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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Curriculum decision-making is an activity in which many individuals and groups participate both within and outside of formal school organizations. Key actors in this activity are identified by Goodlad (1974) in his conceptualization of curriculum practice and study (pg. 22), Mosher (1977) in terms of legal and extralegal agencies participating in the government of education (pp. 104-105), and Boyd (1979) in his discussion of the politics of curriculum change and stability (pg. 17). Each of these writers identifies persons or groups at various "levels" of authority or concern who participate in decision-making about what children should learn and what they will learn in school. Everyone, it would seem, has a piece of the action, from teachers to superintendents within school districts, from parents to agencies of the Federal government outside.

Although we know that a variety of persons, groups and agencies participate in curriculum decision-making, we know very little about the particular contributions that each makes to the decision process. We know even less about the everyday situations these various actors find themselves in, what they bring to these situations, what activities they perform, how their intentions and activities are formed, modified, extended or limited in these situations and how these factors are influenced by policy intentions and their
expressions at the other various "levels" of participation.

It is important, therefore, to inquire into the nature of curriculum decision-making in the various arenas of participation. What persons, groups and agencies do what in determining "who gets what, when and how" relative to curriculum and instruction in the public schools (Lasswell, 1958, pg. 187) and under what circumstances are those determinations made? It is often assumed that certain persons by virtue of title or position possess both the authority and power to make certain decisions. Such assumptions are rarely documented by empirical evidence.

Focus of the Study

The everyday decisional activities of three central office school administrators charged with responsibility for the development and implementation of the K-12 curricula in their districts was the focus of the study. The focus was chosen for three primary reasons. First, no observational studies had previously been done which concentrated on either the everyday activities of persons occupying this position or more particularly on the decisional aspects of the position. At the time this study was undertaken, the research literature related to the work of curriculum leaders was largely limited to:

(1) survey-based profiles of the personal and professional characteristics of persons occupying the position;

(2) survey-based listings of certification requirements and competencies;
(3) prescriptive discussions of the curriculum leader's role in curriculum development or curriculum decision-making; and

(4) surveys of curriculum leaders or other actors in school organizations describing perceptions or preferences regarding curriculum leaders' activities or roles.

Second, observational studies focusing on other actors in decisional positions in school organizations, most notably principals and superintendents, suggest that that these persons are not involved extensively on a day to day basis with problems of curriculum and instruction. (Pitner, 1982, pp. 9-10) While one might hope that principals and superintendents would play active roles in determining what children should learn and how they would learn it, the limited evidence we have suggests that they may not. The question becomes, who does attend to matters of curriculum and instruction in the school organization? And, a next obvious focus of study is the curriculum administrator and the role he/she plays in curriculum decision-making.

Third, the ambiguous nature of the term "curriculum" and the wide-spread participation in curriculum decision-making already noted, lead implicitly to questions about what administrators with specialized responsibilities in this area actually do. As Bartoo (1976) has noted:

Since it is commonly agreed that the improvement of instruction and the development of curriculum is everyone's responsibility, the focus upon function in the schooling organization creates an identity problem for the curriculum leader.
If curriculum development is everyone's responsibility then it is no one person's special responsibility.

(Bartoo, 1976, pg. 18)

A study was, therefore, needed which would address the lack of information available about the everyday decisional activities of curriculum administrators. It was decided to approach the problem by concentrating on the curriculum administrator not as an individual who makes decisions (as is so often suggested in the prescriptive literature) but as one who (as the list of participants in curriculum decision-making suggests) participates in decision processes. Consistent with this view of decision, a conceptual framework for the study was developed based on Harold D. Lasswell's "decision phase analysis." (Lasswell, 1971, pg. 28) The decision phase model was adapted to guide inquiry during the observation/data collection period and later as an analytical tool to characterize the subjects' activities with regard to the constituent elements of decision. Other Lasswellian constructs were also useful in conceptualizing the research including the "social process" model and the "value/institutional categories".

Data collection for the study was undertaken using an adaptation of Mintzberg's "structured observation" techniques. (Mintzberg, 1973) The approach which has subsequently been used by a host of researchers (e.g. Pitner, 1978; Willis, 1980; Duignan, 1980; and Morris et al, 1981) to study the work activities of other positions in school organizations was chosen because it allowed the researcher
to occupy the middle ground between intense, single subject
ethnographic studies on the one hand and more broadly based survey
research on the other. Because the study was intended to illuminate
the decisional activities of curriculum administrators in everyday
situations, this approach to data collection which combines direct
observation of subjects with open-ended interviewing was well suited
to the task.

The Research Problem

The primary purpose of the study was to describe the nature of
the curriculum administrator's work with particular attention to
participation in the decisional processes of the school organization.
More specifically, the study was conducted to answer two primary
questions:

What kinds of decisions do curriculum adminis-
trators help to make?; and,

At what phases of the decision process does
the curriculum administrator become involved?

A second purpose of the study was to appraise the utility of
Lasswell's "decision phase analysis" as a guide to making sense of
observational data. This conceptual construct, most often used to
guide and analyze policy formation, had not previously been used to
structure analysis of qualitative data. The study, therefore, repre-
sented an attempt to explore and expand the uses of Lasswellian theory.

Description of the Research

The research was conducted in three Ohio school districts
during the Spring of 1962. For purposes of comparison and contrast,
two of the districts were medium-sized local districts and the third
was a large urban district. The three subjects of the study
comprised a convenience sample similar to those used by Mintzberg
(1973) and others who have replicated his work in different settings.
The field notes which provided the data set for the study were
collected in conjunction with a funded study of curriculum
administrators' work activities which this writer served as a graduate
research associate. The field notes were, however, subjected to
very different treatment in this study than in the funded study.
The emphasis here is clearly directed to characterization of the
subjects' participation in decisional processes by means of Lasswellian
analytical constructs. The funded study analyzed the data in
relation to the categories identified by Mintzberg (1973) and
utilized by some educational researchers as indicated earlier.

An assumption of this study was, in fact, that our understanding
of what curriculum administrators do in their daily activities
could be expanded greatly by focusing greater attention on the
substance of administrators' work than is normally done by those
who conduct Mintzberg-like studies. These studies have, thus far,
yielded fairly thin descriptions of administrative work, telling
more about the subject's potential for efficiency than anything
else. (Gronn, 1981) One explanation for this weakness has been
the absence of a comprehensive conceptual schema to guide
investigation and analysis in these studies. The research reported
here shares with the previous studies of administrative behavior
a fundamental concern with everyday activities; however, a conceptual framework focusing on decision has been employed in an effort to direct attention specifically to the consequential aspects of the curriculum administrator's work.

Significance of the Research

The findings should have significance for a number of persons, groups and agencies concerned with curriculum decision-making in general and the work of curriculum leaders in particular. Within the academic community, members of curriculum and administration faculties which prepare or share in the preparation of curriculum workers and curriculum leaders have an obvious need to know what their students will be doing on the job and the circumstances of their work. The adequacy of preparation programs must be judged to some extent against this type of knowledge. Also, within the academic community are persons who have less interest in particular programs of preparation than in the emerging literature on the "politics of education". Those who contribute to or follow the development of this relatively new area of educational scholarship should also find the results of the study to be of interest.

A second group of persons who should find relevance in the results are institutional actors at the state level who are responsible for setting certification requirements for curriculum leaders. Members of state boards of education and their institutional representatives need such information to set adequate, demanding standards for those who occupy administrative positions in the public schools.
Finally, the findings should have significance for those who occupy positions similar to those being examined and those who intend to occupy such positions. For those who occupy these positions, it is intended that they will recognize their own activities in the descriptions offered and find new ways to reflect on those activities and contribute to the continuing development of the curriculum leader's role. For those who intend to occupy such positions, the descriptions yielded by the research should offer insight into the nature of the work and the personal and professional characteristics needed to be successful.

The results of the study are reported as follows:

Chapter II Review of the Literature describes the previously existing research literature on curriculum leaders and briefly reviews studies of other leadership positions in school organizations.

Chapter III Design of the Study describes the selection of the subjects, the procedures employed in observing and interviewing the subjects and the development of the conceptual framework used to analyze the data.

Chapter IV Presentation and Analysis of the Data displays analyzes, and interprets the data.

Chapter V Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusions reviews and discusses the major findings of the research, presents conclusions about the utility of the Lassellian conceptual framework, and presents recommendations for further research. Final conclusions are drawn.
Chapter II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature conducted for the purposes of this study is presented here in two sections. In the first section the existing literature on the work of curriculum leaders is reviewed. In the second section selected studies of other key positions in school organizations are reviewed and the limitations of these studies are discussed. The chapter ends with a summary of the conclusions reached as a result of these reviews and suggests several factors which must be taken into account in designing future studies.

Research on Curriculum Leaders

Three major sources of information were used in preparing this summary. First a mechanized search of ERIC microfiche records and journal articles was conducted using 18 descriptors relating to curriculum work, curriculum leaders and observation or field studies. Second, major texts intended for use in the professional preparation of curriculum workers were reviewed both for the discussions of curriculum work which they contain and for bibliographic references. Third, the two most recent ASCD reports on the role, function and preparation of the curriculum leader (Leeper, 1965 and Speiker, 1976) were reviewed including the annotated bibliography prepared by the 1976 working group.
As a result of these efforts two conclusions seem to be warranted:

1. **The existing literature on curriculum leaders may be classified in four categories:**
   
   (1) survey-based profiles of the personal and professional characteristics of persons occupying the position;

   (2) survey-based listings of certification requirements and competencies;

   (3) prescriptive discussions of the curriculum leader's role in curriculum development or curriculum decision-making; and

   (4) surveys of curriculum leaders and other actors in school organizations describing perceptions or preferences regarding curriculum leaders' activities or roles.

2. There are no observational studies of the curriculum leader's activities in the existing literature.

The literature on curriculum leaders is replete with prescriptive statements about curriculum work and descriptions based on survey questionnaires. We know some things about the characteristics of persons occupying the positions and the requirements they must meet for employment. We know what various writers think curriculum leaders should know and do and we have some survey research reporting what curriculum leaders say they actually do. But we have no observational studies which test the utility or accuracy of these claims. More importantly, for the purposes here, we
have no observational studies which provide grounded descriptions of the curriculum leader's participation in curriculum decision-making even though the prescriptive literature often emphasizes the importance of decision processes.

Personal and Professional Characteristics

While curriculum leaders are assigned a variety of titles, the ones most frequently used are assistant superintendent for curriculum, curriculum director and curriculum coordinator. Most of the persons occupying such positions are males between forty and fifty years of age who have been professional educators for more than twenty years. Most specialized in elementary education or a secondary subject area as undergraduates and in educational administration in their graduate programs. Many have had some work in curriculum theory or curriculum development included as a minor aspect of their professional preparation programs; however, only a tiny percentage have pursued or completed academic programs in curriculum per se. Most curriculum leaders have general responsibility for the K-12 curriculum in comprehensive school districts and most report directly to the district superintendent. (Christensen, 1976, Swick and Driggers, 1977)

Certification Requirements and Views on Competency

The most recent yearbook of the ASCD to focus on the role, function, and preparation of the curriculum leader (ASCD, 1976) was produced as a result of an effort to establish a rationale for recommending certification requirements for the position. In
conjunction with this effort, three surveys were commissioned; one attempted to identify present certification procedures in the 50 states, the second was directed to professors in selected universities whose faculties prepare curriculum leaders, and the third asked universities with competency-based preparation programs to identify competencies appropriate for curriculum leaders.

Sturges (1976) conducted the first study and found that 32 states have certification programs for curriculum workers, and that in most cases these programs lead to an administrative certificate with requirements similar to those of a superintendent.

Typically, a curriculum worker would have a minimum of a master's degree and be certificated as a teacher with at least three years experience. The program would emphasize content in the areas of curriculum and supervision, followed closely by content in administration and in measurement/evaluation/research design. The program would combine field-related experiences, probably in the form of an internship, with university-based classes. Both method of instruction and content would be considered equally important. The program would probably not be specifically stated but would provide maximum freedom for the preparing institution to provide an appropriate program for each student, and to provide the school district the opportunity to employ the person most appropriately prepared for the district's needs.

(Sturges, 1976, pg. 38)

The second survey was a companion to the first and the same survey instrument was used. The instrument was sent to 78 universities with doctoral programs for curriculum workers accredited by NCATE. There was general agreement among the respondents that curriculum workers should be certificated and that certification should remain
the responsibility of state departments of education. The professors recommended that:

a typical curriculum worker would have a specialist's certificate, from two to five years classroom experience, and would have course work in elementary and secondary curriculum development, principles of administration, principals of supervision, and probably some preparation in evaluation.

(Sturges, 1976, pg. 40)

Interestingly, the respondents in both surveys seemed to consider the curriculum leader position to be a management position. Both groups, however, recognized the need for additional preparation in curriculum, supervision and evaluation.

