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ABSTRACT

ENABLING BUREAUCRATIC BEHAVIORS AND STRUCTURES IN SCHOOLS

The purpose of this study is to identify enabling structures and behaviors in educational bureaucracies. Contemporary theorists conceptualize enabling bureaucracies as those that help employees in dealing with contingencies. Enabling bureaucracies provide a great deal of information and a strong foundation of organizational memory to provide a solid basis for problem solving and innovation. Previous quantitative studies show that enabling and hindering bureaucracies can be identified and measured. This study attempts to fill gaps in the literature regarding the nature and specific identification of enabling rules, structures, and behaviors. This qualitative study will use interviews of faculty and principals, observation of staff interactions, and document analysis to develop a thick, rich description of enabling structures, behaviors, and procedures. The perceptions by staff of current enabling behaviors and structures plus their projections of what should be are the basis of a catalog of enabling behaviors and structures.
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CHAPTER 1

"Bureaucracy has been and is a power instrument of the first order."
Max Weber

Introduction

According to Weber (1947), bureaucracies are necessary for attaining the highest degree of efficiency possible in organizations. However bureaucracies both in business and at all governmental levels are continuously criticized for being unresponsive and inefficient. The larger the organization and the more levels in the bureaucracy, the greater the amount of criticism the bureaucracies usually receive.

Bureaucracies are defined by their elements of structure (Weber, 1947). Key elements of bureaucracy identified by Weber are typically noted as division of labor and specialization of duties, an impersonal orientation, a vertical hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, and employees with a career orientation. Weber saw these elements as crucial in moving administration away from dilettantism by amateurs who received positions by accident of birth or financial influence to administration by trained professionals. This echoed the sentiment of Weber’s time that problems could be solved by the rational application of well-considered rules and regulations. Weber believed that rational men could be counted on to consistently make decisions that did not depend on the personal qualities of either the bureaucrat or the client. Administration of
governmental policies would no longer be capricious. The administration would now effectively and efficiently carry out the goals of the government. Government would function on the basis of rational-legal authority with normative rules and officials legally entitled to enforce the rules and to issue commands.

The point of contention is whether a particular bureaucracy enables or hinders the members of the organization from efficiently and effectively completing their job tasks and reaching organizational goals. While bureaucracies are necessary for carrying out policy, their efficiency and effectiveness can be hindered by dysfunctions that can arise from the basic elements of bureaucracies (Blau and Scott, 1962; Gouldner, 1954; Merton, 1957). Division of labor and specialization can lead to bureaucrats who are bored and indifferent to their job performance. Specialization may cause workers to refuse to do any non-routine tasks. They may refuse to do anything not specifically listed in their job descriptions. Impersonal orientation may extend to relationships within the bureaucracy as well as with clients. This may lead to low morale due to a lack of personal interest and reinforcement from fellow workers and superiors. This leads to workers who are only interested in promoting and protecting themselves. The bureaucrats become alienated from their fellow workers and from the organization as a whole. Hierarchy of authority can lead to communication blocks both from the top down and the bottom up when superiors do not trust subordinates with information and vice versa. Subordinates may also fear letting superiors know about the problems the subordinates cannot handle. The subordinates fear the discipline from those above them in the hierarchy more than they value organizational goals. Elitism is also a common problem. Those who have “made it”
look down on those who have not. Superiors in the hierarchy want to protect their privileges and their power. Rules and regulations can lead to rigidity in meeting challenges and a lack of flexibility and innovation in problem solving. Goal displacement then occurs when the accomplishment of procedures become the ends rather than the means to the ends. Career orientation can lead to bureaucrats who are more concerned with gaining and maintaining seniority and pension rights than in meeting organizational goals efficiently and effectively.

**Definitions**

**Bureaucracy**: Blau and Scott (1962) point out that the colloquial definition of a bureaucracy is that of administration characterized by rule-encumbered inefficiency. Scott (1998) defines bureaucracy as a specialized administrative staff whose function it is to service and maintain the organization itself. Niskanen (1971) gives us the economic definition as the part of the organization that is financed by sources other than sale of output. For governmental bureaucracies, Kaufman (2001) includes in the bureaucracy all those on the government’s payroll who are not elected officials. This would include all clerks, secretaries, other white-collar workers, and blue-collar workers. This would fit the public’s view of the constituents of a bureaucracy.

For the purpose of this study, we are concerned with school bureaucracies and include both line and staff administrators. Line administrators are superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and those with other titles e.g. dean of students who carry out policy and make administrative decisions. Staff administrators vary in districts from none in very small districts to several hundred...
individuals in large city systems. These bureaucrats deal with areas such as curriculum, pupil personnel, certificated and noncertificated personnel, grounds, transportation, food services, grants, finance, and other auxiliary services.

In the minds of most citizens, administrators would be the subset of bureaucrats who hold some discretionary decision making authority. Administration and bureaucracy are thus different entities. The public tends to think of the school officials in their schools as administrators rather than as bureaucrats.

**Centralization:** Centralization occurs when all the power for decision-making rests at a single point in the organization. The organization is decentralized to the extent that the power is dispersed among many people (Mintzberg, 1983). Mintzberg states that centralization is the tightest means of coordinating decision-making. Centralization is necessary for the coordination of the entire organization for the completion of organizational goals. When the authority to make decisions is concentrated in the discretion of a few individuals, centralization is high. When authority to make decisions is diffuse, particularly when it extends down the hierarchy to the people who actually carry out the purpose of the organization (teachers, janitors, etc.), centralization is low.

High centralization is made possible in bureaucracies by the existence of the vertical hierarchy. High centralization may also be facilitated by the particular make-up of the rules and regulations, by the division of labor with specialization in limits and levels of decision-making, and by the impersonal nature of bureaucracies in the Weberian model.
Effectiveness: Scott (1998) contends that effectiveness is relative. An organization or bureaucracy cannot be judged effective in a general sense. There are always multiple criteria. Some theorists such as Campbell (1977) list as many as 30 possible criteria. Multiple criteria are partially a result of the different values, goals, and expectations of the various segments of participants and constituents. In order to measure effectiveness for any particular goal, standards must be set and measurement indicators must be selected. In terms of schools, most participants and constituents would agree that this means that students are educated as well as their innate abilities will allow.

Efficiency: Efficiency is the ratio of inputs to outputs (Swanson and King, 1997). This is a relative concept since increases in efficiency can be achieved in separate ways. Efficiency may be increased by increasing output for a constant quantity of input or by maintaining the same output while reducing input. Mintzberg (1989) points out that while the neutral definition for efficiency is the greatest benefit for the cost, in practice efficiency too often means the greatest measurable benefit for the measurable costs. The meaning of efficiency is too often reduced to economy since costs are usually more easily measured than benefits. Also, since economic costs are more easily measured than social costs, social costs tend to rise. The organization treats social costs as externalities and leaves remediation to the public sector. Finally, since economic benefits are more easily measured than social benefits, the organization values economic morality that tends to lead to social immorality.

In terms of schools, many consider efficiency to be the cost of education relative to student achievement. Others consider it to be in terms of student achievement relative
to the efforts required by students, teachers, and other staff. Opportunity costs are always a factor in measuring efficiency since there is never complete agreement on what the desired outputs should be or how they are best measured. Even in a world of scarce resources, there are still many choices among possible inputs into an educational system. Relative scarcity for every possible input changes over time as is demonstrated by the periodic changes in over and under supply of teachers. Increased technology and the increasing rate of technology change also complicate the decisions regarding the selection of inputs.

Enabling Structure: Adler and Borys (1996) draw upon a technology implementation model to formulate a concept of enabling formalization. Enabling procedures and designs help employees deal more effectively with contingencies. Best practice is codified which provides organizational memory and a solid basis for innovation. Employees are provided with a great deal of information in order to enhance their problem solving capabilities.

For the purpose of this study, enabling structure means that the bureaucracy and bureaucrats help the employees and clients achieve the purpose of the organization. For schools, this means theoretically that students get educated to the full extent of their abilities. For teachers and other workers, this means that needed materials and services are available when needed and in adequate supply. Problem solving and innovation are encouraged in line with the goal of continuous improvement in educating the students.

Formalization: Formalization is the regulation of bureaucratic behavior by the standardization of work processes (Mintzberg, 1983). Behavior may be formalized by position, workflow, and/or rules. Formalization by position is by specifications attached
to the job and the job description. Formalization by workflow is by specification of procedures attached to the work itself. Formalization by rules is specifications in general ranging from formal policy manuals to intra office memos. More simply, formalization may be seen as the extent of written rules, procedures, and instructions (Adler & Borys, 1996).

High formalization is characterized by a plethora of rules, regulations, and guidelines that must be followed (Hoy and Sweetland, 2000). Low formalization allows discretion for the individual bureaucrat in decision-making and problem solving. Formalization is directly related to Weber's fourth element, rules and regulations. The vertical hierarchy, the impersonal orientation, and the division of labor with specialized roles and skills facilitate formalization.

**Hierarchy:** In the Weberian sense, a hierarchy is the ranking of bureaucrats with each level subordinate directly to the level above it and in reality subordinate to all levels above (Weber, 1947). In the school setting as in most, we see this vertical hierarchy. Theoretically, the top of the hierarchy is the electorate followed by the elected board of education and then the superintendent. Practically and in concurrence with the popular definition of bureaucracy, the hierarchy begins with the superintendent and extends down through line administrators to teachers, secretaries, custodians, and auxiliary workers.

**Hindering Structure:** The concept of hindering structure is derived from earlier conceptions of coercive formalization in bureaucracies (Adler & Borys, 1996). Coercive formalization attempts to force employees to conform to the procedures and rules of the organization. Coercive formalization undermines commitment, limits innovation, and
seeks to punish employees who do not strictly follow the organization's rules and procedures. Gouldner (1954) called such bureaucracies punishment-centered. Coercive formalization coupled with an authoritarian hierarchy form a type of bureaucracy which Hoy and Sweetland (2000) have termed hindering.

For the purpose of this study, hindering means that the bureaucracy and bureaucrats prevent or impede the employees and clients from achieving the purpose of the organization. For schools, this means that students fail to be educated to the full extent of their abilities because of bureaucratic blunders and inefficiencies. Teachers and other workers are impeded or prevented from working at peak efficiency. This may be due to necessary materials and services not being received in a timely manner. It may be the result of rules and regulations that slow the educational process and/or result in inefficient use of teacher and student time. It may also be the result of oppressive rules and hierarchies that erode teacher morale and distract the staff from the fundamental purpose of educating students.

**Impersonal Orientation:** Weber (1947) saw an impersonal orientation as crucial to the rational application of the rules and procedures in decision-making. Impersonal orientation is the professional handling of decision making uninfluenced by emotion, personal feelings, status of the clients, and social or political considerations. Decisions are based on facts and best practices that are applicable even in new situations. Clients get fairer, more equitable treatment when rules and procedures are applied without the personalities or personal characteristics of either bureaucrats or clients being a factor in
the decision-making. Thus impersonal orientation was seen as a vast improvement over
the favoritism, discrimination, and outright corruption of the pre-bureaucratic systems.

**Purpose of the Study**

Anderson (1974) gives three reasons to study the nature of school bureaucracies.
The first is that bureaucratic structure is a manipulable variable. If we understand it, we
can change it to better serve teachers and students. Given the dissatisfaction with
bureaucracies in general, there is good reason to improve the input delivery systems and
decision-making systems that comprise bureaucracies.

The second reason is that there is an increased interest in the school as an
organization. Clients have become increasingly critical of schools. Both individuals and
interest groups are increasingly proactive and demand a voice in the decision making
process. Their input changes the function and structure of the schools. The effects of
these changes need to be understood. Understanding the organization increases our ability
to use it more effectively and efficiently.

Finally as a result of the first and second reasons, school bureaucracy may be
related to student achievement. Marion and Flanigan (2001) examined the studies
attempting to correlate economic inputs with student achievement. They found the results
mixed and contradictory. Results seem tied to the local decision-making and input
delivery systems and not generalizable. This would suggest that the decision-making
abilities of local bureaucracies are a key factor in whether or not expenditures make a
difference. Since student achievement is the sine qua non of schools, any understanding
that produces better conditions for student achievement is important for study. Given the
grumbling that can be heard from teachers, parents, and students concerning the bureaucracy of schools, any impetus for improvement should be welcomed. With the goal of improvement of student achievement, the bureaucracy must be developed so it efficiently and effectively delivers the inputs needed for maximum results.

The purpose of the study is to identify 1) enabling and hindering behaviors, rules and structures of the school bureaucracy and 2) enabling and hindering behaviors of individual administrators and staff who comprise the bureaucracy. Through interviews and surveys, teachers will give detailed descriptions of behaviors, rules, and structures that help them in completing their educational goals and of those behaviors, rules, and structures that are hindering.

The identification of enabling behaviors, rules, and structures will hopefully serve as a guide to administrators and bureaucratic staff. Administrators will be able to probe the context of their schools in order to identify which behaviors are enabling and which are hindering. Often bureaucrats are not fully aware of the impact of their actions and of the way in which their actions are perceived by clients and others outside the bureaucracy. The administrators can build a frame of behaviors that are generally enabling and examine their own behaviors to see if they are contained within that frame.

The value of the study will be realized if it can provide information that will enable administrators and bureaucracies to shift from hindering to enabling behaviors. A concurrent value will be to help enabling bureaucracies maintain the focus needed to remain enabling. Given the tendency to retrench and take a protective stance when under outside pressures, self-preservation sometimes takes precedence over goal achievement.
Outside pressures lead to feelings of insecurity (Blau, 1955). Insecurity leads to rigidity and as a result the organization operates with less ability to meet challenges at a time when the challenges are increasing.

**Focus of the Study**

The study will use school staffs that were identified by the “100 Schools Study” (Hoy et al., 2000) as being on the high end of the variable “Enabling Bureaucracy.” Six of the highest schools in the study will be asked to let members of their staff be interviewed. Individual teachers from the schools in the study will describe their perceptions of enabling and hindering behavior. Detailed descriptions of behaviors, rules, and structures that are identified to be enabling or hindering will be generated. Desired behaviors, rules, and structures will be compared with actual behaviors, rules, and structures. The emphasis will be on identifying behaviors, rules, and structures that are considered enabling by the principals and teachers of the schools involved in the study.

**Statement of the Questions**

The problems of concern in this study are both the nature of bureaucracies and the perceptions of bureaucracies by the bureaucrats and the clients of the bureaucracy. What are the distinctions between enabling and hindering bureaucracies? Given a distinction both in perceptions and in the performance results of enabling and hindering bureaucracies, what are the differences and similarities in the formalization and behaviors of the respective bureaucratic structures and the bureaucrats in each type of structure?

To mention bureaucracy to most people elicits negative reactions. These negative reactions can be seen from ancient to modern times throughout the world’s cultures. Why
should there be negative reactions since organizational theorists consider bureaucracies to be absolutely necessary to organizational function? Removing the stigma from the term will only be accomplished if bureaucracies function in a manner that enables staff and clients to effectively and efficiently complete their tasks. Removing the stigma from the term may improve the public perception of schools and thus would be a positive factor in increasing public support for the schools. Since there will always be conflicts between individuals, a bureaucracy cannot serve all persons equally well. So there will always be some negative attitudes toward any particular bureaucracy. Alternatively, should the term bureaucracy be abandoned as unredeemable? In this study, the term administration more closely identified the focus group of the study and the usage by the participants.

Hoy and Sweetland (2000) identify gaps in the literature regarding the nature of enabling and hindering bureaucracies. This study will employ qualitative research methods in order to better understand what constitutes enabling and hindering bureaucracies. This is an effort to inform research and improve practice. The emphasis will be on what constitutes the enabling rules and structures in the administrative hierarchy of the school and district.

The teachers in the study will be surveyed on a one-to-one basis with standardized open-ended interviews (Patton, 1990). Standardized questions concerning previously identified behaviors will be asked which will elicit teacher perceptions of what is enabling and what is hindering. These open ended questions will ask for specific examples of enabling and hindering behaviors, rules, and structures. Teachers will be able to expound and expand on what they would like to see instituted as enabling behaviors,
rules, and structure and how these would make them more efficient and effective educators. The interviews will provide a framework that will allow the teachers to express their own understandings in their own terms.

Bureaucracies are not either completely enabling or completely hindering but range along a continuum between these two extremes (Hall, 1961, 1963). The position of the respective schools along this continuum will be determined through quantitative analysis of surveys of the teachers in these schools. Interviews with principals and teachers from schools high on the enabling bureaucracy continuum will provide detailed descriptions that will answer the following questions.

1. What behaviors, rules, and structures can be identified and described by the teachers as enabling or hindering? The teachers will be asked to provide descriptions of their experiences with the school bureaucracy.

2. How will these behaviors, rules, and structures be consistently categorized as enabling and hindering by the teachers interviewed? These categorizations will reflect the opinions and values of the teachers.

3. To what extent will there be a difference between principals and teachers in identification of enabling behaviors and structures?

4. To what extent will there be differences in the schools based on the experiences of individuals who have experienced both enabling and hindering administrations?

Individuals who have been in only one school with one administration may not
recognize the positive characteristics of a situation when those characteristics are present. The individuals often assume that what is positive is natural and normal and do not visualize a situation without these positive characteristics.

These detailed and specific descriptions will hopefully provide more specific definitions of enabling and hindering bureaucracies. Descriptions of behaviors, rules, and structures will be generated which can be used as guidelines for line and staff administrators to promote the efficient and effective education of students. These descriptions will provide a contextual framework that will serve as a basis for problem solving in new situations.

**Limitations**

Limitations are evident in terms of geographical area, type of institution, and self-selection of participants. The schools in this study are located within an eighty-mile radius of Columbus, Ohio. The presence of The Ohio State University makes the schools and faculties more aware of current research and issues in education than in most areas of the state.

The schools in the study are public high schools. The "100 School Study" had schools in three major categories: urban, suburban, and rural. The number of teachers and schools were strongly skewed toward urban and suburban. However, the numbers of schools measuring high on the variable of enabling bureaucracy were strongly skewed towards rural school. The schools with faculty participating in the study were in the classifications of urban (1), suburban (1), and rural (4).
The study is limited in the extent of the bureaucracy that is studied. The local school and the school district bureaucracy are the principal subjects of the teacher responses. Arguably, teachers and students are strongly affected by state and federal education bureaucracies and any other governmental bureaucracy that affects the funding of schools. The effects of the state government are an issue that is touched upon due to the restrictions imposed by state laws and the effects of the state mandated proficiency tests as they affect administrative behavior and school structure.

Additionally, since the quantitative and qualitative data were not collected simultaneously, the time lag may affect the perceptions of principals and faculty. This is particularly true if the policies of the school have changed, which is unlikely to be substantial over the short term or if the line administrators have changed which is a distinct possibility.

A final limitation is the nature of case study research (Merriam, 1988). Care must be taken not to oversimplify the working of enabling and hindering bureaucracies. Triangulation and member checks were used to overcome possible blind spots on my part and to add to the breadth and depth of the data. Even though many individuals and several schools were involved, a case study is not a study of the whole but only of a slice of the phenomenon of bureaucracies.

**Assumptions**

One assumption is that teacher perceptions of enabling and hindering behaviors, rules, and structures will correspond to behaviors, rules, and structures that truly are enabling or hindering in terms of the effective and efficient education of students.
Secondly, it is assumed that teachers will give accurate accounts of their perceptions of enabling and hindering behaviors, rules, and structures in the schools in which they teach. Can enabling and hindering behaviors, rules, and structures in their schools be adequately identified and defined by teachers? Conversely, can these teachers adequately project enabling and hindering characteristics that are not present in their school?

A necessary assumption is that the high schools in the study approximate the bureaucratic model. As mentioned above, schools vary in the degree in which they fit each of Weber’s elements. Larger schools tend to more naturally move to the bureaucratic model. An argument can be made that the school may influence the development of the bureaucratic model rather than the bureaucratic model influencing the functioning of the school. Our assumption here is that the bureaucratic model affects the school, hence it affects the efficiency and effectiveness of the teachers and the achievement of the students.

A final assumption is that the time lag between the identification of enabling and hindering schools based on the quantitative “100 Schools Study” and the gathering of the qualitative data will not diminish the validity of the study.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"The best way to win is without fighting."
Sun Tzu

The Power of Bureaucracies

"Bureaucracy has been and is a power instrument of the first order...The individual bureaucrat cannot squirm out of the apparatus in which he is harnessed,"
(Weber, 1947)\(^1\). Despite this somewhat bleak depiction, Weber saw bureaucracies as necessary for attaining the highest degree of efficiency possible in organizations. In Weber's opinion, the clients of the bureaucracy cannot do without the bureaucracy once it is established. Weber saw this as being the same for both public administration and private management.

Weber compares the effectiveness of the bureaucracy to other forms of administration as analogous to the superiority of the machine to non-mechanical production methods. Weber sees bureaucracies as superior to collegiate, honorific, and avocational administrations in speed, precision, continuity, unity, and cost effectiveness. Bureaucracies have a much quicker reaction time that is crucial in the fast-paced modern society. In highly competitive environments such the modern global economy, private enterprise cannot function competitively without strict bureaucratic organization. Public
administration also needs the bureaucratic model even though the consequences are often not as immediate and do not have as significant repercussions on the individual bureaucrat.

Weber (1999) points out that in any society in which a bureaucracy gained the upper hand, the bureaucracy did not disappear unless the supporting culture collapsed. This was true whether the bureaucracy was found in ancient China, Egypt, Rome, or in modern times. He states that modern bureaucracies are even harder to displace due to the advent of specialization and training that is due to the increasing scope and complexity of modern administration. The modern bureaucrat’s training increases in correspondence with the increase in the rational technology of modern society. Weber’s view is that the power of the modern specialized private or public bureaucracy becomes indestructible since the supply of even the most elementary needs is now in the control of the bureaucracies.

In almost all political ideologies and cultures, there is agreement that bureaucracies should be servant and not master. It is expected that bureaucracies should respond willingly and effectively to policy leadership from outside the bureaucracy (Heady, 2001). However, Weber’s analysis (1999) was that the actual ruler in the modern state was necessarily and unavoidably the bureaucracy. The power of the state is actually exercised through routine administration rather than through legislative machinations or executive directives. Legislation is passed in general terms and the implementation by the bureaucracy is subject to interpretation by the bureaucracy (Musgrave & Musgrave, 1980). Weber saw this power of bureaucratic administration as being true both for the
military and civilian sides of the state. In Weber’s view, military effectiveness is a product of bureaucratic discipline. In line with this reasoning, the larger the army or the civilian administration, the faster and more complete is the growth of the bureaucracy.

The power of bureaucracies is also demonstrated by their permanence. Weber (1946) points out that a bureaucracy continues to function through periodic changes in political governmental leadership in a representative democracy. Anyone who gains control over the bureaucracy is served by it. This happens even during war when the bureaucracy of the conquered country continues to function if the conqueror chooses to maintain that bureaucracy after merely changing the top officials. The bureaucracy continues to function because it is in the best interest of both the conquered and the conqueror to keep the administration of government functioning. Even if the bureaucratic administration is destroyed, its restoration is facilitated by the orientation of compliance to orders by the bureaucrats and the acceptance of bureaucratic rules and regulations by the citizens. This tendency toward compliance is conditioned into both bureaucrats and the citizenry by their reliance on the functioning of the bureaucracy.

Bureaucracies seek to maintain their superior position based on specialized knowledge by limiting access to that knowledge (Weber, 1946). Bureaucracies prefer to keep their knowledge and intentions secret. The bureaucracy has power interests not only against either economic competitors or foreign powers, but also often with internal bureaucratic competitors for shares of the organizational budget. Governmental bureaucracies defend their ‘official secrets’ even against the legislatures and executives who have legal responsibilities and powers of oversight. The more poorly informed the
legislature and executives, the more likely the bureaucracies are able to extract the budgetary share they desire and the more likely they are to be unfettered in their activities.

On the other hand, individual bureaucrats are vulnerable to being replaced by their superiors with the help of ambitious subordinates. Recruitment of governmental bureaucrats from the propertyless classes increases their economic vulnerability and increases the power of the rulers (Weber, 1946). The individual bureaucrat is as vulnerable in the commonly used machine metaphor as any defective part is vulnerable to replacement.

Weber believed that a modern capitalistic society could not exist without bureaucracies. Weber was aware of the power that accrued to bureaucrats and the possibilities for abuse of the system by the bureaucrats. The greatest danger would be a bureaucracy that had as its main goal the maintenance and advancement of the powers of that bureaucracy. Yet, despite the flaws that stem largely from human frailties, bureaucracies are needed to keep organizations and modern society as a whole functioning on a day-to-day basis.

For Weber (1947) part of the power of the bureaucracy was that its authority was based on rational-legal authority. This type of authority was not dependent upon the individuals in leadership or bureaucratic positions. Rather, the authority was imbued in the positions and in the legally installed system of rules and regulations that defined and empowered the positions. Weber reasoned that the modern capitalistic society could not function without a legal system that was consistent and impartial. Weber saw the modern capitalistic society as rational. It reacts consistently and predictably if we are able to
discern the cause and effect relationships. Besides the ‘monocratic’ type of bureaucracy based on rational-legal authority, Weber described a collegiate type of bureaucracy based on plurality of the members of the organization. But Weber felt this type of bureaucracy lacked the efficiency of the monocratic type.

Extending Weber’s arguments, Michels (1993) argued that rule by an elite group is inevitable. His first argument is that rule by mass direct democracy is technologically impossible. (This argument may not stand the test of time and the advancement of technology.) As democracy increases the circle of those with a say in the government, the governmental organization becomes larger and more complicated. Technical specialization inevitably results in the need for individuals with the skills necessary to deal with increasingly complicated tasks. The growth and development of organizations naturally tends to foster oligarchy by giving privilege to those with the necessary skills and knowledge. As organizations grow and the power of the leadership increases as a result, direct control by the rank and file becomes less effective and control by small groups becomes more effective. Even a collectivist society needs a minimal bureaucracy to administer the social wealth.

Michels’ contention is that democracy must naturally develop an organization to implement the wishes of the many. This organization then passes to control by parties that in turn are naturally bureaucratic. Oligarchical and bureaucratic tendencies in parties are technical and practical necessities just as they are in government by mass democracy. Democracy declines as the power of the parties increases and rule by the many returns to rule by the few. Thus democracy continually waxes and wanes as the power becomes
concentrated in the hands of the oligarchy (the leaders of the party in power) and the numbers of the powerless grow. When the disparity is large enough, the disenfranchised finally rally against the oligarchy and begin a new push toward mass democracy. Democracy again begins widening the circle of those with a say in public affairs. Then the cycle toward oligarchy begins again. This is the 'Iron Law of Oligarchy.'

In economic terms, governmental bureaucracies have no incentive to reduce cost and operation. Often, they face the task of spending all of their current appropriations or receiving reduced appropriations for the next fiscal period. Bureaucracies are monopoly producers and face no competitive pressures to maximize either profit or revenues. Their output is difficult to measure so the standards to be met are often how well the bureaucrats meet rules and regulations. With the protection of tenure, bureaucrats fear errors of commission rather than omission. They are more likely to face disciplinary action for doing their jobs incorrectly rather than for not doing their jobs at all.

Elements of Bureaucracies

The power of bureaucracies comes from the essential elements of bureaucracies. Essential elements of a bureaucracy were delineated by Weber (1947). Weber's list of elements is not without its dissenters however. Hall (1963) examined the work of nine major experts on bureaucracy and found that only hierarchy of authority was listed by all nine as an element or characteristic of bureaucracy. While the enumeration of the elements varies from three to as many as ten according to the interpreter, five essential elements are identified by Hoy and Miskel (2001). Although Weber's model may or may not be found in the real world, the elements he identifies do describe the form a
bureaucracy naturally strives toward (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). These elements are found in both private and public bureaucracies including schools. In the school setting, Weber's model is more likely to be closely approximated in larger systems. Smaller systems often resemble the pre-bureaucracy model.

The first element is division of labor and specialization of duties. As any organization becomes larger, specialization increases. The range of tasks becomes too broad for any one person to have either the time or expertise to accomplish. Specialization due to division of labor increases efficiency as employees become more skilled and knowledgeable in specific tasks. Specialization increases the value and consequently the security of the bureaucrats. Experienced decision makers are more cost effective but the investment in their long-term training is considerable. This specialization fixes and limits the jurisdictional areas of the bureaucrats. It thus limits the authority of the individual bureaucrat to their jurisdictional area.

Division of labor also contains an implicit guarantee to the governed that no level of the bureaucracy will accrue too much power. For example those who make the decisions will not be the same people who can evaluate and/or overturn decisions. The delimitation of authority makes it more difficult for any bureaucrat to use coercion against the governed or against other members of the bureaucracy.

Secondly, an impersonal orientation was advocated by Weber (1947). By removing emotions and personal ties, the bureaucrat can make decisions based on facts not on personal feelings or on personalities. Making bureaucratic decision making impersonal provides equality for the clients. This is not to mean that impersonal
administration fails to consider the needs of the clients or does not treat them in a civil manner. It simply means that all are treated equally well with no special privileges based on social class or economic advantage. However, impersonal orientation can also be a source of much criticism from the clients when the bureaucracy becomes too rigid. Many clients attempt to gain special consideration through social and/or economic influence or by appealing to the sympathies of bureaucrats.

The impersonal orientation is also important in the selection of bureaucrats. The optimum functioning of the organization dictate that the optimum bases for selection are talents and training. Applicants from all strata of society compete on an equal footing as far as social and economic factors are concerned. This is the concept of the meritocracy. Once selected to the bureaucracy, accomplishments and hard work determine who is to move up the ladder of hierarchical positions.

Impersonal orientation is also found in the conduct of those at the top of the hierarchy of the bureaucracy whether they are elected or appointed officials (Weber, 1993). They are limited in their scope of possible actions and reactions to their subordinates by the rules and regulations of the organization. The bureaucrat is insulated both from above and below in the hierarchy by the impersonal orientation that is required by the bureaucratic structure and function.

Third, bureaucracies necessarily have a vertical hierarchy of authority. The larger the organization, the more likely there is to be a vertical hierarchy of authority. The verticality of responsibility and control is a natural result of the desire to set goals at the
organizational level rather than at the individual level and to see that these goals are accomplished. This setting of group goals is needed to insure maximum efficiency in group efforts and resource use.

The status of inclusion in the hierarchy helps maintain the existence of the bureaucrat’s office (Weber, 1946). The office has a delimited but definite jurisdictional area that is not likely to be taken over by the offices above it and below it in the hierarchy. Once established and functioning, the office tends to continue to exist no matter how often the incumbent changes.

Ostensibly, hierarchies contain two guarantees for justice for the governed (Martin & Knopoff, 1997). The first is that the lower levels of the hierarchy that most often come into direct contact with the governed will be closely supervised by the higher levels. The second implicit guarantee is that there will be a well-defined path of appeal upward.

Every bureaucracy has at least two sets of rules and regulations. The first set consists of those the bureaucracy was formed to implement. The second is the set through which the bureaucracy carries out its mandate. The first set is formal and established by legislative or administrative directives. The second set may be formal or informally established by past practice or personal decision-making.

Weber (1947) concludes that rules and regulations are necessary to coordinate activities and to insure efficiency in the bureaucracy. Rules and regulations provide continuity when personnel change. Uniformity and stability of action resulting from standardization of bureaucratic rules and regulations lends itself to equal and fair treatment for the clients.
However it must be remembered that rules need not be permanent. Rules are born, develop, and often die (March, Schulz, & Zhou, 2000). The history of rules is that of reactions to problems and attempts to deal with those problems. Rules provide structure to meet current contingencies. To be effective bureaucracies must take into consideration changes in the environment and necessary contingencies and so let rules develop naturally as reactions to changing problems.

Finally, since bureaucratic work is technical and requires skills learned in the position, effective bureaucracies are manned by employees with a career orientation. Career orientation is dependent upon fair and consistent practices in promotion and reward. This flows naturally from the control of the bureaucracy by rules and regulations. Career orientation is also fostered by the hierarchical structure which rewards good work through upwards mobility. Impersonal orientation contributes to career orientation through an atmosphere of dispassionate reward based on merit rather than emotion or personal relations.

Weber (1946) sees this career orientation coupled with impersonal orientation in the fulfillment of duties as a vast improvement over the former systems of administration by “notables” which often resulted in uneven, untimely, and inefficient results. He sees non-bureaucratic administration as administration by amateurs and dilettantes. These administrators are often part-time due to their interests in other areas. They lack the training, the experience, the interest, and the will to do the necessary hard work to carry out the business of the organization in a consistently effective and efficient manner. The modern bureaucratic position demands the full working capacity of the bureaucrat.
Weber (1946) pointed out that the professional tenured position of the bureaucrats gives them a certain power status. However, this does not necessarily translate into personal status. The general public is more likely to hold the public or private official who is not protected by tenure in higher regard than they do the tenured bureaucrat. There is greater respect for the official who is in danger of losing position if they do not produce efficient and effective results day in and day out. The public often sees the protections of tenure as shielding bureaucrats from repercussions for incompetence. There is a feeling that the best people cannot be put into bureaucratic positions because incompetents cannot be removed. It may be perceived that the bureaucrats have less to fear from those above them in the hierarchy and are less responsive to clients because they are protected from the consequences of poor work and poor decisions.

There have been criticisms to Weber's delineation of the elements of bureaucracies and its authority base. Gouldner (1954) saw a different configuration to the authority base of bureaucracy. He divided the authority for bureaucracies into authority based on position and the authority based on expertise. Punch (1969) examined bureaucracies in schools and found that the dimensions of hierarchy of authority, rules for incumbents, procedures, and impersonality were closely enough related to make bureaucracy a one-factor concept. Adding specialization/division of labor and technical competence made bureaucratic structure a two-factor concept.

Isherwood and Hoy (1972) further tested these ideas with a study of secondary schools in New Jersey. They conducted an orthogonal factor analysis since they hypothesized that the dimensions were independent. Their findings were consistent with
the Gouldner division of bases of authority. The dimensions of hierarchy, rules, procedures, and impersonality had strong positive loadings on one factor while division of labor and technical competence had strong negative loadings on that factor in the unrotated version. The rotated version gave similar results with support for a two-factor solution. When the first four dimensions were summed and compared to the other two, there was a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.77, p < .01$). Whether viewed as a bipolar factor or as two factors, there is clearly support in this study for a division in the basis of authority between authority based on position and authority based on expertise.

A somewhat different interpretation of the elements or characteristics (Weber, 1968) is particularly adaptable to school systems. The six characteristics here are 1) jurisdictional areas governed by rules and regulations, 2) hierarchical system, 3) management by written rules and regulations, 4) thorough training in a field of specialization, 5) official activities go beyond the working day if necessary, and 6) management of the office follows general rules. In schools, we see 1) division of labor by specialization in teaching and other areas, 2) teaching roles defined by subject and kind of students, 3) rules and regulations narrowing the range of teacher initiative, and 4) an authority structure tied to the role the teacher occupied (Lee, Bryk, and Smith, 1993).

Some criticism of Weber's model stems from objections to his concept of the 'ideal-type.' Weber's concern was to explain the cultural meaning of historical facts through a unified concept rather than a chaotic collection of facts and data (Kasler, 1988). The ideal-type was an attempt to reduce many variations to one concept that incorporated an ideational perfection that resulted in a conceivable extreme. This 'pure' type could
then be used as a basis for comparison with what is actually found in the real world. Weber’s concept of ‘ideal-type’ as applied to bureaucracies is attacked by feminists calling it a justification for the male dominated domains of business, politics, and public institutions (Martin & Knopoff, 1997). Other critics see his concept as too static and shortsighted (Hall, 1961; Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, & Turner, 1968).

Hall (1961) contended that comparing organizations to Weber’s ideal-type lacked flexibility. He conceptualized the elements or characteristics of bureaucracy as continuous dimensions and measured organizations according to their position along the continuums. His studies (Hall, 1963) led to his view that bureaucracies should be viewed in terms of degree along the continuums rather than by kind. Hall’s approach was based on surveying subordinates in organizations about their attitudes and perceptions. Pugh, Hickson, Hinings, MacDonald, Turner, and Lupton (1963) saw a neglect of the study of personal behavior in organizations as a weakness of the Weberian model. Pugh led the ‘Aston studies’ that used interviews to measure dimensions of structure. The characteristics or elements of organizations clustered into the factors 1) structuring of activities, 2) concentration of authority, and 3) line control of workflow. Pugh et al. (1968) found that the larger the number of specialists in an organization, the greater the degree of bureaucratic structure. The Aston method examines documents for factual data and interviews CEOs and it is considered to be more objective than Hall’s approach (Sousa, 1980).

However, Weber had never claimed that the ideal-type of bureaucracy had ever existed or ever would exist (Kasler, 1988). He saw the ideal-type as hypothetical. It was a
heuristic tool to guide research and to help divine the cultural meanings of historical events. The value of the ideal-type conceptualization depended upon its success in aiding understanding of history, economics, and sociology.

Another important concept of Weber (1947) is that the bureaucrats will be faithful to those who appointed them. The bureaucrats are thus dependent upon their superiors. Of course, there is some conflict with this idea and the protection of professional bureaucrats through rules and regulations. The relatively recent establishment of seniority systems in both governmental and business bureaucracies exemplifies this protection.

Supportive Preconditions

Niskanen (1971) contends that bureaus are probably the oldest form of organization above the level of the communal tribe. The Sumerians first used written language extensively to record the directive and decisions of their bureaucracies. Early Egyptian writing was dominated by the rules of conduct for imperial officials. Bureaucracies have been the dominant form of government for states with any sizable territory beginning with the ancient kingdoms of Sumeria and Egypt through modern times.

Weber (1946) theorizes that the development of a money economy is conducive for bureaucracies although it is not absolutely necessary. He points to the examples of ancient Egypt, the Roman Empire, the Roman Catholic Church, and China as examples where bureaucrats were paid in kind or out of the production of the territories
administered by the bureaucrats. But generally, in order to foster professionalism in bureaucrats, the bureaucrat needs to be separated from the means of production and from the income stream of the organization whether in private or public bureaucracies.

In order to separate the bureaucrat from the means of production and yet encourage a career orientation, the bureaucrat must have a secure and consistent salary. The payment in money rather than in kind protects the bureaucrat from economic change and so promotes the consistent, ongoing functioning of the organization. The bureaucrat's sense of importance, prestige of the status group, and a lessening of public criticism are promoted by fixed and consistent remuneration. The bureaucrat is tied to the source of remuneration and this helps insure loyalty and discipline within the ranks of the bureaucracy. The maintenance of the source of the salaries is also made more important to the bureaucrats. For governmental bureaucracies, this depends upon a stable system of taxation. Tax systems are much more stable when they are based on a money economy than when they are dependent upon payment in kind from the citizenry.

Conducive to the development of bureaucracies is the rise of the great state and of mass parties (Weber, 1946). Sheer size increases the probability of specialization of tasks that in turn emphasizes the importance of the hierarchy and dependence on rules and regulations. Specialization also protects the bureaucrat from being readily replaced and so promotes career orientation. Weber points to China, the great African empires, and the Holy Roman Empire as notable exceptions to great states developing strong bureaucracies. He credits the cultural unity of these empires as providing the unifying
strength usually provided by state bureaucracies. But in the end, cultural unity could not provide the stability that a strong government bolstered by an efficient bureaucracy provides.

The Roman Empire provides a different kind of exception. It had a strong bureaucracy but the state was funded through a system of taxation that led to dependence on a subsistence economy. The army and national government was highly bureaucratized, but their importance diminished as Rome ran out of territories to conquer. A large part of the increase in wealth of the Empire had been due to a steady influx of slave labor provided by the highly bureaucratized army. The dwindling supply of slaves led to a decline in the flow of wealth into Rome and into a decline in the remuneration to the legions.

Weber (1946) concludes that the growth of power in the modern states in Europe went to those governments that developed strong administrative bureaucratization. He concludes that a great "modern" state is absolutely dependent upon its bureaucracy. At the time of his writing, Weber saw the United States as an exception because the mass political parties dominated its government. But in turn, these parties were highly bureaucratized. Rather than strong specialization and training in running governments, the bureaucratic strength of the United States was turned to organizing campaigns and winning elections.

Qualitative changes in government functions support the growth of bureaucracies. The qualitative changes in bureaucracies are determined by the needs that are found in each individual case (Weber, 1946). Qualitative changes concern intensification of the
control of the bureaucracy due to the importance of the state function that has been bureaucratized. For example, the growth in bureaucracy in ancient Egypt was due to the importance of the Nile River to the whole economy. This importance caused the intensification of control of all factors involved in the regulation of waterways. Also in Egypt as in many countries, the creation of standing armies helped create the needs that were necessary preconditions for the intensification of bureaucratic administration. This is tied to Weber’s assertion that the great plains states initially developed extensive bureaucracies due to the need for standing armies to defend the borders. Weber asserts that only the bureaucratic army structure can sustain the levels of discipline and technical training necessary in modern warfare.

The necessary preconditions for the intensification as well as the extension of bureaucracies in modern states are the complexities of modern civilizations. These complexities drive the demand for administration by highly trained bureaucrats. Global competition demands efficient and effective governmental action in economic, industrial, and social efforts as well as in military efforts. Weber acknowledges that non-bureaucratic administrations have managed large imperial expansions but contends that the intensification of internal administrative control was not as complete as with bureaucracies.

Increases in wealth create a demand for bureaucratization. This is especially so when the increases in wealth of the influential classes leads to increased consumption and sophisticated life styles. The continued supply of goods and services then requires organized, reliable, coordinated administration capable of cross-country and global
procurement. The consumers of a sophisticated life style require a stable and orderly society. This is provided by the bureaucratic state in the form of police protection and state provision for social welfare that also helps provide order in society.

Purely technical advances also increase the need for and the supportive climate for increases in bureaucracies. The speed, scope, and importance of modern communication and travel require that they be managed publicly. These same characteristics of modern travel and communication in turn provide improved tools for the bureaucracy to carry out its tasks and to increase its efficiency and effectiveness. The circle continues as increased efficiency and effectiveness increases demands for increased governmental control of public goods and services that must be administered by increased bureaucratization.

Besides gradual, ongoing societal developments that lead to the installation and growth of bureaucracies, sudden shocks to a society can bring the implementation of bureaucratic government (Turner & Halligan, 1999). The arrival of Commodore Perry in Japan in 1853 precipitated the collapse of the Tokugawa shogunate in favor of a government that was a modernizing oligarchy run by a powerful bureaucracy. Recruitment to the new bureaucracy was through competitive examinations and the old familial and political status appointments were replaced by merit based recruitment and advancement (Heady, 2001). This development led to a bureaucratic system noted for resilience and adaptability. It also proved to be a productive training ground since many retired bureaucrats move into private corporations, public corporations, or politics. Over half of postwar Japanese prime ministers have been former government bureaucrats.
Stages in the Development of Bureaucracies

Weber (1946) sees the accumulation of specialized knowledge and the attempts of the rulers to use this knowledge as a key to the development of bureaucracies. The ruler preferred to utilize the specialized knowledge of experts without yielding power to the experts. The experts' power position was based on specialized knowledge and was the basis for improving their economic and social positions. As the rulers begin to rely more and more on expert knowledge, they moved from occasional use of the experts to the use of 'collegiate' bodies that meet on a continuous basis. Collegiate bodies often began as meetings of 'notables' or persons with political, social, and/or economic influence. Later, the collegiate bodies often combined the knowledge of experts with the influence of 'notables.'

The members of the collegiate bodies gave the ruler their respective opinions and settled the matter by resolution with the approval of the ruler or by the unilateral decision of the ruler. As time passed, the ruler tended to become more and more dependent upon the experts in the collegiate body. Often the ruler attempted to maintain the dominant position by using the experts as checks on the powers of each other. The ruler may thus attempt to gain a comprehensive view by seeking the advice of all the experts. The ruler may attempt to keep the experts from increasing their power by keeping them from combining their knowledge into a comprehensive picture. The ruler may use a personal cabinet as an intermediary to the collegiate body. As an insulating layer, the cabinet members receive the personal animosities of the experts and serve to shield the ruler.
As the collegiate body moves to the practice of meeting continuously, it gains permanence based on the fact that the loss or addition of individual members does not affect its existence or substantially affect its overall accumulation of expert knowledge. As rulers continue to change, the power position of the collegiate bodies based on knowledge increases in importance and permanence. As permanent governmental structures, the collegiate bodies maintain more influence over the long run than do advisory councils or boards of control that depend upon the influence of individual members or the economic interests of the groups they represent.

Weber (1946) sees the demise of collegiate bodies as being tied to technological advance in communication and increased technological demands that require rapid, consistent, and unambiguous decisions. The deliberative process of collegiate bodies is too slow for efficiently running a growing organization on a day-to-day basis. Collegiate administration disappears in favor of bureaucratic administration whenever the ruler values a unified administration over a more thorough but slower deliberative process of decision making.

The influence of outside forces upon the organization moves from representation by members of the collegiate body to the supply of information and influence by interest groups. This movement further advances the depersonalization of administration by bureaucracy. This depersonalization allows for the separation of public and private roles for officials and for the difference between public and private law. Public law affects the
governmental bureaucrat in their official relationships with citizens. Private law covers the relationships of citizens among themselves including government officials outside of their official roles as representatives of the government.

The Importance of Bureaucracies

Bureaucracies are important because of their efficient structure. Weber (1947) stated that bureaucracies were capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency possible in organizations. Experts are produced by division of labor and specialization. Experts use an impersonal orientation to make rational decisions based on facts. The hierarchy of authority combined with the rules and regulations insures compliance to decisions down through the ranks. Employees are loyal to the bureaucracy because of their career orientation. This loyalty insures that the employees will strive to comply with the decisions made by their superiors in the hierarchy. They will also strive to make the best decisions for which they have responsibility.

Anderson (1974) stresses the importance of bureaucracies in school systems. He gives three reasons why it is important to study school bureaucracies. The first is that bureaucracies are variables that can be changed. If we understand the workings and the characteristics of bureaucracies, we can change them. Bureaucracies can be made to facilitate the optimum effectiveness and efficiency of staff. Then we gain the optimum of student achievement limited only by the abilities of the students themselves.

Anderson’s second point is that there is an increased interest in the school as an organization. School is no longer seen as a collection of individual classrooms. As the size of schools has increased, their reliance on central planning and decision-making
increased the size of the bureaucracies necessary to coordinate the activities of the school district. Increased interest in business and governmental organizational structure and function has progressed into educational settings. This interest is directly tied to the first reason of Anderson that school bureaucracies can be changed for the better. These two points are crucial to the purpose of this study. The assumption that bureaucracies can be improved is essential to establish the value of developing theories of bureaucracy. Anderson's points are also crucial to the idea that bureaucracies may be enabling or hindering and may be analyzed and remediated.

Anderson's final point is that school bureaucracy may be related to student achievement. In an age of accountability for school systems and school personnel, student achievement is the ultimate measure of performance. While many disagree on how student achievement should be measured, it is futile to resist the public's call for accountability. This final point flows logically from the first two. Research attempts have been made to correlate economic inputs to student achievement. Marion and Flanigan (2001) found the intervening variable of local school decision making to be important since overall results on the effects of economic inputs were mixed and contradictory. If competent decision making of bureaucracies can help make teachers and other staff more efficient and effective, then they will be better able to help the students be more effective and efficient in their studies.

**Alternatives to Bureaucracies**

Even when alternatives to governmental service delivery systems are attempted, they too contain their own internal bureaucratic structures (Henderson, 1999). As non-
governmental organizations (NGOs) such as CARE or the Red Cross attempt to increase their effectiveness, they look to economies of scale to maximize their efficiency and must develop internal bureaucratic structures. As NGOs seek to increase their power, they must either persuade or engage with governmental bureaucracies. Knowledge of bureaucratic workings and mindsets are important assets for NGOs to be effective in dealing with governments. These charitable/social NGOs often face the dilemma of either compromising with governmental bureaucracies in order to be effective or of confronting the governmental bureaucracies in order to preserve their philosophical or ethical standards.

**Bureaucracy as a Function of the State**

Weber (1950) sees bureaucracy in the form of expert officialdom and rational law as necessary to the development of the modern capitalistic state. Weber traces the model of the modern bureaucracy to the formal structure of the Roman judicial system. It was in the natural interest of the state to have fixed laws administered by trained officials who specialized in the impersonal administration of the laws and resolution of disputes.

The actual content of Roman law was not the basis for the development of modern capitalism. Weber sees the content of modern law rising from medieval law in Western Europe that arose simultaneously with capitalism. Capitalism requires that the laws of the state can be counted on to be consistent time after time. This is reflected in the development of impersonal orientation on the part of bureaucrats. Under theocracy and monarchy, decisions were based on material and social concerns. In bureaucracies, decisions are based on the principles of the formal system i.e. rules and regulations.
The power of the bureaucracy arises from the power of the state that it serves. That power is based on violence. Weber (1948) reasons:

If no social institutions existed which knew the use of violence, then the concept of ‘state’ would be eliminated, and a condition would emerge that could be designated as ‘anarchy’ in the specific sense of this word. Of course, force is certainly not the normal or the only means of the state—nobody says that—but force is a means specific to the state. (pp. 77-78)

This violence is limited in modern governments by its conception as the “legitimate” use of physical force within the state’s jurisdiction.

