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The purpose of this study was (a) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making (SDM), and (b) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. Randomly selected members from the stakeholder categories of: parents, board of education members, superintendents, principals, and teachers, were the sample (N = 100). Stakeholder perception was compared on a composite score of the survey instrument. Perceptions were also compared across the six constructs of SDM for each of the stakeholder categories. Seventy-three respondents completed the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument (SDMSI) which was designed by the researcher via an expert panel. Stakeholder response to individual survey questions and demographic influences were also sought.

Research Question 1, concerned with what differences exist in the perceived barriers to shared decision-making between the stakeholder categories, was tested by analyzing data using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha level at .05 level of significance. The
findings did not provide enough evidence to reject the null Hypothesis 1 of no difference.

Research Question 2, concerned with what differences exist in stakeholder perception across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations, was tested by analyzing data using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha level at .05 level of significance. The findings did not provide enough evidence to reject the null Hypotheses 2 through 6 of no difference.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Statement of the Problem

The present context of American society is experiencing a strong, broad trend toward the decentralization of power. The American society has valued education for a long period of time. As a result of that belief, the society has become well educated. With this education comes the desire for individual leadership, power, and decision-making autonomy. Shared decision-making in education is part of that trend. It is likely that the effectiveness of this movement will be contingent upon the leadership addressing this change, taking a similar path of other historic initiatives. In addition to the overall growth in societal education is the current global economic climate in which the country is embedded.

The United States is experiencing an accelerating decline of competitiveness in the 1990s. Since 1973 the national productivity has increased by less than 1% a year. Over the last 4 years, productivity has increased by only 0.5% a year. Ten years ago, the United States paid the highest wages in the world. Today, 10 other nations pay higher wages (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990). In 1980, in average worker earnings, the United States ranked number one in the world; in 1990 the United States ranked 12th; and economic forecasters predict that by the year 2000, the United States will rank 25th (Dagget, 1992). The United States used to be a high wage-low
skill nation. With the increase in global competitiveness, that is no longer an option (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990). While it is true that the United States annual increases in productivity lag behind other nations, the overall productivity of United States workers in the manufacturing sector compares quite favorably with other nations. The issue is not that United States workers are not productive, rather that their annual productivity increases are low. The National Center on Education and the Economy stated the belief that this is an important reason for major educational reform, but the cause may also be due to lack of investment in incumbent workers, capital investment, and the position that American workers have reached a plateau on the learning curve. Educational leaders are responding to the climate of the present economic situation. Whatever the specific cause, education is responding to assist this change effort, and responding through shared decision-making.

Setting of the Problem

Any change, or acceptance of change, will vary with the context of the individual and the context of the geographic region. In any setting there are similarities and differences in behaviors that determine the values unique to the way of life in that culture. In the education community in the state of Wisconsin, for example, parents, boards of education, administration, and teachers as separate and related groups develop their own unique culture. This culture may be different from other organizational cultures even within similar communities.
The primary focal point for the setting of this study was K-12 public educational institutions in the state of Wisconsin.

Purpose and Significance

The significance of this study was in determining stakeholder’s perceptions of the barriers preventing shared decision-making (SDM) from being implemented. In addition to identifying the stakeholder’s perceptions, the researcher also determined differences in stakeholder perceptions of barriers across the following constructs of SDM: leadership, motivation, empowerment, accountability, organizational culture, and learning organizations.

The philosophies that are being actively professed to restructure education for competitive, educational, and economic advantage are deeply embedded in shared decision-making, thus creating a leadership culture that will foster a climate where leaders can more effectively lead and followers can increase their contributions.

For this study, stakeholders were defined as individuals identified as stakeholders in the shared decision-making process from both within educational institutions and external to educational institutions in the state of Wisconsin. These stakeholders were categorized by their position as either: parents, board of education members, superintendents, principals, and teachers.

Barriers were defined as perceived impediments preventing shared decision-making from being implemented for educational reform in the state of Wisconsin.
The barriers to implementing shared decision-making were measured by the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument developed by the researcher. An expert panel was secured for this purpose.

Educational reform in this study addresses the current hopeful initiatives in administrative leadership, specifically, shared decision-making. This initiative focuses on the current literature on self-renewal and the learning organization with the eventual outcome being an efficient educational organization which is highly competitive, with managers equally competitive. This change will enhance organizational culture and competitiveness and will cause empowerment for the members of the organization. The eventual outcome will be a highly effective organization concerned with organizational progress, but in a setting where climate is as important as productivity.

Identifying the barriers to shared decision-making could be of critical value to Wisconsin leaders attempting to restructure education for global competitiveness. Implementation efforts could then be tailored by the findings of this study to allow for potential impediments.

As the country finds itself in an increasingly competitive global economy, the attention toward competitiveness in global education and its relationship to the work force has intensified. Competitiveness in global education has been addressed in numerous restructuring efforts. Restructuring should not be equated with the implementation of shared decision-making. "Restructuring addresses changes in the structural organization to foster a system and climate for better teaching and learning. The focus of shared decision-making is intended to equip the various stakeholders with greater authority to make decisions" (Renze,
Furthermore, shared decision-making needs to then be "applied" to issues throughout the context of the educational organization, leading to reform.

Research Objectives

Historically, collaboration among the various stakeholders in K-12 public education has not been a formal process. The void of collaboration has resulted in a lack of effectiveness and capacity for education to be competitive and continually improving. An answer to this void is the implementation of shared decision-making.

These stakeholders from very different roles are now expected to join efforts to collectively plan and ultimately improve the public educational system. This study is intended to investigate the perceptions of those different stakeholders. Specifically, the purpose of this study was (a) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making, and (b) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. The following conceptual hypotheses derive from those objectives.

1. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of barriers preventing implementation of shared decision-making.

2. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of empowerment.
3. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of leadership.
4. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of motivation.
5. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of organizational culture.
6. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of accountability.
7. Differences exist between stakeholder category and their perceptions of learning organizations.

Rationale

The importance of this study lies in determining if differences exist among stakeholders relevant to shared decision-making. The findings could serve as the framework for continued staff development for educational leaders at the state and local level. In addition, the findings would also be of value to the state organizations for each stakeholder category as well as the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Identifying potential barriers and addressing those issues in a plan for implementation is destined to produce an outcome of higher quality.

Summary

In Chapter I, the background and statement of the problem, setting of the problem, purpose and significance, research objectives, conceptual hypotheses, and rationale were presented. Each component was discussed in relation to the stated problem for the study.
Presented in Chapter II is a discussion of the review of related literature. Discussion on the future of economics, empowerment, definitions of shared decision-making, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, learning organizations, and a summary of the literature are the focus for Chapter II.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was (a) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making, and (b) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations.

The trend toward the decentralization of power and decision-making, as discussed in Chapter I, provides the background for the review of the literature. This review is divided into eight sections.

Section 1 refers to the broad context of shared decision-making for the future of economics. Section 2 examines a theoretical framework of empowerment through shared decision-making. Section 3 addresses multiple current definitions of shared decision-making and management restructuring. Section 4 deals with shared decision-making and the construct of leadership. Section 5 handles shared decision-making and the construct of motivation. Section 6 presents shared decision-making and the construct of organizational culture. Section 7 refers to shared decision-making and the construct of learning organizations. Section 8 concludes the review of the literature with a summary and conclusions of barriers to shared decision-making and implementation.
American education is seeing fundamental changes in expectations for student learning, in the practice of teaching, and in the organization and management of public schools (Dagget, 1992). Brown (1990) suggested that employees will follow the expectation which is set for them. Brown further stated that high expectations may cause personnel to respond with quality.

Outcomes are the renewed focus. Effectiveness of the educational organization to assist the economic growth and competitiveness of the future will be the focus. Educational leaders are experiencing the movements to more standardized testing at the state and national level, the appearance of state mandated school outcome reports, and the movement toward state and national uniform core high school curriculum.

School curriculum leaders are focusing on measurable outcomes and competencies as opposed to grades. School buildings and districts are expediting the process of the school report card and the reporting system for this information. These results or favorable competitiveness don’t happen by accident. "Systematic planning of organizational needs as well as individual needs must be addressed to achieve maximum productivity" (Selznick, 1957, p. 27).

"Improved productivity processes and managerial skills always contributed and will continue to assist productivity" (Drucker, 1969, p. 250). "If leaders and managers have taken the time to systematically plan for where individual employees would be best located for intrinsic
reward, productivity should be improved" (Hitt, 1988, p. 110). In the context of followership, productivity has long been associated with top-down management in public and private institutions. Corporate America of the future will continue to reduce its levels of management through down-sizing and right-sizing (Drucker, 1986). This flattening out of the organization is one of the critical points of the shared decision-making approach and will call for greater productivity of the employees remaining. Front line workers will possess greater technical skills and will have improved role and decision-making autonomy.

McGregor (cited in Hitt, 1988) stressed the importance of motivation in the context of decision-making. In his book, The Human Side of Leadership, McGregor made his position clear: "Many managers would agree that the effectiveness of their organizations would be at least doubled if they would discover how to tap the unrealized potential present in their human resources" (Hitt, 1988, p. 149).

In his book, The Power of Followership, Kelley (1991) described productivity in today's flatter, leaner environment. "Organizations and leaders cannot succeed without committed, contributing followers" (p. 200). Kelley further implied that leaders must understand roles and viewpoints other than their own. Wide varieties of leaders in this country achieve outstanding results because they have the full support of their followers.

Applying Deming's management theories, specifically, shared decision-making, to restructuring education deserves serious consideration (Brandt, 1992b). Deming believed that people are purposeful, cognitive beings with an intrinsic desire to learn and be innovative and
that each individual has the right to enjoy his or her work and be successful (Brandt, 1992b). When considering change, Deming would change the governance from the traditional hierarchical system of school governance. Deming further implied that shared decision-making at all levels improves quality and productivity (Brandt, 1992b).

Dagget (1992) inferred that America must revamp the way it develops and utilizes human talent. America's productivity in the 1990s will increase only if American employers redraft strategies to include incumbent worker training (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990).

Empowerment Through Shared Decision-Making:
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework utilized in Block's (1987) book, The Empowered Manager, will undergird the current literature on shared decision-making.

Block (1987) inferred that individuals can make personal choices that shape the work environment. These choices and the norms and values of the organization shape the path taken. Managers strive to create high-performing organizations while treating the employees well. Block discussed the ideal organizational culture as one in which a person would want his or her own children to work. Decisions need to be made that have long-term positive impacts on the organization and the organization’s members.

Historically, the traditional hierarchial organization was concerned with manipulation, managing information flow, calculating relationships,
impressing superiors, and cautious about telling the truth (Block, 1987). Most often the result of this process is not rewarding. Is the objective to become better at a bad game or to change the process of the game? In the traditional hierarchial model there is a reluctance to take full responsibility for one's own actions or for the organization one is trying to create (Block, 1987). "Choosing an entrepreneurial path is equivalent to being political in a positive way" (Block, 1987, p. 11). Block posited that life and organizational life bring the challenge and opportunity for multiple decisions. With those decisions also comes a consequence, such as the decision of autonomy and the result of greatness. Is it possible that the implementation of shared decision-making has this far reaching potential?

"The fundamental choices to be made in determining the path of the individual and the organization are maintenance and greatness; caution and courage; dependency and autonomy" (Block, 1987, p. 11).

The higher one goes, the greater the fall and the tragedy. This results in a greater wish for maintenance. "The choice of greatness is an alternative to traditional organizational life, operating and achieving in a unique way" (Block, 1987, p. 13). "The alternative to caution is to choose courage; stepping forward to create an organization takes courage" (Block, 1987, p. 15).

