

# Education Policy Analysis Archives

Volume 10 Number 23

April 28, 2002

ISSN 1068-2341

---

A peer-reviewed scholarly journal

**Editor: Gene V Glass**

College of Education

Arizona State University

Copyright 2002, the **EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS ARCHIVES** .

Permission is hereby granted to copy any article

if **EPAA** is credited and copies are not sold.

Articles appearing in **EPAA** are abstracted in the *Current Index to Journals in Education* by the [ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation](#) and are permanently archived in *Resources in Education*.

---

## **School-Based Management: Views from Public and Private Elementary School Principals**

**Mary T. Apodaca-Tucker**  
New Mexico State University

**John R. Slate**  
University of Texas at El Paso

Citation: Apodaca-Tucker, M. T. & Slate, J. R. (2002, April 28). School-Based management: Views from public and private elementary school principals. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(23). Retrieved [date] from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n23.html>.

### **Abstract**

In this study, we analyzed the principal questionnaire contained in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten (ECLS-K) database regarding the extent to which school-based management was reported as having been implemented differently by public and by private elementary school principals. Statistical analyses indicated many differences in the degree of influence reported to be present on the part of principals, parents, and other groups on important decisions made at schools. Differences in school-based management between our public and private elementary school principals were linked to the extant literature.

Moreover, recommendations for further research were discussed.

In 1991, the Texas Education Agency directed schools to form school-based decision-making committees. Other states in this nation have created similar mandates to reform their schools. The ultimate purpose of all decision-making in schools is to achieve the state's educational goals of equity and excellence for all students. Committees also served as advisory councils to the principal. Shared decision-making (SDM) committee was to include parents, teachers, administrators, and community representatives. Because of the increased local autonomy and accountability that is created through SDM, increased student achievement has been cited as a positive outcome of SDM (TEA, 1992). Strong leadership by school principals has also been supported by the Department of Education in the report entitled Turn Around Low-Performing Schools (U.S. Department of Education, May 1998). Limited research, unfortunately, is available about the extent to which school-based management has been implemented across the United States.

## **Theoretical Basis of the Study**

School-based management functions under decentralization, the development of internal resources, and the wide participation of school members in the decision-making process, which closely accompanies the tenets of critical theory. Livingston, Slate, and Gibb (1999) reported that administrators agree that all stakeholders must be involved in decision-making if the school is to be successful and that teachers possess expertise that is necessary to make important decisions about the school. In addition, Cheng (1996) suggested that SBM assumes a multiplicity of educational goals, a complex and changing educational environment, need for educational reforms, school effectiveness, and the pursuit of quality.

The theory that guides this study is based on the work of two educational researchers: Glickman (1993) and Sergiovanni (1992, 1994, and 2001) as well as researchers Conley (1993) and Schlechty (1997). The framework that guided Glickman's research (1993) consisted of a covenant of teaching and learning that is brought to life using shared governance and action research. A covenant of teaching and learning is a set of belief statements that capture what people associated with a school want students to know and be able to do, the type of instructional practices they believe will bring about these desired results, and a description of how students will demonstrate mastery of the desired skills and understandings. Shared governance is a democratic process that gives all of a school's stakeholders the opportunity to actively participate in bringing their covenant to life. Action research is an information-producing process that provides feedback and guidance as a school works to carry out the terms of its covenant (Glickman, 1993).

Sergiovanni (1992) reported that most educators would agree that leadership is an important component in improving our schools, yet few people are satisfied with leadership practices now in place. Sergiovanni illustrated how creating a new leadership practice, one with moral dimension centered around purpose, values, and beliefs, can transform school from an organization to a community (1994) and inspire the kinds of commitment, devotion, and service that can make our schools great (2001). Sergiovanni agreed with the research by Glickman (1993) by arguing that this new leadership style is

importance to legitimizing emotion and getting in touch with basic values and connections with others. Sergiovanni and Glickman both reported in their separate research how collegiality, based on shared work and common goals, leads to a natural interdependence among teachers. When teachers and administrators are motivated by emotional and social bonds, guided by a professional ideal, and feel they are truly part of a community, the guiding principle is no longer what is rewarded occurs, but what is good happens (Conley, 1993; Schlechty, 1997).

## **Participatory Management**

Participative decision-making is not a new concept. Senge (1990) catapulted learning organizations in business into popularity in the 1990s, and he also reported about participative openness. This theory by Senge (1990) about participative management soon became part of the educational reform movement. Researchers, through their literature, illustrated a development in school reform that became known as school-based management.

The concept of school-based management (SBM) and shared decision-making (SDM) basically fell under the theoretical umbrella of participative management. In recent years, it has become a generally accepted belief that people who participate in the decisions that directly affect them are more likely to have a sense of ownership and commitment to the decisions and situations that involve them (Glickman, 1993; Conley, 1993). School systems are beginning to acknowledge the need to reform traditional hierarchical structures and to experiment with participative management styles to meet the needs of students who are falling behind acceptable academic standards (Conley, 1993).

Supposedly the low morale of school employees and the decrease in organizational effectiveness has led many experts in the field of education to recognize the need for organizational and structural change. Educational systems in America have been publicly criticized for being disorganized and having little empathy for the plight of their employees (Conley, 1993). Consequently, it appeared a natural outgrowth that reform related to participative management styles would be a viable consideration to traditional school structures. Teachers who have low morale and a sense of helplessness within their school system would seemingly be less inclined to apply maximum effort or maximum use of their professional capacities when instructing the nation's students (Conley, 1993).

It becomes apparent that participative management is complex in its theoretical structure. Different perceptions of participation may be related to the success or failure of the emergent styles of participative management (SDM, SBM, site-based management) that are currently being considered for implementation or already have been implemented in schools nationwide. How does participative management merge into education?

## **Shared Decision-Making**

Shared decision-making, according to Allan S. Vann's magazine article in *Educational Horizons* entitled "Shared Decision-Making: A Paper Tiger?" (Fall, 1999), is a state mandate that each school have a site-based management committee composed of

parents, teachers, and administrators. The purpose of each committee is to engage in shared decision-making to improve student achievement. Consequently, it is left to each local school board, however, to determine each school's precise committee composition, the membership selection process, and the issues that such committees can, and cannot, consider. Researchers have revealed contradicting information from studies on school reform; some researchers reported the advantages, limitations, and components of SDM. Therefore, the following review of the literature on shared decision-making reflects the diversity of information discovered by these writers.

According to Rodriguez (2000), site-based management is implemented in a variety of ways in districts and schools across the United States. One of the reasons for the differences in implementation is a variation in focus. Clune and White (1988) reported that many districts judge SDM as more of a mind set or disposition than a structured system. Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz (1990) stated that the emphasis is more on the spirit of the approach than the details of the arrangement. In addition, they indicated that key parameters are set in place by districts regarding site-based management, but explicit detail of the governance process is left up to the individual school (Hill & Bonan, 1991). In a study conducted by Smith (1993), the conclusion was that districts supplied insufficient clarification of the roles teachers were to play in the decision-making process, and that districts gave little assistance as to how site-based management should be implemented. Ambiguity left by the districts caused teachers to build their own varying definitions of SBM (Smith, 1993). During the investigation of Chicago's school reform conducted by Hess (1991), he found that the first years of site-based management were a time of "informal negotiations" (p. 8) during which shared decision making began to take on meaning.