The governmental bureaucracy depends upon domination and a belief in legitimacy to maintain its status (Weber, 1993). For Weber, domination is the probability that a command will be obeyed by a given group of persons. This applies not only to members of the bureaucracy, but also to the clients of the state. Domination is always present if an organization is large enough to possess an administrative staff. Domination is relative, but to be effective, the organization must exercise administrative control.

Domination may be based on economic influence, custom and habituation, affectual ties, or by ‘ideal’ motives. But to be truly effective, domination needs to include a belief in legitimacy. In the legal-rational bureaucracy, legitimacy is based on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and a belief in the right of those in authority to issue commands.

The power of the state is also exemplified by the ability of “mass democracy” to level economic and social differences. This power levels the privileges and preferences of the ruling class. The move from government administration by those of rank and privilege to administration by bureaucracy is concomitant with the replacement of rule by aristocracy or monarchy with rule by democracy (Weber, 1948).
Weber reasoned that mass democracy removes plutocratic privilege in administration. Administration by aristocrats is necessarily replaced by administration by paid professionals who are career orientated, specialized in skills, and impersonal in carrying out the duties of the office.

Weber pointed out that the political parties that arise in modern democracies are also run in a bureaucratic fashion. While rule based on personal relationships and personal esteem is not completely replaced, effective functioning of the party makes the use of the bureaucratic model necessary.

Weber (1948) pointed out the internal conflict that is inevitable in the development of the rule by bureaucracy that is fostered by mass democracy. Mass democracy is interested in expanding the influence of public opinion i.e. the power of the electorate at the expense of the authority of the officials. Mass democracy sweeps away rule by privilege by making office holding accessible to all. Office holding is no longer an inherited right or the result of social or economic status. But holding office inevitably becomes a source of status and power. The bureaucracy that is fostered by mass democracy becomes the elite. This development of a power position by the bureaucracy is the internal conflict with which mass democracy must contend.

Weber (1947) sees two sources of authority for bureaucracies. One is based on holding “a legally defined office.” The appointment and the job protection needed for career oriented bureaucrats gives power to the persons in the position. The other source is “the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge.” Hence, bureaucracy tends to make the office holders who really run the government on a day-to-day basis a privileged class.
This privilege is based on training and the maintenance of their career orientation by job protection. In a modern democracy, it is too inefficient to replace trained professionals at the rate in which it is possible to replace elected officials.

Thus, besides the powers delegated to the bureaucracies by the government necessary for maintaining government services, bureaucracies tend to develop powers of their own (Torstendahl, 1991). Two types of power particularly prevalent due to the workings of bureaucracies are organizational power and the power of knowledge. Organizational power is that power which is generated by cooperation by of the members of the organization. The whole bureaucracy is greater than the sum of its parts. A bureaucracy generates this power when the bureaucrats collectively envision and work toward goals and interests. In this way, bureaucracies tend to become special interest groups that lobby in their own behalf (Weber, 1946).

The power of knowledge in the bureaucratic situation is based on the ability to control and determine who can use the information. Bureaucracies as special interest groups use their knowledge of the workings of the government to their own benefit. The bureaucracies control the flow of information to the budget-making powers. This is true whether the budgetary power resides in the executive branch, legislative branch, or is split between both. The larger and more complex the government, the more difficult it is for the legislative and executive branches to keep informed. They become dependent on the bureaucracies for the information on which budgetary decisions are based.

It is in the interest of the bureaucrats to equate at the average product rather than at the marginal product. Equating at the average product maintains staff and budget. This
maintenance is often an unspoken goal of bureaucratic departments. Equating at the marginal product is the competitive business model and the most efficient use of resources. Equating inputs at the average product increases the financial burden to the government beyond the most efficient level. But since bureaucrats are protected in most governments today by job security such as Civil Service, positions are not easily cut. Since bureaucracies control their financial cost information, they are in a position to provide justification for increased budgets. This in turn increases the size and power of the bureaucratic special interest group. The more effectively the bureaucracy controls information, the more powerless are the legislature and executives in dealing with the bureaucracies (Weber, 1946). Individual bureaucrats benefit from being part of a growing organization. When the bureaucracy is expanding and enlarging its budget, promotions and increases in salary are more plentiful. Bureaucrats have no internal incentives to work themselves out of a job.

Bureaucratization also plays a role in political party organization (Weber, 1946). As the party increases in size and the size of government increases the stakes at the polls, efficiency demands the establishment of a bureaucratically run party machine. Previously, particularly in the United States, offices were awarded after elections to the supporters of the winners of the elections. This is a throwback to pre-bureaucratic systems of dividing the spoils of administration among the winners. As the need increased for experts rather than partisan politicos as officials, the parties could no longer afford to leave administration to greedy amateurs. Legislative reforms in the United States made great strides toward the professionalism of the bureaucracy.
While political parties depend upon their own bureaucracies. It is questioned whether governmental bureaucracies enhance or inhibit the political development of a country (Heady, 2001). A dominant bureaucracy tends to inhibit the development of the political system. This inhibition of the political system is due to the bureaucracy itself dealing in politics. Attention to the political process by the bureaucracy comes at the expense of administrative effectiveness.

In developing, particularly post-colonial nations, civil servants tend to ascribe to "the spirit of the clerk". The bureaucrats give more attention to detail, legalism, and ritualized relationships. The top echelon of bureaucrats in developing nations often usurp functions that are properly the business of legislative and executive branches of government (Heady, 2001). The domination of bureaucracies in developing nations is more likely to occur where the bureaucracies are less developed and therefore less likely to follow the Weberian bureaucratic models.

In Weber's view (1946), geography of the state plays a part in the development of the bureaucracy. He reasoned that coastal cities and states tended to develop "collegial" type of government while the great states of the plains; Russia and the United States for example, favored bureaucracy. Sheer size of the state also affected the development of bureaucracies. Large areas and large populations contributed to the need for bureaucratic administration.

While Weber's focus was primarily on bureaucracies in capitalistic states, he did pay a great deal of attention to China. Weber saw the traditional Chinese method of appointing officials as a chief reason for the inefficiency of the Chinese bureaucracy.
(Weber, 1950). For centuries, Chinese provincial ministers were appointed on the basis of their learning in Chinese literature rather than for competence in running a governmental department. Additionally, these ministers were never appointed to their home provinces for fear they would develop a power base. In the twentieth century, Maoist China was considered to be a bureaucratic nightmare as are most Communist bureaucracies that are noted for red tape, delays, fearful and defensive bureaucrats, and administration by coercion.

Post-Mao China has attempted to 'reform' their sluggish bureaucracies with the infusion of market dynamics into some parts of the bureaucratic system (Lieberthal & Lampton, 1992). The Chinese have attempted to replace the traditional method of getting things done through guanxi (use of personal ties to gain favors). This has been chiefly accomplished in the bureaucracies dealing with economics. These bureaucracies have enhanced prestige due to the overriding necessity for economic growth. They deal with tangible resources that can be used to bargain with other state level bureaucracies and with provincial bureaucracies. The military and civilian coercive bureaucracies still use coercion as the main tool in their administrations. In fact, these bureaucracies have found that high coercion capabilities benefit these particular bureaucracies in dealing with the other governmental units.

The Chinese have developed what Lieberthal and Lampton (1992) have described as a 'Fragmented Authoritarianism' model in their bureaucracies. Decentralization of decision-making authority was a key initiative. Decentralization has introduced problems such as a lack of value integration. Weber had seen value integration as a natural
outgrowth of belonging to a state bureaucracy but decentralization in the Chinese system led to fragmentation of value systems coincident with fragmentation of authority and fragmentation of control over fiscal resources. Particularly in the economic bureaucracies, there was an emphasis on bargaining between units of the bureaucracy to achieve joint projects and on the encouragement of units to become self-supporting.

The incentive to become self-supporting led to increased competition among bureaucratic units for resources but also increased cooperation in projects that were mutually beneficial. The leadership had originally intended market forces to reduce the amount of bargaining in the economic sector. But bargaining was increased since control over information and skills became an additional bargaining tool in addition to control over resources. This was all made possible by the reduction of coercive methods by the hierarchy that had stifled innovation and initiative in the past. Bureaucracies in the economic sector developed a real sense of mission and purpose along with the need for self-promotion. The leaders at the top did retain powerful influence as long as they marshaled all available information and issued clear and specific instructions. The leadership was still in a position to maintain control over economic information and skills. However, when strong central leadership was not present, local officials adopted the attitude of *tamen you zhengce, women you duice* (they have their policies, we have our countermeasures) towards the central government officials.

The bureaucracies not involved in economic projects retained the administrative style of governing based on the power struggles among elite groups. At the very top, bureaucratic boundaries and the division between government and party fade.
Personalities and personal relationships retain importance. At the next level, Chinese politics and government are still heavily influenced by 'leading groups' which are unofficial but have immense power due to their abilities to advise the top leaders, initiate policy research, resolve conflicts, and coordinate activities among various bureaucracies. The State Statistical Bureau and the new policy-research institutes of the central government actually increased their clout due to the information and skills that they developed and controlled. The information and skills were needed by the provinces and cities and thus were used by these central bureaucracies as bargaining tools to advance their priorities with the cooperation of the local bureaucracies. This development of power based on statistics echoed that of the Russian bureaucracy in the middle of the nineteenth century (Blum, 1961). As in the Russian experience, the Chinese research institutes made the top leaders less dependent upon their subordinates in the bureaucratic hierarchical line for information. This made the lower levels of the hierarchy more careful and diligent in considering the externalities of their proposals since they were in competition with the proposals of the research institutes. Another overall effect was to enable lower level governmental bureaucrats to move forward with projects even when local Party bureaucrats were working to slow down the effects of reform.

One continuing problem is that the legal system is not strong enough and mature enough to adjudicate key issues and establish precedents. Judicial and statutory controls cannot control the redistribution of power and violation of commitments by the bureaucracies. There has been an actual increase in corruption and in rent-seeking behavior both within the bureaucracies and in non-bureaucratic sectors. This is due to
confusion over guiding norms, diffusion of authority, and the loss of former rules and practices. The bureaucratic structure has been flattened and non-bureaucratic sectors have gained importance.

In all countries, bureaucrats also hold power in one sense when the government grows larger and the resulting specialization makes the positions highly technical. The bureaucrats cannot be easily replaced because the cost of training the replacements is high. Recruitment costs for replacements can be high if the positions have little stability and job security is tenuous. The cost to society of eliminating the functions of the bureaucrats may be too great to bear in the short run.

Weber points out that in mass democracy, the people never actually govern but are governed by their representatives. This represents only a change in the way leaders are chosen and in the ability of the people to change their leaders. This brings into importance 'public opinion' and the relative abilities of the subgroups in the democracy to shape public opinion. Ironically, the political concept of democracy includes both the idea that administrative office is universally accessible based on talent and training and that there is a minimization of the authority of the administration in favor of expanding the influence of the people through public opinion. The selection of leaders in a democracy is based on a relatively short and fixed term of office and on the ability of the people to recall officials. As a result, elected officials cannot be held to rigid expectations of expertise in the workings of their offices. This runs counter to the elements of bureaucracy. Democracy comes into conflict with its own tendencies to set up professional bureaucracies. Bureaucracies become a new rule by 'notables' whose special
status is based on specialization of knowledge and their career orientation that is protected by the necessity for the continuous efficient functioning of the government.

Weber stated that bureaucracies received their power from a rational-legal authority base. It was legitimate because the members of the society and the state agreed that it was legitimate. Bureaucrats have a legal right to their position based on the governmental rules of selection and a legal responsibility to carry out the functions of their offices. Bureaucracies naturally function better under a rational system of law because bureaucracies are rational organizations.

Weber (1946) argued for a “rational” law based on strict formal conceptions as opposed to systems that he sees as based on traditions. Decisions in tradition-based systems are decided by precedents or by interpreting precedents by analogy. Weber called this “empirical justice” and sees it as nonrational. Empirical justice is a combination of traditionalism and free arbitrariness on the part of the judges. Weber sees English and American adjudication as bound by precedents, hence it is empirical justice. The failure of these two systems to move to a more rational codification of the law is due to the obstruction of lawyers. Lawyers are motivated economically to maintain a system of training that requires specialization in knowledge of precedents and thus restricts entry into the occupation.

On the European continent, Weber saw the prevalence of law based on the Roman model as being due to its rational form and the necessity to run the courts with rationally trained experts due to the increased complexity of modern economies. English law has retained its less rational character due to the domination of landed wealth and the denial
of justice to economically weak groups. The rational nature of Roman law lends itself to administration by bureaucrats while the empirical nature of English law is conducive to administration by notables, lawyers, and elected or appointed judges.

Weber saw democratic principles being served best by a formal and rational administration of the law. This leads to equality before the law and legal guarantees against the arbitrariness found in systems in which judges are able to use discretion based on their view of the unique circumstances of the individual case. This concept of judge as automaton deciding cases strictly on codified rules is in opposition to the frequent public outcry for substantive justice in individual cases. The rational, formal systems favor the economically fortunate while the less fortunate hope that substantive justice may compensate for their economic and social deficits. This type of substantive justice is possible only in less formalized systems where substantive considerations are valued more highly than procedural consistency. The pressure of public opinion for substantive justice is counter to rational justice and administration. Weber sees public opinion as conduct governed by irrational sentiments. The bureaucratic administration of justice provides stability and consistency and is better able to withstand the pressures of public opinion as well as the influence of powerful or persuasive individuals.

**Bureaucracies as Budget Maximizers and Special Interest Groups**

McNutt (1996) states that a public bureaucracy attempts to maximize its budget. The bureaucrats have a self-interest in maximizing their organization's budget in order to maintain and expand their bureaucracy and reap the rewards of security, pay advancement, and upward mobility that come with membership in a bureau that is
expanding. In a growing bureaucracy, it is easier to get promotions, power, and prestige. Alternatively, an incremental theory of public budget making holds that budgets are made to satisfy rather than maximize (Sorensen, 1987). The complexities of budget making, limitations in time, knowledge, and resources force bureaucrats to base new budgets on incremental increases in the previous year's budget. Bureaucratic attempts to maximize budgets are tempered by bargaining with the legislative sponsors, competition from other bureaucracies, and oversight from both citizen's groups and governmental watchdog agencies (Sorensen, 1987).

Weber (1946) viewed the bureaucrat as naturally embracing the goals and attitudes of the organization. This would place the bureaucrat in the role of a dedicated worker in both the public and private sectors. However, in the public sector, the bureaucrat is pulled by the goals and attitudes of two organizations: the government in general has goals and attitudes that may be different from the goals and attitudes of individual bureaucracies (Hwang, 1999). In a vein similar to Weber, the Skinnerian (Skinner, 1975) view of management of human beings would yield bureaucrats who would toil for the greater good of the society as a whole. The bureaucracy and the superiors in the bureaucratic hierarchy should be able to condition the subordinates into faithful public servants by utilizing an efficient system of rewards and punishments. The reality is that neither Weber nor Skinner take into consideration the subjective values and personal agendas of the human beings who make up bureaucracies. The subjective compatibility of individual bureaucrats with the democratic ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity will vary from individual to individual and probably not be congruent between
any two individuals. The effect is that bureaucratic compatibility with the ideals of
democracy will not exist as the bureaucracy strives to maintain and expand its position in
the political process of government (Cooper, 1981; Hwang, 1999). An additional
stumbling block is that the ideals of democracy not only run counter to each other (e.g.
liberty versus equality); they vary in agreement with different elements of bureaucracy.
For example, the ideal of liberty runs counter with the elements of rules and regulations
in bureaucracies while the ideal of equality is compatible with impersonal orientation and
rules and regulations.

The provision of public goods by the economics of the public sector is
accomplished by the political process rather than by market dynamics (McNutt, 1996).
Bureaucracies as self-interested political actors have an interest in overstating the benefits
of the public goods they produce, understating the costs of production, and inducing an
inefficient appropriation in order to maximize their budgets. The other two groups in the
collective determination of the budget, the politicians and the citizens, have their own
agendas to pursue. The politicians wish to ease the problems of reelection by winning the
support of interest groups. The citizens form interest groups in order to influence
government into providing the specific programs which the interest groups desire
(Mitchell & Simmons, 1994). While some theorists see two roles for bureaucrats,
dedicated civil servant and self-interested budget maximizer (Musgrave & Musgrave,
1980), the bureaucrat often functions as agent for an interest group. Whether the interest
group is an outside pressure group or the bureau itself, inefficiencies in government arise as the bureaucrats redirect resources for the benefit of the particular interest group that has holds their allegiance (McNutt, 1996).

The power of knowledge is based on the ability to control information and determine who can use the information. Bureaucracies functioning as special interest groups use their knowledge of the workings of the government to their own benefit. Bureaucracies can control the flow of information to the elected representatives. As self-interested agents within a principal-agent framework, bureaucrats have an incentive to misinform the principal whether the principal takes the form of a legislative committee or the appointed official who temporarily heads a career oriented bureaucracy (McNutt, 1996). The larger and more complex the government becomes, the more difficult it is for the elected representatives and the citizens to keep informed and the greater the costs of information.

Budget makers become dependent upon the bureaucracies for the information with which budget decisions are made for the bureaucracies. It is in the interest of the bureaucracies to equate at the average product rather than follow the competitive market example of equating at the marginal product (Niskanen, 1971). In this way, the bureaucracy captures for itself what would be the consumer surplus in open market dynamics and what would be governmental surplus if the government had enough control to run itself as efficiently as a competitive business. As a result, the bureaucracies increase the financial burden to government beyond the most efficient level for providing public goods and services. Since bureaucracies must offer public goods to all citizens at
no cost (with some exceptions), the precise value that citizens place on the goods and services is never learned. Without a market, values are impossible to ascertain and efficient choices become impossible. Demand curves become guesswork (Mitchell & Simmons, 1994).

Beck (1981) sees school districts presenting voters with an all-or-nothing choice at the polls as trying to extract the entire consumer surplus. The choice they present is either pass the levy or the schools close. In reality, administrators who try this would lose their jobs and so Beck discusses an all-or-little approach. Here the bureaucracy satisfies itself with part of the consumer surplus. In the case of electorates deciding on levies, the median voter cannot make incremental choices so many citizens will pay higher costs than they prefer.

Beck (1981) contends that lump sum aid from the state has greater stimulative effect on expenditures than an equivalent increase in income. The voters do not have the flexibility to reduce taxes in the amount of the aid due to statutory and time constraints. Beck further contends that matching grants have a greater effect than lump sum grants but disputes Niskanen (1971) by saying neither types of grants increase expenditures on a one-to-one basis with the amount of the grant.

Legislatures and citizens can control high costs by holding bureaus accountable for specified levels of public goods and services if they have the will and perseverance to do so (Niskanen, 1971). In obvious cases such as the end of the Cold War, bureaucracies are unable to protect their budgets and staffs from down sizing (McNutt, 1996). However, much of the budget cuts from down sized bureaus is usually captured by other bureaus.
Control of financial cost and benefit information enables the bureaucracies to increase their budgets. This increases the size and power of the bureaucratic special interest group. The more effectively the bureaucracy controls information, the more powerless are the elected representatives and the citizens in dealing with the bureaucracies (Weber, 1946). Elected representatives and citizens are reduced to the practice of rational ignorance. The cost in time and money to determine the accurate facts and figures concerning the bureaucracy is too high to bear. The cheaper alternative is to accept the information that is presented by the bureaucracy. Since the bureaucracy functions as a special interest group, rational ignorance saves the elected representatives and the citizens time and effort but keeps them from knowing completely the activities of the bureaucratic special interest group. Loyalty to the bureaucracy gained through systems of rewards and punishments prevents individual bureaucrats from giving this information to legislatures and the public. If something goes wrong in the production of public goods and services, the blame is diffused throughout the hierarchy (Wildavsky, 1987). It becomes very difficult for the citizens, legislatures, and oversight groups to determine the causes of any breakdowns. This protection of individuals and diffusion of blame also protects the bureaucracy as a whole in the appropriations system.

Bureaucrats also hold power in another sense when governmental growth and increased specialization makes positions highly technical (Weber, 1946). Highly technical positions protect the office holder because the cost of training replacements becomes high. If job security is tenuous, recruitment costs become too high so it is to the economic advantage of government in the short run to retain current members of the bureaucracy.
The reluctance on the part of government to replace bureaucrats as easily as elected representatives are replaced adds to the power base of the bureaucracies. Additionally, the time needed for elected representatives to gain a working knowledge of the government places them at a disadvantage vis-à-vis bureaucrats with tenure.

Governmental bureaucracies function as monopoly providers for public goods and services (Nicholson, 1997). The bureaucracies are in a position to bargain for both the price and quantity of output for services. In the United States, they deal only with Congress for budgets. This reduces the transaction costs for both sides. Congress is in the position of a monopsony but without the leverage to reduce labor that a monopsonist in the private sector enjoys due to high information costs for Congress. Due to tendency of bureaucracies to increase their numbers due to a dual demand role as citizens and employees, the bureaucracies induce the government to purchase an inefficiently high amount of bureaucracy (Tullock, 1974). Part of this increased cost is due to the increase in numbers of supervisors. Supervisors command a higher salary and this brings up the averages. Nicholson (1997) points out that the government's marginal expense for hiring additional bureaucrats is more than the wages due to movement on the upward-sloping supply curve for labor. Congress is further handicapped by being one sponsor dealing with many bureaucracies. The bureaucracies have more time to work on their budget requests and justifications. Their tendency to overestimate benefits and underestimate costs is not readily countered by Congressional staffs. Additionally, budget negotiations in the US Congress are done in committees. Committee members with power within the
committee are there by choice. These members come from interested sectors and have vested interests in the workings of the particular bureaucracy whose budget is before the committee.

Bureaucracies benefit from the ratchet effect. Money spent during crises or times of increased demand creates new bureaucracies and constituencies for government spending. When the crisis is over, the level of spending drops but seldom drops to the pre-crisis level of spending. Bureaucracies as their own special interest groups work to prevent the level of spending to drop to the original level. To do so would be to suffer loss of jobs and budget with a resulting loss of influence and prestige. Since bureaucracies must compete among themselves for budget resources, a loss of power and influence could lead to a steady downward spiral due to depredations by rival bureaucracies. Bureaucracies naturally strive for self-perpetuation (Niskanen, 1971) and have no inherent motivation to work themselves out of jobs.

Although it is widely recognized that while democracy and bureaucracy are both needed for members of modern societies (Hwang, 1999), it is also recognized that bureaucracies have anti-democratic tendencies in the development of an elite whose power is based on superior technical knowledge, career orientation, and impersonal orientation both toward clients and other members of the bureaucracy (Weber, 1946). Inevitably, the bureaucracy becomes the elite group, the oligarchy, which controls the government (Michels, 1993). Moreover, complete democratic control over bureaucracy is
difficult not only because of the bureaucracy’s effective resistance from a strong power base, but also because complete democratic control leads to undesirable losses in the contributions and efficiencies of the bureaucracy.

The production of public goods by bureaucracies fails to meet the standards of economic efficiency established by private firms in the free market. Part of this is due to the imperfect information held by both the bureaucracies and the legislature or other budget approving body. The bureaucracy’s lack of sufficient knowledge comes partly from the diversity of goods and services that the government provides and the overlapping by different levels of government in the provision of these goods and services. For example, education receives goods and services from at least three levels of government. The mix of these goods and services must be negotiated between and within the levels and negotiations in themselves have costs in the time, efforts, and material resources of the educational bureaucracies. The private firm on the other hand usually has a much more limited scope of interests and goals. Even in large corporations, tasks are completed and products are produced by semiautonomous divisions.

The other lack of knowledge comes from the common practice of bureaucracies to view knowledge as power and to hoard their knowledge, expending it only when necessary. In education, this tendency is somewhat ameliorated by the very nature of education’s intrinsic valuing of spreading knowledge. In addition, the vast majority of educational bureaucracies are at the local level. The public is particularly interested in local educational bureaucracies and members of the bureaucracy are part of the community. Board of education meetings are open to the public and citizens may speak to
question the board or to voice opposition. Local educational bureaucracies are particularly sensitive to and cooperative with the citizenry since funding depends upon support at the polls. Rational ignorance is a small factor and the local educational bureaucracies are more likely to be equating at the marginal product. At the state level in Ohio, the many interest groups and the proximity of the legislative and executive branches keeps the state educational bureaucracy under close observation.

In the private sector, there are many instances of levels and subdivisions of the private bureaucracies withholding information from one another. However, if this practice is extreme, it leads to loss of profit and threats to the existence of the firm. These threats are a control to information hoarding in the private sector. In the public sector, withholding or falsifying information may be productive to the bureaucracy if it leads to budget increases. Public bureaucracies do not need to meet a break-even point and often expand their budgets and staffs in the face of governmental spending deficits. This allows the governmental bureaucracies to produce beyond the optimal level where marginal social benefit intersects marginal costs (Niskanen, 1971). The bureaucracy strives to produce at a level where total social benefits equal total social costs. This allows the bureaucracy to capture a portion or the entire consumer surplus. This is accomplished at levels of staffing and budgeting that are higher than the optimal levels.

Also part of the political process is the debate over whether funding affects student achievement. The debate covers research methodology, interpretations of findings, political biases, scholarship, and even personality (Turner, 2000; Payne & Biddle, 2000). Factors to be considered are whether or not the bureaucrats have been
efficient in the past and what non-educational factors such as union contracts will influence the use of additional funds. Certainly, the same bureaucratic model will yield differences in student achievement based on the abilities and goals of the bureaucrats in the individual bureaucracies.

What it comes down to in the end as Will Rogers points out is selfishness (Sterling, 1979). The Weberian model is based on developing bureaucrats who are removed from the financial stream and are dedicated careerists (Weber, 1947). The downfall of this model of bureaucracies is the same human frailty that led to the downfall of Communism, racial strife, and religious wars. While designing better organizational structures and developing better procedures and instruments will improve bureaucratic functioning, the key to success in a human endeavor is the hearts and minds of participants. The process of improving bureaucracies will be a constant struggle against selfishness, sloth, and apathy. Not the same as life or death struggles conducted in mud, blood, and smoke; but struggles just the same.

**Economic and Social Factors**

Weber (1946) sees bureaucracy as a force that influences and is influenced by economic factors. Weber distinguished between what is "economic," what is "economically determined," and what is "economically relevant." Weber also distinguished between economic power and political power. While Marx (1993) points to the separation of the worker from the means of production as the deciding characteristic of capitalism, Weber emphasized that the political impact of the separation of the soldier
from the ownership of the tools of war and the separation of the administrator from the stream of income are equally important in their effects on the modern capitalistic society.

In the case of bureaucratic armies, their rise has often been due to the decrease in numbers of citizens who were economically able to equip themselves. This loss of economic power determined the loss of political power for these soldiers. The bureaucratization of the armies is concomitant with the army service passing from the propertied classes to the propertyless classes. The propertied classes often became unsuitable for the hardships of military service and unwilling to endure military service. The initial bureaucratization of warfare had often led to private enterprise in the form of mercenary troops and the granting of commissions to those who privately raised regiments for the army. Finally, increased bureaucratization led to complete control of the raising and equipping of armies by the state.

Weber (1946) also differed from Marx in that Weber viewed modern capitalism as inherently rational. Both corporate and public bureaucracies promoted efficiency, continuity of production, speed, precision in execution, and calculation of results. The system is dynamic and reduces human error by compelling the bureaucrat to be an expert in their area. Unfortunately, rationality of the process of government can result in mechanism, depersonalization, and oppressive routine. Weber sees bureaucracies selecting the type of man who is willing to give up personal liberty for financial security, a career, and a pension. He sees bureaucracies as demanding individuals who lack
heroism, spontaneity, and inventiveness in return for economic stability. Weber sees even
the followers of a charismatic leader eventually succumbing to their material interests and
losing their fervor for supporting the charismatic leader.

Weber denies Marx's "class struggle" is the central factor in the course of history. Weber sees socialism as the end product of a possible evolution of economic factors that would mimic the evolution of administration into bureaucracy. The modern state has already nationalized the weapons of war and the means of administration. This separation of the citizen from ownership of means of political power would be complemented by the economic separation of citizens from the ownership of the means of production. The bureaucracy of the state would then control all major factors of society. Weber could agree with Marx that the indispensability of a class leads to its political supremacy (Mills, 1993). Marx saw the capitalists replacing the feudalists and in turn being replaced by the proletariat. Weber saw the bureaucracy as potentially being the ultimate holders of power. Weber (1946) feared this ultimate control by bureaucracy as a shackle on individual liberty. He saw this possibility as the dictatorship of the official rather than Marx's dictatorship of the proletariat. His vision of bureaucratic supremacy tempered his admiration for the efficiency and effectiveness of bureaucracies.

In a parallel to Marx's premise that conflict arises between the forces of production and the relations of production (Mills, 1993), a bureaucracy that has attained control of the power of the state would then tend to inhibit innovation and growth. The interests of the bureaucracy would be in maintaining the established relations of production of governmental action while technology may facilitate the elimination of
segments of the bureaucracy. This reflects Weber’s idea that while mass democracy facilitates the development of democracy, mass democracy also is basically inimicable to the establishment of an elitism based on specialized knowledge and the protection of career oriented bureaucrats by rules and restrictions governing 1) removal from office and 2) oversight of the bureaucrats by elected officials. By analogy, the masses represent the expanding forces of production while the bureaucrats represent the ruling class interested in maintaining established relations of production.

A key factor in the impersonal orientation and career orientation found in Weber’s (1999) conceptualization of bureaucracies is in the separation of the bureaucrats from the means of production and from the stream of income. This has the same characteristic as modern capitalism. As the means of production in the forms of tools, equipment, and work sites are removed from the control of the artisans, laborers, and tradesmen, the workers become more dependent upon the actual owners, the people at the top of the hierarchy. Control of the means of production is in the hands of those to whom the bureaucrats must answer. This is true for both private and public bureaucracies. Increasing public ownership in modern societies results in increasing bureaucracy. The current economic structure of modern capitalistic society requires administration that can be rationally predicted because of its foundation on rationally established law and custom. This is best accomplished with a bureaucracy that has no immediate economic interest in the outcome of the decisions. The bureaucrat is to have no economic stake in the results of the bureaucracy’s decision beyond the stake of any other member of society.
Weber theorized that the abolition of private capitalism would lead to complete control of the economy by governmental bureaucracies. He felt that public and private bureaucracies checked each other to some degree. The abolition of private ownership would leave the government bureaucracy unchallenged. One of the strongest checks on bureaucracy was the existence at the top of the bureaucracy of a non-bureaucrat. This is the appointed head of the political agency in government and the entrepreneurial owner in private enterprise. These persons have a different type of responsibility than the bureaucrat. The bureaucrat may object to an order or directive, but must in the end carry it out. The political leader or entrepreneur is engaged directly in the struggle for power and has the responsibility of being the moving spirit rather than a mere functionary. The political leader and entrepreneur have the responsibility of opposing orders or directives that they feel are harmful or inefficient.

Individually, each bureaucrat has a private stake in the maintenance of the bureaucracy. Securing a position in the professional bureaucracy becomes dependent upon certification by education. The acquisition of the necessary education incurs an economic cost. The reward is a well-paying position with job security and fringe benefits including pension rights. The bureaucrat's financial security depends upon the continuing justification of the existence of the bureaucracy. Besides the economic advantages of gaining certification by examination, there is also a social prestige attached to the earning of degrees and the attainment of position by examination. The attainment of position by examination leads to claims for social status, for respectable remuneration, for advancement and retirement rights, and for a monopolization of socially and
economically advantageous positions. The attainment of position by degree and examination leads to a monopolization of positions by the holders of degrees. The economic costs to attain the degrees tend to increase while intellectual costs may decrease as the competition grows and the length of training increases. There is a dependency on property in order to support the student who is making a substantial outlay in order to obtain a degree. This dependency on property leads to a limitation of the pool of aspirants based on economic class.

Bureaucracies usually come into power concurrently or as a result of the leveling of social and economic differences (Weber, 1946). Bureaucracy accompanies mass democracy as rule by notables is contrary to the ideals of a democratic state. Bureaucracies with their impersonal orientation stand for equality before the law and the rejection of case-by-case decisions based upon individual characteristics of the parties involved. Non-bureaucratic administrations are based upon the awarding of administrative positions on the basis of social and/or economic position. Commonly, the administrative positions in non-bureaucratic administrations are used to solidify and enhance existing social and economic advantages.

Bureaucratization based on the democratic ideal of awarding bureaucratic positions on the basis of training open to all citizens does increase the costs to the state. The non-bureaucratic administrator was usually able to use their office as a source of income whether accomplished by tax farming, bribery, or fees for services rendered. The democratic bureaucrat receives a fixed salary and is separated from the direct stream of income to the state and so is dependent upon salaries from the state.
The rise of bureaucracies is accompanied by a shift in the relative power of different classes within the society. These differences may be based on economically determined origins of new classes that are the result of economic activities such as expanded trade and industrialization. Sometimes the shift came as a result of rulers' attempts to forge new coalitions in order to maintain or enhance their ruling position. The rise of bureaucracies has been slowest in nations where the rule by notables was more effective and the social structures less vulnerable to change.

Weber (1946) notes that in England and the United States, the financing of political parties gives political power to the individuals and groups that contribute to the winning candidates. Even the contributors to losing causes achieve some clout as potential backers for the current office holders in future elections. The gain of political influence by economic means is exemplified by the practice of some businesses and individuals in making contributions to both sides in a campaign. Capitalists realize the importance of influencing the governmental rules and regulations that affect their businesses. The legal and social leveling which generally accompanies the bureaucratization of governmental administration tends to favor an expansion of capitalist activities. However, bureaucracy is a tool that can be made to serve a wide variety of interests and systems of government not just modern capitalism and mass democracy. Weber (1946) cautions that bureaucratization tends to accompany mass democracy and a social leveling but points to many examples, especially in antiquity, in which extensive
bureaucracies where used by monarchies, plutocracies, and aristocracies. Bureaucracy tends to level those powers that stand in its way and not to necessarily level all social inequalities.

Weber (1946) stated the modern bureaucratic official enjoys a distinct social esteem. This is due to the distinction between the governed and those who do the governing. The social position of an official is partly due to laws insulating the official from reprisals by clients and by the jurisdictional limits that protect any individual bureaucrat from shouldering the lion’s share of the blame for failures. The ultimate blame for failure falls on the appointed official at the top of the hierarchy not on the individuals down the line. Weber pointed out that the social esteem of officials was particularly low in the United States with its low demand (written in the early 1900s) for expert administration and low regard for the status conventions due to the possibility for rapid change in social stratification.

**Effects on Education and Training**

Bureaucracy as conceived by Weber (1946) comes out of the movement to ‘rational’ thinking and ‘rational’ management of organizations. In turn, the prevalence of bureaucracies in a society’s organizations fosters the development of educational systems that produce ‘rational’ persons who fit into the bureaucratic model. In Weber’s Europe, he saw the rapid development of institutions and programs that prepared future bureaucrats for a system of special examinations and a life of concentrated knowledge in
a narrow field of expertise. While examination systems existed in the European and Middle Eastern churches and in China for centuries, they did not specifically cover the actual skills and knowledge needed for bureaucratic positions.

While an examination system is not necessary to bureaucracies, it is commonly instituted when the bureaucracy is formalized or it develops as the information needed to run the bureaucratic system grows. As modern society moves to full bureaucratization, the pressure for an examination system for entry and advancement in the bureaucracy grows. Weber also notes the ambivalence of democracy toward the examination system. On one hand, such a system is egalitarian in that there is a selection of officials from all social classes rather than rule by notables. On the other hand, educational certification and the merit system result in a privileged group based on the power of knowledge. Minority groups also fear that an examination system will be culturally loaded in favor of the majority.

One notable exception to the standard methods of recruitment and training of bureaucrats was the Ruling Institution of the Ottoman Turks (Gladden, 1971). The Ottoman Empire took slaves and made them the ministers of the state and generals of the army. The Moslem Turks took Christian boys by capture, purchase, gift, and most importantly by levy and trained them to run the government. This system presented a great opportunity for social advancement to boys from the captive provinces. Family and religious ties were cut and all allegiance was given to the Sultan who bestowed all honor and wealth on his ministers.
Bureaucracies that are responsible for education are often considered to have a 'mushy' product as described by Lieberthal and Lampton (1992) in their explication of the Chinese system. In any governmental system, it is difficult in the short term to determine the value of outputs as effects of various inputs of resources into educational systems. Educational bureaucracies tend to consume rather than generate resources. Educational systems often tend to produce values and behaviors that run counter to the values of governmental and business leaders. Educational bureaucracies tend to have less clout and fewer bargaining chips than the bureaucracies of other areas particularly bureaucracies dealing with economic activities.

Problems of Bureaucracies

Bureaucracies have been continually attacked and disparaged whether Russian bureaucracy under the Tsars or American bureaucracies in 2001. This is due to the dysfunctions that can arise from each of the elements of bureaucracies (Blau and Scott, 1962; Gouldner, 1954). Division of labor can lead to boredom and the inability or refusal to do any non-routine tasks. Impersonal orientation can lead to lack of morale due to a paucity of personal reinforcement and feedback. Hierarchy of authority can lead to communication blocks, elitism, and resentment. Rules and regulations can lead to rigidity and goal displacement when the means become the ends in themselves. Finally, career orientation can lead to conflict between achievement and seniority. Moving up the ladder may become more important to the bureaucrat than doing a good job.

Merton (1957) states that the bureaucrat is controlled by his social relations to the instruments of production. The very training and skills that insures continued
employment and career benefits lead to 'trained incapacities' when the normally appropriate responses become inappropriate under changed conditions. The constant pressures on the bureaucracy for precision, reliability, and efficiency lead to inflexible thinking and responses. The means to efficient administration become ends required by the rules. The bureaucratic tendency is to overconformity and depersonalization in relationships with clients and coworkers. This makes it especially difficult for an outside expert or 'intellectual' to fit into the bureaucratic structure. Merton sees intellectuals as accustomed to a degree of personal autonomy that is often not afforded them when they go to work for a bureaucracy.

Scott (1998) sees the problems in terms of pathologies. These pathologies, which are exaggerated manifestations of the elements of bureaucracies, have negative consequences for participants (bureaucrats) and the public. He cites alienation, inequity, and overconformity as problems for the participants. Problems for the public primarily are unresponsiveness and relentlessness.

Alienation has many parts including sense of powerlessness and sense of self-estrangement. These two facets of alienation are particularly relevant in the bureaucratic setting. The bureaucrats may feel that they are simply cogs in a machine as envisioned by Weber. Their feelings may be that they are easily replaceable and do not have any impact in the goals and direction of the bureaucracy. This is largely due to imposition of rules and procedures from above. The lack of discretion in problem solving and decision-making leaves the subordinate bureaucrat with feelings of powerlessness (Scott, 1998).
In the school bureaucracy, Isherwood and Hoy (1973) theorized that sense of powerlessness would affect teachers differently depending upon the orientation of the teacher and the type of school in terms of bureaucratic structure. Isherwood and Hoy delineated three types of teacher work value orientation. Professional work values are held by teachers who value professionalism, knowledge, and their field of specialization. Organizational work values are held by teachers who identify with the goals and values of the organization, conformity to system policy, and promotion into supervisory positions. Social work values are held by teachers who identify with the values and goals of membership in their work group, home and family, religion and society's conventions.

Using two factors, authority and expertise, the schools used in the study clearly fell into two categories, Authoritarian and Collegial. The factor of authority contained the Weberian dimensions of hierarchy, rules, procedures, and impersonality. The factor of expertise contained the dimensions of division of labor and technical competence. Authoritarian school structure was high on emphasis of the factor of authority and low on the factor of expertise. Collegial schools were high on expertise and low on authority.

Isherwood and Hoy first hypothesized that in schools characterized by an Authoritarian structure, teachers with professional work values will experience a higher sense of powerlessness than will teachers with organizational or social work values. The second hypothesis was that in schools characterized by a collegial bureaucratic structure, teachers with organizational work values will experience a higher sense of powerlessness than will teachers with professional or social work values. The first hypothesis was partially supported by the statistically significant finding that in Authoritarian schools,
teachers with professional work values had greater sense of powerlessness than socially oriented teachers. The second hypothesis was partially supported by the statistically significant finding that organizationally oriented teachers in a collegial structure had a greater sense of powerlessness than teachers with professional work values.

Additionally, there was the statistically significant finding that as a single group, teachers in Authoritarian schools experienced a greater sense of powerlessness than teachers in Collegial schools. Teachers with professional and with mixed work values comprised 89% of the sample and these two groups in particular felt a greater sense of powerlessness in Authoritarian schools than in Collegial schools.

Self-estrangement is partly due to the demand by constituents that they be treated in a friendly, helpful manner. This is not unreasonable on its face, but often constituents and superiors do not treat the bureaucrat in this manner. The forced emotional expression by bureaucrats dealing with superiors and with clients inflicts a psychological toll on the bureaucrats. Argyris (1982) asserts that workers who feel such constraints on the job are affected in their actions as employees and in the enjoyment of the other aspects of their lives.

Hoy, Blazovsky, and Newland (1983) studied alienation as it relates to centralization and formalization in schools. Following the lead of Aiken and Hage (1966) they subdivided alienation into alienation from work and alienation from expressive relations. Alienation from work is dissatisfaction with one's position in the organization. It is based on the perceptions of position in the hierarchy, career expectations, recognition
and acceptance, and comparisons with the status of other workers. Alienation from expressive relations is the extent of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with superiors and with fellow workers.

Hoy, Blazovsky, and Newland use Pugh’s (Pugh et al., 1963) definition of centralization as “...the locus of authority to make decisions affecting the organization.” Two important characteristics of centralization are differentiated, hierarchy of authority and participation in decision-making. Both of these characteristics vary from organization to organization in the degree to which they are present. Formalization is determined by the degree to which work requirements have been standardized and by the amount of deviation from the standards that is permitted (Aiken and Hage, 1966). Work requirements standardization depends on job codification or the extent to which rules and regulations guide the work. Deviation from standards or rule observation is determined by the degree to which superiors monitor work. These two characteristics of formalization are independent. Obviously, there can be situations with a plethora of rules and regulations that are not enforced and situations in which there are few rules that are rigorously enforced.

Hoy, Blazovsky and Newland used Aiken and Hage’s indices to measure the two alienation variables and the characteristics of bureaucracies. Aiken and Hage (1966) studied bureaucrats in social welfare agencies while Hoy, Blazovsky, and Newland studied high schools in New Jersey. Hoy and his colleagues found a strong positive relationship between alienation from work and hierarchy of authority and a strong negative relationship between alienation from work and participation in decision-making.
The measures of formalization, job codification and rule observation, were also positively correlated with alienation from work. Centralization and formalization measures had weaker correlations with alienation from expressive relations. The correlations with expressive relations were still significantly positive for hierarchy of authority and rule observation and significantly negatively correlated for participation in decision-making. Job codification did not show a significant correlation. These finding were similar to those found by Aiken and Hage (1966) in regard to alienation from work. However, Aiken and Hage found a far stronger correlation between rule observation and alienation from expressive relations and a weaker correlation between participation in decision-making and alienation from expressive relations in social welfare agencies than Hoy and his colleagues found in high schools.

Further, Hoy and his colleagues found that schools have a significantly more centralized structure than social welfare agencies. In schools, there is more hierarchy of authority and less participation in decision-making. Of course, this study was done before the push in the 1980s and 1990s for shared decision-making and participatory management of schools. The high schools in the study were found to have fewer rules and regulations (job codification) but the rules in the high schools were much more strictly enforced by superiors in the bureaucratic hierarchy. Within the two types of organizations, the indices of centralization and formalization were much more highly correlated in the high schools than in the social welfare agencies.

Hoy and his colleagues conclude that greater levels of work alienation are found in high school with high levels of centralization and formalization. The high levels of
bureaucratic structure are also significantly correlated with alienation from expressive relations with the exception of job codification. No social welfare agency exhibited the degree of hierarchy of authority and rule enforcement as high as the school with the lowest level of these characteristics. The high schools showed statistically significant higher means in both types of alienation than the social welfare agencies. However, the relatively moderate levels of alienation found in the high schools lead Hoy and his colleagues to theorize that teachers differentiate between administrative and professional tasks. They see themselves controlled in administrative matters even though they have a high degree of professional autonomy in the classroom.

Scott (1998) also cites inequities in the bureaucracy as a source of problems for bureaucrats. While there have been advances in equalitarian standards of employment since the 1960s, there still exists inequities in employment, advancement, and earnings. This is particularly true in comparisons between white males and women and between whites and nonwhites. On a positive note, bureaucracies under systems such as Civil Service have minimized earnings variations. Affirmative action has made improvements in the disparities in hiring practices. However, jobs still remain highly segregated by gender and the jobs held primarily by men are higher paying.

Overconformity is present when adherence to rules and regulations become ends rather than means to ends. Two of the elements of bureaucracies, the vertical hierarchy and the use of rules and regulations, are particularly strong causes. Combined with the elements of career orientation and division of labor with specialization of tasks, overconformity becomes the survival mode for many bureaucrats. Overconformity can be
minimized if the superiors in the vertical hierarchy make clear the expectations are to achieve the organizational goals rather than maintain the status quo (Ashworth, 2001). Organizational goals must be developed with the needs of the clients foremost. Superiors must give subordinates the feeling that they are in control of their work. Delegation of authority and responsibility spark innovation and effort. The bureau is more productive and there is an increase in esprit.

Extreme centralization of decision-making facilitated by the hierarchical structure leads directly to overconformity. A proliferation of rules and regulations cuts into problem solving and decision making discretion. If the rules and regulations are enforced down the hierarchy, overconformity to the detriment of innovative thinking and problem solving is the result. Scott (1998) points out that overconformity and goal displacement are not unique to bureaucracies. Overconformity and goal displacement is found in many settings and aspects of modern society.

This need not be so. Kohn (1971) surveyed the effects of bureaucracies on attitudes. His findings were that men in modern American bureaucracies were not affected in their attitudes:

Men who work in bureaucratic firms or organizations tend to value, not conformity, but self-direction. They are more open-minded, have more personally responsible standards of morality, and are more receptive to change than are men who work in non-bureaucratic organizations. They show greater flexibility in dealing both with perceptual and with ideological problems. (p. 465)

Kohn's finding was that modern bureaucracies tend to have a liberalizing effect. Aiken and Hage (1968) contend that as organizations increase their division of labor, they
become more complex and innovative. Innovations increase the need for resources. This increased need promotes increased interdependent relations with the environment. Often these new relationships then in turn increase internal specialization and complexity.

Typically, a member of the public who has a complaint with a bureaucracy will indicate unresponsiveness as the problem. Weber (1946) saw the greatest danger of a bureaucracy as the power position built upon the specialized knowledge and skills fostered by division of labor and career orientation of bureaucrats. The bureaucracy tends to gain power as a collective even though individuals may have little power. This collective tends to become absorbed in self-preservation and attempts to minimize the effects of external groups on the workings of the collective. Resulting instances of unresponsiveness range from weak attempts to help individual constituents to being overly responsive to special interest groups with the resulting detriment of response to the general public (Scott, 1998).

Scott (1998) sees relentlessness as potentially the most serious threat from bureaucracies, yet this is the problem that has had the least attention from researchers. Bureaucracies and other organizations have become a dominant force in the direction of social and economic development. The creation of a bureaucracy brings into existence a new entity with a new set of interests. The individuals comprising the bureaucracy give up varying amounts of their autonomy in order to benefit from membership in the bureaucracy. The interests of the collective bureaucracy become the interests of the
individual bureaucrats. The bureaucracy can become relentless in the advancement of its own interests to the detriment of both constituents and the superiors who are nominally in command of the bureaucracy.

Hartman (1997) sees Weber's fondness for quantification and rationality as holes in the overall theory. Hartman states that quantification of outputs and inputs as the evaluative criteria for bureaucracies sidesteps the real issues of making decisions about how to evaluate work, allocates resources, and establish goals. That which is not easily quantified tends to be overlooked or devalued in bureaucratic valuing. Rationality may be the most efficient choice of means to reach organizational goals. But there is no guarantee that the goals have been chosen on a rational basis. Managing by rules is done with the awareness that no set of rules can cover all circumstances so managers tend to invoke rules when the rules suit their purposes and invoke rationality and/or intuition when the rules do not suit the purposes of the bureaucrats. Hartman further contends that Weber's view of the world is a naive assumption that if the right system with the right training of the best people implementing the right set of rules were established, then the bureaucracy would be infallible.

In schools, the economic production function is not quantifiable (Hanushek, 1986). In business applications, production functions are assumed to be known precisely by the decision makers. Relatively few inputs are used which can be precisely measured and standard units of outputs can be exactly counted. The educational production function is unknown to both decision makers and researchers. The production function must be estimated using imperfect data and unproven theories. Inputs cannot be freely varied and
some (students) cannot be controlled at least in the public schools. The relative values of
inputs are subject to personal and political biases. Legislatures, courts, parents, educators,
and voters each have a different view of the relative importance of the various inputs and
the amounts necessary for student achievement. In addition, there is no consensus on the
relative values of the outputs and how they can be measured. Student achievement is
viewed in many different ways by the contending parties.

