal	23 (69.7%)	17 (65.4%)	32 (61.5%)	33 (63.5%)	105 (64.4%)
A teacher	33 (44.6%)	70 (64.2%)	64 (48.5%)	41 (51.9%)	208 (52.8%)
SA principal	1 (3.0%)	6 (23.1%)	5 (9.6%)	3 (5.8%)	15 (9.2%)
SA teacher	5 (6.8%)	15 (13.8%)	17 (12.9%)	4 (5.1%)	41 (10.4%)
State M	2.5981	2.9333	1.7011	2.6489	2.753
Principal M	2.6970	3.1154	2.7885	2.7500	2.8098
Teacher M	2.5541	2.8899	2.6667	2.5823	2.6904
State sd	.6567	.6488	.7559	.6192	.6903
Principal sd	.6366	.5883	.6367	.5557	.6142
Teacher sd	.6650	.6574	.7976	.6526	.7173

By state - Chi-square = 27.98, df = 9, p < .001
By T/P - Chi-square = 20.03, df = 4, p < .001

Table 38

Student Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Higher Student Expectations

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (6.1%)	0	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.0%)	4 (2.5%)
SD teacher	5 (7.1%)	5. (4.7%)	14 (10.9%)	4 (5.1%)	28 (7.3%)
D principal	12 (36.4%)	7 (28.0%)	17 (33.3%)	23 (46.0%)	59 (37.1%)
D teacher	44 (62.9%)	42 (39.6%)	62 (48.4%)	44 (56.4%)	192 (50.3%)
A principal	16 (48.5%)	14 (56.0%)	30 (58.8%)	23 (46.0%)	83 (52.2%)
A teacher	20 (28.6%)	56 (52.8%)	45 (35.2%)	27 (34.6%)	148 (38.7%)
SA principal	3 (9.1%)	4 (16.0%)	3 (5.9%)	3 (6.0%)	13 (8.2%)
SA teacher	1 (1.4%)	3 (2.8%)	7 (5.5%)	3 (3.8%)	14 (3.7%)
State M	2.3592	2.6031	2.4469	2.4453	2.4677
Principal M	2.6061	2.8800	2.6863	2.5600	2.6604
Teacher M	2.2429	2.5377	2.3516	2.3717	2.3874
State sd	.6694	.6526	.7276	.6498	.6841
Principal sd	.7475	.6658	.6161	.6440	.6640
Teacher sd	.6004	.6351	.7486	.6468	.6771

By state - Chi-square = 14.39, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 32.36, df = 4, p < .001

Table 39

Student Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Fewer Discipline Referrals

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (5.7%)	1 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	7 (13.5%)	11 (6.6%)
SD teacher	6 (8.8%)	9 (8.7%)	22 (17.2%)	15 (19.7%)	52 (13.8%)
D principal	11 (31.4%)	14 (53.8%)	23 (43.4%)	24 (46.2%)	72 (43.4%)
D teacher	39 (57.4%)	45 (43.3%)	55 (43.0%)	33 (43.4%)	172 (45.7%)
A principal	22 (62.9%)	10 (38.5%)	24 (45.3%)	18 (34.6%)	74 (44.6%)
A teacher	20 (29.4%)	49 (47.1%)	44 (34.4%)	24 (31.6%)	137 (36.4%)
SA principal	0	1 (3.8%)	5 (9.4%)	3 (5.8%)	9 (5.4%)
SA teacher	3 (4.4%)	1 (0.9%)	7 (5.5%)	4 (5.3%)	15 (4.0%)
State M	2.3883	2.4077	2.3812	2.2656	2.3616
Principal M	2.5714	2.4231	2.6226	2.3269	2.4880
Teacher M	2.2941	2.4135	2.2813	2.2237	2.3059
State sd	.6749	.6553	.7913	.8083	.7436
Principal sd	.6081	.6433	.6857	.7852	.7027
Teacher sd	.6924	.6626	.8127	.8262	.7551

By state - Chi-square = 16.05, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 15.18, df = 4, p < .01

Table 40

Student Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Reduced Absenteeism and Tardiness

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	2 (6.1%)	0	0	3 (5.8%)	5 (3.1%)
SD teacher	6 (9.1%)	5 (4.6%)	16 (12.5%)	6 (8.1%)	33 (8.8%)
D principal	13 (39.4%)	12 (48.0%)	23 (43.4%)	29 (55.8%)	77 (47.2%)
D teacher	43 (65.2%)	27 (25.0%)	53 (41.4%)	43 (58.1%)	166 (44.1%)
A principal	16 (48.5%)	11 (44.0%)	28 (52.8%)	19 (36.6%)	74 (45.4%)
A teacher	16 (24.2%)	67 (62.0%)	52 (40.6%)	22 (29.7%)	157 (41.8%)
SA principal	2 (6.1%)	2 (8.0%)	2 (3.8%)	1 (1.9%)	7 (4.3%)
SA teacher	1 (1.5%)	9 (8.3%)	7 (5.5%)	3 (4.1%)	20 (5.3%)
State M	2.3030	2.7252	2.4530	2.3175	2.4583
Principal M	2.5455	2.6000	2.6038	2.3462	2.5092
Teacher M	2.1818	2.7407	2.3906	2.2973	2.4362
State sd	.6617	.6685	.7259	.6530	.7003
Principal sd	.7111	.6455	.5664	.6226	.6321
Teacher sd	.6053	.6749	.7760	.6770	.7275

By state - Chi-square = 36.01, df = 9, p < .001
By T/P - Chi-square = 18.82, df = 4, p < .001

Table 41

Student Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Increased Achievement

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (3.2%)	0	1 (1.9%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (2.1%)
SD teacher	3 (5.5%)	6 (5.8%)	14 (11.5%)	2 (4.3%)	25 (7.6%)
D principal	9 (29.0%)	5 (20.0%)	21 (39.6%)	14 (45.2%)	49 (35.0%)
D teacher	24 (43.7%)	18 (17.3%)	47 (38.5%)	24 (51.1%)	113 (34.5%)
A principal	19 (61.3%)	16 (64.0%)	30 (56.6%)	15 (48.4%)	80 (57.1%)
A teacher	26 (47.3%)	74 (71.2%)	56 (45.9%)	20 (42.6%)	176 (53.7%)
SA principal	2 (6.5%)	4 (16.0%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (3.2%)	8 (5.7%)
SA teacher	2 (3.6%)	6 (5.8%)	5 (4.1%)	1 (2.1%)	14 (4.3%)
State M	2.5698	2.8062	2.4743	2.4615	2.5812
Principal M	2.7097	2.9600	2.5850	2.5161	2.6643
Teacher M	2.4909	2.7692	2.4262	2.4255	2.5457
State sd	.6605	.6383	.7015	.6178	.6768
Principal sd	.6426	.6110	.5695	.6256	.6188
Teacher sd	.6631	.6421	.7488	.6166	.6980

By state - Chi-square = 32.28, df = 9, p < .001
By T/P - Chi-square = 20.90, df = 4, p < .001

provided in Table 42. The two most frequently cited responses fell into the category of more or improved programs and services and into the category of more decisions based upon student needs. This was true for each of the states and for the principal and teacher groups. Unfortunately, academic achievement was one of the least frequently cited categories in all states and by both principals and teachers.

Research Question 4: How do the perceptions of principals regarding school outcomes of SBM compare to those of teachers?

Six items were used on the questionnaires to obtain data for the research question which dealt with a comparison of principal and teacher perceptions regarding school outcomes of SBM. The items were of the four-point, forced-choice format. There were two additional items on the principals' questionnaire concerning school outcomes which required a yes or no response.

When the chi-square statistic was used, there were no significant statistical differences among the states on the three items dealing with the formulation and monitoring of shared values (chi-square = 19.05, df = .05, $p > .05$), achievement of goals and objectives (chi-square = 11.51, df = 9, $p > .05$), and addressing of individual and school problems (chi-square = 9.95, df = 12, $p > .05$). There were significant statistical differences among the states on the other three items dealing with a school vision (chi-square = 18.59, df = 9, $p < .05$), more decision-making authority at

Table 42

Student Benefits of SBM Implementation

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
More time on learning					
Principal	1 7.1%	2 14.3%	2 5.0%	1 2.6%	6 5.7%
Teacher	0	3 4.9%	0	2 4.0%	5 1.9%
Self esteem/ discipline/ attendance					
Principal	3 21.4	1 7.1	9 22.5	2 5.3	15 14.2
Teacher	2 7.1	2 3.3	6 7.9	6 12.0	16 7.4
Better/more programs & services					
Principal	4 28.6	6 42.9	9 22.5	11 28.9	30 28.3
Teacher	6 21.4	18 29.5	25 32.9	17 34.0	66 30.7
Input					
Principal	1 7.1	1 7.1	6 15.0	6 15.8	14 13.2
Teacher	7 25.0	11 18.0	17 22.4	7 14.0	42 19.5
Teacher expectations					
Principal	1 7.1	0	3 7.5	2 5.3	6 5.7
Teacher	0	2 3.3	5 6.6	4 8.0	11 5.1
Decisions based on student needs					
Principal	4 28.6	4 28.6	12 30.0	4 10.5	24 22.6

Table 42 (Continued)

Category	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Teacher	7 25.0	17 27.9	14 18.4	9 18.0	47 21.9
More funding					
Principal	0	0	2 5.0	3 7.9	5 4.7
Teacher	0	3 4.9	3 3.9	1 2.0	7 3.3
Academic achievement					
Principal	0	1 7.1	3 7.5	1 2.6	5 4.7
Teacher	0	3 4.9	3 3.9	2 4.0	8 3.7
Parent involvement					
Principal	0	0	6 15.0	3 7.9	9 8.5
Teacher	1 3.6	9 14.8	3 3.9	6 12.0	19 8.8
None/too early/ other					
Principal	2 14.3	1 7.1	5 12.5	12 31.6	20 18.9
Teacher	9 32.1	11 18.0	13 17.1	8 16.0	41 19.1
Number of responses					
Principal	16	16	57	45	134
Teacher	32	79	89	62	262
Number of different respondents					
Principals	14	14	40	38	106
Teachers	28	61	76	50	215

* Percentages do not total 100.0%, because some respondents gave more than one benefit.

the local school (chi-square = 26.85, df = 9, p < .05), and decisions being made based upon the unique needs of the school (chi-square = 32.21, df = 9, p < .001). There were significant statistical differences on all six items between teacher and principal responses.