Rodriguez (2000) reported that investigators have delineated three broad spheres of influence, or domains of site-based management, budgeting, curriculum, and personnel. In addition, goals and organizational structure have been added to these domains by Hill and Bonan (1991). Freedom to develop goals is perhaps one of the most important aspects of self-governing schools. Clark and Meloy (1989) remarked that well-developed goals include the values on which collaborative action can be taken. They also represent agreement on principles according to Hill and Bonan (1991) that aided in the solution of daily matters. Ultimately, control over its mission enables a school to create a distinctive culture and climate that allow it to meet the needs of the local community (Dade County Public Schools, 1989).

Another aspect of site-based management is control over the budget. Autonomy in the sphere of finance is affected in numerous respects, reported Rodriguez (2000). Brown (1990) reported that SDM brings about a change in the manner in which resources are allocated to schools. Therefore, advocates of site-based management called for districts to allocate a lump sum of money to the schools, not to determine how that money is to be spent (Clune & White, 1988). Such an allowance by site-based management permits stakeholders at the school-level to decide how the money will be dispersed. Hannaway (1992) noted that the larger the sum of money allocated to a school, the greater the amount of decentralization.

A key issue that Rodriguez (2000) noted was that the spending of schools' money is the extent to which those schools are able to spend the money as they wish, such as purchasing from vendors outside the district. Consequently, schools operating under site-based management generally have greater flexibility regarding how they spend their

money and whom they purchase from than schools operating under the traditional model of school governance (Wohlstetter & Buffet, 1991). Hill and Bona (1991) reported that the greater the decentralization in a district, the greater the ability for empowered site-based managed schools to purchase what they need to meet their students' needs.

Closely connected to control over the budget was control over the hiring of school personnel (Rodriguez, 2000). In districts with the least amount of decentralization, hiring was generally left up to the district, whereas districts that were highly decentralized gave nearly full control to their schools over the hiring of staff and faculty (Lindelow, 1981). In successful site-based managed schools, Lindelow (1981) reported that administrators and teachers, along with community members, select candidates to interview and make a decision, which is sent back to the district for final approval by the school board. Some decentralized districts permitted their schools to choose how they use personnel funding, such as purchasing books or materials or hiring paraprofessionals instead of teachers with the money (Fernandez, 1989). In the most extreme cases of site-based management, control over the hiring of the principal is a decision left up to the site-based decision-making committee (Chapman, 1990).

Another aspect of school-site autonomy was the ability to choose curricula that meet objectives set by the board and district administration (Rodriguez, 2000). School-based curriculum allowed the site-based decision-making committee to determine which instructional materials should be used for instruction (Steffy, 1993). Clune and White (1988) reported that SDM schools make decisions regarding the selection of textbooks, the selection of learning activities and supplemental instructional materials to be used, and determine the nature of alternative programs to be offered in the school.

The more in-depth implementation of site-based management in a district, the more opportunities local communities have to be involved in the selection of theoretical approaches used in the schools (Rodriguez, 2000; Watkins & Lusi, 1989) and in choosing professional development activities that helps teachers meet the needs of the students. In addition, Guthrie (1986) reported that SBM implemented extensively allows for effective monitoring and evaluation of local learning and teaching by the particular school.

A final sphere of influence that Rodriguez (2000) reported was the influence related to site-based management in school organizations. She indicated that decision-making committees are free to change the fundamental delivery of instruction and the traditional set-up of the classroom. Schools expansively implementing site-based management at the elementary level are drastically altering the manner in which students are grouped to form classes, such as changing age and ability combinations (Murphy, 1991). He also argued that secondary schools with widely implemented site-based management have offered alternative instructional programs, core curricula, and outcome-based education to their students.

Numerous authors (Carlson, 1996; Reynolds, 1997) in the literature emphasized the importance of shared decision making training. Whereas teachers are knowledgeable in their own domain, their preparation seldom included a heavy emphasis on collaborative decision-making. Shared decision-making schools used a variety of methods to provide the necessary training, including outside consultants, trains the trainer programs, and the use of specific training methods.

In support of improving schools from within using shared governance, Barth (1990) argued that the personal visions of most school practitioners need no apology. "For certain, they differ in important ways from the lists of desirable school qualities constructed by those outside the schools. But these visions of insiders deserved to be taken as seriously as those of outsiders", (Barth, 1990, p. 177). He illustrated this argument by stating that not one but two tributaries flow into the knowledge base for improving schools: the social science research literature from the academic community and the craft knowledge and vision from the school community. The former is often a mile wide but only an inch deep; the latter is often only an inch wide but a mile deep. Together, they offer remarkable depth and breadth and a fertile meeting place for considering school improvement. Working in a school day after day, or rearing children of their own, entitles school people and parents to have a vision and to introduce that vision into conversations about school reform (Barth, 1990).

As principals struggled with their daily dilemmas of leadership, they sometimes allow themselves daydreams in which their authority is unlimited and they can act without having to plead, lobby, or negotiate with anyone. Yet, for the past decade, many school leaders have willingly participated in a movement that asks them to share their power with teachers and parents. In shared decision-making (SDM), principals collaborated with teachers and sometimes parents to take actions aimed at improving instruction and school climate. In some cases, teachers or parents are formally given a slice of power; more commonly, principals retain their authority but commit themselves to govern through consensus.

After reviewing the literature, it appeared that shared decision-making is still too new to determine its overall effectiveness in schools. Longitudinal studies on the academic achievement of students, school operations, quality of instruction, the perceptions of students, teachers, and administrators must continue to be conducted to determine the effectiveness of SDM as a means for school reform (Herman & Herman, 1994).

## **Public and Private Schools**

Differences in the organization of public and private schools are a focus of school reform discussions. Yet, how different or similar public and private schools really are is not well understood. School sector is not a simple organizational fault line running through the nation's schools. Debates about improving schools often overlook the diversity among private schools, as well as the potential for a high degree of similarity between many public and private schools (Baker, Han, & Keil, 1996; Synder, 1997). Using data from a national sample of secondary schools in the 1990-91 Schools and Staffing Survey, conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), examined organizational differences across public and private schools and among private school types (Baker et al., 1996). Overall, the results from researchers indicated considerable organizational variation among different types of private schools and some significant similarities between public schools and some types of private schools. In addition, although private schools tend to have more on-site control of key administrative decisions about teacher hiring, curriculum, and student discipline policies, not all public schools lack this feature. Accordingly, some difference exists in degree of administrative control among types of private schools as well (Baker et al., 1996). Principals reported that on three types of policies, decision-making in private

secondary schools is dominated by principals. Private school principals are more likely to have a greater influence over establishing the curriculum than public school principals. However, both private and public school principals have a great deal of influence on hiring (93 versus 84) and disciplinary policy (91 versus 88).

Teachers in only a few schools in both sectors have a great deal of influence on hiring policies. About two-thirds of private schools have important input from teachers into curriculum decisions, compared to just over half of public schools (Baker et al., 1996). School boards had a similar impact on teacher hiring across public and private sectors, but there is variation among private and public school type. Public school boards are more likely to have an influence on curricular and disciplinary policies than private school boards. Therefore, decisions about organizational policy related to the educational functioning of the school tend to be more influenced by on-site personnel in private schools than in public schools. Clear differences are present between the public and private sectors in the governance environment of schools as reported by Baker and his colleagues (1996).