Weick (1994) discusses organizations that have a more pressing issue in reliability
than in efficiency. In nuclear industries and the space program, the major learning strategy
of trial and error is not viable. Accidents occur because humans are less complex than the
systems they operate. Humans are unable to sense and anticipate problems in complex
systems due to the lack of 'requisite variety.' When people have less variety than the
system, there are two possibilities: make the system less complex and make the human
operators more complex. Adding diverse types of individuals is a way of adding requisite
variety. Divergent groups have more requisite variety than homogeneous groups.
However, this runs counter to the bureaucratic model's emphasis on uniformity in
decision-making and action. Adding divergent individuals to achieve requisite variety
weakens impersonal orientation and often career orientation. Certain types of individuals
such as intellectuals (Merton, 1957) and professionals (Blau & Scott, 1962) do not fit
well into bureaucracies and tend to leave after relatively short periods of time. Having
only homogeneous groups in the bureaucracy has the same effect as building redundancy
into a system. Common errors are found but a group with diverse points of view better
foressees the unusual, potentially catastrophic error.
One problem with diversity in the group is that trust is more difficult to establish (Weick, 1994). It is necessary for face-to-face communications to take place in order to assess and build trust. Face-to-face contact also adds to the richness of the data received from other individuals. The element of trust is important in a crisis situation when delegation of responsibility is necessary. One person cannot cover all areas so the superior in the hierarchy must maintain the overall view and trust subordinates to carry out their jobs. Training and consistent oversight lead to a condition where the subordinate is trusted in an emergency but mistakes tend to creep in when situations are normal. Normal situations tend to encourage complacency and the attention of the worker flags. Small errors can enlarge to a dangerous point so it is important to develop a group mentality of searching for incipient errors rather than waiting for developed problems.

Bureaucracies insure uniformity and rationality through specialized training. Weick (1994) sees this type of training as a source of errors. The individual is discouraged from seeking innovative solutions during the training program and this carries over to the job. First tendencies learned in training are crucial because they reappear when pressure increases. Additionally, training settings may not be congruent to work settings unless the training is 'on the job.' On the other hand, if the training is very good, there is no pattern to the errors due to random distribution and so there is no way to predict and prepare for errors.

Overload of the human operators is often the result of the complexity of the situation. Removing the problem of complexity from the humans through automated systems runs the risk of disaster if the automated system goes down and humans are
forced to pick up the pieces. Systems need to be designed to accommodate human
limitations rather than bypass those limitations and thus become dependent upon
automation. Human discretion must be allowed to be applied in unusual situations.

Weick (1994) sees a lack of information richness as a source of error in industries
requiring high reliability in operation and decision-making. He states that face-to-face
communication provides the highest information richness but bureaucracies with an
emphasis on written communication, e-mail, and telephone contacts minimize
information richness. He cites the example of the Challenger disaster when the
communication between the bureaucracy at Morton Thiokol and the bureaucracy at
NASA consisted of a conference call that diluted the effects of the concerns of the
engineers at Morton Thiokol by eliminating visual cues from the faces and body language
of the concerned engineers.

Public perception of the cost and number of bureaucrats/administrators in
bureaucracies is another problem. Riley (1999) attempts to refute the often-used argument
that school bureaucracies are top-heavy and far too costly than they need to be. He
counters Brimelow's (1998) article that contends that bureaucrats are too numerous.
Brimelow pointed out that in seven states, over half of the total staff is not classroom
teachers. One of these states is Indiana in which Brimelow identifies 47.3% of the total
staff as classroom teachers and 52.7% as personnel outside the classroom. The
implication is that many of these nonteaching personnel are administrators and central
office bureaucrats. Brimelow based his arguments on large categories and failed to break
down the nonteaching category into its many components.

81

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Brimelow further implied that nonteaching staff in the form of administrators typically is better paid than the classroom teachers. While this is true, Riley showed that the percentage of nonteaching personnel who are administrators/bureaucrats is relatively small. He examined the original data from the National Center for Education Statistics (1996), which was the basis for analysis. This data breaks total staff into several categories and clearly separates administrative categories from other nonteaching personnel categories.

Per NCES definitions, personnel who could be classified as administrators and central office bureaucracy would comprise only 4.4% of the total of school employees in Indiana. A similar percentage of the nonclassroom teacher category is comprised of psychologists, speech and hearing pathologists, counselors, and other workers who are paid on the same schedule as teachers. These are not classroom teachers per se but they perform the same basic educational function with low incidence populations or in specialized fields. The vast majority of nonteaching personnel include secretarial and clerical staff, custodians, bus drivers, food service workers, maintenance staff, and security. While many of these workers work all year, their total annual earnings do not come close to those of classroom teachers.

Riley points out that the specialization of tasks differentiates earnings in the public schools just as it does in the private sector. Administrators receive higher wages than classroom teachers because they have building or district wide responsibilities.
Direct support of the teachers in terms of curriculum development, discipline, instructional coordination, supply of materials, and finance is needed for efficiency in providing classroom instruction.

Protheroe (1999) lists six myths identified by the Educational Research Service concerning administration. They are 1) administration is an unnecessary burden on schools, 2) there are too many administrators, 3) the number of administrators is growing, 4) administrators are paid too much, 5) increasing amounts of budgets goes to administration, and 6) money spent on administration could be better spent for other purposes.

To refute these assertions, Protheroe cites data collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that shows that the ratio of nonsupervisory employees to each administrator/manager is the highest of ten industries examined. Education has a ratio of 13.5 staff per administrator with the next highest being hospitals at 12.6. This compares to ratios of 6.2 for all manufacturing and 3.5 for public administration.

She points out that although there have been large increases in total administrative costs, much of the increase is due to inflation and enrollment increases. Public, political, and judicial demands have also contributed to the number of tasks the administrators in a school district are required to complete.

As a percentage of the total budget, central office administration and board services has declined from 4.8% to 4.5% from 1982-83 to 1996-97. Principals and assistant principal percentages declined from 5.8% to 5.6% over the same time period. Total instructional services which is largely teacher salaries increased from 63.3% to
69.8% in the same time frame. Nationwide during the 1995-96 school year, central office and administrative staff comprised only 1% of the total public school staff. Principals and assistant principals added another 2.4% (Protheroe, 1999).

Odden and Busch (1998) assert that school administrative expense is modest compared to other organizations. Public school administrators receive less compensation compared to administrators in other occupations who have comparable numbers in staff supervised and budgetary responsibility. Elimination of central office administration would free only 1.8% of the total district budget. If this small amount of money were spent elsewhere, school districts would eliminate fiscal services, transportation coordination, and personnel administration. These responsibilities would need to be performed at some other level reducing any possible savings and quite possibly coming at increased costs.

Pugh et al. (1963) see a problem in the difference between the growth of bureaucracy and the growth of bureaucratization. The growth of bureaucracy is the development of bureaucratic organizations while bureaucratization is the extension of power by bureaucracies into new areas and the gain of control of those areas. Growth in bureaucracies is spurred by societal factors such as mass democracy, needs for efficiency, and belief in meritocracies. Growth in bureaucratization is based on the relationship between bureaucracies, government, and society and the aggressive actions of the bureaucrats.

Problems in bureaucracies may be specific to local or regional cultural norms. In East and Southeast Asia, the relationships between people and the nature of the state
leads to a bureaucratic situation that appears dysfunctional (Turner & Halligan, 1999). The pathologies described by Scott (1998) of aloofness, overformalization, resistance to change, and unresponsiveness are cultural norms in many parts of Asia. Patronage between officials and clients is a centuries old tradition that has not been supplanted by the need for bureaucratic efficiency. Finally, many Asian peoples have had a long reliance on governmental bureaucracies and have developed less mental resistance to governmental intervention and control than is found in Western countries.

'Typical' Asian values have been credited with both the rapid development of Korea and the slow development of China. Values such as group reference, conflict avoidance, maintaining 'face', respect for authority and elders, paternalism, respect for academic credentials, undervaluation of women, cosmology and superstition, and family support are considered assets when they aid economic growth and as detriments in bureaucratic and governmental systems marked by conservatism and authoritarianism (Turner & Halligan, 1999).

**Bias in Bureaucracies**

Bureaucracies are attacked by feminists as institutions dominated by males and based on masculine values. Since bureaucracy is based on masculine values, it necessarily rewards masculine behavior and values such as competition, power, and hierarchy (Martin and Knopoff, 1997). This male dominated oligarchy is perpetuated by cooptation so that the make-up of the elite does not change. Additionally, this domination is reinforced by the intertwining of public and private bureaucracies (Ferguson, 1984). Feminists say it is not enough to explore ways women can better fit into the existing
bureaucratic structures. Instead, feminism looks at how bureaucracies can be changed to better utilize and value the capabilities of women. Martin and Knopoff (1997) contend that although many organizational theorists state that Weber's bureaucratic model is gender neutral, Weber was really just supporting the established gender inequalities of his time.

Martin and Knopoff (1997) contend that Weber's lack of attention to inequities shows a tacit adherence to the class, racial, and gender prejudices of the early 20th century. They attack Weber's suppositions that many of the developments in bureaucracies are 'natural' as dogmatic and intended to avoid discussion of weaknesses in his arguments. Weber's contentions such as the inevitable development of bureaucracy from mass democracy are seen as avoidance of the pertinent questions of what viable alternatives exist to bureaucracies. They also reject Weber's characterization of bureaucracies by such adjectives as rational, impersonal, and objective as valuing viewpoints that are traditionally male and as a result devaluing viewpoints that are traditionally female. Hartman (1997) seconds this with the observation that although what is rational changes over time, it is always men who get to decide what is rational and what is not. Hartman sees male bonding and the retention of the good old boy system as greater threats to equity for women that any structural deficits of bureaucracies. Further, he sees legislative remedies for gender and other inequities as inadequate without a concurrent change in attitudes on the part of the males entrenched in the power positions of the bureaucracies.
Martin and Knopoff (1997) see Weber’s admission that bureaucracies strengthen the position of those in power as condoning male domination of political, economic, and governmental structures. The process is the problem since the official usually comes from socially and economically privileged classes due to the costs of training needed to move into the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy strengthens the social and economic status of the bureaucrats. The bureaucracy is needed to help the socially and economically advantaged maintain their privileged, consumption oriented lifestyle.

Impersonal rule by rules is seen as a rejection of the values of nurturing, personal, emotional, and sympathetic behaviors that are generally characterized as feminine. Weber’s praise of bureaucracy as eliminating decisions based on love, hate, emotion, and sympathy is seen as dehumanizing and pandering to the aggressive (masculine) behaviors of capitalism (Martin & Knopoff, 1997). Martin and Knopoff further contend that Weber realized that the exclusion of emotions in decision-making is impossible to attain and so his arguments in this area are particularly dogmatic with the intention of hiding the weaknesses in his arguments. Weber’s rejection of making decisions on a ‘case by case’ basis is seen as a prohibition on any attempts to provide substantive justice and as a furtherance of the interests of the established economic and social elites.

A practical gender issue examined by Martin and Knopoff (1997) is derived from Weber’s element of written documents covering all decisions, rules, regulations, and actions of a bureaucracy. They see jobs in modern bureaucracies as rigidly sex segregated. Males dominate the decision-making levels of bureaucracies while females are predominant at the lower levels that handle the clerical positions of processing the written
records. This is the cause of gender-based inequities in pay and promotion. Another gender issue is that the training necessary to move up the hierarchical ladder is constrained to the advantage of men. This constraint is the same as that for the more than full-time commitment needed for the career-oriented bureaucrat. This constraint consists of binding the official to the activities of the organization so that time devoted to family and child rearing duties is minimal. This hardship falls principally upon women who retain the bulk of home keeping and child rearing even if they are full-time workers.

Ferguson (1997) extends the criticism to a questioning of the moral and political legitimacy of the practices of business organizations. The real problem is not the abuses and excesses of organizations and the people in power in the organizations but rather why these people and these organizations have power. She contends that liberal feminism which calls for equity in organizations is not enough. There must be a questioning of the basic values of organizations by radical feminists. Modern capitalism and the business and governmental bureaucracies that support it have disseminated a value system that is largely taken for granted in industrialized nations. Part of this value system is that labor traditionally done by women is devalued. The process of maternal thinking is in opposition to the bureaucratic goal of self-sustaining activities. Maternal thinking strives to make itself unnecessary as the child grows to adulthood while bureaucracies seek to maintain and extend their power. The ‘thoughtful feeling’ in maternal thinking is in opposition to the male oriented dichotomy of reason versus passion found in organizational values.
Larson and Ovando (2001) maintain that bureaucracies in schools sustain racial and ethnic inequities that are the products of the logic of a racist hierarchy. They contend that feminist critiques have exposed the masculine biases of bureaucracies, but the racial and ethnic biases are only just in the beginning stage of exposure. Bureaucracies are the product of and controlled by the dominant culture in a society. Bureaucratic logic in American society is based on the philosophy of sociological positivism and its post positivist modifications. This philosophy assumes that there is one universal reality, so there is one right answer in any situation. Bureaucracies search for that universal reality, define it, and strive to maintain it through rules, regulations, and established practices. Bureaucratic logic assumes the answer determined by the application of the bureaucracy’s rules and procedures in the one right answer for the situation.

Larson and Ovando decry the machine metaphor that naturally arises from structural functionalism. They see conflict and diversity as possibilities for progress and efficiency that are shunned by the current bureaucratic values for maintaining order, stability, and harmony. Further, the logic of structural hierarchy is based on domination as the accepted form of leadership. Top-down bureaucratic systems prevent staff at all levels from seeing themselves as agents for change. Each level tends to see the level above it as the agents of the bureaucracy.

The closed bureaucratic system forces nondominant groups into public protest. Since there are no opportunities for working within the system, both peaceful and violent protest have given nondominant groups the best opportunity for changing the system.
(Edelman, 1977; Jasper, 1997). Interfering with the order, stability, and harmony of the bureaucratic system has proven to be the best way to force concessions from the bureaucrats.

Fine (1992) sees the bureaucracy as ignoring the real issues for minorities through "white noise, or administrative silencing" (120). Administrators will not speak about real problems and only repeat the statistics that can be given a positive spin. Administrators justify their reluctance to speak about the real problems of minorities by claiming that "naming" the problem can be construed as discrimination. Fine contends the real discrimination comes from the majority's assumptions that naming the problems would only incite discontent and that there is little that the school system can actually do. She also contends that minority students are socialized by the school system to ask no questions for fear of being considered disruptive. This bureaucratic logic assumes that dissension cannot be productive especially when it comes from a dissatisfied minority student.

Naturally, any institution cannot satisfy all clients and participants equally. Even if this were achieved, individual perceptions would be that treatment and benefits were unequal. Criticisms are necessarily framed by the standpoint of the individual and of the groups to which the individual belongs.

**Enabling versus Hindering Bureaucracies**

Hoy and Sweetland (2000) identify bureaucracies as being either enabling or coercive/hindering. They identify enabling bureaucracy as a bipolar concept that varies along a continuum ranging from enabling to hindering. Whether a bureaucracy is enabling
or hindering depends on two of the basic characteristics of bureaucracies, formalization and centralization. Formalization is generally seen as the degree to which a bureaucracy has written rules, procedures, regulations, and policies. Centralization is concerned with the locus of authority and the diffusion of decision-making authority in the organization.

Adler and Borys (1996) focused on formalization in the bureaucracy. They defined formalization as organizational technology. They identified two basic types of formalization, enabling and coercive. Formalization was defined 1) as rules and regulations and 2) as job specialization with defined job procedures. Enabling formalization helps employees to do their tasks. Coercive formalization is the attempt by management to control employees' efforts. Coercive bureaucracies punish for failure to follow the standards of formalization rather than reward productive progress toward goal fulfillment. On the whole, formalization in schools is generally related to job stress and dissatisfaction (Isherwood & Hoy, 1973; Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

Enabling formalization can provide guidelines, reduce stress by defining goals, delineate responsibilities, and generally support employee problem solving. Rules are used as guidelines to best practice and not as binding cords that restrict any leeway on the part of the bureaucrats. Coercive formalization stifles creativity in problem solving. This inflexibility tends to make employees dissatisfied and unmotivated in their jobs.

Hoy and Sweetland (2000) further refine the contrast between enabling and coercive formalization with opposing lists of characteristics contrasting enabling formalization and coercive formalization respectively. Communication can be two-way
communication or top-down communication. Problems may be viewed as opportunities or constraints. Differences may be encouraged or be met with suspicion. Enabling formalization promotes trust while coercive promotes distrust. Enabling formalization learns from mistakes while coercive punishes mistakes. The unexpected brings either delight in enabling formalization or fear in coercive formalization.

Studies show that most employees work in an environment with extensive formalization (Marsden, Cook, & Knoke, 1994). School districts in Ohio and most states have extensive policy manuals that are continually updated with the help of state associations for administrators and boards of education. These associations have extensive legal staffs to keep up with current case law and legislation. Most districts adopt state association recommendations as a protective measure against lawsuits.

Arches (1991) found formalization had negative connotations for many employees. Positive associations were found between formalization and the number of instances of absences, quitting, stress, self-estrangement, and alienation. Negative associations were found with job satisfaction and innovation.

But other studies have found that work is fulfilling and not the disutility that it is considered in the economic model. Thus, bureaucracies have the ability to enhance the lives of their employees. The employees would then welcome formalization as a facilitation of task performance (Deming, 1986; Schonberger, 1986). Other studies have shown that formalization reduces role conflict, feelings of alienation, and role ambiguity.
Formalization can be positively correlated with employee’s attitudes and stress reduction (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Stevens, Diedriks, & Philipsen, 1992).

Stevens, Diedriks, and Philipsen (1992) found that formalization in the form of structured routines added to the satisfaction of professionals particularly when the professionals had a part in developing the routines. The routines limit role ambiguity and can give the workers a sense of ownership in the work environment. As long as professional autonomy and a good affective work climate are maintained, formalization is a positive factor in job satisfaction. Desire for professional autonomy increased as the level of standardization increased. Amount of contact time with clients compared to time spent on other activities such as administrative duties also had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. The amount of satisfaction also varied with position in the hierarchy. Those higher on the hierarchy had greater satisfaction partly due to the workload. Professionals lower on the hierarchy tend to get the jobs that are less desirable and which carry a higher workload. This is commonly found in schools with new teachers teaching basic courses which tend to have higher enrollments and in hospitals where the residents have traditionally been given heavy workloads.

Adler and Borys’ (1996) interpretation of the conflicting results cited above is that the studies cover situations that contain both “good” and “bad” rules. They contend that the studies do not adequately differentiate between the two types of rules. Organizational theory has done little to assess the “goodness” of a rule. Gouldner (1954) theorizes that the best model of formalization occurs when rules and regulations serve the interests of
both managers and the employees of the bureaucracy. Naturally, the assessment of identically worded rules will vary from organization to organization, employee to employee, and from one time period to another. Each rule’s goodness must be assessed in terms of how it contributes to job performance and the satisfaction of employees, clients, and the organization’s welfare.

Scott (1998) stresses that formalization is based on the premises that rules should be precise and explicit and that roles are independent of the personalities and characteristics of the persons in the bureaucratic positions. This fits with Weber’s elements of administration by rules and regulations, impersonal orientation, and division of labor associated with technical specialization.

Adler and Borys’ (1996) concept of enabling formalization draws from the concepts of formalization as organizational memory that codifies best practices and enables the bureaucracy to best meet its goals and develop new capabilities (Blau, 1955; Nelson & Winter, 1982; Walsh & Ungson, 1991). Conversely, coercive formalization is not user friendly. Any deviation by the bureaucrat is considered improper no matter how positive the results. Compliance with procedures and standards are used as the yardstick for employee competence rather than successful job completion.

Adler and Borys (1996) further contend that enabling formalization will result in positive attitudes no matter what type of organization and what type of work is performed. Additionally, the degree of formalization is not the measure of determining
whether or not formalization is enabling or coercive. As Gouldner (1954) argues above, assessment must be made in terms of facilitation of job performance that in turn determines the ability of the organization to meet its goals.

Weber (1947) argued that an external stimulus was needed to maintain an organization's striving for adjustment and improvement. If the organization does not have an outside force to contend with or problems to solve, it tends to focus inwardly and become coercive as the internal groups and individuals contend with each other for status and rewards. However, external stimuli do not insure an enabling bureaucracy. In fact, external threats may be used as justification for instituting more coercive measures in an organization. There is some evidence that enabling formalization is positively correlated with external stimuli at least in for-profit organizations (Damanpour, 1991).

Adler and Borys (1996) identify three tendencies that encourage the formation of enabling bureaucracies. The first is the trend in U.S. society toward favoring enabling behavior. Coercive behavior tends to increase conflict. Conflict resolution and consensus is increasingly valued in U.S. society. The second tendency is that organizations under competitive pressure are more willing to try new methods including wider distribution of power. It is not efficient to keep any segment of employees from making possible contributions to the improvement of the organization's performance. The third tendency is that increased automation increases the need for the enabling form of management. Technology that enables employees to be problem solvers rather than cogs in the machine is more productive in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.
For educational institutions, the first trend listed above is particularly relevant. Larson (1997) describes a school situation in which adhering to the logic of bureaucratic control was costly to the administrators involved. The Weberian view is that order in society is continually being negotiated (Weber, 1946). This means that administrators must be flexible and able to deal with changing interest groups and changing demands. Various interest groups engage in a political struggle to establish unanimity for their respective positions.

In Larson’s study the district was changing in demographic make-up. But the administrators were influenced by the desire to maintain the status quo. This view was reinforced by the views of a large and influential section of the community. The administrators and many of the faculty remembered the “good old days” and attempted to maintain that situation in the school. The administrators attempted to maintain control through the bureaucratic procedures that had always worked in the past.

The administrators in the study wanted to maintain an image of certainty and control. In contrast, the leadership of the minority community wanted the administrators to use new ways of dealing with the student problems. The minority community was able to achieve their goals through coalition building, mobilization of interested parties, public protest, and effective use of negative media attention. These were strategies and tactics that the administrators had never had to face before. They were unable to adjust their bureaucratic logic to the new situation. The administrators were unable to deal with the new situation using the old methods. Eventually the administrators were overruled and removed by their superiors.
Larson's analysis is that the logic of bureaucratic control was substituted for effective leadership. This eventually leads to a breakdown in the face of ever changing conditions. Greene (1988) points out that rules and policies provide no easy assurances that the decisions administrators make are the right ones. No rule or policy, disciplinary or otherwise, can ever be finished or complete or capture the complexity of organizational life within any school community.

Larson applies Edelman's (1977) theory of political language to this case. Edelman states that administrators are often better at shaping beliefs about their actions than in meeting the problems that need to be solved. These beliefs are the basis of their political thinking and actions. These beliefs limit the range of responses that the bureaucrats have available.

Edelman's view of the difference between a bureaucrat and a thinking person is in the way they frame the problems that must be met by the organization. In this situation, the assistant principals and principal framed their actions as impersonal and neutral. They based their behavior on past practices and on following rules and regulations. Administrators often justify bureaucratic impersonality by framing their functioning in the organization as that of roles, not of whole persons.

Edelman (1977) states that administrators/bureaucrats often limit their problem solving responses to their current skills and scope of authority. Administrators often feel compelled to meet problems within these limits of skills and authority. Information and courses of action that are incompatible with their beliefs and interests are not considered. Information and expertise outside of the bureaucracy is not sought or accepted.
Besides formalization, centralization is a characteristic of bureaucracies that ranges along a continuum from high to low but can also be rated along a continuum from enabling to hindering. Centralization is based on hierarchy of authority. It may be defined as the degree to which employees participate in decision-making (Hoy and Sweetland, 2000). High centralization means that the decision making power is concentrated at the top of the hierarchy. Since the few dictate to the many, high centralization is typically seen as coercive. With high levels of centralization, the information is meant to flow from the top down and each level is supposed to follow the directives without interpretation at the lower levels.

Hierarchy of authority in some form is necessary for the functioning of any large organization according to the Weberian model. Even schools, which have a great deal of authority residing in the individual teacher, cannot function without a hierarchy in the bureaucracy. If nothing else, it is necessary to meet the growing accountability requirements imposed from outside the school and school district.

With too great a concentration of decision making at the top, the members of the bureaucracy and the clients it serves often feel alienation, hostility, and dissatisfaction (Aiken and Hage, 1968; Hoy, Blazovsky, and Newland, 1983; Mintzberg, 1989). However, Hirschhorn (1997) claims that centralization can be enabling when the bureaucrats and employees have clearly defined roles and work within those roles. There is currently a trend toward collaboration and diffusion of authority in schools as well as other organizations. This situation still requires clear role definitions and members of the organization who are willing to fulfill their responsibilities.
Hoy and Sweetland (2001) conceptualize hindering centralization as hierarchy of authority that impedes rather than helps employees solve problems and complete their tasks. Innovation is stifled and the actions of employees are controlled and disciplined. In schools, teachers have a large degree of professional autonomy in the classroom. Teachers have a large investment in time and money in specialized training. These two factors tend to make them resistant to arbitrary rules and regulations that do not contribute to the education of students. In return, resistance to the hierarchy typically induces the hierarchy to increase supervision and control. The circle becomes more vicious until outside forces intervene or one of the parties is forced to make concessions.

Enabling centralization helps employees solve problems by allowing different levels of the hierarchy to work across role and hierarchy boundaries (Hirschhorn, 1997). In the school, teachers are able to make innovative flexible decisions to help students achieve (Hoy and Sweetland, 2001). So, although hierarchy of authority is inevitable in schools as in all large organizations, it can be used to facilitate rather than hinder or coerce.

Hoy and Sweetland (2000) investigated 1) hierarchical dependence that can be considered a measure of centralization and 2) rule dependence that can be considered a measure of formalization to test teacher feelings of alienation. Their findings confirmed Aiken and Hage’s (1968) designation of these characteristics as strong indicators of centralization and formalization. As hypothesized by Hoy and Sweetland, dependence on
hierarchy and rule dependence were both positively related to alienation and so negatively related to enabling bureaucracy. The concepts of centralization and formalization were found to combine to form one bipolar measure of bureaucracy.

In a second study, enabling bureaucracy was measured by collegial trust and sense of powerlessness as dependent variables. Hoy and Sweetland hypothesized that high collegial trust was a characteristic of enabling bureaucracies. It was hypothesized that enabling bureaucracy would be correlated negatively with sense of powerlessness. The higher the level of enabling bureaucracy, results in lower sense of powerlessness on the part of the teachers. Previously, Etzioni (1975) found a positive correlation between alienation of employees and coercive bureaucracies. Since sense of powerlessness is a classic indicator for alienation, Hoy and Sweetland then hypothesized that an enabling bureaucracy would minimize teachers' sense of powerlessness.

As hypothesized, collegial trust was enhanced by an enabling bureaucracy as measured by lower levels of hierarchical dependence and rule dependence ($r = .61, p < .01$). Sense of powerlessness was negatively correlated with enabling bureaucracy as hypothesized ($r = -.74, p < .01$). The greater the levels of hierarchical dependence and rule dependence, the greater the sense of powerlessness. Enabling bureaucracies have lower levels of hierarchical dependence and rule dependence and so have lower levels of sense of powerlessness.

Weick (1994) sees centralization existing alongside decentralization as a necessary condition for organizations with a need for high reliability. The organization must benefit from past experiences in order to reduce errors. When an error occurs, there
needs to be a clear chain of command in the hierarchy to deal with the error.

Centralization enables superiors in the hierarchy to delegate authority to subordinates with no loss in effectiveness. In this way, an enabling centralization allows for a decentralization of responsibility so that both the big picture and the details get the necessary attention. Both standard operating procedures and culture can impose structure, but only culture allows for interpretation, improvisation, and unique response to unique situations. Culture creates a homogeneous set of assumptions and decision-making parameters that preserves centralization and coordination while allowing for decentralization of decision-making. Centralization by culture allows compliance without surveillance. Centralization by rules and regulations, standardization, and hierarchy requires surveillance to insure compliance. Centralization by culture allows for unprecedented emergencies to be met.

**Orientations: Professional versus Bureaucratic**

Blau and Scott (1962) differentiate between professional orientation and bureaucratic orientation. This is important in school settings due to the quasi-professional nature of teaching. Teachers are situated in a structure that has characteristics of both professional and bureaucratic organization (Kuhlman and Hoy, 1974). Blau and Scott caution that when professionals are working in a bureaucratically structured organization, they experience divided loyalties due to a basic conflict between professional expertise and bureaucratic discipline.

Blau and Scott discuss a number of similarities and contrasts between the two orientations. First they state that professional decisions and actions are governed by
universal standards which are based a body of specialized knowledge. This knowledge is
gained through a period of specialized training. This knowledge is applied to individual
cases. In this first respect, bureaucrats are very similar with the exception of some
differences in training particularly because the length of training is much shorter for
bureaucrats.

Another common characteristic is specificity of professional expertise. Both
professionals and bureaucrats can claim in-depth knowledge in only a limited area. This
area is limited by the scope of the training. The authority of both professionals and
bureaucrats is limited to the area covered by the training. It would necessarily follow, that
areas with greater depth of knowledge would cause the scope of training to be narrowed
or for the period of training to be lengthened.

Two more common characteristics between professionals and bureaucrats are the
nature of relationships with clients and the basis of status within the occupation. Both
professionals and bureaucrats are expected to deal with clients with what Blau and Scott
call affective neutrality. This would be another way to express Weber’s element of
impersonal orientation. Affective neutrality protects both practitioner and client from
emotional involvement so that judgments can be based on rational applications of
knowledge and expert problem solving skills. The successful application of knowledge
and judgment is what gives status to both professionals and bureaucrats. Evaluation of
performance is based on results not on personal, social, political, or economic
characteristics. This is how Blau and Scott see the proper application of both the professional and bureaucratic models which may or may not be found in organizations in the real world.

Another similarity is that decisions should not be based on the self-interest of the professional or the bureaucrat. This is different from the practice of the business where the businessperson is expected to operate in accordance with their economic self-interests. Professionals and bureaucrats who make decisions based on self-interest are looked down upon and some cases may be prosecuted. Associated with this principle is the idea that service rendered to clients is based upon need and not on ability to pay or any other social, political, or economic characteristic. Professionals who are self-employed have a more difficult time following this principle since they also have the role of businessperson.

The characteristic in which professionals differ markedly from bureaucrats is that professionals are organized into associations that exercise self-control. The professional association sets its own norms and punishes its members who break the rules. Society has granted professional associations this power based on the specialized training and expertise of professionals. This expertise makes the collegial group exclusively qualified to judge the standards of service given by its members. However, bureaucrats are controlled and disciplined by the hierarchy of authority. Professionals employed in bureaucracies experience role conflict and as a result there are some who maintain a professional orientation, some who take on a bureaucratic orientation, and some who take on characteristic behaviors of both.
Gouldner (1957) found that high commitment to the profession of teaching led to low loyalty to the organization in a study of a small liberal-arts college. Following Gouldner's borrowing of the sociological classification of cosmopolitans and locals to designate professionally oriented and organizationally oriented employees respectively, Blau and Scott (1962) found that professionally oriented employees in a welfare agency were more likely to have reference groups outside the agency, more likely to engage in professional growth activities, more likely to be critical of the agency, and more likely to be willing to leave or to expect to leave the agency.

Studies have indicated that a dual orientation is possible (Wilensky, 1964). Kuhlman and Hoy (1974) state that Wilensky's ideas that dual orientation would emerge in modern organizations should be applicable to teachers because of the marginal professional status generally given teaching. Wilensky asserts that this "interpenetration" of orientations would allow the individual to function both as a professional and as a bureaucrat. Teachers are under pressure to become more professional at the same time that bureaucratization of schools is increasing (Kuhlman and Hoy, 1974). Kuhlman and Hoy theorized that formal socialization in the school by the hierarchy would increase bureaucratic orientation while informal socialization by colleagues would increase professional orientation.

Kuhlman and Hoy tested two hypotheses using new graduates in teacher preparation programs from four New Jersey colleges. The first hypothesis was that beginning teachers would have a significantly greater bureaucratic orientation after the first year of teaching. The second hypothesis was that beginning teachers would have a
significantly greater professional orientation after the first year of teaching. The results supported the first hypothesis but not the second. A closer look dividing the teachers between secondary and elementary revealed that secondary teachers became more bureaucratically orientated to a statistically significant degree. But contrary to the second hypothesis, they became significantly less professionally orientated. Elementary teachers remained unchanged in both bureaucratic and professional orientation. Kuhlman and Hoy concluded that Wilensky's idea of interpenetration was not supported. They theorized that secondary schools are more bureaucratic in nature than elementary schools but pointed out that the elementary teachers were more bureaucratically oriented at the beginning of the study. In fact, even though the secondary teachers increased significantly in bureaucratic orientation during their first year, they were still significantly less bureaucratically orientated than the elementary teachers. For secondary teachers, it was concluded that perhaps both formal and informal socialization contributed to bureaucratic orientation.

**Differences Between Educational and Standard Governmental Bureaucracies**

Both educational bureaucracies and standard governmental bureaucracies are found at all levels of government. But citizens tend to think of the federal government as the model for standard governmental bureaucracies and think of their state departments of education as the model for educational bureaucracies. In many school systems, the central office staff and line administrators of the local system are hardly considered bureaucracies by the citizens. These bureaucrats are local people with local ties and are known while the bureaucrats in Washington and Columbus are faceless entities. In Ohio,
the citizens in school districts large and small have grown to expect to have access to and influence with the educational bureaucracies. This expectation is not found in the attitudes of citizens toward the standard governmental bureaucracies. Here, the attitudes are more likely to be helplessness and resentment. These attitudes intensify as the level of the governmental bureaucracy involved moves up from the local to the national level.

Educational bureaucracies differ from standard governmental bureaucracies due to the quasi-professional nature of teaching. Teachers are professionally oriented by the required training and the relatively high levels of autonomy which they have in the classroom as they carry out their primary function. Teachers generally encounter the superior levels of bureaucracy for only a small portion of their working day. Often in a school building, teachers do not know whether or not the principal is in the building let alone what he/she does with their time. Teachers tend to expect support from the bureaucracy with a minimum of supervision. The line and staff administrators in an educational bureaucracy were by and large teachers themselves at the beginning of their careers. Members of the bureaucracy who are non-certified personnel tend to be parents, citizens of the school community, and often alumni of the district. Members of standard governmental bureaucracies tend to come from more diverse educational and training backgrounds than educational bureaucrats and are less likely to have the personal and emotional ties to the community.

A similarity between professionals and bureaucrats is that both professionals and bureaucrats deal with clients with an impersonal orientation. This impersonal orientation protects both practitioner and client from personal and/or emotional ties so that decisions
are made on the basis of a rational application of the knowledge and training that define the positions of the practitioners. Teachers and school administrators differ in this respect since they are expected to be sympathetic and come down on the side of substantive justice rather than a cold adherence to procedures. The higher the level in the educational hierarchy, the more likely and expected it is to find the impersonal orientation and behavior bound by rules and regulations found in the standard governmental bureaucracy. The expectation is that the superintendent’s actions and decisions will be controlled by the norms of public relations and of legal responsibilities. Superintendent and board actions usually conform to the recommendations of state level groups such as the Ohio School Boards Association. So there is a uniformity of bureaucratic behavior at the highest levels of the local educational bureaucracies across the state.

A key difference between professionals and bureaucrats is that professionals belong to associations that police their own ranks (Blau and Scott, 1962). Teachers have striven to become more professional and the public has pushed for teachers to be more professional although the definitions of professional by the two groups are not congruent. Teachers have not yet reached the standard of professionalism held by doctors and lawyers due to their inability to control entry, norms, and evaluations. Teachers are still bound to a hierarchical structure by the nature of the political process for electing boards of education that in turn appoint superintendents and grant the superintendents the prerogatives needed to control the personnel in the hierarchy. Evaluations are top down.
This is the same as in the standard governmental bureaucracy. Whether or not evaluations are to some extent negotiable is dependent on the local union contract and the personalities of the administrators.

With the rise in demands for accountability by parents and politicians, there has already been a sea change in the way educational bureaucracies work with their clients. There are a myriad of programs of participatory leadership that include staff, parents, and students to a greater or lesser degree. Teachers, parent, and interested citizens take part in hiring of administrators and in formulating policies that are implemented by administrators. Patterson (1998) sees the changes in terms of market metaphors. The old metaphor of 'Bureaucrats and their Victims' is still often used but Patterson says it no longer valid. Patterson reviewed a number of studies and generalized that citizens are fairly satisfied with bureaucratic services whether private or public. Many theorists and practitioners favor a new metaphor of 'Bureaucrats and their Customers.' Criticisms are that this metaphor makes it harder for citizens to distinguish differences between government and market. In the school setting, the identification of customers becomes muddled. Parents, taxpayers, future employers, students, and voters could all be considered clients with varied and sometimes conflicting needs. A newer metaphor is 'Citizen as Shareholder.' This places an emphasis on an informed and efficient citizen with a vested interest in society and institutions such as schools.

When discussing bureaucracies, many citizens and theorists contend that less is
more. Anderson (1974) theorizes that a decrease in bureaucratic school structures would increase student achievement based on the argument that bureaucratic structures increase student alienation and student alienation decreases student achievement.

Hirschhorn (1997) echoes both Verdugo et al. (1997) and Rogers (Sterling, 1979) by laying the problems of bureaucracies at the feet of psychological problems which are inherent to human beings and which are exacerbated by the bureaucratic structure. Hirschhorn lists envy, dependency, abdication, and resentment as problems which are fostered by bureaucracies and which cause problems in current bureaucracies. Resentment and envy are often seen in the relationships of teachers to administrators, subordinate administrators to superior administrators, teachers with low seniority or low status assignments to other teachers, and non-certified staff to professional staff. Resentment, envy, and abdication are often manifested in absences, lateness, poor paperwork, and an overall lack of effort and enthusiasm. Teacher unions can exacerbate these conditions by protecting poor teachers and making things unnecessarily difficult for administrators. On the other hand, union officials who cozy up to administrators for their own personal benefit contribute to teacher resentment. Teacher union activities can divide the teaching staff into two camps. The groups of teachers will be supporting the union to various degrees ranging from blind loyalty to antipathy. Members of the non-supporting group either look on union activities as unprofessional or are too fearful of the administration to support the union. Hirschhorn sees the solution to these problems in the willingness of the members of the staff to share information and skills and the willingness to take some risks on a group basis. Taking risks means breaking out of the mold whether it takes the
form of block scheduling, site-based management, or the inclusion of parents and citizens in decision making. Some initiatives will fail so the school district must have an ethic of forgiveness so that those who fail are given another chance and are not fearful of taking risks in the future.

The new bureaucratic style that Hirschhorn advocates is strategic ‘conversations’ in which data is used to encourage innovative ideas. Openness and risk-taking on the part of staff and administration will help the school get past personal and political games and address the real problems of education. Energy expended on personal turf battles will be used to develop and implement programs to improve student achievement.

Kaufman (2001) emphasizes the importance of bureaucrats by including in the bureaucracy everyone who is on the payroll of a unit of federal, state, or local government if they were not elected. By this definition, elementary and secondary education is by far the largest bureaucracy with higher education being second, both well ahead of hospitals and national defense. Kaufman contends that although public bureaucracies are generally well equipped, energetic participants in government, they are not without problems. He agrees that the activities of bureaucracies tends to be elitist or antidemocratic and notes some theorists regard the federal bureaucracy as an unelected equal to the three branches of American government. But he cautions that these fears are exaggerated. Bureaucracies are controlled by legal and political restraints. Perhaps more importantly, bureaucracies are less dangerous due to the divided and often antagonistic relationships of the various bureaucracies. Kaufman contends that the many problems with bureaucracies can be remedied. He recommends depolitizing appointments and strengthening the authority of
top bureaucrats in policy formation. In schools, these objectives are being met in many schools and yet to be met in many others. The relatively small size of school districts makes the variations highly dependent on personalities of local school officials, board members, and influential citizens. Kaufman also recommends privatizing as many functions as possible. In schools, this commonly includes transportation, food service, security, and even some educational services. He advocates decentralizing administrative decision making as is commonly done in site-based management.

Kaufman encourages bureaucracies to simulate the market. One proposal is to have schools compete for students and hence for funding. This has occurred in a modified form in some city systems where failing schools have been closed and the student bodies absorbed by higher performing schools. Kaufman also cites semiautonomous charter schools, magnet schools, and voucher programs as market devices stimulating competition in bureaucracies. He recommends reducing paperwork, training administrators in modern management practices, bringing in citizens to democratize administration, and training in ethics. In ethics training he does recognize schools for being leaders among bureaucracies.

Changes in educational bureaucracies had been slow in coming but now the pace has quickened and the administrator who rules autocratically with an iron hand is an anachronism. The new generation of school administrators has come through systems where the autonomy of the administrators has been tempered by union contracts, the demands of parents and citizens, student advocacy, and political buffetings. Having been teachers in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, current educational bureaucrats have been more
sensitized to the needs of marginalized groups. The educational bureaucracy is much more accessible and observable at the local and state levels than standard governmental bureaucracies. Advocacy groups easily get the ear of local educational bureaucrats.

Current training of administrators stresses the need for cooperation with all constituencies and for community building. Courses at the university level are designed to teach administrators how to get along with boards of education, teachers, special needs groups, and the voters. The expectation is that educational administration is a system of give and take with an emphasis on maintaining positive public relations.

The stress on accountability for education and the difficulties of financing in most districts has forced the educational bureaucracy to be responsive. The difficulty at times is that factions within the bureaucracy have attempted to gain the upper hand by appealing to the community at large either overtly or covertly. When the bureaucracy comes to a consensus based on data that supports improvements in student achievement, the members of the bureaucracy must come together in informing the public. The educational bureaucracy needs to maintain flexibility in thinking for educational improvement and in meeting the needs of the community.

The Market Model and Other Alternatives in Education

Although the debate over the merits of governmentally controlled schools versus free market education goes back at least to the differences between the Spartan and Athenian educational systems, the impetus for the current school choice and free market movements can arguably be traced to the work of 1976 Nobel laureate in Economics, Milton Friedman (1955). His belief was that the application of free market dynamics to
education would provide incentives for improvement and speed technological progress in order to compete in the education market place. This was seconded by West (1991) in his analysis of the effects of free educational markets versus government-run schools. West also contended that the deadweight loss resulting from the costs of tax collection place a tremendous burden on the taxpayers.

Conversely, the accepted necessity for public financing of education is due to the idea of ‘market failure’ in education (Vandenberghe, 1999). It is generally accepted that the market mechanism is not capable of regulating education properly. Public financing is necessary since education is a semi-public good (Friedman, 1962). Society as a whole is seen to benefit from education. Education provides a better-informed work force. This increase in human capital increases productivity through increased problem solving and learning abilities.

Society also benefits from an increase in education because the individual is better able to participate in society. The individual is able to process more information and make better-informed social, political, and economic decisions. This contributes to greater social cohesion and helps insure the public peace and cooperation in attaining societal goals.

The market does not do an adequate job of producing semi-public goods since providers are motivated by profit. They tend to provide the minimal amount of services consistent with enhancing their own benefits. Society’s need for an educated citizenry requires a higher level of education for all citizens, not just those who can afford to pay. Also, concerns about equity in the distribution of a nation’s income favor public
financing of education. Public financing of education increases the chances of an equal opportunity for all. This can currently be seen in the disparity of incomes in developing nations that is directly tied to differences in the level of education. Coleman (1990) points out the contradictions of the two American values of liberty and equality. Liberty concerns have to do with the autonomy and choice of parents in deciding what is best for their children. Equality concerns deal with the need for society to make decisions that will insure what is best for all children. The balancing of these two concerns has proved to be an unsolvable challenge for both the bureaucratic and the market models of education.

The efficiency of a system as large and complex as public education is dependent on the organization of the institution (Milgrom & Roberts, 1992). Public education as a semi-public good requires administration by a bureaucracy. The hierarchical or bureaucratic model is the most prevalent form of institutional organization in education (Weiss, 1990). The problem is that increases in the costs of public education have not been equaled by increases in student achievement (Hanushek, 1986). The levels of financing of education are not consistently related to student academic achievement. The bureaucracy model has proved to be inefficient in many cases especially in urban areas (Hanushek & Rivkin, 1997).

Given the failings of both the market model and the bureaucratic model, efforts have been made to combine the better features of both. An educational quasi-market model has been seen in Belgium and The Netherlands since the 1950s. It has also been advocated and installed in various limited forms in the United States under the banner of school choice (Friedman, 1962; Clune & Witte, 1990; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Cohn, 1997).
Parents and students are permitted a greater choice in school districts whether in the form of voucher systems, open enrollment, or other market mechanisms. Results have not proven the quasi-market model to be superior to the bureaucratic model (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Lankford & Wyckoff, 1992). Additionally, there is a tendency in the quasi-market model to increase segregation by ability groupings. This is a concern in issues of equity and also of efficiency in the system as a whole since some schools will fail and will require costly intervention on the part of the government. Such intervention is an externality whose cost must be borne by society. Studies show that social interaction among students affects the levels of achievement (Coleman, 1966). Society has an interest in the attainment of the highest educational levels possible for students from all socioeconomic classes and ethnic groups.

While parents and voters often voice the opinion that there are big problems with schools and school bureaucracies, they tend to give their local systems satisfactory to high marks (Rose & Gallup, 2000). Voters and citizens as a whole generally assign lower grades than parents to both local schools and the nation's schools as a whole. High marks from parents are found especially for small and medium size systems. Perceptions are much lower for large city systems that are more likely to be seen by its clients to have poor schools and bureaucracies that are wasteful and unresponsive. Indeed, most school districts that have been taken over by the state are large city school districts.

The onus on the bureaucratic model is that increases in the costs of public education have not been equaled by increases in student achievement. The levels of financing of education are not consistently related to student academic achievement.
Indeed, there is great debate among researchers as to the effects of funding (Payne & Biddle, 1999; Turner, 2000; Payne & Biddle, 2000). If there are effects from increased spending, do these effects outweigh such factors as race, socioeconomic status, teacher characteristics, or bureaucratic characteristics? Nevertheless, it is widely held that the bureaucracy model has proved to be inefficient as a delivery system in many cases especially in the large urban schools (Hanushek & Rivkin, 1997). Hanushek and Rivkin point to the complexity of the interactions between educational bureaucracies and their environments. One example is the apparently contradictory trend of increases in teacher salaries and deterioration in the quality of teachers. This is due to a relative loss of teacher earnings compared to other occupations and the resulting loss of teachers to other occupations. This is one of the difficulties which educational bureaucracies must contend with but over which they have little control.

In any size system, there are a sizable number of parents and voters who are dissatisfied over perceived weaknesses of public schooling. Researchers such as Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1982) led the criticism of public schools and the search for better alternatives. Chubb and Moe (1990) evaluated a large set of data on high schools and recommended publicly financed vouchers in order to infuse free market dynamics and to free schools from hierarchical foot-dragging in implementing improvements in educational delivery systems. Chubb and Moe concluded that schools with greater autonomy produced higher test scores and free market devices such as a voucher system would increase autonomy and hence student achievement spurred by the growth of a competitive market in education. Bohte's (2001) study backs Chubb and Moe...
in finding a negative relationship between bureaucracy and student performance as measured by student scores on standardized reading, arithmetic, and writing tests. However, Bohte questioned the cause and effect sequence. Does poor student performance lead to hiring more administrators or does top-heavy administration lead to poor student performance? Bohte points out that cuts in administrators would lead to declines in school performance as teachers assumed the burdens of administrative duties. This is especially true of the ‘buffering’ duties that administrators perform to protect teachers and teacher time from discipline problems, parent relations, and school/district wide decisions.

The mixed results of studies of efforts such as the Milwaukee program of school vouchers show that the voters, parents, and politicians overestimated the possible effects of changes in educational bureaucracies and underestimated between schools factors such as the social economic status of the student population. Witte’s (2000) analysis of the Milwaukee program acknowledged that there are no clear-cut answers to the problems of delivering the goods and services to classrooms that will facilitate maximum student achievement. Likewise, the analyses of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program have generated conflicting sets of data and interpretations of the meaning of the data sets (Greene, Howell, & Peterson, 1997; Metcalf, 1998). The results are unclear and their meanings are further blurred by accusations of political bias. One telling criticism is that the new bureaucracies set up by the state and local schools to administer the program and to handle admissions were inefficient and slow. This would conform with Weber’s (1946) conclusion that experienced bureaucrats function best and drastic changes in bureaucratic
structures can have disastrous effects in the short run. The critics of public educational
bureaucracies have not yet demonstrated that eliminating these bureaucracies is a solution
to declining scores, deteriorating buildings, and the dissatisfaction of students and parents
with public education.