For the third study Sturges and Kollar (1976) asked university professors to identify competencies they felt curriculum leaders should possess. In all, 967 specific competencies (some identified as competencies appropriate to other actors in the school organization e.g. principals) were identified. There was general agreement that curriculum leaders should possess competencies in at least ten areas; curriculum, instruction, in-service, communications, community relations, administration, organization, leadership, research and evaluation. Subcategories for some areas are shown in Figure 1.

Prescriptions

Historically, the literature on curriculum work has been a prescriptive literature relying largely on deductive reasoning resulting in normative statements suggesting what persons in curriculum and instruction positions should know and do. Most of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Management Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial and budgetary responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel (instructional and non-instructional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student accounting and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting (board, parents, for feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Personal attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources identification (human/material)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership with/for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills in evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of evaluation (programs, objectives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application of evaluation (personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applications in working with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design, constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection and analysis of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying conclusions, reporting, using results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>Community expectations and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community involvement in programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of curriculum worker in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community contacts, information dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Theories and basic knowledge needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied skills necessary to communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities in communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1
textbooks used in professional preparation programs by specialists in curriculum development, supervision and educational administration and many of the articles on curriculum work appearing in journals and professional publications are firmly rooted in this tradition. In most cases, the improvement of curricular decision-making is cited as the primary purpose of such writing.

For example, Ole Sand, writing in the 1965 ASCD yearbook discusses what the curriculum supervisor or director should know in relation to the decision processes of school organizations. Acknowledging that many persons have both the duty and the responsibility to make decisions regarding the schools, Sand suggests that curriculum supervisors and specialists are in positions of considerable responsibility and vulnerability. There are, he says four sets of problems from which the supervisor or curriculum director cannot escape:

1. analyzing three kinds of data-sources that are bases for decisions - these sources include societal forces causing change, knowledge of the human being as a learner and the accumulated body of organized knowledge about the world and man;

2. screening the data from these sources against the values and educational aims which society sets for education;

3. identifying important kinds of decisions; and

4. determining what can be and should be.

(Sand, 1965, pg. 31)

The "problems" Sand identifies are reflected in the decision-related tasks or activities other writers suggest for curriculum
leaders. Lewis and Miel (1972) offer the following list of tasks related to curriculum decision making.

1. taking a value stance, deciding on needs to be met and setting objectives;

2. planning sets of intended opportunities... through (a) selecting, organizing and ordering subject matter to be employed, (b) determining and ordering processes to be utilized, (c) clarifying value components, and (d) making decisions about time, space, material resources and human resources to be provided;

3. working for unity, consistency, balance and continuity in planned opportunities;

4. preparing curricular materials (documents such as guides and resource bulletins); and

5. conducting research on the curriculum.

(Lewis and Miel, 1972, pg. 41)

Similarly, Harris (1975) offers the following list of tasks:

1. developing curriculum;

2. organizing for instruction;

3. providing staff;

4. providing facilities;

5. providing materials;

6. arranging for in-service education;

7. orienting staff members;

8. relating special pupil services;

9. developing public relations; and

10. evaluating instruction.

(Harris, 1975, pg. 12)
A shorter list is provided by Sergiovanni (1980) identifying five "subtasks" of curriculum and instruction:

1. development of philosophy of education, and objectives consistent with that philosophy;
2. construction of programs to fulfill these objectives;
3. constant appraisal of curriculum and instruction;
4. engender a climate which displays a readiness for change; and
5. provisions of support and materials to curriculum and instruction activities.

(Sergiovanni, 1980, pg. 268)

Tasks, Activities and Responsibilities - Perceptions and Preferences

The fourth category used to classify the existing literature on curriculum workers includes surveys of curriculum leaders and other actors in school organizations describing perceptions or preferences regarding curriculum leaders' tasks, activities and responsibilities. Such surveys often focus on decision-related activities and often elicit lists similar in some ways to those discussed in the previous section.

Shafer and Mackenzie (1965) surveyed 45 curriculum workers (most occupying central office positions) to ascertain functions being served. In terms of time devoted to certain functions the responses revealed a priority for participation in the accomplishment of the following:

1. Analyzing the adequacy of new or existing instructional programs or activities. This might include coordinating or engaging in
research or evaluation as well as the reporting of such efforts.

2. Formulating new or revised instructional purposes or policies. This includes primarily the policy decisions made at the school system level.

3. Defining and redefining content, methodology, materials, grade placement, time allocations and evaluation procedures.

4. Planning for the overall organization or design of instruction including the scope of the program at various levels, the sequence of learning opportunities, and the impact of the total program in terms of desired outcomes.

5. Directing and participating in in-service programs planned for the professional development of teachers and other staff members.

6. Organizing, coordinating and administering a staff of instructional service personnel such as general and special supervisors and audio-visual specialists.

(Shafer and Mackenzie, 1965, pp. 69-70)

Doll (1970) reviewed the survey literature on general curriculum leaders activities for the book Curriculum Improvement: Decision-Making and Process. Among the studies cited were those by Kirk (1953) and Doll, Shafer, Christie and Salsbury (1955). The Kirk study surveyed 386 persons with general curriculum responsibility in 134 school systems to determine actual typical activities. The types of activities reported by the respondents included many public relations assignments and miscellaneous activities undertaken at the behest of superintendents. The types of activities identified are summarized in Figure 2.
Meeting with local faculty groups and supervisors and discussing special programs and programs (e.g., social studies);

Addressing P.T.A., community groups, school groups, etc.;

Serving as technical consultants to principals and teachers;

Conferring with supervisors or other curriculum staff members about problems of curriculum and instruction;

Conferring with commercial educational, and other representatives visiting the school system;

Serving as members of various community activities groups;

Attending and actively participating in meetings of community civic clubs and organizations;

Attending state and national professional meetings, conferences, etc., and making reports on these to local personnel;

Developing and distributing a variety of curriculum publications and materials;

Securing consultants for in-service education programs;

Filling questionnaires, information forms, blanks, etc.;

Making periodic oral and written reports to their superintendents on the status of curriculum and instructional programs;

Assisting in the development and executive of policies concerning classification, progress, promotion, and failure of pupils;

Organizing and directing formal in-service education programs;

Observing classroom teaching and conferring with teachers concerned;

Arranging for school exhibits, demonstrations, etc.;

Providing for orientation of teachers new to the school system.


Activities Curriculum Leaders Say They Perform
The study by Doll, Shafer, Christie and Salsbury asked curriculum leaders in New Jersey to specify how they thought curriculum leaders "should" spend their time. The finding of the study were reported in two categories: duties or activities which curriculum leaders considered most important, and activities which the leaders considered "related" or "adjunct". The types of activities identified in each category are shown in Figure 3.

The question "How should curriculum leaders spend their time?" has, more recently been studied by Fry (1978). Fry used a questionnaire listing 85 specific tasks a curriculum director might perform as a contributory Delphi probe with 76 elementary teachers, 44 secondary teachers and 35 curriculum directors in Illinois. Of the 85 original tasks, modified in subsequent trials, consensus was ultimately reached among the respondents from the three groups that 14 of these were very important tasks for curriculum directors to perform. The consensus tasks were:

1. Evaluate innovations in curriculum, educational technology and school organization patterns.
2. Develop criteria by which to evaluate proposed changes in curriculum.
3. Establish the long-range goals of curriculum and instruction in the district.
4. Coordinate the work of curriculum committees in the district.
5. Coordinate articulation between grade levels and between school units.
6. Serve as a consultant on curriculum matters for the professional staff.
Most Important Activities

1. Planning for improvement of the curriculum and of the curriculum development program.
2. Helping evaluate continuously both the appropriateness of the curriculum and the quality of the curriculum development program.
3. Directing the formation of point of view, policies and philosophy of education.
5. Using ready-made research data, and promoting local research.
6. Coordinating the activities of other special instructional personnel, e.g., supervisors, librarians.
7. Working with guidance personnel to integrate curriculum and guidance functions.
8. Providing for lay participation in curriculum and guidance functions.
9. Arranging time, facilities, and materials for curriculum improvement.
10. Serving school personnel as technical consultant and adviser regarding curriculum problems.
11. Organizing and directing special in-service education projects.
12. Interpreting the curriculum to the public and, in certain situations, to the board of education.
13. Encouraging articulation among levels of the school system.

Adjunct Activities

2. Making recommendations for the budget.
3. Helping select teachers for appointment.
5. Completing questionnaires dealing with instructional matters.
6. Attending national, state, and local conferences on education, and making reports of these conferences to local personnel.
7. Confering with commercial, educational, and other representatives who visit the school system.


Duties Curriculum Leaders Say Are Most Important and Adjunct Activities

Figure 3
7. Plan in-service programs for teachers.

8. Coordinate changes in school-district instructional goals.

9. Confer with principals, teachers, and department heads about the effectiveness of the instructional goals.

10. Explain to the school board the need for curriculum changes.

11. Explain to the school board any changes in curriculum which have been made.

12. Interpret the school program for school board members.

13. Communicate with building principals concerning instructional problems in their buildings.

14. Discuss curriculum needs with the superintendent.

(Fry, 1978, pp. 91-92)

The most recent surveys of curriculum leaders activities uncovered in the search undertaken for this review were by Christensen (1976) and Griffin (1979). The Christensen survey, conducted with a random sample of curriculum leaders drawn from ASCD membership lists, revealed 12 task descriptors most often mentioned by the respondents. The most frequently mentioned area of involvement was in-service education. The least frequently mentioned area was teacher negotiations. The 12 descriptors and the percentage of respondents reporting involvement in each area are shown in Table 1.

Christensen (1976) also asked the respondents to report their most successful curriculum decision in the past twelve months and
Table 1

Twelve Tasks Areas Most Often Identified
By Curriculum Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Task</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Indicating Involvement in Curriculum Task Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing standards</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal programs</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service programs</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluations</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher negotiations</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher supervision</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other categories</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Christensen, D. J.
to comment on what they perceived would be the most critical curriculum problems during the next five years. The responses to these questions were particularly interesting, and were summarized in the report as follows:

Curriculum workers cited accomplishment in specific content areas (reading, mathematics, language arts) as their greatest accomplishment over the past year. However, when looking to problems and issues of the future, some curriculum workers saw the greatest problems in educational orientation or policy involving what education should be, and cited a general lack of leadership in curriculum planning. Generally curriculum workers were oriented to a wide perspective dealing with the role and mission of education, but circumstances forced curriculum workers to cite as their greatest achievements those dealing with particular content areas.

(Christensen, 1976, pg. 61)

The Griffin survey was actually a study intended to gauge the utility of the Goodlad (1966) conceptualization of "levels" of curricular decision-making. The Goodlad framework posits three levels at which curricular decisions are made; the societal level, the institutional level and the instructional level. Griffin asked respondents at each level to identify the types of decisions they had been involved in. The findings suggest that while societal level decisions and instructional decisions seem to be made by persons at the appropriate levels, institutional level decisions are not made by institutional level persons. Of twenty-five decisions one might expect to be made at the institutional level two were reported made at the societal level and nine were reported
made at the institutional level. Thirteen of the twenty-five institutional level decisions did not appear to be made clearly at any of the three levels. The study raises fresh questions for those who would attempt to understand the role of the curriculum leader who is often perceived to be the most important actor at the institutional level and whose importance in the curriculum decision process is often emphasized in the research literature.

The literature review contained in this section is not exhaustive. The citations and quotations offered are, however, representative of four types of literature available to those who would seek to understand curriculum work in general or the work of the curriculum leader in particular. The level of generality characteristic of much of the writing suggests the distance between the literature and actual practice. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, a fundamental problem in ascertaining the actual nature of the curriculum leader's activities exists and results from the fact that curriculum work is not the particular province or responsibility of any one actor or even one group of actors in school organizations. As Sergiovanni (1980) notes:

Those who work directly in the area of curriculum and instruction deal directly with the roles of teacher and principal. Teachers, as they function in their roles, make curricular decisions in their classrooms while creating learning environments and teaching. The principal is also responsible for making curricular decisions and creating a school climate which enhances learning. Hence, there are clearly overlapping functions in these roles.

(Sergiovanni, 1980, pg. 295)
The situation is hardly even this simple. So many persons and groups in so many positions and places claim and exercise the right to participate in curriculum making that talking and writing about curriculum often specifies no particular position or location in the school organization. Neither prescriptive statements nor survey based descriptions are very satisfying in this context. The level of generality characteristic of prescriptive statements about the roles, duties and responsibilities of curriculum workers precludes understanding of everyday practice. And, in a situation where overlapping functions are so well documented, surveys tend to elicit non-distinguishable tasks and activities, providing few substantive insights into the curriculum decision-making process. As Griffin (1979) has noted, the curriculum literature has tended to "flee from specification and closet itself in generalities little more precise than noting that...decisions must be made but with very little indication of what those decisions might look like in actual practice." (pg. 82) There is a real need for observational research which will put meat on the bones of existing descriptions of curriculum work. The need is particularly acute at the institutional level of curricular decision making.