Bryk, Lee, and Holland (1993) indicated that many reform proposals for public schools have looked to the private sector for models to emulate. School choice, small schools, and decentralization decision-making, for example, are among features commonly associated with private education that many have suggested might benefit public schools. The variation that exists is as follows:

- The defining distinction between public and private schools is their different sources of support.
- Private schools provide an alternative for parents who are dissatisfied with public schools or have other reasons for wanting their children to attend a private school.
- Racial and ethnic diversity can enrich the school experiences of students and teachers in many ways; however, a heterogeneous school population creates additional challenges to teachers and administrators, who must be sensitive to different cultural backgrounds.
- Differences between public and private school teachers are an important dimension in comparing public and private schools. Public school teachers appear to be more qualified than private school teachers in terms of their education and years of experience. On average, public school teachers receive higher salaries and more benefits than private school teachers. Although teacher attrition tends to be higher in private than public schools, private school teachers were more likely than public school teachers to be highly satisfied with their working conditions (36 % versus 11 %).
- Smaller schools are generally thought to be easier to manage, and to promote a greater sense of community among students and teachers; however, large schools are often more equipped to offer a wider range of academic programs and support services. Private schools, on average, have smaller schools and class sizes than public schools.
- A key aspect of school management is where important decisions are made concerning curriculum, school policies, and classroom practices. Whereas public schools must necessarily take some direction from state departments of education, local school boards, and districts staff, private school teachers and principals are more likely than their public school counterparts to believe they have a great deal of influence, particularly in setting discipline policy and establishing curriculum.

- In the area of teacher evaluation, almost all principals, public and private, thought they had a great deal of influence; however, in a number of other policy areas as discipline, curriculum, inservice training, budgeting, and hiring, private school principals were more likely than public school principals to think that they had a great deal of influence.
- Although crime occurs in and around both public and private schools, public schools have a much greater exposure. In 1993-1994, teachers in public schools were far more likely than private school teachers to report that students' poor attitudes toward learning and negative interactions with teachers were serious problems in their schools. They were also more likely to believe that a lack of parent involvement was a serious problem. Parent accountability and participation in elementary schools may be more associated with the social class of parents than with the private or public character of the school.
- The key aspects of the instructional program at the elementary level are the amount of time spent on core subjects, the teaching methods used in the classroom, and how homework is handled. Public and private schools exhibit both similarities and differences in these areas.
- Public schools provide a wide array of academic support and health-related services, some of which are required by federal and state laws that do not apply to private schools. Most support services are found more often in public schools than private schools (Choy, 1998).

The National Center for Education Statistics conducted a study to determine exactly how public and private schools differ. The data reported many systematic differences, and provided a context in which to consider the debates about the merits of various aspects of public and private schooling. Synder and colleagues (1997) reported that a key aspect of school management is where important decisions are made concerning curriculum, school policies, and classroom practices. Whereas public schools necessarily must take some direction from State Departments of education, local school boards, and district staff, more site-based management and local decision-making are frequently advocated as a means of improving school effectiveness.

- Private school principals (or heads) reported having more influence over curriculum than their private school counterparts.
- In a number of school policy areas, private school teachers and principals are more likely than their public school counterparts to believe that they have a great deal of influence.
- Private school teachers reported having more autonomy in the classroom (Synder, 1997).

In the areas of setting discipline policy and establishing curriculum, in particular, private school teachers in the 1993-94 school year were considerably more likely than public school teachers to think that they had a great deal of influence. Only a relatively small percentage of teachers in either sector were likely that they had a great deal of influence over certain other important policy areas, such as making budget decisions, hiring, and evaluating teachers (Synder, 1997). In contrast, public and private school principals reported they had a great deal of influence in the area of teacher evaluation. However, in a number of other policy areas, discipline, curriculum, in-service training, budgeting, and hiring, private school principals were more likely than public school principals to think that they had a great deal of influence reported Synder and his colleagues (1997).



Public school principals share authority for many policy decisions with school boards, district personnel, and State Departments of Education.

The following research question will be addressed in this study. Is there a significant difference in the extent to which school-based management has been reported as having been implemented in public and private elementary schools in the United States?

## **Methods and Procedures**

### **Sample**

In this study, 866 elementary school principals completed the survey. Of these 866 principals, 630 surveys were completed by public elementary school principals and 236 surveys were completed by private elementary school principals. Although not analyzed by category within private elementary schools, 105 private schools were Catholic, 75 were Other Religious category, and 56 were Other private. Information on the survey was also present regarding school characteristics such as region and location and student enrollment. Regarding school region, 154 were from the Northeast, 228 were from the Midwest, 286 were from the South, and 198 were from the West. In terms of school location, 385 were designated as Central City, 286 were Urban/Large Town, and 195 were Small Town/Rural. Student enrollment ranged from 0-149 students ( $\underline{n} = 117$ ), 150 to 299 ( $\underline{n} = 179$ ), 300 to 499 ( $\underline{n} = 223$ ), 500 to 749 ( $\underline{n} = 226$ ), and 750 and above ( $\underline{n} = 121$ ).

Information was also present regarding principal characteristics such as gender and Hispanic ethnicity. Regarding gender, 331 elementary school principals indicated they were male and 517 reported they were female. Of the sample, 36 reported they were of Hispanic ethnicity and 805 indicated they were not non-Hispanic. Other data regarding principal ethnicity was suppressed on the database used herein.

### **Instrumentation**

School administrators, principals, and headmasters were asked to complete self-administered questionnaires during the spring of 1999. They were asked to provide information on the physical, organizational, and fiscal characteristics of their schools and on the school's learning environment and programs. Special attention was paid to the instructional philosophy of the school and its expectations for students.

The questionnaire was an important part of the ECLS-K project and the questionnaire was directed to the school principal. As a result, the questionnaire was divided into nine sections. These sections could have been answered either by the principal or by a designee who was able to provide the requested information. The final two sections requested judgmental evaluations about the school climate and factual information about the principal's background and experience. These last two sections were to be completed by the principal. Some factual questions requested information that was not readily available from school records (the average number of years a limited-English-proficient first grader receives English-as-a-Second-Language services). Informed estimates were acceptable for such questions.

Section 8 focused on school governance and climate. Principals were asked to respond

to questions about frequency of classroom observations of kindergarten teachers, staff development, goals and objectives for kindergarten teachers, how decisions are made at their school, the school climate, and what influences the principal's job performance evaluation. Section 9 focused on 10 principal characteristics. The time required to complete this information collection was estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collected (U.S. Department of Education, April 2000).

## Results

The degree to which school-based management had been implemented in public elementary schools in the United States was examined through an analysis of question 67, "We are interested in how decisions are made at your school." Respondents were provided with six decisions: (1) establishing criteria for hiring and firing teachers; (2) selecting textbooks and other instructional materials; (3) setting curricular guidelines and standards; (4) establishing policies and practices for grading and student evaluation; (5) deciding how school discretionary funds will be spent; and (6) planning professional development. Percentages regarding the influence each category of decision maker (i.e., principal or director; teacher organization or individual teachers; parent organization; school board or council; school district office; and school-based management committee) had on each of the decision categories made at their school are reported in Tables 1-6 based on the responses from public and private elementary school principals in the United States.