"Autonomy is the attitude that my actions are my own choices in the organization; what I am part of is in many ways my own creation. When we feel dependent, we are waiting for someone above or below to make a decision" (Block, 1987, p. 15). People are constantly calling for strong leadership, but is the organization conducive to this leadership,
conducive to shared decision-making?

Block (1987) further indicated that a common mode of operation is for a person to focus on change that is needed above him or her and feeling that until that happens, he or she, too, cannot change. Autonomous individuals realize there is nothing holding them back from creating an individual, subunit, or organization, of their choosing.

"The choice each individual must make is high risk, high anxiety and high integrity. This choice is good for the organization as a whole" (Block, 1987, p. 17).

"Historically, change from the top down happened at the will and whim of those below. As managers, we state our intentions and give direction, but many of the most critical choices are made by the people below us" (Block, 1987, p. 63). "The power of a boss is asymmetrical. It is easier to use authority to tighten up, shrink, and make an organization more cautious than it is to use power to open up, expand, and make an organization more courageous" (Block, 1987, p. 63). This tightening up of the organization will not yield outstanding results; although the process of shared decision-making may be more complex, it may be more potent.

"This entrepreneurial approach is the answer to the bureaucratic cycle. The way through this dilemma is to act in a way that serves our empowerment" (Block, 1987, p. 64). Block referred to empowerment as a state of mind. "Empowerment stems from two sources: (1) the structure, practices, and policies we support as managers who have control over others, and (2) the personal choices we make that are expressed by our own actions" (Block, 1987, p. 65).
Block (1987) also discussed the importance of sharing information to empower people. Block's perception of the military model holds that only those who need to know should be informed; subordinates need to be thought of as partners.

"The alternative to the bureaucratic cycle is the entrepreneurial cycle" (Block, 1987, p. 22). "Becoming positively political is to act as if the whole organization we are part of is in fact our own" (Block, 1987, p. 22). The goal then is to transfer this feeling of ownership to all employees. This is possible as one moves toward an entrepreneurial cycle:

**Part 1: The entrepreneurial cycle:** The entrepreneurial cycle begins with a contract that is based on the belief that the most trustworthy source of authority comes from within the person. The primary task of supervision is to help people trust their own instincts and take responsibility for the success of the business. The contract demands that people make a serious commitment to the organization but do so because they want to, not because they have to. The expectation is that people at each level will treat the business as their own.

**Part 2: Enlightened self-interest:** Rather than defining success as moving up in the organization, Block (1987) defined success in terms of contribution and service to customers and other departments. People are offered rewards such as: jobs that have meaning, the opportunity to learn and create something special, and the chance to grow in a business through their own efforts. Advancement and pay are still important but are given a secondary focus.
Part 3: Authentic tactics: An entrepreneurial contract encourages leaders to be direct and authentic in their management style. If people begin to believe that it is their business, they will feel empowered to act on their own values. For most people this will mean letting others know where they stand, sharing as much information as possible, sharing control, and taking reasonable risks. These are the kinds of tactics that minimize the belief that one has to be calculating and controlling in order to move up the ladder. The good news is that it makes sense; the bad news is that experience indicates that it takes courage.

Part 4: Autonomy:

The entrepreneurial contract and a service-oriented definition of self-interest support each of us in claiming our own autonomy. Autonomy reduces the need for us to give so much attention and power to those above us. It reduces our fear of being shot and demands that we own our own actions. Each of us will always at times continue to choose caution, maintenance, and dependency; but the basic beliefs of the organization will operate to support greatness, courage, and independence (Block, 1987, pp. 23-24).

Block (1987) made his position clear that to be successful, competitive, and even survive, organizations need to empower their people. Shared decision-making is being posited as a solution for the future.

Power generally refers to a leader’s capacity to influence an individual or an organizational subunit. Hitt (1988) inferred that to lift people to their better selves, leaders must empower people to move toward self-actualization. Burns (1978) stated that leaders may lead with the implied consent of their followers as they influence followers toward achievement of mutual goals.

Hitt (1988) indicated:
When leaders empower people, leaders themselves gain power. In this statement, the following context is a given: The leader is working in an environment that is conducive to transforming leadership and the leader is supervising people who are psychologically mature. (p. 154)

Burns (1978) indicated, "leadership, unlike naked power wielding, is thus inseparable from follower's needs and goals" (p. 19). "Although some theorists have emphasized a downward flow of authority from owners and top management, the potential influence derived from authority depends as much on the consent of the governed as on the ownership and control of property" (Yukl, 1989, p. 16).

Yukl (1989) also described the social exchange theory which explains how power is gained or lost. The focus is primarily on expert power and authority. Organizational subunits gain power much as individual leaders do. The most powerful subunits are often successful in having one of their members accept a higher leadership role. Subunits of the organization attempting to control the decision-making process attempt to get a representative voice into a position of authority.

Renze (1991/1992) analyzed the perceptions of shared decision-making in the early stages of implementation. The selected factors were restructuring of roles and decision-making processes, empowerment, involvement in decisions, collegiality, collaboration, and teaching and learning. Two methods were used to collect data. Six hundred and two staff members were surveyed and 104 staff members were interviewed with open-ended questionnaires. The following conclusions were reached: Shared decision-making roles and decision-making processes are not clear to a majority of the staff, staff are not sure how decisions are to be made, and who should make them. Staff members don't feel
empowered in areas that affect their jobs. Nonmembers of planning teams viewed shared decision-making less positively than shared decision-making teams. Nonmembers have little knowledge of the project or process. Project communication is limited and ineffective. Staff have been positive toward the project, but believe little has affected how teachers do things. The findings of the study conducted by Renze (1991/1992) support the need of this research study in that further investigation of the barriers preventing successful implementation needed to be explored for successful implementation of shared decision-making.

Hunt (1991) posited that the practical purpose of leadership is understanding meaning in a specific situation so that decision-making leads to action. Deming (cited in Brandt, 1992b) contended that employee involvement at all levels of decision-making leads to improved quality. Owens (1987) differed slightly with this opinion, stating that only those situations to which employees are sensitive, as Barnard (cited in Owens, 1987) described the zone of sensitivity, really require the use of employee participation.

Owens (1987) also posited that the use of participative decision-making as having two potential benefits: "(1) arriving at better decisions, and (2) enhancing the growth and development of the organization and the organization's participants, for example, improved motivation" (p. 284).

Vroom and Yetton's (1973) model for decision-making is the best supported situational leadership theory. This model is based upon an analysis of how a leader’s decision behavior affects decision quality and
subordinate acceptance of that decision. A basic assumption of the model is that participation increased decision acceptance, if it is not already high; and the more influence subordinates have, the more they will be motivated to implement a decision. Subordinates who have considerable influence in making a decision tend to identify with it and perceive it to be their decision, which increases their motivation to implement it successfully. A quality decision is one where the best alternative is selected. The Vroom and Yetton model should be focused on by leaders considering the implementation of shared decision-making. The underlying philosophy of the model mirrors the concepts and benefits of the shared decision-making initiative.

Shared decision-making has been defined by numerous authorities. The constructs of shared decision-making are interrelated with contemporary leadership style. This research study defined shared decision-making for the context of this study and expanded upon its relationship with its related constructs.

Definition of Shared Decision-Making

The 1991 Wisconsin Senate Bill No. 483 (cited in Grover et al., 1992) outlines the management restructuring program as follows:

118.013. Management Restructuring Programs. (1)(a)1. The school board and the school administrators shall each appoint representatives, and the teachers of each school and the parents of pupils enrolled in each school shall each elect representatives, to participate in the development of a management restructuring program designed to decentralize school board powers and duties and to foster shared decision-making.

2. If the school includes high school grades, a pupil enrolled in those grades, selected as determined by the
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school board, shall participate in the development of the program under subd. 1 as a nonvoting member.

(b) During the 1992-1993 school year, the state superintendent shall hold a training session on management restructuring programs in the territory of each cooperative educational service agency. The representatives chosen under par. (a) shall participate in the training sessions.

(2) During the 1993-1994 school year, if the representatives under sub. (1)(a) agree, they shall meet to develop a management restructuring program that addresses all of the school’s educational practices except those that are mandatory subjects of collective bargaining under subch. IV of ch. 111. The representatives may agree to allow members of other groups to participate in the meetings. The meetings shall be by school, except that if a principal supervises more than one school, the meetings shall be by the group of schools that he or she supervises.

(3)(a) A school board on its own initiative or upon receipt of an application from the principal of a school located in the school district may apply to the state superintendent for a grant to assist in developing or implementing a management restructuring program. The state superintendent shall appoint a 12-member council under s. 15.04(1)(c) to review the applications and make recommendations to the state superintendent. The council shall consist of the governor or his or her designee and at least one member representing school boards, one member representing school administrators, one member representing parents of pupils enrolled in the school district, and one member representing teachers. The state superintendent may also appoint members representing other groups. Grants shall be awarded from the appropriation under s. 20.255(2)(ds). To the extent possible, the state superintendent shall ensure that grants are equally distributed on a statewide basis.

(b) If a management restructuring program is implemented following the receipt of a grant under par. (a), the program shall specify that the school board determines the school district and each school’s budget but shall also provide that any management council established for a school under the program may make recommendations to the school board regarding how the school’s budget is allocated.

(c) No grants may be awarded under this subsection after June 30, 1994. (Grover et al., 1992, p. 13)
The definition of shared decision-making as defined by Senate Bill No. 483 places emphasis on why this management restructuring effort is being addressed and what the administrative process for implementation will be. The following resolution, adopted in 1992, by the Wisconsin Education Association Council (WEAC, 1993) places primary emphasis on what local agreements for the shared effort should include.

**WEAC Resolution B-60: Site-Based Decision-Making**

The Wisconsin Education Association Council (WEAC, 1993) supports site-based decision-making processes that are based on contractual and/or formal agreements between districts and local associations. The WEAC believes that the scope of local site-based decision-making should be limited only by the contractual and/or formal agreement. The association further believes that such agreements must include the following elements:

- Voluntary participation by local sites.
- A district-association structure for processing conflict resolution.
- An agreement on the scope of decision-making authority available to sites.
- Any site-based decision which would violate a negotiated contract must receive a waiver from the local bargaining unit specifying exact parameters and timeline. Waivers would be non-precedent-setting.
- Constituent representation appropriate to the site and selected by each constituency in conjunction with the local bargaining unit.
- Compensated planning and training time for staff and governance bodies as well as additional resources necessary for successful implementation.
Compensation and/or release time for participating staff members. (p. 10)

(This resolution was adopted by the 1992 WEAC Representative Assembly.)

The Wisconsin Education Association Council (1993) resolution placed specific emphasis on what local agreements should include relative to shared decision-making. The following document outlines the minimal requirements for participation in addition to the timeline suggested for implementation of the shared decision-making plan.

State Statute 118.013: Management Restructuring Program

1. Minimum Compliance Requirements:
   A. 1992-1993:

   1. School District must form an "Informational Team" consisting of one (1) parent and one (1) teacher from each building; one (1) High School student; one (1) Board member; one (1) administrator.

   2. The "Informational Team" must attend an "Informational Meeting" conducted by CESA #9 where an understanding of the management restructuring statute 118.013 and an overview of basic terms and concepts of site-based management/shared decision-making are presented.