Research on Managers in School Organizations

It was suggested in the preceding section that observational studies of curriculum leaders at work are needed to fill in the gaps in description apparent in the four types of literature examined. It is, in fact, generally recognized that a large part of the
literature traditionally embraced by scholars associated with many of the sub-fields of educational research (including those most relevant to the research presented here) has been produced without benefit of adequate descriptions of educational practice drawn from observation of such practice as it occurs in natural settings.

Goodlad (1979), for example, writing about the state of inquiry related to curriculum development has said:

What curriculumists have tended to do is jump over descriptions and analysis which have been found necessary in other fields and, indeed, to proffer prescriptions of what ought or should be, normative judgments not enlightened by adequate awareness of what is.

(Goodlad, 1979, pg. 50)

Harris (1975) suggests that a similar state of affairs exists with regard to research about supervision when he notes that:

...most views of supervision by theory-oriented writers are more prescriptive than descriptive and tend to be narrow rather than broad-gauged...The need for objective descriptions of complex human affairs in advance of schemes for change hardly needs detailing...(however) case studies are few and fragmentary.

(Harris, 1975, pg. 3)

Likewise Sergiovanni (1980), writing about the work of educational administration researchers states:

Accounts of gaps between normative and descriptive views of educational administration are not cause for alarm, provided that the supply of both views is rich and abundant. Presently, abundance and richness characterize the normative literature but not the descriptive literature. A need exists,
therefore, for theorists to focus more talent and attention to mapping and describing the real world and work of administration.

(Sergiovanni, 1980, pg. 318)

The need for more accurate description of practice, at least insofar as leadership positions are concerned, has been addressed only by researchers in the third group. Curriculumists who have recognized, as Goodlad has, the need for observation and description of practice have tended to focus on the instructional level of curricular decision making. (See, for example, Lortie, 1975) and the literature on general supervision has continued to operate within the bounds of traditional deductive reasoning. Traditional forms of research in educational administration have, however, been supplemented in recent years with a number of observational studies of the everyday activities of educational administrators. Most of these studies have been modeled on the work of Henry Mintzberg and it is to these studies that attention now turns.

The Mintzberg Legacy

The observational studies of school leadership positions which are reviewed briefly here have all employed, with varying degrees of modification, what has come to be known as the Mintzberg method of studying managerial work. The method was first used by Henry Mintzberg (1973) to study the everyday activities of five chief executive officers to develop a more complete understanding of what it is that managers actually do as they go about the work of managing. Rejecting "POSCORB", the classical notion that managers
activities could adequately be described as planning, organizing, directing, staffing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting (Fayol, 1916, Gulick, 1937), Mintzberg searched the literature on managerial work and found that other categories commonly used to describe such work seldom went far beyond "PODSCORB". Even the "work activity" school which had surfaced in reaction to the "classical" school was criticized by Mintzberg because the research it produced, although empirically-based, relied heavily on pre-determined categories and self reports resulting in what he believed were questionable findings.

To overcome the problems he associated with the existing literature, Mintzberg fashioned a new methodology to be used in the study of managerial work. At the heart of the method was "structured observation" which he defined as follows:

I use the label 'structured observation' to refer to a methodology which couples the flexibility of open-ended observation with the discipline of seeking certain types of structured data. The researcher observes the manager as he performs his work. Each observed event (a verbal contact or a piece of incoming or outgoing mail) is categorized by the researcher in a number of ways (e.g. duration, participation, purpose) as in the diary method but with one vital difference. The categories are developed as the observation takes place. In effect, the researcher is influenced in his coding practices, not by the standing literature and his own previous experiences, but by the single event taking place before him. In addition to categorizing events, the researcher is able to record anecdotal information and to collect anecdotal materials (e.g. copies of letters).

(Mintzberg, 1970, pp. 89-90)
Mintzberg used this "double-barreled" approach to data collection with a selected sample of managers. Because he wanted the sample to reflect the diversity of managerial positions, but recognizing that the method required a very small sample, he chose five chief executives from middle to large-sized organizations of different types. Included were the chairman and chief executive officer of a major consulting firm, the president of a firm that produced sophisticated technological products for industry and defense, the head of a large, important urban hospital, the president of a firm producing consumer goods and the superintendent of a large suburban school system. Mintzberg "shadowed" each of the subjects for a full work week, from beginning to close of business each day. His systematic observations were coded into categories of activity which he claims emerged from the data and his anecdotal records were analyzed to reveal the "content" of the work he observed.

From these observations, Mintzberg induced a theory of managerial work which characterized the form of the work and described the roles assumed by the subjects as they pursued their daily activities. Although there were some differences evident between and among subjects, Mintzberg concluded that in general the subjects' work was characterized by (1) much work at an unrelenting pace and as a consequence little, if any, free time, (2) variety, brevity and fragmentation (i.e. managers engage in many diverse activities of short duration, with one activity often interrupting the previous one), (3) preference for live action (i.e. activities that are
current, specific and well-defined, and those that are nonroutine), (4) attraction to the verbal media (i.e. a strong preference for verbal rather than written means of communication), and (5) a low degree of self-initiated tasks.

The managerial roles derived by Mintzberg from the data were concerned primarily with interpersonal relationships, the transfer of information and decision making. In all, ten roles were derived—three interpersonal roles, three informational roles, and four decisional roles. The interpersonal roles were (1) figurehead i.e. representing the organization in all matters of formality, (2) liaison i.e. interaction with peers and others outside the organization to gain favors and information and (3) leader defining largely his/her relationships with subordinates.

The three informational roles were (1) monitor i.e. the collector and receiver of information (2) disseminator i.e. the sender of specialized information to others in the organization and (3) spokesman i.e. the dissemination of the organization's information into its environment.

The decisional roles were (1) entrepreneur i.e. acting as a change agent, (2) disturbance handler i.e. responding to threats to the organization, (3) resource allocator i.e. deciding where the organization will expend its efforts and (4) negotiator i.e. dealing with others on behalf of the organization.

The Mintzberg method and the findings are sketched here because of the profound influence that his work has had on observational
studies of administrative positions in school organizations in recent years. As one group of educational researchers has noted, while acknowledging that their own study was in part inspired by his work:

Because Mintzberg's book provided such a direct glimpse of the manager at work, and because it extrapolated these data into a comprehensive theory, it has been widely read and has won general recognition as a definitive work on management theory. It is not too much to say that the volume now serves as a guidepost for investigations into administrative practice in many organizational settings.


The Mintzberg-like Studies

Since 1976, the Mintzberg method has been employed in a series of studies by educational researchers to investigate the work activities of administrators in school organizations. These studies have examined the everyday activities of principals (O'Dempsey, 1976; Peterson, 1978; Crowson and Porter-Gehrie, 1980; Martin and Willower, 1981; Morris et al, 1981) and superintendents (Pitner, 1978; Duignan, 1980; Larson, et al, 1981). The studies have been conducted in the United States, Canada and Australia in a variety of district types. Like Mintzberg, these researchers usually began with the general question "What does the administrator actually do?" and followed his basic procedure which involves direct observation of a small sample of administrators for several days, minute-by-minute recording of these administrator's activities during the period of observation, and the coding of each discrete
activity into the Mintzberg categories. This last phase of the process, in fact, represents a departure from Mintzberg's original schema in that the data are coded into the pre-existing Mintzberg categories rather than into categories emerging from the data as Mintzberg found necessary.

Although there is some variation among studies and between the studies of principals and superintendents, Mintzberg's findings about the "characteristics" of managerial work have generally been confirmed by the educational researchers. The Mintzberg descriptors: much work at an unrelenting pace, variety, brevity and fragmentation, a preference for live action, attraction to the verbal media and a low degree of self-initiated tasks, all seem to apply to the work of principals and superintendents. Therefore, in terms of the form their work takes, educational administrators seem to behave much like managers in general.

The role or "content" categories have proven to be more problematic. The ten managerial roles Mintzberg derived from his data have, in fact, been abandoned by some researchers. Pitner (1982) in a critical review of the Mintzberg-like education studies notes that:

Many of the Mintzberg-like studies use the time analysis data which yield the characteristics of managerial work, but quickly discard the notion of purposes and roles which Mintzberg claims gives us the content of managerial work. For example, after confirming that school administrators spend their days in much the same way as Mintzberg's executives, Pitner (1976) illustrates through cases that superintendents in the performance of their role act as information managers and
use various devices...to control the acquisition, retention and dissemination of information within their districts; and Morris, et al., (1981) illustrate through cases the principals exercise discretion in their decision-making and interpretation of district policy. Peterson (1978) on the other hand, totally discards Mintzberg's category scheme and uses a typology developed by Sayles (1964) to analyze seven types of relationships through which a manager interacts with others in the organization.

(Pitner, 1981, pp. 11-12)

Pitner goes on to criticize the Mintzberg method in terms of five basic inadequacies which will not be repeated here. It is important to note however that she concludes her critique by saying "we are not improving our theory or ethnographic research methods by continuing to replicate Mintzberg-like studies but are simply adding a large number of descriptive observations of school administrators of dubious validity and value to the body of social science knowledge." (Pitner, 1982, pg. 29).

Pitner, is certainly not the only critic of the Mintzberg method. Gronn (1982) has suggested that the question "What do school principals, superintendents, or whomever do?" has not been answered by Mintzberg or his followers "other than in an over-simplified or unduly mechanistic sense" (Gronn, 1981, pg. 17). He accuses the Mintzberg-like educational studies of "Neo-Taylorism" and suggests that they are preoccupied with efficiency and do not differ substantially from the "time and motion" studies some found fashionable in earlier periods. He, like Pitner, raises serious questions about the possibility of getting at work content by
using the Mintzberg method.

The purpose here is not to provide a comprehensive review of Mintzberg's work or that of his followers or of the numerous criticisms which have been made of such work. The point to be made, and to be made somewhat forcefully, is that the gap in description evident in the literature on curriculum work in general and curriculum leaders in particular will not be filled by researchers who would choose to adopt the mode of observational research which has become dominant in educational administration research in recent years. Even if the Mintzberg method could be accepted as suitable for the purposes intended, it would not be sufficient. Knowing the form work takes or even the roles assumed by the worker is no more important than knowing the types of decisions one participates in and the nature of the participation. This is particularly true for curriculum work where ambiguity of function is a constant complaint of professionals and where widespread participation in decision making is well documented. It has been suggested that observational studies are needed to fill in the descriptive gaps evident in the existing literature on curriculum work in general and curriculum leaders in particular. It has also been suggested that the design of such studies should not follow in lock-step fashion, the lead of educational researchers who have made the Mintzberg method the most widely used approach to studies of other leadership positions in school organizations. What is needed is a fresh approach to observational research which shares with previous studies
a fundamental concern with everyday activities but which (1) takes into account the participatory nature of curriculum work and curriculum making and (2) focuses on the particular contributions that curriculum leaders make to the decision processes of school organizations. The conceptual framework used to guide the design of the present study was developed in response to these needs.

**The Participatory Nature of Curriculum Work**

If there is one thing that we know for certain about curriculum work it is that curriculum making is a shared responsibility. As noted earlier, everyone seems to have a piece of the action from teachers to superintendents within school districts, from parents to agencies of the Federal government outside. It is, therefore, not as surprising as it might be that the existing literature contains only very general descriptions of the tasks, duties and responsibilities appropriate for persons engaged in curriculum work, or that particular contributions which are or might be made to this participatory enterprise by persons in particular positions or at particular levels of participation are often left unspecified. The descriptions that we have, when considered together, seem at the core to owe more to Ralph Tyler's general principles of curriculum and instruction (Tyler, 1950) than anything else; the good educator must assess student needs, set goals and objectives, organize materials and design a strategy, implement the strategy and evaluate accomplishment. When the literature goes beyond these basic principles, re-stated in one form or another, it is often
only to add elements of "PODSCORE" to the description; the curriculum leader attends to the same kinds of things all good educators attend to but does so by planning, organizing, directing, staffing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.