**Table 1**  
**Percentages of U.S. Public And Private Elementary School Principal Responses Regarding The Influence of Decision Makers On The Hiring and Firing of Teachers**

Decision Makers	Public	Private
<b>Administrator Input To Hiring/Firing Teachers</b>		
No Influence	6.2	1.5
Some Influence	15.3	6.7
Major Influence	78.5	91.8
<b>Teacher Input To Hiring/Firing Teachers</b>		
No Influence	29.4	49.4
Some Influence	47.6	39.0
Major Influence	23.0	11.6
<b>Parent Input To Hiring/Firing Teachers</b>		
No Influence	79.8	82.7
Some Influence	19.2	14.3
Major Influence	1.1	3.0
<b>School Board Member Input To Hiring/Firing Teachers</b>		

No Influence	17.0	43.9
Some Influence	22.1	22.9
Major Influence	60.9	33.1
<b>School District Input To Hiring/Firing Teachers</b>		
No Influence	8.6	52.5
Some Influence	23.6	22.1
Major Influence	67.8	25.4
<b>School-Based Management Committee Input To Hiring/Firing Teachers</b>		
No Influence	58.3	81.7
Some Influence	25.9	10.8
Major Influence	15.9	7.5

**Table 2**  
**Percentages of U.S. Public And Private Elementary School Principal  
Responses Regarding The Influence of Decision Makers On Selecting  
Textbooks**

<b>Decision Makers</b>	<b>Public Private</b>	
<hr/>		
<b>Administrator Input On Selecting Textbooks</b>		
No Influence	5.6	2.1
Some Influence	48.3	14.9
Major Influence	46.2	83.1
<b>Teacher Input On Selecting Textbooks</b>		
No Influence	6.0	3.2
Some Influence	19.4	13.4
Major Influence	74.6	83.3
<b>Parent Input On Selecting Textbooks</b>		
No Influence	55.3	67.5
Some Influence	38.5	28.2
Major Influence	6.3	4.3
<b>School Board Member Input On Selecting Textbooks</b>		
No Influence	24.6	57.3
Some Influence	36.8	33.1
Major Influence	38.6	9.6
<b>School District Input On Selecting Textbooks</b>		
No Influence	11.2	52.0
Some Influence	31.0	29.6
Major Influence	57.8	18.4

**School-Based Management Committee****Input On Selecting Textbooks**

No Influence	38.2	79.3
Some Influence	28.3	16.3
Major Influence	33.5	4.3

**Table 3**  
**Percentages of U.S. Public And Private Elementary School Principal Responses Regarding The Influence of Decision Makers On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standards**

<b>Decision Makers</b>	<b>Public Private</b>	
<b>Administrator Input On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standard</b>		
No Influence	6.5	1.0
Some Influence	39.4	10.4
Major Influence	54.1	88.6
<b>Teacher Input On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standards</b>		
No Influence	9.4	6.6
Some Influence	37.7	24.2
Major Influence	52.8	69.2
<b>Parent Input On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standards</b>		
No Influence	46.6	66.3
Some Influence	46.2	31.3
Major Influence	7.3	2.4
<b>School Board Member Input On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standards</b>		
No Influence	9.6	38.2
Some Influence	27.7	40.8
Major Influence	62.7	21.0
<b>School District Input On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standards</b>		
No Influence	4.0	41.4
Some Influence	16.0	16.5
Major Influence	80.0	42.1
<b>School-Based Management Committee Input On Setting Curricular Guidelines and Standards</b>		
No Influence	35.4	79.8

Some Influence	34.5	8.5
Major Influence	30.1	11.7

**Table 4**  
**Percentages of U.S. Public And Private Elementary School Principal Responses Regarding Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation**

Decision Makers	Public	Private
<b>Administrator Input On Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation</b>		
No Influence	4.8	.5
Some Influence	36.8	11.1
Major Influence	58.4	88.4
<b>Teacher Input On Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation</b>		
No Influence	5.1	4.4
Some Influence	29.2	21.3
Major Influence	65.7	74.3
<b>Parent Input On Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation</b>		
No Influence	53.7	77.3
Some Influence	39.0	19.6
Major Influence	7.3	3.1
<b>School Board Member Input On Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation</b>		
No Influence	12.7	52.3
Some Influence	29.6	29.7
Major Influence	57.7	18.1
<b>School District Input On Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation</b>		
No Influence	5.2	44.7
Some Influence	23.3	17.4
Major Influence	71.5	37.9
<b>School-Based Management Committee Input Establishing Policies and Practices for Student Grading/Evaluation</b>		
No Influence	38.2	83.0

Some Influence	31.7	8.5
Major Influence	30.1	8.5

**Table 5**  
**Percentages of U.S. Public And Private Elementary School Principal Responses Regarding The Influence of Decision Makers On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent**

Decision Makers	Public	Private
<b>Administrator Input On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent</b>		
No Influence	.4	.5
Some Influence	14.0	11.7
Major Influence	85.6	87.8
<b>Teacher Input On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent</b>		
No Influence	11.5	18.4
Some Influence	42.5	54.7
Major Influence	46.0	26.8
<b>Parent Input On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent</b>		
No Influence	40.6	36.3
Some Influence	43.2	43.5
Major Influence	16.2	20.2
<b>School Board Member Input On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent</b>		
No Influence	35.4	27.4
Some Influence	35.8	30.6
Major Influence	28.9	42.0
<b>School District Input On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent</b>		
No Influence	29.0	79.5
Some Influence	38.1	15.6
Major Influence	32.9	4.9
<b>School-Based Management Committee Input On Deciding How School Discretionary Funds Will Be Spent</b>		
No Influence	25.2	76.3
Some Influence	27.5	9.7
Major Influence	47.3	14.0

**Table 6**  
**Percentages of U.S. Public And Private Elementary School Principal Responses Regarding Professional Development**

Decision Makers	Public Private	
<b>Administrator Input On Professional Development</b>		
No Influence	.4	0.0
Some Influence	20.8	7.0
Major Influence	78.8	93.0
<b>Teacher Input On Professional Development</b>		
No Influence	3.6	2.2
Some Influence	29.0	33.9
Major Influence	67.5	64.0
<b>Parent Input On Professional Development</b>		
No Influence	68.4	78.3
Some Influence	28.0	19.3
Major Influence	3.7	2.5
<b>School Board Member Input On Professional Development</b>		
No Influence	35.1	52.6
Some Influence	42.3	35.3
Major Influence	22.6	12.2
<b>School District Input On Professional Development</b>		
No Influence	8.2	43.2
Some Influence	28.7	27.3
Major Influence	63.1	29.5
<b>School-Based Management Committee Input On Professional Development</b>		
No Influence	22.8	82.4
Some Influence	28.4	9.9
Major Influence	48.7	7.7

Pearson chi-squares were conducted to ascertain the extent to which differences were present between public and private elementary school principals for each individual decision and each individual decision-maker. This procedure permitted a detailed analysis of where specific differences might be in school-based management implementation.

Six Pearson chi-squares were calculated to determine whether public and private elementary school principals reported a different amount of principal influence (i.e., 0, 1,

or 2) in each of the six decision categories. The first chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals in the degree of principal influence regarding establishing criteria for the hiring and firing of teachers,  $\chi^2(2) = 17.23, p < .0001$ . As reported in Table 1, private elementary school principals (91.8%) indicated they had significantly more influence in the hiring and firing of teachers than was indicated by the public elementary school principals (78.5%). A second chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of principal influence regarding the selection of textbooks,  $\chi^2(2) = 78.60, p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 2, private elementary school principals (83.1%) indicated they had significantly more influence in the selection of textbooks than was indicated by public elementary school principals (46.2%). A third chi-square revealed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the degree of principal influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards,  $\chi^2(2) = 72.07, p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 3, private elementary school principals (88.6%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards than was indicated by the public elementary school principals (54.1%).

In the fourth chi-square, a statistically significant difference was noted in the degree of principal influence on establishing policies and practices for student grading and evaluation,  $\chi^2(2) = 56.58, p < .0001$ . As shown in Table 4, private elementary school principals (88.4%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in establishing policies and practices for grading and evaluation than was reported by the public elementary school principals (58.4%).

In terms of school discretionary funds, no statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals. See Table 5 for exact percentages. Regarding professional development, a chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of principal influence between public and private elementary school principals,  $\chi^2(2) = 19.42, p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 6, private elementary school principals (93.0%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in professional development planning than was indicated by the public elementary school principals (78.8%). The effect sizes for the five statistically significant differences between public and private elementary school principals ranged from small (hiring and firing; policies and practices for grading; professional development) to moderate (selection of textbooks; curricular guidelines and standards) in size (Cohen, 1988).