   3. Any party on the "Informational Team" may veto the entire concept for a school district. All parties must agree to proceed with the process. After the "Informational Team" has attended the meeting conducted by CESA #9, the team will meet to discuss the meeting information and whether the entire team wishes to move to the second year (1993-94) planning phase.
B. 1993-94:

1. All parties proceed with the planned development of management restructuring.

C. 1994-95:

1. School District implementation of plan. Two-thirds of the teachers employed at each school must agree to the planned implementation in order to commence. (Grover, 1992, p. 1)

Barriers to Shared Decision-Making and Leadership

Effective leadership must be present if an organization and its members are to be successful.

The nature of leadership skills will vary with the situation, but one talent all leaders must possess—the capacity to perceive needs of followers in relationship to their own, to help followers move toward fuller self-realization and self-actualization along with the leaders themselves. (Burns, 1978, p. 166).

In his book, The Power of Followers, Kelley (1992) indicated that "most people are followers and leaders" (p. 9). Kelley further noted that exemplary followers are engaged, assume ownership, support the team, and go above and beyond the job.

Hersey and Blanchard (1984) posited the life cycle theory of leadership. The theory indicates the level of subordinate maturity will determine the optimal level of leader behavior. The theory also holds that maturity can increase over time; and that as maturity increases, the effective leadership style will use less task oriented behavior. The more mature subordinates are, the more relationship oriented leader behavior is required. Less mature subordinates require more task type of leader behavior. Yukl (1989) supported this by inferring that no theorist
supports treating all subordinates exactly the same. This position differs substantially from the WEAC (1993) position.

In his seminal text, Leadership, Burns (1978) set forth a definition of what he called transformational leadership. He defined it as "leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers" (p. 19). Bass (1985) stated that transformational leaders induce motivation to go beyond goals. Gandhi and Martin Luther King are examples of transformational leaders who were in touch with their followers, living and experiencing the process.

Followers can become their higher selves and shed their lower selves, they need the help of the leader who takes a personal interest in the development of his or her people. Persons ideal selves need to be identified and leaders should help them move toward it. Potential becomes transformed into actuality. In this helping relationship, the leader is also elevated. This is what transformational leadership is all about, change serving a high purpose. (Hitt, 1988, p. 160)

Is it possible for people to become their higher self without decision-making autonomy?

The general trend in society, as posited by the authorities, is a revisioning of how employees should be treated. This shift in leadership style mirrors the societal desire to decentralize the power bases in organizational settings. If one uses the analogy of the recent developments in computer technology related to leadership, one finds that: At one time most computer work revolved around a mainframe computer. Recently, the intent and focus is to have each personal computer or notebook computer act as its own mainframe. The result is greater efficiency, improved skills, decision-making autonomy, and empowerment at a
widespread level of impact. With this thought in mind, is the historical "great man" theory relevant any longer? The change in leadership movement can equate to this. Society is highly educated. Historically, a few leaders would lead large numbers of the masses in the chosen direction. The direction society has chosen today is an offer and an expectation to have greater numbers of leaders emerge from the masses to self-manage their own direction and the direction of the organization. If this offer of leadership is not made available, the result may be rebellion or mandate. In a study by Mesenburg (1987) where 330 subjects were surveyed regarding decentralized decision-making and school governance, the findings appeared positive. Schools set clear goals, establish a climate to support the goals, establish collaborative planning, and promote collegial relationships. Future funding was identified as critical in continuing the process.

Additional barriers were identified by Lipham (1983) in a study of over 100 schools. Although principals, the key instructional leader for the school, found positive outcomes by balancing structural and participative behaviors, several questions remain. Who is involved in the decision and to what extent is largely determined by the content of the issue. This position differs dramatically from the position of the Wisconsin Education Association Council (1992) who stated that shared decision-making should be limited only by contractual language. Lipham further commented on the seven change phases necessary for implementing planned change. This change process describes the interaction of leadership, decision-making, and change. Leadership style, frequency of involvement in decisions, and role clarification are additional areas of
concern.

Greer (1983) studied participative decision-making and concluded that school administrators were a barrier to the implementation of this strategy. The reason for this barrier is that they view participative decision-making as a threat to existing power relationships.

Edelman (1991/1992), using four schools, investigated shared decision-making. The research questions focused on leadership, with teachers and administration being reviewed through qualitative techniques. The findings indicated that "teacher participation in decision-making has occurred to some degree, but haphazardly, without well developed plans, and without specific training for teachers or principals (Edelman, 1991/1992, p. 30). Recommendations indicated that if empowerment is an objective, both necessary resources and appropriate staff training be provided.

Leadership training must be available if organizations and their members are to be successful with shared decision-making. "The nature of leadership skills will vary with the situation, but one talent all leaders must possess--the capacity to perceive needs of followers in relationship to their own, to help followers move toward fuller self-realization and self-actualization along with the leaders themselves" (Burns, 1978, p. 166).

Barriers to Shared Decision-Making and Motivation

Sherman (1991/1992) studied perceptions of senior high assistant principals. The purpose of the study was (a) to identify perceptions of assistant principals with regard to change toward shared
decision-making, (b) study the degree to which they feel empowered to be leader, and (c) study the impact of this change. Twenty assistant principals were interviewed.

The findings indicated the process was time consuming. Forty percent reported negative feelings. The negative feelings had more to do with the process than the philosophy. Subjects felt teachers and assistant principals need to be involved in the entire planning and implementation process to gain that same empowerment necessary for intrinsic motivation.

Maslow (cited in Hitt, 1988) indicated that an employee who is motivated will seek to not only fulfill individual needs, but relate to other areas of satisfaction, such as pride in product and organizational success.

McGregor (cited in Hitt, 1988) stressed the importance of motivation. In his book, The Human Side of Leadership, McGregor made his position clear. "Managers would agree that the effectiveness of their organizations would be at least doubled if they would discover how to tap the unrealized potential in their human resources (Hitt, 1988, p. 149).

In Maslow’s (cited in Hitt, 1988) Hierarchy of Human Needs, lifting people into their better selves is addressed. Maslow further stressed that motivation lies within the human organism. Based on Maslow’s findings, "leaders must understand the needs of their people and create an environment that will help them move up the hierarchy of needs toward self-actualization, causing followers to be intrinsically motivated. Individuals, work units, and organizations will be more productive" (Hitt,
1988, p. 163). Hitt further indicated that individuals moving toward self-actualization status experience high productivity, while individuals not moving toward self-actualization experience low job satisfaction and low productivity. Maslow also stated that few persons ever reach the top rung of the hierarchy. McGregor's (cited in Hitt, 1988) Theory Y concept and Kelley's (1992) position are similar in that leaders need to understand followers' motivations. Yukl (1989) indicated that employee participation leads to greater satisfaction, where possible, employees need to be involved in participative management.

House (1971) posited the Path Goal Theory to explain how the leader's behavior influences the satisfaction and performance of subordinates. "The motivational function of the leader consists of increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the path to those payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks, and increasing the opportunity for personal satisfaction" (House, 1971, p. 374). Much of this personal satisfaction is addressed by the issue of shared decision-making.

McClelland (1975) researched managerial motivation; in this study:

The leader's need for power was explored. People with a socialized power concern are more emotionally mature. They exercise power more for the benefit of others. This type of leader is more likely to use a participative, coaching style of managerial behavior and is less likely to be coercive and autocratic. Such leaders help make their subordinates feel strong and responsible, bind them less with petty rules, help produce a clear organizational structure, and create pride in belonging to the unit. (McClelland, 1975, p. 302)

In looking at the bigger picture of motivation, Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated that when individuals believe they can make an impact
and improve society, they will bring enthusiasm and commitment to their task, energies are focused toward a common goal, thus a major precursor for success has been achieved.

Barriers to Shared Decision-Making and Organizational Culture

Willner (1990/1991) studied autonomy, professionalism, and efficacy (shared decision-making, collective efficacy). Willner stated that in a time when improving schools is at the peak of national attention, teacher participation and professionalism is taking on different characteristics. Isolated teachers have an opportunity to embrace a new culture. Teachers can have the opportunity to influence others in a collective effort which can enrich learning.

As teachers participate in shared decision-making, they can become empowered and more professional. This research explored how teachers perceive the opportunities of this new school environment. Do they continue to address their individual needs based on the old professional culture, thus resenting the norm of collaboration and additional time required of shared decision-making? Will teachers discover a new meaning to autonomy and professionalism under the influence of collaboration? The significance of this study addressed the necessary shifts needed to fulfill the new role of autonomy and professionalism. This investigation was a case study involving a questionnaire and in-depth interviews among three schools. Willner (1990/1991) investigated organizational culture and shared decision-making. The findings indicate both concerns and benefits, thus warranting further investigation.
Deal and Kennedy (1982) inferred that the culture of an organization is concerned with how things are done in the organization. Culture derives from tradition, leadership initiatives, employee interaction, and employee commitment. Selznick (1957) noted that "the institutional leader is primarily an expert in the promotion and protection of values" (p. 27). These values of an organization set the framework from which a leader will be able to exert his or her leadership influence on the members. Hodgkinson (1991) indicated that "leadership in its fullest sense is more concerned with values than with the facts" (p. 89).

Owens (1987), citing Deal, Peters, and Waterman and Kanter, argued that "organizations who have an open culture are more innovative and successful" (p. 30). "Schein (1985) described the relationship between organizational culture and the ability of administrators to exercise leadership" (Owens, 1987, p. 30). Owens also inferred that leaders need to consider both organizational and human needs as they tend to the culture of the organization.

Barriers to Shared Decision-Making and Accountability

The purpose of site-based management, like the move toward participatory management in business, is to improve performance by making those closest to the delivery of services, teachers and principals, more independent and, therefore, responsible for the results of their school's operations (Hill & Bonan, 1991). A system of distinctive, site managed schools requires a rethinking of accountability indicated Hill and Bonan. Although school board governance and state mandates can serve as an umbrella, site managed schools must develop the ability to
develop, design, and market their own unique character (Hill & Bonan, 1991). If compliance at various levels above the teacher leadership council continue to dominate, teacher accountability will continue to erode. This teacher accountability is a central component of what shared decision-making strives for. If the shared decision-making initiative attempts to progress without a congruent commitment and follow through, the goal of autonomy will likely never exist.

Russell, Cooper, and Greenblatt (1992) focused on the relationship of accountability and shared decision-making. Russell et al. emphasized the use of standards for assessment purposes. What was unique in Russell et al.'s work is the fact that teachers were involved in shaping these standards. These standards focused on the following areas of accountability: teachers' personal performance, student performance, and student discipline (Russell et al., 1992). Through this self-directed work and self-assessment, teachers set standards for their performance as well as student success and discipline. Shared accountability as a component of shared decision-making was also explored by Mesenburg (1987). In this study, Mesenburg posited that shared governance is focused at increasing shared accountability among parents and teachers for the purpose of improved student learning.

Owens (1987) indicated that there are two primary purposes for implementing shared decision-making: to arrive at better decisions and to cause the organization and its membership to continually improve. Better decisions and continual improvement are forms of accountability that should be viewed as central components to the shared decision-making process.
Block (1987) indicated that when people are involved in the decision-making process, they feel ownership to the vision and work harder to implement the idea as if it were their own. Patterson (1993) indicated that through consensus decision-making, leaders are able to get other people so engaged that they feel the idea discussed was theirs and they become energized to champion that specific issue. Block (1987) furthered this point by indicating that autonomy within the organization is so important to overall organizational success. Block also discussed the analogy of getting each player within the organization to feel as though he or she personally owns it. This results in higher productivity, decisions made from a critical and discerning point of view, and ultimately, enhanced accountability.