Levin (1991a) cautions that the social effects of free market programs may be
negative in the long run. Schools that are removed from the present educational
bureaucratic system tend to be selective in their admissions. This 'creaming' yields strong
student achievement results at a minimal cost due to the inherent academic talents and
motivation of these students. Meanwhile, disadvantaged students who need greater
amounts of services that engender greater costs are left to the care of the public
educational bureaucracies. The market system appears superior in meeting private
benefits, the liberty function of democracy; while the current system and/or a public
choice system appears superior in meeting social benefits, the equality function of
democracy. Levin prefers a public choice system which would incorporate features such
as site-based management, open enrollment, magnet schools, mini-schools within large
school buildings, post-secondary options, 'mini-vouchers' for enrichment or special
needs, and the use of private contractors. He concludes that the oversight costs for market
choice programs would be far greater than similar costs for public choice programs. This
is since the greater diversity of choices in market choice programs and the increase in the
numbers of educational units would require an expansion and centralization of oversight
activity at the state level.
New Zealand has had over a decade of experience with an alternate educational bureaucratic system (Fiske & Ladd, 2000). The system was radically decentralized in 1989 when the control of primary and secondary schools was turned over from the national ministry of education to locally elected trustees. Two years later, a new government moved further from the traditional educational bureaucracy to a market model by abolishing geographical boundaries, instituting parental choice, and forcing schools to compete for students. The central ministry continues to fund and maintains accountability through independent review offices. The result is that every school was forced to become self-governing. The measures of self-governance and parental control have become popular, but without a national testing program, effects on student achievement are not measurable. However, many schools have been hurt by de facto segregation of school populations based on ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and student abilities. Schools with high percentages of students of European descent were considered better. Since applications exceeded enrollments, these schools could further increase the percentage of students of European descent through selective admissions. Meanwhile, schools in low-income urban areas experienced an increase in their percentages of disadvantaged students including students expelled from other schools. This downward spiral of many schools forced the central government to give additional aid to failing schools and concede that the system was not working for nearly one-fourth of the country’s schools.

Similarly, in Ohio, the courts have found that the public educational system is contrary to the state constitution (DeRolph, 1997). Although the state purports to
supplement the funding of low-income schools, the results are similar to those of New Zealand’s free market competition among schools. In Ohio, vagaries of geographical location determine which children get superior educational resources that lend themselves to superior educational achievement. Even with open enrollment and limited programs of school choice, most students are bound by time and money to the districts in which they live or districts that are in close proximity. For most parents, voters, and politicians, the realization that alternate models of educational bureaucracies are not panaceas takes some cold, hard experience with the ups and downs of the alternate models.

Free market capitalism results in success for some enterprises and failure for others. In the business world, such competition benefits the consumers at large. In education, society cannot afford to have a large number of students in failing institutions. This is a social cost that must be borne by all. Just as an unrestrained free market competition leads to monopolies and an eventual loss of the benefits of the free market, competition between schools results with the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer. Government must intervene to balance the benefits provided by self-governance and parental choice with assurances of educational equity for all students in all schools. As Adam Smith (1963) conceded two centuries ago, society as a whole benefits when a satisfactory educational minimum is provided to all. The market does not do an adequate job of producing public goods like education since producers are motivated by profit. The tendency is to provide a minimum so that profits are maximized. Society’s need for an educated citizenry requires a higher level of education for all, not just those who can
afford to pay. Concerns about equity in the distribution of a nation’s income favor public financing of education. Public financing of education increases the chances for equal opportunity in education and so a more equal opportunity in life.

Actually, the public tends to give local public schools marks of A or B (Rose & Gallup, 2000). The public feels that reforming current systems is the best way to bring about school improvement rather than to go to systems such as vouchers Some critics argue that the U.S. should move to a model such as Japan’s where private high schools are publicly funded. But it is unlikely that Americans would want to follow the Japanese model which makes the home an ‘education factory.’ Japanese students do not hold part-time jobs or do household chores so their time can be devoted to study. The mothers consider educational support for the children to be a full-time job (Levin, 1991b).

In order to change public perceptions, the educational bureaucracy needs to acquaint itself with the studies and the literature that have investigated the link between funding and achievement. Too often, critics cite studies that at best have poor methodology and findings that are exaggerated and at worst are hatchet jobs. Given the political debate over the effects of money on educational attainment, it is important to know and be able to explain studies like that of Wilson (2000). By controlling for factors such as neighborhood and family, she showed that schools with high expenditures produce students who gain greater long-term education.

There have been steady changes in the attitudes and actions of administrators over the past thirty years. Administrators are more comfortable and willing to bring in parents,
interested citizens, and other community members. Getting out into the community reaps great benefits. Administrators who demonstrate accessibility are highly regarded in the community.

Some of the strongest critics of public education have been business leaders (Perry, 1990). By dealing with local business leaders and using their available resources, educational bureaucracies can build support for schools. One demand of the business community that has already been adopted in most states is minimum standards. Since around 70% of jobs do not require a college education, businesses want the high school diploma to mean that a student has basic academic and problem solving skills. One response in Ohio has been the growth of vocational schools that have a record of adding and deleting programs depending on local employment demands. Schools have also been charged with helping children before they are of school age. Education has been extended downward to help disadvantaged children become ready for school. The hard sell to business is that the educational bureaucracy is necessary to deliver what is needed to the educational system. By being familiar with private bureaucracy methods and staffing characteristics, educational bureaucrats can answer their critics with hard facts. By working with community business leaders and citizens, educational bureaucrats can demonstrate their worth to the educational system and the community.

**Funding Educational Bureaucracies**

Closely related to the public's perceptions of public schools and the educational bureaucracies which run them is the public's willingness to provide funds for schools. The case for the funding of schools by the public is supported by Adam Smith's (1963)
argument for public education, "The expense of the institutions for education and religions instruction, is likewise, no doubt, beneficial to the whole society, and may, therefore, without injustice, be defrayed by the general contribution of the whole society."

This means taxes and taxes mean governmental bureaucracies for collection and dispersal. Yet Smith also praises the free market's effects when he comments on the Greek and Roman Republics which demanded citizens undergo physical training to prepare for possible military service but expected the citizens to pay for it, "Masters, however, had been found, it seems for instructing the better sort of people among those nations in every art and science in which the circumstances of their society rendered it necessary or convenient for them to be instructed. The demand for such instruction produced, what it always produces, the talent for giving it; and the emulation which an Unrestrained competition never fails to excite, appears to have brought that talent to a very high degree of perfection."

A basic problem is that bureaucracies cannot easily or accurately measure how much of a public good is demanded (Mitchell & Simmons, 1994). Market failure for public goods like education forces taxation on the general public for the governmental provision of the good and taxation carries with it the problems of free riding and forced riding. Forced riders pay for levels of public goods that they neither need nor want. This is reflected by senior citizens voting persistently against school levies and by large landowners pushing for support of schools through income taxes rather than property taxes. The outcome of school levies is decided by the median voter, the voter with as many voters preferring positions both above and below the median voter's position. With
increasing percentages of households having no school age children, the median voter has
become one who has no personal stake in schools. While parents with school age children
pay their share of taxes, they are essentially free riders because the value they receive is
greater than the price they pay because it is subsidized by the forced riders.

An analysis of the statistics from the U.S. Department of Education by the Center
for Education Reform (1999) purports that local funding averages 45.1% of the total of
elementary and secondary school funding, states funds provide 45.2%, federal funds
provide 7%, and private funding contributes 2.7%. In Ohio, the principal source of local
funding has traditionally been property taxes (Crim, Maxwell, Baughman, and Overly,
1994). While property taxes fund many local units of government, approximately 70% of
local property taxes go to the local public schools. The key problem of property tax
support of schools in Ohio is that they are the only tax for which increases are directly
decided upon by the electorate (with some infrequent exceptions). New local property
taxes for schools must be approved at the polls. Property taxes increased at a faster rate
than the consumer price index during the period 1980-90. Property taxes went up by 85%
while the CPI rose at only 60%. The percents of increase in property taxes varied across
the state since voters in some districts are more willing and/or able to afford increases in
property taxes.

The disparity in the willingness to pay is difficult to measure but the disparity in
the ability to pay as determined by property tax valuation per pupil in Ohio is tremendous.
It varies at the extremes by a ratio of 34:1 (Crim et al., 1994). While property tax has
several components, political rhetoric tends to focus on agricultural and residential taxes
even though businesses and industries pay for the majority of taxes for schools. Since business and industrial bases vary widely, agricultural and residential taxes provide from as little as 4% of the property taxes in some districts to as high as 85% in districts with small amounts of industry and business. The greater the industrial base, the lower the burden on agricultural/residential taxpayers. The picture in Ohio is further muddied by the practice of valuation being set at a percentage of market value. Market value varies from location to location and is determined by local officials.

As inflation increases the value of real estate, the Ohio Revised Code provides that voted millage is adjusted downward so that schools do not receive an increase (Crim et al., 1994). The taxpayers do not directly see this since their bills go up anyway due to the other components of the real estate bill. Additionally, over the years, political processes have induced the General Assembly to grant tax credits: 10% to every real estate tax payer, 2 1/2% to homeowners, and additional amounts to senior citizens. So property tax policies have neutralized increases in local property values as a source of increased revenues for schools. The statewide tax reduction factors, abatements granted locally by counties and cities, and reduction of rates have forced school districts to wage a constant battle to convince voters to support schools at the polls. Often, the districts have been forced to make cuts in programs and staff in order to convince voters that money is spent carefully and wisely. Still, much less than half of all levies pass in Ohio and the situation is not helped by the common perception that no one person completely knows
the workings of the state’s property tax system and the state’s system of funding for
schools. School officials have a difficult time understanding the state’s funding formulas
and an even more difficult time explaining their problems to voters.

The picture of state funding in Ohio is currently unclear since the General
Assembly has not yet met the requirements of DeRolph v. State (1997) as of September 6,
2001. This case overturned Board of Education v. Walter (1979) and declared the state’s
funding unconstitutional. Despite the state’s efforts over the years to provide equalization
of funding resources and equity in the quality of education, the quality of education has
continued to be a function of local wealth. The state has enforced minimum standards but
has not approached equal standards. The minimum standards enforced by the state have
been determined by the courts to be much too low. The funding question has continued to
be a political football with both political parties, both the executive and legislative
branches, and many interest groups providing input (Sandham, 2001). Ohio has added a
local income tax option that is also subject to the approval of the voters at the polls. Other
states have tried other sources of funding such as the sales tax that were traditionally not
funding sources for education (Viadero, 2001).

Education in Ohio has received a smaller and smaller percentage of the funds
spent by the state of Ohio. The drop has been from 40% of the state budget in the 1960s
to 32-33% in 1992 (Crim et al., 1994). In the 1970s, the General Assembly justified both
the inception of a state income tax and a state lottery on the need for more educational
funding. In reality, the state income tax was not earmarked for education and lottery funds
simply replaced other monies from the general funds for schools. All of the efforts of
Ohio have not yet solved the problem in the state funding formula of the effects of differences in the abilities of school districts to raise money. The state of Washington addressed similar concerns by attempting to minimize the disparities in local wealth with a goal of a ten percent lid on the percentage of local levy revenue of the district's state allocation (Plecki, 2000). The legislature justified this attempt as a tax shift rather than an increase in taxation at the state level. This effort was aided by an unexpected revenue surplus at the time of the program's inception. Initially, there was a significant reduction in interdistrict disparities but this has eroded since 1991 due to failure to reach the ten percent goal and a resulting increase in dependence on local levies. Further weaknesses come from the state's failure to account for differences in costs of living among regions and a shift in focus from fiscal equity to funding adequacy. Equity problems occur when one is being treated worse than others, while adequacy problems occur when one is receiving worse treatment than prescribed by performance standards (Odden, 2000). The state funding formula has not kept pace with its adoption of standardized assessments. The finance system is input driven while other educational policies are focused on performance and the standards for performance are being raised and formalized.

Washington has addressed equity problems but is now struggling with adequacy. Washington has not been able to coordinate educational funding with its educational ambitions.

Crampton (2000) sees a nationwide increase in attempts by state legislatures to address educational finance. In 1997, there were 441 educational finance laws enacted compared to 260, 212, and 127 respectively in the three previous years. While many of
the bills were merely reenactments of previous versions, there was some innovative and
groundbreaking legislation. Some states such as Vermont and Wyoming took new
directions in state funding systems due to state supreme court decisions. Other laws
reacted to national attention in the areas of educational technology, capital outlay, and
charter school funding. There were a record number of bills that funded specific
categories of special purpose education programs. Three clusters received special
attention: student achievement, early childhood education, and student access to
alternative education. Special purpose categorization may have been due to desires to
focus attention on a particular educational program or categorization may have been due
to a lack of faith in local administrations to use the funds as the legislatures desired. Part
of the growth may be due to a continuing interest by legislators on education and part may
be due to a strong economy where revenues outstripped projections and large year-end
balances were targeted by educational interest groups.

Federal funds tend to be categorical in nature and target specific problem areas
such as handicapped children (Crim et al., 1994). In recent years, the main areas targeted
by Federal funds have been vocational education and special education. In the short term,
it is unlikely that Federal funds will become a major factor in funding elementary and
secondary education in Ohio. Federal funding tends to be on an ad hoc basis and highly
sensitive to politics on the national level. However, Odden (2000) calls for providing
funding on a national basis. Reasoning that high educational standards should be a
national goal, he states that the Federal government is best able to address the cross-state
differences. Similar to Ohio’s funding system, the Federal government would cover the
difference between the Federal adequate foundation level and the yield of the state education tax. This program would also help address equity issues since the educational spending in poorer states would be dramatically increased. With the current Federal surpluses, the time may be right but there are many technical and accountability issues to be resolved not to mention the minefield of the political process.

A growing viewpoint is that equity and adequacy problems cannot be based on funding on the local level. The disparities between the wealth of communities in Ohio and across the nation are just too great. It is impossible for poorer local districts to make up the shortfall in its tax base and these districts have the children who have more needs to be addressed in order to meet the goal of attaining an adequate education. *De facto* segregation by economic status not to mention ethnicity creates an externality that must be paid for somewhere down the line. Better to pay at the beginning of the process and avoid higher costs at the end. In Ohio, a major growth industry is prisons. While the correspondence between poor education and criminal activity may be tenuous, as a former teacher in the prison system, I could see the low levels of education that the inmates had achieved. Most of them came from the type of urban districts that experience inadequacies in funding.

Believers in the value of human capital feel that students in Ohio do not receive adequate problem solving and analytical skills needed in business and industry. They see the link between productivity on the job and the development of good work habits and flexibility in thinking which can be developed by good educational systems.
An additional problem with local funding is the rancor that it brings to local communities. Levy campaigns are often divisive with personal acrimonies and resentments that can keep the community divided for years afterwards. Farmers, small businessmen, landowners, and senior citizens have legitimate concerns that must be balanced against the needs of parents, staff, and students. Staff often faces the problem of seeming to be neutral in campaigns. They feel that although they might be parents, landowners, voters, and long time residents, an advocacy position on their part will be interpreted as selfishness. Staff must deal with the children of people opposed to the levy as well as the children of supporters. They must maintain balanced relationships no matter their point of view. This may be difficult when campaigns get ugly and any inattention may be perceived as a slight. School administrators take the heat no matter what the outcome at the polls.

In an all or nothing system decided at the polls, many people are going to be forced to pay for an educational system they cannot use or face an educational system that is inadequate for their needs. Often, both of these conditions occur at the same time. When the district loses, it may be forced to cut programs and staff in the short run. If it wins in the next election, it faces startup costs that would not be necessary if the state insured a continuous and adequate level of funding. Districts that are forced to cut programs tend to lose students and usually these are the types of students who add much to the school climate in terms of scholarship, extracurricular participation, and leadership. Time, effort, and money spent on levy campaigns are enormous and a drain on the resources of the schools, school staff, and concerned citizens.
Statewide taxation to finance education and adequacy funding would help most districts but might penalize the parents and students in richer districts. In order to maintain the high standards which they currently enjoy, these districts might need to turn to charging fees for advanced programs which are currently part of the curriculum and provided by public monies. This would partially address the free rider status that parents currently enjoy.

An intriguing possibility is the notion of nationwide funding. It is done in other countries but would take a great deal of time and effort to be implemented in the United States. The federal government is not prepared to undertake such a great task either in terms of bureaucratic capabilities or political processes. In addition, states would fight to maintain control over education and there would surely be a slew of litigation.

Educational bureaucracies on the local level are easier for the electorate to influence. Local bureaucracies are accessible and local bureaucrats generally have similar overall outlooks and goals as the other members of local communities. People like to have local control and distrust of government grows in geometric proportion with the distance between the bureaucracy and the local citizens. However, bureaucracies are necessary at all levels to see that the income distribution function of government is effectively (and hopefully efficiently) carried out. People do not like bureaucracies but they are necessary for providing public goods such as education.

Efficacy of Bureaucrats

One aspect that is not often considered by the clients of the bureaucracy is how the conditions of the bureaucracy affect the bureaucrats. In the school setting, one of the
most numerous groups of bureaucrats is the principal. The principal is the leader/administrator of the individual district unit, the school, and the link between the unit and the central administration.

Bandura (1977) defined efficacy as a judgment of one's capability to organize and execute actions required to attain a certain level of performance. Osterman and Sullivan (1996) examined the efficacy of new principals in the New York City public school system. While there were many influential factors including the basic psychological make-up of the principal, school district and school district superintendent characteristics played an important role in the sense of efficacy for the principals.

External factors interact with the mental processes of the principals and affect the effectiveness of the principals' decision-making and problem solving practices. The urban school system is a highly bureaucratized organization and relations with superiors were seen as a crucial factor in the sense of efficacy for these new principals. The bureaucratic level to which the principals reported was the district superintendents. The perceptions of the new principals of superintendent support varied from highly supportive for most of the principals with a high sense of efficacy to being ignored for the principals with a low sense of efficacy. The actions of the district superintendents toward the new principals helped determine the levels of confidence and support that the principals felt. Principals with high levels of efficacy felt the superintendents supported them. This can be construed as enabling behavior on the part of the superintendents.

When the goals of the superintendent and the district coincided with those of the principal, there was an increased sense of efficacy. Principals felt that performance
expectations were clear. Demands were seen as being few but clearly defined. The principals felt the goals were reasonable and to an extent negotiable, not simply imposed from above. The emphasis was on high expectations rather than on adhering to rules, regulations, and hierarchically imposed demands. These principals felt that they were part of a collective effort.

Enabling behaviors of superintendents identified included being available and being a good listener. Giving clear, concise instructions was also seen as behavior that increased principal efficacy. The enabling superintendents met regularly with principals and telephoned often to check on progress. Enabling superintendents were also flexible and realistic in planning. Initial goals were reachable. When externalities made goals no longer feasible, new, more realistic goals were set.

Principals with low sense of efficacy did not actually identify behaviors, rules, and structures that were hindering. Rather, they felt that they were left to shift for themselves. District superintendents and other personnel were seen as impersonal. There was no feeling of partnership with the district and central administrators. The sense was that of a lack of enabling behaviors rather than of the existence of hindering behaviors.

Perceptions of the organization and their superiors in the hierarchy did vary among principals in the same district. Principals with a low sense of efficacy both within and outside of the school setting tended to see the hierarchy and district as non-supportive. Principals with a high sense of efficacy in all situations tended to respect the goals and actions of the organization. They often identified with the district goals and felt that the district's values were consistent with their own.
Osterman and Sullivan state that information is crucial to the sense of efficacy. The information sharing behaviors identified by the principals were clearly enabling in that they contributed to the efficiency and effectiveness of principals. Information about performance expectations and about the performance itself is needed to be given by superiors. The organizational conditions must be clearly and honestly communicated. Task-relevant information is needed so that skills can be developed and appropriate strategies can be chosen. In one particularly illuminating example, when a principal began to feel pressures and a lowering of her sense of efficacy, she abandoned her vision of collaborative leadership with the staff. Instead, she turned to increased formalization as a strategy to insure teacher compliance to her perceptions of appropriate behavior.

**Trust, Authenticity, and Conflict in School Bureaucracies**

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) followed their study of the effect of enabling bureaucracies on collegial trust with a study of the effects of enabling bureaucracies on trust in the principal. Again, as in their previous study, it can be theorized that the concepts may well be mutually reinforcing. They hypothesized that the more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the extent of faculty trust in the principal.

Also measured was the effect of enabling bureaucracies on authenticity. Truth spinning is the reverse of authenticity and involves concealing the truth, adding to it, or subtracting from the truth in communications with others (Sweetland & Hoy, 2001). Enabling bureaucracies foster open and honest communication among the staff members. The honest exchange of information is necessary for an enabling environment, which in turn promotes effective and efficient task completion. Truth spinning limits the value of
information so teachers are hindered by lack of information and lack of faith in the information they do receive. Sweetland and Hoy hypothesized that enabling bureaucratic structure in schools would be negativity correlated with "truth spinning."

Another hindrance to the effective and efficient operation of schools is role conflict (DiPaola & Hoy, 2001). Role conflict creates tension, inconsistency, and negative conflict because individuals cannot comfortably and consistently fulfill different roles for different people. Since enabling schools depend on cooperation and openness, role conflict should be negatively correlated with enabling bureaucracies. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) hypothesized that the more enabling the bureaucratic structure of a school, the less the amount of role conflict in the school. The results based on surveys completed in the "100 Schools Study" (Hoy et al, 2000) were that the more enabling the bureaucracy the greater the degree of trust in the principal ($r = .76, p < .01$), the less the amount of truth spinning ($r = -.74, p < .01$), and the less the amount of role conflict ($r = -.71, p < .01$). When enabling bureaucratic structure was regressed on the three variables in the study, the result was an $R = .89, p < .01$ and an $R^2$ of .78. The three variables explained 78% of the enabling bureaucracy in the schools.

This does not mean that the consequences of all conflict are negative. Conflict is inevitable in organizations. The type of conflict and the way it is handled determine whether it leads to productive change or not. The Deweyian perspective of conflict is that it is healthy as a force for change (DiPaola & Hoy, 2001). Conflict suppressed tends to
lead to a disruptive clash in the long run. Conflict met as an expected facet of organizational life can balance power, improve communications, facilitate understanding of various points of view, and spur organizational development.

Two basic types of organizational conflict are cognitive which is task oriented and affective that is social-emotional oriented (DiPaola & Hoy, 2001). Cognitive conflict tends to enhance organizational performance while affective conflict lowers decision quality and lowers organizational performance. Conflict can be met with either an enabling formalization in the organization or with a coercive formalization. Enabling formalization uses cognitive conflict as a basis for productive change. Innovation and individual/group problem solving are encouraged. Coercive formalization stifles the most productive and innovative individuals leading to frustration on the job or to leaving the organization. Enabling formalization minimizes the disruptions that tend to develop from affective conflict. The group cohesiveness is sustained and individual complaints are given attention even though they cannot all be met. Coercive formalization attempts to suppress affective conflict. This leads to dysfunctional working relationships and the potential for problems to grow until they reach unmanageable proportions.

The principal/teacher relationship is particularly vulnerable in schools with coercive formalization since teachers see themselves as professionals who need autonomy in solving the learning and behavioral problems they meet every day in the classroom. The Weberian bureaucratic model with its impersonal orientation, hierarchical structure, and control by rules and regulations is not the best model for meeting intra organizational conflict. Weber tends to minimize the possibility of conflict with the assumption that
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rational bureaucrats will realize that their needs are best met when organizational needs are met. Cognitive conflict from within has a limited role in Weber's bureaucracy. In his view, the organization is spurred to greater action by forces outside of the organization. Internal affective conflict is minimized by the impersonal orientation and the career orientation of the bureaucracy and of the rational bureaucrats, which make up the bureaucracy.

A lack of trust and authenticity in principal/teacher relations is often due to the struggle for power in the organization. Each side may try to create their own vision of reality by playing games and ‘spinning’ the truth (Sweetland & Hoy, 2001). Both sides adhere to the idea that power can be used to define reality. Spinning the truth by one side tends to bring retaliatory spinning by the other and a vicious cycle develops. Spinning the truth has a positive correlation with role conflict. The greater the amount of truth spinning the greater the teacher sense of powerlessness and the distrust found among teachers. The atmosphere that develops is that of a coercive, hence hindering, bureaucracy. Covey (1989) makes the case that trust is necessary for a productive organization and that it reduces or inhibits feelings of alienation. Covey states, “trust is the highest form of human motivation.” (p. 178). If so, then trust is a necessary element in the development of enabling bureaucracies.

Conflict in bureaucracies often leads to the phenomenon of bureaucratic opposition (Weinstein, 1979). While organizational theorists view internal opposition by members of the bureaucracy as irrational, Weinstein contends that this opposition is often rational and in the best interest of the bureaucrats and/or bureaucracy. Purposive,
committed bureaucrats may oppose the goals or methods of the bureaucracy due to rational motives not rooted in fear, resentment, or selfishness. Organizations are political systems and the bureaucratic opposition may be reacting to political abuse of the bureaucracy or to the loss of freedom due to bureaucratic structure and/or procedures. Within the individual or a small group, there may be a mixture of grounded and ungrounded motives. The grounded motive of loss of efficiency may be in combination with the ungrounded motives ambition and jealousy. Opposition may form in response to violations of bureaucratic forms as exemplified by Weber's bureaucratic model. These violations may include inefficiency, injustice, and incompetence among others. Other violations may be based on ethical or moral grounds such as fairness or honesty. Bureaucratic opposition may lead to an improvement of the bureaucracy and more efficient and effective goal attainment.

**Loyalty and Esprit in School Bureaucracies**

Blau and Scott (1962) associate worker productivity with loyalty to supervisors. They reason that supervisors who command the loyalty of subordinates were more successful in gaining compliance with work directives and in gaining work efforts from their subordinates. Blau and Scott see the crux of the matter as the ability of the supervisor to expand their authority from the narrow scope of formal authority to a broader range of informal authority. Informal authority is dependent largely upon loyalty to the superior as a common value of the group.

Hoy, Newland, & Blazovsky (1977) studied the variables loyalty to the immediate supervisor (principal) and esprit as they are affected by centralization and
formalization in the schools. Hoy and his colleagues define esprit as, “a sense of group morale arising from satisfaction of social needs and a sense of enjoyment derived from the feeling of accomplishment on the job” (72). Esprit and subordinate loyalty were hypothesized to be lessened by high levels of centralization and formalization. This was expected to be particularly true in school settings since teachers have a professional orientation. Professional orientation is characterized by a demand for autonomy on the job and a desire to participate in decision-making.

The hypotheses were tested by using scales measuring 1) hierarchy of authority and 2) participation in decisions as aspects of centralization. Aspects of formalization were tested using scales measuring 1) job codification and 2) rule observation. Job codification is the extent to which rules and regulations prescribe job obligations and rule observation is the extent to which teachers are observed and checked for rule compliance. The four measures were significantly correlated with each other with participation in decisions having negative correlations with the others while correlations among the other three independent variables were positive.

Hierarchy of authority was found to have significant negative correlations with both esprit and loyalty to the principal. The other aspect of centralization, participation in decisions, as expected had significant positive correlations with esprit and loyalty. Job codification, the first aspect of formalization, had a significant negative correlation to loyalty to the principal but a statistically insignificant correlation with esprit. The other aspect of formalization, rule observation, had significant negative correlations with both esprit and loyalty to the principal.
Analysis by multiple regression (partial correlation analysis) showed that hierarchy of authority is still significantly negatively correlated with esprit and loyalty while participation in decisions loses its significant correlation with loyalty to the principal but retains positive significance with esprit. Overall, hierarchy of authority had the highest influence on loyalty to the principal. The greater the degree of centralization due to hierarchy of authority, the lower the level of loyalty to the principal. Surprisingly, job codification goes against the theory and has a significant positive correlation with esprit and loses significant correlation with loyalty under partial correlation analysis. Rule observation retains significant negative correlations with both dependent variables. The most surprising finding was that contrary to the hypotheses; job codification had a significant positive correlation with esprit. Apparently, teachers like the structure provided by rules and regulations defining the job, but do not like to be observed and have the rules and regulations strongly enforced.

School Bureaucracy and Student Achievement

Anderson (1974) theorizes that manipulation of school bureaucratic structures may be a way to increase student achievement. He contends that there may be a link between student achievement and the feeling of powerlessness that is a component of alienation. To test these ideas, Anderson proposed three hypotheses. The first is that the higher the level of bureaucracy in a school, the higher the level of student alienation from school. The second hypothesis is that bureaucracy is apt to be most extensive in schools where the student population is of low socio-economic status. If achievement is correlated with alienation and alienation with bureaucracy, then increased levels of bureaucracy in
low SES schools depresses the chance for student achievement in those schools. The third hypothesis is that teachers and students do not perceive the same degree of bureaucratization in schools.

The testing of the hypotheses by regression analysis revealed that much of the variance in individual student alienation is not explained by bureaucratization and control factors. Anderson does conclude that the trend relating bureaucratization to alienation is strong for the total student group. A statistically significant finding shows that social class has a negative effect on behavior control. The lower the average social class of the school, the greater the degree of behavior controls. A lack of correlation between teacher and student perceptions of levels of bureaucratization gives support to the third hypothesis. Anderson concludes there is a possibility that modification of the bureaucratic structure of the school could reduce student alienation. Therefore, less bureaucratic school structures could enhance student achievement. A final finding is that students in low SES schools experience more bureaucratization. This increased bureaucratization may be partially to blame for low achievement.

Brewer (1996) investigated the common contention that allocation of resources to administration is detrimental to student achievement. Variations of this contention are 1) more administrators per se lowers student productivity due to an increased burden on teacher time and energy, 2) allocation of resources to administration reduces available resources for instruction, and 3) it is central office administration that has a negative effect not building level administration. Brewer analyzed data from 700 New York school districts from 1978-87 and found some support to the contentions that districts with larger
central office staffs have lower educational achievement based on standardized test scores at all three levels, elementary, junior high school, and secondary. However, numbers of building administrators had positive relationships with student achievement.

Analyzing the data, Brewer found no support for contentions that increasingly large shares of resources are channeled into administration. There is little difference in the percentage of central office administrators employed based on district size, district wealth, urbanicity, or percent of white students. The only significant positive effect on student achievement came from higher levels of teacher employment. While number of central office administrators has an effect that is not statistically different from zero, the effects are uniformly negative. On the contrary, building administrator numbers have a weak positive effect on standardized test scores.

In Brewer's study, the strongest and most consistent positive variable was the employment of teachers. This echoes the finding of Hanushek (1986) that teachers are the difference. Although Hanushek's findings indicated that differences in teacher 'skills' made the difference in student achievement.

**Transforming Bureaucracies**

As technology moves forward, the structure of organizations must change with it (Scott, 1990). Technology changes organizational structure and capabilities, while organizational structure determines the ability of organizations to either generate or incorporate new technology. As technology and organizations change, the effects on the
humans must be taken into consideration in order to keep the organization efficient and effective. The goals of the organization must not be lost in the push to technological advancement. In schools, the bottom line is always student achievement.

Darling-Hammond (1996) and Odden (1996) both stated that today's bureaucracies were developed for yesterday's technological transformation of the American economy from agrarian based to an industrial based society. But now, it is not enough to instill rudimentary academic skills and socialization for a work life of routine, repetitive tasks. Darling-Hammond contends it is no longer appropriate to focus on an efficient delivery of a standardized curriculum but that education needs to develop all students into problem solvers who are capable of learning and of educating themselves during their whole lifetime. She sees schools as too impersonal with both teachers and students too often working in isolation. She sees too much rote learning and independent seatwork and not enough of the high-involvement group problem solving that is required in today's information based economy.

Darling-Hammond (1996) reported on successful schools in New York City that are organized around four functions that high-involvement workplaces exhibit. These functions were the decentralization and configuration of power, knowledge, information, and rewards. In high-involvement workplaces, motivation is achieved by collaboration rather than coercion. Cooperation is assured by relationships rather than by rules. Work is seen as the production of whole products rather than having each group concerned only with their limited contribution. An information-rich environment is created in which workers are motivated to self-teaching and the sharing of information without regard for
intraorganizational boundaries. Decentralization, flattening of hierarchies, and flexibility contribute to making schools learner centered. The work and goals of the school are organized around the needs of the learners. Lee, Bryk, and Smith (1993) contend that such 'communitarian' school structures are more effective than traditional bureaucratic structures.

These successful schools conduct a self-examination to answer such questions as how is work organized to provide focus on learning and effective teaching, are work units structured for optimal relevance and function, and what are the processes for evaluation and change in school structures and technologies (Darling-Hammond, 1996). These schools examine the processes of decentralization of power, independence of work units, and the hiring, evaluation, and retention of staff. These schools work to insure that information about performance is shared, individual and group learning is supported, and the development of staff expertise and skills is encouraged. Rewards are directly tied to increased knowledge, contributions to the schools, and the collective achievement of goals. One key to the achievement of the above goals is the structuring of the school into subunits in which students associate with a small group of teachers for extended periods of time not only during the day but also through their stay in a particular building. Work units are organized around a shared group of students rather than around a shared subject matter. Teachers and students are able to get to know and understand each other and a stability is produced that encourages student achievement and problem solving not only in their academic lives but also in their personal lives.
Odden (1996) sees the bureaucratic structure of staff compensation as a roadblock to educational reform. He contends that compensation has been treated as being independent of overall educational change. In fact, the two are inextricably linked. Past attempts at reform have utilized performance bonuses. These do not make sense for reforming the prevailing current system in which workers are responsible for only their own job. Past changes in teacher compensation structure have reflected broad changes in the society and economy. It is time to reward teachers for expertise, growth in knowledge, and multiple competencies to meet the challenges of the new information based economy.

The high-involvement school model can provide not only intrinsic rewards but also facilitates the restructuring of extrinsic rewards to reflect the skills and competencies needed for educational change. The staff of the school as a group would be responsible for the performance goals of the school. Performance bonuses would be based on school-wide and/or district-wide achievement. School-wide increases in student achievement can only be attained when staff members increase their knowledge, competencies, and the ability to work as a team in attaining goals. Odden (1996) sees the need for researchers to identify the essential competencies and skill blocks which can either supplement or replace National Board Certification, longevity, educational level, and recertification requirements in determining salary levels. Student achievement should also be a factor in determining compensation, but no current system meets the multifactored requirements that will prevent teaching to the test.

Darling-Hammond (1996) discussed extrinsic incentives other than compensation. Restructured time enables more collegial learning and interaction. It allows for new
faculty roles and facilitates teamwork. Coupled with this is a reduced pupil load.

Restructured time and reduced loads allow more opportunities for teachers to be creative and to focus on teaching students rather than teaching subjects. Work variety and leadership opportunities are facilitated by the previously described incentives. Finally, teacher ownership allows for and facilitates internally developed standards that are more relevant for each school.

Further problems include the process of design that will require participation from all affected groups in order to be viable. Funding is an issue that has doomed past attempts at educational reform that was tied to changes in the bureaucratic structure of compensation. Both of these issues are linked to the present process of collective bargaining that has developed in conjunction with the current bureaucratic structures and practices. Teachers and teacher unions must be involved in the new design efforts in order to make educational reform and compensation changes viable (Odden, 1996).

Koppich and Kerchner (1999) presented a solution to the problem of collective bargaining that utilizes teacher unions as the solution to the problems. They argued that unions have organized salaries and working conditions and now must organize the actual work of teaching. Unions can make it possible for teachers to have a leading voice in determining standards for student achievement and therefore standards in for teaching. Unions can negotiate a peer review system that has proved in some cases to be tougher than conventional evaluations by administrators. The union becomes that watchdog that protects both individual's due process rights and the teaching quality in schools.
Negotiations would be done on two levels. There would be a district wide contract that would contain basic agreements and individual school *comacts* that would be negotiated at the building level. Teachers would have a greater responsibility in determining salaries, benefits, and assignments for their peers based on training, skill development, responsibilities, and contributions to goal attainment. The school compact would cover student performance goals and resource allocation guidelines that would set standards for professional development and performance. These standards would be tied to the building standards for salaries and other compensation.

The union would function as a hiring hall for a district. It would provide a pool of teachers from which the school team could interview and hire. Teachers who were no longer needed or wanted at an individual school would return to the pool for placement at another school. Hiring would be decentralized and the union would be part of the market solution for supplying qualified teachers and other staff members. The emphasis on job security would be replaced by an emphasis on career security. Building control helps control the contracting out of services by setting standards that must be met at the building level. Decentralized control would give each school flexibility and efficiency in providing services within the school’s budgetary allocation.

Koppich and Kerchner (1999) also suggested statewide and nationwide changes in the educational bureaucracies to facilitate the allocation of teachers. They advocated portable pension and benefits that would facilitate teacher mobility with the teacher unions as the plan holder. A nationwide pension system would enable teachers to move from areas of oversupply in particular subject matters to areas of scarcity.
Union involvement could enable education to move from a traditional bureaucratic model to a professional, collegial model. Teachers would be enabled to create schools as professional service organizations. Teachers would be encouraged to develop materials that would belong to the creators thus encouraging an innovative, entrepreneurial atmosphere in education.

Verdugo, Greenberg, Henderson, Uribe, and Schneider (1997) theorized that teacher job satisfaction is highly related to student achievement. In turn, teacher job satisfaction depends upon the relationship between bureaucracy, legitimacy, and community. Weber (1947) conceived legitimacy as the credence workers give authority in regard to morals, beliefs, and cultural norms (the informal) and in regard to the job contract (the formal). Community is the teachers’ sense of unity, belonging, and cooperative interdependence (Newman, Rutter, & Smith, 1989). Beginning with Gardner et al. (1983) there was a growing consensus that the bureaucratic model of school management had failed and there was a calling for schools as communities (Chubb, 1988). Verdugo et al. (1997) tested four hypotheses regarding teacher job satisfaction, legitimacy, and community. They used overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with job autonomy as dependent endogenous variables in analysis with Structural Equations Modeling.

The first hypothesis is that although schools are bureaucracies, the closer schools come to developing a community, the greater will be teachers’ job satisfaction. This hypotheses was supported by the measurement of overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with job autonomy. The second hypothesis, the degree to which schools develop
communities depends on the degree to which teachers give legitimacy to the governance regime in their schools, was also supported since in both models, the most important predictor of community is legitimacy. The third hypothesis, the greater the legitimacy given to a governance regime in the schools the greater will be teachers' job satisfaction, was supported not only by the direct effects of legitimacy but also by the indirect effects via the effect of legitimacy on community. The fourth hypothesis, that the greater the involvement of teachers in the evaluation and assessment of school programs and not of individuals, the more likely it is that 1) they will give legitimacy to their governing regime, 2) the greater will be their sense of community, and 3) the greater will be their job satisfaction, was supported with positive but not large indirect effects. Statistical product control, the ongoing participation of teachers in decision making with a focus on programs not on assessment of individuals, emerged as a major positive factor in both overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with job autonomy.

Verdugo and colleagues conclude that efforts to improve schools should focus on developing organizational climates that enable teachers to do their jobs in a professional, autonomous manner. In order to accomplish this, schools need to move from a bureaucracy orientation to community orientation or to merge the two with a melding of needed elements from both. The type and extent of bureaucracy influences teacher perceptions of the legitimacy of the bureaucrat/administrators. Teacher perceptions of legitimacy strongly influence community that in turn influences job satisfaction.

Feminists (Martin & Knopoff, 1997) make suggestions that cut to the heart of the impersonal orientation and career orientation of Weber's elements. The demand for more
than a full-time commitment is seen as excessive and punitive to those with childcare responsibilities. Feminists contend that training which only enhances status and does not directly contribute to job skills should not be required for placement and advancement. These changes would in turn affect division of labor by allowing flexibility in hours worked which would then entail job rotation, cross training, job sharing, and leaves of absence. Feminists see computer technology as a way of blurring the lines of job specialization and eliminating jobs that are considered low-level clerical positions and hence pink collar ghettos. This would help eliminate sex segregation by occupation. The bureaucratic model's separation of home and work will continue to discriminate against women until men carry an equal share of the home and child care responsibilities.

In organizations in which reliability is more crucial than efficiency such as nuclear power plants and space exploration, bureaucrats need to see that inertia is a complex state which must be carefully monitored and tended in order to avoid disasters (Weick, 1994). Stable situations are more often produced by continuous change rather than continuous repetition. Changes in the organization and the systems it operates must be compensated by offsetting changes in other areas of the organization. The organization must provide its own reinforcement to its members since the public tends to ignore reliability except when it fails.

Hirschhorn (1997) takes a more psychological approach to reconfiguring organizations. He states that feelings such as envy, dependency, abdication, and resentment contribute to problems in bureaucracies. Resentment divides the official from the sources of authority yet locks them into a psychological dependency to the authority.
The person who resents feels victimized and must overcome feelings of weakness and isolation. Unfortunately, the politics of the society or the organization too often make resentment the center of feelings. Politics focuses on fairness of past decisions and who is owed what. This fosters resentment and envy. The current economic climate has made organizations more careless about its members as the organizations struggle to meet competitive pressures. Career security has been weakened as organizations have struggled to meet competitive demands. Career security once meant that the bureaucrat had to surrender individuality and conform to organizational norms. Organizations were able to reduce costs due to standardized procedures and standardized employee roles. But employees failed to gain the experience, conviction, and confidence needed to meet new challenges. Strategic planning concentrated in one team or department became more of a cover-up for the real anxieties and problems of the organization. High-stakes issues stimulated bureaucrats to use formal planning methods that created superficial discussions and less meaningful decisions.

Members of an organization must be aware that everyone is vulnerable and the future of all is interrelated (Hirschhorn, 1997). As relatedness is acknowledged, members become more secure in dealing with the group. The sense of authority and responsibility for their own future is deepened. The ostensibly contradictory outcome is that employees have less job security due to economic pressures, yet they must feel secure enough to share information and skills with one another to create an organization that can meet the economic pressures. Hirschhorn (1997) advocates strategic 'conversations' that are supported by data and allow freewheeling thinking. Organization members must become
more open, vulnerable, and risk-taking in order to get past the personal and political

games and must address the real challenges to the organization. The organizational

climate must have an ethic of forgiveness. Second and third chances must be given. This
gain in teamwork and abilities to meet outside challenges requires that organizational
members risk job instability and loss of organizational coherence. These risks can be
offset by political and social policies that can increase the benefits and reduce the costs of
the risks taken to develop an effective post-modern organization. Without a government
supported social safety net, employees will be reluctant to take the necessary risks even
though the potential rewards are high. This ‘post-industrial safety net’ (126) would assure
health care, retraining, new skill acquisition, and help in creating new enterprises. In
short, it would insure second and third chances for individuals willing to take the risks.
Individuals helped would be those willing to take risks so that the system does not
become similar to those in Europe that benefit job holders rather than job seekers. The
distinction between those who failed and those who were victimized would blur. The
public’s desire to protect itself from the vicious side of the free market while using free
market dynamics to advance living standards would be accommodated. This would
enable bureaucrats to work themselves out of a job. This idea is currently anathema to
bureaucrats and counter to the Weberian model of bureaucracies.

Endnotes:

1. Various translations and interpretations of Weber were consulted in writing this review
of the literature. The 1946 (Gerth & Mills) and 1947 (Henderson & Parsons) translations
are often cited and cover a substantial portion of Weber’s voluminous works. Newer
interpretations such as Kasler (1988) and Swedborg (1999) see Weber as less dogmatic
and more realistic in his appraisal of the workings of bureaucracies.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

"Not everything that counts can be counted. And not everything that can be counted counts."
Albert Einstein

Design of the Study

This study draws upon both quantitative and qualitative methodology. The quantitative study was the "100 Schools Study" which identified schools on high and low ends of the bipolar continuum of enabling/hindering bureaucracy. That study used teacher surveys which involved the entire faculties of the schools. In order to explore the processes and dynamics of enabling and hindering bureaucracies, case study methodology is indicated (Merriam, 1988). I chose case study methodology using interviews as the principal instrument. Schools at the high end of the enabling/hindering continuum were contacted for permission to interview teachers in depth. The purpose of the interviews was to identify behaviors on the part of the bureaucracies (administrators/central office personnel) that were viewed by teachers as either enabling or hindering. These interviews were used to generate lists of behaviors, rules, and structures that the teachers viewed as best practice. The results of the interviews were supplemented by observations of faculty meetings and by analysis of school documents that dealt with bureaucratic structure and behavior as exemplified by policy manuals, administrative directives, and staff memoranda.
The rationale for the interviews is that while the quantitative study did indicate that enabling and hindering bureaucracies do exist and can be measured; discrete behaviors, rules, and structures cannot be specifically identified from the quantitative data. The quantitative portion of the study confirms the concepts of enabling bureaucracy and of hindering bureaucracy. This portion also confirms the ability of surveys to identify schools that have the two types of bureaucracies. It gives us the basis for selection of the schools that were chosen to conduct the qualitative interviews of the study. Qualitative data from the interviews allows us to capture the perspectives of participants (Patton, 1990). The qualitative interview provides a framework within which teachers and principals can express their own understandings of the effects of the bureaucracies. Combining qualitative and quantitative methods complements the knowledge which each can bring.

While the quantitative surveys identified a large number of concepts in the schools, the qualitative portion of the study gives us a deeper understanding of the specific concept under study, enabling bureaucracy. All scientific methodology begins with observation. The quantitative portion was based on observations that led to hypotheses that were tested statistically. Qualitative methods are employed to follow a quantitative study in order to add dimensions of complexity and richness as well as meaning.

The schools selected for the quantitative study were limited to public high schools in Ohio. An attempt was made to include a representative portion from urban, suburban, and rural high schools. Additional factors in selection were no change in school
leadership between the time of studies, permission to participate in the study, logistics and time frames which might hinder the study, and any extraordinary change in the make-up of the school or the district which would have significantly affected the functioning of the bureaucracy and as a result weaken the validity of the research.

**Participants**

Participants in the “100 Schools Study” quantitative portion of the study included the entire available faculty at school faculty meetings. In most cases, this included nearly 100% of the schools' faculties. Participants in the qualitative portion of the study were those who either volunteered or were asked to participate by their principal. The goal was to get at least three faculty members from each school. The orientation of the participants on enabling bureaucracy was unknown at the beginning of the interviews since the quantitative surveys were anonymous. Participants to a certain extent were self-selecting since it is impossible to interview people who are unwilling to cooperate.

Participants as a group could be characterized as older and more experienced staff members. The schools in which first year teachers and other young teachers participated were the ones in which the principal recruited a mixture of faculty members. The older staff members were more talkative and more assertive in their comments than the younger staff members. They had the opportunity to observe the principals over many years and tended to be more strongly supportive of the principals.
For the quantitative study, the school was the unit of analysis. The orientation of the school on the continuum of enabling bureaucracy was measured by the collective responses of entire faculties. Survey data was based on the perceptions of the teachers for the whole school. Teachers were asked to evaluate the items measuring enabling bureaucracy for the school as a whole not just for themselves. The surveys were administered from January through May 2000.

The items were generated by Hoy and his colleagues (Hoy and Sweetland, 2000; Hoy and Sweetland, 2001). The initial list of 24 items used in previous studies was pared to the 12 with the highest factor loadings using principal-axis factor analysis. The initial 24 items had a strong internal consistency with alpha = .94 in one study and alpha = .96 on a second study. The 12 items used in the “100 Schools Study” are presented below in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling Formalization</th>
<th>Coercive Formalization Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative rules in this school enable authentic communications between teachers and administrators.</td>
<td>4. Administrative rules in this school are used to punish teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative rules help rather than hinder.</td>
<td>5. In this school red tape is a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Administrative rules in this school are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedures.</td>
<td>6. Administrative rules in this school are substitutes for professional judgement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enabling Centralization

7. The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their jobs.
8. The administrative hierarchy of this school facilitates the mission of the school.
9. The administrators in this school use their authority to enable teachers to do their job.

Hindering Centralization

10. The administrative hierarchy obstructs student achievement.
11. The administrative hierarchy of this school obstructs innovation.
12. In this school the authority of the principal is used to undermine teachers.

Table 1: Items Measuring Enabling Bureaucracy in the “100 Schools Study”

The factor loadings, reliability, and validity of the 12 enabling bureaucracy items in the “100 Schools Survey” were even stronger than they had been in two previous studies. The factor loadings ranged between .69 and .86 with 10 of 12 at .80 or greater. The factor had an $r^2$ of 64.4%. The alpha coefficient for reliability was .95. Since the correlation between the 12 item form and the initial 24 item form is near 1, the validity evidence from the previous two studies pertains to this study (Hoy and Sweetland, 2001).

The Qualitative Study

The purpose of the qualitative study was to provide a thick, rich description of the situation under study (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Specific to this study are the behaviors, rules, and structures in the schools that are either enabling or hindering to the teachers in
the accomplishment of their instructional goals. Access and entry are subject to the prerogatives and limitations of the school and of the individuals who participate in the study.