Another chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals in the degree of teacher influence regarding establishing criteria for the hiring and firing of teachers,  $\chi^2(2) = 25.05, p < .0001$ . As reported in Table 1, public elementary school principals (23.0%) indicated that teachers had significantly more influence in the hiring and firing of teachers than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (11.6%). A second chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of teacher influence regarding the selection of textbooks,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.03, p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 2, private elementary school principals (83.3%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the selection of textbooks than was indicated by the public elementary school principals (74.6%). A third chi-square revealed the presence of a statistically



significant difference in the degree of teacher influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards,  $\chi^2(2) = 14.74$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 3, private elementary school principals (69.2%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards than was indicated by the public elementary school principals (52.8%). In the fourth chi-square, a statistically significant difference was not noted in the degree of teacher influence on establishing policies and practices for student grading and evaluation. See Table 4, for exact percentages.

In terms of school discretionary funds, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding teacher influence,  $\chi^2(2) = 21.07$ ,  $p < .0001$  as depicted in Table 5. Regarding professional development, a chi-square did not yield a statistically significant difference in the degree of teacher influence between public and private elementary school principals. See Table 6 for exact percentages. The effect sizes for the five statistically significant differences between public and private elementary school teachers were small (hiring and firing; textbooks; curricular guidelines and standards; discretionary funds, and professional development) were small in size (Cohen, 1988).

Another chi-square did not reveal a statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals in the degree of parent influence regarding establishing criteria for the hiring and firing of teachers. See Table 1 for percentages. A second chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of parent influence regarding the selection of textbooks,  $\chi^2(2) = 7.56$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 2, public elementary school principals (6.3%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the selection of textbooks than was indicated by private elementary school principals (4.3%). A third chi-square revealed the presence of a statistically significant difference in degree of parent influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards,  $\chi^2(2) = 20.66$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 3, public elementary school principals (7.3%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (2.4%).

In the fourth chi-square, a statistically significant difference was noted in the degree of parent influence on establishing policies and practices for student grading and evaluation,  $\chi^2(2) = 28.35$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As shown in Table 4, public elementary school principals (7.3%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in establishing policies and practices for grading and evaluation than was reported by the private elementary school principals (3.1%).

In terms of school discretionary funds, no statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals. See Table 5 for exact percentages. Regarding professional development, no statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals. See Table 6 for exact percentages. The effect sizes for the three statistically significant differences between public and private elementary school principals (selection of textbooks; curricular guidelines and standards; and policies and practices for grading) were small in size (Cohen, 1988).

Another first chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals in the degree of school board influence regarding establishing criteria for the hiring and firing of teachers,  $\chi^2(2) = 52.73$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As reported in Table 1, public elementary school principals (60.9%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the hiring and firing of teachers than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (33.1%). A second chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of school board influence regarding the selection of textbooks,  $\chi^2(2) = 71.49$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 2, public elementary school principals (38.6%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the selection of textbooks than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (9.6%). A third chi-square revealed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the degree of school board influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards,  $\chi^2(2) = 105.02$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 3, public elementary school principals (62.7%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (21.0%).

In the fourth chi-square, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding school board influence on establishing policies on student grading,  $\chi^2(2) = 121.93$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 4, public elementary school principals (57.7%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on establishing policies on student grading than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (18.1%).

In terms of school discretionary funds, a statistically significant difference was not noted between public and private elementary school principals. See Table 5 for percentages. Regarding professional development, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding school board influence on professional development,  $\chi^2(2) = 17.12$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 6, public elementary school principals (22.6%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on establishing policies on student grading than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (12.2%). The effect sizes for the five statistically significant differences between public and private elementary school principals were small (hiring and firing teachers; and professional development) were small in size. The effect sizes for selection of textbooks; curricular guidelines and standards; and policies for student grading were moderate (Cohen, 1988).

Another chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals in the degree of school district influence regarding establishing criteria for the hiring and firing of teachers,  $\chi^2(2) = 135.58$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As reported in Table 1, public elementary school principals (67.8%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the hiring and firing of teachers than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (25.4%). A second chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of school district influence regarding the selection of textbooks,  $\chi^2(2) = 115.93$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 2, public elementary school principals (57.8%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the selection of textbooks than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (18.4%). A

third chi-square revealed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the degree of school district influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards,  $\chi^2(2) = 139.94$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 3, public elementary school principals (80.0%) indicated they had significantly more influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards than was indicated by private elementary school principals (42.1%).

In the fourth chi-square, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding school district influence on establishing policies on student grading,  $\chi^2(2) = 138.73$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 4, public elementary school principals (71.5%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on establishing policies on student grading than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (37.9%).

In terms of school discretionary funds, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding the spending of school discretionary funds,  $\chi^2(2) = 107.48$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 5, public elementary school principals (32.9%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on spending school discretionary funds than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (4.9%). Regarding professional development, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding school district influence on professional development,  $\chi^2(2) = 103.68$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 6, public elementary school principals (63.1%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on professional development than was indicated by private elementary school principals (29.5%). The effect sizes for the six statistically significant differences between public and private elementary school principals were moderate (hiring and firing teachers; selection of textbooks; curricular guidelines and standards; policies for student grading; discretionary school funds; and professional development) were moderate in size (Cohen, 1988).

Another chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals in the degree of school-based management committee influence regarding establishing criteria for the hiring and firing of teachers,  $\chi^2(2) = 17.95$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As reported in Table 1, public elementary school principals (15.9%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the hiring and firing of teachers than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (7.5%). A second chi-square yielded a statistically significant difference in the degree of school-based management committee influence regarding the selection of textbooks,  $\chi^2(2) = 55.28$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 2, public elementary school principals (33.5%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the selection of textbooks than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (4.3%). A third chi-square revealed the presence of a statistically significant difference in the degree of school-based management committee influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards,  $\chi^2(2) = 62.13$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 3, public elementary school principals (30.1%) indicated that they had significantly more influence in the setting of curricular guidelines and standards than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (11.7%).

In the fourth chi-square, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding the influence of the school-based management committee influence on establishing policies on student grading,  $\chi^2(2) = 62.11$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 4, public elementary school principals (30.1%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on establishing policies on student grading than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (8.5%).

In terms of school discretionary funds, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding school-based management committee influence on the spending of school discretionary funds,  $\chi^2(2) = 88.66$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 5, public elementary school principals (47.3%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on spending school discretionary funds than was indicated by private elementary school principals (14.0%). Regarding professional development, a statistically significant difference was noted between public and private elementary school principals regarding school-based management committee influence on professional development,  $\chi^2(2) = 120.76$ ,  $p < .0001$ . As depicted in Table 6, public elementary school principals (48.7%) indicated that they had significantly more influence on professional development than was indicated by the private elementary school principals (7.7%). The effect sizes for the five statistically significant differences between public and private elementary school principals were moderate (selection of textbooks; curricular guidelines and standards; policies for student grading; discretionary school funds; and professional development) were moderate in size. There was one statistically significant difference between public and private elementary school principals that was small, hiring and firing of teachers (Cohen, 1988).

In sum, differences were present regarding the implementation of school-based management across the United States in public and private elementary schools. Furthermore, differences regarding the influence different decision-makers have in the six areas of decisions made in elementary schools were also reported by all respondents to be present.