Joyce, Wolf, and Calhoun (1993) researched the mission of the self-renewing school and its relationship to shared decision-making and accountability. Joyce et al. posited that in all reported cases of school improvement initiatives, substantial student learning was central throughout planning. Joyce et al. further stated that through this process, student interest and accountability were central throughout the phases. Patterson (1993) inferred that shared governance assumes that all members of the leadership council have equal say in governing the institution, thus resulting in shared accountability for decisions. The goal of accountability with shared decision-making should be to embed the value of shared accountability in the organizational culture.
"Human beings are designed for learning" (Senge, 1990b, p. 7). "Unfortunately, most societal organizations are oriented predominantly toward controlling rather than learning" (Senge, 1990b, p. 7). Education reform must address management options to allow “for understanding how organizations learn and accelerate that learning” (Senge, 1990b, p. 7). The rate at which organizations learn may become the only sustainable future competitive advantage (Senge, 1990b).

Management in private organizations have initiated change for the purpose of being competitive in productivity. Educational leaders have inferred that change in management is necessary to compete globally in the business of education and economics. One management option receiving considerable attention today in Wisconsin is shared decision-making. Lindelow et al. (1989) advocated the use of shared decision-making. Lindelow et al. posited shared decision-making as the cornerstone of reform to cause organizations to move from authoritarian to democratic in styles of operations. Lindelow et al. further implied that this process does not significantly alter the school governance power structure, but can be a high risk undertaking. Numerous advantages are expected, including better decisions, higher employee satisfaction, and better relations among staff and administration. Lindelow et al. cautions administration to move gradually and to learn to vary their decision-making styles for effectiveness and motivation.

The state of Wisconsin has recently passed legislation mandating that all schools embrace site-based management and shared decision
making. The interest of Public Law 118.013 (cited in Grover et al., 1992) is to decentralize the power of Wisconsin boards of education. The ultimate objective is for shared vision and leadership, employee empowerment, increased motivation, improved organizational culture, broad based accountability, and to cause Wisconsin schools to continually evolve as learning organizations.

Private industry has engaged public education in an attempt to upgrade skills of front-line workers and future leaders. Morgan (1992) inferred that the private sector in Wisconsin desires that educational institutions begin to implement educational reform in the area of shared decision-making. Shared decision-making concepts have contributed to a revived Japan and are being successfully engaged by progressive business and industry throughout the United States and Europe" (Dagget, 1992). The barriers to this specific reform process of shared decision-making as applied to education need to be explored through research study.

Summary and Conclusions of the Literature Review: Barriers and Implementation: Is There a Relationship?

A thorough review of the related literature indicates that shared decision-making has merit. Empowered employees build a trust relationship over time that fosters intrinsic motivation. These employees develop the vision, commitment, and leadership that enables them to believe they can control their own destiny and the destiny of the organization in which they work (Block, 1987).
Decision-making autonomy leads to the creation of an environment that is conducive to intrinsic motivation. This autonomy is the result of effective leadership within the motivations and values of both the leader and the follower, as Burns (1978) described. Persons who are given decision-making autonomy are generally motivated at a higher level to implement decisions as if the entire project was their own idea. The vision can be generated by the leader or be shared by the leader and employee, but the process by which issues are addressed should be decided upon by individuals at the level where the implementation will occur.

Although merits of the shared decision-making process may lead one to believe implementation is occurring at a steady pace, the research contradicts this. Numerous barriers to the shared decision-making process have been identified. The stakeholders involved in the process represent a diverse group of individuals who may be motivated quite differently. Stakeholders may be politically motivated or motivated by the end result of empowerment. The individual background and context of the present setting are key factors in the collegial climate of the leadership groups.

The process for shared decision-making is not always clear to persons outside of the leadership group. A critical issue/barriers the leadership group should address are the boundaries and parameters of that council. Specifically identifying what decisions should come within those boundaries. Not only which decisions, but the degree of involvement in making certain decisions.
Adequate training for the members of leadership council has been identified as a barrier. The organizational leadership should provide training in shared decision-making, group processing, and leadership. Individuals are often assigned a task with high expectations and are not provided the tools to adequately accomplish this task.

The ability or willingness of people to change and embrace the learning organization philosophy has been found to be a barrier. Individuals who become content are not likely to embrace the change process and are more likely to be cynical and resistant.

Although shared vision, shared governance, shared decision-making, and shared accountability in theory indicate those roles are shared, the research does not find this to be true. Administration holds the majority of the accountability, even for decisions made by the leadership councils. This has caused school administrators to suggest the shared decision-making process evolve and move at a slow pace. This slow pace also becomes a problem as a perceived bureaucracy settles in.

Educational organizations, their members and customers, may benefit to a large degree by implementing shared decision-making. It is extremely critical that intense and effective planning take place prior to and throughout the implementation process. Stakeholder groups need to identify the barriers on which research has focused and tailor their plans according to those identified barriers. This process will cause the leadership to begin shared decision-making in a nonthreatening manner that will be preventive in nature.

Zalesnick (1989) posited that although the supervisor and employee both exist in a work culture, a compact must exist between the
two allowing for mutual understanding of goals, mission, trust, and level of achievement desired.

Kelley (1992) stressed the importance of followers in the organizational culture, noting that followers are the extended eyes and ears of the leader. They are often closer to the action and will pick up information to which the leader does not have access. Their input should be valued and sought through shared decision-making.

Chapter III contains a detailed description of the study and the discussion of methods and procedures used to test the hypotheses. The overview of the study, purpose, research design, research questions, independent variable, dependent variable, characteristics of the sample, sample selection procedures, protection of human subjects, possible contaminating variables, instrumentation, pilot study, initial sampling, data collection procedures, data analysis, and summary are discussed.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to investigate differences in stakeholders' perceptions of the barriers preventing shared decision-making from being implemented in Wisconsin. This chapter presents a detailed description of the study and the discussion of methods and procedures used to test the hypotheses.

The primary aspects of this chapter are: (a) the purpose, (b) research design, (c) research questions, (d) independent variable, (e) dependent variable, (f) operational hypotheses, (g) null hypotheses, (h) characteristics of the sample, (i) sample selection procedures, (j) protection of human subjects, (k) possible contaminating variables, (l) instrumentation, (m) expert panel, (n) pilot study and initial sampling, (o) data collection procedures, (p) data analysis, and (q) summary.

The Purpose

Research studies on shared decision-making indicate favorable results to implementation of the model. Several studies discuss the merit of shared decision-making in terms of empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. However, a number of studies have identified barriers preventing shared decision-making from being implemented. An extensive review of the related literature has discovered that there has not been a study
Research Design

Data were collected across the five categories of the independent variable to test the hypothesis. The study was concerned with determining if differences exist between stakeholder categories. The research was also concerned with the extent to which perceived barriers are associated with implementing shared decision-making.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this research are:

1. What differences exist in stakeholder perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making?

2. What differences exist in stakeholder perceptions across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations.

The Independent Variable

Stakeholder role, the independent variable of this study, was defined in terms of the stakeholders involved in Wisconsin's site-based management initiative. Five categories are described in the variable: parent, board of education member, superintendent, principal, and teacher.
Dependent Variable

For the purpose of this study, differences in stakeholder perception of barriers to shared decision-making served as the dependent variable. A list of barriers has been assembled from the current literature on shared decision-making. The survey items identified as barriers have been classified by the following constructs: power, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organization.

Operational Hypotheses

1. The population mean scores of barriers from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument (SDMSI).

2. The population mean scores of empowerment from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

3. The population mean scores of leadership from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

4. The population mean scores of motivation from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

5. The population mean scores of organizational culture from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.
6. The population mean scores of accountability from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

7. The population mean scores of learning organizations from one category of stakeholder will be different from the other population mean scores under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of barriers from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

2. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of empowerment from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

3. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of leadership from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

4. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of motivation from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

5. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of organizational culture from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

6. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of accountability from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.
7. There will be no difference in the population mean scores of learning organizations from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration, as measured by the SDMSI.

An additional topic which was investigated explored differences among stakeholder categories in response to individual questions within the survey instrument. This investigation was followed by determining possible influences of demographic data on the findings of the study.

Characteristics of the Sample

The target population of this study was defined as individuals identified as stakeholders in the site-based management initiative in the state of Wisconsin. These individuals were categorized by their position as either parent, board of education member, superintendent, principal, or teacher.

Sample Selection Procedures

Formal procedures were used to select a random sample of 100 stakeholders from the state of Wisconsin. Twenty stakeholders were surveyed from each of the five categories of stakeholders, thus allowing for homogeneity of variance, one of the assumptions of the statistical procedure of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), to be considered. Lists of stakeholders were obtained from each stakeholder organization in Wisconsin. Those organizations that were considered are as follows: Wisconsin Parent Teacher Organization, Wisconsin Association of School Boards, Wisconsin Education Association Council, Association of Wisconsin School Administration, and Wisconsin Association of School
District Administrators. From each of those lists, a random selection procedure was implemented. A random number table was used in this process. The population was defined and a representative sample was selected that mirrored the overall characteristics of the state relative to school size, socioeconomic status, and location, such as rural or suburban. Size and location were obtained from the demographic component of the survey instrument.

Protection of Human Subjects

Protection of human subjects was a priority for this study. All information, including demographic data initially obtained from the pilot study and the original survey instrument, was assured confidentiality. The actual research study followed the federal guidelines established for the protection of human subjects. A full review of the procedure was conducted by the Human Subjects Review Board at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Permission was granted by the Human Subjects Review Board at Western Michigan University. (See Appendix A for approval letter.)

Possible Contaminating Variables

There could be potential contamination of the study due to the individual and institutional differences in various locations throughout the state of Wisconsin. In this study, differences in stakeholders' age, gender, education, occupational experience, and years of employment may contaminate the results. Statistical tests for control of these
demographic variables were implemented to isolate the influence of those variables.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to measure the variables was designed by the researcher. Various steps were followed to ensure consistent and effective results would be possible. Primary focus was on the current literature relating to barriers of shared decision-making and the constructs of: leadership, empowerment, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. The survey was constructed and forwarded to a panel of experts. These individuals offered quality recommendations and thus content validity was achieved. The response format was Likert-type with choices from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The various scores were achieved by summing the weights for all items relating to the variable and comparing differences in mean scores for each category of stakeholder and, secondly, by summing the weights relative to the constructs of power, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and the learning organization, and comparing differences in scores across five stakeholder categories. The researcher determined a composite mean score for each category of stakeholder. The researcher also addressed differences between stakeholder category and each of the six constructs identified within the survey.
Expert Panel

The three members of the expert panel served as an extremely valuable and informative resource during this research study. The panel's task was to review the researcher-designed instrument. During that review process the panel reviewed individual items for comprehension, content, and length. In addition to those tasks, the expert panel verified the sentence structure, wording, and the accuracy of each statement. Also, it helped to gather their valued input on survey items related to the various constructs of shared decision-making.

The results of the expert panel were successful. Each member acknowledging their willingness to participate in the study was a motivating factor for the researcher. In addition to upgrading the individual survey items, the demographic information and the attached survey cover letter were also revised.

Pilot Study and Initial Sampling

A pilot study was administered to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument. The instrument was forwarded to a panel of national experts to determine content validity and readability of the instrument. In addition to providing information about the instrument, the pilot study also provided information on methodology and statistical procedures used. The instrument, methodology, and statistical procedures were refined upon completion of the pilot study.

The initial sampling procedures utilized mirrored the sampling procedures utilized for the study, with the exception of the number being
surveyed. This procedure allowed for additional control, thus the data yielded dependable results.

Data Collection Procedures

The instrument, along with a cover letter (see the cover letter in Appendix B), explaining shared decision-making and the significance of this study, was mailed to the sample population in May of 1993. A follow-up packet was sent within 2 weeks to participants who had not yet responded.