The qualitative study is in the form of a case study that has the characteristics of both instrumental and collective case studies (Stake, 1995). It is instrumental because the purpose is to gain a broader understanding of what constitutes enabling bureaucratic structures and behaviors. The observations and the interviews obtained at the various schools will hopefully have a transferability (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) to other educational bureaucracies. The purpose is not to understand the workings of a particular school but of educational bureaucracies in general. The ability of the case study to yield insight into the workings and dynamics of the situation and to discern the perspectives of the participants gives this method particular value (Merriam, 1988). This case study is designed to reveal the dynamics of enabling bureaucracies. This case study provides an in-depth analysis (Thomas, 1998) of the characteristics of enabling bureaucracies. The case study will be collective in that several schools will be studied and the data from all of the schools will be synthesized into an instrumental form. When certain responses, perceptions, and observations come up again and again then generalizations can be drawn (Stake, 1995). It is the responsibility of the researcher to represent the viewpoints of the multiple participants so that each viewpoint is valued (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) in a way that leads to balancing the synthesis of observations into a model of best practice with the consideration of alternative explanations.
Interviewing

The interview approach was that of the standardized open-ended interview (Patton, 1990). This approach uses a set of questions worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence of questions. A drawback is that flexibility in the interview is limited. This limits the extent to which individual differences and circumstances can be taken into account. A strength of this approach is that it is easier to maintain the focus of the interview on the topic under study. Data is complete for each person in the study group since each person is given the same basic questions in the same order. This approach is more effective when time limitations must be considered. Variations that result from external factors such as time of day, interviewee distractions and stress, and variations in the interviewer(s) are minimized. This approach also allows the instrument used in the interviews to be available for inspection by decision makers, participants, and potential users of the information from the study (Patton, 1990).

As a result of the standardized open-ended approach, these interviews contained both structured and unstructured components (Fontana and Frey, 2000). The drawback to having both is that using the structured component first may frame the mindset of the participant. Using the unstructured component first can make it difficult to impose a structured component later. The participants may resist moving from one aspect of the interview to the other.

The questions attempted to encourage the participants to give specific, detailed examples of experiences, behaviors, actions and activities that characterized enabling or
hindering bureaucracies. The opinions and values of the participants not only tell us about what the participants think about past experiences but also what they would like to see in the future. Finally, since effective and efficient work habits are influenced by feelings, attitudes, and emotions, participants were encouraged to share their feelings about their experiences. The questions were constructed to be truly open-ended (Patton, 1990) rather than encouraging dichotomous or limited range responses.

Since the respondents in the quantitative study were anonymous, it was helpful to gain a measure of how closely the sample in the interviews corresponds to the survey sample in their assessment of the enabling structure in their schools. This correspondence was indicated by administering Form ESS (Appendix D) to each interviewee. Form ESS is comprised of the twelve questions from the “100 Schools Study” surveys that measured enabling bureaucracy. A close fit between the two would enhance the validity of the study. A weak correspondence will require more interpretation of the recommendations developed from survey results.

The structured component of the interview was based on the enabling bureaucracy items from the “100 Schools Study.” For structured interviewing, it was necessary to ask the same set of questions that corresponded to the survey items (Fontana and Frey, 2000).

The unstructured component was used to elicit examples from experience on how the bureaucracy enabled or hindered the teachers in doing their jobs. Particularly important was the solicitation of teacher ideas for developing an enabling bureaucracy.
Teachers were asked to provide specific recommendations for their school and to theorize behaviors, rules, and structures that they felt would foster enabling bureaucracy in all school situations.

The interview questions were developed subject to the review of professors in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. The questions were designed to elicit appropriate responses by being constructed to utilize presuppositions that bureaucracies were enabling or hindering (Patton, 1990). They were also evaluated for being singular and clear. The questions were introduced with an opening statement intended to inform participants what would be asked, who will see and use the information, the purpose of collecting the information, how the information will be used, and giving an assurance of confidentiality. The resulting interview protocol was pilot tested with experienced teachers. The interview protocol was modified based on the input of the professors and the teachers in the pilot test. See Appendix A for interview protocol. The unstructured component of the interview was sometimes modified during the interviews to take advantage of teacher insights and unforeseen ideas.

A total of twenty-seven interviews involving twenty-seven participants were conducted over period of four months. Each participant was involved in an initial interview, a member check in which the transcript of the initial interview was reviewed and possibly revised, and in the opportunity to see the final aggregation of identified behaviors and structures with the opportunity for further input.
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Observation

Faculty meetings and staff committee meetings were observed where and when possible. The reactions of the staff members to the application of school and district rules and procedures were observed. The perceived effect on the morale and efficiency of the staff was observed. When possible, the participants were asked to state their perceptions and reactions to the applied rules and procedures as part of the interview process. Nonverbal cues and reactions were also recorded and interpreted by the researcher. When possible, the participants observed were asked to confirm or correct the interpretation of the observer.

Staff was also observed in informal situations. In fact, most of the observation was informal. Staff interaction with students, administrators, and other staff members was observed in lunchrooms, hallways, offices, classrooms, and study halls. Eating lunch with staff members elicited comments that were not expressed in the more formal interview situation. Personalities were observed that would have only been faceless names if the only contact with staff had been in the interview sessions. Moving through the hallways and classes gave a more complete and detailed comprehension of the school climates and cultures.

Document Analysis

Copies of the schools and district policy manuals as well as memos and staff handouts were examined for instances of enabling and hindering structures and behaviors. Besides the written policies, staff were asked for their interpretation of the policies and
the degree to which various policies were actually enforced. Staff members were asked for their suggestions for modifying policies and for their suggestions for policies that would facilitate their work.

Questions of authenticity and credibility were minimized by using official policy manuals and memoranda that were disseminated to all staff members (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). While private memos and oral communications are an important part of bureaucratic process, they do not have the weight of official policy and administrative interpretation of policy as given in written documents disseminated to the whole staff. The perceptions of the participants of documents were given equal importance as well as the strength of the wording of particular policies and memoranda (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). No appreciable differences were observed among student handbooks and Master Agreements as schools in Ohio tend to follow Ohio School Boards Association recommendations and as a result contain very similar wording.

Data Collection

Interviews were conducted at the participant’s schools at the convenience of the participant. This meant they were sometimes conducted after school but mostly when the teachers had a break during the day. Interviews ranged from forty-five minutes to one hour in length. Immediately after the interviews, a post-interview checklist was completed (See Appendix B). Data was collected in the winter and spring of 2002. Since this research is subject to Human Subjects Review Board procedures, each interview began with the reading of the guarantee of the confidentiality of the subjects. Permission to tape record the interviews was gained and participants were asked to sign the consent
form. See Appendix C for Consent form and Confidentiality script. Tapes and notes were unidentified except for coding known only to the interviewer to protect the confidentiality of the participants. Interview tapes were transcribed verbatim.

Member checks are necessary to insure the validity of the information gathered in qualitative research (Janesick, 2000). This helps remove possible bias or preconceptions on the part of the researcher that might affect the interpretation of the results. Member checks help give ownership to the participants and help the researcher gain insight into the situation and the mindsets of the participants. Member checks add depth and breadth to the interpretation of the data in the study. Since interpretation is a major part of all research and other interpretations exist other than that of the researcher (Stake, 1995), member checks contribute to the interpretation of the data before it is finalized, influence the interpretations of the researcher, and add to the verity of the interpretations.

Two types of member checks were used. The first was the opportunity for the individuals to read the transcription of their own interview. They were then able to make any corrections or revisions they felt were necessary. The second member check was the opportunity for all of the participants to read the descriptions of enabling and hindering behaviors, rules, and structures generated from all the interviews. They were able to give input for possible revisions and clarifications.

**Data Analysis**

Transcripts were read and coded to identify and categorize behaviors and structures of the rules and hierarchy. The coding scheme was allowed to evolve as the data collection indicated (Glesne, 1999). It did begin with some a priori categories and
key words based on the theory of enabling bureaucracies (Weitzman, 2000). See Appendix G for the coding scheme. Analysis was ongoing as the interviews took place in order to make an early identification of themes and common recommendations. This helped in the recognition of confirming data as well as the identification of unique contributions from the participants.

The standardized open-ended interview approach facilitated data analysis since it was possible to locate each respondent’s answer to the same question rather quickly and to organize questions and answers that are similar (Patton, 1990). Since the focus of the interviews was tightly fixed on the bureaucracies of the schools, the standardized open-ended interview approach’s advantage in data analysis over the informal conversational interview and the general interview guide approach was apparent in both efficiency and appropriateness.

**Internal Validity**

Methodological triangulation along with the member check element in data collection is basic strategies for ensuring internal validity (Merriam, 1988). Methodological triangulation was achieved by comparing the survey results from the “100 Schools Study” with the interview data. This was used to test hypotheses and to provide a greater depth to the data than could be accomplished by either method alone. Data triangulation was achieved since there were multiple respondents within each school for the qualitative data and multiple sources due to the quantitative data. A limited form
of investigator triangulation was achieved by gaining the insights of faculty members from The Ohio State University as they reviewed the preliminary findings for the study (Janesick, 2000).

The other strategies for ensuring internal validity (Merriam, 1988) long-term observation over a period of time, peer examination of findings as they emerge, participant involvement, and identification and clarification of researcher bias were used in varying degrees. Since the purpose of the study was to identify participant perceptions, researcher bias in interpretation was minimized by the input of participants and peers.

Reliability

Guba and Lincoln (1989) suggest that reliability in the traditional sense is better expressed as ‘dependability’ or ‘consistency’ in qualitative research. According to Merriam (1988), this is established by the researcher’s statement of position, triangulation, and an audit trail. My statement of position is evident in the continued assertions of the value of bureaucracies and the ability of bureaucrats to improve their bureaucracies through informed reflection and action. Triangulation for dependability is the same as that used for internal validity. The audit trail of transcripts, member checks, interpretative decisions, and observation notes are detailed in Chapter Four.

External Validity

External validity or the ability to generalize is always a problem in qualitative research (Merriam, 1988). Being a collective case involving several schools increased the generalizability of the findings in this study. Considering findings in terms of working hypotheses rather than generalizations gives a more accurate model for the practical use
of the findings. Practitioners can look for patterns in the findings that explain their own experience and assist them in making informed decisions for future action. The greater the amount of data gathered and the resulting thick, rich descriptions adds to the transferability of the findings.

**Ethical Considerations**

Despite institutional safeguards, the burden for conducting ethical research lies with the researcher (Merriam, 1988). Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. Each interview began with a statement of confidentiality with the provision for non-participation or withdrawal from participation at any time. Member checks were used not only for purposes of validity but also for verity in the description and interpretation of the participant perceptions. This researcher engaged in self-examination at all stages of the research in order to eliminate research bias (Merriam, 1988).

**Significance of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to generate descriptions of specific behaviors, rules, and structures of the school system and the bureaucrats/administrators within the schools that will enable the teaching staff to perform their teaching duties. Assuming general agreement that the primary function of the school is to advance student achievement as far as the innate abilities of the student will allow, all parties should work together to reach this goal. Based on the quantitative portion of this research, it has been established that teachers can differentiate between behaviors, rules, and structures that are enabling and those which are hindering.
The qualitative portion of this study, the case study, is hypothesis-generating (Merriam, 1988). The behaviors, rules, and structures identified should be considered starting points or guidelines for the practitioner who then tests them in practice. Although there will not be complete consensus as to whether all of the identified behaviors, rules, and structures are enabling or hindering, general agreements can serve as guidelines to best practice for the school’s bureaucrats/administrators. The current descriptions generated by the study are the basis of our recommendations with the understanding that two of the recommendations are flexibility and the ability to change with the times as goals shift and what constitutes best practice changes. This means that these descriptions are not set in stone or that they are best practice in all schools. Truth is subject to the interpretation and consensus among informed people (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). So observations from this study will need to be combined with unique aspects of each educational situation in order to form the best synthesis of courses of action.

In this way hopefully, the descriptions generated will provide practitioners with the ability to improve the workings of school bureaucracies. In this way, the descriptions have predictive power. Practitioners believe, as does Friedman (1955) that predictive power is the true test of theory. Successful use of suggested behaviors, rules, and structures would prove or disprove the value of this research.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

"Life is a battle. On this point optimists and pessimist agree. Evil is insolent and strong; beauty enchanting but rare; goodness very apt to be weak; folly very apt to be defiant; wickedness to carry the day: imbeciles to be in very great places, people of sense in small, and mankind generally, unhappy...

In this there is mingled pain and delight, but over the mysterious mixture there hovers a visible rule, that bids us learn to will and seek to understand.”

Henry James

Quantitative Data

This study began as a quantitative study of ninety-eight high schools that covered a wide range of variables including 'enabling bureaucracy'. The “100 Schools Study” confirmed that school bureaucracies/administrations could be identified as being enabling or hindering along a bipolar continuum (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). The concept of enabling bureaucracy was ranked on a five point Likert scale by each member of the school’s faculty. The score for the school was the mean of the faculty rating. The complete range of schools was from a high of 4.41 to a low of 2.74. The mean score for all ninety-eight schools was 3.689.

In order to capture the essence of enabling bureaucracies, interviews were used so that faculty and principals in enabling schools could identify specific behaviors and structures in those schools (Patton, 1990). This identification of enabling behaviors would be consistent with Anderson’s (1974) reasoning on why it is important to study
educational bureaucracies. If bureaucracies/administrations are to be changed to promote student achievement, then we need to understand which administrative behaviors and structures are considered enabling by those who deliver the product to the clients in schools. With this in mind, the schools chosen for the 2002 qualitative study had to meet two criteria:

1. No change in the principal since the 2000 study. The principal is considered the key administrator in dealing with faculty. Many of the highest-ranking schools had no assistant principals. While superintendents were more accessible in many of the highest-ranking schools since the schools were small, most participants indicated that their contact with the superintendent was minimal. While Weber (1946) maintained the power of bureaucrats and administrators was based on rational-legal authority, the premise of this study is that individual's behaviors and personalities do make a difference. Since all of the administrators in the “100 Schools Study” had the same rational-legal authority, the differences in the enabling bureaucracy scores must be due to differences in administrative behaviors and structures.

2. The schools selected for this qualitative study had to rank in the top 25 in the enabling bureaucracy score. Originally, the goal was to obtain schools in the top 15 but changes in principal and the willingness of principals to participate forced the expansion of the range of schools surveyed.

School principals were contacted by letter with an overview of the study outlining
the goals of the study and the extent of participation of the principal and the faculty. Six school principals agreed to participate and felt that their faculty would be willing to participate.

Both principals and faculty members were given an abbreviated version (Appendix D: From ESS) of the surveys that were administered to the high school in 2000. This version contained only the twelve questions that pertained to enabling bureaucracy. Six of the questions were directly related to rules of the school and district and the other six pertained to the hierarchy of the school and the district.

The administration of this ‘Form ESS’ (See Appendix D. Items 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 11 are reverse scored) served two purposes. It was a rudimentary quantitative check to gain an indication if the variable of enabling bureaucracy had changed to any great degree over the two years (See Table 2). Since no statistical claims are being made, any differences do not preclude the use of the qualitative data obtained at any of the schools. Any radical shifts are most likely due to the extremely small sample of teachers participating in the qualitative portion of this study. The second purpose was to orient the faculty to the nature of the interview questions. Initially, Form ESS was to be administered at the end of the interview because it was felt that the questions might have an undue influence on the teacher’s thinking. But practice sessions with graduate students showed that it was difficult to shift from the interview to Form ESS at the end without cutting people off when they were in a flow of thought. Also, since some of the principals
shared the content of the interview questions with the faculty beforehand and some did not, the administration of Form ESS helped orient the faculty members to the type of questions they would be answering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2000 Full Faculty Mean</th>
<th>2002 Interviewee Mean</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>w/P 3.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>w/P 4.46 wo/P 4.45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>w/P 4.22 wo/P 4.28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>w/P 4.08 wo/P 3.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>w/P 4.04 wo/P 4.01</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>w/P 4.28 wo/P 4.27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

w/P = with principal scored included

**TABLE 2: Comparison of Variable Scores on 2000 Survey to 2002 Interview Scores**

The data in the table gives us the basis for some speculation. Since the 2002 Interviewee Mean is higher than the 2000 Full Faculty Mean for three of the five schools, there may be effects from self-selection of teachers and/or some mild principal bias in asking for volunteers. Interesting to note is that the union representatives in schools F and B rated the school's administration much higher than the overall means. Union representatives normally tend to have more negative views of administrators than other faculty members and so these high scores probably reflect an appreciation on the part of union leaders of the enabling leadership style of the principals. The principal at school D
claims to have never had a grievance files by the union as far back as the 1970s. But the
difference between the averages with and without the principal in school D is the only
one that is appreciable. This is a reflection of both the small sample and the very
business-like, professional attitudes of the two participants. Both of them had advanced
degrees and were long-time faculty members.

School Descriptions

The top 25 schools in the ranking of enabling bureaucracy are composed mainly
of small, rural schools. Nineteen of the 25 top ranking schools can be classified as rural
and they have fewer than 50 teachers with many of them having 30 or fewer teachers.
Five of the schools can be considered suburban or small city and only one fits into the
urban category. That urban school is smaller than most in its city school district and has
some special characteristics that make it more like a suburban school.

The concept of an enabling bureaucracy is consistent with the tacit agreement that
the bureaucracy should respond to policy leadership from outside the bureaucracy
(Heady, 2001). In the case of school districts, this policy leadership theoretically comes
from the Board of Education and its electorate. But practically speaking, the
administrators guide the board. The overwhelming proportion of small schools in the top
25 rankings is understandable with the heightened ability of the board and the public to
influence the schools in small communities and for the administration to be accepted as
the educational experts in the district.

School A: This school fits the small suburban category. Originally a small country
school, it resisted consolidation and managed to grow enough through move-ins from an
adjoining city to avoid the state's campaign for consolidation in the late 50s and early 60s. The principal was very receptive but seemed hesitant to encourage the faculty to participate. I was invited to come in on a teacher workday and ask for volunteers. While the faculty listened and seemed receptive, none of them volunteered for an interview. The student body has outgrown the high school building. All of the school district's buildings are on the same campus. It also has an assistant principal.

**School B:** This school is a small rural school set in a very small town. The area is quite poor and until recently was struggling with finances. This school does have a fairly new building which houses both the high school and the middle school. There is some crossover between the high school and middle school among the staff but a strong effort is made to keep the student bodies apart with separate administrators, counselors, and libraries. The town has always had the reputation as a fairly tough town and has a large Appalachian population. There is no assistant principal. This school was 3rd on the "100 Schools Study" ratings of enabling bureaucracy with a score of 4.23.

Here, the principal recruited specific members of the staff to participate. He made an effort to balance academic areas as well as including both males and females and both long-time faculty members and recent hires. He also included a teacher who had been critical in the past in order to give a possible negative point of view. Five teachers consented to interviews at this school.

**School C:** This school is much like school B with three main differences. It is also a small rural school set in a small town with a slightly larger population of about 1,000 and is quite far from any large urban area. The building also houses grades 7-12. One
difference is that the principal covers grades 7-12 and the district’s administrative offices of the superintendent and the treasurer are in the building. Another difference is that the main ethnic group is German due to the large number of German Catholics and German Lutherans who immigrated into the area in the mid to late nineteenth century. The third difference is that the community is fairly prosperous being situated in a good farming area with a number of small, locally owned businesses. The community has a lot of school pride with the school being the focal point of community activities. It is the only district in its county to have passed a school district income tax. The district contains three small towns with one of them having most of the Appalachian population. This town is considered to be the source of most of the discipline problems in the school. This school is most like the majority of schools in the top 25 in the rankings of enabling bureaucracy in the size and organization of the district, in the area of the state in which it is situated and in the ethnic and SES make-up of the community.

The principal had asked the staff for volunteers and had four teachers consent. One of them could not do the interview due to time constraints so the principal said, “Go down and find so-and-so. He should have some time.” So there were four teacher interviews at this school.

School D: This school is another small, rural school close to a small town. This school has had an assistant principal for about five years. But this assistant also functions as the athletic director and that accounts for a large portion of his workload. The building also
houses the district’s administrative offices. This district is within 30 miles of a large urban area and has experienced steady growth that has caused the student body to outgrow the high school.

Here the principal also asked for volunteers, but just gave the faculty my e-mail address. Only two teachers volunteered. Both were science teachers and either had or were pursuing advanced degrees. Both were critical of the lack of volunteers among their fellow staff members.

School E: Much like school D, this is a small rural school close to a small town but with the high school building set out in the middle of corn and soy bean fields. This school is also within 30 miles of a major urban area. Their high school is fairly new and large enough to have an assistant principal. The principal was relatively new with the fewest years at the building of any of the schools involved in the interviews. This principal was also the only female in the group.

Here the principal asked for volunteers but evidently did some cajoling and coaxing. There were six faculty members interviewed at this school. This principal was the only principal who was interviewed on the same day as the faculty. All of the other principals opted to be interviewed before the day the faculty members were interviewed.

School F: This was the only urban or large suburban high school in the top 25 schools in the rankings of enabling bureaucracy. Getting this school into the interview process was a good example of a hindering bureaucracy. This was the only district contacted which required a written application for conducting research. This application was submitted to a group of four who each reviewed it on their own. The initial application was rejected as
"Incomplete" with no explanation of what was missing. Informal contacts within the bureaucracy had to be made in order to learn what needed to be done. Fortunately, one helpful individual gave guidance to navigating the approval process. Finally, after three months, the approval was received. This district was also part of a concurrent study of elementary schools that covered over 150 schools in over 70 districts. The only other district in that study to require written application was also a large urban system. The tortuous path to approval for that study was much the same as this one. So School F is an example of an enabling school that is within a hindering district.

While part of an urban district, this school has many of the characteristics of a suburban school. It has both a graduation rate and a percentage of students going on the post-secondary education that are higher than the district average. It is a Venture Capital school and supports a large number of successful extracurricular activities. One salient factor in the commitment of the students to the school is that it does not accept intra-district open enrollment of sophomores, juniors, or seniors. Intra-district students who live outside the attendance area must make the commitment during their 8th grade year. This often makes it the decision of the parents since students at the 8th grade level are usually not ready to make such a commitment. This school ranked 4th in the rankings of enabling bureaucracy with a score of 4.20. It had by far the highest rating of an urban school on the measurement of enabling bureaucracy.

**Qualitative Data**

The teachers were interviewed during free time such as conference periods. The principals generally had more time as some were interviewed after school or during a
nonattendance day. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed. The transcripts were then returned to the teachers and principals for their review and any editing they wished to make. Responses to the transcripts varied from a blanket approval of the transcript to catching a few typos to massive rewriting. One teacher said that she spent four hours on a Sunday afternoon going over hers and rewriting it. Another at the same school said that she was only half done going through hers when I came to pick it up. She said that she was a poor speaker and was making it more readable and understandable. When I reassured her that only she and I would ever be reading it, she said that she would give it to me the way it was because the content was OK.

The most commonly mentioned documents, student handbooks and master contracts, were requested from the schools. Getting handbooks was not a problem but not all the schools were willing to part with a contract copy. Principals were worried either about repercussions from the union or from their superiors.

Transcripts and documents were examined for frequency of responses with an attempt to gauge shadings of meaning within categories. Post interview checklists were made in order to record an overall impression of the interview with an emphasis on the participant mood and any conditions that would affect their answers. For example, the woman who was only halfway through going over her transcript had been in the teacher lounge during the interview and the principal entered the room three times. The teachers' mailboxes were in there and the principal came in three times to put things into boxes and quickly left. Although she was very positive about her principal and we stopped the
interview each time he entered, she said was still very nervous and uncomfortable in that setting. But she did not change the substance of her interview when she reviewed the transcript.

Categorization of behaviors by their relevance to the questions was chosen after other categorization schemes were considered. This meant several behaviors had effects on more than one category. Accordingly, they are touched upon in more than one analysis of questions in the following discussion. The answers of the participants tended to overlap the categories as designated by the questions. But this is just a reflection of how behaviors can have several different effects or sometimes a ripple effect that eventually reaches all of the different categories of behaviors.

Coding

The assignment of codes and code names are subject to change as needed. Codes are renamed and reassigned as needed in order to organize the data (Glesne, 1999). I started with no preconceptions of the behaviors to be identified and coded. Simply beginning with the first interview and coding the discrete behaviors identified in the transcript gave the basis for the initial codes. Coded behaviors are grouped under the questions but were not necessarily mentioned when answering those specific questions (see Appendix G for codebook). Participants often answered questions that were not asked. They sometimes repeated or reverted to previous ideas. Often, they had one or a few major points that they kept returning to no matter what questions or prompts they were given.
The sampling's basic units were behaviors (Ryan & Bernard, 2000). These behaviors were identified with a grounded theory approach. As more and more transcripts were reviewed, the categories of behaviors changed growing more specific. Some behaviors were moved to other Question groups and some were not readily assigned to any category. The transcripts were the source of the themes that define enabling bureaucracies in the schools from which the interviews were taken. This grounded theory approach identified the concepts that emerged from the data (Ryan & Bernard, 2000).

Coding categories presented a problem since specific behaviors often affected several factors in the school administration. For example, rules providing structure (STRUCT) was initially considered to be most closely related to the category of Rules as Guidelines to Problem Solving (RLSGUI). But as the review of the transcripts progressed this categorization became fuzzy and when it came time to discuss structure, the discussion fit more neatly into the Enabling Rules (ENRLS). Other behaviors were moved around as each new transcript gave a new shading to the meaning of the behavior. The more a behavior was cited (structure was mentioned in every school usually as being there but sometimes as lacking) the more it tended to resist categorization. So no claims are made for exactness in behavior categorization.

**Analysis of Questions**

The survey questions evolved as they were used in the pilot interviews and in the initial interviews at the schools. The questions originated from Form ESS but were changed from the twelve questions on Form ESS into ten open-ended survey questions. The change was done by combination of questions rather than by elimination so all of the
ideas and concepts of Form ESS were retained. The questions were reviewed by two members of the faculty of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University who are familiar with the literature and concepts in the study of bureaucracies. The questions were piloted with graduate students in the College of Education including International students in order to make sure that the questions were understandable to college trained persons who were not necessarily familiar with the literature and concepts concerning bureaucracies.

It became evident in the practice surveys and in the early school faculty interviews that the term 'bureaucracy' had too strong a negative connotation. It tended to make the respondents a little defensive and negative in their attitudes and responses. The term 'bureaucracy' also seemed to have a strongly different meaning than the term 'administration' to most of the respondents. They tended to look at the local level as administrators and at the state and national level as bureaucrats. There were also varied interpretations as to the membership of the bureaucracy. So the term administration was substituted since it was clear to all that this included building administrators plus central office personnel.

It also became evident that when the questions asked about negative situations such as 'hindering,' 'punishing,' and 'obstructing' that the respondents focused on rebutting the notion that those type of actions would happen in their school. It became useful to use the caveats such as 'might the administration obstruct/hinder/punish' or 'if that happens' in order to keep the focus positive. This was helpful in making the respondents become more open and expressive in the beginning of the interview. Even
the respondents in the early interviews were fairly open and expressive by the end of the interview as they became assured as the interview went on that the positive aspects of their school's administration were being emphasized. It was helpful to remind these respondents that their schools had been selected because they rated highly on the 'enabling bureaucracy' scale. Some of the respondents were obviously somewhat suspicious initially and concerned that the interviews were meant to discover negative aspects of the local administrators.

**Question 1:** “Enabling administrations aid communications between teachers and administrators. In what ways do the rules in this school enable communications?”

The first question elicited 25 discrete behaviors. Some behaviors were specific to a particular school such as using e-mail for communication. Other behaviors were identified in all schools although not by all participants. Of course, some desired behaviors were mentioned by only one person and thus often ran counter to the collective perception of the group. Some desired behaviors were identified because they were cited as lacking in a particular school or not seen by a particular participant.

Not all of the behaviors discussed in this section are categorized under Communication in the tables of codes. But in the minds of the participants, they are relevant to the communication in that particular school. Many of the behaviors cut across categorization by questions and prompted the attempt to redo categorization.

As the first question was about rules, a common response elicited was, “We don’t have rules.” This response was given 14 times out of a total of 27 respondents. When probes or
clarifications were utilized, it was understood that procedures, whether formal or informal also constituted rules. For instance all four teachers at school C responded that the rules regarding communication with the administration were informal.

C3 responded, "Whenever I have to see the principal, I just knock on the door and talk to him. As long as he is not busy with someone else. His door is always open. The same with the superintendent. If he is busy with somebody, I come back. Otherwise there is no problem to see him."

C2 responded, "He has an open door policy which I absolutely love. Sometimes I walk in and I've had a very, very frustrating day and because of that informal open door policy, I can walk in there and I can close the door and I know that I can talk to him through my problems. Which is terrific because he is able to look at it from his viewpoint and really help me out. I say that that open door policy is wonderful." This opportunity to get another perspective from someone who has seen and heard both similar and different situations from other teachers allows C2 to avoid the three traps of what is termed 'mindlessness' (Langer, 1989). The principal's advice helps the teacher avoid the trap of acting from a single perspective. The principal can take a broader view of the behavior of students and quite possibly a much less emotional view. The time to step back and vent also gives the teacher the chance to avoid the trap of automatic behavior. Reflecting rather than reacting is encouraged by the principal's comments and the calm, supportive manner in which he listens. The ability to listen without jumping quickly to suggestions of solutions avoids the trap of entrapment by category. Quick answers are usually automatic answers based on previously learned categorizations. Time to think avoids
solution by categorization. Sometimes suggestions by the principal are not needed or even appropriate as indicated by another teacher in School C. So the rule in School C is that communication is informal. Teachers in School C tend to interpret this as “We have no rules on communication.”

Both open door policy and informal communication were mentioned by at least part of the teachers interviewed at every school. The only other behavior mentioned at all schools was principal to teacher communication. Teachers appreciate the fact that the administrator directly communicates needs, wants, and expectations directly to the teachers. Direct communication is preferred to getting things through intermediaries, impersonal notices, or the ‘grapevine.’

One cluster of behaviors concerning formalized, procedurally group communication was principal announcements, teachers’ meetings, all information contained in one communication, and prior notice. This was particularly emphasized in school E because it had been lacking before but much improved this year. As Principal E relates, “I did an evaluation of myself this year.... One of the things on that evaluation was that they praised the principal’s page and thought it should be continued.” This principal had listened to her staff and realized that one page each week of prior notices would minimize meetings and in-school disruptions and so maximize instructional time. The principal saw a drawback as the lack of any way for the teachers to respond on that sheet. But the staff was particularly appreciative that they no longer were being surprised by assemblies and other disruptions.
Principal A felt his teachers appreciated consistent information that was presented collectively rather than piecemeal over a long period of time. "...Monthly teachers’ meetings we put everything out rather than have 14 different memos. Put everything all in one succinct document. We let them know the things that are going to happen. What they need to know and I try to do it one time…"

Communications on an individual basis were characterized by direct principal to teacher communication, the encouragement by the principal of teacher-to-teacher communication, formal chain of communication for communicating from the principal down to the teacher and the teacher to the principal, as well as the principal facilitating communications among parents, students, and teachers. Principals especially emphasized that the proper chain be followed. Some said they would not talk to a parent or student unless the parent or student had talked to the teacher first. This was especially true for coaching and then the athletic director was to be contacted before it came to the principal.

However, even in schools in which most of the teachers felt communication was easy to achieve, there were individuals who felt the principals were too busy to adequately communicate, more communication with the community was needed, and more staff meetings for communication were needed.

Another formalized communication vehicle that was appreciated in schools in which it was found was the principal’s advisory committee. This weekly or biweekly session allowed teachers to make suggestions or complaints either 1) directly, 2) through
a faculty representative, or 3) even anonymously through writing to the representative. In one school, this committee also included parents and students. Communication was completed by giving minutes of the meetings to all staff members.

An important part of communication on the part of the principals is in receiving information.

C4: "He is willing to listen and hear the whole story before he makes a judgement if he is called on the make a judgement." This response is typical in that it indicates that a key behavior is the willingness to listen and then make a suggestion. This theme of the principal being willing to listen and being a 'good' listener was echoed in schools B and D.

State laws dealing with confidentiality were seen as hindering to communication since the principals cannot or choose not to disclose information about students to the teachers. This was sometimes seen as detrimental and sometimes not. C4 said, "I think sometimes, some of the state laws hinder teachers from really helping a student with a problem. Does that make sense?"

Interviewer: "Can you give an example of that?"

C4: (from amended transcript) "Yes I can. Perhaps a student has some kind of an emotional problem. I think that if teachers become aware of the motives or problems students face, teachers could be more effective in helping the student. In many cases teachers could effectively change teaching styles working with behavior modification."

Enabling administrators aid communications by modeling efforts to communicate. At schools B and C, the principal writes a little note on every student's grade card.
For this sample of schools, it is apparent that enabling communications tend to occur when 1) the schools are small, 2) administrators are approachable especially when there is an open-door policy, 3) rules for teachers tend to be informal or "just the ways things are expected to be done." and 4) not either too voluminous or too scanty.

For all of the small schools, small size was seen to be an advantage not only in internal communication but also communication with the outside. Small size allows the staff to know the kids and the parents. Communication often occurs outside the school, informally in the community. Small size can also lead to an open door policy on the part of the superintendent that is not seen in large districts. In the one urban school, size of the school was not seen as a problem but size of the district was seen as a hindrance to communication with the central office.

The view of communication found in these schools conforms to the characteristic of enabling formalization identified by Hoy and Sweetland (2000) as two-way communication. The teachers talk as much or more about their communication to the administration as they do about receiving communications from the administration. While communication from the administration is more often formalized; communication from the teachers is generally informal, welcomed by the enabling administration, and acted upon in order to facilitate the work of the faculty and staff.

At two schools, two-way communication was lacking in the area of discipline. The blame for this fell upon the assistant principals in both schools. Teachers felt that they often sent a student to the office and never found out what was done with the
student. This feeling led some teachers to avoid sending students to the office for discipline if at all possible. They felt they got better results applying discipline themselves.

Since all observed behavior whether verbal or nonverbal communicates meaning, behaviors from other categories cross into communication. For example, informal rewards may take the form of informal praise and contribute to teacher efficacy. F1 relates:

How are teachers rewarded? In staff meetings, teachers are told we are doing a good job. Maybe the principal walks by our class and sees something good going on. He will make mention of it at a staff meeting. It has not become competitive where: Oh he's coming, let me do something good so I'll get an 'Atta boy or atta girl.' But it is nice to know that someone acknowledges the fact that you are doing a good job. Verbal praise, everyone needs strokes no matter what.

This is seconded by F4, “He will do everything he can to make sure everybody else in our departments or in our staff knows that something has been successful.” This not only benefits the teacher being praised but also gives the other staff members a model of what is valued and expected. It also models behavior that they can use in the classroom to encourage their students.

One of the goals of communication mentioned by principals and teachers in four of the schools was to get the teachers to buy into the ideas of the principal. While sounding cynical on the surface, it is often a matter of answering concerns and more fully explaining procedures and ideas. Not everyone ‘gets’ everything the first time it is presented. An informal one on one can help the teacher understand without the embarrassment of appearing obtuse in front of their peers.
Weber's (1946) view that bureaucracies seek to maintain power by controlling and denying access to knowledge and information is not followed by enabling school administrations. These administrators give information to teachers in order to help teachers do their jobs.

Question 2: "Rules can either aid teachers in achieving their goals or hinder teachers. In what ways do the rules in this school enable and in what ways might they hinder?"

Often the rules that were on the minds of the teachers were either rules regarding the students or rules that come from the state level concerning such matters as confidentiality, financial reporting and requisitioning, and special education students. One response at school C was, "I don't think there are any set rules as such in this school. It is just personalities that will hinder (referring to students and teachers). If there are any hindrances, it is just personality conflicts. But there's no rules as such here."

Having input to the rules both for teachers and students and having rules that are periodically amended make them more palatable. C4 explains:

"The students sometimes don't understand some of the rules especially with dress code and things like that. But they have a representative body that goes down and discusses rules changes and policy changes at the end of the year. The dress code is revised yearly. The student council and the principal look it over and together have dialogue and the principal then makes his decision partially based on student recommendations."

At both schools A and B, teachers have input into making rules for the building. In school A, they are part of an advisory committee that also has parents and students. In school B, the faculty channels complaints through a complaint committee that sits down
with the principal on a monthly basis. Both principals could point to rules that came out
of these organizational structures. The decision this year to give first semester exams
before Christmas break came out of school A’s advisory committee. It was proposed by
students and parents and the teachers had to commit to making an adjustment. The
concern of the principal had been that teaching might stop in semester courses in January
with two weeks to go in the semester. But the principal feels the teachers have bought
into the new rule and that it will work.

Of course many of the recommendations from both students and teachers are not
or cannot be implemented. Teachers expect the principal to be able to apply state
education laws and policies as well as local policies in determining whether any
recommendation is feasible.

Enabling input on the part of the principal can be informal and is characterized by
Principal A as practices instead of rules. “Practices as opposed to rules. I try to be very
visible in the hallways, I talk to teachers, I encourage them to talk to me. I encourage
them to talk to each other...we get together and talk over the problems, not all the
problems. But we have a basis to go with.” So enabling communications lead to enabling
rules and practices.

Teachers expect the rules to make sense and be enforceable. A rule that cannot be
enforced is worse than no rule at all. At school C, girls began wearing tops with narrower
and narrower straps so that eventually their bra straps were showing. In a conservative
community, this was not acceptable to a sizable number of teachers and parents. The
principal made a rule that the straps on the tops had to be at least three inches wide. But
the rule was too difficult and time consuming to enforce so the rule was changed so that
the tops had to have sleeves. So the dress code became more conservative as a result of
the factor of enforceability and the students’ efforts to push the rule to the limit.

As C4 explained:

“But the students had their say first. So they (the administration) went with the
three inches. Then they realized it was nonenforceable because you can’t, when I
was in high school the nuns would measure. We don’t do dumb things like that.
The kids laugh at you in a situation like that. So maybe it is two and seven eighths
as opposed to the three inches. So then we went to the longer situation. But they
(the students) had voice in that to begin with.”

Interviewer: “So do you think the rules aid the teachers in achieving their goals?”

C4: “Yes, because I don’t think there are that many.”

Teachers expect the rules protecting the learning environment to be firmly and
consistently enforced. C1 relates:

“You send a kid down here for discipline, I don’t think the reason is to get that kid. I think the reason is to make it work so we can move on and teach and learn. There has got to be some set up rules for discipline. What happens next if you did not do this? What is going to be the next thing? We are trying to keep them in school and keep them in class as much as possible.”

At the opposite end are the complaints from the teachers at school E. E1 claims, “I hear that sometimes the assistant principal tells the student that the teacher’s rule is a stupid rule or that the teacher just is having a bad day. So the assistant is not going to count it against the student.” This teacher quit sending her students to the office. While she didn’t think the assistant had done that with her students, she felt she could just as effectively handle her own discipline. She felt the assistant principal was too soft on the students.
The potential upside of teacher-enforced discipline is that it is seen as a sign of effective classroom management. Both principals D and F explicitly expressed that they expected their teachers to handle their problems in the classroom first. Then if the student failed to comply with reasonable requests, the situation would be moved to the office.

Rules in these enabling administrations tended to be viewed positively rather than negatively. Rules give the teachers power and insure the backing of the administration when dealing with students and parents. Rules give structure that protects the teacher. F1 talks about the tardy procedures at her school, “Having a rule there spelled out in black and white enables teachers to maintain consistency...the students know that is the expectation. No particular teacher is the bad guy because that is the policy.”

The value of rules providing structure was mentioned in every faculty. Over half of the teachers mentioned this as being so or as needing greater emphasis. In small schools, the social dynamics of the community sometimes breaks down enforcement on an evenhanded basis. E4 relates:

I know that is difficult because sometimes there are extenuating circumstances and we are not all privy to that. I think that is a problem and I think that we have favorites here. This goes way back through different principals. It depends on whether you are an athlete, board member’s son. We are still a district like that. I don’t know if a lot of the others are. Maybe just because we are small and we are rural. Sometimes things are just overlooked or shoved under the rug. The code of conduct is not followed and that hinders us. We are expecting everything to be enforced across the board. I don’t think we always see it done that way.

But structure is seen as needed for both students and teachers. F3 explains, “I think the rules we have try to make the climate conducive to learning...it sets a tone...Many of our kids need the structure. They have to know what is expected of
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them." F3 thinks teachers need structure too, "One thing is good even for our young teachers. They know where he stands on certain things...our young teachers need almost as much structure sometimes as the students."

Rules are often viewed with a great deal of flexibility when they pertain to the teachers. Rules pertaining to students are also given leeway when it is agreed to be in the best interest of the student. Rules that inhibit the staff from doing their job are often overlooked or changed. In this way, these enabling administrations use formalization to facilitate task performance or overlook formalization that cannot easily be changed (Deming, 1986; Schonberger, 1986).

The interpretation of rules as procedures or 'just the way things are done' conforms to the view of Stevens, Diedriks, and Philipsen (1992) that structured routines adds to the satisfaction of professionals. This is especially true when as in Schools A and B, teachers have input in developing the rules. When this is coupled with professional autonomy and a good school climate as is demonstrated by the schools in this study, then the rules add to job satisfaction. Another of the findings of Stevens, Diedriks, and Philipsen (1992) is that workers lower on the hierarchy have less satisfaction due to a heavier workload. This is demonstrated by new teachers in the schools surveyed as well as teachers in School D where the teachers covering freshmen and sophomore classes are required by the rules to carry a much greater burden in communications. In School D, freshmen and sophomore classes are generally covered by teachers with fewer years in the building.
Informal rules that are enabling often take the form of common expectations. E4 explains, "There are expectations for the students and for the most part students know that. So if you have a problem in your classroom or whatever we know that it will be dealt with so that we can teach." E4 sees this as the general case in her school even thought she sees inconsistencies as shown by her quote above.

Common expectations allow the staff to unify behind decisions. F3 says, "I think we have in this building where we are trying to work together for the common goal so having as much success as possible for the kids." When decisions are made in an enabling environment, they become common expectations, Principal A, "There are some things that they divide on. We make a decision and we all live with it. We're pretty good about living with things." Principal A sees his staff as reasonable and willing to temporarily suspend doubt and give ideas a try.

While rules can be enabling when they provide structure and are consistently enforced, rules can also be seen as hindering. This happens when teachers are forced to do things or when the rules cut down on the options of the teachers. For these schools the burden of rules seen by the teachers as hindering is relatively light. For example, the principals stressed the importance of hall duty. Only one teacher mentioned teachers required to be in the hall as a positive rule. Most were willing to accept hall duty as a necessary burden. Another necessary burden was taking attendance and the reporting of tardy students. Some found the procedures in their schools to be cumbersome although many felt this structure for students was necessary.
More onerous in some schools were forced computer use, technology snafus brought about by demands for use of certain hardware, programs, or procedures, and required units in technology for all classes. Some teachers are just not ready to embrace computer technology even though a few of these admitted they were better off in the end.

Mixed approval was given to the need for lesson plans and other paperwork for the school district. Many saw this as necessary but burdensome. Others saw this as providing structure and a paper trail that either helped protect them or helped keep them on track.

Discipline was a prime concern of both principals and teachers. As discussed above, rules especially rules for students are seen to provide the necessary structure to keep the educational process moving forward. Enforcing student rules was seen as imperative with the faculty mentioning this behavior in a negative manner. Nearly half of the teachers mentioned the need for stricter enforcement of student rules. Some called for stricter rules and some called for more consistent enforcement. Sometimes this is the result of numbers of students and staffing. As F2 explains, “The only thing I can think of is if you do have a discipline problem we don’t have enough administrators to really deal with…You have two and a half people trying to deal with discipline problems (for over 900 students).”

At school E, E4 explains how the system gets bogged down, “…our poor administration and secretaries spend more time in the paperwork…The paperwork goes out for Wednesday school. Then they don’t show up so then on Thursday he (the assistant) has a stack this big. He has to call them all down.”
No wonder the assistant principal might react in the way described by E3, "The assistant principal has actually stood in my classroom and said this. Sometimes he thinks teachers just write too many demerits and he just tears them up. Which would pull the teacher's legs right out from under her or him."

Sometimes the perception of the need for stricter student discipline lies in the differences in the perspectives of those involved. D1 makes this observation about his principal, "On the other hand, sometimes the principal is being known as wishy-washy. But he is flexible by the same token. Depending upon who is looking at the situation, it is how they view what is going on." The differences in points of view could be attributed to either what Langer (1989) calls 'context confusion' or 'process vs. goal orientation.' With context confusion, people equate the context controlling their behavior with the context controlling the behavior of another person. The teacher's context is order and learning in the classroom. The principal's context is the development of the student within the total school environment or indeed both inside and outside of the school and so is process oriented. The principal is in a position to also consider the context of the student. A little one on one can bring out problems and concerns that the teacher does not have time to elicit when they must deal with 29 other students needing attention.

The teacher is more likely to have more specific, immediate goals in regard to student behavior. The principal can look at the process of the student becoming a better student and a better citizen. The principal deals with all students over the course of their time in the high school and can see changes and developments that the teacher's perspective does not afford. Even a teacher concerned with process is more likely to be
concerned with process in the development of the student within their class or their field of expertise. While flexibility is desired and being wishy-washy is not, whether the principal is seen as one or the other depends not only on point of view but also from case to case.

Some teachers see the need for stricter discipline for teachers. E5 speaks with the Interviewer of the lack of an authoritative figure in the administration, “I think if you don’t view them in that way, I don’t think that it enables accountability among the faculty. So that can cause problems to the faculty as a whole. Are we all on the same page?”

Interviewer: “In other words, you are saying that the administration doesn’t really crack down and hold people accountable to the same standards across the board?”

E5: “Correct.”

Interviewer: “Is that an advantage to you as a band director?”

E5: “Yes, very much so. But it is also frustrating because the students are not accountable as well. It starts at the top and goes down.”

E4 gives another frustration when individual teachers are not held accountable for their actions:

One other thing and every administrator I have ever had has done this. Call us into a teachers’ meeting and yell at all of us for something and we all sitting there know the two or three that have done it. Instead of doing their job and calling that person in and talking to them, they yell at everybody. The two or three that are doing it don’t change half the time anyway. I think for administrators in general that seems to be a problem. They don’t want to deal head-on with certain staff members. This is a problem and you need to fix this instead of bailing us all out. She doesn’t do it as much but we have had some who it’s like, “Well, here we go again.” Like I said I have only been in this district. I’m a lifer.
So in administrations that are enabling in general, some teachers take advantage of the flexibility and reasonableness of the administrators. This creates resentment among the teachers who do follow the procedures and meet the common expectations.

It is often difficult for teachers to feel free to talk about problems they see in the behaviors of other teachers. While B5 feels comfortable about going to the principal with her problems, she is reluctant to mention other teachers or substitute teachers.

B5: "...I think sometimes the teachers are afraid to go to the Advisory Committee because they are afraid the administration will find out this is the person who is griping about it because it is a small school. It is hard for there to be any anonymity in terms of suggestions. I imagine that concerns people at times. But I think there are things going in classrooms that probably shouldn't be."

Interviewer: "You don't want to rock the boat and be the person?"

B5: "Exactly, I think that is the problem. Nobody wants to be that troublemaker especially in a small school. If you do that once, it is difficult to overcome a stigma like that."

While teachers appreciated an administration with few rules and which allows autonomy in the classroom, they recognize that beginning teachers need more direction. E1 first praises the principal, "We don't get micromanaged. We don't have someone standing over us...It is assumed that we are going to do the right thing. Then if there are problems, they are dealt with."

On the other hand E1 says, "Yes, as for red tape things, if anything this school could use a little bit more red tape. A little bit more..."

Interviewer: "Structure?"
E1: “Structure, there are things as a new teacher last year, there are things I had no
cue how this went on, how this was done, how to get information.”

B5 concurs with this new teacher experience. “I have a hard time coming up with
any specific rules for us. I think that is a good thing. It can be difficult when you first
come because you don’t know what to expect.”

Interviewer: “So there wasn’t a lot of structure when you first came here?”

B5: “Yes and that can be a little, this is my first teaching job so I guess I was
expecting a little bit more, but as you get used to it I think you learn to work in that kind
of a system and I think it works really well for most people here. As far as I know
anyway. This is my fifth year.”

Question 3: “Rules may either serve as guides to problem solutions or be rigid
barriers to problem solving. In what ways do rules in this school aid and in what
ways do they act as red tape and inhibit problem solving?”

Flexibility is valued on the part of the administrators. Eighteen of twenty-one and
five of six principals mentioned this behavior trait making it the most mentioned
behavior. Most administrations have the foresight not to let themselves get boxed in
regard to either prohibited activities or decisions on punishment. While student
handbooks proscribe many specific acts and often list the specific penalties, all of the
handbooks examined carried catchall phrases such as:

No student has the right to infringe on the educational opportunity of any other
student or the rights of a teacher to provide the educational opportunity to every student.
Students shall not...or any other action that would disrupt the orderly operation of the
school program...will be disciplined on an individual basis.
Administrators see the need for a balance between flexibility and consistency.

Principal A:

We have like everybody ...a student handbook. That's for consistency and the kids know what to expect. Sometimes because we try to be so consistent...we are in a society today where we have to be so consistent, although sometime it takes away flexibility. Although we do have some phrases in our handbook that allow us to have some flexibility.

This flexibility applies to staff as well as students. In school C, rules for the teachers are sometimes overlooked in order to benefit the teacher. There is a tacit understanding between the faculty and the principal that exceptions are made for good reason. C4: “Understood, yeah, He has been very kind to people who have had to be out for a period of time. He has not made a big issue of it. In other words, they (the rules) have been bent.”

Interviewer: “For the benefit of the teachers?”

C4: “They have. There have been many times. I mean there are people who have had to leave for just a short period of time and they have not been docked for it. At the same time, no one has taken advantage of those types of situations. That's because they have been working, I think, in a very positive manner in treating him with a great deal of respect. So I think that he has earned his respect and as a token, the perks are not clamped down on.”