The existing literature on curriculum work may, therefore, tell us more about the assumptions of scholars than about anything else. At the very least, the lines between prescription and description have been blurred by generic terminology, ambiguous references to positions or levels and the obvious echoes of the Tyler rationale and classical management theory. The problem is one that is often acknowledged in the literature but only rarely addressed by researchers. Where particular positions have been studied with reference to participation in curriculum decision-making the conclusions reached, however tentative, raise additional questions about the efficacy of the existing literature. One consensus finding of the Mintzberg-like studies of principals and superintendents was that the persons who occupy these positions are not concerned much on a day-to-day basis with curriculum and instruction matters. (Pitner, 1982, pp. 9-10) Griffin (1979) has also suggested that actors at the institutional level do not seem to function as anticipated where curriculum matters are concerned. Studies which would add to our knowledge of curriculum making must begin by acknowledging the generality and ambiguity of the existing literature and confront head on the participatory nature of curriculum decision-making by conceptualizing research in these terms.
Particular Contributions to Decision Processes

The curriculum leader is often described as a decision-maker in both the prescriptive and the descriptive literature on curriculum work. However, as the preceding discussion suggests, decisions about the curriculum are rarely, if ever, made unilaterally. It is, therefore, reasonable to characterize the curriculum leader as a participant in decision rather than as a decision-maker and to frame questions about the curriculum leader's work in these terms. 

The view of decision offered here is similar to that presented by Sayles (1964);

From the point of view of an outsider, looking "inside" at one point in time, decisions are made by individuals. But insofar as they appear fixed and solely the product of a single mind, appearances are deceiving. In physics, statics is a special case of dynamics, a balance, although often a tenuous one, of the respective forces. Similarly, one can view the resultant of dynamic forces as a decision, but the realist knows that it is a result of many actions and interactions. For some purposes, we may wish to know only the result and be happy with that. But the student of organization should be able to distinguish the process from the result.

(Sayles, 1964, pg. 219)

In a similar view Mann (1975) in discussing the work of Simon (1965) notes that:

The usual way to represent the decision process is as a choice. The choice, which is viewed as a singular event, is predicated on data gathering and analysis activities in which the universe of alternatives is reviewed, the requisite calculations are performed, and, at the threshold of choice, a decision as a singular definitive selection is made. For some purposes the representation is an
adequate one, but...it obscures the fact that most of the time there is no such discrete, dramatic, final event that it itself embodies 'the' decision.

(Mann, 1975, pg. 49)

Mann goes on to say that:

Classic rationality puts too much emphasis on decisions made by a single decision-maker, whereas most decisions are instead made by groups, or at least are participated in by a number of different people at different points in time...Decisions made by groups, decisions participated in by multiple people at different points in time, and social decisions in general are quite different from those made by a single sufficient individual.

(Mann, 1975, pg. 50)

The questions left unanswered in the existing literature on curriculum work are precisely those which this view of decision permits, e.g.; "What sorts of decisions do curriculum leaders help to make?" and "How does the curriculum leader participate in decision processes?" The questions in each case focus on the particular contributions the curriculum leader makes to the decision processes of the school organization.

To adopt this view of decision with its corollary focus on contribution is to begin shedding the baggage of the Tylerian assumptions which seem to undergird most of the writing and research which has been done about curriculum work. It provides a starting point for extracting from observations a more definitive view of the curriculum leaders activities. An additional virtue is that it permits the researcher to consider the curriculum leader's
participation in all decision processes, not just those associated
with curriculum and instruction. Curricular decisions are placed
within the context of other decisions about education by Hawley
(1977) when he notes that:

Of course children's learning may be only one
consequence of the politics of education that
people may value. There is status to be had,
authority to be allocated, financial costs to be
avoided, curricula to be adopted..., standards
to be set, taxes to be assessed, rights to be
assured, conflict to be avoided, and a series of
other outcomes that are often valued as ends in
themselves by people interested in schools.

(Hawley, 1977, pg. 331)

It is important to ascertain how much of the curriculum
leader's attention is given to non-curricular concerns which are
often ignored in the prescriptive literature and reported as an
afterthought if at all in the survey literature.

The study presented here has adopted the view of decision
sketched above. It was, in fact, used as the starting point in
developing the conceptual framework for the research. The conceptual
framework is explained in more detail in Chapter III which follows.
Chapter III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the everyday activities of three curriculum administrators with particular attention to their participation in decision processes. The particular questions chosen to guide inquiry and analysis of the data were:

What kinds of decisions do curriculum administrators help to make?; and,

At what phases of the decision process does the curriculum administrator become involved?

The emphasis on everyday activities required that data collection be undertaken utilizing what are generally referred to as "field methods" involving observation of events in a natural setting. (Schatzmann and Strauss, 1973, pg. 13) The emphasis on the decisional aspects of the subjects' activities required that a conceptual framework be developed which would systematically direct attention to such activities during the data analysis phase of the research. A "policy-sciences" framework was adapted for this purpose. (Lasswell, 1973) In this chapter the selection of the subjects, the procedures employed in collecting and recording the data and the development of the conceptual framework used to analyze the data are described. Attention is also given to the credibility of the results.
The Subjects of the Study

Three subjects were selected for observation. All three were "curriculum leaders" as that term has been defined by the ASCD Working Group on the Role, Function and Preparation of the Curriculum Worker. According to that definition, curriculum leaders are persons "with primary responsibility for the planning, coordination and/or management of curriculum activity in a district." (Speiker, 1976, pg. 5) The subjects' actual titles varied: Subject A's title was Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Communications; Subject B was Director of Instruction and Federal Programs; Subject C was Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction. This variation is consistent with the findings of the ASCD Working Group which reported no common designation for central office curriculum leaders noting that those who fit the definition of "curriculum leader" held a wide range of titles.

As has been the case with many previous "work activity" studies, the sample employed in this study was a convenience sample. An attempt was made, however, to choose two subjects from districts as comparable as possible and to select a third subject working in a very different environment. Subject A worked in a medium-size suburban school district serving 5,114 students in eight buildings including one high school, two middle schools and five elementary schools. Similarly, Subject B worked in a medium-size suburban school district serving 4,771 students in five buildings; a comprehensive high school, a combined elementary-junior high school
and three elementary schools. District A had 304 professional staff members and District B had 286. In contrast, Subject C worked in a large urban district enrolling more than 37,000 students. The district has 59 buildings including 8 high schools, 9 junior high and middle schools and 42 elementary schools. The district employs 2,233 professional staff members.

All three subjects were white males between forty and fifty years of age. All three subjects had completed graduate programs in educational administration. Subjects A and C held Ph.D.'s and Subject B had completed an M.A. program. Subjects A and B had occupied their positions for more than ten years. Subject C had occupied his position for only one year. All had general responsibility for the K-12 curriculum in their districts.

**Collection of Preliminary Data**

For each of the curriculum administrators studied, three kinds of information were collected before the actual observation began.

First, a preliminary interview was conducted to familiarize the researcher with the subject's background, personality and his perceptions of his role in the school organization. Specific questions were asked to elicit typical areas of responsibility, to identify co-workers with whom the subject would likely interact during the week of observation and to identify particular activities the subject might be involved in. More general questions probed the subject's attitude toward the job and the organization and asked the subject to describe the kinds of tasks he thought
curriculum administrators should perform. Each subject was also asked to provide the researcher with a current vita.

Second, information was gathered about the subject's work environment. Materials gathered included tables of organization, district maps and personnel directories, descriptions of special programs, curriculum outlines, job descriptions and information on the communities the districts served. In two of the districts informal interviews were held with the subjects' secretaries to gain additional information about the work environment.

Third, the calendar kept by the subject or the subject's secretary was reviewed with particular attention to the month immediately preceding the week of observation. Patterns of contacts and scheduled appointments were checked to later give the researcher a rough indication of the typicality of the actual activities observed.

Recording and Initial Coding of Observations

Mintzberg's structured observation techniques (Mintzberg, 1970, 1973) were adapted for use in the data collection phase of the research. The researcher was a non-participant observer or perhaps, more accurately, an observer who engaged in what Schatzmann and Strauss (1973) call limited interaction with the subject.

The researcher engages in minimal, clarifying interaction. In this type of situation, the observer does not set himself apart from the participants. His interventions in the flow of the interaction are confined mainly to seeking clarification and the meaning of ongoing events. He does not attempt to direct interaction into channels of his own choosing. This type of activity has two distinct advantages: it gets at meaning, and it meets the expectations of the hosts insofar as the researcher is not only
an observer, but is revealed as personable and interested; through his comments or questions his apparent agenda is indicated...
This allows them quickly to minimize, even temporarily forget his presence, and thus return the situation nearly to 'normal'.

(Schatzmann and Strauss, 1973, pg. 60)

Each subject was "shadowed" for five consecutive work days in this manner. The present writer recorded field notes for nearly the entire observational period, from arrival at work to departure with each subject. A second researcher, the principal investigator for the funded study, was also present about a fourth of the time spent with any one subject. On some occasions both researchers observed the subject simultaneously. On other occasions, however, the researchers alternated observational periods to reduce the likelihood of subject reactivity.

The field notes contain the carefully recorded, minute by minute summaries of the subject's activities associated with the "structured observation" technique. The starting and ending time of each new activity (i.e. a scheduled meeting, an unscheduled meeting, a telephone call, a tour or a desk work session) was carefully noted. A description of each activity was recorded along with an identification of the participants if a contact was involved and the place where the activity occurred. Activities which seemed of particular import or interest were described in considerable detail. Copies of documents and correspondence were obtained. And, notes were made on informal discussions held with the subjects from time to time.
The field notes also contain "methodological" and "theoretical" notes (Schatzmann and Strauss, 1973, pg. 101) written for use in subsequent observations and in the data analysis phase of the research. The "methodological" notes recorded problems in the observations or critical comments about the researcher's approach or the subjects reactions to being observed; things to be considered as the research progressed. The "theoretical notes" were most often made to record on-the-spot categorizations of activities into decisional types or phases. Final categorization was not done until later when time for systematic reflection on the data was available. However, the "theoretical" notes served to jog the researcher's memory in the data analysis phase of the research and to improve recollections about actual events.

For the purposes of the funded study (Donmoyer and Neff, 1983) the field notes and documents were organized into three cross-referenced records consistent with the Mintzberg method of data analysis: (1) a chronology record listing the subjects daily activities in sequential form; (2) a contact record describing each of the subjects interpersonal contacts; and (3) a mail record listing incoming and outgoing correspondence. The initial coding of the data necessary to produce these records proved valuable in the data analysis phase of the present study. As will be shown further on, the organization of the data into discrete, timed activities served the purposes of both studies even though the method of analysis utilized in the present study was very different
from that used in the funded study.

Data Analysis - The Conceptual Framework

In Chapter II it was determined that observational studies are needed to fill in the descriptive gaps evident in the existing literature on curriculum work in general and curriculum leaders in particular; and that, the Mintzberg-like studies of other key positions in school organizations are insufficient models for such research. It was suggested that observational studies of curriculum leaders' activities should (1) take into account the participatory nature of curriculum work and curriculum making and (2) focus on the particular contributions that curriculum leaders make to the decision processes of school organizations. A view of decision responsive to and consistent with these criteria was also sketched in Chapter II.

With these understandings in mind, the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter were developed to guide inquiry in the present study. A conceptual framework based on the "policy-sciences" research of Harold D. Lasswell was then developed as a necessary preliminary step toward deciding upon procedures for categorizing and analyzing the data. Lasswell's work was in fact very much in mind when the topic for this dissertation was selected. As noted above, the present study was undertaken in conjunction with a funded, Mintzberg-like study of curriculum leaders' work activities and the potential for extending Lasswell's work by using it as an analytical tool in the interpretation of
of observational data seemed suitably challenging.

The use of Lasswell's work here should not be surprising, in that the versatility of the concepts he devised for use in the formation and analysis of public policy has been demonstrated in a variety of ways. The "decision seminar" for example incorporates twenty-seven of his concepts organized into four interrelated sets including "five intellectual tasks", the "social process model", "decision phase analysis" and eight "value/institution categories". (See Burgess and Slonaker, 1978) The "decision seminar" has been employed in numerous settings to guide decision-making and problem-solving activities, including those undertaken in several public school systems. (Cunningham, 1979, 1981) The concepts have also served to guide the analysis of the development of childrens' services policy in the Province of Alberta in Canada (Dickson, 1978); to chart the evolution of federal nutrition legislation (Finn, 1978); to plan a system of community colleges to be developed for Jamaica (Rodney, 1979); to study the structure and process of educational policy-making in Ohio (Parkinson, 1980); to guide a study focusing on the effectiveness of educational reform legislation enacted in Florida (Cunningham, et al., 1979); and to study policy making within vocational education consortia (Schilling, 1981).