To determine the perceived barriers, as identified by the categories of stakeholders, a composite score for each category of stakeholder was made available. The survey instrument consisted of a list of 36 barriers with a Likert-type response. A question-by-question review of the perceived barriers by stakeholder role was accomplished by applying a one-way ANOVA. This procedure determined the perceived barriers by stakeholder categories. Six one-way ANOVAs were utilized to analyze stakeholder differences across the six shared decision-making constructs.

In an attempt to adequately answer the second research question of the differences that exist between stakeholder category and barriers within each of the six predetermined constructs, the following procedure was adhered to: The responses to the questions were grouped by the six predetermined constructs.
Data Analysis

The individual respondent scores obtained on the shared decision-making survey measuring the dependent variable were used as the unit of analysis. The null hypothesis of no difference was tested using one-way ANOVA procedure at the .05 level of confidence. If the observed value was less than the $F$ critical value, the null hypothesis was rejected. If the $F$ probability was less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. If the null hypothesis was rejected, both the conceptual and operational hypotheses would be supported. The differences between stakeholder category for composite score and each of the six constructs identified were determined by a post-hoc analysis procedure of the one-way ANOVA procedure. The Scheffé test for comparisons was also utilized.

Summary

In Chapter III, the purpose of the study, instrument used for data analysis, data gathering procedures, and data analysis were discussed in relationship to the problem stated for this study. The methods described here sought to identify differences in perceptions of stakeholders in Wisconsin schools as to the barriers to the implementation of shared decision-making. Parents, teachers, board of education members, superintendents, and principals were surveyed. In addition to the perceptions of barriers, differences were drawn between stakeholder category and the six predetermined constructs within the survey instrument. An individual item analysis of survey questions also was explored across stakeholder categories.
Demographic data were collected with each survey instrument and statistical influences will be addressed. The data provided could produce several hypothesis for additional study, relative to shared decision-making.

Through analysis of these data, the various views on leadership, motivation, empowerment, organizational culture, and learning organizations may support conclusions on recommendations for the continued implementation of shared decision-making.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the research process that was outlined in this chapter. The stakeholder response rate for the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument, overall characteristics, data analysis, hypothesis test results, responses to individual survey items, demographic information, and summary of findings are the specific focus.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was: (a) to investigate differences in stakeholder perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making, and (b) to determine if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations.

The findings of the research process as described in Chapter III are discussed in this chapter. First, the stakeholder response rate for the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument and the overall characteristics of the study are discussed. Second, the data analysis and hypotheses test results are examined. The stakeholder responses to individual survey items are presented.

These data, on individual survey items, are addressed in this way as individual survey items were not addressed by the first hypothesis or the second set of hypotheses. The first hypothesis analyzed stakeholder perceptions on a composite survey basis. The second set of hypotheses analyzed stakeholder perceptions on six groups of constructs of shared decision-making within the survey instrument. The final analysis focused on stakeholder perceptions of each survey item individually. These data then present a voice of how the various stakeholders reacted to individual statements within the survey instrument.
The descriptive data for the demographic information are presented. Lastly, the findings are summarized.

Response Characteristics

The questionnaires were distributed to 100 shared decision-making stakeholders throughout the state of Wisconsin. The stakeholder category constitutes the independent variable of the study. The five categories of stakeholder were: parent, board of education member, superintendent, principal, and teacher. The instrument was distributed by the researcher directly, as each of the five stakeholder categories were mailed the survey instrument.

The data collection process was closely monitored by the researcher who eluded personal contact with the participating subjects to avoid bias in the responses and contamination of the data. A cover letter specifying directions written by the researcher was included with the instrument. The weeks directly following the initial distribution of the instrument were occupied receiving and coding the returned instruments. After 3 weeks the total response rate was 48, out of a possible 100.

A follow-up cover letter, an additional survey instrument, and a return addressed stamped envelope were forwarded to all nonrespondents. This procedure was planned as the end of the process for data collection. After 4 additional weeks a total of 73 questionnaires had been received out of 100 distributed. This resulted in an overall return rate of 73%. This response rate was uniquely similar to the 72% response rate for the previous pilot study for this research project.
Twenty-seven percent of the sample ($n = 27$) did not return the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument (SDMSI). Nonrespondents were not contacted to determine a reason for nonresponse. Table 1 gives the numbers of respondents per category of stakeholders. Of the 73 stakeholders who returned the questionnaire, there were no missing values in any of the surveys. This behavior was consistent with the pilot study, leaving the researcher confident in the user-friendly format of the instrument.

Table 1 presents information on survey rate of return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/stakeholder</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Number of SDMSI surveys distributed</th>
<th>Rate in percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education members</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overall response rate of 73% is favorable. Current interest in the legislated topic of shared decision-making and management restructuring is likely to have accounted for the high rate of return.

The response characteristics that have been presented provide an important framework from which the hypotheses testing occurred. The
number of respondents for each category of stakeholder is an indication of stakeholder interest in the topic of shared decision-making. In the following section, data from the testing of hypotheses are presented.

Testing of Hypotheses

Research Question 1, concerned with what differences exist in the perceived barriers to shared decision-making between the stakeholder categories, was tested by analyzing data using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha at .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis stated that there would be no difference in the population mean scores of one category of stakeholder from the other categories of stakeholder under consideration. The analysis of data for Hypothesis 1 resulted in a probability for $F$ of 1.30 as noted in Table 2. Since the probability of $F$ is larger than alpha of .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be retained and the research hypothesis cannot be defended. The first analysis utilized the independent variable of stakeholder role.

Table 2 presents information concerning Hypothesis 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>123.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The $F$ ratio for these data is 1.30. Since the $F$ was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be supported. The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder categories relative to perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making.

Table 3 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 1.

Table 3
Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Differences of Stakeholders' Perceptions Regarding Barriers to Implementing Shared Decision-Making Across Five Categories of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80.27</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77.68</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.26</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second analysis utilizes the independent variable of stakeholder category. Six null hypotheses were derived from Research Question 2. The null hypotheses stated that there would be no difference in the population mean scores of one category of stakeholder from the other categories under consideration across the constructs of shared decision-making; specifically the constructs of empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. The null Hypothesis 2 dealing with no difference between
stakeholder role and perceptions of empowerment was tested using one-way ANOVA at .05 alpha level (see Table 4).

Table 4 presents information concerning Hypothesis 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio for these data is 0.06. Since the F was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be supported. The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder categories relative to perceptions of empowerment. Further post-hoc analysis (Scheffé) confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 5 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 2.

The teacher category has the lowest mean of the five categories (13.73). The Scheffé post-hoc analysis confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level, relative to empowerment.

The null Hypothesis 3 dealing with no difference between stakeholder category and perceptions of leadership was tested using one-way ANOVA at .05 alpha level (see Table 6).

Table 6 presents information regarding Hypothesis 3.
Table 5
Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Stakeholders' Perceptions of Empowerment Across Five Categories of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education members</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Summary of ANOVA for Hypothesis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $F$ ratio for these data is 1.09. Since the $F$ was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be supported. The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder categories relative to perceptions of leadership. Further post-hoc analysis (Scheffé) confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 7 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 3.
Table 7

Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Stakeholders' Perceptions of Leadership Across Five Categories of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education members</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal category has the lowest mean of the five groups (8.43). The Scheffé post-hoc analysis confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level, relative to leadership.

Table 8 presents information concerning Hypothesis 4.

Table 8

Summary of ANOVA for Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F ratio for these data is 1.62. Since the F was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be supported. The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder
categories relative to perceptions of motivation. Further post-hoc analysis (Scheffé) confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 9 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 4.

Table 9
Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Stakeholders' Perceptions of Motivation Across Five Categories of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher category has the lowest mean of the five groups (13.0). The Scheffe post-hoc analysis confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level, relative to motivation.

Table 10 presents information concerning Hypothesis 5.

Table 10
Summary of ANOVA for Hypothesis 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The $F$ ratio for these data is 1.12. Since the $F$ was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be supported. The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder categories relative to perceptions of organizational culture. Further post-hoc analysis (Scheffé) confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 11 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education members</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal category has the lowest mean of the five groups (11.93). The Scheffé post-hoc analysis confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level, relative to organization culture.

Table 12 presents information concerning Hypothesis 6.

The $F$ ratio for these data is 0.50. Since the $F$ was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypothesis of no difference must be supported. The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder
Table 12
Summary of ANOVA for Hypothesis 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

categories relative to perceptions of accountability. Further post-hoc analysis (Scheffé) confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 13 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 6.

Table 13
Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Stakeholders’ Perceptions of Accountability Across Five Categories of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education members</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The board of education category has the lowest mean of the five groups (14.92). The Scheffé post-hoc analysis confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level, relative to accountability.
Table 14 presents information concerning Hypothesis 7.

Table 14
Summary of ANOVA for Hypothesis 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $F$ ratio for these data is 0.78. Since the $F$ was larger than alpha at .05, the null hypotheses of no difference must be supported.

The findings indicated no significant differences across stakeholder categories relative to perceptions of learning organizations. Further post-hoc analysis (Scheffé) confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 15 presents descriptive data concerning Hypothesis 7.

Table 15
Sample Size, Means, and Standard Deviations of Stakeholders’ Perceptions of Learning Organizations Across Five Categories of Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of education members</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The board of education category has the lowest mean of the five groups (13.76). The Scheffe post-hoc analysis confirmed no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level, relative to learning organizations.

In the following section, focus on stakeholder voices is presented. This additional topic investigated within the study explored differences among stakeholder categories in response to individual questions within the survey instrument. This investigation specifically addressed differences in individual responses from parents, board of education members, superintendents, principals, and teachers. Investigating these stakeholder differences clearly indicates the varied stakeholder positions relative to selected individual survey questions. Only those responses found to be unique are reported.

Focus on Stakeholder Voice

The following data, stakeholder response to individual survey items, are addressed in this manner as individual survey items were not addressed by the first hypothesis or by the second set of hypotheses. The first hypothesis analyzed stakeholder perceptions on a composite survey basis. The second set of hypotheses analyzed stakeholder perceptions on six groups of constructs of shared decision-making within the survey instrument. The final analysis focused on stakeholder perceptions of each survey item individually. These data then present a voice of how the various stakeholder categories reacted to individual statements within the survey instrument.
Parent Responses

Concerning parent responses to survey Item 3, 63.6% of the parent respondents agreed that teacher contracts should be modified due to changes in time and responsibility as a result of shared decision-making.

Concerning parent response to survey Item 23, 45.5% of the parent respondents agreed that existing school cultures cannot produce the results needed for substantial educational reform.

Concerning parent response to survey Item 29, 45.5% of parents disagreed that administration should have veto power over shared decision-making council decisions.

Board of Education Responses

Concerning board of education member responses to survey Item 15, 38.5% of the board of education member respondents agreed that with district guidelines, board of education policy, master contracts, state regulations, and lack of funds, there is not enough "autonomy" for shared decision-making to make significant changes at the school level.

Concerning board of education member responses to survey Item 27, 53.8% of the board of education member respondents strongly agreed that certain areas of decision-making should be excluded from the shared decision-making process and should be left only to administration.

Concerning board of education member responses to survey Item 34, 53.8% of board of education member respondents agreed that an
outside facilitator is necessary to effectively implement shared decision-making and to insure that continual growth is experienced.

Superintendent Responses

Concerning superintendent responses to survey Item 4, 50% of superintendent respondents agreed that special interest groups will attempt to misuse the power of shared governance.

Concerning superintendent responses to survey Item 27, 83.3% of the superintendents either strongly agreed or agreed that certain areas of decision making should be excluded from the shared process and should be left only to administration.