In School C, personal day and professional day limits are sometimes overlooked if the staff member is doing an activity that benefits the school and the students. While the
transcript gives instances that do not directly benefit the school and the students, these instances do not cause a problem for the school and contribute to teacher morale that indirectly benefits the school and the students.

Inflexibility in rules is seen by teachers and principals to come in three main areas; 1) union contracts, 2) state laws and policies regarding confidentiality and special education, and 3) rules and procedures regarding budgets and purchasing. While the principals are generally the ones who say their hands are tied by union contract provisions, several teachers also criticized these restrictions. As C3 stated, “The only rules that I can see that are a problem are the rules that are enforcing the contract. People are afraid of violating written procedures in the contract.”

In close approximation of Hoy and Sweetland’s (2000) characterization of enabling formalization, in these enabling administrations problems are viewed as temporary barriers to be solved through the joint efforts of the teachers and the administration. While not quite meeting the characterization of viewing all problems as opportunities, problems are only viewed as delimiting constraints when they are imposed from outside of the system. Then they are not viewed as absolutes but rather as difficulties to dealt with and overcome. Even the Ohio Department of Education is often dealt with according to the Chinese philosophy of tamen you zhengce, women you duice (they have their policies, we have our methods) in which a wily, half-hearted acquiescence is given rather than an obedient snap-to (Lieberthal & Lampton, 1992).

The administrations in these enabling administrations have managed to avoid the crisis described by Larson (1997) where that school’s administration was unable to
change with the times and relinquish some degree of bureaucratic control in order to meet new strategies and tactics from school critics. Although many of the administrators in this study have over a decade of experience in their schools, they express the belief that maintaining the status quo just for the sake of stability is not a viable option. They recognized the need to meet new demands from the state, students, parents, and the electorate.

Administrators in this study would meet Edelman's (1977) criteria for being a thinking person rather than just a bureaucrat. These principals recognize that exceptions exist and the individual differences must be considered both for students and for teachers. These principals are willing to consider the points of view of students, staff, and from experts outside of the school and the district. Principal D explains his philosophy:

Seven to ten years ago we were heavy on the veteran end of the scale that made it a little more difficult at times for instituting change. With the diversity I think you find that the personalities that are black and white type personalities go a little nuts at times mainly because I am a gray person. I think you need to look at situations and not just say, "Here's this and here's this. Here is the result. Here is the cause, here is the solution." Because there are so many mitigating factors I try to preach that a little bit...Not that we are enabling kids or coddling kids but you have to understand that they are people. Sometimes there are reasons for other things and if they want to just cut the legs off of a kid...If I graded some of the teachers on their performances that way without allowing for their personal lives or their forgetfulness or whatever, they wouldn't like it.

So Principal D hopes that the teachers will also show a little flexibility in dealing with the students. But he realizes that some teachers' personalities make it difficult for them to be flexible or to reconcile flexibility with the perceived need for consistency.

The perceived need for consistency is not as strong as the approval of flexibility except where consistency is woefully lacking. In school E, four of the six teachers felt the
assistant principal was very weak in consistent handling of the discipline problems. This was exacerbated during the basketball season because he is a basketball coach. The same situation is found in school D.

D2 explains, “I think he (assistant principal) wears one hat at a time. Every teacher here knows this. We know when discipline is going to be very strict and we know when discipline is going to be a little bit more lenient.”

Interviewer: “Depending upon the time of the year (basketball season)?”

D2: “Right and students know that too. I think that is something, if you look at it from a consistency standpoint that is when we are least consistent. Certain times of the year when students know they can get away with things because there is not enough time in the day.”

D2 sees the balance between consistency and flexibility lying in the differences between the two building administrators:

Our principal is excellent (in being flexible). I think our principal is in my estimation too flexible sometimes. He will look at each situation and I think sometimes overlooks each situation. I think our assistant principal does a better job in that maybe he is on the other end. He doesn’t care what the reason is, “This is what is going to happen.” So we have, it works well because we have a principal who will listen to what they have to say and we have an assistant principal who will go with what is in black and white. So I think between the two of them, they discuss where it is at and a lot of times, they end up in the middle...Even though the rules are in black and white they don’t pinpoint what is going on...There are going to be exceptions. I think when you start making big exceptions that is when you get yourself in trouble.

Flexibility is lost when the influence of the state’s guidelines and the school report card influences decisions. E1 discusses this with the interviewer. “...We send kids to in-
school suspension. We have kids who live in in-school suspension. We think at what point do they get out of school suspension? At what point, do they get further things? Part of the reason that we get told that we don’t tend to give OSS is that OSS counts against our state report card where ISS doesn’t.”

Interviewer: “Oh, that (OSS) probably does.”

E1: “Whereas ISS doesn’t so they are reluctant, unless the offense is very bad, to go that next step.”

Interviewer: “One of the markers is percentage of attendance.”

E1: “There is something that we try to qualify on that OSS counts against.”

Faculty in every school mentioned the effect of the state’s influence on the administrative and curricular decisions made in their schools.

Red tape abounds. It is generated by school districts, the Ohio Department of Education, and master contracts between unions and school districts. D2 feels the effects of district red tape in requisitions. D2 relates that a requisition has to be signed by four people in order to get it approved. “If you accidentally forget to order the year before, you just forget it until the next year because by the time you went through all the paperwork to get what you wanted it would be too late.”

In school F, it was unanimous that the red tape comes from the central office of the district. Principal F gave a laundry list of red tape from ‘downtown’ but particularly galling was his inability to hire a retired English teacher. She was the teacher who wrote the curriculum used by the district. But she had to go through the interview process with
the personnel department and receive approval. She has not gotten it yet and may not until August. The principal needed to hire someone in April. He cannot understand why the district is treating this expert teacher so shabbily.

In another situation, a retired teacher was told that the district desperately needed tutors. He applied in December but did not receive the completed paperwork from the central office until April. One of the conditions was that he not teach in any other school district. With the end of the year fast approaching, he tore up the tendered contract and continues to teach in other districts.

Ohio Department of Education red tape often takes the form of efforts ostensibly designed to aid students but may have an opposite effect. Principal F explains, “All those rules (special education), sometimes are hard to live with. Special Ed notebook came out and it is about this thick (3 inches) and they said you need to know all of the regulations for all your kids.”

The students sometimes use the rules as a crutch. “One kid we tried to mainstream. He didn’t want to. He said that he didn’t want to work that hard...I can leave the room and come here and get my tutor to help me. I want that.” The principal felt the student would be better able to advance as a mainstreamed student, but the student used the rules to avoid the effort that would be involved.

Principals A, B, and C agree that the Master Contract and union rules bind them in exercising options. In school C, the strong union is not the teachers but the support
staff. The union rules for bus drivers, cooks, and custodians limits what the principal and teachers can do. Principal B feels that the union representatives do not always look out for what is best for their membership:

The one impression I get is that no matter the six or seven teachers the association sends in there (negotiations) it ends up what they are interested in gets negotiated. I think this is a disservice to the whole faculty. I remember a guy in there once who tried to negotiate away family insurance, because we did not have many teachers on family insurance. He didn’t need it. He thought if we took that money and put it into salary then everybody would benefit. To our superintendent’s credit he said that we were not going to rip off the third of our teachers who had family insurance.

So the administration was put in the position of protecting union members from their own leadership. Instead of taking advantage of ending expensive insurance coverage, the superintendent considered the greater good of the teachers.

Question 4: “Rules may be used to punish or to reward teachers. In what ways are rules in this school used to punish, if they are, and in what ways are they used to reward teachers?”

Principal C claimed that he had never written a reprimand in the seven years that he had been in the position. He did say that he had suggested on rare occasions that teaching might not be the ‘calling’ for a particular individual or that his building was not the right place for them.

In all of the schools, disciplinary action for teachers is guided by the master contract between the teachers’ association and the school board. Teachers get representation from the association and everything is documented. But all of the
principals liked to use informal methods to solve problems before the formal process kicks in if at all possible. Principal A, "I like to work with teachers on an individual basis if I can and work out what is best for the individual."

Working on an individual basis depends on the ability of the principal to exercise discretion in the interpretation and the application of procedures, rules, and standards. Dealing with teacher problems on an individual basis was mentioned as a characteristic of the administrations in all six of the schools. Allied with this is dealing with the teachers behind closed doors. This minimizes any potential embarrassment on the part of the teacher. Even Principal F who claims that he never closed his door says that when he has a problem with a teacher, he 'takes them downtown.' The conference is held at the central office instead of in the building.

Principals E and F see the evaluation system as delineated by the Master Contracts as not only a possible tool for discipline but more importantly as a tool for improving teacher capabilities and habits. Principal E tries to bring out both strengths and weaknesses in her evaluation conferences. Having done hundreds of evaluations, she is proud that a teacher has never refused to sign the evaluation document. She feels that this is because she tries to be accurate and writes to improve, not to reprimand. She is seen by members of her staff as a nurturing person rather than as an authority figure.

As with flexibility, the type of treatment the teacher receives is apt to be the type of treatment that students receive. Principals see dealing with discipline of both teachers
and students as something that needs to be done on an individual basis. Seven of eight teachers who mention discipline for teachers being done on an individual basis also mentioned this as being done for students.

Principal A relates the situation at the beginning of his principalship in which the teachers felt he was punishing them. He demanded that they be in the halls at the beginning of school and during class changes. The teachers felt they were more productive at their desks for those three minutes. The principal used the carrot-and-stick approach. He told the faculty that being in the halls or not would be the first thing on their evaluations. Then he walked the halls and gave out little candy bars to the teachers who were in the halls. He was afraid at first that he might be insulting their professionalism but they said, "We get the hint and we like the candy bars."

Principal A feels that the staff has 'bought into it' now. Even the teacher who complained after being written up for not being in the halls, "I'm never out there at the right time. When I'm out there nothing happens. Those kids only misbehave when I'm not out there and I never know what time to go out there."

Principal A, "I said wait a minute, listen to what you just said. When you're out there you stop misbehavior."

The teacher said, "Oh, I never thought of it that way." So sometimes a rule appears punitive because the rationale has not been fully grasped by members of the staff.

As far as rules rewarding teachers, most respondents did not see that happening now or in the future. As one teacher/athletic director succinctly put it, "This is education, we don't get a Christmas bonus." But the same respondent later stated that there were
informal rewards. For example, if he takes one too many personal days or one too many professional days, he is allowed to do that. These practices continue as long as they are not abused and the other members of the staff do not consider the application is based on favoritism but on 'common sense' and individual needs.

Principal C feels that the camaraderie among the staff was a reward for both teachers and the administration. Perhaps since it is a small school, many activities both in and outside of school are done as a group. The staff meets informally and does activities with their families.

Some participants see the value of money as a reward. Principal B would like to see merit pay but feels that it would never get past the union. B3 concurs saying that some teachers go above and beyond the call of duty but questions how this could be measured. How can progress in such disparate subjects as English, Agriculture, and band be measured on the same scale? He also realizes a stumbling block in who would be doing the measuring. If it is an individual, it will automatically be open the question and complaint. If it is done by a group, it could be cumbersome and open to political maneuver.

Under less enabling administrations, merit pay and bonuses for achievement could be doled out in a punitive manner. One teacher recounted that at another school, administrators had been hit with several grievances due to their disregard for the rules of the contract. A new union president cut grievances to a minimum. This president
subsequently received ‘rewards’ from the administration while less pliable faculty members were punished in various ways such as lunch duty assignments, high class loads, and not being considered for supplemental contracts for coaching.

In school D, there is a reward of gift certificates for teachers who complete the Master Teacher Challenge. But D2 sees this as somewhat demeaning, “For me, I thought that was kind of downgrading to be honest because I don’t think I should be doing something so that I can get a restaurant pass.” For D2, the problem was remembering to document those things that he had already been doing all along. He felt teachers didn’t need this reward for doing what they should already be doing. His emphasis was that teachers should be motivated strongly enough by intrinsic rewards that extrinsic rewards are not needed.

Most principals have the opinion that food is always good. It is an informal type of reward that works with both students and teachers. Having visited 76 schools to do surveys for two quantitative studies including the one from which this study was born, I see the difference that feeding teachers at teachers’ meetings makes. The atmosphere is more relaxed and jovial. There is less criticism and feedback is more conciliatory. On the downside, teachers pay less attention and there are more disruptions and people moving around. Overall in these enabling administrations, mistakes on the part of the teachers are not used as excuses to punish as is found in organizations with coercive formalization (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000). Mistakes are used as opportunities to learn and to improve the teacher’s reactions when the same or similar circumstances occur again.
Question 5: “Administrative rules can be used as substitutes for professional judgement. How are rules used in this way in this school, if that happens?”

For Principal A, professional judgement is the basis of some of his rules. For instance, he insists on a written exam in every class including fitness. Since 80-90% of that school's students go on the college, his philosophy is that this helps the students prepare for the rigors of post-secondary education.

The use of professional judgement supports using the rules as guides to problem solutions rather than judging all situations in terms of the black and white on the pages of the student handbooks and policy manuals. While teachers value consistency on the part of the administration in dealing with students, they see the point in making exceptions.

At School C, “...that attendance rules never seems to be that hard and fast.... if they have a broken leg or mono or some kind of big thing...it's on an individual basis.” The individual cases are decided as the principal consults with the teachers. One person doesn't say, “...they failed and what I say goes.”

B4 responds to this question in this way, “In termination of a contract. 'We (administration) said you needed to get this and this done and you did not.' It gives you very structured guidelines for that teacher to follow and for the administrative discipline. In that aspect it is good to have the rule there. Are we talking rules and guidelines as the same thing?"

Interviewer: “Yes.”

B4: “It gives something for the administrator to fall back on and say, 'Hey, you need to have this right here and you didn’t.'”
Interviewer: “Is that using the rules in place of professional judgement?”

B4: “That is supporting professional judgement. Now professional judgement can have somebody come in and have their own opinion on it. The rules, I guess help in this. I have a master’s in administration and have no desire to be in that role. But at least if I had a guideline to go by it would help me on that end of the deal.”

E5 does not see this as a problem in her school but has experience with this problem in a previous school:

I don’t know if I have had much experience with that in this school. I know that I have had before. What it says is this so they can’t make their own decision. So they fall back on what they are told to say. I think you are put in an administrative position so that you can make judgement calls. Some of those have to go on an individual basis. Now is the time to do this and it is not always done.

Sometimes, there is more than one professional judgement. Both Principal A and D say that sometimes they just have to ‘be the boss.’ They listen to the professional judgement of the teacher(s) and give their own professional judgement. If a compromise cannot be worked out, then the boss has the final say. Principal A and D both see teachers coming back two, three, and four times with new arguments. If new facts warrant, decisions can be changed. If the teacher is arguing for the sake of argument, both principals will say that discussion is over. A final decision has been made. Live with it.

Although mentioned in the discussion of the previous question, two sets of rules were repeatedly mentioned in the interviews concerning the suspension of professional judgement. One set was the rules promulgated by the state on Special Education students and units. Both teachers and principals felt that students had learned to use these rules to
avoid work and to avoid punishment on the same level as non-Special Education students. E4 dissents from this general assessment of Special Education rules:

Well from a Special Ed end of it they very often act as guides. You are looking at the student’s disability. Our district has been very good at not being hard line and hard nosed as I hear from other districts. They look at circumstances, in school or out of school. We try to intervene ahead of time like we are supposed to and not get ourselves in a mess like that...In Special Ed, I look at it a different way. I don’t have a curriculum to follow. I don’t have a lot of the things that the other teachers have to follow.

The other set of rules seen as hindering were those from ‘on high.’ In the smaller districts, ‘on high’ is the state with its proficiency tests, budget and requisition red tape, auditor’s guidelines, and reporting requirements. For the one urban school, ‘on high’ was the central office. F3 goes so far as to say, “I wish we could be our own system. Sometimes I feel that way after being here all these years. We are the school farthest north and you know.”

Principal F frequently punctuated his remarks with statements like, “Don’t they know downtown what we are doing here.” “Don’t they know we are giving proficiency tests this week?” and “Don’t they know we are different? We are on a block schedule. They sent us end of the year curriculum guides and half our math classes ended in January.”

When principals and teachers believe that the rule makers, whether superintendents, Departments of Education, or legislators are out of touch, they see the rules as substitutes for professional judgement. They see the agendas of those rule makers as hindering to the agenda of the schools that is to maximize student achievement.
Question 6: “Administrative hierarchy may be used to enable teachers to do their jobs or to hinder teachers in doing their jobs. In what ways does this school’s hierarchy enable or hinder teachers in doing their jobs?”

Support from the hierarchy enables the teachers to act with confidence. As explained by Principal A:

For the teachers, they know that if a decision has been made, it has full support all the way up. There are a lot of decisions that the superintendent does not get involved in, but he gets involved in a lot of them. I confer with him probably 3 or 4 times every day. He knows exactly what is going on here and he knows he can support the decisions we are making. Teachers know the support is there all the way up. The one bad thing about that is sometimes it takes longer. The superintendent and board are definitely very involved. I inform them but sometimes that slows things down.

Sometimes the hierarchy is extended to persons who have experience and expertise. At school C, C1 relates, “You have a problem, you need a result, you go and talk it over with the principal. A lot of times it isn’t even the principal. A lot of times you just go to the secretary and she’ll take care of it.” This informal process takes precedence over the formal process. This is not to say that the informal process is stronger because if there is conflict between the formal and informal processes, especially if the upper hierarchy becomes involved, then the informal process decisions will be overruled.

Experienced teachers can be an informal part of the hierarchy. D1 explains the situation at his school, “Another thing you can do here quite often is go get the help from other teachers. You know to ask their opinion before you go to the principal or even afterwards.”
This may be a natural outgrowth of School D's formalized version of using teachers as part of the hierarchy as D1 continues:

We are told to go through problem solving when you start on board here because you get a mentor. An older teacher is usually a mentor. Typically, I think I have mentored eight or nine people here now and still after nine years these people will come to me to ask my opinion on a question. You sort of see that as a chain of command. If I don't know, I will go ask the principal and then I go back to that person. I think we use a lot of our older teachers here as part of the rules system. They come and talk to the old people and see what has always been done. That is the typical way to do things.

School E also has a formalized mentoring system. The problem as one new teacher sees it is that mentors have limited time and limited information. She used her mentor but found that she often had to go to the principal. This was not a problem for her because she saw her principal as a nurturing person who was interested in helping the new teacher deal with problems and develop as an educator.

Another enabling feature mentioned as a positive and as a negative in the large school was the height of the hierarchy. In the small schools, the hierarchy was flat. In two, there were only two levels, teachers and the principal. In two of the small schools, the superintendent was in the same building as the high school. Teachers who worked on district level task forces such as technology saw this as a positive especially when the superintendent also had an open door policy.

Principal D saw the superintendent being in the building as a potential pitfall. He explained that when the superintendent moved up from principal and he moved up to the principalship a tacit agreement was made that the superintendent would put the principalship behind him and not interfere in day-to-day operations of the high school. The superintendent recognized that they were two people with different styles of
administration and methods of dealing with problems. Principal D sees the superintendent as being careful not to interfere or micromanage but the principal is always alert to this possibility. Perhaps in turn this point of view is why he is seen by at least one member of his staff as not managing teachers closely enough to insure that teachers follow the procedures and to make sure that students follow procedures.

Another key member of a school hierarchy is the treasurer. While many of the participants mentioned budget and requisition paperwork as hindering, they did not lay this blame on the treasurer. The treasurer was only mentioned in school C. Here she was seen as an enabler, a person who was able and willing to help the staff work their way through the paperwork and obtain the materials and services that were needed.

The majority of participants from the small schools mentioned that the small size was a help in dealing with the hierarchy. On the other hand, in the city district, the hierarchy was characterized as 'downtown.' Individuals were not mentioned. It was as if the central office was so far removed that faces and names were unfamiliar. The principal told of the curriculum supervisors of the various departments visiting his school at his special request. The reception the supervisors received from the teachers due to course revisions made it certain that they would not soon be willing to return.

In some schools, there was the feeling that there was in the hierarchy an informal unofficial step composed of coaches. While the position of athletic director was recognized as a legitimate authority, some teachers felt that coaches were favored. This is often reinforced by the common knowledge that most administrators in small schools were at one time coaches. In fact in one school, the superintendent was still coaching
which is a rarity even in small schools in Ohio. Sometimes the position of athletic
director was combined with that of assistant principal which tends to create conflicts of
interest.

More rare but growing is hierarchy by technology. A few teachers acknowledged
that faculty who embrace technology are favored in the district. Use of technology can be
made highly visible to the public and puts both the district and administration in a
favorable light. In one school, teachers felt that the faculty was coerced to use technology.
Of course they conceded that it was not all bad for some teachers to be forced kicking and
screaming into the 21st century. Another downside is that technology chews up huge
sections of the school budget that can leave little for books, printed materials, field trips,
and even salary increases.

Since these schools are included in this study because they have enabling
administrations, the hindering from the hierarchy comes mainly from two sources. The
first source is the state. While most of the blame is laid at the feet of the Ohio Department
of Education, the Ohio General Assembly also receives blame. E5 flatly stated, "As long
as Republicans control the legislature, I really don't believe that school funding in Ohio
will be solved. It is just a political football that the legislators can use to say, 'Look we
did something.'"

The Ohio Department of Education is taken to task largely over the proficiency
testing. While most administrations concede that testing is reasonable and made
necessary by the political climate, they feel that there is too much testing. They see this as
even more of a problem in the lower grades than at the high school level. These principals
feel that their teachers' and students' time could be better used in instruction rather than
testing and teaching for the test. The state is also cited for being inconsistent. Principal A
pointed out that as soon as school districts became successful at preparing students for the
tests, the state changed them. Now with the new round of tests, most principals feel that
their performance will drop until the teachers and students become acclimated to the new
format. A drop in scores is difficult to explain to a public that tends to see things only in
terms of black numbers on a white page.

Principal F points out that the state's backtracking caused him a huge problem:

Sometimes the legislature, all the proficiency tests. We missed the proficiency
tests for 8th grader last year so I have to test my 9th graders a third time. They
missed an opportunity. They (the state) said they weren't going to do it and then they changed their mind...So the state said that you can test them again. We
would be stupid not to because they have another chance. But the state
discontinued it last spring. I test 373 kids in math. This kills my school
environment. It is a burden on the urban schools because we test so many. In (name of suburban school), what are they testing? Five kids maybe, nobody will
know there is a difference in their district. I think sometimes legislators are
making rules and aren't educators and they hurt us.

The second source of problems with hindering hierarchy comes from the district
level rather than the building level. A general complaint is that going to the level above
the principal takes longer. This is a trade-off with the benefit of knowing that there is
support for decisions from the top down. Nonsupport from the top was mentioned in only
two schools.

In one school there was one specific instance that was mentioned by the principal
and several of the teachers. A student had been caught smoking marijuana on a school
bus. The principal had moved for expulsion. The superintendent had overruled this
recommendation partly on the grounds that this was a Special Education student. Both the principal and teachers felt this not only was inconsistent with policy but also cut the legs out from underneath the principal. The teachers wondered how the principals in the district would react in the next similar situation. They also wondered how this would affect the behavior of the students. Particularly in small schools, such exceptions are widely known and students and parents are emboldened to challenge the authority of the first line of administration by appealing to the higher level.

In the largest school, nonsupport from the top does not come in the form of specific but relatively isolated cases but in the day-to-day workings of the school. The principal cited the above-mentioned problems in hiring teachers as well as the fact that he cannot pick his own administrative assistants. Assistant principals are assigned by the central office and can be moved from year to year without consulting either the assistants or the principals. Above the principal, the hierarchy is seen as impersonal and not willing to listen to the principals. This principal relates that the district is always preaching to the principals that they should listen to the staff and include them in decision-making. But the central office does not listen to the principals and include them in decision-making. This principal is admired by his staff for his willingness to fight for them and for the school. As one teacher put it, “I think he wins more battles than he loses. Experience counts. We have a better school because he is willing to go out on a limb.”

As the principal puts it, “Sometimes I ask for forgiveness rather than for permission.” This is also a common experience and tactic for teachers in schools where the principals are hindering and coercive rather than enabling.
Question 7: “School administrations are concerned with the mission of the school. In what ways, does this school’s administration facilitate the mission of the school?”

While most of the respondent’s could not immediately recall the mission statement, they all had a general idea of what the school’s main goals were. Since student achievement is the main goal of all of the schools in the sample, this question was often answered in conjunction with Question 9.

Commonly, teachers and principals said that decisions were made in order to do what is ‘best for kids.’ With the welfare of students being at the heart of mission statements, it was not surprising that in five or six schools at least part of the participants felt that administrative decisions were based on the mission of the school. Since if the participants were fuzzy in their recall of the school’s mission they were prompted to think of student achievement as one of the main components of any mission, student achievement was even more commonly mentioned as the basis of decisions.

In contrast, the operationalization of most mission statements, the Continuous Improvement Plan was mentioned in only two schools by a total of two principals and two teachers. Principals mentioned staff and parent input into the mission statement but this was not mentioned by a single teacher. Indeed one teacher said that the entire mission statement for their district had been written by the principal a few years before.

There was some mention in one school of the effort to communicate goals. This was by the principal who had written his district’s mission statement and one of the
teachers at that school. The Master Teacher Challenge was mentioned as a way to implement the goals of the mission statement by inducing faculty to meet goals set by the administrators.

What was seen as generally lacking was communication to the parents and community of the goals of the mission statement of the school. While several participants lauded the efforts of superintendents and principals to keep the public informed on current issues and school activities, the overall mission and broad policies were not considered to be adequately explained.

This question drew the most blank stares and non-response of any of the ten standard questions. As a result only five behaviors/structures where mentioned and these were cited by very few participants.

**Question 8:** “Individual administrators can use their authority in various ways. In this school, in what ways is administrative authority used to enable teachers to do their jobs and in what ways is authority used to undermine teachers, if that happens?”

The two most common enabling behaviors on the part of administrators in regard to the use of authority to enable are 1) supporting teachers and 2) treating teachers as professionals. Teachers view the hierarchy as enabling when they feel supported. C1 feels confident that her principal will stand behind her:

I think that just about anybody here would say that the principal supports us in what we are trying to do. When we send a kid to the office for further discipline than we can do on our own in our room, he is there and will do it. He doesn’t question that well maybe the teacher is making it up. That’s never the question.
It's OK, what are we going to do?...He is on the side of the teacher. If the kid says that's not what happened. He says that's what happened because that is what your teacher said happened.

B3 gives a similar interpretation from the point of view of a teacher new to the district.

I don't think that I have seen authority used to undermine teachers here. That points to why they are enabling us. They are very supportive. If I make a questionable action in my classroom, I know they will support me. If a parent calls, the administrator will back me first and then ask me questions later. It is easier to go into a classroom and teach with authority with a bunch of kids who may or may not respect you just because you are a teacher. It is easier going in if you know you have the support of the administration.

On the other hand in a rather extreme example of hindering behavior that undermined the teacher, a veteran teacher relates experiences in another school with a past assistant principal. The teacher caught two students smoking in the parking lot. He brought them in and the assistant principal talked to each student separately with the teacher in the office. One boy denied smoking while the other admitted that he had been smoking. The assistant principal still did nothing with either student. Another time a student was shooting spit wads through a straw during detention. When the teacher brought the student down after detention, the assistant principal interrogated the teacher more than the student. He asked how the teacher could be sure if it was this student. He asked if the teacher was 100% certain. The teacher had already explained how the seating arrangement allowed him to keep track of who was doing what and was by now irked. He replied, "Only 99% sure, if they fell from the sky." Again the assistant principal did nothing. The teacher felt that not only was referring discipline problems to this assistant principal a waste of time, it also undercut his authority in the school. So the teacher
handled everything himself as long as that assistant principal remained in the position. He relates that things improved when the assistant became principal. The new assistant supported the teachers first and the old assistant principal had less opportunity to undermine the teachers in his new position of principal. The teacher explains, “I had been president of the association. We filed grievances when they (administrators) broke the rules. They said I wasn’t a team player. They expected us to allow them to break the rules.” The next president of the association was a team player and looked the other way when administrators broke the rules. She was rewarded eventually with an administrative position. She sold out the membership for her personal gain.

The examples above demonstrate that enabling administrations promote trust that in turn gives teachers the confidence to tackle their jobs. They are assured that as long as they make an honest attempt to do their jobs, the administration will support them. This conforms with the view of Hoy and Sweetland (2000) that enabling rules and structures promote trust while coercive (hindering) rules and structures promote distrust. Teachers in enabling administrators trust that the administration will support them, but the administration is to be avoided when it tends to undermine the teachers.

Mentioned even more often by teachers is an appreciation that they are treated like professionals. Principal D’s attitude is, “Just treat me professionally and I will treat you professionally. If you have a problem with what I am doing just come and close the door and say what you want.” But some things depend on the level of professionalism this principal perceives in the teachers.

For some teachers, I require them to turn in lesson plans monthly. I don’t require it of all of them just depending on what their year of seniority is here versus what
my comfort level is with their planning. Again that is a private issue. There are a couple who need to stay focused on doing lesson plans. The majority of them I would never need to see their lesson plans.

At school B, teachers feel strongly that their principal treats them as professionals and expects them to be professional. B4: “A lot of freedom in the classroom, that is the one thing I think our administrator does well. Hindering, I don’t see where if I wanted to teach something that he would ever undermine us and he would say you should not.”

B3: “Our administration is very straightforward and to the point. If they see something they don’t like, they say, ‘Hey, I am not sure I like this.’ …and I tell them and they say OK.”

B2 came into teaching from a business background and worked for several companies in ten years before coming to her first teaching job. “I guess I am comparing the autonomy of running the classroom to the office. I know what I need to get done and they allow me to do that.”

She sees the hiring process as the key to treating teachers as professionals.

I find that a lot of things are left up to me. I think the strength of this school is that they are very good at recruiting teachers. It has a lot to do with attitude and with the way that they are trained. How well they continue. I know what I need to do and they give me the freedom to do that. They watch and see how I do it…As far as the interview, they checked out my professors and they knew that I knew what I was doing. Now that they know that, they say, ‘You know what you need to do.’ Of course they evaluate me but they know it is up to me. It is just very rewarding.

B5 sums it up with, “I guess that they automatically think the best of what the teachers are doing rather than the worst.”

Closely allied to treating teachers as professionals is treating teachers as experts. Principal C points out that he is not qualified to teach foreign languages, art, or any
number of subjects. He relies on the teachers to be the subject matter experts. What he
does see as his role is teaching classroom management and leadership especially to
beginning teachers.

I don't ever perceive myself as the expert in their particular area. I let them run
things. I look more at their way of running the class and seeing how they are
leaders in the classroom. I definitely cannot go down to a French class and teach a
French class. But I can see how the teacher is leading. I believe that is the best
way to allow them to do their job. If they are good leaders, I will support them.
Give them ideas on how to deal with whatever little problems they are having. If
they are not good leaders, then I really have to sit down and talk with them and
give them some ideas as to ways they can become better classroom leaders...I
would say it is more informal.

In school C, we see that treating teachers as professionals and experts in their fields leads
to mutual respect between the principal and the teachers.

When teachers are the experts, we naturally find that curriculum development is
teacher driven. Principals expect teachers to come up with ideas and methods. In turn,
principals try to provide the best opportunities for teachers to be successful within the
limitations of the situation.

Teachers mentioned several limitations but usually added that these were not the
fault of the administration. Foremost was money limitations especially in one school that
was in fiscal emergency. At other schools, teachers marveled at how administrators were
able to come up with funds. At school B, one teacher explained that even though they
were a poor district, the principal found money and supported new material purchases
after several years of loses at the polls for school levies. At school F, one teacher pointed
out that the principal was always alert to sources of money outside the school and the
district. Sometimes the principal had to fight the central office to accept the money since
funding sources and methods were outside the normal routine which the central office was used to following in a prime example of 'mindless' routinization (Langer, 1989).

Every school but one mentioned size as a limitation. Numbers of students and staff simply cannot support specialized and higher level courses. For two principals, this limitation was partially offset by the willingness of teachers to make extra efforts such as teaching two groups of students different levels of math or art during the same period or special tutoring during study hall duty. Space was also mentioned as a limitation where a school was at maximum capacity. Although this is not necessarily a function of size, it more commonly found in the small schools with old buildings. Some buildings were built in two or three phases and space is utilized to the maximum.

Another enabling behavior is quick response to teacher questions and problems. Principal E makes it a point to try to respond immediately if possible and not put things off. This principal emphasizes that principals are very busy and it is easy to lose track of items that are postponed. She also feels that many teachers do not realize how busy principals are. Other teachers do appreciate the crush of business for their principals and so especially appreciate the quick response of their principals.

Quick response is facilitated when the principal is out and about the building. Being visible was mentioned in every school as an important enabling behavior on the part of administrators. Even in the one school where teachers felt the administrators were not visible between classes, the criticism was that the administrators should be in the hallways. Principal B did not mention the importance he placed on being visible but it was evident from his behavior. The four times I was in the building, he was visible in the
hallways. Being a big guy, he was also visible from a long way off. He tended to pick the spots that commanded the greatest number of hallways and the heaviest student traffic.

B5 says this about her principal:

The principal is out and about quite a bit. He will come into your classroom and see what is going on even if it is just to like come into my class today and ask me if I would do this interview. Things like that. I am pretty sure he doesn’t do it just for that. I am pretty sure he gets a look at what is going on in the room as well. I am not saying that it is a pretext for spying on teachers. It just serves as a way for him to see what else is going on. I think it works really well. He knows what is going on in most of the classrooms.

Of course this is the same teacher who didn’t think the principal knew what was going on in some classrooms with a particular substitute teacher but she was reluctant to be the one to tell.

Principal F also makes it a point to be visible. F1 describes the administrator’s behavior:

I have been in buildings where the administrators did not come out of their offices very often. If you saw them in the hallway, you just figured that they were on their way out the door or they were on their way to somewhere. That is not the case here. There are administrators in the hallway. Sometimes they are on their way to talk to a student or a teacher. Sometimes they are just in the hallway to see how things are going. Speaking to students, talking to students, saying, 'Take off your cap. How are you doing today?' That kind of thing. I find that to be the way it is supposed to be. Not saying that it is perfect here. It isn’t. I had my choice... I chose here and I don’t regret it because of the people that I get to work with here.

It isn’t perfect anywhere. Some of the more common problems include teaching to the state proficiency tests and individuals in the hierarchy undermining teachers. Five of six principals felt that the proficiency tests forced them to put pressure on teachers to teach content that would be tested. The teachers however did not seem to be as concerned. A far smaller proportion of teachers mentioned this as a problem associated
with hindering behavior on the part of the local administration. They realized the pressures on them were the same pressures felt by principals, superintendents, central office personnel, boards, and to some extent even the students.

Since this was a select sample of enabling administrators, we would not expect principal behavior that would undermine teachers. Only one teacher felt that she had been undermined in a discipline situation concerning graduation practice attendance and did not lay it all on the principal. When she went into the discipline conference, both the superintendent and principal were there. She felt the decision on punishment for the student had been decided before she walked into the room. The situation arose again the next year and again she felt undermined but was less surprised. She did say that the administration had since tightened the policy and she had no more problems.

However, undermining behavior was seen on the part of assistant principals and guidance counselors. As previously mentioned, one assistant would sometimes tell students that he didn’t think a demerit was warranted and would tear up the slips. Another assistant principal seemed to single out one teacher to hassle and would give that person difficulties until a) the teacher told the assistant off, b) the principal would step in usually at the request of another teacher, or c) in one case, the teacher left. Then after a while, the assistant would start in on another teacher. Some guidance counselors were seen as ineffective because they were overburdened or teachers felt they were giving students inappropriate advice.

Less frequently mentioned enabling administrative behaviors included minimizing meetings. This is strongly related to maximizing instructional time which is discussed in
the next section. Giving the teachers input into budgeting and hiring were also seen as positive behaviors. At school F, the principal is only one of five members of a hiring panel. Theoretically, he could have the final say but he feels it is in the best interest of the school to reach consensus on hiring personnel.

The fact that the administration looks out for everyone was only mentioned twice. But the fact that it was not mentioned in a negative way as happens in so many schools is a positive sign. In hindering administrations, the adage “The squeaky wheel gets the grease” is too often true. Principals often have allies among the faculty members and teachers will often compete for favorable assignments and supplemental contracts by currying the favor of administrators in coercive administrations.

A key enabling behavior that fits rather loosely into this category is effective hiring. Mentioned in four schools, good decisions in hiring eliminate most problems before they can start. By making sure the new teachers have a solid background both academically and personally, the principal can avoid many problems and minimize the time and effort needed to develop the new teacher into an autonomous professional.

When the administration is clear and direct at the hiring interview about what is expected, the prospective teacher is able to make a good decision about how they will fit into the school. Schools that have control over hiring and removal have a greater chance of developing a staff that shares the same goals and mission (Chubb, 1988).

Another behavior that is seen as enabling by more principals than teachers is cracking the whip when needed. While all six principals were highly enthusiastic about their staffs as a whole, they acknowledged they have had to help teachers meet
expectations. Each had at least one example when they had to crack down or reprimand a teacher. While Principal C had never written a reprimand, his informal suggestions were reinforced by the cohesive climate of his small school.

Another characteristic that principals and a few teachers felt helped in the building was a long tenure for the principals. Whether this is an enabling behavior or a result of enabling behavior is open to debate. But knowing the school, the community, and the staff over a long period of time was seen to be very helpful in decision-making. It also gives the principal enhanced authenticity and prestige if they have been effective and capable administrators over a long period of time. New principals tend to be second guessed and often unfavorably compared to predecessors.

**Question 9:** “Student achievement is the main goal of schools. In what ways does the administration aid in attaining student achievement and in what ways might it obstruct achievement?”

The administrative behavior most often mentioned in response to this question was that decisions were based on student achievement. The measure of student achievement that was on everyone’s mind was the state report card that consists mainly of the results of the state proficiency tests. This was specifically mentioned by five of the six principals.

While this study makes no statistical claims in regard to the correlation between enabling administration and student achievement, if the schools in this study uniformly did poorly on the state report card then the assumed positive value of enabling administration would be open to question.
These schools did uniformly well on the state report card with the exception of the urban school. Five of the schools reached all or almost all of the seventeen measures that pertain to high schools. School F did do better than most urban schools and was one of the top high schools in its district (Ohio Department of Education, 2002).

Principals used a number of behaviors to maximize state test scores. One was to maximize instructional time. As mentioned in the previous section, maximizing instructional time means minimizing disruptions. Meetings and announcements are kept to a minimum. Disruptions taking place in the middle of a period are avoided. Principal F goes so far as to confer with the fire department as to what times would be most disruptive for testing. Principal A takes his stopwatch with him when he does evaluations in order to measure instructional time and makes that one of the first items discussed in the evaluation conference.

Without stepping on professional autonomy, principals see consistency in the way subjects are taught, in grading, in content covered in curricula, and in classroom discipline as conducive to student achievement. When students know what to expect, they are more comfortable and better able to plan their studies. Problems may arise in schools with buildings that are shared with the middle school. Inconsistencies in the two administrative styles and sharing of teachers and facilities sometimes create problems for students.

It is generally held, especially by principals, that being small is a plus when working on student achievement. It is easier to make individual contacts with students
and parents. In the two smallest schools, the principals make comments on each student’s grade card every grading period. When the parent is known personally, student discipline is also easier to accomplish.

Assistance programs for students who are having problems are carried out in both small and large schools. But in small schools informal approaches including kids helping kids are easier to arrange. Smaller numbers make it easier to reward students informally. As previously mentioned, food motivates students as well as teachers. Small numbers make this more affordable and informal with less chance to run afoul of union rules or district regulations.

Less obviously, these six enabling schools tend to encourage extracurricular activities. Both principals and teachers believe that students with interests outside of the classroom are more motivated to do well in the classroom. One teacher went so far as to advocate requiring all teachers to work with an extracurricular activity. He believed it would be beneficial to teachers to take an interest outside of subject content and to meet students in a setting outside of the classroom.

Teachers who do extra are also credited with aiding student achievement. Practices cited included 1) staying after school or coming in early to meet with students, 2) helping students during study halls or conference periods, 3) forming subject matter based clubs, and 4) arranging tutoring by other students or volunteers. Some principals and teachers were willing to bend the rules by allowing students who wanted courses with
insufficient enrollment to meet in other classes with the teacher moving from group to
group and instructing both groups. Here the teacher also had to spend extra time outside
of the classroom with the students in the higher-level course.

Still it is noted that kids make a difference. One principal recounted the story of
another colleague in the system:

I know a guy who was a principal at a low performing school. He was moved to
another school and won an award for having a high performing school. They
asked him to give seminars on how middle schools can perform. He said, 'I am
the same guy. I was the same guy at this low performing school as I am here. I am
not the difference. It is the kids that are the difference. Here, I am principal of the
year. There, I was the worst principal in the district. I am the same guy. I try to do
the same things. I have the same academic stress. I haven't changed.'

While kids certainly do make a difference, hopefully administrators do too. While an
administrator cannot do it all by herself, their behaviors hopefully do make a difference in
academic achievement in their schools.

Question 10: "In what ways does the administration of this school support and
encourage innovation and in what ways does it obstruct innovation?"

The administrative behaviors that enable teachers to do their jobs and aid in
student achievement also tend to encourage innovation. Allowing teachers to be
professionals and to be the experts in their subjects is the first step toward encouraging
innovation. Participants in five of the six schools mentioned that innovations were
teacher driven. Principals were given some credit for making suggestions, procuring grant
money, and passing information on to teachers and students about programs that might be
interesting and worthwhile.
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Seventeen of the twenty-one teacher participants said that they were free to try innovations in their classrooms. A couple were surprised that their off the wall ideas were approved. One said, “They will let me try almost anything. But if it fails they might say, ‘Don’t do it again’.”

The supportive principal suspends their personal judgement. In School C, the home economics teacher relates, “I don’t know if he really likes my projects.... He supports that all the way.... he is right there saying, ‘yeah, OK, go for it.’”

In some schools, innovation in technology and in classes which use technology such as Tech Prep courses were given the greatest amount of emphasis. The support of technology advancements and education is demanded by students and parents. One district even requites interdisciplinary units using technology such as computers and audio-visual presentations.

A rarer complaint is that the hierarchy is too quick to change. The urban administrator laments that every time the superintendent changes there are major curriculum changes. Sometimes the changes come before a program has been in place long enough to be evaluated. Also in a large system, feeder schools may be sending students with considerably different experiences in programs such as reading. The innovations at the lower grade levels are not consistent and this causes problems as students merge into middle schools and later merge into high schools.

Administrators encourage innovation by encouraging teachers to use their professional days to attend seminars and visit schools that have innovative methods or
materials. These administrators also use in-service time to allow teachers to explore innovative teaching strategies and structures and then use subsequent in-service time for training needed to implement the innovations.

Four of the six schools reported recent major innovations such as block scheduling and academic assistance programs which changed assignments for all teachers. Teachers thought that the administration generally made a good effort to find financial support for innovations especially when the innovations had to do with computers and other technology. Teachers tended to feel that must be reasonable in their requests because they realized that there is only so much money to go around in any district. Only the school under the fiscal emergency had negative evaluations on funding support for innovations and the teachers did not blame the administrators.

However, some schools try to avoid risk taking in innovation. The costs of failure can be high in terms of time, money, and personal prestige in smaller systems. As Principal A put it, "In innovation sometimes we try to see if something is going to work before we try it. We do have lots of innovations here. Some of them have worked out real well." School A is a high performing school so the tendency is to keep doing what has worked in the past.

Many principals and teachers attribute the lack of innovations to budgetary restrictions. This falls into Langer’s (1989) entrapment by categories as belief in limited resources. While resources may well be limited, the ways in which they can be utilized is
unlimited. Innovation does not always depend upon funds to buy material, equipment, and services. Many teachers fall into the trap of thinking that innovation must come from outside of the system.

**Final Question:** “Now we come to the less structured portion of the interview. I would like to hear what is on your mind. If you do not have any particular thoughts at first, consider what policies or rules you would like to see or what rules would you never want to see. You might share what your feelings are about certain rules, procedures, or structures in this school. Perhaps you know of some rules that are considered enabling by some members of the faculty and hindering by other members.”

Respondents also were usually encouraged to draw upon other sources for comparisons. Some had been teachers or administrators at other schools and/or other school districts. Some had been in other professions, particularly business, before entering education. Many had experience with previous administrators at the same school and could draw positive or negative comparisons regarding different aspects and behaviors of the administrators. This was particularly true when the previous administrator had moved to another position within the district, usually to the superintendency. Several common areas of concern emerged which cut across the already loose boundaries of the ten standard questions.
Principal is both Strong and Flexible

Teachers respect an administrator who can be forceful and decisive when the situation calls for it. Both teachers and principals see times when the principal has to lay down the law. Teachers tend to see this more in dealing with students but several also see a need for administrators to get tough with other teachers. Administrators need to be able to listen, discuss, consider, and then make a decision. Indecisiveness does not inspire confidence.

C4 contrasts flexibility and decisiveness of the members of the rather flat hierarchy in her district. "I work will them all of the time. I work very comfortably with our treasurer. I work very comfortably with our superintendent because I am on technology. I can sit down and say, 'I see this problem and I need support here.'"

Interviewer: "So you see basically the same style from all three?"

C4: "Yes, I don't see the same style with the administrator over at the elementaries. He is just a different type of administrator."

Interviewer: "That can give you a jumping off point for some comparison and contrast."

C4: "He is just different. He is a nice person, but he is just not a very hard-nosed administrator or he is not, (pauses). He gets bent. I don't know what to say."

Interviewer: "It does not sound like any of them are really hard-nosed."

C4: "No, I don't think so either. None of them are. But the elementary principal is not a guider. He is being guided (by the teachers). So I have to work with him too in a different capacity."
Many principals and teachers see the state mandated testing program as an administrative structure that inhibits teaching. Principals feel that the schools are forced to test too much, especially in the younger grades. Additionally, changing the tests and testing program fosters frustration in administrators and teachers. Principal A offers:

I guess I didn’t see a problem with the proficiency tests. But it seems to me that as soon as everybody started mastering them, we changed them. I am not sure that change for the sake of change is always good. We were doing real well at least in this building in proficiency tests. As far as the state report card went of the 15 possible measures, we made all 15. They are changing that now. I wish the state department would get something set and just leave it for a while.

But his school built incentives into the senior proficiency tests that resulted in very good performances, “I am not going to lie to you, we almost bribed them.” The students developed teamwork in helping each other prepare. Some of this was formalized by the school in tutoring sessions and some was informal with better students by their own initiative helping others prepare for the tests.

The principals in this study of enabling administrations all seemed to chafe at the outcome orientation (Langer, 1989) of the state’s requirements. It was common to hear the idea that teaching to the test takes time away from teaching to think. Yet, it was recognized that their schools were being evaluated by the public on their school report cards given by the Ohio Department of Education. They all felt compelled to bend to public perceptions of whether or not their schools were successful. The recognized that what they felt was mindless categorization by the state was automatically accepted by the public. So they felt compelled to meet the expectations of their clients.
External Constraints

The teachers tended to be understanding of the dilemmas of administrations in dealing with the main external restraints of budgets and space. Even schools with strong results on the proficiency tests such as school A are limited in what they can offer with a staff of 28 teachers serving over 450 students. Five of those teachers are shared with the middle school. But the principal states that they would not have space to put more teachers if they could hire them. There are only 17 classrooms so Spanish is held in the biology lab and classes are held on the stage, in the library at times, and in the music room. This results in what the principal sees as a lack of course offerings. This lack of course offerings was mentioned in all five of the smaller schools in this study.

An enabling bureaucracy aids the teachers in dealing with the record keeping requirements of the state which are manifested in the forms and procedures required by state auditors. As C1 explains how the district treasure and her secretary help the teachers, “She and her secretary work that out and give you the proper paperwork to go on from there...They’re just real helpful about working you through the methods.”

Enabling administrations help the teachers deal with state mandated paperwork, irate parents, boards of educations, probation officers, and inclement weather. Relatively small gaffs such as waiting to cancel school due to weather conditions after the staff has already begun arriving do not inspire confidence and cooperation however.

Teachers about Teachers

Often teachers are more critical of other members of the faculty than they are of the administration. These teachers would like to see other teachers held to the same
standards that they set for themselves. When C3 was asked what he might like to see, he responded:

I would like to see teachers have a set time they have to be at school and a set time they have to leave school. We have some teachers here who get here and open the door after the bell rings because the kids are standing in the hall. I don't think that's good. I think the teachers should have to be here 15 or 20 minutes before the bell and I don't like the idea that some teachers beat the kids out the door.... I wish more teachers would get involved in what the kids do. . You have teachers who have been here for years and never seen a kid other than in their classroom...Every school has teachers who come here for one reason and one reason only...I think the administration does encourage (faculty attendance at student events). I think we like any other school have some teachers that don't care about that.

Dealing with teachers is where principals get caught on the flexibility scale between too wishy-washy and too hard-nosed. Even in a small school, perhaps especially in a small school, it is difficult to please everyone. Teachers have different standards for themselves and are often not tolerant of others whose standards are dissimilar. Principals have to reconcile differences and get the teachers to pull together.