The differences among states on the item concerning creation, communication, and realization of a school vision did not appear to be simply between the frequency of agreement and disagreement with the statement. Seventy-four percent of the respondents from Texas and Kentucky and 75% of the respondents from Florida and North Carolina either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Inspection of the frequencies indicated that the difference was in the degree of agreement or disagreement. For example, 63% of the Kentucky respondents agreed and 12% strongly agreed; while 50% of the Florida respondents agreed and 25% strongly agreed. Of the respondents from Texas indicating disagreement with the statement, 19% disagreed and 7% strongly disagreed. Of the Kentucky respondents, less than one percent strongly disagreed and 25% disagreed.

For the item concerning more decision-making authority at the local school level, Kentucky respondents had the highest percentage of agreement with the statement, which was 92%. The next highest percentage of agreement, 79%, was from Texas respondents. Third was from North Carolina with 75% agreement, and fourth was Florida with 73% agreement.

Kentucky respondents, also, had the highest percentage of agreement with the statement regarding decisions being

made based upon the unique needs of the school with 94% agreement. Eighty-two percent of the respondents from North Carolina either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, as did 80% from Texas and 76% from Florida. Again, there were differences among the states in the degree of agreement or disagreement.

For all six of the items, principal respondents had a higher percentage of agreement with the statements than teachers. Even on the item with the lowest percentage of agreement, 70% of the teacher respondents either indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Data regarding principal and teacher perceptions of school outcomes and benefits of SBM are reported in Tables 43-48.

Principals were asked to respond to a question regarding whether or not long-range improvement goals had been reached by consensus. Ninety-three percent of the responding principals indicated that consensus on long-range goals had been achieved. When the chi-square statistic was used for this item (chi-square = 7.13, $df = 3$, $p > .05$), there was no significant statistical difference among the states. Table 49 provides frequencies and percentages of responses for each of the states regarding whether or not consensus was reached on long-range improvement goals.

There was also an item on the principals' questionnaire regarding whether or not action plans had been developed and implemented. Data regarding this item are reported in Table 50. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that annual action plans had been developed and implemented.

Table 43

School Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Vision

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (3.1%)	0	1 (1.9%)	0	2 (1.2%)
SD teacher	4 (5.4%)	4 (3.7%)	12 (9.1%)	1 (1.3%)	21 (5.3%)
D principal	4 (12.5%)	1 (3.8%)	4 (7.4%)	13 (26.5%)	22 (13.7%)
D teacher	17 (23.0%)	29 (26.6%)	32 (24.2%)	19 (24.1%)	97 (24.6%)
A principal	19 (59.4%)	20 (76.9%)	37 (68.5%)	31 (63.3%)	107 (66.5%)
A teacher	34 (46.0%)	56 (51.4%)	65 (49.2%)	49 (62.0%)	204 (51.8%)
SA principal	8 (25.0%)	5 (9.2%)	12 (22.2%)	5 (10.2%)	30 (18.6%)
SA teacher	19 (25.7%)	20 (18.3%)	23 (17.4%)	10 (12.7%)	72 (18.3%)
State M	2.9623	2.9037	2.8548	2.8516	2.8865
Principal M	3.0625	3.1538	3.1111	2.8367	3.0248
Teacher M	2.9189	2.8899	2.7500	2.8608	2.8299
State sd	.8039	.7215	.8023	.6159	.7430
Principal sd	.7156	.4641	.6034	.5897	.6119
Teacher sd	.8400	.7371	.8505	.6352	.7841

By state - Chi-square = 18.59, df = 9, $p < .05$
By T/P - Chi-square = 27.19, df = 4, $p < .001$

Table 44

School Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Shared Values

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (3.0%)	0	1 (1.9%)	0	2 (1.3%)
SD teacher	5 (7.4%)	4 (3.8%)	12 (9.0%)	1 (1.4%)	22 (5.9%)
D principal	3 (9.1%)	2 (8.3%)	7 (13.2%)	8 (18.2%)	20 (13.0%)
D teacher	11 (16.2%0	27 (25.7%)	22 (16.5%)	16 (23.2%)	76 (20.3%)
A principal	23 (69.7%)	17 (70.8%)	30 (56.6%)	29 (65.9%)	99 (64.3%)
A teacher	38 (55.9%)	61 (58.1%)	77 (57.9%)	46 (66.7%)	222 (59.2%)
SA principal	6 (18.2%)	5 (20.8%)	15 (28.3%)	7 (15.9%)	33 (21.4%)
SA teacher	14 (20.6%)	13 (12.4%)	22 (16.5%)	6 (8.7%)	55 (14.7%)
State M	2.9406	2.8527	2.9032	2.8850	2.8941
Principal M	3.0303	3.1250	3.1132	2.9773	3.0584
Teacher M	2.8971	2.7905	2.8195	2.8261	2.8267
State sd	.7592	.6858	.7927	.5939	.7205
Principal sd	.6366	.5367	.6978	.5902	.6287
Teacher sd	.8129	.7030	.8150	.5930	.7453

By state - Chi-square = 19.05, df = 12, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 25.26, df = 4, p < .001

Table 45

School Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Goals and Objectives Achieved

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (3.0%)	0	1 (1.9%)	0	2 (1.2%)
SD teacher	2 (2.7%)	2 (1.9%)	5 (3.8%)	1 (1.3%)	10 (2.6%)
D principal	2 (6.1%)	0	2 (3.7%)	9 (17.6%)	13 (7.9%)
D teacher	13 (17.8%)	24 (22.2%)	31 (23.5%)	17 (22.1%)	85 (21.8%)
A principal	20 (60.6%)	22 (84.6%)	38 (70.4%)	34 (66.7%)	114 (69.5%)
A teacher	42 (57.5%)	68 (63.0%)	73 (55.3%0	50 (64.9%)	233 (59.7%)
SA principal	10 (30.3%)	4 (15.4%)	13 (24.1%)	8 (15.7%)	35 (21.3%)
SA teacher	16 (21.9%)	14 (13.0%)	23 (17.4%)	9 (11.7%)	62 (15.9%)
State M	3.0472	2.9254	2.9516	2.9141	2.9549
Principal M	3.1818	3.1538	3.1667	2.9804	3.1098
Teacher M	2.9863	2.8889	2.8636	2.8701	2.8897
State sd	.7089	.6085	.7074	.6022	.6613
Principal sd	.6826	.3679	.5746	.5828	.5757
Teacher sd	.7167	.6315	.7390	.6145	.6845

By state - Chi-square = 11.51, df = 9, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 27.95, df = 4, p < .001

Table 46

School Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Problems Addressed

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (2.9%)	0	0	0	1 (0.6%)
SD teacher	4 (5.3%)	5 (4.6%)	8 (5.9%)	2 (2.5%)	19 (4.8%)
D principal	0	0	2 (3.8%)	3 (5.7%)	5 (3.0%)
D teacher	8 (10.7%)	17 (15.6%)	18 (13.3%)	7 (8.6%)	50 (12.5%)
A principal	23 (65.7%)	19 (73.1%)	32 (60.4%)	37 (69.8%)	111 (66.5%)
A teacher	48 (64.0%)	65 (59.6%)	81 (60.0%)	58 (71.6%)	252 (63.0%)
SA principal	11 (31.4%)	7 (26.9%)	19 (35.8%)	13 (24.5%)	50 (29.9%)
SA teacher	15 (20.0%)	22 (20.2%)	28 (20.7%)	14 (17.3%)	79 (19.8%)
State M	3.0727	3.0148	3.0585	3.0970	3.0600
Principal M	3.2571	3.2692	3.3208	3.1887	3.2570
Teacher M	2.9867	2.9541	2.9556	3.0370	2.9775
State sd	.7001	.7017	.7252	.5735	.6803
Principal sd	.6108	.4523	.5468	.5210	.5373
Teacher sd	.7258	.7377	.7616	.6009	.7164

By state - Chi-square = 9.95, df = 12, p > .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 33.99, df = 4, p < .001

Table 47

School Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: More Local Decision-Making Authority

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	0	0	0	0	0
SD teacher	5 (7.0%)	3 (2.9%)	10 (7.4%0	1 (1.3%)	19 (4.9%)
D principal	4 (12.1%)	8 (30.8%)	3 (5.6%)	3 (5.7%)	18 (10.8%)
D teacher	19 (26.8%)	22 (21.0%)	26 (19.1%)	7 (9.0%)	74 (19.0%)
A principal	21 (63.6%)	12 (46.2%)	37 (68.5%)	33 (62.3%)	103 (62.0%)
A teacher	38 (53.5%)	69 (65.7%)	74 (54.4%)	49 (62.8%)	230 (59.0%)
SA principal	8 (24.2%)	6 (23.1%)	14 (25.9%)	17 (32.1%)	45 (27.1%)
SA teacher	9 (12.7%)	11 (10.5%)	26 (19.1%)	21 (26.9%)	67 (17.2%)
State M	2.8462	2.8550	2.9526	3.1985	2.9676
Principal M	2.8611	2.9231	3.2037	3.2642	3.1627
Teacher M	2.7183	2.8381	2.8529	3.1538	2.9295
State sd	.7474	.6578	.7579	.6003	.7095
Principal sd	.5999	.7442	.5277	.5599	.5960
Teacher sd	.7780	.6374	.8122	.6258	.7268

By state - Chi-square = 26.85, df = 9, p < .05
By T/P - Chi-square = 34.42, df = 4, p < .001