Concerning superintendent responses to survey Item 29, 50% of the superintendent respondents agreed that administration should have veto power over council decisions.

Principal Responses

Concerning principal responses to survey Item 7, 75% of the principals agreed that leadership style of administrators will play an important role in the success of shared decision-making.

Concerning principal responses to survey Item 22, 81% of the principal respondents agreed that organizational culture and climate will improve with shared decision-making.

Concerning principal responses to survey Item 28, 62.5% of the principal respondents agreed that certain stakeholders don't have the technical information or expertise to make adequate decisions.
Teacher Responses

Concerning teacher responses to survey Item 6, 60% of the teacher respondents agreed that certain council members cannot make sound decisions.

Concerning teacher responses to survey Item 19, 66.7% of the teacher respondents agreed that frequency and degree of involvement depend on the context of the decision to be made.

Concerning teacher responses to survey Item 23, 53.3% of the teacher respondents agreed that existing school cultures cannot produce the results needed for substantial educational reform.

Demographic Analysis

The purpose of the following statistical analysis of the demographic data variables: gender, age, years of employment, education, district progress with shared decision-making, knowledge of shared decision-making, district enrollment, and district location is to investigate the possible influences of demographic data on the findings of the study. However, institutional and individual differences in various sites could be a potential contamination of the study. The analysis of demographic data will provide the interpretation of the influence found in the research variables. Information concerning demographic data addresses unique characteristics of the respondents.

From the personal, demographic data component of the questionnaire, the following information was obtained: There were 44 males and 29 females; 86% of the respondents were over 40 years of
age; 46% of the respondents were in their present position for 10 years or more; 72% of the respondents had achieved a master's degree or higher; 54% of the respondents indicated a beginning level progress of implementation in their district; 52% of the respondents indicated their personal knowledge of shared decision-making was average; 32% of the respondents indicated their personal knowledge of shared decision-making was competent; a near equal number of respondents represented school districts from enrollment classes of A, B, and C; 57% of the respondents were from a rural setting; and 42% of the respondents indicated they were from a suburban setting.

Demographic data for gender, age, years of employment, education, district progress with shared decision-making, knowledge of shared decision-making, district enrollment, and district location were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha at .05 level of significance. During the investigation as to the possible influences of the demographic variables under consideration, none were found to be significantly different at the .05 level.

Summary

This chapter has presented the findings of data collection and analysis. The data collection procedures utilized resulted in an acceptable return rate. Stakeholder category did not result in a difference in perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making. Furthermore, stakeholder category did not result in a difference in perceptions of the six predetermined constructs relative to shared decision-making. Therefore, members of the five categories of stakeholder
answered the shared decision-making survey consistently relative to empowerment, leadership, motivational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. An overview of the demographic characteristics of the five stakeholder categories and their organizations was presented. One-way ANOVAs were calculated to determine significance levels between demographic data and the six predetermined constructs. Significant differences at .05 level were not substantiated in any category of demographic information.

Interpretations of the research findings and implications for further research are found in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was (a) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions of barriers to implementing shared decision-making (SDM), and (b) to investigate if differences exist in stakeholder perceptions across the following constructs of SDM: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations.

This chapter presents a discussion of the research and its findings. The conclusions are based on the analysis of the data collected (a) to investigate differences in stakeholder category and their perceptions of barriers preventing shared decision-making implementation, and (b) to determine differences in stakeholder category and their perceptions of barriers across the following constructs of shared decision-making: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. The discussion is organized into the following areas: (a) interpretations of the findings, (b) limitations of the study, (c) implications of the findings, (d) future research, and (e) conclusions.

Interpretations of the Findings

Seventy-three stakeholders from five categories (parents, superintendents, board of education members, principals, and teachers)
participated in the study. Each subject was asked to provide demographic information. Thirty-six questions assembled into the Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument (SDMSI) addressed barriers relative to six constructs: empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations.

Two research questions were investigated:

1. What differences exist in the perceived barriers to shared decision-making between the stakeholder categories?

2. What differences exist between stakeholder category and responses to the six predetermined constructs of SDM?

An additional investigation explored differences among stakeholder categories in response to individual survey questions. Demographic influences were also sought. One research hypothesis derived from Research Question 1. It was:

Hypothesis 1: Differences exist in the perceived barriers to shared decision-making between stakeholder categories.

In relation to the second research question, the following six research hypotheses were stated. They were:

Hypothesis 2: Differences exist between stakeholder categories and their perceptions of empowerment.

Hypothesis 3: Differences exist between stakeholder categories and their perceptions of leadership.

Hypothesis 4: Differences exist between stakeholder categories and their perceptions of motivation.

Hypothesis 5: Differences exist between stakeholder categories and their perceptions of organizational culture.
Hypothesis 6: Differences exist between stakeholder categories and their perceptions of accountability.

Hypothesis 7: Differences exist between stakeholder categories and their perceptions of learning organizations.

Each research hypothesis was tested in the null form at the .05 level of significance. The first and second hypotheses were tested using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

In Hypothesis 1, differences in the perceived barriers to SDM between stakeholder categories were expected. The differences in the group means of the superintendents (84.38), parents (80.27), principals (77.68), teachers (79.26), and board of education members (78.00) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no difference. The characteristics of the very different roles of stakeholder seem not to affect their position on shared decision-making. In the different roles in education, stereotypes are often labeled on the different stakeholder groups. These stereotypes may often be driven by specific dealings with small groups of people, but ultimately shaping one's view of all members of that stakeholder group.

The literature has emphasized barriers to shared decision-making related to the stakeholder categories. The research has focused studies on stakeholder perceptions, but primarily on an independent stakeholder basis. For example, Lipham (1983) focused on barriers to SDM reflecting on principal’s perceptions. Greer (1983) studied participative decision-making and barriers related to administration. Edelman (1991/1992) investigated SDM while focusing on teachers' and principals' perceptions.
If stakeholders are unified in mission and that mission is a collective, grass roots effort the entire community works enthusiastically to meet its goal (Brecher, 1992). Brecher further stated that goals and objectives of the stakeholders can vary due to their diversity. The research has focused on barriers to shared decision-making, but research comparing the perceptions of all of the stakeholders is limited.

Null Hypothesis 2 stated that there will be no difference in the population mean scores of empowerment from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration. The difference in the group means of the parents (13.63), board of education members (13.92), superintendents (14.11), principals (14.18), and teachers (13.73) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no difference.

The literature on empowerment and SDM emphasized the basic need for stakeholder involvement and ownership to foster an environment where educational organizations and their related members can continually progress. Block (1987) inferred that leaders must take the role that followers need to be in a position where they can create their own destiny. Block further indicated that the process of being empowered takes a long time. This literature is supported by the 61.6% of the respondents from this research study who strongly agreed that the process of trust, a precursor to empowerment, takes a long time. Renze (1991/1992) analyzed perceptions of the decision-making process and empowerment. Renze stated that staff didn’t feel empowered in areas that affect their jobs. This research study indicated common held beliefs regarding empowerment. Empowerment can serve as a key link in SDM.
success. If an organization and its members are poised for and are mature for match empowerment, it should be part of the plan.

Null Hypothesis 3 stated that there will be no difference in the population mean scores of leadership from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration. The difference in the group means of the parents (8.72), board of education members (8.76), superintendents (9.94), principals (8.43), and teachers (8.93) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no difference.

The literature on leadership and SDM emphasized that leadership is a central component to the success of SDM implementation. The literature indicated that leadership is necessary for all stakeholders and relates to each construct. The literature also emphasized the relationship between leadership, leadership training, and successful implementation of shared decision-making. Shared decision-making requires effective instructional leadership (Bernd, 1992). Bernd further stated that teacher empowerment loses its effectiveness if teachers do not have an instructional leader to keep them on track, well informed, and involved. Vann (1992) advised that teachers be given leadership opportunities; Vann specifically addressed teacher leadership in advisory councils. Glickman (1992) discussed leadership opportunities for all stakeholders. Glickman further stated that students need to be making choices, accepting responsibility, and progressing toward becoming self-directed leaders.

In addition to the support provided by the current literature on leadership training and leadership opportunities, 76.6% of all respondents to this research study strongly agreed that providing appropriate
training in facilitating change is essential to the stakeholders before and
during the process. Appropriate training in leadership style should be
given consideration prior to the planning stages of implementation of
SDM. Also, leadership opportunities should be strategically mapped out
to ensure followers are poised for success as they ascend to leadership
roles.

A critical observation of the procedures of this study should be
brought forward. Although the population surveyed was from five very
different categories, a common thread existed. The subjects surveyed
were leadership oriented subjects from each category. It is the judgment
of this researcher that this single observation may have fostered the
similar responses from different stakeholders. Therefore, persons having
had leadership training or having been placed in leadership roles may be
near equally poised for progress and change, as well as personal and
organizational growth.

Null Hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no difference in the
population mean scores of motivation from one category of stakeholder
as compared to other categories under consideration. The difference in
the group means of the parents (13.36), board of education members
(13.92), superintendents (15.55), principals (13.37), and teachers
(13.00) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

The literature on shared decision-making and motivation empha­sized that all stakeholders need to be involved in the entire process for
intrinsic motivation to occur. Sherman (1991/1992) studied perceptions
of assistant principals and found that principals and teachers who
weren’t involved in the process were not as motivated as were
leadership council members. The literature emphasized that persons external to any SDM process likely will not share the motivation that involved members' experience. This research study supported the relationship of SDM and motivation. The study indicated that 86.3% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the SDM process increases mutual respect among the stakeholders. As a leader embraces SDM, the outcome of intrinsic motivation for stakeholders will need early attention.

Null Hypothesis 5 stated that there will be no difference in the population mean scores of organizational culture from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration. The difference in the group means of the parents (13.27), board of education members (12.69), superintendents (13.83), principals (11.93), and teachers (13.33) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no difference.

The literature emphasized a relationship between shared decision-making and organizational culture. Willner (1990/1991) studied shared decision-making and organizational culture. Willner concluded that teachers have an opportunity to move from an historical culture of top down thinking to a modern collaborative culture. This research study confirmed the importance and the relationship of SDM to improved organizational culture. This study indicated that 54.8% of the respondents agreed that organizational culture and climate will improve with shared decision-making. Conley (1989) inferred that a change in basic school organizational structures and process must be a component to shared decision-making to allow for the teachers' expanded role in
decision-making. Conley further stated that persons attempting the shared decision-making reform should be trained in organization theory.

Goldman and O'Shea (1990) studied collaborative decision-making and school culture. Goldman and O'Shea found that developing a district-wide culture for change takes courage, patience, conviction, and vision. Goldman and O'Shea also inferred that ambiguous roles had to be defined and a process by which to discuss those roles had to become part of the new organizational culture. Organizational culture can be a barrier to SDM implementation. A leader attempting to move from an autocratic decision-making organization to one of shared input should tend to the change needed in culture at that same time.

Null Hypothesis 6 stated that there will be no difference in the population mean scores of accountability from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration. The difference in the group means of parents (16.36), board of education members (14.92), superintendents (15.88), principals (15.37), and teachers (16.46) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no difference.

The literature emphasized accountability as a central component to the SDM process. Hill and Bonan (1991), in their book entitled Decentralization and Accountability in Public Education, inferred that site-managed schools require a rethinking of accountability. The basis of a site-managed school's accountability must be its ability to define and maintain a distinctive character, not its compliance with procedural requirements at the state or board level (Hill & Bonan, 1991). Compliance of state or board level mandates which dominate accountability
will erode the autonomy for which SDM strives. Russell et al. (1992) focused on accountability and shared decision-making. Standards focused on the degree to which teachers shared in setting standards for their own performance, student performance, and discipline. Teachers, employing self-directed work, set their standards for their performance as well as students and monitored progress (Russell et al., 1992).