**Teachers about Parents**

Teachers see the rules and policies as less important than the attitudes of the students and the parents toward the importance of education. The following dialogue shows the frustration with that and the expectancy that things will not change.

C3: "OK, here's a suggestion for your list. Fire the parents."

Interviewer: "That's been said."

C3: "You've been in education a long time. You understand that. I mean we can only do so much with what we're given. If we don't have the support of the parents, I
don’t care what rules or regulations you set down. If you don’t have parents who force their kids to study, if you don’t have parents who want their kids to study and be successful, it doesn’t make any difference what we do here.”

Interviewer: “Is there some way do you think that the administration or the school at the top level could put some pressure on parents?”

C3: “The parents don’t care or the kids don’t care or the kids don’t talk to their parents. I guess on thing you could do is force the parents to come to meetings at the school. Say hey, if you don’t come your kid doesn’t graduate but that becomes a logistical nightmare. You could try and do something along that line. Forcing the parents isn’t going to make them come. Some parents work and we understand that. But that’s the biggest battle that education has. It is not lack of money. It’s lack of parental interest, lack of, parents just don’t care. We do a good job of babysitting.”

The Enabling School Model Versus Weber’s Model

Weber’s (1946) first element, division of labor and specializations of duties does not conflict directly with our findings in enabling school administrations. But enabling administrators do not hoard their specialized information. On the contrary, the main limits are those that protect student confidentiality. Superintendents, principals, treasurers, administrative assistants, and secretaries in enabling systems strive to give the faculty all the information and support the faculty needs to be successful.

We also see where expertise and information is gained outside of the administrative channels. This is especially true in systems, which employ mentoring
techniques. Here, new teachers need not depend solely on the administrators for needed information. Additionally, the habit of going to more experienced teachers carries over for many years.

Additionally, since administrators have the same basic training and experience as the faculty, there is not a lot of specialized knowledge that they can keep from teachers. Many districts have agreements with the unions that board agendas and financial reports are to be shared with the union leadership at the same time that the superintendent gives the information to the board. In the smaller communities, it is extremely difficult for administrations to keep information from getting into the community and to the faculty.

Still, the principals in these schools are seen as the 'go-to-guy.' The principal is seen as the person who is to interpret policy, find the answers concerning state laws and policies, go to the superintendent with requests, and finally, to make the hard decisions for the building. This is consistent with the findings of Isherwood and Hoy (1972) that there is a division in the basis of authority between authority based on position and authority based on expertise. These principals have both which is not to say that principals in hindering administrations do not have authority based on both position and on expertise. But in enabling systems these are clearly evident and are used to enable teachers to do their jobs.

Weber's second element, impersonal orientation, runs counter with what is found in enabling administrations. Weber's concept was that impartiality on the part of the bureaucrat/administrator would lead to greater fairness for all clients. Closely following the rules would eliminate favoritism, discrimination, and corruption. In these enabling
schools, the concept of fairness dictates that not all students or all teachers should be treated exactly the same. In these schools the concept is that treating everyone exactly the same is unfair and that individual circumstances should be taken into account.

While Weber’s model bureaucrat was immune to personal blandishments, in all the schools in the study, teachers praised at least one member of the building administration for approachability. D1 describes the situation at School D, “One thing I can say about our current principal. He is very much on talking, very open. Wants to know what is going on if you have a problem...I think a lot of people are very friendly especially with the principal. We knew him when he was a teacher. Been friends for years so it is a very easy place to come and talk to him.”

The principals in particular in this study have been described as good listeners, someone who can make you feel better, someone you can tell your problems to, someone who encourages and supports you, and someone who wants you to succeed. On the other hand, administrators who are seen as by the book and disciplinarians are often avoided. As mentioned previously the assistant principal at one school is seen as a person who attempts to intimidate teachers. This hurts teacher performance. A teacher explains, “(Assistant principal) Tends to pick on one (teacher) and keep picking. It can get to be such a problem that the teachers literally start worrying about their schoolwork, you know their typical teaching day rather than teaching the kids.”

Weber’s third element, vertical hierarchy, is not developed to any great degree in the enabling administrations in this study. Only four of the six schools have an assistant principal. In two of the schools, the superintendent’s and treasurer’s offices are in the
high school building. In small schools, the superintendent was often a former principal in
the district. So the typical hierarchy is very flat and the members of the hierarchy are well
known to the faculty. Given that the theoretical top of the hierarchy is the electorate and
that in small systems faculty members are often graduates and/or residents of the district,
teachers can have a greater influence on community opinion than is possible in larger
systems.

Weber’s fourth element, rules and regulations, are much in evidence in all
schools. Teachers and administrators are bound by state laws, state and board policies,
union contracts, and to lesser extent by student and teacher handbooks. In these enabling
schools however, rules that are used daily tend to be informal. As D1 explains, “I don’t
think of them as rules. I guess I think of them as just ways that we go about things. It’s
what’s expected.” This type of explanation was repeated in all of the schools in the study.
Rules were seen and categorized by the faculties as practices, procedures, and “just the
way things are done here.” The word ‘rules’ itself was objected to by several of the
teachers.

Weber’s fifth element, career orientation, is clearly evident in a profession which
has 1) continuing contracts, 2) due process for teacher discipline and dismissal that is
protected by both state laws and union contracts, and 3) in Ohio, a strong retirement
system. Administrators actually give up some of these benefits when they move from
teaching to administration. They do not have continuing contracts as administrators and
are more vulnerable to dismissal. They do retain these rights at the teaching level and on occasion a nonrenewed administrator will move to a teaching position within their school district.

In most districts, vertical movement is limited and often involves moving to a new system. In this study, we see four of the six principals coming from within the system. They have an average tenure in their position of over ten years. So we see the stability of the position and the lack of incentive to engage in the cutthroat type of activity that is found in business and government bureaucracies, which have an extensive vertical hierarchy and the resultant opportunities for moving up the ladder.

Other Theoretical Considerations

Isherwood and Hoy (1973) theorized three types of teacher work value orientation. We see all three types of work value orientation in School C. Professional work values are held by teachers who value professionalism and knowledge in their field of specialization. This is typified by C4 in School C as indicated by her answers in the interview and transcript revision.

Organizational work values are held by those who identify with the values of the organization, conformity to the norms of the system, and advancement into supervisory or leadership positions. This is typified by C3 who in addition to being a teacher holds a quasi-administrative position. He was highly critical of other teachers whom he felt did not fully support the system and embrace the values of the system.

The two other teachers in School C typify mixed work values with a strong component of social work values. They identified with values of the work group, home
and family, and their church. But by their answers and discussion they also exhibited
professionalism and identification with the school system. All four teachers’ discussion of
the school and administration clearly showed that their designation of the administration
would be Collegial rather than Authoritarian. All four exhibited a sense of empowerment
in their discussion of their work, their relationships with the administration, and their
ability to do their job well.

The teachers in these schools overwhelmingly agree that their principals regard
them as professionals. The principals agree that they regard the teachers as experts in
their specializations and do not try to tell them how to teach. The teachers also feel
professional respect in that the administrators (with some exceptions) try to help them
rather than control or punish. These characteristics categorize these schools as
professional rather than bureaucratic organizations (Blau & Scott, 1962). Professional
orientation is also enhanced by the great deal of autonomy the teachers have in the
classroom. In fact, many teachers do not deal with members of the administration on a
day-to-day basis. Some only see the principal or other administrators when a problem
crops up that the teacher cannot deal with on their own.

Sitting across from the teachers, eating in the lunch rooms, and moving around the
buildings give a real sense of loyalty and esprit in these schools. Respect between
administrators and teachers is mutual and evident. These teachers exude a sense of group
morale as described by Hoy, Newland, and Blazovsky (1977) due to satisfaction of social
needs and feelings of accomplishment.
The students also seem to have a higher level of politeness, respectfulness, and helpfulness than is commonly found in high schools. All of the teachers included in the interviews were positive about their experience at the school. While many were critical of individuals or of certain behaviors, in general all of them felt they were working in a good place to be a teacher. No one said that things were perfect or that the principal did not have flaws. But there was none of the disparagement for the school or administration that I often saw in faculties both as a teacher and while doing surveys across Ohio. The one common negative perception at the local level was in the urban high school and that was their perceptions of the central office.

Allied to loyalty and esprit is the observed effect of teacher morale on student achievement. Verdugo, Greenberg, Henderson, Uribe, and Schneider (1997) theorized that teacher job satisfaction was positively correlated with student achievement. The evidence from these schools supports that hypothesis. All six schools were high on the measurement of enabling administration. All six did as well or better than expected on the school report cards when student and district characteristics were factored into the interpretation of the scores.

The feeling of community that is evident especially in the smaller schools supports Chubb's (1988) contention that schools would function better as communities. In the small districts, teachers and administrators know parents. Parents are involved in the activities of the schools. Chubb's contention that a supportive environment around the school was more important in determining effective schools than student aptitudes or the school's material resources. Particularly in the smaller schools, teachers are also parents,
community members, taxpayers, and often graduates of the district. Their stakes in the success of the district are high. These schools tend to function as a team or if you will as a large, extended family. That the principals cared for their students and teachers was very evident. In return, teachers were motivated to make extra effort for the good of the school.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

“Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.”
Matthew 7:12

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to identify enabling administrative behaviors and structures. That enabling and hindering administrative behaviors and structures do exist was indicated by surveys conducted by the “100 Schools Study” in the winter and spring of 2000. These surveys were completed by principals and teachers with twelve of the questions designed to measure the participants’ ratings of enabling administration in their schools (These twelve questions comprise the ESS, Appendix D).

Whether rules, hierarchy, and behaviors in a particular school were enabling as indicated by the survey was a collective subjective assessment of the participants. The problem for the researcher was to identify specific behaviors and structures. This again was a subjective assessment of the participants’ individual interviews. Complete agreement among the participants as to the desired behaviors and structures was not expected. As expected, participants disagreed on whether or not some of the specific behaviors were enabling or hindering. Variations occurred not only due to the varied personalities but also due to which subjects they taught and their years of service. This was a point emphasized by the participants themselves.
Review of the Research Methodology

The use of Standardized Open Ended Interviews served the purpose of collecting the observations and ideas of the participants as to the features of enabling administrations. It was apparent that the categorization of questions into five questions about rules and five questions about hierarchy would not restrict the responses of the participants. Their observations cut across categories. For example, an instance of the principal informing a teacher of a student's personal problems might be discussed under 1) communication, 2) enabling authority, 3) professional judgement, or 4) enabling student achievement. Some individual participants had concerns that influenced their attitudes so strongly that they continued to refer back to those concerns throughout the interview.

Encouraging the participants to talk about anything on their minds at the end of the interview allowed them to 1) expand on previous comments, 2) bring out situations that were not elicited by the standardized questions, and 3) recall informative scenarios that had happened at previous schools, under previous administrations, or in non-school settings. This was critical for eliciting examples of behaviors and structures that were not enabling whether they occurred in a school or non-school setting.

Participant selection was a slight problem. In two schools where the principal did not actively contact staff, participation was light. In one school, all of the participants were long time teachers. In fact, three out of four of these teachers commented during the interviews that their reactions might be different if they were new teachers rather than veterans who had known the principal for a long time.
Two principals had made an effort to provide a diverse mix of teachers. One went so far as to include a teacher with whom there had been a dispute over student discipline. Both of these principals provided a mix of male and female teachers with differing levels of experience from a cross section of teaching areas.

The sixth school principal used the volunteer basis except when one participant could not make the interview. So a substitute was quickly found. Fortunately, this was a school in which I had some previous contacts and was known by several members of the staff since it was close to where I previously taught. So the staff was unusually cooperative and the substitute readily agreed to the interview.

Overview of the Findings

First we will review how well the study answered the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Then dilemmas faced by administrators will be discussed. For the third and largest part of this overview, data gathered from interviews, documents, and observations is arranged into themes. Themes are discussed on the basis of what is the consensus of opinion of the participants. The fourth part is the prototype of an enabling administration that is based on the findings of this study. The fifth part is a series of recommendations for further study.

Research Questions

The first research question: “What behaviors, rules, and structures can be identified and described by the teacher as enabling or hindering?” has nearly 150 separate behaviors and structures as answers. These behaviors and structures will be discussed in
the third section below by grouping them into themes. A theme represents a general pattern of behavior that cuts across categorization by questions and across differentiation between rules and hierarchy.

The second research question: "Will these behaviors, rules, and structures be consistently categorized as enabling and hindering by the teachers interviewed?" can be answered in the affirmative. An examination of the counts in Appendix G: Codebook show that most behaviors and structures identified had multiple counts involving more than one school. For some behaviors and structures, their identification as negative was not that the behavior and structure was negative but that it was lacking in that particular school. There were a few disagreements as to how far an administrator should go along a continuum of behavior for example in the behavior of flexibility.

The third research question: "Will there be a difference between principals and teachers in identification of enabling behaviors and structures?" can also be answered affirmatively. There were some differences but they were relatively few. Most behaviors and structures with more than one response were identified by both teachers and principals. The two notable exceptions had only principals identifying "Teacher discipline is done behind closed doors," and "State is inconsistent in its actions and requirements." This may be due in the first case to the teachers in the study not having any experience in a discipline situation and in the second to the principal’s position of dealing with all state requirements for the school on a day to day basis.

The fourth research question: "Will there be differences in the schools based on the experiences of individuals who have experienced both enabling and hindering
administrations?" needs more study. The very few teachers who had prior experience in business were able to point out substantial differences in behaviors and structures with business organizations. Teachers who had been at other schools almost uniformly said that their current school was the best place that they had taught. But there were few examples of the hindering behaviors and structures. Most responses centered on the lack at previous schools of the enabling behaviors and structures that they were experiencing in their present school.

Dilemmas Faced by Administrations

An examination of the behaviors and structures mentioned by teachers and administrators reveals several dilemmas that must be faced. The behaviors and structures are seen to range along a continuum. Avoiding going too far in either direction is a general case dilemma that calls for constant adjustments consistent with Langer's (1989) conceptualization of mindfulness. She sees mindfulness as a combination of ongoing scrutiny of existing expectations, continuous change and differentiation of expectations based on new experiences, the ability to make new expectations based on new and unprecedented events; an appreciation of context and how it must be dealt with, and an identification of new facets of the context that enhance predictive powers and current functioning.

Blau and Scott (1962) pose the overall dilemma of order versus autonomy. Order is the hallmark of the bureaucratic model of organizations while autonomy is found and prized in professional organizations. The model found in these schools with enabling
administrations is more like the professional model with the major exception being that
the staff is controlled and disciplined at least in theory by the hierarchy of authority.

One specific dilemma facing the administrator is communication versus
coordination (Blau & Scott, 1962). Coordination is facilitated by hierarchical
differentiation of status while communication tends to be blocked by differentiation in
status whether differentiation is imposed formally by the hierarchy or develops informally
due to the process of communication itself. In the schools in this study, the hierarchy
tends to be flat and communication is prized by both teachers and administrators. Not
surprisingly, communication in these schools is generally considered to be very good. The
exceptions in the schools that do have an exception occur in one particular area such as
with parents, or with one individual, or with the hierarchy that extends above the building
level. Coordination seems to vary with the personality of the principal. None of the
principals in this study is seen to be overly concerned with controlling the teachers. With
one or two steps in the schools' hierarchy and the excellent communications, the principal
has little problem in exerting coordination when it is needed.

Another organizational dilemma is disciplined compliance versus professional
expertness (Blau & Scott, 1962). Again the schools in this study tend toward autonomy
rather than order. The staffs are praised for their professionalism and expertness.
Principals hire on the basis of finding teachers who know what they are doing and can
advance education in the classroom with a minimum of supervision. When the principals
find that expertness and/or professionalism are lacking, they move to address this with
development of the teacher rather than discipline.
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A third dilemma proposed by Blau and Scott (1962) is the need for both centralized planning and individual initiative. The school setting allows for a great deal of individual initiative but there are increasing controls imposed by state mandated testing. State standardized testing leads to a closer examination of lesson plans by principals to determine if the content coverage is directed toward tested areas. Principals report that they now pay more attention to the subject matter covered when they do classroom evaluations. Teachers in the high schools have disciplined themselves to cover tested materials and feel that the preparation at the elementary and middle school levels could be better directed toward skills and knowledge bases covered by the state tests. Principals with more than one feeder school lament the lack of coordination in methodology and content coverage for the feeder schools.

Long-time teachers report that in the past, even administrators who were obsessed with control did not pay as much attention to content taught as they did to paperwork, hall duty, appearances, and other auxiliary behaviors. Now even the most permissive administrators feel the pressure of the school report cards. Their behavior is affected accordingly and this in turn puts pressure on teachers and students.

In the smaller schools, managerial planning benefits from the ease of communication and the resulting enhanced flow of professional expertise from the staff to the decision makers. In enabling systems, decision makers often include the teachers as professional experts and even parents as experts on the children and the community. As the school systems get larger, managerial planning is removed from the school site and in hindering systems even principals are often out of the loop for providing input and
influencing decisions. Even site-based decision making in larger systems is dependent upon a great deal of coordination from the central office especially in the allocation of resources among the schools in the system.

Another type of dilemma is the categorization of administrator behavior by staff members, parents and students who are acting from a single perspective (Langer, 1989). A good example is the administrator who exhibits one of the most appreciated behaviors, flexibility. What is seen as flexibility by one person may be seen as weakness by another. Observers categorize the administrator’s behavior according to their wants and goals and also according to the similarity of the administrator’s behavior to their own behavior.

The flexible principal is more process oriented and realizes there is no one right way to deal with a situation. When a teacher sends a student to an administrator, the teacher has the goal of having the behavior of that student changed when the student returns to class. When the principal tries an approach that does not completely extinguish the objectionable behavior, the teacher may view the principal’s efforts as unsuccessful. But the mindful principal will use the experience to change expectations and devise new possibilities for solutions. For example, one teacher stated that she admired the way the administrators kept working with students who ‘don’t get it.’ She said that sometimes students ‘don’t get it’ until the end of the junior or beginning of the senior year. Some never seem to understand what school is about according to her view. But the development of the student is seen as a never-ending process with the goal being reached only when the student leaves the school and takes his or her place in the community.
In order for the principal to retain flexibility in problem solving and to adapt to changing circumstances over time, entrapment by category must be avoided (Langer, 1989). Categorizing students by ethnic background, socio-economic status, and religion to name a few is not only limiting in flexibility but also illegal. Subtler and less ostensibly objectionable is categorizing students by their behavior patterns. This was a pattern that was observed by participants in the study. On the other hand, it was also realized that treating all students equally is unfair since the first time offender should not be treated the same as the repeat offender. But the repeat offender is not automatically guilty and when an individual is making progress but backslides it is a different situation than when the student is unrepentant and bent on disruption of the educational process.

The principal who is cognizant of the dilemma of being shuttled back and forth in the minds of the faculty between the categories of 'flexible' and 'wishy-washy' better understands the effect of labeling. One teacher may see a student as impulsive while another teacher may see the student as spontaneous. The 'class clown' for one teacher may be the source of enthusiasm and humor for another. Common examples of students who shine in one area but glow ominously like eyes in the dark in other classes are students who succeed only in band, physical education, or a vocational education course.

Langer (1989) states that categorization is a fundamental mental activity and labels are how we differentiate those categories. The harm comes from single-minded labels that prompt an automatic response. Just as flexible and wishy-washy are differing
interpretations of the same behavior there are many value laden differential
categorizations such as consistent-rigid, informal-unstructured, calm-phlegmatic, and
creative-undisciplined.

The administrator faces many other dilemmas that are based upon placement
along a continuum rather than categorical entrapment although movement along the
continuum results in categorization in the minds of others. Besides the problem of being
labeled either flexible or wishy-washy, there is a more fundamental dilemma of where to
place yourself along a flexible-consistent continuum. The enabling principals and their
staffs see this as being determined by the individual situations. In some cases, more
flexibility is desired especially when the rules do not serve what is seen as the best
interests of the students or teachers involved. Yet overall, consistency is also valued
because it provides structure for the expectations of behavior and helps prevent chaos in
the classrooms and in the halls.

The basic dilemma of freedom versus order applies to classroom. In these
enabling administrations, the administrator’s faith in the professionalism and expertise of
the staff prompts them to believe that the teachers are capable of maintaining discipline
and order in the classroom. The administrator must judge how much freedom to allow the
teacher who in turn must balance between freedom and order in student behavior. Each
must be careful not to allow so much rope that the teacher or student hangs themselves.
The principals in this study again solve this dilemma by dealing with each teacher and
students as an individual in an individual situation. For example, some teacher’s lesson
plans have to be closely monitored until the teacher shows greater capability in
formulating and following the plans. Then there is less monitoring unless the teacher backslides. For some teachers, the knowledge that they are being monitored is all the prompting that the principal needs to make.

Another dilemma is formal versus informal. This applies not only to interpersonal treatment of the staff but also to structure related to communications, evaluations, discipline, and rewards. The administrators in this study tended to prefer informal modes of communication, discipline, and rewards and were able to do this based upon the mutual respect and relaxed informal relations that they enjoyed with their staffs. Evaluations and other procedures were necessarily more formal to the degree required by the Master Agreement, district rules, and state laws that govern these areas.

One area in which formality was desired to a degree was in dealing with students. In these schools, students were expected to be courteous and not to argue with teachers in front of the other students. This respect on the part of the students is facilitated by relatively formal staff relationships when the interaction is in front of the students. When principals show respect to the teachers, students tend to follow suit.

A final dilemma has to do with internal and external pressures and orientations. The principal experiences internal pressures and responsibilities from the staff and students in the building. In these enabling administrations, the principals are very responsive to the internal needs and goals. The principals also experience external pressures and responsibilities. That they have been successful in dealing with these pressures and responsibilities is evident in their average tenure in the buildings of over ten years. But the external influences are also the greatest source of frustration as evident
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by the verbal responses of both principals and teachers. The attitude is to do what is necessary to satisfy the external forces and then to expend the bulk of their efforts on the needs and wants of the staff and students in the building.

**Themes**

The identification of themes was made difficult by the interweaving, overlapping, and reciprocal relationships of the behaviors and structures (see Appendix H for the theme categories). For example, the behavior, Principal Fights Upper Hierarchy, could fit under 1) Strong but Supple, 2) Support of Teachers by Administrators, or 3) Knowledge and Expertise of Principal. Choosing Strong but Supple not only conformed more neatly with fewer connotations not fitting into the category, but also fit the tone and emphasis of the teacher who gave that information.

Another example of overlapping would be placing Principal Visibility in Strong but Supple rather than the arguable categories of Support of Teachers by Administrators or Facilitates Teaching and Learning. Visibility adds to strength unless the administrator is already so weak that his or her visibility means nothing. Added strength then adds bite to the principal's effort to support the teachers and to facilitate teaching and learning.

The main themes that emerged included 1) Support of Teachers by Administrators, 2) Strong yet Supple, 3) Facilitate Flow of Information, 4) Two-way Influence and Encouragement, 5) Professionalism and Expertise of Teachers/Staff Acknowledged, 6) Facilitates Teaching and Learning, 7) Structural Factors.
8) Knowledge and Expertise of Principal, and there was a pair of important characteristics which did not fit into administrative behaviors and structures and so were placed in a section entitled Not Categorized.

Based on the identified behaviors, themes seriously considered but discarded included Mutual Respect, Reciprocal Influence, Bases of Decision-Making, and Approachability. These classifications move too far toward evaluating climate and culture rather than administrative behaviors and structures.

To practice mindfulness, this discussion will avoid the tight categorization of a list of do's and don'ts and also the lack of structure of generalizations about enabling and hindering behavior. Observations will be clustered with the overriding idea of keeping a balance in behavior and structures. Balance is not achieved by a static grasping of the status quo but by a dynamic series of constant adjustments (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001) as the administrator allows each new situation to affect and shift his grounded theory of administrative behavior.

Support of Teachers by Administrators

The balance in an enabling administration is between support for the staff based on an appreciation for their professionalism and expertise and support based on an automatic unwillingness to consider parent and student concerns. The principal should be constantly monitoring for changes in the quality of staff decisions. New conditions in both personal and professional situations are to be considered in evaluating any change in teacher behavior and teacher effectiveness in the classroom.
The staff appreciates when the principal supports the teachers first and then asks questions. The principal recognizes that teachers are not going to be in the right all of the time but if the other enabling behaviors in communication and professionalism have taken place, then the teacher should be expected to exhibit the correct behavior and make the best choices most of the time. When teachers do not seem to be making the correct choices and responses, these principals then discuss this and make sure that what is perceived by the principal is the actual situation. The principal can then educate and advise in a supportive way so the teacher feels support rather than retribution.

Teachers stated that they feel secure in conducting business in their classroom when the administration supports them. They are unafraid to make decisions and are confident in enforcing discipline in the classroom and hallways. Principals supporting teachers (SUPTCH in the Codebook, Appendix G) was one of the administrative behaviors most often mentioned in a positive way. This was considered one of the two or three most enabling characteristics of an enabling administration. Administrative support was considered crucial to all behaviors and structures involving student discipline, innovation, and two-way communication and encouragement. In situations without administrative support, the teachers commented that they were hesitant in disciplining students and avoided contact with the administrators who were not supportive.

In those reported instances where an administrator “cut the legs out from under the teacher” by not enforcing the rules, the rules meant nothing or worse than nothing. When a teacher attempts to enforce a rule and is then overridden or otherwise not supported, the teacher loses credibility in the eyes of the students.
Rules give the teacher support by being logical and enforceable. Unenforceable rules undermine the staff and need to be eliminated or modified so that they are workable. The rules enforcing the chains of communication for conflict resolution must be enforced. To loop outside the chain undermines the person in the position that has been skipped whether a student has gone to the principal first or a teacher has gone to the superintendent. The principal or superintendent then advises the complainant to follow the steps in the complaint procedure. This gives top-down support and provides structure for conflict resolution. Standardized complaint procedures facilitate problem solving and tend to cut down on the total number of complaints and make them more reasonable.

Support of teachers was facilitated by the principal communicating directly with the teacher about problems. When the principal facilitated and monitored communications among parents, student, and teachers, the teacher felt reassured and less fearful of those meetings. In disciplinary and other possibly confrontational meetings, having the principal sit in on the conference was reassuring to the teacher. Having a Parent Complaint Procedure in black and white gives the teacher structure in dealing with problems with parents.

The administrator has the responsibility to represent the entire staff. The faculty member who does not complain and who seems to accept the short end of everything may still be resentful and so unwilling to give his or her best effort. Staff members and students must learn that being louder and more aggressive does not make them right and does not insure that they will be favored. The principals did however acknowledge that
they let behaviors and effort enter into some of their decisions. Teachers who worked hard and made strong accomplishments in the classroom were more likely to get any perks that were available.

The principal is wise to solicit opinions from people with expertise and so must constantly scan the staff for expertise and support the people with expertise in the decision making process. A diversity of opinions gives complexity and breadth to the possible problem solutions. Criticism based on knowledge and reflection should be encouraged.

The principal supports the teachers by quickly responding to problems especially problems with students. The teachers suffer when problems are left to fester. Teachers with strong personalities may overreact and create confrontational situations that aggravate the problems. Other teachers may simply suffer and become preoccupied with coping with the problem and lose concentration in the educational process. They let the situation degrade so that less and less education is taking place.

Support is even greater when it is from the top down. In schools where the teachers feel supported not only by the building administrators but also by the superintendent and/or the board of education, the teachers exhibited more confidence and assurance in being able to carry out their responsibilities in the classroom. On the other hand, a non-supportive hierarchy above the principal did not lessen teacher confidence appreciably but there was a noticeable ‘us against them’ edge to their answers. In these
situations, the respect and support for the principal from the staff was more strongly voiced. The principal was viewed as the champion of the school against the central office bureaucrats.

**Strong Yet Supple**

The ideal principal is like the ideal sword in the philosophy of Lao Tzu (Wang Pi, 1979) strong but supple. The sword must be strong to cut effectively, but it must also be supple to avoid breaking or bending when it hits bone or iron. The principal needs to be strong to enforce rules and command the respect of teachers, students, other administrators, and the community. But the principal also should be flexible in applying rules and following procedures in order to avoid falling into an untenable position or doing harm when flexibility would provide a better resolution for all concerned. Larson’s (1997) study shows the pitfalls of being inflexible when faced with changing demographics in a district. The administrators who could not adapt to deal with the needs, demands, and tactics of minorities eventually lost their jobs.

**Strong**

Teachers appreciated a principal who enforces student rules. This insures the structure that the rules are designed to provide. Although there was general agreement by participants that discipline was good and/or better than it had been previously, teachers in this study saw the need for better enforcement although they did not necessarily look to the principal as the person responsible for the problem. There was also a perceived need by some teachers for stricter enforcement of rules for teachers although these perceptions may be due to differences in personality and motivation among teachers. There is even a
noticeable difference in the conceptions of what a teacher ought to do for the school based on subject matter taught with academic teachers being less engaged in non-classroom activities than those teaching vocational education, music, art, and physical education.

When the professional judgments of the principal come into conflict with the professional judgments of teachers, even the teachers expect the principal to prevail. Both teachers and principals expected the principal to take a definitive stand after all sides have been heard. To revisit an issue time after time irritates all involved except a minority who feel that protesting over and over will allow them to get their way. Principals should not allow themselves to be swayed when they are convinced of their opinion. Just as they allow the teachers to try things and learn from the experience, the principal should be willing to take the risk of trying out an idea that might fail.

The strong principal fights for the benefit of the school, teachers, and students. Fighting the hierarchy in order to benefit the school is highly admired by the teaching staff. This tends to develop a staff that will rally around the principal in difficult times. The downside is the development of a bunker mentality with less flexibility in the attitudes of the teachers when dealing with the upper hierarchy and central office staff.

Teachers felt that the principal exhibits strength by being visible and cracking the whip when necessary. Being in the hallways and enforcing rules utilizes the strength of the principal in supporting teachers and providing structure to the school climate and culture. It also increases the strength of the principal. Strength is best increased by using it. The application of capabilities allows them to develop and deepen. The principal who
hunkers down in their office and avoids interaction may inspire fear but cannot develop
the strength of an enabling administrator. When the principal is out observing the
students, there is a noticeable change in their demeanor. In my visits to most schools, the
presence of an adult who appears to be serious and professional tends to calm student
behavior even if the adult is a visitor.

The principal not only affects student behavior by being visible, but also affects
teacher behavior. Teachers are human too and respond to both observation of their
behavior and reinforcement of desired behavior. Demands by the principal for unpopular
requirements like hall duty and written examinations in non-academic subjects can be
enforced by actively monitoring teacher behavior.

The balance must be struck between being perceived as strong but too rigid and
being flexible but too weak. Rules for students and expectations for teachers must be
enforced and it is a truism that erring on the side of rigidity and strength is easier to
amend than erring on the side of suppleness. While the old saying, "Never smile before
Christmas," may be a bit harsh, students respect teachers and administrators who give
them structure and expectations. The enforcement of student rules shows the strength
needed to make support of teachers valuable. Support from a principal perceived to be
weak is seen by teachers to be ineffective in giving the staff confidence in doing what
they believe needs to be done in the classroom. When the staff is unsure of the
effectiveness of the support of the principal, they are hesitant in making decisions.
The behavior mentioned most often as enabling in this study was flexibility. The shadings of meaning on the part of the teachers and principals included flexibility in decision-making, flexibility in applying and understanding varied perspectives, flexibility in interpreting and applying rules, and flexibility in adapting behavior to varying and changing circumstances over time. The ability to adapt to changing circumstances in the school and society allows the principal to hold a long tenure in office and avoid burnout. This long tenure provides a wealth of experience from which to draw varied problem solving strategies and human relations techniques.

Flexibility is exhibited by dealing with personnel on an individual basis. Teachers have differing problems and personal situations. The flexible, enabling principal takes these into account when dealing with the teachers' strengths and weaknesses. Individual teachers respond to different motivations. Some need nurturing and feelings of belonging and protection. Others need to be independent and allowed to find their own way. As Isherwood and Hoy (1973) concluded, teachers with varying work values identify with different organizational values and thrive in differing organizational climates. The enabling administrator is able to accommodate differing work values and personalities.

Flexibility is also valued in dealing with students. However, teachers did see necessary limits to flexibility in dealing with students. Too much flexibility in assigning student punishment leads to feelings on the part of the teachers that their efforts are not being supported and that the rules don't count. Teachers do see flexibility built into the Student Handbook as valuable. Flexibility in student codes of conduct allowed teachers
and administrators to let the punishment fit the crime. They realize that it is not really fair to treat everyone the same way. Procedural justice is often in conflict with substantive justice. In these enabling administrations, substantive justice is more highly regarded.

By the same token, principals appreciate flexibility on the part of the teachers. Teachers who are unwilling to make an attempt to try new curricula or methods make implementation more difficult for the whole faculty. Principals appreciate teachers who will give ideas a try before condemning and/or sabotaging new projects. Principals also appreciate teachers who show some flexibility in dealing with students. Inflexible teachers send more problems to the principal’s office and put the principal into more situations where they have difficulties in justifying the actions of the teachers. Teachers should be shown that flexibility on their part leads to fewer situations where they might be second-guessing the flexibility on the part of the administrators.

Principals who show flexibility are rewarded with fewer problems from the faculty. The schools in the study showed little labor strife with few grievances being reported and in some cases no grievances filed for many years. In fact, the teachers who were most strongly involved with the union in these schools were often the most verbally supportive of the principal. Even teachers who believe that their principal is sometimes too flexible to the point of being wishy-washy qualified their criticism by expressing appreciation of the overall effects of an administrator who can apply more than just the black and white of printed rules to most situations.

Teachers expressed the belief that making decisions on an individual basis for students and teachers can be overdone when it is perceived that the differences in severity
are unfair and based upon other conditions such as social status, participation on athletic
teams, relationships to staff members, and other forms of favoritism and bias. When the
transgressions of rules are severe, there is also the common belief that it is more
important to go by the book and avoid setting precedents that will be difficult to follow in
the future. So a balance between flexibility and consistency or equality must be struck.

Facilitate Flow of Information

The enabling principal strikes a balance between giving too little and too much
information. Teachers do not need to know everything that is going on in every
department and in every facet of the building especially in a large school. Information
overload takes a lot of time and teachers must use energy to sort through the information
and pick out what is important and what isn’t.

In order the strike this balance, the principal should first err on the side of too
much information and ask for feedback from the teachers on what they feel they need to
know and what they think is superfluous. When any new system is put into place, the
tendency is to become enamored with it and use it to the point that it becomes annoying
or burdensome. When the principal and teachers have established a trusting relationship,
giving and receiving feedback should not be a problem. If teachers are reluctant to give
feedback about the flow of information, the principal should consider if there are barriers
to feedback in more sensitive and crucial areas of the principal/staff relationship.

Another balance that needs to be found is between confidentiality in student and
teacher information and the benefits to the staff of knowing such information. Several
respondents felt that state laws regarding confidentiality prevented the teacher from having a complete picture of student problems and this results in not being able to fully prepare for the best possible student achievement. But principals are advised to first err on the side of confidentiality in order to avoid any possible legal entanglements.

One structural recommendation derived from the interviews included printed principal announcements on a weekly or biweekly basis. Having this in hand during planning is helpful and convenient and reduces errors produced by a reliance on memory. Teachers should get the information first. Although this is also a factor in the theme, Facilitates Teaching and Learning, it is aggravating to get your news from the students. The enabling principal informs the teachers first and sometimes memos are not meant for student eyes.

Teachers' meetings are not only important forums for dissemination of news of upcoming events and concerns. Meetings can also be a vehicle for feedback from the teachers. I attended many of these meetings recently in over forty schools in addition to the schools in this study and they provided a wide variety of examples of enabling and hindering administrations. Some were free flowing with the exchange of many ideas without getting bogged down in debate or domination by one or a few teachers. Sometimes the principals do have to corral people in order to move on with the meeting. To facilitate an orderly meeting, the principal usually gives the teachers an outline of the agenda and/or a list of items that are coming in the future. Not all items need to be discussed. Some are only called to the attention of the staff.
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In order to make the meeting valuable, the principal needs to command the attention of the group with either topics that are of interest to all or with a business like demeanor. There was some interest expressed in this study for more meetings to facilitate increased communication, but most teachers felt they already had an appropriate number of meetings. Principals took the view that meetings were held as needed. No meetings just for the sake of meeting. The principals in this study were not overly concerned about union rule restriction on meetings as were many principals in the quantitative study that preceded this study. These enabling principals kept the Master Agreement restrictions in minds and did not abuse those restrictions. They practiced give and take with the union so each side could benefit from small accommodations.

The principal carries the responsibility of initiating and maintaining lines of communication with individual teachers. The enabling principal communicates individual and class concerns directly to the teacher. Teachers appreciate that there is not an intervening link in the communication chain. The principal also encourages teacher-to-teacher communication and resolution of problems. The principal needs to judge when to step in and how directive he or she must be in dealing with teacher conflicts. When teachers come to the principal about problems with another individual, these enabling principals encourage and often facilitate direct communication whether the parties are teachers, students, or parents. The principal monitors their own frequency and usefulness of contact with teachers. Most teachers are too polite or too intimidated to brush off a principal when they are not really interested or need to be completing another task.
Highly praised were open door policies on the part of principals and in a couple of instances, open door policies by superintendents. This informal channel shows respect for the teachers and also for the students. People are not too intimidated to bring problems and information to a principal who is known to be approachable. Sometimes the doors are closed at the request of the teacher or by some principals who are concerned with confidentiality for the individuals in specific cases. There was some concern by a small number of teachers that sometimes the principal was just too busy and concerns had to be placed on the back burner by the teacher. Even if the principal is very busy there needs to be time to listen to teachers. If this does not seem to be possible, the principal can step back and look at the situation from outside. Priorities may need to reordered, responsibilities may need to be delegated, skills may need to be upgraded, and adjustments or additions in personnel may need to be made.

The one area of some concern was communication with the parents and community. A few teachers felt that while the community was well informed about the nuts and bolts of events and conditions in the schools, there could be more explanation of the school mission and other educational concepts. Even with staff and parent input into mission statements and various policy committees, the broader community does not get the benefit of the information and explanations that those on the committees enjoy. The need for more communication with the community was generally held to be a district shortcoming rather than specific to their school.

Open and honest communications are important to these enabling administrations. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) demonstrated that enabling bureaucracies were associated
with a greater degree of trust in the principal. The more honest the principal is perceived to be by the staff, the less role conflict the staff feels. The variables 1) trust in principal, 2) honesty (truth spinning as termed in the study), and 3) role conflict accounted for 78% of the enabling bureaucracy in the schools in the “100 Schools Study”. Trust is built over the long-term experience of the teachers with the principal. Given that the principals in these schools tend to deal with teachers and problems on an informal and flexible basis, it is reasonable that the staff perceptions of whether or not the administration is enabling is determined by the principals’ history of authenticity.

A lack of trust and authenticity is often due to the struggle for power in the organization. In schools in which the principal’s efforts are directed toward enabling teachers to do the best job of teaching and to enable students to do the best job of learning the struggle for power is minimized. The staffs in these schools showed a reluctance to challenge the authority of the principal based upon their perceptions of the motives of the principal to help them and their respect for the principal’s abilities to communicate with them, support them, and solve their problems. There was a real sense of esprit, of a team effort involving administrators, teachers, support staff, and often even the students.

**Two-way Influence and Encouragement**

The behaviors discussed in the section above also facilitate two-way influence. In addition, more formalized structures may be utilized. One structure commonly used may be termed the principal’s advisory committee. This committee is formally authorized by contract in some districts and informally established in others. Teachers are encouraged to
bring their ideas and concerns or communicate them to representatives on the committee. Principals report that ideas originally introduced in this committee often formed the basis of new rules or procedures in the school. Teacher input through these committees is often supplemented by input from parents and students who sometimes are members of the committee.

More informally, the principal may use the lines of communication that have been forged in the attempt to facilitate the flow of information to influence teachers to get behind ideas and projects. In return, the principal will likely be receptive to the attempts of staff members to influence him or her. The key to listening is not just to keep silent while waiting for your turn to speak. It requires focused attention on the speaker. The principal who listens well pays attention to the details and to the overall demeanor of the teacher. The principal considers alternatives and thinks ahead to possible solutions. Then as the teacher adds details and new perspectives, the principal modifies the mental lists of alternatives and solutions. The enabling principal attempts to see things from the point of view of the teacher and also helps the teacher see the points of view of the other people involved.

This two-way influence involves teacher and student input into rule making. Knowing that they have some impact in rule making makes the rules more palatable to those who must follow them. Articulation of opinions about rules and about desired rules and procedures leads to common expectations. Common expectations bring the influence of the school culture to bear on the behavior of the staff and students.
With the free flow of information, the principal will most often be rewarded by the staff unifying behind decisions at least until the idea or project has been tried long enough to receive a fair evaluation. The principal should be wary of the development of shared mindsets (Langer, 1989) that lead to mindlessness because staff members cease to question and search for improvements within the current procedures and systems and to search for new procedures and systems that may replace current procedures and systems.

The enabling principal influences teachers with informal rewards. Sometimes administrators underestimate the effect of a pat on the back or public recognition. The principals in this study were uniformly aware of the effects of their efforts to informally encourage teachers. Teachers often mentioned that they were motivated by recognition of their efforts. Of course sincerity or the perception of sincerity is as important as the words themselves. It was pointed out that a former principal almost always began meetings by saying, “I think we don’t mention often enough the work you people do and how much we appreciate it.” After a few repetitions of this, the ensuing repetitions lost value and the previous uses of this phrase also lost their value. As the old saying goes, “When you can fake sincerity, you can get away with anything,” but this is not a practical mode of behavior for a public school administrator to attempt.

In smaller schools, a sense of camaraderie often develops since teachers are more likely to associate with each other outside of school. They have the common interests and socio-economic status that form the common ground that lead to the development of many friendships. In larger schools, the camaraderie may be more likely to exist within
the school as the staff struggles as a unit to grapple with the specialized problems of large
districts and to deal with the hierarchy which affects the school from outside the building.

Principals providing food for staff meetings and districts providing funds for
projects and graduate studies are more tangible rewards that may or may not be
formalized. Punishments may also be formal or informal. The informal punishment by
undesirable assignments and lack of opportunities for the plum assignments were the
most often mentioned types of informal punishment.

The principal is rewarded by the cohesiveness and work ethic of the staff. Mutual
respect goes a long way in getting the staff to back the principal even when they have
doubts as to the advisability of a project. Constant two-way influence and encouragement
develop common expectations that are part of the culture of the school. In turn, school
culture strongly influences behavior and keeps the staff together in stressful situations.

In these schools, the teachers tend to realize that the context of the principal is not
the same as their own. People tend to confuse the context controlling their own behavior
with the context controlling their own behavior (Langer, 1989). But many teachers
expressed the realization of the many forces pressing on the principals and were grateful
that these enabling principals gave them so much individual time and help. In turn, they
supported and encouraged the principal even though they did not always agree.

**Professionalism and Expertise of Teachers/Staff Acknowledged**

In their work on high reliability organizations (HROs), Weick and Sutcliffe
(2001) address the need for deference to expertise. The diversity of views and opinions
they see as important in HROs is built into high school staffs with the differentiation by
subjects into departments and the obvious personality differences between such diverse
groups as football coaches and art teachers. Although there may be a football coach who
teaches art there are generally a wide variety of opinions in faculty meetings that I have
attended. The enabling principal who practices mindfulness uses these differences to help
see more complexities in the school setting and utilize more points of view.

Treating teachers as professionals and experts in their areas are the keys to this
cluster of behaviors and structures. The professionalism and expertise of the teachers in
their areas allow the principals to leave the bulk of classroom decision making to the
teachers. A controlling principal passes any errors he or she might make down to the next
level where they may combine with errors on the part of the teachers. This combination
makes the problems larger, more difficult to understand, and harder to control. An
enabling principal allows decisions to be made at the front line where they can be based
on the situational immediacy by the person who has the day in and day out experience
that facilitates prompt, accurate response. These principals and teachers agree that
teachers should make the first level of decisions regarding student discipline. There is no
need for the administration to be continually looking over the shoulder of the staff when
the common expectations of professionals are mutually understood. The administration
then backs the staff until it becomes apparent that professional judgement and/or
expertise is slipping.

Also in enabling administrations, curriculum developments and innovations are
teacher driven. Teachers who are regarded as professionals and experts are in some
schools given input into the budget process. This input is based on their assessment of
needs and expertise in choosing curricula materials. Teachers know what is needed in the classroom and have the subject matter expertise to make appropriate choices. Enabling administrations respect this expertise and so the teachers are free to try innovations that they feel are appropriate. Failure is not punished but considered a natural consequence of attempting to move forward and improve instruction.

Included in this hierarchy of expertise are secretaries and other staff members who are experts in their own fields. Teachers often go to secretaries first when it is a question of how to do something rather than of policies or rules. In my time spent waiting in the offices of the schools in this study and the schools in two quantitative studies, I have much more often seen principals seek information from secretaries then I have seen secretaries need information from principals. The teachers often say that if the principal is out things can go on, but if the secretary is out for a day, chaos ensues. One principal even said that part of his philosophy is that when he is out, they don’t need a substitute and also that no substitute can do as well as the regular teachers on his staff. His attitude reflects the value he places on the professionalism and expertise of his staff.

Senior teachers may be part of a formal or informal mentoring system that deals with problems and disseminates information so that the principal does not need to be involved. These senior teachers are seen not only as experts in their subject areas, but also as experts in the formal and informal workings of the school. An obvious situation where decision-making migrates to expertise is in technology. No matter the degree or age, the person who can deal with technology is integral to decision making.
Informal modes of communication are the result of the recognition of teacher professionalism and staff expertise. Communication is between experts in their fields. Principals are the experts in administration and in supporting the technical core of teaching. Teachers are the experts in the technical core techniques and in their subject matter. Communications among professionals is freer and less likely to be hindered by awareness of hierarchical differentiation than communication along a vertical hierarchy based strictly on authority as envisioned by Weber (1946). Informal communication allows for more information at crucial times so that responses are immediate and more appropriate.

The principal is the key facilitator of a professional and expert staff in two key areas. The first is in hiring. Enabling administrations however tend to involve more than one person in the evaluation of candidates for positions. In some cases, a committee is formed which includes teachers, particularly department heads, and parents. Each committee member has input and decisions may be made by consensus although the principal may reserve the right of final approval. Appropriate hiring decisions bring in personnel who fit into the culture of the school with the recognition that diversity of opinion is part of a healthy culture capable of supplying many different problem-solving approaches based on an increased ability to see the different aspects of any situation.

The other key area is that as an expert in administration and leadership, the principal is responsible for developing leadership and classroom administration skills in the teachers. Beginning teachers in particular need to be reassured that the measures they take are appropriate. If the teachers do not make appropriate decisions and responses, the
principal is responsible for instructing the teachers in methods that will allow them to come to appropriate decisions and responses in the future. Staff development is ongoing as society changes and individual staff members change. The principal needs to strike a balance between autonomy and order by both allowing the teachers to be decision-making professionals in the classroom and by monitoring and if necessary controlling the classroom situations so that student achievement as well as teacher success is facilitated.

Conversely, teachers do not feel that their professionalism and expertise is respected when they are forced to make curricula changes and add units that they are not convinced are valuable. For example, although the administration may see the value of technology innovations, they must convince the staff to buy into giving innovations a chance before making a negative evaluation. Even though the administration is sure that in time their judgement will be vindicated and this does in time come true, teacher professionalism takes a hit when the staff as a whole is forced to make changes against their judgement.

A mutual regard for professionalism and expertise between administrators and teachers and among the teachers for each other was evident in these schools. This gives these schools a culture that believes in the school’s ability to do the best job for student achievement. Confidence in one another leads to confidence that the support needed to do the best job possible will be received. Expectations of professionalism and expertise lead to feelings of professionalism and expertise. When the principal publicly states that the teacher is the expert and authority in the classroom, this increases teacher credibility and effectiveness with the students.
Facilitates Teaching and Learning

The acknowledgement of the professionalism and expertise of teachers is a preliminary step in facilitating teaching. This leads to attempts to maximize the amount of instructional time the staff has to facilitate student achievement. Minimizing interruptions is a key to maximizing instructional time. Giving the teachers all the information they need outside of the school day and giving prior notice of any interruptions that may occur during the day helps minimize breaks in classroom routine. This includes potential interruptions like fire drills and visitors in the building.

To facilitate teaching and learning, decision-making is based on what is considered to be most conducive to student achievement and thus the attainment of the mission of the school and district. The Continuous Improvement Plan is more often given more than lip service. The goals of the school and district are a constant reference when the administration is making plans. Decisions based on student achievement provide a consistency in the academic press that gives teachers and students direction. Student achievement is considered to be the final evaluative factor in the initiation, development, and retention or deletion of any program not mandated by the state or board of education.