## **Discussion**

Public school principals also reported a high degree of involvement by the school-based management committee regarding influence across all six decision categories namely, hiring/firing teachers, selecting textbooks, setting curricular guidelines/standards, establishing policies and practices for student grading/evaluation, deciding how school discretionary funds will be spent, and planning professional development. Responses from private school principals indicated a low degree of school-based management decision-making committee involvement regarding influence across all six-decision categories. This finding may again be due to the lack of federal and state mandates for the implementation of shared governance (Rodriguez, 2000). Revealed within the literature was that federal legislation, state regulations, district mandates, local and community interests, all have demanded change in public schools but not private schools. In addition, because construction of campus improvement plans call for the expertise of many people in a variety of areas, public school principals may be more open to the input of others who are knowledgeable. Private school principals are not required to comply with state regulations (Rodriguez, 2000). After all, school-based

management is a structure and process that allows for greater decision-making power related to the areas of instruction, budget, policies, rules and regulation, staffing, and all matters of governance (Herman & Herman, 1994). The more administrators deem stakeholder input to be important, the more likely they may be to empower those stakeholders (Glickman, 1993; Herman & Herman, 1994; Schlechty, 1997; Sergiovanni, 1992 & 1994).

Though different perceptions exist about the role and function of school-based management in schools, no standard operating model exists of shared governance for public or private schools. Murphy and Beck (1995) argued that the elusiveness of decentralized participation as a construct also creates challenges for the SBM implementation process. As a result, this change process involves controversies, conflicts, frustrations, and ultimately satisfaction when educators exert a collective will to do more for all their students (Glickman, 1993). In addition, this reform movement of SBM in the United States is based on the shared belief that the best education grows out of the wisdom, care, and diligence of members of local schools and local communities who take on greater authority, autonomy, and public responsibility for their students (Glickman, 1993). Public school respondents suggest that public schools are generally willing to explore and make changes in their school, whereby private schools are reluctant to change their school environment.

Consequently, some public elementary school principals may also be responding more than private elementary school principals to the low morale of school employees and the decrease in organizational effectiveness, and thus are making school structural changes. Educational systems in the United States have been publicly criticized for being disorganized and having little apathy for the plight of their employees (Conley, 1993; Schlechty, 1997). Therefore, it seems natural that some school principals would consider school-based management as opposed to traditional school structures. Although the implementation of SBM varies from school to school, its focus on collaboration and shared governance are seen as essential to school restructuring (Schlechty, 1997).

Glickman (1993) reported that schools need to make their own judgments regarding the best way to proceed at any particular moment and each school must choose their own model for shared governance. Furthermore school-based decision-making training for committee members often encompasses the construction of improvement plans (Rodriguez, 2000). Though both public and private elementary school principals perceived degrees of involvement by committees, public school respondents indicated a higher degree of school-based management implementation than private school respondents. The difference may be that some public elementary schools foster educational citizenry for a democracy and attempt to model the concept of shared governance in their school whereas others do not value democracy as a priority belief (Conley, 1993). Private elementary schools may choose to maintain a neutral position and stay true to the philosophy for their school. A democratic form of school governance strives for decisions that focus on matters of school-wide education, is fair and equal in the distribution of power and is morally consistent with the goal of democratic engagement of students (Glickman, 1993).

Percentages of public and private elementary school principal responses regarding the influence of decision-makers on the hiring/firing of teachers, selection of textbooks, setting curricular guidelines and standards, establishing policies and practices for student grading/evaluation, deciding how school discretionary funds will be spent, and planning

for professional development were investigated. Public elementary school principals indicated a higher degree of influence by teachers, school boards, school districts, and school-based management committees on the hiring/firing of teachers at their school. Private elementary school principals reported a higher degree of influence for the principal and parents. In contrast, in a study by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) when comparing ratings for 1987-88 to those ratings for 1993-94, evidence was present of an increase in public school principal influence over hiring new teachers (5.3 versus 4.9). Perhaps this difference in perception may be due to the fact that private school principals are expected to be the individual responsible for their school teaching staff and only need to respond to the parents who pay tuition for their children's education. Public elementary school principals view themselves and their school as only one voice in many with regard to the hiring/firing of teachers at their school (Sergiovanni, 1994). In contrast, Synder and colleagues (1997) reported a different view on the issue of hiring/firing of teachers when investigating the condition of public and private schools in 1997. Only a small percentage of public and private elementary school teachers were likely to think that they had a great deal of influence over the hiring/firing of teachers.

Public elementary school principals also indicated a higher degree of influence by parents, school boards, school districts, and school-based management committees on the selection of textbooks. Private elementary school principals reported a higher degree of influence for the principal and teachers. This influence may suggest that public elementary schools have progressed to a level of partnership with their school district personnel and school board in regard to shared governance, whereby private schools are not motivated to include various stakeholders in their decision-making (Sergiovanni, 1994). Perhaps this difference in perception may be explained by the fact that private elementary school principals are expected to be the person responsible to a lesser degree along with their teachers (Snyder, 1997). Additionally, private elementary schools do not have state mandates on the selection of their textbooks. But public elementary schools must comply with the use of state-selected books (Baker et al., 1996). Textbook companies are big business in public school education. In contrast, research by Synder and colleagues (1997) indicated different findings concerning textbook selection; they discovered that relatively few teachers in public and private schools thought that they had a good deal of control over the selection of textbooks.

Public elementary school principals again indicated a higher degree of influence by parents, school boards, school districts, and school-based management committees on setting curricular guidelines and standards. Private elementary school principals again reported a higher degree of influence for the principal and teachers. Snyder and colleagues (1997), using national data survey results, agreed that private school principals were more likely to report that they, rather than any other group, had a great deal of influence on establishing curriculum. In addition, public school principals attributed more influence to the State Department of Education, school district staff (which private schools do not have), and even to teachers than to themselves (Snyder, 1997). Therefore, the possibility may exist that the difference in perception may be because private elementary school principals consider themselves to be the sole decision-maker concerning curriculum planning and instruction. Public elementary schools, conversely, are expected to include all stakeholders in the district and the school board to design the school curriculum and instruction.

Public elementary school principals also indicated a higher degree of influence by parents, school boards, school districts, and school-based management committees on establishing policies and practices for student grading/evaluation. Private elementary school principals again reported a higher degree of influence for the principal and teachers. In the 1993-94 national study (NCES) by Synder and colleagues (1997), private school principals and teachers reported that they believed they had a great deal of influence on a number of school policy areas. One can deduce again that the difference in perception may be because private elementary school principals are viewed to be the only decision-makers along with teachers on the establishment of policies and practices for student grading/evaluation by tuition paying parents. Public elementary schools, conversely, are expected to include all stakeholders of the district and the school board to design the establishment of policies and practices for student grading/evaluation (Glickman, 1993; Herman & Herman, 1994; Rodriguez, 2000).

Public elementary school principals once more indicated a higher degree of influence by teachers, school districts, and school-based management committees on deciding how school discretionary funds will be spent. Private elementary school principals in contrast reported a higher degree of influence for the principal, parents, and school board. Therefore, the possibility may exist that the difference in perception may be that private elementary school principals are responsible for the design of the school budget along with parents and the school board, which are usually composed of tuition-paying parents (Baker et al., 1996). Public elementary schools, conversely, are mandated by the state to include all stakeholders of the district and the school board to design the school budget. Public elementary school principals, district personnel and board members are all together accountable to the state and tax-payers for responsible spending of public funds (Rodriguez, 2000). In contrast, Synder and colleagues (1997) reported a different view on the issue of fiscal spending when investigating the condition of public and private schools in 1997. Only a small percentage of public and private school teachers were likely to think that they had a great deal of influence over budget spending. Accordingly, some public and private school districts may say they are all in favor of school-based management, as long as they do not have to do anything differently. This unwillingness to look at underlying assumptions, values, beliefs, practices, and relationships can prevent schools from coming to grips with the profound and disturbing implications of true restructuring (Conley, 1993).