The conceptual framework for the present study was based largely on Lasswell's "decision phase analysis". The "social process model" and the "value/institution categories" were also used in developing the framework and influenced the development of
the procedures used to analyze and categorize data. The "decision phase analysis" categories were of particular importance because they encompass the constituent elements of decision processes, and may be readily used to describe the "nature" of a particular actor's participation in such processes. Such description is essential to understand the decisional activities of persons like curriculum workers who share responsibility for decisions with other actors. Lasswell's own definition of decision is, in fact, compatible with the participatory views of decision cited in Chapter II, "A decision is a policy involving severe sanctions" and:

Since a decision is an effective determination of policy, it involves the total process of bringing about a specified course of action. In decision making only those participate whose acts do in fact matter...And since the decision-making process includes application as well as formulation and promulgation of policy, those whose acts are affected also participate in decision-making: by conformity to or disregard of the policy they help to determine whether it is or is not in fact a decision.

(Lasswell and Kaplan, 1950, pg. 74)

The "decision phase" framework provides a conceptual map of the decision process directing systematic attention to the constituent elements of collective acts. The seven constituent elements included in Lasswell's conception of the decision process are:

(1) \textit{intelligence}, gathering, processing and disseminating information for use by the self and other actors in the decision process;

(2) \textit{promotion}, advocating certain decisions to others;

(3) \textit{prescription}, adopting certain decisions unilaterally or with others;
(4) invocation, activities necessary to prepare others for implementation;

(5) application, implementing decisions or making sure decisions are carried out;

(6) termination, overseeing or terminating implementation; and;

(7) appraisal, judging the effectiveness of decisions.

For the purposes of the study an eighth phase initiation has been added focusing "attention on the prime, influential persons or groups making an input into the (decision) process...those who have initiated some course of action or expressed some type of demand". (Schilling, 1981, pg. 37)

Data Analysis - Methods and Procedures

The Lasswellian framework described in the preceding section was used to construct a coding scheme which would systematically collapse the data into "decision phase" and other categories. The scheme was incorporated into the coding form included here as Appendix A. The form permitted listing each discrete activity observed including a description of the activity, a record of the participants present when the activity occurred and the duration in minutes of the activity. As noted earlier, advantage was taken of the fact that the researcher had previously coded the data into Mintzberg categories thereby systematically organizing the data into discrete activities or events. Activities were in fact cross-referenced by number or letter to the chronology and contact records produced for the Mintzberg-like study.
The coding form permitted the researcher to make determinations as to whether the observed activity or event was decision-related or not, the origin of the decision, whether the decision was curricular or non-curricular and whether the decision process was internal or external with regard to the school organization. The form also included blocks to be checked indicating the phase of decision represented by the activity or event. Prior to coding the data, guides were developed for each "decision phase" category describing the phase, illustrating the phase with examples of activities or events which might be coded into the category and stating the key question to be asked before coding an activity or event into that category. The complete set of guides is included here as Appendix B.

In addition to the "decision phase guides", a modified version of the "constant comparative method of qualitative analysis" (Glaser, 1969) was used to test the coding of the data into categories. A running list of incidents coded into each category was kept so that each incident coded could be compared with incidents previously coded into the same category and so that each list could be compared with each other list. For example, each incident was initially coded into one of the "decision phase" categories based only on the category definitions and the illustrative examples established in the "decision phase guides". The incident was then compared for similarity or difference to each other item recorded on the list and with items recorded on the other lists. As a result of this process the categories
were refined and category definitions became much more precise than those originally established by the "decision phase guides". This was particularly the case with the "intelligence phase" and the "application phase" categories. Through constant comparative analysis it was determined that three particular subcategories of "intelligence phase" activities could be distinguished and that five particular subcategories of "application phase" activities could be described. Such refinements served to make descriptions of the subjects' activities much clearer than they might otherwise have been and to insure the discrete nature of each category.

The same basic procedure was also used to test the coding of data into categories descriptive of the types or kinds of decision processes in which the subjects became involved. Initially a general distinction was drawn between decision processes directly related to curriculum and instruction and other types of decision processes in which the subjects might become involved. At the outset of the coding, curriculum-related decision processes were broadly defined to include all those decisions which have to do with what students will be expected to learn, how they will be expected to learn and how their work will be evaluated in school. Through constant comparative analysis of the items coded as "curriculum-related" or "not curriculum-related" it was determined that the former category could be defined in terms of seven particular subcategories and that the latter category could be defined in terms of three particular subcategories. Again, such refinements
served to make descriptions of the subjects' activities much clearer than they might otherwise have been and to insure the discrete nature of each category.

When the coding of data was completed, the number of activities, the amount of time and the proportion of time for each category and subcategory was computed. This information is shown in tabular form in Chapter IV.

**Credibility of the Findings**

Before closing this chapter it is important to address the question of the credibility of the research findings. Evidence from this study and from other work suggests (a) that the one-week observation periods were representative of each subject's work, (b) that the sample size was sufficient for the purposes of the study, (c) that the descriptions of activities and events recorded in the field notes and the meanings assigned to these activities and events were reasonable and accurate, and (d) that the categories used to characterize activities and events were discrete.

First, there are reasons to believe that one-week observation periods were representative of each subject's work. As noted earlier, the subjects' calendars were reviewed prior to the beginning of each actual observation period. Patterns of activities noted in these preliminary reviews were similar in each case to patterns of activities evidenced during the week of observation. Also, each of the subjects commented on more than one occasion about the "typicality" of the observation period. Previous work
activity studies (e.g. Mintzberg, 1973) have used similar methods to determine the "representativeness" of one week observation periods and have reported similar results.

Second, there are reasons to believe that the sample size was sufficient for the purposes of the study. The study was intended to produce accurate descriptions of the subjects' decisional activities and no claims were made as to the generalizability of the findings. Because the descriptions are based on observations of the subjects in natural settings, they provide an initial basis for reconsidering earlier descriptions which have been documented by survey data and for testing certain assumptions underlying the prescriptive literature on the work of curriculum leaders. It was also hoped that the findings might suggest directions for future research.

There is evidence to suggest, however, that the subjects' work activities were similar in many ways. Each spent the largest proportion of work time in decisional activities. Each spent the largest proportion of decisional time in curriculum-related activities. Each was active in similar kinds of curriculum-related activities. And, each was active in similar phases of decisional activities. There were differences but none which called the findings regarding similarities into question. Differences, when noted were often differences between the activities of the two subjects working in similar, medium-size districts and the activities of the subject working in the large urban district. One
can at least speculate that the subjects may have been more "typical" of curriculum leaders in general than the small sample size might suggest. Again, previous work activity studies have used small "convenience" samples and have also reported remarkable similarities in subject activities.

Third, there are reasons to believe that the descriptions of activities and events recorded in the field notes and the meanings assigned to these activities and events were reasonable and accurate. The use of two researchers during certain portions of each observation period, sometimes during overlapping time periods, established a basis for checking the accuracy of the field notes. The notes were reviewed by the two researchers and both the descriptions and meanings assigned were tested through intersubjective agreement or disagreement. Both researchers considered the general level of agreement to be quite high.

Fourth, there is considerable evidence to suggest that the categories used to characterize activities and events were discrete. Through constant comparative analysis of the data (Glaser, 1969), categories were continually refined and category definitions were clarified. The categories are explicated with illustrative examples in Chapter IV.

The discrete nature of each category is further documented by lists providing detailed summaries of the activities coded into each category. The lists are included here as Appendixes C through Q. In most cases the lists contain all of the activities coded
into the category. In some cases, where the number of activities
coded into a category was quite large, the lists contain representative
activities. Representative activities were selected by listing
every fourth activity coded into the category. Each reader,
therefore, may check the consistency of the coding by reviewing
the lists of incidents coded into each category. Similar methods
have been used by other researchers to demonstrate the discrete
nature of coding categories. (see, for example, Mehan, 1970)
Chapter IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This study focused on the everyday decisional activities of three central office school administrators charged with responsibility for the development and implementation of the K-12 curricula in their districts. The findings presented in this chapter are responsive to the two primary questions asked at the outset of the study:

What kinds of decisions do curriculum administrators help to make? and;

At what phases of the decision process does the curriculum administrator become involved?

Answers to these questions based on the findings are found in the sections which follow.

The study posed methodological as well as substantive questions. Conclusions about the utility of the Lasswellian conceptual framework which was used to guide the collection and analysis of the data are reported in Chapter V. Comparisons to methodologies employed in previous studies of administrative work activities are made.

Time Devoted to Participation in Decision Processes

Because the findings presented in this chapter focus on the subjects' participation in decision processes, it is important to
establish the proportion of time each spent in decision-related activities as compared to other kinds of activities. Each of the subjects was observed for five consecutive work days from arrival at work to departure each day. As shown in Table 2, Subject A worked a total of thirty-four hours and fifty-nine minutes, Subject B worked forty-three hours and twenty-two minutes, and Subject C worked forty-four hours and forty-five minutes excluding non-working lunches and time spent in travel. To determine the proportion of the subjects' work time which was devoted to participation in decision processes, each discrete activity recorded in the field notes was coded as described in Chapter III. Decision-related activities were coded into the eight decision phase categories and the number of hours each subject spent on such activities was computed. Activities which did not meet the criteria for inclusion in one of the decision phase categories included unanswered phone calls, calls to schedule meetings, personal business, banter with colleagues, social segments of meetings, passive time at the desk, filing, quick skimming of mail and recreational tours taken seemingly to get away from more purposeful activities for a few moments.

Surprisingly, perhaps each of the subjects spent the largest proportion of his work time in decision-related activities. Subject A, who had the smallest percentage, devoted more than two-thirds of his work time to participation in decision processes. Subjects B and C spent 73% and 78% of their work time respectively in decision-related activities. The activities which were determined
Table 2

Proportion of Time Devoted to Participation in Decision Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours Observed</td>
<td>42:06</td>
<td>50:06</td>
<td>48:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours in Travel</td>
<td>4:27</td>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>1:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours in Non-Working Lunches</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>4:18</td>
<td>1:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours Remaining</td>
<td>34:59</td>
<td>43:22</td>
<td>44:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours in Decision Processes</td>
<td>23:58</td>
<td>31:29</td>
<td>35:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Remaining Hours to Decision</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to be decision-related varied in kind and importance. For this reason, the numerical and proportional data presented in the following sections are supplemented, wherever, possible, with illustrative examples of the range of activities coded into any given category.

Given that each of the subjects spent most of his work time participating in decision processes, the next important question is, "In what kinds of decision processes did they participate?" It is to this question that attention now turns.

The Kinds of Decisions Curriculum
Administrators Help to Make

As a first step toward describing the nature of the subjects' decision-related activities, it is necessary to make certain basic distinctions between and among the various kinds of decision processes in which they became involved. The most basic distinction to be made is between internal and external decision processes. Internal decision processes are those which focus on problems and issues having to do with the particular purposes and programs of the school district. Participants in such processes include both district personnel and actors from outside the organization. External decision processes are those which serve the purposes and programs of other institutions and agencies including those which have purposes complementary to those of the public schools. Schools district personnel may participate in such processes just as extraorganizational actors participate in the internal decision processes of the schools.
As shown in Table 3, 90% of Subject A's time, 93% of Subject B's time and all of Subject C's time were devoted to participation in internal decision processes. Subject A, who spent the largest proportion of time on external activities participated in the decision processes of a local joint recreational district board, a local joint vocational education district board and a state professional organization which he served as an officer. All of Subject B's external activities were related to his role as president of the board of trustees for a local rehabilitation services agency. While the amount of time these two subjects spent on external decision processes was limited, the work was not considered unimportant either by the subjects or by the superintendents they worked for. The subjects, in fact, served as district representatives to these organizations. Subject C who worked in the largest of the three districts and who did not participate in external decision processes indicated in interviews that while he did often have occasion to work with external agencies, his contacts most often served ceremonial or public relations purposes.

Given the finding that each of the subjects spent nearly all of his decisional time on internal decision processes, it is important to next draw a basic distinction between two general categories of internal decision processes. The first category is comprised of decision processes directly related to and which directly affect curriculum development and instructional practice. Decisions about curriculum development and instructional practice are broadly
Table 3

Number of Activities and Amount of Time Devoted to Participation in Decision Processes by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Activities</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Hours</strong></td>
<td>23:58</td>
<td>31:29</td>
<td>35:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>15:53</td>
<td>27:12</td>
<td>22:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>5:48</td>
<td>2:06</td>
<td>12:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Internal Decision Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>21:41</td>
<td>29:18</td>
<td>35:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All External Decision Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>2:17</td>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
defined here to include all those decisions which have to do with what students will be expected to learn, how they will be expected to learn and how their work will be evaluated in school. Decisions such as those related to the course of study, in-service education for teachers, pupil screening, enrollment, grading and retention are included under this definition as are decisions related to staffing for instruction and instructional budgets.

The second category is comprised of all other internal decision processes. Included are those related to general personnel functions, in-service education for administrators, equity, pupil services, general finances and other areas associated with general district administration. Although almost any decision made about schooling might potentially or actually impact on curriculum and instruction, the distinction made here between general categories of internal decision processes is useful in that it sets off functions normally associated with curriculum work from other functions.