Table 48

School Outcomes and Benefits of SBM: Decisions Based Upon Local Needs

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
SD principal	1 (2.9%)	0	0	0	1 (0.6%)
SD teacher	8 (11.3%)	2 (1.9%)	9 (6.8%)	2 (2.5%)	21 (5.3%)
D principal	2 (5.9%)	4 (16.0%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.9%)	9 (5.5%)
D teacher	16 (22.5%)	18 (16.7%)	28 (21.1%)	4 (4.9%)	66 (16.8%)
A principal	24 (70.6%)	16 (64.0%)	37 (68.5%)	35 (68.6%)	112 (68.3%)
A teacher	37 (52.1%)	74 (68.5%)	69 (51.9%)	53 (65.4%0	233 (59.3%)
SA principal	7 (20.6%)	5 (20.0%)	16 (29.6%)	14 (27.5%)	42 (25.6%)
SA teacher	10 (14.1%)	14 (13.0%)	27 (20.3%)	22 (27.2%)	73 (18.6%)
State M	2.8190	2.9474	2.9786	3.1970	2.9928
Principal M	3.0882	3.0400	3.2778	3.2353	3.1890
Teacher M	2.6901	2.9259	2.8571	3.1728	2.9109
State sd	.8060	.6070	.7617	.5853	.7071
Principal sd	.6212	.6110	.4921	.5134	.5491
Teacher sd	.8551	.6069	.8178	.6283	.7489

By state - Chi-square = 32.21, df = 9, p < .001
By T/P - Chi-square = 33.33, df = 4, p < .001

Table 49

Consensus on Long-Range Improvement Goals

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Yes	31 88.6%	27 100%	50 96.2%	46 88.5%	154 92.8%
No	4 11.4%	0	2 3.8%	6 11.5%	12 7.2%
Total	35	27	52	52	166

Chi-square = 7.13, df = 3, p > .05

When the chi-square statistic was used, there was a significant statistical difference among the states (chi-square = 17.68, df = 3, p < .001). Texas had the highest frequency of affirmative responses with 98%; only one principal from Texas indicated that an annual action plan had not been developed and implemented. Florida had the lowest frequency of affirmative responses with 74%; Kentucky was next with 79%; and North Carolina had 96%.

Research Question 5: How do the major concerns of principals regarding the implementation of SBM compare to the major concerns of teachers?

An open-ended question concerning what went wrong in SBM implementation was utilized on the questionnaires to obtain data for this research question. The responses were placed into the following 10 categories: insufficiency of time, inadequacy of training, resistance to changing roles, lack of clarity about roles and processes, the setting of unrealistic goals, lack of hierarchical support, inadequacy

Table 50

Annual Action Plan Developed and Implemented

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Yes	26 74.3%	26 96.3%	51 98.1%	42 79.2%	145 86.8%
No	9 25.7%	1 3.7%	1 1.9%	11 20.8%	22 13.2%
Total	35	27	52	53	167

Chi-square = 17.68, df = 3, p < .001

of other resources, noninvolvement of all stakeholders, other problems, and no problems. Frequencies and percentages of principal and teacher responses are reported in Table 51.

The most frequently cited category for all principals combined was insufficient time with 20% of the responding principals indicating that there was not sufficient time for the responsibilities of SBM. This category was the third most frequently cited for the teacher respondents with 17%. The number one concern of the responding teachers overall was lack of hierarchical support with 25% of respondents indicating this as a problem. This category, receiving responses from 14% of the principals, was fifth for principals. The responding principals cited inadequate training second most frequently with 18% indicating more training needed. Only 8% of the teachers indicated that more training was needed.

Table 51

Problems Encountered in SBM Implementation

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Time-principal	3 13.6%	5 26.3%	15 34.1%	3 7.0%	26 20.3%
Time-teacher	10 32.3%	7 11.7%	12 14.5%	8 20.0%	37 17.3%
Training - P	3 13.6%	4 21.1%	8 18.2%	8 18.6%	23 18.0%
Training - T	0	7 11.7%	4 4.8%	6 15.0%	17 7.9%
Resistance - P	2 9.1%	0	7 15.9%	6 14.0%	15 11.7%
Resistance - T	2 6.5%	4 6.7%	13 15.7%	3 7.5%	22 10.3%
Lack of clarity - P	1 4.5%	2 10.5%	6 13.6%	5 11.6%	14 10.9%
Lack of clarity - T	1 3.2%	2 3.3%	6 7.2%	2 5.0%	11 5.1%
Unrealistic goals - P	2 9.1%	1 5.3%	4 9.1%	2 4.7%	9 7.0%
Unrealistic goals - T	1 3.2%	2 3.3%	11 13.3%	2 5.0%	16 7.5%
Lack of support - P	4 18.2%	2 10.5%	7 15.9%	5 11.6%	18 14.1%
Lack of support - T	6 19.4%	22 36.7%	22 26.5%	4 10.0%	54 25.2%
Inadequate resources - P	2 9.1%	2 10.5%	2 4.5%	0	6 4.9%
Inadequate resources - T	0	13 21.7%	1 1.2%	3 7.5%	17 7.9%

Table 51 (Continued)

	FL	NC	TX	KY	Total
Not involving all - P	0	2 10.5%	3 6.8%	3 7.0%	8 6.3%
Not involving all - T	4 12.9%	10 16.7%	8 9.6%	6 15.0%	28 13.1%
Other - P	3 13.6%	6 31.6%	9 20.5%	4 9.3%	22 17.2%
Other - T	4 12.9%	8 13.3%	8 9.6%	3 7.5%	23 10.7%
No Problems-P	3 13.6%	1 5.3%	0	16 37.2%	20 15.6%
No Problems-T	8 25.8%	7 11.7%	12 14.5%	14 35.0%	41 19.2%
n - P 22	19	44	43	128	
n - T 31	60	83	40	214	
Responses - P	23	25	61	52	161
Responses - T	36	82	97	51	266

Research Question 6: How do the perceptions of teachers compare with the perceptions of principals within the individual public schools?

Research Question 7: What patterns exist among the individual schools in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers?

There were not any distinguishable patterns that existed among the individual schools in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers. It appeared that each school had a unique blend of responses. It was noted that, in general, principals' responses tended

to be more positive overall than those of the responding teachers.

Summary

The data regarding the existence of the indicators of effective SBM implementation, and the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of teachers and principals regarding SBM implementation were obtained through the responses of 171 principals and 425 teachers from 59 school districts in Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and chi-square statistics were generated from the responses to the questionnaires. Tables were presented which illustrated the varied responses to the items.

Over a third of the principals responding to this survey (39.2%) reported having decentralized decision-making authority in all four areas: budget, personnel, curriculum, and staff development. Another 34.0% had decentralized decision-making authority in three areas, 22.8% in two areas, 1.8% in only one area, and 2.3% in no areas. Stakeholders were included on the SBM council in the following order from most frequently to least frequently: administrators, teachers, parents, nonprofessional staff, business representatives, students and nonparental community, and college people. The great majority of schools had SBM councils with actual decision-making authority as opposed to serving in an advisory capacity.

The schools were nearly evenly divided in whether SBM implementation was voluntary or mandated, with more Florida

and Texas schools being mandated and more Kentucky and North Carolina schools being voluntary. Generally, principals perceived support for their SBM efforts from their school boards, superintendents, and central office administrators. Ten percent or less of the responding principals perceived nonsupport of SBM from either school boards, superintendents, or central office administrators.

Teachers in this study perceived that adequate training had been provided at a rate of 75.9%, while only 65.3% of the principals agreed that adequate training had been provided. According to the respondents, only 31% had been given additional planning time since SBM implementation; and only 26.4% of the principals and 28.8% of the teachers felt that they had adequate time for the responsibilities of SBM.

Principals and teachers both were overwhelmingly positive in their attitudes toward SBM with principals agreeing at a slightly higher frequency than teachers on the items related to positive outcomes, SBM being worthwhile, and a desire to continue the SBM process. Of the three items dealing with the quality and quantity of community involvement, the one regarding parental enjoyment of serving on the SBM council received the highest rate of agreement, followed by the one dealing with an increase in constructive visits; while the one concerning a decrease in parental complaints received the smallest rate of agreement, with only 52.6% of the teachers and 69.1% of the principals agreeing with this statement.

Waivers to school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws had been requested by only 28.8% of the schools represented in this study, with 75.5% of those having had at least some of their requests approved. Waivers had not been requested by over 70% of the schools in this study.

On six of the seven items used to measure the perceptions of teachers and principals regarding teacher outcomes, the principals had a higher rate of agreement than teachers: teachers improved in morale/attitudes, teachers felt more involved, teachers felt free to experiment, increased collegiality, teachers not serving on the SBM council were satisfied with the process, and the school as a whole was involved in decisions. On the item regarding teachers striving for continuous improvement, teachers agreed at a slightly higher rate than principals. When asked to list benefits to teachers of SBM implementation, responses dealing with increased participation and ownership were the most frequently cited by teachers and principals.

On all five items dealing with positive benefits for students of SBM implementation, the principals had a higher rate of agreement than teachers. The item concerning higher teacher expectations of students received the highest rate of agreement and the item concerning fewer discipline referrals received the lowest rate of agreement. When asked to list benefits to students of SBM, the most frequent response was more or improved services for students, closely followed by decisions being based on student needs. Only

62.8% of the principals and 58.0% of the teachers perceived that higher student achievement had resulted from SBM implementation.

The principals more frequently perceived positive school outcomes of SBM implementation than teachers on each of the six items used to measure this: established vision, shared values, achieved goals and objectives, addressed schoolwide and individual problems, increased local decision-making authority, and based decisions upon local needs. Addressed individual and school problems received the highest degree of agreement, with 96.4% of the principals and 82.8% of the teachers either agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement. The overwhelming majority of principals reported that consensus on long-range improvement goals had been achieved in their schools (92.8%) and that an annual action plan had been developed and implemented (86.8%). Insufficient time was the most commonly cited problem with SBM implementation among principals (20.3%), while the biggest concern of teachers appeared to be the lack of hierarchical support (25.2%).