The relationship between school site management and accountability was also explored by Mesenburg (1987). In this study, Mesenburg inferred that shared governance is intended to share increased accountability among parents and teachers for improved student learning. This research study supported that issue. This study indicated that 50% of the respondents disagreed that in the event of failure, principals should be accountable for decisions that are made by the SDM council. Accountability may be more readily achieved if people have input into the decision. When people share in the decision-making process, they work harder to implement the idea as if it were their own. Procedures for accountability need to be addressed during the planning stages for SDM.

Null Hypothesis 7 stated that there will be no difference in the population mean scores of learning organizations from one category of stakeholder as compared to other categories under consideration. The difference in the group means of parents (14.90), board of education members (13.76), superintendents (15.05), principals (14.37), and teachers (13.80) did not provide enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of no difference.
The literature emphasized learning organizations as a component of SDM. The literature focused on shared decision-making as it caused students, teachers, administration, and organizations to be poised to learn. Patterson (1993) posited that an organization's core values should be focused on student success in learning. Senge (1990a) inferred that all human beings are designed for learning. Societies, organizations, and leaders must move from controlling type management to leadership oriented settings that open up the organization. This loosely coupled climate will foster an environment where human beings can continually learn. Lindelow et al. (1989) supported this move from authoritarian to democratic styles of leadership.

Brandt (1992a) discussed building a community of learners. Brandt specifically discussed that the schools need to do an internal transformation of culture. Brandt furthered this relationship to SDM by citing the work of Sizer. Sizer stated the belief that an outsider shouldn’t prescribe a particular process; every school should generate its own site plan. This study supported the relationship between SDM and learning organizations. The findings indicated that 52.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that the purpose of SDM is to arrive at better decisions and to cause organizations and its members to continually evolve professionally. Shared decision-making should not be viewed as a fad or an end in itself, but as a necessary component to individual growth and organizational progress.

An additional topic investigated within the study explored differences among stakeholder categories in response to individual questions within the survey instrument. This study reports only those
findings determined to be unique.

The Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument is a compiled list of actual statements relative to the various constructs of shared decision-making. Analyzing each individual survey item for differences in stakeholder responses further explored unique positions held by the various respondents. These responses are an indication of how each category of stakeholders perceives each individual statement regarding shared decision-making.

In regard to parent response to survey Item 13, 63.6% of the respondents agreed that teacher contracts should be modified due to changes in time and responsibility as a result of SDM. The literature emphasized attention be given to adjustments in teacher contracts. Tuthill (1990) inferred that teachers' working conditions are also student learning conditions. Tuthill further indicated that contract language and teacher compensation had taken place to assist in the implementation of SDM.

In regard to parent response to survey Item 23, 45.5% of the parent respondents agreed that existing school culture cannot produce the results needed for substantial educational reform. The literature supports this skepticism regarding public school capacity to make substantial change. Schlechty (1992) indicated that the future of local school board control will be determined by their ability to respond to the demands of educational reform.

In regard to parent response to survey Item 29, 45.5% of parents disagreed that administration should have veto power over SDM council decisions. The literature emphasized caution when employing veto
power in council decisions. Patterson (1993) indicated that use of veto power can easily cause administration and supervisors to slip back into autocratic leadership.

In regard to board of education response to survey Item 15, 38.5% of the respondents agreed that with district guidelines, board of education policy, master contracts, state regulations, and lack of funds, there is not enough autonomy for SDM to make significant changes at the school level. The literature has taken the position that although the SDM process may not always be smooth, the merits of its success is reinforcing commitment (Kessler, 1992).

In regard to board of education response to survey Item 27, 53.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that certain areas of decision-making should be excluded from the shared decision-making process and should be left only to administration. The literature supported this notion carrying the concept even further. Patterson (1993) indicated not only should certain decisions be left to administration, but also other stakeholder decisions may involve only those stakeholders, thus excluding administration.

In regard to board of education response to survey Item 34, 53.8% of the respondents agreed that an outside facilitator is necessary to effectively implement shared decision-making and to ensure continual growth is experienced. The research supported this finding. Kessler (1992) supported that stating that use of neutral facilitators keeps the consensus process intact.

In regard to superintendent response to survey Item 4, 50% of the respondents agreed that special interest groups will attempt to misuse
the power of shared governance. The literature indicated that the process of consensus decision-making means participants seek higher ground (Patterson, 1993). Special interest groups need to be heard and open to participation as part of the solution (Patterson, 1993).

In regard to superintendent response to survey Item 27, 83.3% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that certain areas of decision-making should be excluded from the shared process and should be left only to administration. Board of education response supported this issue. Patterson (1993) evolved this concept further stating various decisions may also exclude administration as they are handled by the other stakeholders.

In regard to superintendent response to survey Item 29, 50% of the respondents agreed that administration should have veto power over council decisions. Parent respondents disagreed with this position. The literature clearly indicates a need for veto power (Patterson, 1993). The veto concept should be a very silent operator in as few as 5% of the decisions and should not cause organizations to revert to an autocratic style of governance (Patterson, 1993).

In regard to principal response to survey Item 7, 75% of the respondents agreed that leadership style of administrators will play an important role in the success of shared decision-making. The literature emphasized the need for training in leadership as a precursor to implementation. Patterson (1993) indicated the worst thing that can be done is to send people out on the new mission of SDM and not equip them with the skills to be successful.
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In regard to principal response to survey Item 22, 81% of the respondents agreed that organizational culture and climate will improve with shared decision-making. The literature emphasized the relationship between SDM and organizational culture. Renze (1991/1992) inferred that what needs to be improved in the schools is their culture. An improved culture is the basis for quality interpersonal relationships and quality of the learning experiences.

In regard to principal response to survey Item 28, 62.5% of the respondents agreed that certain stakeholders don’t have the technical information or experience to make adequate decisions. The literature supported this finding but takes the concept to a more mature level. If organizations are truly going to be collegial, then the organization or the leadership council must accept the role of openly bringing all stakeholders along in the process (Patterson, 1993).

In regard to teacher response to survey Item 6, 60% of the respondents agreed that certain council members cannot make sound decisions. The literature reviewed this position and the researcher has summarized the findings. Certain individuals are not equipped to be independent decision-makers. Possibly the best place for these individuals is in a group decision-making setting where the consensus of combined minds is better than one (Patterson, 1993).

In regard to teacher response to survey Item 19, 66.7% of the respondents agreed that frequency and degree of involvement depends on the context of the decision to be made. The literature supported this finding. Bailey (1991) indicated that teachers don’t expect or want to be involved in all decisions.
In regard to teacher response to survey Item 23, 53.3% of the respondents agree that existing school cultures cannot produce the results needed for substantial educational reform. The literature advises that developing a district culture for change takes courage, patience, conviction, and vision (Goldman & O'Shea, 1990). Goldman and O'Shea further stated that teachers need to take a leadership role as educational partners to shape that future culture.

The demographic variables of gender, age, years of employment, education, district progress, knowledge of shared decision-making, district enrollment, and district type may have contributed to the types of responses given in the self-report instrument. The higher proportion of respondents that had earned a master's degree or higher might be a conclusive factor impacting their perceptions on issues requested in the questionnaire. On the other hand, the high percentage of respondents with competent knowledge of shared decision-making may also have been a factor.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study fall into two basic categories. The two major limitations are associated with the nature of the population and the setting of the study, and the nature of the variables.

**The Nature of the Population and Setting**

The organizational and functional structure of school governance has been in place since the establishment of public education. The stakeholders involved today are the same categories of stakeholder that
have always been affiliated with K-12 education. As a formal process for shared governance is established, collaborative relationships will continue to evolve. It would be erroneous to attempt to generalize the findings of this study to organizations external to K-12 public educational settings. Also unique to this setting was the state mandated effort for management restructuring. This mandate served as a stimulus for beginning progress. Therefore, it may be likely that future use of this instrument would not produce findings consistent with the findings of this setting for this period of time.

The instrument that was designed by the researcher for this setting had characteristics unique to Wisconsin's legislated mandate. Therefore, replication of the study, with this instrument would also need to mirror the state mandate. Some of the terminology used in the instrument is also unique to the legislated mandate. The barriers to implementing SDM may be generalized to only the stakeholder categories from Wisconsin during the time in which the study was conducted.

The Nature of the Variables

The dependent variable constitute another limitation of this study that must be recognized. The dependent variable barriers to implementing shared decision-making were classified by the following category: power, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and the learning organization. This study attempted to determine differences of stakeholder perceptions (the independent variable) across six categories of the dependent variable. Data were analyzed of composite score and by individual SDM constructs. A global analysis of the items
concerning the specific statements of the constructs of shared decision-making was sought. However, it should be pointed out that in the analysis of the variable measures no significant difference was established.

The constructs of shared decision-making identified for this study would serve as a limitation to research on SDM. Further investigation of additional related constructs or these same constructs utilized in another manner may address that limitation.

The independent variable for this study, stakeholder role, is defined in terms of the stakeholders involved in Wisconsin's site-based management initiative. Five categories are described in the variable: parent, board of education member, superintendent, principal, and teacher. The categories of the independent variable have not been an objective of research interest in this context or in this setting before. Shared governance and shared decision-making have been components that have assisted in restructuring business and industry for the purpose of economic competitiveness. The implementation of SDM in public school governance was specified to be important to Wisconsin's educational system. The goal was specifically to improve outcomes through staff empowerment, stakeholder motivation, and shared accountability. As leadership roles continued to evolve, the public school setting would then be poised to operate as a continuous learning organization. Significant differences in stakeholder category relative to barriers of implementing shared decision-making did not emerge.

Of the stakeholders surveyed in this study, all were leadership oriented persons. Board of education presidents, teacher union
presidents, parent organization officers, superintendents, and principals. This fact may question external validity of the study. The study could be jeopardized because the findings may not be generalized to the external population of each stakeholder category. The external population of each stakeholder category may not have had the leadership training or leadership role exposure of the persons surveyed in this study. A future study may address that limitation.

Implications of the Findings

Implications emerged from this study for each of the stakeholder categories relative to implementing shared decision-making. Those implications that follow are categorized by stakeholder interest, stakeholder opinion, merits of SDM, training in SDM, application of SDM, and training for leadership roles.

The first implication, stakeholder interest, relates to the overall context surrounding shared decision-making. Stakeholder interest in shared decision-making, as evidenced by the 73% response rate indicates a commitment for collaborative progress in education. This high rate of return may have been driven by the recent legislation in Wisconsin addressing management restructuring. Individual responses to the survey instrument may have been impacted upon by recent statewide in-service sessions on management restructuring.

The second implication, respondents' opinions, did serve as appropriate support for SDM implementation. Respondents' opinions were also overwhelmingly congruent on issues related to the barriers identified for implementing SDM. Stakeholders were also overwhelmingly
consistent on their support for the length of time needed to build trust, which acts as a precursor to SDM, the need for ongoing communication, and their feelings that the SDM process increases mutual respect among the stakeholders.

Based on the findings of stakeholder perceptions and current research, the third implication, merits of shared decision-making, far out weighs reasons for nonparticipation. Shared decision-making, if dealt with inappropriately, can be associated with a fad and result in damaging the reputation of what could be the basis for true educational reform. SDM can be a highly complex issue.