Common sense school and classroom rules that are applied consistently yield a structure that facilitates routine and minimizes arguments and disruptions that must be dealt with before students will concentrate on studies. Students feel comfortable with structure and consistency in teaching methods so school-wide expectations must be balanced with professional autonomy in the classroom.
The advent of statewide standardized testing compels the principal to find a balance between 1) decision-making based on maximizing student achievement and meeting district mission goals with 2) decision-making based on meeting the requirements of the proficiency tests and the criteria of the Ohio Department of Education school report card. Teaching to the tests was negatively viewed by participants who touched upon this subject. Teaching to the tests also contributes to 1) a loss of sense of control over what is taking place in their classroom and 2) a routinization of teaching methodology which characterizes the workday with certainties. These two factors can contribute to teacher burnout (Langer, 1989) which is already enough of a problem particularly in large districts where there are many difficulties to begin with. In a situation where these two factors are present, rigid sets of rules contribute to feelings that problems are insurmountable because creative solutions are too risky to attempt.

Fortunately some techniques facilitate both teaching to the state tests and teaching higher order skills and creativity. Principals find that involving students in helping the other students motivates some children more than teacher-student contact. Setting up a meaningful assistance program with the input of the teachers is more valuable than merely having a program for the sake of showing the community that something is being done.

To promote achievement and student development, principals use individual contact and encouragement with students much as is done with teachers. Knowing the students is helpful. Some students get satisfaction if somebody especially an authority figure knows their name. Rewards for achievement do not have to be large. Food is
effective and tends to be remembered by students. Student achievement is not all academics. Students are often rewarded for good behavior and for rate of improvement in achievement. Enabling principals encourage students to look at alternative programs such as Tech Prep and the local Joint Vocational School in order to meet their special interests and needs that cannot be met at the local high school.

Study participants tended to see participation in extracurricular activities such as band, language clubs, and athletics as a tool for the mind-body development of the students and as a source of enjoyment and pride for the students. Many participants felt it was important that administrators and faculty attend and support as many of these activities as possible. It was considered by both principals and teachers that to be involved in extracurricular activities was a valuable experience for teachers. It was considered to give the teachers another perspective on the students. So principals encouraged teachers to support students in their extracurricular interests.

The enabling principal attempts to find the materials and funding needed to provide the best opportunities for teachers to be successful. Principals often must look outside the system for programs that will add to the school curriculum in order to work around financial shortfalls. Looking outside the school also encourages innovation. Enabling principals encourage their teachers to explore new methodology, materials, and delivery systems. Teachers are encouraged to use professional days to explore innovations and inservice days are used to introduce innovations and train teachers in the methodology of new programs. These schools are not standing still. Many recent innovations were evident, both large school-wide changes such as block scheduling and
many smaller changes in individual classrooms. New programs are given a chance to work before decisions are made to continue or discontinue. Evaluation is ongoing and new experiences may require modification during the implementation of a new program in order to avoid allowing initial expectations to control decision-making.

Teachers who do extra work both inside and outside of the classroom were praised by both teachers and administrators. The extra efforts seen on the part of teachers led to comments that teachers who do extra should receive extra compensation. It was recognized that supplemental contracts for extracurricular coaching and supervision provided only a minimal amount of compensation. It was also recognized that merit pay for accomplishments in the classroom would be extremely difficult to implement. Evaluation systems would be difficult to devise and administer and would be open to attack no matter what criteria were chosen.

Structural Factors

Size of the student body and the faculty are seen as a factor that influences the hierarchy and the implementation of the rules in a school. It was often mentioned that being small was an advantage. It was an advantage in communications because there are few intervening layers of hierarchy to slow or distort communication between principals and teachers. Staff members know each other, know students, know parents, and know the community so there is already a basis for communication and as a result communication tends to be more informal. Small size is also an advantage because the number of people needed to approve decisions and implement programs are fewer. Small size speeds the movement of information and decisions along the hierarchy although any
time decision-making authority is not onsite the process is slowed. With small size, the hierarchy is flat and sometimes the superintendent is in the same building so moving up the hierarchical chain is facilitated when appropriate. The opportunities for skipping levels and going straight to the top that is afforded by a flat hierarchy are recognized and discouraged by principals. Another factor in small size is that sometimes building and staffs are shared by high schools and middle schools. This can be a problem if the cultures of the buildings do not mesh or if cooperation between individuals is limited.

Student achievement is considered to be enhanced by small size that allows for individual attention from both teachers and administrators. Small size was also sometimes seen as a limitation due to a lack of students and staff necessary to justify higher level and specialized courses.

Other limitations not caused directly by rules and hierarchy which were often mentioned were space limitations which can be found in large schools as well as small and money limitations which is also not a function of size. These factors were acknowledged to be beyond the control of the administrators but they were seen to influence the decision making of administrators.

Of course structural factors such as size of the school and district are well beyond the influence of the principal. The principal is also hard-pressed to reduce the amount of red tape the teachers must deal with when dealing with the district and the state. The principal has minimal effect on the restrictions of the Master Agreement unless the working relationships with the association representatives are very good. Teacher association leaders do tend to appreciate working with a principal who attempts to follow
the spirit of the Master Agreement and sometimes overlook a minor violation of the black and white of the agreement such as keeping teachers a little too long at a teacher's meeting.

It was agreed in these schools that hindering formalization almost always comes from the hierarchy above the principal. While district rules and red tape and Master Agreement red tape were often mentioned, the state gets the most blame for promulgating inflexible, hindering rules. At the same time, the state is also blamed for being inconsistent and substituting one set of inflexible, hindering rules for another in a seemingly arbitrary manner.

It was conceded that state laws and legal mandates must be followed. Prominently mentioned were Special Education rules. Several teachers and principals felt that their educational options for special education students were limited and that the options that would best serve the students were proscribed. Additionally, students and parents had the power to veto educational choices. Students had learned to use the system in order to be placed in educational situations that were the easiest and required the least work rather than being in the program or situation that would lead to the greatest student achievement.

The principal can however attempt to ease the burden of outside red tape and restrictions by working with the teachers in coping with the paperwork and by getting the best outside information and help so that interpretations and procedures are accurate. The principal does however have the opportunity to minimize the restrictions within her or his building. Teachers and principals agree the fewer the rules, the better. Few rules leave
more room for interpretations based on the best method to handle current situations.

Precedents are useful as guides but not as templates for action. Some rules are necessary for required record keeping such as taking attendance. Some are necessary for keeping teachers on task such as required lesson plans. Some rules provide structure but also leeway such as a well considered and written Student Handbook. The methods and content of all the above can be modified to meet changing conditions both within and outside of the school.

It is helpful to recall Gouldner’s (1954) discussion of rules in a representative bureaucracy when evaluating a school’s rules and rule making procedures. Both staff and administration benefit when both are able to initiate rules. Then both groups view the rules as their own. The rules will then reflect the key values of both staff and administration. Thus the enforcement of the rules will not violate the values of either group. When rules are violated, the violations are attributed to ignorance, carelessness, or human error rather than deliberate intent or human frailties. These violations can be used as lessons that will reduce future violations. Reduction of future violations is in the best interest of both groups because both staff and administration suffer some form of impairment when rules are broken. Finally, Gouldner sees support for rules coming not only from the enforcement by the hierarchy but importantly also from informal communications, mutual participation in adherence to the rules, and mutual benefit from enforcement of the rules.

It is good to remember that all rules are arbitrary (Langer, 1989). Arbitrary because they are based on the expectations and examined data of the present. All of the
data of the present cannot be examined before making a rule because that would be too
time consuming and the situation requiring the rule would have passed. It is futile to
search for certainty in formulating rules. The best rule under the circumstances is taken
and used as a rule of thumb. By realizing that rules are meant to guide not to dictate, it is
easier in the future to discard outdated rules and make new ones based on new data, new
context, and new expectations. The enabling principal acknowledges that she or he is
uncertain of the 'best' rule or procedure but that she or he is confident that the work will
get done and that better rules and procedures may be discovered during the work process.
Leaders who are relatively uncertain of the exact best way but confident that better and
better ways will be found tend to foster creativity, independent judgement, and a lessened
fear of the consequences of failure of an innovation (Langer, 1989). Such leaders realize
that when the staff begins to feel certain that everything is being done the exact right way,
then people tend to quit thinking. The enabling principal finds ways to encourage the staff
to continually search for ways to improve student achievement and teacher productivity.

Being willing to change rules when necessary allows the principal and the staff to
engage in second-order mindfulness (Langer, 1989). Second-order mindfulness lies in
choosing what to be mindful about. Second-order mindfulness realizes that decision-
making is done by people and not by data. Decisions can effectively be made on a paucity
of data and waiting until there is enough data to make the best decision can be self-
defeating. Second order mindfulness chooses what to be mindful about and the endless
A collection of data may be self-defeating as the case of the principal who said that after the teacher comes back three or four times with new arguments, he has to be the boss and say that a decision has been made and that decision must be lived with for the present.

Second-order mindfulness allows the staff to give new ideas and programs an honest try before making an evaluation. When the staff realizes that nothing is written in stone and that rules can be changed when it is evident that student achievement and teacher productivity will be enhanced, they are able to take their attention from fretting about the rules and procedures and concentrate on their job.

Formalization that provides structure for the relationships between teachers and administrators includes the Master Agreement/Contract and the Teacher Evaluations. These documents are seen to have both positive and negative aspects. The Master Agreement provides protection for both the teacher and the administrator. It delineates limitations on the conduct of both for the benefit of the other. Some teachers praised it as an enabling document in the respect that it provides structure for staff relationships and some principals agree. Other teachers and principals mentioned the limitations on 1) problem solving and 2) flexibility in applying rules as the factors leading to an overall negative impact by the Master Agreement.

In hindering systems, when evaluations are not a tool for discipline or termination, they are often perfunctory. Then if teacher performance slips, administrators are often hard-pressed to bring the teacher back their former performance levels. In an enabling system, evaluations are tools for the professional development of staff members. The
principal works with the teacher in identifying and improving areas needing attention. The attitude in the evaluation process should be that everyone is capable of improving and moving forward as a professional.

The principal is also primarily responsible for observing that proper chain of command is maintained. This is also a responsibility of administrators above and below the principal in the hierarchy. The principal reminds the teachers when chain of command is not followed and models the procedure by following it himself and forcing students and parents to follow procedures. The principal also should be observant of the development of informal hierarchy. Some developments may be encouraged such as using experienced teachers as sources of information and development for beginning teachers. Some developments should be discouraged such as favoritism for particular groups and areas such as coaches. This favoritism must be balanced with the perceived value of informal rewards for teachers who make extra efforts for the students and the school. Rewards must be made for accomplishments not for membership in certain groups or for status in the school.

**Knowledge and Expertise of Principal**

The principal passes on knowledge of the building and the student body to teachers especially beginning teachers. On the other hand, the principal realizes that new teachers can give fresh perspectives for evaluations of current rules, procedures, and practices of the building. As an outsider coming in, the new teachers do not take the routine workings of the building for granted and so can identify irrational or destructive
behaviors and structures (Langer, 1989). If the principal is willing to listen to all members of the staff, he or she gets the benefit of multiple points of view which amounts to multiple sources of data on which to base decisions and so gains an increase in knowledge.

A principal with a long tenure in the building often knows the whole family of a particular student including where they live and what the parents do for a living. Knowledge of the families and the community allows the principal to make suggestions based on knowledge that most teachers, especially new teachers, have no other access to. Long tenure also gives a greater knowledge of the complete staff not just teachers. Working with non-certificated personnel and the unions covering them often requires as much expertise as working with the faculty. The ability to work with the non-certificated staff and district maintenance personnel helps keep the physical plant running effectively and looking as nice as possible. This has a positive effect on staff and student pride. The long tenured principal also has the advantage of dealing with the ins and outs of the central office and usually has developed personal contacts within the central office.

The principal is also responsible for interpreting and explaining procedures and rules coming from the district and from the state. Some materials such as Special Education rules are voluminous and sometimes difficult to apply. Knowing where to get answers is often as important as knowing the answers especially when there are so many questions and answers to deal with.

The principal is pressed to decide how much influence state testing, legal mandates, and community preferences are going to have on the instruction in the
building. A balance must be found among the competing influences of state requirements and guidelines, district curricula guides, the desires of parents and students, and the professional opinions of the staff.

The principal teaches leadership and classroom management based upon his or her observations of the teachers’ performance and the requests of the teachers. The principal’s burden in this area is reduced if he or she has the experience and perceptiveness to make appropriate hiring decisions. Candidates’ command of subject matter is important, but the contribution that the candidate will make to the mix of the staff is also a consideration to be carefully considered.

The principal influences innovations directly by making suggestions based on his or her current readings in educational curricula and methods. The enabling principal finds or helps staff find funding sources outside the district if internal budgets are not sufficient. The enabling principal is always scanning the environment to find resources to bring into the building that will enhance the educational program.

The principal’s skills in working with parents are also a key factor in enabling teachers to do their jobs. Parents were identified as a problem by a sizable proportion of the participants considering that the subject of parents was not part of the standardized questions in the interview. Teachers felt that dealing with parents is a growing problem and expect administrators to act as a buffer between staff and parents. The principals who can effectively support teachers in dealing with parents earn high praise from the teachers. This must be balanced by the perceived need to have students and parents with questions and complaints go to the teachers first. Principals need to know how to defuse
situations and get parties to reach consensus on future actions. If this is not possible, the enabling principal will come down on the side of student achievement in the building and be prepared to document and support his or her decision with sound educational arguments.

The principal needs to be a problem solver and good at 'putting out fires.' Weick and Sutcliffe (2001) see the ability to handle contingencies and unexpected problems as signs of resilience and the ability to contain the unexpected. Planning is necessary but plans cannot account for all possible scenarios. Principals who reserve the bulk of their time for planning and anticipating miss the opportunity for interaction with the staff and students and the opportunity for building rapport through problem solving and face to face communications.

The principal is also responsible for monitoring and modifying the culture of the school. Culture controls. It is based on shared assumptions such as the school mission statement. These assumptions are invented and developed by the staff and used to cope with internal integration and adaptation to external forces. If these assumptions have worked in the past, they are considered valid and can be taught to the new staff members as the 'correct' way to think and feel in dealing with internal and external problems. Weick and Sutcliffe's (2001) adaptation is particularly relevant to schools. The adoption of core assumptions such as 'all children can learn' and 'student achievement is the basis for decision-making' by the committed people that teachers tend to be allows the
principal to give the staff the autonomy that professionals need and can manage well. This incorporates centralization on a few key values and decentralization or autonomy on classroom management and instruction.

The principal reinforces culture and changes it if need be by valuing and protecting the flow of information. Those who bring information especially bad news are protected. Weick and Sutcliffe (2001) hypothesize that an organization must focus on failures so that small problems can be solved before they become big problems. They state that culture needs to be a just culture so that mistakes are not punished if they come from acceptable behavior. Unacceptable behavior is punished but learning should take place in either case. The culture needs to be flexible in order to meet changing demands. Principal flexibility is a key enabling behavior in the culture and this needs to include flexibility in problem solving strategies and in choosing who has the expertise to make the best suggestions. To say the school should have a learning culture means that the school as an organization constantly reassesses its practices and accomplishments and discovers new ways to cope.

The principal accomplishes these cultural characteristics in a number of proactive ways (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001). He or she looks for bad news. Problem reporting is encouraged and as well as the reporting of situations that have not yet become problems but have been noticed by someone to have the potential to be a problem. The principal reinforces alertness in the staff and minimizes the natural tendency to explain away deviations and discrepancies. Timely feedback is important to maintain the perception that reporting problems and possible problems is important. The principal models the
behaviors he or she wishes to instill in the staff and student body. It is important to keep repeating the goals of the organization as outlined by the mission statement or by the shared beliefs of the staff, but it is more important to model the behaviors that support and facilitate those goals.

**Prototype of an Enabling Administration**

A prototype of enabling behaviors and structures begins with flexibility in the use of rules and their interpretation. While discretionary leeway can be built into rules, the most flexibility is derived from the principal's interpretation. Flexibility also indicates that rules can be amended or ignored when those actions better serve the teachers and students.

There is more flexibility when there are fewer rules and more representative rules. Fewer rules mean fewer precedents so decisions are based on the case in point. When staff and administrators both contribute to the rule making, the resulting representative rules are supported by both so common expectations develop. Rules are more easily changed because fewer rules and representative rules are less forbidding and more easily viewed as guidelines.

Open two-way communication between principal and teachers is necessary to facilitate many of the following behaviors in this prototype. Two-way communication allows the use of informal rather than formal procedures. Most problems and conflicts can be solved before going to the last resort of formal procedures if there is open and honest communication in the school. Open two-way communication values and protects
the flow of information. This valuing and protection encourages the presentation of bad news that in turn is necessary for effective shared decision-making and for building culture.

So shared decision-making is enabled by open and honest communication between principal and teachers. The staff is able to exchange ideas with confidence that they will be thoughtfully considered. The principal encourages the contribution of ideas from multiple perspectives. The more complex and diverse the points of view, the greater will be the chance that enough factors will be considered so that decisions will better fit the situation. The presentation and contribution of all opinions yields representative rules and common expectations.

The open exchange of ideas in shared decision-making helps insure that decision-making migrates to expertise. When all opinions are considered by professionals who respect each others' expertise, it is more likely that principal and teachers will recognize who has the expertise in the situation and so who should lead in the decision-making process.

Respect by the principal for teacher expertise allows for a high degree of teacher autonomy. The principal will treat teachers as individuals who have varying strengths and needs, but who are all experts in their areas. Teachers will be trusted and expected to make good decisions and uphold the professional standards of the school.

The principal is respected by the teachers as the expert in leadership and administration. This is enhanced when the principal is trusted to be authentic and to tell the truth without attempting to be deceptive in the control of information. When the
principal is highly visible in the school, teachers and students can see the expectations of the school culture in action. The principal is then easily accessible which facilitates the flow of communication and input into informal decision-making by the teachers.

The enabling principal is process oriented and uses conditional thinking to focus on continuous improvement rather let than the attainment of specific goals dominate decision-making. Conditional thinking allows the principal to be flexible in decision-making without sacrificing the needed structure derived from consistently striving for continuous improvement in the process of attaining the overall goals of the school cultures.

Finally, the participants' data strongly suggests that small size and a flat hierarchical structure promote enabling administrative behaviors and structure. This would indicate the use of site-based management and decision-making in larger systems.

From this prototype, features of an enabling administration can be drawn. These are summarized in Table 3 below.

Rules and Procedures: Flexible, Representative, and Informal

Rules have flexibility built-in

Few rules

Representative rules (jointly determined)

Informal procedures predominate
Structure: Flat, Open, and Representative

Smaller

Flat structure

Authorities are accessible

Decision-making migrates to expertise

Open two-way communication

Decision-making is shared

Principal Behavior: Open, Professional, and Supportive

Professional and open with teachers

Respectful of teacher professionalism and of teacher expertise

Supports teachers

Use of multiple perspectives in decision-making

Process oriented using conditional thinking

Flexible in interpretation and application of rules

Teacher Behavior: Informal, Supportive, and Trusting

Prefer informal approaches

Trust principal and principal’s professionalism

Respect principal and principal’s knowledge and expertise

Supports principal

Table 3: Features of an Enabling Administration
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Recommendations for Further Study

This study provides a rich assortment of questions for further study. These studies could include both quantitative work as in the "100 Schools Study" (Hoy et al., 2000) and qualitative investigations such as this dissertation. Quantitative research could be in the form of surveys and would deal with the following examples of tentative conclusions drawn from this study.

Rules can be used to enable teachers to do their jobs or they may hinder teachers in doing their jobs. Rules that enable should be kept and used to provide structure and consistency. Rules that hinder should be abolished or ignored as much as possible.

Tentative conclusion: Rules in enabling structures are different both quantitatively and qualitatively than rules in other structures. Hence, the following predictions.

- Enabling structures have fewer rules than hindering structures.
- Enabling structures have less rigid rules than hindering structures.
- Enabling structures have more representative rules than hindering structures.
- Informal norms are substituted for formal rules more often in enabling structures.
- There is more leeway and flexibility in enforcing rules in enabling structures.

Flexibility was one of the key characteristics of enabling administrations and enabling administrators. Since flexibility like most behaviors ranges along a continuum, enabling schools and hindering schools should differ in where they lie along the continuum of flexibility.

Tentative conclusion: Enabling structures are more flexible than hindering ones. Hence the following predictions.

- Teachers give the principal more leeway in administering the school in enabling structures than in hindering ones.
Rules are seen as guidelines in enabling schools. In hindering schools, rules are seen in absolute terms.

Teachers trust the principal in enabling schools more than in hindering schools. Teachers in enabling schools expect the principal to use discretion in interpreting rules. In hindering schools, teachers expect the principal to stick to the letter of the rule.

The teachers and principals in this study used informal rules and means in their day-to-day conduct of business. They expressed a preference for communicating and interacting on an informal basis.

**Tentative conclusion: Informal rules and means are preferred in enabling structures.** Hence, the following predictions.

The significance of the informal organization is stronger in enabling schools than in hindering schools.
The formal structure is used as a last resort more often in enabling schools while in hindering schools, the formal structure is dominant.
Formal and informal structures are complementary in enabling structures while in hindering schools the formal and informal are more confrontational.
In enabling structures, the informal organization is a more constructive force than in hindering structures.

Most of the top twenty-five schools in the ratings of enabling bureaucracy could be characterized as small rural schools. Only one was an urban school while five were considered suburban. This leads to the conclusion that a certain structural configuration of a school lends itself to enabling characteristics.

**Tentative conclusion: The structural configuration of enabling schools is different than hindering ones.** Hence, the following predictions.

In general, enabling schools are smaller than hindering ones.
Enabling schools have flatter structures than hindering ones.
Enabling schools have more representative governance systems.
Enabling schools have more open communication than hindering schools.
The authority structure of enabling schools is anchored in expertise, while the authority structure on hindering schools is anchored in hierarchy.
The basis for this dissertation is that administrators do make a difference in their schools. Principal behavior was postulated as a key component of an enabling administration in a school.

**Tentative conclusion:** Principals behave differently in enabling schools than in hindering schools. Hence the following predictions.

Teacher empowerment and shared decision-making are greater in enabling schools than in hindering schools.

Principals in enabling schools are more reflective and mindful than in hindering.

Principals in enabling schools are more open and authentic with their teachers than those in hindering schools.

Principals in enabling schools treat teachers as professional to a greater degree than principals in hindering schools.

Autonomous principals are more likely to be enabling.

Just as this study is a qualitative project designed to flesh out the findings of the "100 Schools Study," further qualitative research will be needed to follow up on the findings of any of the quantitative studies suggested above. Some studies naturally follow the questions raised by this research.

An aspect to explore qualitatively would be how could hierarchies be made more enabling. It was simpler in the small districts to minimize the differentiation resulting from hierarchies. One principal reported the intent of the administration to intentionally flatten the hierarchy with the following metaphor. He said to take the usual hierarchical model with superintendent as God, the principals as demi-gods, with the teachers on the bottom and smash it flat. Each group has its own areas of expertise and responsibility and the short and informal chains of communication allowed both communication and coordination to be accomplished. This is more difficult in larger systems so it would be
useful to compare districts that are similar in size and demographics but are dissimilar in perceptions of the degree of enabling administration. This would allow us to see how the structure and procedures of hierarchies work in producing enabling conditions for teachers, building level administrators, and students.

A second avenue for future qualitative study would be the search for mindfulness behavior in the administration and staff of schools. Behaviors and structures could be examined using the work of Langer (1989 & 2002) to assess the presence of mindful thinking in schools. Recommendations could then be made to better implement mindfulness in decision-making and the school culture. The causes and dangers of mindlessness as applied to schools could be identified. Then measures for prevention and remediation could be developed.

A final question that could be addressed by both qualitative and quantitative studies would be do enabling administrations result in greater student achievement? Just because teachers are happy, does that insure they are doing a better job? What specific changes in enabling administration can be correlated with student achievement? It is accepted that stress on the job can have both a negative and a positive correlation with job performance depending on where along the stress continuum the situation falls. Then the question would be, what is the optimum range of enabling behaviors and structures and which behaviors and structures are most effective?

The conclusions of this dissertation are that rules, behaviors, and structures of school administrations and administrators do make a difference in whether the staff is enabled or hindered in doing their jobs. Further study would help identify more of these
rules, behaviors, and structures and delineate the relationships among them and student achievement. As in the rule making procedures of these enabling schools, the enhancement of student achievement should be the guiding light for further studies in enabling administrations.
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Participation in this interview is voluntary. The interview will be taped in order to transcribe it and you will have the opportunity to read the transcription and make any corrections or changes that you deem necessary. All materials are confidential and the audiotapes will be destroyed at the end of the study. You may end the interview at any time and request that the contents of the interview not be used in the study. The questions are designed to get your perceptions of enabling and hindering administrative behaviors and structures.

The first five questions are concerned with the RULES of the school.

Q1. Enabling administrations aid communications between teachers and administrators. In what ways do the rules in this school enable communications?

Q2. Rules can either aid teachers in achieving their goals or hinder teachers. In what ways do the rules in this school enable and in what ways might they hinder?

Q3. Rules may either serve as guides to problem solutions or be rigid barriers to problem solving. In what ways do rules in this school aid and in what ways do they act as red tape and inhibit problem solving?

Q4. Rules may be used to punish or to reward teachers. In what ways are rules in this school used to punish, if they are, and in what ways are they used to reward teachers?

Q5. Administrative rules can be used as substitutes for professional judgement. How are rules used in this way in this school, if that happens?

The next five questions are concerned with the HIERARCHY of the school.

Q6. Administrative hierarchy may be used to enable teachers to do their jobs or to
hinder teachers in doing their jobs. In what ways does this school’s hierarchy enable or hinder teachers in doing their jobs?

Q7. School administrations are concerned with the mission of the school. In what ways, does this school’s administration facilitate the mission of the school?

Q8. Individual administrators can use their authority in various ways. In this school, in what ways is administrative authority used to enable teachers to do their jobs and in what ways is authority used to undermine teachers, if that happens?

Q9. Student achievement is the main goal of schools. In what ways does the administration aid in attaining student achievement and in what ways might it obstruct achievement?

Q10. In what ways does the administration of this school support and encourage innovation and in what ways might it obstruct innovation?

Now we come to the less structured portion of the interview. I would like to hear what is on your mind. If you do not have any particular thoughts at first, consider what policies or rules you would like to see or what rules would you never want to see. You might share what your feelings are about certain rules, procedures, or structures in this school.

Perhaps you know of some rules that are considered enabling by some members of the faculty and hindering by other members.
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Participant/school:

Location and time:

Unusual or relevant circumstances:

Participant mood or demeanor (stressed, tired, happy etc.):

Participant style of answering questions:

Unusual or otherwise relevant nonverbal behavior:

Observations:
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I consent to participating in research entitled: **Enabling and Hindering Bureaucratic Behaviors and Structures in Schools**.

Dr. Wayne Hoy, Principal Investigator, or his authorized representative, James Sinden, has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternate procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available. I agree to have my interview(s) audiotaped with the understanding that the contents will be confidential and I will not be identified in any way to any person other than the researchers. I understand that the tapes and transcriptions will be secured under lock and key during the study. At the conclusion of the research, the tapes will be destroyed.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me. Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ___________________ Signed: ____________________________
Signed: ___________________________ Signed: ____________________________
(Principal Investigator or authorized representative) (Witness)
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The following statements are descriptions of the way a school may be structured. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes behavior in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Record your response by circling the appropriate number beside the statement.

1. Administrative rules in this school enable authentic communication between teachers and administrators. 1 2 3 4 5
2. In this school red tape is a problem. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their jobs. 1 2 3 4 5
4. The administrative hierarchy obstructs student achievement. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Administrative rules help rather than hinder. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The administrative hierarchy of this school facilitates the mission of this school. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Administrative rules in this school are used to punish teachers. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The administrative hierarchy of this school obstructs innovation. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Administrative rules in this school are substitutes for professional judgement. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Administrative rules in this school are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedures. 1 2 3 4 5
11. In this school the authority of the principal is used to undermine teachers. 1 2 3 4 5
12. The administrators in this school use their authority to enable teachers to do their jobs. 1 2 3 4 5
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This research is titled Enabling and Hindering Bureaucratic Behaviors and Structures in Schools. Its purpose is to identify specific behaviors and structures of school bureaucracies that either help or hinder teachers in completing their tasks and in reaching the goals of the school. These lists of behaviors will be based on the observations and perceptions of the principals and teachers interviewed.

The principal researcher is Dr. Wayne Hoy, professor in Educational Policy and Leadership at The Ohio State University. The assistant researcher is James Sinden of The Ohio State University. Both can be reached at 614-292-4672 or by e-mail at waynehoy@aol.com or sinden.2@osu.edu. Their office address is 116 Ramseyer Hall, 29 W. Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210.

Participants will be involved at their discretion in one or more interviews of no longer than one hour in time. These interviews will be concerned with their perceptions of the bureaucracy in their schools. The sessions will be audio taped so that they can be transcribed. At a follow-up session, each participant will be able to review their own transcription to make corrections, additions, or deletions.

Participants will also have an opportunity to comment on the aggregate of participant responses at the conclusion of the study.

Audiotapes will be coded so that only the researchers can identify participants. This is in order to distribute transcriptions correctly for the review of the participants. Audiotapes will be kept under lock and key in a locked, private office at The Ohio State University. Audiotapes and identifying coding of transcriptions will be destroyed at the end of the research.

Results of the study will be reported only in the aggregate. No individual will be identified in any way in either preliminary or in the final report of the study. Every participant will be given the option of receiving a summary of the report. This report will be a sum of the responses of many individuals in several schools.

Participation is voluntary and participation can be withdrawn at any time without penalty or repercussion.

Further questions about the research should be directed to Dr. Wayne Hoy, Fawcett Chair in Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, at the phone number, e-mail address, or street address given above. Each participant will be asked to sign a consent form and will be given a copy of that form.
Appendix F: Telephone Script

"This is Jim Sinden calling from The Ohio State University. I would like to speak with (name of principal at time of previous survey)."

[If principal has changed, thank them and say goodbye]

To principal: "Your school participated in the 'One Hundred Schools Study' in the winter and spring of 2000. We are conducting a follow-up study in order to gain specific information on enabling behaviors and structures of school bureaucracies. We are contacting those schools that have the same principal as during the last study. This study will consist mainly of interviews of the principal and those staff members who are willing to participate. We will arrange the interview schedules for your convenience.

We may also wish to attend one or more faculty meetings and obtain copies of school policies.

Would you be interested in participating in this study?"

If YES, arrange time to meet with principal and faculty or to distribute solicitation information to faculty.

If NO, mention possible tie-in with Continuing Improvement Programs and offer to send an information sheet.
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Behaviors and structures are listed under the question that elicited the responses that were identified. Most behaviors and structures mentioned as enabling were identified in a positive sense. Some were identified as lacking and needed and so were identified in a negative sense. Some behaviors and structures were identified as present but were considered hindering. Participants mentioning the behavior or structure are identified as a principal at a school (AP) or a teacher (AI). Positive behaviors mentioned in the negative as being lacking and needed are designated with parentheses. Behaviors that are hindering and in parentheses show that there is an opposing interpretation of the effects of those behaviors or structures. A plus, minus designation (+-) means that the participant saw both positive and negative aspects of the behavior or structure or that some administrators were considered positive and some were considered negative. Brackets [ ] indicate behaviors not mentioned but very evident during observation. Teacher numbers have no particular significance except to separate their responses and initially to insure that the transcripts were given to the correct participant.

Question 1: COMM: Communications are enabled by rules and practices.

PANN C: Principal announcements are important in communications.

AP CP C2 EP E2 E3 E4 E5

TM: Teachers’ meetings are a tool for communication.

AP C2 (E4)

ONE MEM: One memo is used instead of several memos.

AP C2 EP E2 E3
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BFR: Beforehand notice is given to teachers, no surprises.
   AP B1 EP E2 E3 E4

PTCHER: Principal communicates directly to teacher.
   AP BP B2 B3 CP D2 E6 F1 F3 F4

TCHERS: Principal facilitates teacher-to-teacher communication.
   AP B1 C1 E5

PAC: Principal’s advisory committee aids in communications.
   AP BP B1 B5 EP E1 E2 E3 E5 E6 FP F2 F4

GTTCHBI: Principal talks to teachers to get them to ‘buy in’ to ideas.
   AP BP C4 (E5)

CHPT: Maintain chain of communication: parent/student to teacher first.
   BP DP F1

CHTPR: Maintain proper chain of communication: teacher to principal first.
   BP B2 B5 CP D1 EP E1 E2 E5

FPST: Principal facilitates communication between parent/students/teacher.
   BP B2 B3 C3 D1 D2

PCP: Parent complaint procedure in place and used for structure.
   BP

EMAIL: Communication by e-mail is encouraged and facilitated.
   DP D1 D2

2WAY: Two-way communication is encouraged and evident.
   C2 DP (E1) E2 E3+ (E4) E5 (E6) [Different administrators] FP F1 (F2)

TOOMUCH: Too much communication is required; it is a burden.
   D2
TOOBSY: Principal is sometimes too busy to quickly respond to teachers.

   EP E2 FP F3

MORECOM: More communication to community is needed.

   B4

MOREMTG: More staff meetings needed for communications.

   C2

INFRCOM: Informal communication is effectively used.

   AP BP B2 B4 CP C1 C2 C3 C4 DP D1 D2 EP E2 E3 FP F1 F2 F3 F4

SML+: Being small is a plus for communications.

   BP B1 B2 B3 B5+ CP C1 C4 D1 D2 EP E6

OPNDRP: Open door policy by principal.

   B2 B4 B5 CP C1 C2 C3 D1 E2 E3 E4 E5 E6 FP F1 F2 F3 F4

OPNDRS: Open door policy by superintendent.

   CP C3 C4 E6

KNOWKP: Principal knows kids and parents.

   CP (E1)

PRINTM: The principal is intimidating. I listen to him.

   B1

PRLISWELL:

   B1 B3 C1 C2 C4 D1

Question 2: ENRLS: Rules are enabling rather than hindering.

   STRUCT: Rules provide structure that aids teacher in doing their jobs.

   B2 B4 (B5) C1 C2 C4 D2 EP E1 E2 E3 (E4) E5 FP F1 F2 F3 F4
PYGS: Contract calls for partial reimbursement for graduate school.

FEWR: There are few rules.

ENFSTRS: Enforcement of student rules aids teachers in doing their jobs.

STORRS: Student originated rules helps their acceptance.

COMSENSE: Rules work because there are commonsense.

COMEXP: The rules are common expectations.

UNBDC: Staff unifies behind decisions.

HLLDUTY: Hall duty is required.

RFFR: There are rewards for following the rules.

TKATT: Teachers must take attendance and complete other forms.

STLAWMAN: State and legal mandates influence decision-making.

RQRTECH: Staff is required to use technology.
TCHRDIS: Teacher is expected to enforce classroom discipline.

B2 B3 DP D2 E3 E6 F4

FORCCU: Teachers are forced to use computers.

DP

TECHSNAF: Technology snafus are upsetting to teachers.

DP

TCHRINP: Teachers have input to formulating rules.

D1 EP E6 FP

NDSTRICT-S: Need stricter enforcement of rules for students.

B1 B5 D1 D2 E1 E3 E4 E5 E6 F2

NDSTRICT-T: Need stricter enforcement of rules for teachers.

B5 C3 D2 E5 F2 F3

BEGNEED: Beginning teachers need more structure.

B5 D2 E1 E5 F4

LESSPLAN: Lesson plans and other paperwork is required for structure.

AP BP B1 B2 B3 B5 C1 C2 DP D2 E2 E6 FP F2 F3

Question 3: RLSGU: Rules are guides to problem solutions rather than barriers.

STDHDB: Student handbook is a guide to problem solving.

AP C2 E4

CNSIST: Consistency in enforcement aids in solving problems.

AP BP C2 D2+ - (E1) (E2) (E3) (E4) E5 E6 F1

FLX: Principal shows flexibility in problem solving.

AP BP B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 C1 C2 C4 DP D1 D2 EP E2 E3 E4 E5 FP F1 F2 F3 F4
FLXHB: There is flexibility build into the student handbook.
   AP C2 EP E2 (Document analysis shows flexibility at all schools)
FLXTCH: Teachers show flexibility in dealing with problems.
   B3 B4 (DP) EP+- E2 (E4) FP
STINFL: State tests and school report card influences decision-making.
   B1 B5 C4 D1 EP E1 E2 E3 E4 E6 FP F2
DRDTAPE: District red tape hinders problem solving.
   C1 D2 E1 E2 E4 E6 FP F1 F2 F3 F4
STRDTAPE: State red tape hinders problem solving.
   BP B1 B5 C1 C2 C4 D2 E4 FP
MARDTAPE: Master agreement red tape hinders problem solving.
   AP BP B1 B3 CP C3 E1
PRTNEGTM: Poor teacher negotiations team doesn’t serve teachers well.
   BP

Question 4: DISP: The use of rules to punish or reward teachers.

CLDR: Teacher discipline is done behind closed doors.
   AP DP EP FP
ASSNIN: The association gets involved when a teacher is disciplines.
   AP
INDBS: Teachers are dealt with on individual basis considering the situation.
   AP BP B4 CP C2 C4 DP D1 D2 (E4) E5 FP F3
MAGR: Master agreements sets rules for discipline of teachers.
   AP BP B1 B3 B4 CP C2 C3 D1 E4 FP
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MRTPY: Merit pay would be a good tool for teacher incentives and rewards.

BP B4

NOGRV: No grievances are filed in this school.

BP B3 DP

INFRRW: There are informal rewards.

BP B4 CP C2 C3 C4 DP D2 E2 E3 FP F1 F3 F4

COMARD: Camaraderie among the staff is rewarding.

CP C3

NWRUP: Principal has never written up a teacher.

CP

INFPUN: There is informal punishment from an administrator.

B1 B5 D1 D2 E3

INDBSST: Students are treated on an individual basis.

B3 C2 C4 DP D1 D2 EP (E1) E3 (E4) E5 ± E6 FP F3

MONREW: Monetary rewards are given for teacher accomplishment.

DP D2

FOODRW: Food is used as a reward.

DP D2 FP

EVALSYS: The evaluation system is used to discipline and develop teachers.

B2 B4 C3 EP FP

NDNONRW: Monetary rewards are needed for teachers who do more.

BP B1
**Question 5: PRFJUDG:** Are rules substituted for professional judgement?

**PVST:** The professional judgement of the principal > that of the teacher.

**AP B4 C4 DP D1 E1 E2 E5 F1 F2**

**WREXM:** Principal requires all teachers to give written exams.

**AP**

**FROMHI:** Rules from ‘on high’ limit professional judgement.

**AP BP B5 CP C3 E6 FP F1 F2 F3 F4**

**SPEDRLS:** Special Education rules limit professional judgement.

**B1 B4 B5 C2 C4 (E4) FP**

**TERMIN:** Teacher termination goes by the black and white rules.

**B4**

**Question 6: ENHRCH:** The hierarchy enables teachers to do their jobs.

**TPDOWN:** Decisions have support from the top through the hierarchy.

**AP B5 CP D1**

**TKSLONG:** Working with the hierarchy takes too long in decision-making.

**AP**

**TMT:** Too much testing is mandated by the state.

**AP BP B5 FP**

**STINCSN:** State is inconsistent in its actions and requirements.

**AP BP CP FP**

**HSML+:** Being small is a plus in dealing with the hierarchy.

**BP B1 B3 B4 B5 CP C1 C2 C3 C4 DP D1 EP E6 (FP) F3**

**TRHELP:** The treasurer is helpful.

**CP C1 C2 C4 (FP)**
FLTHIER: The hierarchy is flat which is enabling.

B2 B3 B5 C1 C2 C3 DP D1 E2 E3 E4 E5 (F3)

HBYTECH: There is hierarchy imposed by technology.

B3 DP

SUPPBRD: The superintendent is in same building. This affects hierarchy.

C1 DP

NOSUPT-TOP: There is a lack of support from the top of the hierarchy.

EP E3 E4 E6 FP F2 F3

NOINPHR: Principal has no input in hiring assistant principals.

D1 FP

FGTHIER: Principal fights the upper hierarchy for the good of the school.

FP F3

IMPHIER: The hierarchy above the principal is impersonal.

FP F3 F4

COACHFAV: Coaches are favored. They are above other teachers.

B1 E1

SECHIER: The secretary fills a role in the hierarchy due to expertise.

C1 E4

OLDERTEACH: Older teachers function as part of the hierarchy.

D1 E3 E4 E5

Question 7: HR/MISS: The hierarchy facilitates the mission of the school.

DBMISS: Decisions are based on the mission statement.

AP C2 C3 D1 D2 E4 E6 F1
CONIMP: The Continuous Improvement Plan guides the school’s decisions.

CP C2 C4 FP

STPTIN: There is staff and parent input to the mission statement.

CP (D1) EP (FP)

COMGOALS: The hierarchy communicates the goals of the mission.

DP D2

MTC: The Master Teacher Challenge helps teachers to meet mission goals.

DP D2

NEEDEXP: There is a need to explain the mission to parents/community.

B4 C3

**Question 8: ENAUTH:** Individual administrator authority used to enable teachers.

PROPP: Administration provides the best opportunities for teachers.

AP BP B1 B4 F3

MLMT: There are money limitations.

AP BP C4 D1 EP E1 E2 E3 E4 E6

BDINPT: Teachers have input in budget making.

AP

SZLMT: There are limitations based on the size of school and student body.

AP BP B1 B4 CP C3 C4 D1 EP E1 E3

SPLMT: There are space limitations.

AP BP B1 CP E4

TDCURDC: Curriculum decisions are teacher driven.

BP D1 F1
SUPTCH: The principal supports the teachers.

BP B1 B2 B3 B5 CP C1 C2 C4 DP D1 D2 E1 E3 E5 E6 F1 F3 F4

MINMT: Minimize meetings.

AP BP D1

ADMLKEV: The administration looks out for everybody.

BP C4

TCHEXP: Teachers are considered to be the experts in their fields.

B2 B3 B5 CP C2 DP E1 F1

TCHLDR: Principal teaches leadership and classroom management.

B2 CP DP D2 EP E5

HRING: Hiring is effective in creating school culture.

B2 C3 DP FP F3 F4

PROFL: Teachers are treated as professionals.

B2 B3 B4 B5 C1 C2 C3 C4 DP D1 D2 E1 E2 E3 E4 E5 FP F1 F4

CWHIP: Principal ‘cracks the whip’ when needed.

AP CP C4 DP D1 (E5) FP F3

QUCKREP: Administrators quickly respond to teacher problems.

D1 EP E6 F3

T2TST: Teachers and administrators under pressure to teach to state tests.

AP BP B5 DP D1 EP E2 E4 FP F1

LNGTEN: Long tenure of the principal adds to authority and effectiveness.

BP CP C1 DP D1 FP F3

TCHHRING: Teacher input into hiring decisions.

FP
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UNDERMIN-T: An administrator aids kids but undermines teachers.
   B5 C4 D1 E1 E3 E4 E5 E6

MUTRESPECT: There is mutual respect between the principal and the staff.
   C4

VSBLE: Administrators are visible around the building.
   AP [BP] B5 C1 C2 (D2) E4 FP F1 F3 F4

Question 9: ENSTACH: Administration aids in attaining student achievement.

DBSTACH: Decisions are based on student achievement.
   AP B3 B4 B5 C4 D1 EP E4 E6 FP F1 F3 F4

MXINST: Efforts are made to maximize instructional time.
   AP DP+- FP F1

PRCONS: Efforts made to provide consistency in order to enable students.
   AP FP F3

MAXST: Effective efforts to maximize scores on the state tests.
   AP BP B1 DP EP FP

KNLPK: Kids help kids in preparing for the state tests.
   AP

SASML+: Student assistance programs are aided by small size.
   B1 B4 CP DP D2 EP (FP)

ENCXCURR: Extracurriculars encouraged to benefit student development.
   B3 CP C2 C3 D1 (D2) F4

RWKIDS: Students are rewarded for achievement.
   B4 C4 DP D2 D6
ASSTPRO: There is an effective program to help students who need help.

B5 EP (E4) F1

INDSTCNT: Principal makes individual parent and/or student contacts.

B4 C1 C2 EP FP F3 F4

TCHDOX: Teachers do extra things to help students.

BP B1 B4 CP (D2) F3

SHBLDGPROB: Shared building causes problems.

B5

Question 10: ENINN: Administration encourages innovation.

HESTTT: People are hesitant to try new things.

AP C4 D1

ENTP: Administration encourages Tech Prep and other alternatives.

AP BP B3 B4 B5 E4

TDINV: Innovations are teacher driven.

BP B1 B2 B5 C1 C2 D2 E1 F1 F4

SUPTECH: Administration supports the introduction of technology.

BP B2 B3 B4 CP C4 DP D1 D2 E3 E4 F2+-

ENCPROF: Principal encourages the use of professional development days.

B1 B2 B5 CP C4 D2 E2

USEINS: Administration uses in-service time to encourage innovations.

CP DP F1

RQRINT: Administration requires interdisciplinary units.

DP D2
RCNTINV: There have been recent substantial innovations.

BP B4 B5 D2 EP FP F1 F4

HIERQKCH: Hierarchy too quick to change methods, curriculum, etc.

FP

OUTSIDE: Administration uses outside resources to aid innovations.

EP FP F3 F4

FREE2TRY: Teachers feel free to try innovations.

BP B1 B3 B5 C1 C2 C3 D1 D2 EP E1 E2 E3 E4 E5 E6 FP F1 F3 F4

ADMINSUG: Administration suggests innovations.


FINSUP: Financial support is given to innovations whenever possible.

BP B1 B2 B3 B4 B5 CP C1 C2 C4 DP (D1) D2 (E1) (E2) (E3) (E6) FP F1 F3 F4

Behaviors not classified under questions:

KIDSMKDIF: Kids make the difference in the school.

FP

PARSPROB: Parents are the problem.

B1 B5 C1 C3 C4 (DP) D2 EP E1 E4 E6 F4
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Support of Teachers by Administrators:
COMM: CHPT FPST PCP
ENRLS: STRUCT
ENHRCH: TPDOWN [NOSUPT-TOP] [IMPHIER]
ENAUTH: SUPTCH ADMLKEV QUICKREP [UNDERMIN-T]
ENINN: SUPTECH

Strong yet Supple:

Strong:
ENRLS: ENFSTRS [HLLDUTY] [NDSTRICTS] [NDSTRICTT]
PRFJUDG: PVST WREXM
ENHRCH: FGTHIER
ENAUTH: CWHIP VSABLE

Supple:
RLSGUI: FLXP FLXHB FLXTCH
PRFJDG: [TERMIN]
DISP: INDBS INDBSSST NWRUP NOGRV

Facilitate Flow of Information:
COMM: PANNC TM TCHERS EMAIL [TOOBSU]
[MORECOM] [MOREMTG]
OPNDRP OPNDRS [PRINTM]
ENHRCH: TRHELP
HR/MISS: STPTIN COMGOALS [NEEDEXP]
Two-way Influence and Encouragement:

COMM: PAC GTTCHBI 2WAY PRLISWELL
ENRLS: UNBDC RFFR PYGS STORRS COMEXP TCHRINP
DISP: INFRRW CAMARD FOODRW INFPUN
HR/MISS: MTC
ENAUTH: MUTRESPECT

Professionalism and Expertise of Teachers/Staff Acknowledged:

COMM: INFRCOM
ENRLS: TCHRDIS [RQRTECH] [FORCCU] [TECHSNAF]
RLSGUI: [PRTNEGTM]
DISP: CLDR
ENHRCH: HBYTECH SECHIER OLDERTEACH
ENAUTH: BD TDCURDC TCHEXP PROFL TCHRHRING
ENINN: TDINOV FREE2TRY [RQRINT] [HESTTT]

Facilitates Teaching and Learning:

COMM: ONEMEMO BFR [TOOMUCH]
ENRLS: COMSENSE
RLSGUI: CNSIST
DISP: MRTPY MONREW NDMONREW
ENHRCH: [TMT]
HR/MISS: DBMISS CONIMP
ENAUTH: PROPP MINMT [T2TST]
ENSTACH: DBSTACH MXINST PRCONS MAXST KHLPK ENCXCURR
           RWKIDS ASSTPRO INDSTCNT TCHDOX
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ENINN: ENTP ENCPROF USEINS RCNTIN [HIERQKCH]

**Structural Factors:**

COMM: SML+ CHTPR
ENRLS: TKATT FEWR LESSPLAN [STLAWMAN]
RLSGUI: STDHDB [DRDTAPE] [STRDTAPE] [MARDTQPE]
DISP: ASSNIN MAGR EVALSYS
PRFJUDG: [FROMHI] [SPEDRLS]
ENHRCH: HSML+ FLTHIER SUPTBLD [TKSLONG] [STINCSN]

[COACHFAV]
ENAUTH: MLMT SZLMT SPLMT
ENSTACH: SASML+ [SHBLDGPROB]

**Knowledge and Expertise of Principal:**

COMM: KNOWKP
ENRLS: BEGNEED
RLSGUI: STINFL
ENHRCH: [NOINPHR]
ENAUTH: TCHLDR HRING LNGTEN
ENINN: OUTSIDE ADMINSUG FINSUP

**Not Categorized:** PARSPROB KIDSMKDIF
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