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study focused on the existence of indicators of effective SBM implementation and the attitudes, perceptions of outcomes, and concerns of teachers and principals in Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas. A principal's questionnaire and a teacher's questionnaire were utilized to obtain data.

This chapter provides a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations derived from the analyses of data obtained through this study. The chapter is presented in four sections: an introduction, findings related to the hypotheses and research questions, conclusions and discussion, and recommendations for further study.

Findings Related to the Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in selected southern states in the areas of budget, curriculum, personnel, and staff development.

There were no significant statistical differences among the public schools implementing SBM in selected southern

states in decentralized decision making in the area of budget (chi square = 1.38, df = 3, p > ,05). There were significant statistical differences in the areas of curriculum (chi-square = 19.69, df = 3, p < .001), personnel (chi-square = 14.02, df = 3, p < .01), and staff development (chi-square = 12.91, df = 3, p < .05). Three-fourths of the responding principals indicated budgetary decision-making authority. Kentucky principals had the greatest authority in the area of personnel based upon a response rate of 83.0% in this area. North Carolina principals had the greatest authority in the area of curriculum with 96.3% of the respondents indicating this area, closely followed by Kentucky with 90.6%. Overall, staff development was the area cited most frequently, with 86.5% of the total respondents indicating decision authority in this area.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no meaningful differences among the representation of stakeholder groups on the SBM council/team in the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states.

There were no meaningful differences among the states in representation on the SBM council from the following groups: administrators, who served on 100% of the councils, and teachers, who served on 96.0% of the councils. There were some differences among the states in the representation of the following stakeholder groups on SBM councils: students, serving on 29.5% of the councils overall; parents, 94.0%; nonprofessional staff, 57.2%; nonparental community,

29.5%; business representatives, 33.7%; and college people, 5.4%.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences among the public schools in the selected southern states in whether the SBM council/team is advisory or has final decision authority.

There were significant statistical differences (chi-square = 43.27, $df = 6$, $p < .001$) among the selected southern states in whether the SBM council/team was advisory or had actual decision-making authority. The Kentucky councils had the greatest frequency of decision-making authority with 84.3%; while Florida had the highest frequency of councils which were advisory with 62.9%. Over half of the North Carolina and Texas councils had decision-making authority.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant differences among the public schools involved in SBM in whether SBM was voluntary or mandated when it was first implemented in the selected southern states.

There were significant statistical differences (chi-square = 76.30, $df = 9$, $p < .001$) among the public schools involved in SBM in the selected southern states in whether SBM was voluntary or mandated when it was first implemented. SBM was voluntarily implemented by 88.7% of the schools represented in Kentucky, 70.4% in North Carolina, 37.1% in Florida, and 13.7% in Texas.

Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of the principals of the public

schools participating in SBM in the selected southern states among school board, superintendent, and other central administrators in the degree of support of SBM.

There were no significant statistical differences among the perceptions of the principals of the public schools participating in SBM in the selected southern states in the degree of superintendent (chi-square = 12.81, $df = 9$, $p > .05$) and other central administrator (chi-square = 14.43, $df = 9$, $p > .05$) support of SBM. The great majority of respondents perceived superintendent and other central administrator support, with rates of 91.0% and 90.9%, respectively. There were significant differences (chi-square = 18.72, $df = 9$, $p < .05$) among the perceptions of principals in the selected southern states in the degree of school board support.

Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not adequate training has been provided.

There were significant statistical differences (chi-square = 13.23, $df = 4$, $p < .05$) between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not adequate training had been provided. The responding principals agreed that adequate training had been provided at a rate of 65.3%, while teachers agreed at the rate of 76.0%.

Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of

teachers regarding whether or not sufficient time for planning is provided.

There were significant statistical differences (chi-square = 13.78, df = 4, $p < .05$) among the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not sufficient time for planning had been provided. Only 26.4% of the principals and 28.8% of the teachers felt that sufficient time for planning had been provided.

Hypothesis 8: There will be no significant differences between the attitudes of teachers and principals toward SBM in the public schools in selected southern states who are involved in SBM.

There were significant statistical differences between the attitudes toward continuing SBM (chi-square = 22.30, df = 4, $p < .001$) of teachers and principals in selected southern states who were involved in SBM. There were also significant statistical differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding whether or not positive outcomes had resulted from SBM implementation (chi-square = 32.94, df = 4, $p < .001$) and whether or not SBM was worthwhile (chi-square = 25.92, df = 4, $p < .001$). Principals perceived that positive outcomes had resulted from SBM implementation at a frequency of 96.4%, and teachers at a frequency of 84.2%. SBM was perceived to be worthwhile relative to the time and responsibility required by 91.0% of the responding principals and 78.1% of the responding teachers. Principals indicated a desire to

continue the SBM process at a rate of 95.8%, while teachers desired to continue in 84.9% of the cases.

Hypothesis 9: There will be no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding the quality and quantity of community involvement since SBM implementation.

There were significant statistical differences among the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers on all three items regarding the quality and quantity of community involvement since SBM implementation: decrease in parental complaints (chi-square = 30.20, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), increase in constructive visits (chi-square = 13.25, $df = 4$, $p < .05$), and parents enjoy serving on the SBM council (chi-square = 17.44, $df = 4$, $p < .01$). Sixty-nine and one-tenth of one percent of the principals perceived that fewer parental complaints were being received as a result of SBM implementation, while only 52.6% of the teachers had this perception. Seventy-four and four tenths of one percent of the principals and 64.6% of the teachers perceived that more constructive visits were being received as a result of SBM implementation. The greatest percentages of agreement for both teachers (79.4%) and principals (87.7%) was for the item which stated that parents enjoyed serving on the SBM council.

Research Question 1: To what extent and for what purposes are applications for waivers of school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws made and approval received?

According to the responses of the principals in this study, only 29% of the schools represented have applied for waivers of school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws. Requests for waivers by these schools have been made in the following categories: school calendar or scheduling, teacher evaluation, additional or improved programs or services, class size, student assessment and retention, teacher supplements, and time lines. Principals' responses indicate that 55% of the schools' requests for waivers have been granted, 12% have not been granted, 20% have had some of their requests granted, and 12% were awaiting the decision.

Research Question 2: How do the perceptions of principals regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

There were significant statistical differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers on all seven items regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM: improved morale/attitudes (chi-square = 44.58, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), greater feeling of involvement (chi-square = 38.01, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), increased freedom to experiment (chi-square = 12.30, $df = 4$, $p < .05$), increased efforts to continuously improve professionally (chi-square = 10.86, $df = 4$, $p < .05$), improved collegiality (chi-square = 25.43, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), satisfaction of nonparticipating teachers (chi-square = 38.04, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), and schoolwide involvement in decisions (chi-square = 57.46, $df = 4$, $p < .001$). The great majority of principals and

teachers perceived teacher benefits from SBM implementation, although principals generally felt more strongly that teachers had benefited.

Research Question 3: How do the perceptions of principals regarding student outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers.

There were significant statistical differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers on all five items regarding student outcomes and benefits of SBM: higher teacher expectations (chi-square = 20.03, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), higher student expectations (chi-square = 32.36, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), fewer discipline referrals (chi-square = 15.18, $df = 4$, $p < .01$), reduced absenteeism and tardiness (chi-square = 18.82, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), and increased achievement (chi-square = 20.90, $df = 4$, $p < .001$). Generally, principals perceived more benefits to students than teachers did.

Research Question 4: How do the perceptions of principals regarding school outcomes of SBM compare to those of teachers?

There were significant statistical differences between the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers on all six items regarding school outcomes of SBM: established a vision (chi-square = 27.19, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), shared values (chi-square = 25.26, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), goals and objectives achieved (chi-square = 27.95, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), problems addressed (chi-square = 33.99, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), more local decision-making authority (chi-square +

34.42, df = 4, $p < .001$), and decisions based upon local needs (chi-square = 33.33, df = 4, $p < .001$). Again, principals had a higher rate of agreement than teachers on every item used to measure this hypothesis even though teachers overwhelmingly agreed with all of the items.

Research Question 5: How do the major concerns of principals regarding the implementation of SBM compare to the major concerns of teachers.

There were differences in the concerns of principals and the concerns of teachers regarding the implementation of SBM. The same problems and concerns were cited by both teachers and principals but with varying frequencies: insufficient time (20.3% of principals, 17.3% of teachers), insufficient training (18.0% of principals, 7.9% of teachers), resistance to change (11.7% of principals, 10.3% of teachers), lack of clarity (10.9% of principals, 5.1% of teachers), unrealistic goals (7.0% of principals, 7.5% of teachers), lack of support (14.1% of principals, 25.2% of teachers), inadequate resources (4.9% of principals, 7.9% of teachers), not involving all in decisions (6.3% of principals, 13.1% of teachers), and other (17.2% of principals, 10.7% of teachers).

Research Question 6: How do the perceptions of teachers compare with the perceptions of principals within the individual public schools?

There were some differences in the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers within the

individual public schools. The degree and items of difference varied considerably from school to school.

Research Question 7: What patterns exist in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers in the selected individual schools?

There were no readily apparent patterns existing among the individual schools in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers that could be determined from the data obtained for this study.

Conclusions and Discussion

1. There were differences among the four states studied in the existence of indicators of effective SBM implementation.

2. There were significant differences among the states in the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns related to SBM of teachers and principals as a group.

3. There were significant differences among the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of teachers and the attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals.

4. Greater discrepancies were noted between teacher and principal perceptions among the states. In every area in which the perceptions of principals were compared to the perceptions of teachers, there were significant differences. It was indicated that, in general, principals have more positive attitudes and perceptions of SBM than teachers.