Curriculum-Related Decisions

An important general finding of the study was that each of the subjects spent the largest part of his decisional time participating in curriculum-related decision processes. As shown in Table 3, 66% of Subject A's time, 86% of Subject B's time and 64% of Subject C's time were accounted for in this category. Most of the time each of the subjects spent participating in curriculum-related decision processes was concentrated in four areas of involvement; decisions related to the course of study, decisions related to in-service
education for teachers, decisions related to instructional budgets and decisions related to grading and retention. (See Table 4)

More than half of the time Subject A devoted to curriculum-related decision processes was concentrated in these four areas as was nearly all of the time Subjects B and C devoted to such processes.

**Decisions Related to the Course of Study**

Much of the time the three subjects devoted to curriculum-related decision processes was spent on decision processes related to the course of study. Subjects A and B each spent approximately one-third of their curriculum-related decisional time on activities related to the course of study and Subject C spent more than two-thirds of his curriculum-related decisional time on such activities.

Subject A's activities related to the course of study included efforts to encourage the development of exemplary courses and programs, planning sessions with other staff members to design course offerings for a summer school program, monitoring of teacher compliance with instructional policy and information-gathering necessary to assess the effectiveness of the district's college preparatory curriculum. Subject B's activities included preparation of grant applications to secure outside funding for district educational programs, advising building principals on matters related to course content and instructional methods and frequent meetings with coordinators of the district's learning styles project and talented and gifted program to discuss both immediate concerns and plans for program development. Subject C's activities
Table 4
Number of Activities and Amount of Time
Devoted to Curriculum-Related Decision Processes by Area of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>15:53</td>
<td>27:12</td>
<td>22:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to the Course of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>5:51</td>
<td>9:12</td>
<td>15:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to In-Service Education for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:02</td>
<td>12:08</td>
<td>2:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Instructional Budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>2:01</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>3:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Grading and Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:30</td>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>0:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Staffing for Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>3:34</td>
<td>0:34</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Pupil Screening and Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>2:54</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
related to the course of study included directing the work of the
district's curriculum council, active participation in the meetings
of several subject-specific planning committees and frequent meetings
with the superintendent's senior staff and members of the curriculum
division's senior staff to address problems and concerns related
to district wide efforts to improve student achievement. Additional
examples of the subjects' activities related to the course of study
are shown in Appendix C.

Decisions Related to In-Service Education for Teachers

A portion of the time each of the three subjects devoted to
curriculum-related decision processes was spent on decision processes
related to in-service education for teachers. There was considerable
variation among the subjects in the percentage of time spent on
activities in this category. Subject A in fact, spent less than one
percent of his curriculum-related decisional time on such activities.
Subject B, on the other hand spent 45% of his curriculum-related
decisional time in this type of activity. Subject C spent 11%
of his time on activities in this category.

On the one occasion Subject A was observed in activity
related to in-service education for teachers he simply placed a
phone call to a State Department of Education consultant to get
information about a workshop the district's media specialists
were scheduled to attend. Subject B, on the other hand, spent
considerable time during the week planning and otherwise preparing
for two in-service workshops to be conducted by a nationally
recognized authority on learning styles. He also met with the speaker to discuss continuing efforts to develop in-service programs and attended both workshops. Subject C delivered the keynote address to curriculum specialists and teachers attending a curriculum-planning, in-service workshop one morning and spent the remainder of the morning participating in group sessions with the participants.

A complete listing of the subjects' activities related to in-service education for teachers is shown in Appendix D.

Decisions Related to Instructional Budgets

Part of the time each of the three subjects devoted to curriculum-related decision processes was spent on decision processes related to instructional budgets. Subjects A, B and C spent 13%, 6% and 16% of their curriculum-related decisional time, respectively, on activities in this category.

All of Subject A's activities in this category involved work done to develop a budget for the district's summer school program. The budget which was to be submitted to the board of education for approval was first drafted in tentative form based on past experience and modified several times as information about course offerings and enrollments became available and material and personnel needs could more accurately be anticipated. All of Subject B's activities in this category involved routine attention to pre-existing instructional budgets, e.g., approving curricular materials purchases, processing purchase requisitions to pay teachers for workshop attendance and discussing routine billing.
problems with the district treasurer and suppliers. Subject C spent time during the week working on a budget for the district's alternative schools, making final revisions to textbook budgets and working on a letter to the board of education advocating the purchase of microcomputers for classroom use.

A representative listing of the subjects' activities related to instructional budgets is shown in Appendix E.

Decisions Related to Grading and Retention

Each of the subjects also spent time on decision processes related to grading and retention. Subjects A, B and C spent 3%, 13% and 4% of their curriculum-related decisional time, respectively, on activities in this category.

All of Subject A's activities in this category involved information gathering necessary to a decision about how to treat credit for summer school attendance for children who had been retained in grade. Subject B, who devoted the largest percentage of time to activities in this category, spent all of that time in activities related to the revision of pupil progress reports. Subject C's time in activities in this category was devoted to problems concerning a senior high school student who had been informed he would not graduate at the end of the school year.

A complete listing of the subjects' activities related to grading and retention is shown in Appendix F.

Additional Curriculum-Related Decision Categories

As noted earlier, virtually all of Subject B and Subject C's curriculum-related decisional activities were included in the
categories discussed above. Subject A, in contrast, spent 40% of his curriculum-related decisional time in activities in two additional categories. Twenty-two percent of Subject A's time was spent on activities related to instructional staffing and 18% of his time was spent on activities related to pupil screening and enrollment.

Subject A's instructional staffing activities included work done to recruit teachers for the district's summer school program, making changes to the staffing pattern for elementary school media specialists and problem-solving activities related to the placement of student interns assigned to district classrooms by the local university. Subject A's activities in the pupil screening and enrollment category involved monitoring the progress of the district's kindergarten prescreening program and checking on teachers' compliance with district policy when communicating with parents about kindergarten enrollment deadlines.

A representative listing of the subjects' activities related to instructional staffing and pupil screening and enrollment are shown in Appendixes G and H.

Other Internal Decision Processes

As shown in Table 3, 24% of Subject A's time, 7% of Subject B's time and 36% of Subject C's time were devoted to participation in decision processes which were not directly related to curriculum and instruction.

The time the three subjects spent participating in decision processes which were not directly related to curriculum and
instruction may be classified in three areas of involvement; decisions related to personnel functions, decisions related to inservice education for administrators and decisions related to general district administration.

**Decisions Related to Personnel Functions**

Two of the subjects devoted time to decision processes related to personnel functions. Subject A spent 89% of his non-curricular decisional time on activities in this category. Subject B spent 88% of his non-curricular decisional time on such activities.

The more important of Subject A's activities in this category, involved a review of administrative evaluation models he had secured from other school districts at the request of the superintendent. The review was undertaken to provide an information base for developing new evaluation procedures for central office personnel and building principals. Some of Subject A's activities in this category were, however, almost trivial by comparison. For example, on several occasions he visited school buildings to meet briefly with substitute teachers and get their signatures on a routine form notifying them their contracts would not be renewed.

Subject B's activities in this category were all related to a search for a new high school principal. Subject B chaired the search committee which included teachers, a principal and the president of the school board.

A representative listing of activities in this category is shown in Appendix I.
Table 5

Number of Activities and Amount of Time
Devoted to Other Internal Decision
Processes by Area of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>5:48</td>
<td>2:06</td>
<td>12:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Personnel Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>1:51</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to In-Service Education for Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:15</td>
<td>2:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to General District Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:38</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>10:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decisions Related to In-Service Education for Administrators

Two of the subjects spent time participating in decision processes related to in-service education for administrators. Subject B spent 12% of his non-curricular decisional time in such activities and Subject C spent 17% of his time in similar activities. The reader is reminded that Subject B spent very little of his overall worktime in non-curricular decision processes and should note that Subject C's activities account for the only substantial amount of actual time in this category. Most of the time both subjects spent on activities in this category was devoted to preparations for in-service programs for principals, programs which focused on management rather than curricular concerns. A complete listing of the subjects' activities related to in-service education for administrators is shown in Appendix J.

Decisions Related to General District Administration

Two of the subjects participated in decisional activities related to general district administration. Subject C, who spent the largest proportion of his overall work time in non-curricular decisional activities spent the largest part of that time in activities in this category. As noted earlier, nearly all of that time was spent in daily meetings with the superintendent and the superintendent's senior staff where numerous non-curricular problems and concerns were discussed. Agenda items covered in these meetings included general community complaints, reductions in force, a recent audit, building renovations
and similar matters. Eighty-three percent of Subject C's non-curricular decisional time was spent in these and similar meetings.

Subject A, who also participated in activities in this category spent only 11% of his non-curricular decisional time and much smaller amount of actual time on such activities. Much of this time was spent responding to inquiries from other staff members regarding problems ranging from how to interpret district maternity leave policy to district provisions for funding camp experiences for indigent children.

A representative listing of the subjects' activities related to general district administration is shown in Appendix K.

The Curriculum Administrators' Participation in the Phases of Decision Processes

In the preceding sections, the activities of the three subjects were described in terms of their participation in certain types or kinds of decision processes. Categories and subcategories of decision processes were established and the proportion of time the subjects devoted to activities in each category was shown.

In this section, the subjects' activities are examined again and attention is directed to characterizing these activities in terms of the eight phases of decision included in Lasswell's "decision phase analysis" model. As noted in Chapter III, the decision phase categories provide a conceptual map of the decision process and direct systematic attention to the constituent elements of collective acts. Because the categories encompass the constituent elements of decision processes, they are particularly useful when
used to describe the decisional activities of curriculum leaders who share responsibility for decisions with other actors. The eight decision phase categories are reviewed briefly as follows:

1. initiation - exerting primary influence on the decision process by initiating a new course of action or expressing a new demand;

2. intelligence - gathering, processing and disseminating information for use by the self and by other actors in the decision process;

3. promotion - advocating certain decisions to others;

4. prescription - adopting certain decisions unilaterally or with others;

5. invocation - activities necessary to prepare others for implementation or application;

6. application - implementing new decisions or making sure decisions are carried out;

7. termination - overseeing or terminating implementation;

8. appraisal - judging the effectiveness of decisions.

As shown in Table 6, each of the subjects spent the greatest proportion of his decisional time participating in activities in only two of the decision phase categories. Subject A spent 81% of his decisional time on intelligence phase and application phase activities. Subject B spent 93% of his decisional time on activities in these two categories. And, Subject C spent 85% of his decisional time on activities in these two categories.

The distribution of time spent between these two categories was similar for the two subjects working in similar, medium-sized districts. Each spent approximately half of his decisional
Table 6
Number of Activities and Amount of Time Devoted to Participation in Decision Processes by Phase of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>23:56</td>
<td>31:29</td>
<td>35:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intelligence Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>11:43</td>
<td>17:41</td>
<td>8:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:41</td>
<td>0:35</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>0:04</td>
<td>1:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invocation Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:41</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>7:41</td>
<td>11:47</td>
<td>20:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisal Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:52</td>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Termination Phase Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
time on intelligence phase activities and about one-third on application phase activities. In contrast Subject C, who worked in the large urban district spent a fourth of his decisional time on intelligence phase activities and nearly two-thirds of his time on application phase activities.

None of the subjects participated in activities which could be classified in the initiation or termination phase categories. This is, perhaps, not surprising given the fact that each subject was observed for only one week. Dramatic new policy initiatives are rare in any organization as are program terminations. This does not mean that the subjects never participate in activities in these categories. It does suggest, however, that such activities are not typical on an every day or every week basis.

None of the remaining categories accounted for more than 8% of the time of any one subject. In fact, prescription, the phase that embodies the decision itself accounted for only 1% of Subject A's time, 1% of Subject B's time and 4% of Subject C's time.

With these general findings in mind, it is important now to examine more carefully the subjects' participation in each of the decision phases where activities were observed.

**Intelligence Phase Activities**

The intelligence phase of the decision process involves the gathering, processing and dissemination of information necessary to decision-making. It should be noted, however, that not all of the subjects' activities which involved the gathering, processing
or dissemination of information were included in this category.

For example, the subjects were often observed giving, receiving or exchanging information about existing policies or ongoing programs. Such activities are decision-related but are more appropriately considered to be part of the application (implementation) phase of the decision process. In coding the observational data, the intelligence phase category was defined through constant comparative analysis to include only three types of activity:

1. activities which were undertaken to reach a particular decision and which occurred in advance of the decision;

2. information-gathering activities which were part of a proposal development process and which were intended to result in new or modified programs; and,

3. more general information-gathering activities which might potentially be used in decision-making and which were clearly not related to implementation of existing policies or programs.