Public elementary school principals yet again indicated a higher degree of influence by teachers, parents, school boards, school districts, and school-based management committees on planning professional development. Private elementary schools in contrast reported a higher degree of influence for only the principal. It is possible that private elementary school principals again view themselves as the sole person responsible for the planning of professional development for their teachers as parents hold them accountable for the instructional program at their school. Public schools, conversely, are expected to include all stakeholders with the assistance of district personnel and the school board to plan the professional development of teachers at their campus (Conley, 1993). Findings from the 1997 national report of public and private schools indicated that on certain measures, public school teachers appear to be more qualified in terms of their education than their private school counterparts. Accordingly, public school teachers were also more likely to participate in professional development activities. They believe that teachers, as professionals, should update and improve their

teaching skills throughout their career (Sergiovanni, 1994). Snyder and colleagues continued to report that beginning teachers in public schools (those teachers in their first 3 years of teaching) were much more likely than their private school counterparts to participate in a formal teacher induction program (56% versus 29%). However, induction may be done informally in some schools. A possible explanation for public school teacher participation in professional development could be that teachers have a sense of ownership in their professional development and private school teachers do not experience this ownership for their professional training.

Public schools are in the process of second-order change or restructuring. This change might explain a high degree of implementation of school-based management by public schools. They are altering the ways in which schools are put together, including the development of new goals, structures, and roles as opposed to the first-order change, which may be found in private schools with a traditional form of school governance. Conley (1993) reported that first-order change improves the efficiency and effectiveness of what is already occurring without disturbing the basic organizational features, without substantially altering the way that children and adults perform their roles.

School-based management is commonly applied to only a small subset of the constellation of decisions that go into running a school (Bimber, 1993). Consequently, some school districts have decentralized budgetary decisions but not decisions about personnel or curriculum. Some have decentralized aspects of curriculum only, and others have decentralized other different combinations. Bimber (1993) argued that often SBM plans give authority to schools over marginal issues only; for example safety, and career education. Accordingly, shared decision-making generally does little to change the fact that most schools have discretion over much less than 10% of the money spent within their walls (Bimber, 1993).

## **Implications for Future Research**

Value exists in employing multiple methods and multiple perspectives to produce a more focused and realistic understanding of issues challenging education. Miles and Huberman (1994) are strong advocates of the developmental mixed methods design, where researchers incorporate alternating quantitative and qualitative phases, which build on, and inform one another to produce superior results. The design of this quantitative study evolved from prior quantitative research; the findings now allude to questions that could be answered through one-to-one interviews with a purposefully selected sample of principals, teachers, and parents (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

For example, the administrator response to the *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 1998-99* questionnaire suggests topics for further research. The fact that the administrator of both public and private schools indicated low degrees of parent involvement in their school-based management committees raises questions concerning the inclusion of all stakeholders. Why are parents not more involved in the decision-making process at their school?

In addition, the differences discovered in this study regarding the decision-making influence of various stakeholders in school-based management committees requires some further investigation to understand better the environment of our nation's schools. A need exists to explore the training of school-based management committee members.



Training for SBM committee members and school staff serving on decision-making committees appears not to be prevalent based on a review of the literature (Conley, 1993).

An additional area for future research is to explore the effects of school-based management on student performance using qualitative research at individual schools in the United States and at different stages of school-based implementation (Rodriguez, 2000). The majority of research on shared governance has focused on process and not product. Rodriguez (2000) suggested that the literature on this topic illustrates a profusion of material on what should occur, how to do it, and the practices that effective school-based managed schools should engage in. The question to ask is whether or not students who attend public and private schools that implement the school-based management model receive a better education than students who attend schools that follow the traditional model.

The theory behind school-based management implies that school leadership is the key to implementation of shared governance in our elementary public and private schools (Conley, 1993; Deal & Peterson, 1994; Herman & Herman, 1994). Shared leadership should be an important research focus (Sergiovanni, 1994). Researchers could empirically be examined by researchers regarding the concept of shared governance and its contribution to school climate, school development, and school effectiveness at the elementary level. Furthermore, a close investigation of the relationship between the school leadership role and the model of school effectiveness at not only the national level but also at the state level could aid in the improvement of effective leadership. For example, Rodriguez (2000) examined shared governance in the state of Texas as reported in this study. Accordingly, the next release of data from the *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Kindergarten 1999-2000* from the National Center of Education Statistics will provide another opportunity to obtain a portrait of shared governance in public and private schools in the United States for that period of time and to examine changes in the principalship since 1998-1999.

Finally, another area for research relates to the educational reform initiatives and shared decision-making. That is, researchers could focus on specific reform initiatives and investigate the extent to which shared decision-making changes or has changed as a result of the reform initiative. It may be that states or schools actively involved in educational reform may have greater shared decision-making practices than those states or schools not as involved in educational reform.

## **Conclusions**

According to our findings, public school principals have implemented school-based management to a higher degree than private schools. Furthermore, survey responses from public school principals, as a whole, indicated a higher degree of implementation regarding the influence and involvement of decision-makers on the six categories of decisions made at their schools: hiring/firing of teachers, selection of textbooks, setting curricular guidelines/standards, establishing policies and practices for student grading/evaluation, deciding how school discretionary funds will be spent, and professional development planning.

From this study, new insights regarding the extent to which principals implement

school-based management and the inclusion of stakeholders in school-based management committees across the United States were established. These new insights provide an authentic context from which to conduct further study of school-based management in our public and private schools on the state and national levels.

## References

- Baker, D., Han, M., & Keil, C. T. (1996). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *How different, how similar? Comparing key organizational qualities of American public and private secondary schools*, Washington, D.C.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bimber, B. (1993). *School decentralization: Lessons from the study of bureaucracy*. Santa Monica, California: RAND Institute.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1997). *The fire is back! Principals sharing school governance*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Brown, D. J. (1990). *Decentralization and school-based management*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Carlson, R. V. (1996). *Reframing & reform: Perspectives on organization, leadership, and school change*. New York: Longman Publishers.
- Chapman, J. (1990). School-based decision-making and management: Implications for school personnel. In C. Chapman (Ed.), *School-based decision-making and management*. London: Falmer.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1996). *School effectiveness and school based management: A mechanism for development*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Choy, S. P. (1998). Public vs. private schools. *Principal*, 77 (5), 1-4.
- Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & J. A. Moore, (Eds.) *Schooling for tomorrow: Directing reform to issues that count*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Clune, H. H., & White, P. A. (1988). *School-based management: Institutional variations, implementation, and issues for further research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. New York: John Wiley.
- Conley, D. T. (1993). *Roadmap to restructuring: Policies, practices and the emerging*

*visions of schooling*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Dade County Public Schools (1989). *Renaissance in education*. Miami, Florida: Author.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fernandez, J. A. (1989, May). Dade County public schools' blueprint for restructured schools. Paper presented at the conference on choice and control in American education, University of Wisconsin-Madison. In J. Murphy, & L. Beck, *School-based management as school reform*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Glickman, C. D. (1993). *Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

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

Hammer, C. (1997). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Public and private school principals in the United States: A statistical profile, 1987-88 to 1993-94*, Washington, D.C.

Hannaway, J. (1992, March). *Decentralization in education: Technical demands as a critical ingredient*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 362).

Herman, J. J., & Herman, J. L. (1994). *Making change happen: Practical planning for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.