The indicators of effective SBM implementation on which data were collected for this study included the following: degree of decentralization of decision making, quality and

quantity of community involvement, reason for SBM implementation was voluntary or mandated, adequacy of training for all stakeholder groups, sufficiency of time for planning, effects on teacher's work, consensus of strategic goals and objectives, implementation of action plans, impact on programs and services, degree of hierarchical support, and utilization of waivers. The findings related to the following were based upon information received from the responding principals: degree of decentralized decision making, reason for SBM implementation was voluntary or mandated SBM, consensus of strategic goals and objectives, implementation of action plans, and the utilization of waivers. The perceptions of the principals were used to study school board, superintendent, and other central administrator support. Teacher and principal perceptions were used to study quality and quantity of community involvement, adequate training, sufficient time for planning, teacher benefits, student benefits, and school benefits.

While decentralized decision making has been advocated as one of the criteria for successful restructuring (Pierce, 1989, as cited in Prasch, 1990), only about 40% of the principals in this study reported that they had the power to make decisions at the local level in all four areas of budget, personnel, curriculum, and staff development. According to the literature, these schools are considered as having comprehensive SBM (Clune & White, 1988). The other 60% were limited in the extent to which they had the

authority to make various types of decisions at the local building level.

Clune and White (1988) found from their study that budget is the area that is most readily decentralized. However, from this study, it appeared that decision making in the area of staff development was the most frequently decentralized, followed by curriculum, then budget, and lastly personnel.

There was also a great deal of variability in the stakeholder groups which were allowed membership on the governance councils. It did appear, however, that teachers and parents have membership on the councils to a great extent. Other stakeholder groups are not well represented as recommended in the literature (Herman, 1989; NCCE, 1990; NSPRA, 1989). The governance councils represented by this survey had the power to make actual decisions in 61% of the cases and another 11.6% have decision making authority in some areas. Insufficient data were gathered in this study to draw conclusions about the extent or type of decision making (consensual, participative, consultative) used by these schools.

The percentages of schools which had been mandated to utilize SBM and which had voluntarily begun implementation were fairly evenly divided. However, the rate of volunteering was much higher for the schools responding from Kentucky and North Carolina. This probably was related to the voluntary participation allowed by the laws in those two

states (Kentucky State Department of Education, 1990; North Carolina General Assembly, 1989). For Kentucky, this will change since all schools are required to have SBM by 1995. Some of the Florida systems have SBM mandated by their superintendents (Caputo, 1980; Lindelow & Heynderickx, 1989). Others probably are similar to Dade and Pinellas Counties which have a great deal of union influence (Dunlap, 1991; Tuthill, 1990).

It was apparent from the perceptions of teachers and principals that they feel the need for further training in order to effectively implement SBM. Although, the majority of respondents agreed that adequate training had been provided, nearly a fourth of the teachers and more than a third of the principals were dissatisfied with the amount of training they had received. Insufficient training was also a frequently cited problem in response to the open-ended question about concerns of SBM implementation. This is a common problem found throughout the literature. SBM is often begun without adequate training even though it requires new skills that are very important to the success of the process (Mutchler & Duttweiler, 1989).

Lack of sufficient time for planning and the increased responsibilities of SBM were very common problems among the teachers and principals responding to this study. As the literature suggests, time is a major concern in the implementation of SBM (Mutchler & Duttweiler, 1989; Prasch, 1990). There are many added responsibilities at the local school with SBM implementation. Planning and conducting

meetings having participative decision making are very time consuming. If additional time is not provided for teachers, they become overworked.

Waivers were not commonly requested among the respondents to this survey, and the majority of the requests that were reported in this study were regarding such matters as scheduling, the number of days in the school year, and class size. Although, there are provisions for waivers in at least three of these states (Dunlap, 1991; Kentucky State Department of Education, 1990), the schools are apparently not making use of them in the majority of instances. This probably indicates that the schools are not making the major changes which are called for in the restructuring movement.

Although teacher participation is cited as a major reason for implementing SBM (AASA, NAESP, NASSP, 1988), nearly 30% of the respondents in this study did not feel more involved since SBM implementation. However, all of the teacher benefits of SBM implementation which were studied received higher rates of agreement than disagreement. The respondents to this study apparently felt there were some teacher benefits which accompanied SBM implementation. These findings are consistent with the literature in that the following additional teacher benefits resulted from SBM implementation: existence of collegiality and continuous improvement efforts (Cohen, 1983), improvement of attitudes/morale and freedom to experiment (Lewis, 1989), and existence of satisfaction among teachers not participating on the governance structure.

The percentages of disagreement with the items concerning student benefits as a result of SBM implementation were higher than those for teacher benefits. Benefits to students is the ultimate purpose for any changes that are made in schools (Lewis, 1989); thus, one should be able to expect student benefits to be higher than teacher benefits. That was not the case for this study. This may be due to the recency with which most of these schools had implemented SBM. The benefits of SBM may not become obvious for several years.

The respondents to this study apparently had a great deal of support from their superintendents, school boards, and other central administrators. Support from the district office is essential to the success of SBM or other kind of reform (Fullan & Miles, 1992; NSPRA, 1989). These administrators often act as actual barriers to SBM (Mutchler & Duttweiler, 1989); however, this was apparently not true of the great majority of the schools represented in this study.

The other two indicators of effective SBM implementation identified by Herman (1989), strategic goals and action plans, had been established in the great majority of schools in this study. These are essential ingredients in the strategic planning process.

Recommendations for Further Study

Further study should be conducted as follows:

1. Replication among other groups of states.

2. A study comparing attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of the other stakeholder groups represented.

3. Studies to determine long-term effects of SBM on student achievement and other student benefits.

4. Case studies of the schools with most favorable responses to determine patterns.

5. Follow up studies with the same schools utilized in this study to determine changes in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns with more experience in the SBM process.

6. A study to compare the perceptions of teachers who serve on SBM councils to the perceptions of teachers who do not serve on their SBM councils.

7. Studies of SBM schools using concrete data, such as achievement test scores and discipline referrals.

8. Studies involving interviews with principals, teachers, and other stakeholder groups.

Implications for the Profession

It was obvious from this study, the results of which are consistent with other findings, that time and training are critical factors in implementing SBM. Any school or district considering SBM must address these professional needs of teachers and principals. Schools across the nation are being challenged to make radical reforms, and SBM is necessary to reform. It is almost a unanimous recommendation that changes must begin at the local level. This means that schools must get their teachers and communities involved in decision making and provide them with the training and time to do it effectively.

The time is right for schools to take advantage of their right to request waivers. Real changes probably will require eliminating many of the limitations that are placed on schools by rules and regulations from above.

Principals and teachers must keep student achievement as their primary focus. Teacher benefits are important, but the bottom line is student success.

References

Alabama Association of School Boards. (1991). Ad hoc advisory committee focuses on five key areas. Alabama School Boards, 12(4), 18-20.

Allen, L., & Glickman, C. D. (1992) School improvement: The elusive faces of shared governance. NASSP Bulletin, 76(542), 80-87.

American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1988). School-based management: A strategy for better learning. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Beers, D. E. (1984). School based management. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Number ED 249 641)

Benson, N., & Malone, P. (1988). Teachers' beliefs about shared decision-making and work alienation. Education, 107(3), 244-251.

Bredeson, P. V. (1989). Redefining leadership and the roles of school principals: Responses to changes in the professional worklife of teachers. The High School Journal, 73(1), 9-20.

Bredeson, P. V. (1991). Letting go of outlived professional identities: A study of role transition for principals in restructured schools. Paper presented at the 1991 Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Brown, D. J. (1987). A preliminary inquiry into school-based management. British Columbia, Canada: The University of British Columbia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 331)

Brown, D. J. (1991). Decentralization: An administrator's guidebook to school district change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Burns, L. T., & Howes, J. (1988). Handing control to local schools: Site-based management sweeps the country. The School Administrator, 45(7), 8-10.

Caputo, E. (1980). Freedom, order and school-based management: One principal's story. Principal, 60(2), 25-27.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Carr, R. A. (1988). Second-wave reforms crest at local initiative. The School Administrator, 45(7), 16-18.

Cawelti, G. (1989). Key elements of site-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 46.

Cetron, M. & Gayle, M. (1991). Educational renaissance: Our schools at the turn of the century. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Chapman, J., & Boyd, W. L. (1986). Decentralization, devolution, and the school principal: Australian lessons on statewide educational reform. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(4), 28-58.

Clark, C. R. (1990). Site-based management. In Educational Research Service, Site-based management information folio (pp. 1-9). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Clune, W. H., & White, P. A. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Cohen, M. (1983). Instructional, management, and social conditions in effective schools. In A. Oden & L. D. Webb (Eds.), School finance and school improvement: Linkages for the 1980s (pp. 17-50). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Conley, S. C., & Bacharach, S. B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.

Cunard, R. F. (1990). Sharing instructional leadership: A view to strengthening the principal's position. NASSP Bulletin, 74(525), 30-34.

David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 45-53.

Dreyfuss, G. (1988). Dade County opens doors to site decisions. The School Administrator, 45(7), 12-13, 15.

Dunlap, W. H. (1991). The goal is control. Agenda, 1(2), 24-26.

Drucker, P. F. (1992). Managing for the future: The 1990s and beyond. New York: Truman Talley Books/Dutton.

Educational Research Service. (1990). Information folio: Site-based management. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

English, F. W. (Ed.). (1989). School-site management. The Practitioner, 16(2).

Etheridge, C. P., Hall, M. L., Brown, N., & Lucas, S. (1990). Establishing school based decision making in seven urban schools in Memphis, Tennessee: The first year. Memphis: Center for Research in Educational Policy, Memphis State University.

Fiske, E. B. (1991). Bush's choice: Education secretary pitches bottom-up reform from the top. Agenda, 1(2), 9-11, 13.

Florida Department of Education. (1988). School-based management grants: Status report 1982-1988. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 9-14.

Fullan, M., & Miles, M. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(10), 745-752.

Glickman, C. (1991). Pretending not to know what we know. Educational Leadership, 48(8), 4-9.