As shown in Table 7, a considerable proportion of the time each of the subjects spent on intelligence phase activities was devoted to gathering, processing or disseminating information related to curriculum and instruction decisions. About half of Subject A's time, more than three quarters of Subject B's time and nearly all of Subject C's time were spent on such activities.

Subject A's activities in this category included: obtaining information from a State Department of Education consultant regarding the acceptability of a new study skills course being developed by the district; obtaining information from middle school principals
Table 7

Number of Activities and Amount of Time
Devoted to Participation in the
Intelligence Phase of Decision Processes
by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>11:43</td>
<td>17:41</td>
<td>8:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>5:22</td>
<td>14:10</td>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>4:14</td>
<td>1:46</td>
<td>0:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Decision Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>2:07</td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for use in revising district policy on elective courses; and, securing information from elementary school principals necessary to a decision about how to treat summer school credit for children who had been retained in grade.

Subject B's activities in this category included: obtaining cost estimates for use in making a decision about purchasing microcomputers for instructional use; researching the instructional implications of various methods of scheduling the school visits of speech and hearing therapists; and obtaining and disseminating information for use in revising pupil progress reports.

Subject C's curriculum-related intelligence phase activities included: obtaining and disseminating information related to the potential phase out of a high school auto body program; securing opinions regarding the religious content of a proposed high school assembly; and, gathering information necessary to a decision on budget allocations for textbooks.

Each of the subjects also participated in information gathering related to proposal development. Subject A obtained and disseminated information for use in preparing a grant application for an exemplary art education program. Subject B spent considerable time researching and developing a proposal for a curricular program for handicapped students. And, Subject C obtained information for use in developing a Title I reading program proposal.

As noted above, the subjects also engaged in more general kinds of information-gathering on occasion and much of this type of
activity was curriculum-related. Subject A, for example found several opportunities during a meeting attended by representatives from other districts to inquire about program plans and curricular offerings. Subjects B and C found similar opportunities in similar settings.

Of the three subjects, only Subject A spent a substantial proportion of time on non-curricular, intelligence phase activities. As shown in Table 7, 36% of the time Subject A spent on intelligence phase activities was devoted to other internal decision processes and 18% were spent on external decision processes.

Most of the time Subject A spent on intelligence phase activities related to other internal decision processes was spent reviewing and rating administrative evaluation forms used by other school districts. As noted earlier, these forms were obtained to provide an information base for revising the districts procedures for evaluating central office administrators and building principals. Most of the time Subject A spent on intelligence phase activities related to external decision processes was spent on planning activities for the local joint recreational district board and for the state professional organization he headed.

Subject B also participated in activities in these categories. Nearly all of the time Subject B spent on intelligence phase activities related to other internal processes was spent in chairing a search committee for a new high school principal. All of the time Subject B spent on intelligence phase activities related to
external decision processes was spent on planning activities for the rehabilitation services board he served as president.

Subject C spent the smallest proportion of time in non-curricular intelligence phase activities. All of these activities involved information-gathering related to in-service education for administrators.

A representative listing of the subjects intelligence phase activities is shown in Appendix L.

Promotion Phase Activities

The promotion phase of the decision process involves advocating certain decisions to others. A small proportion of the time each of the three subjects spent on decisional activities was spent on activities in this category. Seven percent of Subject A's time, 2% of Subject B's time and 8% of Subject C's time were spent on such activities.

As shown in Table 8, most of the time the subjects spent on activities in this category was spent promoting decisions related to curriculum and instruction. All of Subject A's curriculum-related promotional activities were focused on two relatively minor decisions. He met briefly with central office personnel and building principals on several occasions to "sell" them on the importance of applying for a grant to develop an exemplary arts education program. And, he advocated modest changes to the district's high school reading program both to the secondary education consultant and in a brief proposal to the State Department...
Table 8
Number of Activities and Amount of Time
Devoted to Participation in the
Promotion Phase of Decision Processes
by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:41</td>
<td>0:35</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>0:24</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>0:11</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Decision Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:10</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Education.

Subject B's curriculum-related promotional activities included encouraging the superintendent and building principals to support continuance of a district arts program and recommending to the junior high school principal that a local social service agency be used in a drug education assembly rather than deputies from the local sheriff's office.

All of Subject C's promotional activities were curriculum-related. He worked with a writing team to draft a letter to the board of education advocating the purchase of microcomputers for classroom use, made a firm recommendation to the superintendent that a student's request to graduate be denied and worked with a building curriculum committee to develop an overall curriculum plan which could be "sold" to the central office curriculum council.

Subjects A and B also participated in non-curricular promotional activities. In meetings with the superintendent, Subject A advocated changes to a personnel policy which be believed negatively affected teachers and to a board policy which limited substitute teachers' contracts to 180 days. Subject A also engaged in promotional activity with the state professional organization he headed by calling another officer of the organization to encourage acceptance of a proposal he had submitted. All of Subject B's non-curricular promotional activities were related to internal matters. These activities included advocating that the superintendent discontinue a contractual relationship with a
neighboring school district and informing the superintendent of the high school principal search committee's final recommendations.

A complete listing of the subjects' promotion phase activities is shown in Appendix M.

Prescription Phase Activities

The prescription phase of the decision process involves adopting certain decisions either unilaterally or with others. As noted earlier, a very small proportion of the time each of the three subjects spent on decisional activities was spent on activities in this category.

As shown in Table 9, all of the time Subjects A and B spent on activities in this category was spent on curriculum-related decisions. Subject A issued a memo to elementary principals prescribing staffing changes for media specialists assigned to their buildings; and he reached a decision with a university supervisor to remove a student teacher from a high school classroom. Subject B's only activity in this category was to deny a request made by the junior high school principal to send accelerated math students to the high school for course work.

Subject C had one curriculum-related activity in this category. It involved preparing a letter denying a student's request to graduate. Subject C, however, spent more time on the only other activity in this category which involved a non-curricular decision. He voted with other members of the senior staff to adopt new procedures for informing the board of education of major equipment purchases.
Table 9

Number of Activities and Amount of Time
Devoted to Participation in the
Prescription Phase of Decision Processes
by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>0:04</td>
<td>1:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:20</td>
<td>0:04</td>
<td>0:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Decision Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A complete listing of the subjects' prescription phase activities is shown in Appendix N.

Invocation Phase Activities

The invocation phase of the decision process involves activities necessary to prepare others for the implementation or application of a decision. As shown in Table 10, only Subjects A and C participated in invocation phase activities. All of Subject A's activities in this category were curriculum-related. On two occasions he made calls to building principals to prepare them for the changes in media specialist assignments referred to earlier. The remainder of the time he spent on activities in this category was devoted to preparing teachers and other staff members for participation in the district's summer school program.

Subject C's curriculum-related activities in this category involved meetings with central office personnel, building principals and teachers association officers in which he prepared them for their roles in an emerging district-wide curriculum program. He also was involved in invocation activities related to an in-service education program for building principals which was not related to curriculum and instruction.

A complete listing of the subjects' invocation phase activities is shown in Appendix O.

Application Phase Activities

The application phase of the decision process involves implementing decisions or making sure decisions are carried out.
Table 10

Number of Activities and Amount of Time Devoted to Participation in the Invocation Phase of Decision Processes by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:41</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:41</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Decision Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted earlier, Subjects A and B spent about a third of their decisional time on application phase activities and Subject C spent more than half of his decisional time on activities in this category.

Five particular kinds of activity were included in the application phase category as a result of the constant comparative analysis of the data described in Chapter III:

1. receiving, gathering, forwarding or exchanging information about policy compliance or program implementation;
2. checking on the status or progress or program implementation;
3. implementing or negotiating implementation of programs;
4. interpreting or disseminating existing policy statements; and
5. checking on compliance with a particular policy or procedure.

As shown in Table 11, each of the subjects, spent the greatest proportion of time spent on application phase activities on activities in the first two subcategories listed above. Sixty-seven percent of the time Subject A spent on application phase activities was spent on activities in these two subcategories. Eighty-seven percent of the time Subject B spent on application phase activities was spent on activities in these two subcategories. And, 93% of the time Subject C spent on application phase activities was spent on activities in these two subcategories.

The distribution of time spent between these two subcategories was similar for the two subjects working in similar, medium-sized
Table 11

Application Phase Activities

Number of Activities and Amount of Time
Devoted to Decision Processes by Subcategory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>7:41</td>
<td>11:47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receiving, gathering, forwarding or exchanging general information about policy compliance or program implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>2:52</td>
<td>4:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checking on the status or progress of program implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>2:18</td>
<td>5:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementing or negotiating implementation of programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:46</td>
<td>1:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting or disseminating existing policy statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:03</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checking on compliance with a particular policy or procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:42</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
districts. Subjects A and B spent 37% and 42% of their time respectively receiving, gathering, forwarding or exchanging information about policy compliance or program implementation. Much of Subject A's time was spent on program reviews with the elementary and secondary education consultants. Much of Subject B's time was spent on program reviews with special projects coordinators. Subject C, who spent a much larger proportion of time on activities in this subcategory (63%) spent most of that time in meetings with the superintendent's senior staff and the curriculum division senior staff.

Subjects A and B spent 30% and 45% of their time, respectively, checking on the status or progress of program implementation. Much of Subject A's time was spent observing the progress of the district's kindergarten pre-screening program. Most of Subject B's time was spent observing the activities associated with in-service workshops. Subject C, who spent a much smaller proportion of time on activities in this subcategory, also spent most of that time observing in-service education activities.

Only Subject A spent a substantial proportion (33%) of time on activities in the remaining three subcategories. He was involved directly in implementing the summer school and student teaching programs in his district. He spent time personally checking on teacher compliance with district instructional policy. And, he responded to several requests for interpretations of district policies including those having to do with maternity leave and other non-curricular concerns.
However, as shown in Table 12, most of the time Subject A spent on application phase activities and nearly all of the time Subject B spent on application phase activities was spent on activities related to curriculum and instruction. In contrast, less than half of the time Subject C spent on application phase activities was spent on activities directly related to curriculum and instruction.

Subject A's curriculum-related, application phase activities were for the most part associated with the summer school, kindergarten prescreening and student intern programs described earlier. He also spent time supervising selection and placement of the district's short-term and long-term substitute teachers. Subject B's curriculum-related, application phase activities included attention to the implementation of the in-service education programs and special projects already mentioned as well as routine, sometimes menial activities related to other programs and contracts. The time Subject C spent on activities in this category was for the most part taken up by meetings with the curriculum council, subject-specific curriculum committees and similar groups. These meetings typically involved a series of reports or information exchanges regarding ongoing programs or practices.

Fifty-two percent of the time Subject C spent on application phase activities was spent on non-curricular matters and concerns. As noted and described earlier most of this time was spent in meetings with the superintendent's senior staff. Subject A spent 18% of his application phase time on non-curricular activities.
Table 12  
Number of Activities and Amount of Time Devoted to Participation in the Application Phase of Decision Processes by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>7:41</td>
<td>11:47</td>
<td>20:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>6:18</td>
<td>11:12</td>
<td>10:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>1:23</td>
<td>0:09</td>
<td>10:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Decision Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:26</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much of this time was devoted to personnel matters not directly related to instruction and to providing explanations or interpretations of district policies not directly related to the curriculum. Subject B spent only 1% of his time on such activities. He was, however, the only one of the three subjects to spend any time on application phase activities related to external decision processes. Although the amount of time he spent on such activities was minimal, he did spend time gathering and exchanging information about the ongoing programs of the rehabilitation services agency whose board he headed.

A representative listing of the subjects' application phase activities is shown in Appendix P.

**Appraisal Phase Activities**

The appraisal phase of the decision process involves judging the effectiveness of decisions. As shown in Table 13, only Subjects A and B participated in appraisal phase activities. Each spent 4% of his decisional time on activities in this category. All of these activities were related to curriculum and instruction.

Subject A's activities in this category included: writing the district's formal response to a State Department of Education evaluation of the district's elementary education program; preparing a report on the effectiveness of the district's college preparatory program; and reviewing building principals evaluations of substitute teachers. All of Subject B's activities in this category were related to a State Department of Education evaluation of a funded
### Table 13

Number of Activities and Amount of Time Devoted to Participation in the Appraisal Phase of Decision Processes by Type of Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subject A</th>
<th>Subject B</th>
<th>Subject C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:52</td>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions Related to Curriculum and Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:52</td>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions Related to Other Internal Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Decision Processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
drop-out prevention program. Subject B made plans for the on-site visit by the contract officer and participated in the evaluation.

A complete listing of the subjects' appraisal phase activities is shown in Appendix Q.