Hess, G. A. Jr. (1991, February). *School restructuring, Chicago style: A midway report*. Chicago: Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance.

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

Lindelov, J. (1981). School-based management. In Smith, S. C., Mazzarella, J. A., & Piele, P. K. (Eds.) *School leadership: Handbook for survival*. Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational management.

Livingston, M. J., Slate, J. R., & Gibbs, A. (1999). Shared decision-making and practices of rural school principals. *Rural Educator*, 21, (1), 20-26.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R. T., & Kranz, J. (1989). *What do we know about school-based management? A case study of the literature- A call for research*. Paper presented at the conference on Choice and Control in American Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, May 17-19.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*, Thousand Oakes, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

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

- Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1995). *School-based management as school reform: Taking stock*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Reynolds, L. J. (1997). *Successful site-based management: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Rodriguez, T. A. (2000). *The implementation of site-based management across Texas: An empirical study* (doctoral dissertation , University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX).
- Schlechty, P. C. (1997). *Inventing better schools: An action plan for educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.
- Smith, W. E. (1993, April). *Teachers' perceptions of role change through shared decision making: A two-year case study*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Snyder, T. (1997). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Findings from the condition of education 1997: Public and private schools: How do they differ?*, Washington, D.C.
- Steffy, B. E. (1993). *The Kentucky education reform: Lessons for America*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Texas Education Code. (1991). Chapter 21, Section 21.931.
- Texas Education Agency. (1992). *Resource guide on site-based decision-making and district and campus planning*. Austin, Texas (II-1).
- Texas Education Agency. (1997-1998). *Snapshot view of Texas*. Austin, Texas.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1998, May). *Turning around low-performing schools: A guide for state and local leaders*. Washington, D.C.: Planning and Evaluation Service.
- Vann, A. S. (1999, Fall). Shared decision-making: A paper tiger? *Educational Horizons*, 78 (1), 16-17.
- Watkins, J. M., & Lusi, S. F. (1989, May). *Facing the essential tensions: Restructuring from where you are*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

West, J., Denton, K., & Germino-Hausken, E. (2000, April). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *America's Kindergartners: Findings from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Kindergarten Class of 1998-1999*, NCES 2000-070 (Revised), Project Officer, Jerry West. Washington, DC.

Wohlstetter, P., & Buffet, T. (1991, March). *School-based management in big city districts: Are dollars decentralized too?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

## **About the Authors**

### **Mary T. Apodaca-Tucker**

New Mexico State University

Mary T. Apodaca-Tucker obtained her Ed.D. in Educational Administration from the University of Texas at El Paso in 2001. She is currently a professor at New Mexico State University in Las Cruces, New Mexico teaching Educational Administration courses focused on the Principalship. She has over 30 years of experience teaching and working as an administrator within the El Paso area and has also worked as an Area Superintendent for the Austin ISD. To date, She authored "Understanding Restructuring in Practice: A Study of Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Interventions and Core Technology on Student Success," Planning and Change (1997) and "Shared Decision-Making: Beliefs and Practices of Principals at the U.S. Mexico Border," *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning* (2001).

### **John R. Slate**

University of Texas at El Paso

John R. Slate received his Ph.D. from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville in 1984. He is currently a Full Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations at The University of Texas at El Paso. His current interests are in examining school reform efforts, specifically through analysis of large-scale databases such as state report cards and the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

---

**Copyright 2002 by the Education Policy Analysis Archives**

The World Wide Web address for the *Education Policy Analysis Archives* is [epaa.asu.edu](http://epaa.asu.edu)

General questions about appropriateness of topics or particular articles may be addressed to the Editor, [Gene V Glass](mailto:Gene V Glass), [glass@asu.edu](mailto:glass@asu.edu) or reach him at College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411. The Commentary Editor is Casey D. Cobb: [casey.cobb@unh.edu](mailto:casey.cobb@unh.edu) .

## **EPAA Editorial Board**

[Michael W. Apple](#)  
University of Wisconsin

[Greg Camilli](#)  
Rutgers University

John Covaleskie  
Northern Michigan University

Sherman Dorn  
University of South Florida

Richard Garlikov  
hmwkhelp@scott.net

Alison I. Griffith  
York University

Ernest R. House  
University of Colorado

Craig B. Howley  
Appalachia Educational Laboratory

Daniel Kallós  
Umeå University

Thomas Mauhs-Pugh  
Green Mountain College

William McInerney  
Purdue University

Les McLean  
University of Toronto

Anne L. Pemberton  
apembert@pen.k12.va.us

Richard C. Richardson  
New York University

Dennis Sayers  
California State University—Stanislaus

Michael Scriven  
scriven@aol.com

Robert Stonehill  
U.S. Department of Education

Alan Davis  
University of Colorado, Denver

Mark E. Fetler  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Thomas F. Green  
Syracuse University

Arlen Gullickson  
Western Michigan University

Aimee Howley  
Ohio University

William Hunter  
University of Calgary

Benjamin Levin  
University of Manitoba

Dewayne Matthews  
Education Commission of the States

Mary McKeown-Moak  
MGT of America (Austin, TX)

Susan Bobbitt Nolen  
University of Washington

Hugh G. Petrie  
SUNY Buffalo

Anthony G. Rud Jr.  
Purdue University

Jay D. Scribner  
University of Texas at Austin

Robert E. Stake  
University of Illinois—UC

David D. Williams  
Brigham Young University

## **EPAA Spanish Language Editorial Board**

**Associate Editor for Spanish Language**  
**Roberto Rodríguez Gómez**  
**Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México**

roberto@servidor.unam.mx

Adrián Acosta (México)  
Universidad de Guadalajara  
adrianacosta@compuserve.com

Teresa Bracho (México)  
Centro de Investigación y Docencia  
Económica-CIDE  
bracho dis1.cide.mx

J. Félix Angulo Rasco (Spain)  
Universidad de Cádiz  
felix.angulo@uca.es

Alejandro Canales (México)  
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de  
México  
canalesa@servidor.unam.mx

**Ursula Casanova (U.S.A.)**

Arizona State University  
casanova@asu.edu

**Erwin Epstein (U.S.A.)**

Loyola University of Chicago  
Eepstein@luc.edu

**Rollin Kent (México)**

Departamento de Investigación  
Educativa-DIE/CINVESTAV  
rkent@gemtel.com.mx  
kentr@data.net.mx

**Javier Mendoza Rojas (México)**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de  
México  
javiermr@servidor.unam.mx

**Humberto Muñoz García (México)**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de  
México  
humberto@servidor.unam.mx

**Daniel Schugurensky**

(Argentina-Canadá)  
OISE/UT, Canada  
dschugurensky@oise.utoronto.ca

**Jurjo Torres Santomé (Spain)**

Universidad de A Coruña  
jurjo@udc.es

**José Contreras Domingo**

Universitat de Barcelona  
Jose.Contreras@doe.d5.ub.es

**Josué González (U.S.A.)**

Arizona State University  
josue@asu.edu

**María Beatriz Luce (Brazil)**

Universidade Federal de Rio Grande do  
Sul-UFRGS  
lucemb@orion.ufrgs.br

**Marcela Mollis (Argentina)**

Universidad de Buenos Aires  
mmollis@filo.uba.ar

**Angel Ignacio Pérez Gómez (Spain)**

Universidad de Málaga  
aiperez@uma.es

**Simon Schwartzman (Brazil)**

Fundação Instituto Brasileiro e Geografia  
e Estatística  
simon@openlink.com.br

**Carlos Alberto Torres (U.S.A.)**

University of California, Los Angeles  
torres@gseisucla.edu