Goldman, J. P. (1992). When participatory management attracts no buyers. The School Administrator, 49(1), 13-14.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodlad, J. (1987). The ecology of school renewal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 305-309.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (1991). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental educational reform. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 681)

Hanson, E. M. (1990). School based management and educational reform in the United States and Spain. Comparative Education Review, 34(4), 523-537.

Harrington-Lueker, D. (1990). The engine of reform gathers steam: Kentucky starts from scratch. The American School Board Journal, 177(9), 17-21.

Harris, L. (1991). Vox populi: Dollars and sense. Agenda, 1(2), 18-23.

Harvey, G., & Crandall, D. P. (1988). What restructuring is: In search of a definition. Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast Islands. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 918)

Heckman, P. E., Oakes, J., & Sirotnik, K. A. (1983). Expanding the concepts of renewal and change. Educational Leadership, 40(7), 26-32.

Henley, M. (1987). Something is missing from the education reform movement. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(4), 284-285.

Herman, J. J. (1989a). A decision-making model: Site-based communications/governance committees. NASSP Bulletin, 73(521), 61-66.

Herman, J. J. (1989b). External and internal scanning: Identifying variables that affect your school. NASSP Bulletin, 73(520), 48-52.

Herman, J. J. (1989c). A vision for the future: Site-based strategic planning. NASSP Bulletin, 73(518), 23-27.

Herman, J. J. (1989d). Site-based management: Creating a vision and mission statement. NASSP Bulletin, 73,(519), 79-83.

Herman, J. J. (1990a). Action plans to make your vision a reality. NASSP Bulletin, 74(523), 14-17.

Herman, J. J. (1990b). School-based management. Instructional Leader, 3(4), 1-4.

Herman, J. J. (1990c). School-based management: A checklist of things to consider. NASSP Bulletin, 73(521), 61-66.

Herman, J. J. (1992). Key steps to develop school governance teams. The School Administrator, 49(1), 34-35.

Herman, J. J., & Herman, J. L. (in press). School-based management: Current thinking and practice. Urbana, IL: Charles Thomas Publishers.

Herman, J. J., & Herman, J. L. (1992). Educational administration: An overview. The Clearing House, 65(3), 133-134.

Hill, P. T., & Bonan, J. (1991). Decentralization and accountability in public education. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Howell, S. B. (1992). Restructuring school governance: The 20th Century Task Force report. Alabama School Boards, 13(6), 15-16.

Howell, S. B. (1991). Foundation for reform: Hunt's 1991 education proposals. Alabama School Boards, 122(5), 2.

Jenkins, K. D., & Phillips, J. (1992). Reforming schools needs work, not waivers. The School Administrator, 49(1), 29-30.

Jennings, M. (1991). Perestroika, Kentucky style. Agenda, 1(2), 32-35.

Jennings, W. B. (1989). How to organize successful parent advisory committees. Educational Leadership, 47(2), 42-45.

Jones, M. L. (1991). Personal correspondence. Springdale Public Schools, Arkansas.

Kaufman, R. (1988). Preparing useful performance indicators. Training and Development, 42(9), 80-83.

Kentucky State Department of Education (1990). School-based decision making, from House Bill #940, Part I--Curriculum Section 14.

Kirst, M. W. (1984). Who controls our schools? New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Kowalski, T. (1980). Attitudes of school principals toward decentralized budgeting. Journal of Education Finances, 6(1), 68-76.

Lane, J. (1991). Instructional leadership and community: A perspective on school-based management. Theory Into Practice, 30(2), 119-123.

Lawler, E. E. (1986). High-involvement management: Participative strategies for improving organizational performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 8-11.

Lewis, A. (1989). Restructuring America's schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Lewis, A. (1991). Sharing power. Agenda, 1(1), 40-43.

Lewis, J., Jr. (1989). Implementing school-based management ... by empowering teachers. Westbury, NY: J. L. Wilkerson Publishing.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Expanding the leadership team. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 4-8.

Lindelow, J. (1981). School-based management. In S. C. Smith, J. A. Mazzarella, & P. K. Piele (Eds.), School leadership: Handbook for survival (pp. 94-129). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Lindelow, J., & Heynderickx, J. (1989). School based management. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), School leadership: Handbook for excellence (2nd ed.) (pp. 109-134). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Mahon, J. P. (1991). What to do when the rhetoric of reform turns into reality. Executive Educator, 13(1), 25,28.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1990). Site-based management: Unfulfilled promises. The School Administrator, 47(2), 300,32,53-56,59.

Marburger, C. L. (1985). One school at a time. School based management: A process for change. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Mauriel, J. J. (1989). Strategic leadership for schools: Creating and sustaining productive change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mitchell, J. E. (1990). Share the power. The American School Board Journal, 177(1), 42-43.

Mojkowski, C., & Fleming, D. (1988). School-site management: Concepts and approaches. Cranston, RI: Educational Leadership Academy.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. T. (1989). The paradox of decentralizing schools: Lessons from business, government, and the Catholic Church. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(10), 808-812.

Mutchler, S. E., & Duttweiler, P. C. (1989). Implementing shared decision making in school-based management: Barriers to changing traditional behavior. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

National Clearinghouse on School-Based Management. (1991). Fourth annual conference announcement. Westbury, NY: National Clearinghouse on School-Based Management.

National Committee for Citizens in Education. (1990). School based improvement and effective schools: A perfect match for bottom up reform. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

National Education Association. (1988). Employee participation programs: Considerations for the school site. Washington, DC: Author.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results. The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, DC: Author.

National LEADership Network. (1991). Developing leaders for restructuring schools: New habits of mind and heart. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education.

National School Public Relations Association. (1989). School-based management: Communication kit. Arlington, VA: Author.

Neal, R. G. (1989). School-based management lets principals slice the budget pie. The Executive Educator, 11(1), 16-19.

Noblit, G. W. (1986). What's missing from the national agenda for school reform? The Urban Review, 18(1), 40-51.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1989). Recommended guidelines for implementation of the school improvement and accountability act of 1989. Raleigh: Author.

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. (1989). Especially for teachers: The connection. An invitation to school improvement in North Carolina. Raleigh: Author.

North Carolina General Assembly (1989). School and Improvement Accountability Act of 1989.

Osterman, K. F. (1989). Supervision and shared authority: A study of principal and teacher control in six urban middle schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S. C., & Parker, J. V. (1986). Productive school systems for a nonrational world. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Pierce, L. C. (1980). School based management. OSSC Bulletin, 23(10), 6-21.

Poplin, M. S. (1992). The leader's new role: Looking at the growth of teachers. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 10-11.

Prasch, J. (1990). How to organize for school-based management. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Psencik, K. (1991). Site planning in a strategic context in Temple, TX. Educational Leadership, 48(7), 29-31.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1985). School reform. The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 353-389.

Raywid, M. A. (1990). The evolving effort to improve schools: Pseudo-reform, incremental reform, and restructuring. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(2), 139-143.

Reavis, C. A., & Griffith, H. (1992). Restructuring schools: Theory and practice. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Rennie, R. J. (1985). School centered management: A matter of style. School Business Affairs, 51(4), 64-66.

Robinson, S., & Barkley, R. (1992). Nine principles guide decentralizing efforts. The School Administrator, 49(1), 13-14.

Rogers, L. R., & Ahearn, C. (1990). New Florida legislation supports district school site restructuring. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Scott, J. J., & Smith, S. C. (1987). Collaborative schools. Eric Digest Series, Number 22. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Simmons, T., Webster, K., Filiatreau, J., & Bruder, I. (1991). Schools that work: Putting it all together. Agenda, 1(1), 32-38.

Sirotnik, J. A., & Clark, R. W. (1988). School-centered decision making and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(9), 660-664.

Snyder, K., Anderson, R. H., & Johnson, W. (1992). A tool kit for managing productive schools. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 76-80.

Sokoloff, H. (1990). Ideas for making shared governance work. The School Administrator, 47(3), 43.

Stevenson, R. B. (1987). Autonomy and support: The dual needs of urban high schools. Urban Education, 22(3), 366-386.

Stover, D. (1989). What's cooking in school-based management? Executive Educator, 11(1), 19.

Taylor, B. O., & Levine, D. U. (1991). Effective schools projects and school-based management. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 394-397.

Tewel, K., & Holzman, M. (1991). Toppling roadblocks: Take a fresh run at reform or collide with the bureaucracy. The American School Board Journal, 178(5), 36-37.

Texas Legislature. (1991). House Bill 2885, Texas Education Code, Section 21.931--Site-Based Decision Making.

Timar, T. B., & Kirp, D. L. (1987). Educational reform and institutional competence. Harvard Educational Review, 57(3), 308-330.

Toch, T. (1991). Separate but not equal. Agenda, 1(1), 14-19.

Tornillo, P. (1992). The union label on reform. Agenda, 2(1), 6.

Tuthill, D. (1990). Expanding the union contract: One teacher's perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(10), 775-780.

United States Department of Education. (1991). America 2000: An education strategy. Washington, DC: Author.

Van Meter, E. J. (1991). The Kentucky mandate: School-based decision making. NASSP Bulletin, 73(532), 52-62.

Staff. (1992). Where do you draw the line in shared decision making. The School Administrator, 49(1), 8-9.

White, P. A. (1989). An overview of school-based management: What does the research say? NASSP Bulletin, 73(518), 1-8.

Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (1989). The politics of education: Schools in conflict. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Wissler, D. F., & Ortiz, F. I. (1986). The decentralization process of school systems: A review of the literature. Urban Education, 21(3), 280-294.

Wood, C. J. (1984). Participatory decision making: Why doesn't it seem to work? The Educational Forum, 49(1), 55-64.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS FROM CHAIRPERSONS

The University of Alabama at Birmingham
School of Education
Department of Educational Leadership and Instructional Support
205/934-4892 Telex: 888826 UAB BHM

Dear Superintendent:

We appreciate your cooperation in permitting the sharing of the attached school-based management principal and teacher questionnaires. Mrs. Oliver's dissertation study will contribute to the knowledge base about school-based management, particularly in the southern states. We have used some of her proposal research information in our in-press text School-Based Management: Current Thinking and Practice and feel that the study is quite worthwhile.