The fourth implication, training in shared decision-making, is critical. Sending leaders or followers into SDM action without appropriate training has proven to act as a setback. Collectively establishing core organizational goals centered on student outcomes should act as the central theme for SDM existence. Equipping the stakeholder groups with the various components, processes, and knowledge of the barriers of open, honest dialogue; consensus building and consensus decisions; conflict resolution; team building; and strategic planning are necessary to move the group and the issues from awareness to implementation.

Considering the complex makeup of a proposed successful SDM implementation model the researcher is comfortable in positing that true SDM will take a long commitment to make successful. Once SDM is established, the multiple benefits will be rewarding.

The fifth implication, and possibly the most significant implication related to SDM, is the concept of application. SDM needs a reason for existence. The process should focus on the core organizational goals for
existence and then be applied to specific needs or visions that are necessary for educational reform. With this in mind, a structure will be put forth that will evolve the organizational culture as well as evolve those specific needs or visions of the organization. If done successfully, the organization and its members will grow to new levels, operating on high ground, and likely will never return to the organizational context from which they came.

The final implication, training for leadership roles, is, according to this researcher, an important factor in this study. This research study indicated no significant difference existed among stakeholder categories relative to SDM barriers. The study further indicated no significant difference existed among stakeholder categories relative to empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations. Therefore, these data confirmed that there appears to be a congruent perception of aspects related to SDM, but among very different roles. This finding may have been influenced by the characteristics of the stakeholders themselves.

All stakeholders surveyed were leadership oriented persons who likely are more poised for change than the average person. In closing, a final implication focuses on the context of the study. This study was conducted in the state of Wisconsin during the time that management restructuring legislation was passed and marketed. Following this legislation, a series of statewide in-services were conducted on SDM options. This alone may have attributed to the high percentage of respondents who indicated having competent knowledge of SDM.
Future Research

In this research an attempt was made to determine differences between stakeholder category and the perceived barriers to SDM implementation. Differences were also examined between stakeholder category and perceptions of the constructs of empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations as they relate to SDM.

In the opinion of the researcher, a substantial amount of research remains to be done with regard to the implementation of shared decision-making, specifically in identifying and overcoming barriers prior to and during the implementation process. Further research could also be recommended that does not deal with barriers, but rather leadership training as a precursor to SDM council development and implementation of SDM.

In addition, of specific interest to the researcher would be a future study that would focus on SDM in-service training specifically tailored to a specific need for that organization. Within this context the SDM in-service training would not be viewed as an end in itself, but rather applied specifically to a new vision or an organizational need.

While this study focused on the perceptions of parents, board of education members, superintendents, principals, and teachers, key people in the shared decision-making process were not included. Further research is recommended regarding the perceptions of others involved in the process, such as students and business leaders.
This study focused on global implementation of SDM at the state level, further study is recommended within schools comparing perceptions of the stakeholders within districts and buildings. Such a study could explore the relationship of leader/follower style and the organization's capacity to progress with SDM.

Further research is suggested regarding dealing with the specific issue of noncouncil member ownership. This research study and others (Elliot, 1991/1992; Renze, 1991/1992; Sherman, 1991/1992; Willner, 1990/1991; Witherspoon, 1987/1988) identified communication as a central component to the success of SDM. Furthermore, determining a process by which nonmembers had ownership and are engaged would be of value to the educational reform process.

Further research is suggested regarding how the process has impacted school climate and outcomes after several years of successful implementation. A longitudinal study of schools who have implemented SDM could focus on how the process is functioning and what modifications or adjustments have been made.

Finally, the results of the present investigation reported in this document were obtained in a specific geographical region. Using the shared decision-making instrument constructed by the researcher, a replication of this study is needed in another setting. This follow-up study would provide more conclusive results regarding the reliability of it. Similar findings in another setting would broaden the implications of this study regarding implementation of shared decision-making.
Conclusions

Originally, this study sought to determine if there were differences in stakeholder perceptions and the perceived barriers to SDM implementation. Perceptions were also examined between stakeholder category and the constructs of empowerment, leadership, motivation, organizational culture, accountability, and learning organizations as they relate to SDM. The findings of this study did not support significant differences among stakeholder categories relative to barriers. Furthermore, findings did not support significant differences among stakeholder categories relative to the six identified constructs of SDM.

The literature review did reaffirm the critical importance of the notion that if schools are to reform, a new set of collaborative relationships must evolve among all stakeholders. This collaboration could ensure a climate where leaders can lead and followers can contribute.

Without question, the literature also reinforced numerous recommendations in educational leadership literature that has surfaced during recent years. This literature has called for collaborative strategies in decision-making to improve school effectiveness.

The entire study and literature review surfaced the results of the historical, hierarchal, top-down structure that stifled parent ownership, teacher creativity, and overall organizational accountability. Teachers managed classrooms with little to say about program or district vision. Parents, who actually are customers, were basically only on the receiving end of operations as opposed to inputting to it. Boards of education, superintendents, and principals co-existed in the traditional top-down
military model with little individual sense of autonomy.

Collaborative and collegial settings evolve slowly. As new school cultures continue to ascend, decision-making autonomy will begin to unveil multiple benefits. Empowered staff now reach new limits, leadership training and leadership opportunities breed additional success, motivation turns intrinsic, organizational culture fosters reform, all stakeholders feel responsible, and the institution embodies itself around continual improvement for the institution and its members. Shared decision-making caused all stakeholders to revise their roles and reason for existence. Stakeholders each become part of a larger effort, their ownership serves as the stimulus to take control of their role and the collective destination of their organization.

Additional future recommendations will likely continue with positive directions in shared vision, governance, and decision-making. It is the hope of this researcher that the information, conclusions, and recommendations presented in this study have assisted in the continual plight for educational reform.
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Appendix A

Approval Letter From the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
Date: January 22, 1993

To: Donald Viegut

From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 92-12-33

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Barries to implementing shared decision making" has been approved under the exempt category by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: January 22, 1994

xc: Jenlink, EL
May 13, 1993

Dear Stakeholder:

I am asking that you take a few moments from your busy schedule to complete and return the attached survey on shared decision making. You have been randomly selected for this study. The findings and your help will assist educational leaders in doing more good things for kids. I am completing my doctoral degree in educational leadership at Western Michigan University. My research topic is: Issues to implementing shared decision making.

Shared decision making has been defined as having a leadership council made up of representatives from the various stakeholders in the educational process. In Wisconsin, those stakeholders have been categorized as: parent, teacher, board member, principal, and superintendent. The intent is to decentralize decision making to enable all stakeholders to share in the vision and accountability for local schools.

The intent of this study is to determine the perceived barriers to implementing shared decision making in Wisconsin's public schools, specifically, focusing on the differences in responses among the stakeholder groups. Please return the completed survey by Thursday, May 20, 1993. Please call if you have questions. My home phone number is (715) 355-4497; my work phone number is (715) 536-6101.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Viegut
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
Appendix C

Shared Decision-Making Survey Instrument
SHARED DECISION-MAKING SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Part I.

1. Which category best describes you?
   ___ Parent  ___ Board of Education Member  ___ Superintendent
   ___ Principal  ___ Teacher

2. Gender:  ___ Male  ___ Female

3. Age:  ___ 18 - 30  ___ 41 - 50
   ___ 31 - 40  ___ Over 50

4. Years of employment in present position:
   ___ 1 - 3
   ___ 4 - 6
   ___ 7 - 10
   ___ Over 10

5. Education:
   ___ High School  ___ Specialist's Degree
   ___ Associate Degree  ___ Doctorate
   ___ Bachelor's Degree  ___ Other ______
   ___ Master's Degree

6. Please indicate to the best of your knowledge the progress your district has made in shared decision-making.
   ___ implementation has not begun
   ___ implementation is beginning progress
   ___ implementation has made considerable progress
   ___ implementation is fully operational

7. My personal knowledge of shared decision-making is:
   ___ limited  ___ average  ___ competent

8. My school district is classified by enrollment to be:
   ___ Class A  ___ Class B  ___ Class C

9. My school district is:  ___ Urban  ___ Rural  ___ Suburban
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Part II.

Directions: Please mark on the answer sheet the choice that most nearly states your position on each of the following items. Note: The term "Shared Decision Making" (SDM) refers to a school's collective decision making process.

For the purpose of this study, stakeholder, will be defined as being either: parent, teacher, board of education member, superintendent, or principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree more than Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree More than Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. SDM is a threat to existing power relationships between Boards of Education. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Stakeholders not involved in the SDM process will view SDM as less positive. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Stakeholders not involved in the SDM process have little knowledge of the process. 1 2 3 4 5

4. Special interest groups will attempt to misuse the power of shared governance. 1 2 3 4 5

5. The process of trust and feeling empowered takes a long time. 1 2 3 4 5

6. SDM council membership may have some members that cannot make sound decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

7. Leadership style of administrators will play an important role in the success of SDM. 1 2 3 4 5

8. SDM should be a formal process without administrator control. 1 2 3 4 5

9. Moving too quickly without adequate plans will cause the SDM process to lose credibility. 1 2 3 4 5

10. Ongoing communication and public relations about the SDM process should occur. 1 2 3 4 5

11. Shared vision, planning, and implementation should be components of the SDM process. 1 2 3 4 5

12. Appropriate training in facilitating change and SDM should be provided to the stakeholders before and during the process. 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree more than Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree More than Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Teacher contracts should be modified to allow for the broadened role as a result of SDM, i.e., time and responsibility.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The SDM process increases mutual respect among the stakeholders.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>With district guidelines, Board of Education policy, master contracts, state regulations, and lack of funds, there is not enough &quot;autonomy&quot; for SDM to make significant changes at the school level.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The longer SDM will operate in your school the more effective the process will be.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The selection process for SDM council members should be voted on by members of the specific stakeholder groups.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Board of Education members and administration lack ownership in the philosophy and process of SDM.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The degree and frequency of involvement depends on the context of the decision to be made.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The total beauracracy of education and parents are resistant to change.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The SDM process does not facilitate quick action as does the present hierarchial model.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Organizational culture and climate will improve with SDM.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Existing school cultures cannot produce the results needed for substantial educational reform.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Re-establishing role clarification of the stakeholders will be necessary with SDM.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>In the event of failure, principals should be accountable for decisions that are made by the SDM council.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Students should have more opportunities to make decisions about class activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree (1)</td>
<td>Agree more than Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Disagree More than Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (4)</td>
<td>Don't Know/Not Applicable (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Certain areas of decision making should be excluded from the SDM process and should be left only to school administrators.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Certain stakeholders don’t have the technical information or expertise to make adequate decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Administration should have veto power over council decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Involving a wider group of stakeholders will be problematic due to the varied level of information and involvement for each member.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>The purpose of SDM is to arrive at better decisions and to cause organizations and its members to continually evolve professionally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>The school district’s goals and philosophies are consistent with my own personal goals and beliefs relative to life-long learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Teaching and learning, the primary priorities, become secondary priorities to staff due to involvement in SDM.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>An outside facilitator is necessary to effectively implement SDM and to ensure continual growth is experienced.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Developing a sense of trust is a precondition to becoming a learning organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Individual and institutional fear will prevent this organization from evolving as a learning organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Follow-up Letter
May 20, 1993

Dear Stakeholder:

Recently you were mailed a survey on shared decision making. As of this time, I have not yet received a response from you. It is extremely important to me to have as high a return rate as possible to ensure the data is dependable. If you have already completed and returned the survey, please disregard this note. If you have not completed the survey, I would sincerely appreciate your assistance in filling out the attached survey and returning it to me. The findings of this study may assist individuals interested in further expansion of the shared decision making philosophy.

Again, thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Donald J. Viegut
Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
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