We join Mrs. Oliver in thanking you for your support in completion of this research.

Sincerely,

Jerry J. Herman
Area Head and Professor
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa
Chair of Mrs. Oliver's Doctoral Committee

Janice L. Herman
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Co-Chair of Mrs. Oliver's Doctoral Committee

/sm
Attachment

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS FROM RESEARCHER

STEMLEY ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2760 Stemley Bridge Road
Talladega, Alabama 35160
(205) 362-9460

February 29, 1992

Superintendent's Name
Name of School District
Street Address or Post Office Box
City, State Zip Code

Dear _____ (Superintendent's Name):

I am conducting a study of schools involved in school-based management (SBM) in selected southern states through the University of Alabama in Birmingham. Your school district was identified through my search as having one or more schools involved in SBM by one of the following:

1. Your state department of education
2. Your regional educational laboratory
3. A review of the related literature
4. National Clearinghouse on School-Based Management

Then several weeks ago, someone in your central office was contacted by telephone and requested to provide the names, addresses, and principals' names of schools in your district participating in SBM. Through the stratified proportional random sampling procedure that I utilized, the following school(s) in your district has (have) been selected to be surveyed:

_____ (List names of schools in

_____ sample from this district.)

Please find enclosed the following items:

1. Letters to principals requesting participation
2. Principal's Questionnaire
3. Letter to teachers requesting participation
4. Teacher's Questionnaire
5. Stamped, addressed postcard on which you may indicate your approval for schools in your district to participate

The questionnaires have been revised based upon recommendations from some members of an expert panel. It is possible that other minor revisions will be made to the instruments upon receipt of recommendations from

other members of the expert panel and after field testing. The substance of the instruments will not change, however.

I hope that this meets with your approval. I can assure you that the confidentiality of responses will be maintained. Results will be reported in a cumulative manner; and no principal, teacher, school, or school system will be individually identified.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this request for participation from your school district. Your assistant will be of great benefit to me personally as I seek to complete a dissertation study and will be an important contribution to the field of education as related to SBM. I will be happy to share my findings with you if you desire.

Sincerely,

Vicki Oliver
Principal

enclosures (5)

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS FROM RESEARCHER

STEMLEY ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2760 Stemley Bridge Road
Talladega, Alabama 35160
(205) 362-9460

March 12, 1992

Dear_____ (Principal's Name):

Your school has been selected for participation in a study of school-based management (SBM) in selected southern states. Identification of your school as a SBM school was by one of the following:

1. Your state department of education
2. Your regional educational laboratory
3. The National Clearinghouse on SBM
4. The review of the literature on SBM

Your participation will be of great benefit to me personally as I strive to complete a doctoral study, and it will be a valuable contribution to the field of education as related to SBM.

A set of these survey items was sent to your superintendent recently, and he/she responded with approval for your school to participate. I am requesting your assistance with this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me in the stamped, addressed envelope that is also enclosed.

The next step in this study will involve surveying all of the teachers in some of the schools. I hope that you will consider assisting with this. It will involve your distributing the survey to teachers, collecting them, and mailing them back to me in a stamped, addressed envelope. It will be inconvenient for you, but it will also provide you with some data for your own school if you desire and if your school is selected. Principals who assist in the next stage will be given the opportunity to request the data at the same time that teacher surveys are returned.

I will assure you that the confidentiality of your responses will be maintained. Results will be reported in a cumulative manner; and no principal, teacher, school, or school district will be individually identified in this study. The only exception to this will be that principals will be provided with cumulative data for their own schools if they so request.

Thank you very much for your help with this study.

Sincerely,

Vicki Oliver
Principal

enclosure

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

DEMOGRAPHICH INFORMATION

1. ___ elementary school
   ___ middle school
   ___ high school

2. Number of miles to nearest university:
   ___ less than 30
   ___ 30-60
   ___ 60-100
   ___ more than 100

3. School district's per pupil expenditure:
   ___ under $2500
   ___ $2500-$5000
   ___ over $5000

4. Number of schools in district:
   ___ less than 10
   ___ 10-20
   ___ 20-50
   ___ more than 50

5. Number of years SBM has been used in your school building: _____

SBM refers to School-Based Management or Site-Based Management - the process through which the primary decision making authority is at the individual school building level.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO MARK YOUR RESPONSES TO THE ITEMS BELOW:

(1) strongly disagree
(2) disagree
(3) agree
(4) strongly agree

1A. The outcomes of SBM implementation in my school have been positive.	1	2	3	4
2A. SBM is worthwhile relative to the amount of time and responsibility required of me.	1	2	3	4
3A. I am in favor or continuing SBM in my school. . . .	1	2	3	4
4A. Those persons involved in SBM in my school have received adequate training in the process. . . .	1	2	3	4
5A. The superintendent supports our efforts.	1	2	3	4
6A. The school board supports our efforts.	1	2	3	4
7A. Other central administrators support our efforts. .	1	2	3	4

Please respond to the remainder of the items in relation to outcomes that have occurred since the implementation of SBM in your school. Use the same rating scale as for items 1A to 7A above.

1B. Teacher attitudes/morale have improved.	1	2	3	4
2B. Teachers feel more involved in problem solving and improving the school.	1	2	3	4
3B. Teachers feel comfortable to experiment with new instructional practices.	1	2	3	4
4B. Teachers strive for continuous improvement in their performance..	1	2	3	4
5B. Cooperation and collegiality among teachers has increased.	1	2	3	4
6B. Teachers who are not members of the SBM council/school improvement team are satisfied with the SBM process.	1	2	3	4
7B. The school as a whole is involved in major decisions.	1	2	3	4
8B. Teachers' expectations of students are higher. . .	1	2	3	4
9B. Students' expectations of students are higher. . .	1	2	3	4
10B. Student discipline referrals to the principal have decreased.	1	2	3	4
11B. Student absenteeism/tardiness have been reduced.	1	2	3	4
12B. Student performance has improved as measured by achievement tests.	1	2	3	4
13B. A school vision has been created, communicated, and realized.	1	2	3	4

14B. Shared values have been formulated and monitored yearly.	1	2	3	4
15B. Goals and objectives have been obtained.	1	2	3	4
16B. Individual and school problems are being addressed.	1	2	3	4
17B. The number of parent complaints has decreased.	1	2	3	4
18B. There has been an increase in constructive visits by parents/community members.	1	2	3	4
19B. Parents enjoy serving on the school council. ...	1	2	3	4
20B. More decision-making authority has been transferred to the local school level.	1	2	3	4
21B. Decisions are made based upon the unique needs of my school.	1	2	3	4
22B. Additional time for planning has been provided since the implementation of SBM.	1	2	3	4
23B. Sufficient time is allotted for the additional responsibilities of SBM.	1	2	3	4

1C. How have teachers benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2C. How have students benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3C. What went wrong in your implementation of SBM (that others can learn from)? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1D. Indicate the areas in which SBM is utilized in your school:

___ budget - budgetary allocations are made at the school site
___ personnel - principal or SBM council/team participates in hiring by interviewing and making recommendations
___ curriculum - staff or council can make decisions regarding instructional matters such as course offerings, course content, or textbook selections
___ staff development - staff or council participates in decisions about topics for inservice sessions.

2D. Check all categories of stakeholders which have representation on your governance council/school improvement team:

___ administrators ___ teachers
___ students ___ parents
___ nonprofessional staff ___ nonparental community
___ business representatives ___ college people

3D. Does your SBM council/school improvement team serve in an advisory or decision-making capacity?

___ is advisory ___ has actual decision-making authority

4D. Was SBM voluntary or mandated for your school?

___ voluntary ___ mandated

5D. Number of SBM or related topics inservice sessions attended:

___ 0 ___ 1 ___ 2-5 ___ more than 5

6D. Approximately how many hours have you spent in training sessions for SBM? _____

7D. Was consensus reached on long-range improvement goals for the school? ___ yes ___ no

8D. Has an annual action plan been developed and implemented?

___ yes ___ no

9D. Has your school applied for waivers of school board policies, state department mandates, or state laws? ___ yes ___ no

10D. If yes, briefly explain. _____

_____

_____

_____

11D. If you have applied for waivers, were they approved?

___ yes ___ no

****

___ I am willing to assist with the teacher survey.
If my school is chosen, I will distribute and collect the survey forms and mail them in the envelope provided. Number of teachers _____

___ I cannot help with the teacher survey.

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO TEACHERS FROM RESEARCHER

STEMLEY ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2760 Stemley Bridge Road
Talladega, Alabama 35160
(205) 362-9460

March 30, 1992

Dear Teacher:

Your school has been selected to participate in a study of school-based management (SBM) in the southern states because of your involvement in the SBM process. Your feelings and perceptions of the outcomes of SBM in your school are very important to the study of SBM. By completing the attached questionnaire and promptly returning it to your principal, you will be making a valuable contribution to the field of education; and you will be assisting me greatly as I seek to complete a doctoral study.

Please complete the survey, seal it in the envelope provided, and return it to your principal as soon as possible. Do not identify yourself on this form. I will assure you that the anonymity of your responses will be protected. Results will be reported in a cumulative manner; and no teacher, principal, school, or district will be identified individually in this study. I appreciate very much your time and effort in completing this survey and your thoughts regarding the implementation of SBM in your school.

I know that you are interested in SBM research, since you are an active participant in SBM. I will be happy to share my findings with you if you include your name and address when you return your envelope to your principal (You may put it inside your envelope or turn it in separately).

Thank you again for your time and help with this study!!!

Sincerely,

Vicki Oliver
Principal

APPENDIX F

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

SBM refers to School-Based Management or Site-Based Management - the process through which the primary decision making authority is at the individual school building level.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Number of school-based management (SBM) or related topics inservice sessions attended:
   ___ 0
   ___ 1
   ___ 2-5
   ___ more than 5

2. Approximately how many hours have you spent in training for SBM? _____

3. These inservice sessions were conducted by:
   ___ another teacher
   ___ my principal
   ___ central office person
   ___ state department person
   ___ university person
   ___ other

4. Do you serve on the SBM council/team in your school? ___ yes ___ no

5. Number of years SBM has been used in your school building: _____

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO MARK YOUR RESPONSES TO THE ITEMS BELOW:

(1) strongly disagree
(2) disagree
(3) agree
(4) strongly agree

1A. The outcomes of SBM implementation in my school have been positive. 1 2 3 4

2A. SBM is worthwhile relative to the amount of time and responsibility required of me. 1 2 3 4

3A. I am in favor of continuing SBM in my school. 1 2 3 4

4A. Those persons involved in SBM in my school have received adequate training in the process. 1 2 3 4

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE REMAINDER OF THE ITEMS IN RELATION TO OUTCOMES THAT HAVE OCCURRED SINCE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SBM IN YOUR SCHOOL. USE THE SAME RATING SCALE AS FOR ITEMS 1A TO 4A ABOVE.

1B. Teacher attitudes/morale have improved. 1 2 3 4

2B. Teachers feel more involved in problem solving and improving the school. .. 1 2 3 4

3B. Teachers feel more comfortable to experiment with new instructional practices. 1 2 3 4

4B. Teachers strive for continuous improvement in their performance. 1 2 3 4

5B. Cooperation and collegiality among teachers has increased. 1 2 3 4

6B. Teachers who are not members of the SBM council/school improvement team are satisfied with the process. ... 1 2 3 4

7B. The school as a whole is involved in major decisions. 1	2	3	4
8B. Teachers' expectations of students are higher. 1	2	3	4
9B. Students' expectations of students are higher. 1	2	3	4
10B. Student discipline referrals to the principal have decreased. 1	2	3	4
11B. Student absenteeism/tardiness have been reduced. 1	2	3	4
12B. Student performance has improved as measured by achievement tests. .. 1	2	3	4
13B. A school vision has been created, communicated, and realized. 1	2	3	4
14B. Shared values have been formulated and monitored yearly. 1	2	3	4
15B. Goals and objectives have been obtained. 1	2	3	4
16B. Individual and school problems are being addressed. 1	2	3	4
17B. The number of parent complaints has decreased. 1	2	3	4
18B. There has been an increase in constructive visits by parents/ community members. 1	2	3	4
19B. Parents enjoy serving on the school council. 1	2	3	4
20B. More decision-making authority has been transferred to the local school level. 1	2	3	4
21B. Decisions are made based upon the unique needs of my school. 1	2	3	4
22B. Additional time for planning has been provided since the implementation of SBM. 1	2	3	4
23B. Sufficient time is allotted for the additional responsibilities of SBM. .. 1	2	3	4

1C. How have you benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school?

2C. How have students benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school?

3C. What went wrong in your school's implementation of SBM (that others can learn from)?

APPENDIX G

CORRELATION OF HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO ITEMS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRES

CORRELATION OF HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS
TO ITEMS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Hypothesis 1. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in selected southern states in the areas in which decisions have been decentralized to the local school building level: budget, curriculum, and personnel.

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Item 1D

1D. Indicate the areas in which SBM is utilized in your school:
___ budget - budgetary allocations are made at the school site
___ personnel - principal or SBM council/team participates in hiring by interviewing and making recommendations
___ curriculum - staff or council can make decisions regarding instructional matters such as course offerings, course content, or textbook selection.
___ staff development -staff or council participates in decisions about the kinds of inservice in which they participate.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states in the groups that are represented on the SBM council/team.

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Item 2D

2D. Check all categories of stakeholders which have representation on your governance council/team:

___ administrators	___ teachers
___ students	___ parents
___ nonprofessional staff	___ nonparental community
___ business representatives	___ college people

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant differences among the public schools implementing SBM in the selected southern states in whether the SBM council/team is advisory or has decision-making authority.

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Item 3D

3D. Does your SBM council/team serve in an advisory or decision-making capacity?
___ is advisory ___ has actual decision-making authority

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant differences among the public schools involved in SBM in the selected southern states in whether SBM was voluntary or mandated when it was first implemented.

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Item 4D

4D. Was SBM voluntary or mandated for your school?
___ voluntary ___ mandated

Hypothesis 5. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of the principals of the public schools participating in SBM in the selected southern states in the degree of school board, superintendent, and other central administrator support of SBM.

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Items 5A, 6A, and 7A

5A. The superintendent supports our SBM efforts. 1 2 3 4

6A. The school board supports our SBM efforts. 1 2 3 4

7A. Other central administrators support our efforts. 1 2 3 4

Hypothesis 6. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not adequate training has been provided.

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Items 5D, 6D, and 4A
Teacher's Questionnaire - Demographic Items 1, 2, and 3
- Survey Item 4A

5D. Number of SBM or related topics inservice sessions attended:
___ 0 ___ 1 ___ 2-5 ___ more than 5

6D. Approximately how many hours have you spent in training sessions for SBM? ___

4A. Those persons involved in SBM in my school received adequate training in the process. 1 2 3 4

1. Number of SBM or related topics inservice sessions attended:
___ 0 ___ 1 ___ 2-5 ___ more than 5

2. Approximately how many hours have you spent in training for SBM? ___

3. These inservice sessions were conducted by:
___ another teacher ___ my principal
___ central office person ___ state department person
___ university person ___ other

Hypothesis 7. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding whether or not sufficient time for planning is provided.

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaire - Items 18B and 19B

22B. Additional time for planning has been provided since the implementation of SBM. 1 2 3 4

23B. Sufficient time is allotted for the additional responsibilities of SBM. .1 2 3 4

Hypothesis 8. There will be no significant differences between the attitudes toward SBM of teachers and principals in selected southern states who are involved in SBM.

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaire - Items 1A, 2A, 3A

1A. The outcomes of SBM implementation in my school have been positive. 1 2 3 4

2A. SBM is worthwhile relative to the amount of time and responsibility required of me. 1 2 3 4

3A. I am in favor of continuing SBM in my school. 1 2 3 4

Hypothesis 9. There will be no significant differences among the perceptions of principals and the perceptions of teachers regarding the quality and quantity of community involvement since SBM implementation.

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaire - 17B, 18B, 19B

17B. The number of parent complaints has decreased. 1 2 3 4

18B. There has been an increase in constructive visits by parents/community members. 1 2 3 4

19B. Parents enjoy serving on the school council. 1 2 3 4

Research Question 1. To what extent and for what purposes are applications for waivers of school board policies, state department of education mandates, or state laws made and approval received?

Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Items 9D - 11D

9D. Has your school applied for waivers of school board policies, state department mandates, or state laws? ___ yes ___ no

10D. If yes, briefly explain.

11D. If you have applied for waivers, were they approved? ___ yes ___ no

Research Question 2. How do the perceptions of principals regarding teacher outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaires - Items 1B-6B and 1C

1B. Teacher attitudes/morale have improved. 1 2 3 4

2B. Teachers feel more involved in problem solving and improving the school. . 1 2 3 4

3B. Teachers feel comfortable to experiment with new instructional practices. . 1 2 3 4

4B. Teachers strive for continuous improvement in their performance. . 1 2 3 4

5B. Cooperation and collegiality among teachers has increased. 1 2 3 4

6B. Teachers who are not members of the SBM council team are satisfied with the SBM process. 1 2 3 4

7B. The school as a whole is involved in major decisions. 1 2 3 4

1C. (Teacher's) How have you benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school?

1C. (Principal's) How have teachers benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school?

Research Question 3. How do the perceptions of principals regarding student outcomes and benefits of SBM compare to those of teachers?

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaire - Items 8B-12B and 2C

8B. Teachers' expectations of students are higher. 1 2 3 4

9B. Students' expectations of students are higher. 1 2 3 4

10B. Student discipline referrals to the principal have decreased. 1 2 3 4

11B. Student absenteeism/tardiness have been reduced. 1 2 3 4

12B. Student performance has improved as measured by achievement tests. . . 1 2 3 4

2C. How have students benefited from the implementation of SBM in your school?

Research Question 4. How do the perceptions of principals regarding school outcomes of SBM compare to those of teachers?

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaire - Items 13B, 14B, 15B, 16B, 20B, 21B
Principal's Questionnaire - Survey Items 7D and 8D

13B. A school vision has been created, communicated, and realized. 1 2 3 4

14B. Shared values have been formulated and monitored yearly. 1 2 3 4

15B. Goals and objectives have been obtained. 1 2 3 4

16B. Individual and school problems are being addressed. 1 2 3 4

20B. More decision-making authority has been transferred to the local school level. 1 2 3 4

21B. Decisions are made based upon the unique needs of my school. 1 2 3 4

7D. Was consensus reached on long-range improvement goals for the school? ___ yes ___ no

8D. Has an annual action plan been developed and implemented? ___ yes ___ no

Research Question 5. How do the major concerns of principals regarding the implementation of SBM compare to the major concerns of teachers?

Principal's and Teacher's Questionnaire - Item 3C

3C. What went wrong in your implementation of SBM that others can learn from?

Research Question 6. How do the perceptions of teachers compare with the perceptions of principals within the individual public schools?

Research Question 7. What patterns exist among the individual schools in attitudes, perceptions, and concerns of principals and teachers?

GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA AT BIRMINGHAM
DISSERTATION APPROVAL FORM

Name of Candidate Vicki S. Oliver

Major Subject Educational Leadership

Title of Dissertation A Study of School-Based Management in Selected Southern States: Extent of Implementation and Comparison of Attitudes, Perceptions, and Concerns of Principals and Teachers

Dissertation Committee:

_____, Chairman Jerry F. Herman

Jamie S. Herman

Gypsy Albrecht

J. Kenneth Cross

David K. Dagley

Director of Graduate Program Bonnie Cox

Dean, UAB Graduate School W. A. Stokely

Date 12/7/92