**Additional Comments on the Subjects' Decision-Related Activities**

In the preceding sections, each of the categories used to characterize the subjects' decision-related activities has been illustrated with examples drawn from the entries on the forms and lists used to code the raw observational data recorded in the field notes. Additional examples of the subjects' decision-related activities in each category are shown in Appendixes C through Q. In reviewing these examples, it becomes obvious that many of the subjects' decision-related activities were undertaken in relation to rather routine decisions of somewhat narrow scope. This was particularly the case for the two subjects working in the similar, medium-size districts. Only the subject working in the larger, urban district participated in activities which addressed curricular or other concerns in more comprehensive fashion.

The activities of Subjects A and B were most often directed to a particular program or a particular policy. Even in cases where their activities were clearly intended to lead to change, the change sought was most often a rather modest modification to an existing program or policy. To be sure, Subject A's efforts to encourage the development and submission of a proposal for an integrative arts education program and Subject B's activities in
support of his district's learning styles and talented and gifted programs provide evidence that some attention is given to concerns spanning grade levels and subject areas. And, the evidence at least implicitly suggests that both subjects served to some extent as communication links between and among the various programs in their districts. There is, however, no compelling evidence to suggest that either gives systematic attention on a day to day basis to the overall curricular programs in their districts or to the existing or potential interrelationships between the various program elements.

Subject C, the subject working in the larger district, also devoted time to concerns associated with particular programs or policies on occasion. His activities with regard to a particular high school auto body program come to mind. There is considerable evidence to suggest, however, that Subject C devotes considerably more time to district-wide concerns and more particularly to issues and problems which span grade levels and subject areas, than do the other two subjects. The district he works for has made a commitment to developing an overall curricular plan which will direct attention to relationships between and among program areas. During the week of observation, Subject C participated in a number of meetings, with a number of groups and committees working to plan and implement this overall curricular program. Given the size of the district Subject C worked in and the large number of staff members he had to assist him it is, perhaps, unsurprising that more of his time
was devoted to activities which address the curriculum and other concerns in more comprehensive fashion than the subjects working in the smaller districts. However unsurprising, it is a difference worthy of note.

**Summary**

Each of the subjects spent the greatest proportion of his work time participating in decision-related activities. Subject A spent more than two-thirds of his work time in decision-related activities. Subjects B and C spent 73% and 78% of their work time respectively in such activities.

Each of the subjects spent by far the largest part of his decisional time participating in the decision processes of his school organization. Ninety percent of Subject A's time, 93% of Subject B's time and all of Subject C's time were devoted to participation in internal decision processes. Subjects A and B who worked in similar, medium-sized districts devoted the remainder of their decisional time to the decision processes of external organizations.

Each of the subjects spent the largest part of his decisional time participating in curriculum-related decisional processes. Sixty-six percent of Subject A's time, 86% of Subject B's time and 64% of Subject C's time were accounted for in this category. Each of the subjects spent a smaller proportion of time on other internal decision processes. Subjects A, B and C spent 24%, 7% and 36% of their decision time, respectively on such processes.
Most of the time each subject spent participating in curriculum-related decision processes was concentrated in four areas of involvement:

1. decisions related to the course of study;
2. decisions related to in-service education for teachers;
3. decisions related to instructional budgets; and,
4. decisions related to grading and retention.

More than half of the time Subject A devoted to curriculum-related decision processes was concentrated in these four areas as was nearly all of the time Subjects B and C devoted to such processes.

All of the time the subjects spent participating in other internal decision processes was spent in three areas of involvement:

1. decisions related to personnel functions;
2. decisions related to in-service education for administrators; and,
3. decisions related to general district administration.

The two subjects working in similar districts spent nearly all of their time in this category on activities related to personnel functions. The subject working in the larger district spent nearly all of his time in this category on activities related to general district administration.

The subjects of the study, both collectively and individually spent the greatest proportion of their decisional time participating in activities in only two of the decision phase categories. Eighty-seven percent of the combined time of the three subjects was spent
in intelligence phase and application phase activities. Subject A spent 81% of his decisional time on activities in these two categories. Subject B spent 93% of his decisional time on activities in these two categories. And, Subject C spent 85% of his decisional time on activities in these two categories.

The distribution of time spent between these two categories was similar for the two subjects working in similar, medium-sized districts. Each spent approximately half of his decisional time on intelligence phase activities and about one-third on application phase activities. In contrast, Subject C who worked in the larger district spent a fourth of his decisional time on intelligence phase activities and nearly two-thirds of his time on application phase activities.

None of the subjects participated in activities which could be classified in the initiation or termination phase categories. And, none of the remaining categories accounted for more than 5% of the combined time for the three subjects nor for more than 8% of the time for any one subject. Prescription, the phase that embodies the decision itself accounted for only 2% of the subjects' time.

Through examples, it was shown that many of the subjects' activities were undertaken in relation to routine decisions of somewhat narrow scope. This was particularly the case for the two subjects working in similar districts. Only the subject working in the larger district participated in activities which addressed the curriculum or other concerns in more comprehensive fashion.
Chapter V

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to describe the everyday activities of three central office curriculum leaders with particular attention to their participation in decision processes. The particular questions chosen to guide inquiry and the analysis of the data were:

What kinds of decisions do curriculum leaders help to make?; and,

At what phases of the decision process does the curriculum leader become involved?

A second purpose was to appraise the utility of Lasswell's "decision phase analysis" as a guide to making sense of observational data. This conceptual construct, most often used to guide and analyze policy formation, had not previously been used in this way to structure analysis of qualitative data. The study, therefore, represented an attempt to explore and expand the uses of Lasswellian theory.

In this chapter, the major findings are listed and discussed in terms of previously existing knowledge of curriculum leaders' work and the work of other administrators in school organizations. Conclusions about the utility of the Lasswellian conceptual framework which was used to guide the analysis of the data are reported and comparisons to methodologies employed in previous studies of
administrative work activities are made. Recommendations for further research are also proposed; and, final conclusions are drawn.

Summary Listing of Major Findings

1. Each of the subjects spent the greatest proportion of his work time participating in decision-related activities.

2. Each of the subjects spent by far the largest proportion of his decisional time participating in the decision processes of his school organization.

3. Each of the subjects spent the largest proportion of his decisional time participating in curriculum-related decision processes.

4. Most of the time each subject spent participating in curriculum-related decision processes was concentrated in four areas of involvement.

5. Each of the subjects also spent time participating in other internal decision processes of their school organizations; and, two of the subjects participated in external decision processes.

6. Each of the subjects spent by far the largest proportion of his decisional time participating in only two phases of the decision process, the intelligence phase and the application phase.

7. None of the subjects participated in activities which could be classified as initiation phase or termination phase activities.

8. None of the subjects spent a substantial proportion of time in promotion, prescription, invocation or appraisal phase activities.

9. Many of the subjects' decisional activities were undertaken in relation to routine decisions of somewhat narrow scope.

Discussion

Time Devoted to Participation in Decision Processes

Each of the subjects spent the greatest proportion of his work time participating in decision-related activities. This finding seems surprising in light of the findings of earlier studies.
which have focused on administrative work in general and more specifically on administrative work in school organizations. Mintzberg (1973) found that the five chief executives he observed spent only 21% of their time on decisional activities. More recently, a study which used Mintzberg's categories to report the proportion of time elementary and secondary principals spent on decisional activities noted that the subjects "found themselves in this mode only six to eleven percent of the time" (Morris, et al, 1981). Duignan (1980) reported similar findings regarding the school superintendents he observed for a Mintzberg-like study of work activities.

There are reasons to believe, however, that the findings of these earlier studies are not directly comparable to the findings of the present study. There is evidence to suggest that Mintzberg and those who have used his method of data analysis may have underestimated decisional activity by defining such activity in very narrow terms. This is a problem which some of those who have used the Mintzberg method have acknowledged. For example, the researchers who conducted the second study cited above also noted that:

> The term "decision" in Mintzberg's lexicon may have been chosen to carry only a limited, restricted sense, namely those behaviors which exhibit a dramatic visibility...


Even given such disclaimers, the general impression that one might have after reading the Mintzberg and Mintzberg-like studies
is that managers (including managers in school organizations) spend little time on decisional activities. The findings of the present study suggest that curriculum leaders spend a substantial proportion of their work time on decisional activities. And, the findings provide new evidence which suggests the limitations of research methodologies which define decisional activity in narrow terms.

The Kinds of Decisions Curriculum Leaders Help to Make

Each of the subjects spent by far the largest proportion of his decisional time participating in the decision processes of his school organization. This finding is not surprising. Indeed, it would be surprising if the situation were otherwise. It is at least interesting, however, to note that the two subjects who worked in the similar, medium-size districts did spend some time participating in external decision processes and that this was not only accepted but seemed to be expected by their superintendents. It may be that the superintendents perceive that such activities serve to demonstrate the school district's interest in community affairs and provide opportunities for influencing external policies which might impact on school district concerns.

Each of the subjects spent the largest proportion of his decisional time participating in curriculum-related decision processes. While it might seem commonsensical that curriculum leaders spend most of their time on matters related to curriculum, this finding contrasts sharply with the findings of previous studies of administrative work and curriculum leadership. Descriptive studies
of persons occupying other administrative positions in school organizations (see, for examples, Peterson, 1978; Sproull, 1979; and, Martin, 1980) have consistently found virtually no involvement with curriculum and instruction concerns even though prescriptive theory in educational administration (see, for examples, Jacobsen, et al, 1973; Lipham and Hoch, 1974; and, Roe and Drake, 1980) has traditionally portrayed some of these positions (e.g., the principalship) as sources of curriculum and instructional leadership. Furthermore, a study associated with Goodlad's recent study of schooling (Griffin, 1979) found virtually no curriculum leadership at the central office level. The finding of the present study suggests that there is at least one administrative position in the school organization which attends primarily to curriculum and instruction concerns; and, the finding implicitly raises questions about the methods used to determine levels of curricular involvement in previous studies.

Most of the time each subject spent participating in curriculum-related decision processes was concentrated in four areas of involvement; decisions related to the course of study, decisions related to in-service education for teachers, decisions related to instructional budgets, and decisions related to grading and retention. This finding is also important. Although the subjects showed some variance in the proportion of time devoted to each area and one subject participated in activities in two additional areas, the substantial amount of time each spent on only four areas...
seems significant. One must be careful about generalizing given a small sample size and a short observation period with each subject. The sample did, however, include two district types and the consistency of findings across districts permits speculation at least that these four areas of involvement may be ones curriculum leaders cannot escape on an everyday or every week basis.

Each of the subjects also devoted time to participation in other internal decision processes of their school organizations. This finding is of at least minor interest. The subjects varied considerably in terms of proportion of time devoted to decision processes which were not directly related to curriculum and instruction. However, both of the subjects working in medium-size districts spent most of their non-curricular time on personnel functions and the subject working in the larger district spent most of his non-curricular time on matters relating to general district administration. This may suggest that curriculum leaders working in smaller districts tend to have more specialized secondary responsibilities than those working in larger districts.

The Curriculum Leaders' Participation in the Phases of Decision Processes

Initiation Phase Activities

In designing the study, it was decided to add the initiation phase category (Schilling, 1981) to the seven categories included in Lasswell's original conception of the decision process (Lasswell, 1971). This was done in anticipation that the subjects might become
involved in activities which would serve to introduce new and important ideas or programs into the decision processes of their school organizations. The importance of the curriculum leader's participation in such activities has often been emphasized in the prescriptive literature on curriculum work. (See, for examples; Sand, 1965, and Lewis and Miel, 1972)

In retrospect, it is, perhaps, unsurprising that the subjects spent no time on initiation phase activities during the observation periods. Dramatic new policy initiatives are rare in any organization. This does not mean the subjects never participate in initiation phase activities. It does suggest, however, that such activities are not typical on an every day or every week basis. And, the finding raises questions about when and how the subjects participate in such activities.

Intelligence Phase Activities

The finding that each of the subjects spent a substantial proportion of time participating in intelligence phase activities might seem surprising in light of the finding that the subjects participated in no initiation phase activities. Given the examples of activities in this category included in Chapter IV and in the appendixes, two explanations seem reasonable.

First, many of the subjects' intelligence phase activities were undertaken in relation to initiation phase activities which occurred in advance of the periods of observation; and, some were undertaken in relation to initiatives by other actors. Subject A's
review of administrative evaluation models in response to a
previously-made assignment by the superintendent of his district
serves as an example as does Subject B's research into the costs
of instructional microcomputers which was responsive to a previous
assignment by the superintendent of his district.

Second, the phases of decision needn't necessarily be considered
in linear fashion. The impetus for the subjects to engage in
intelligence phase activities was generated in some cases by routine
and ongoing assessments of existing programs and practices. Subject
C's information-gathering activities in response to an ongoing
review of a high school auto body program is an example. Many
of the subjects' intelligence phase activities were undertaken
to inform routine decisions of fairly narrow scope.

Promotion Phase Activities

It is interesting that even though each of the subjects spent
a substantial proportion of time on intelligence phase activities,
none of the subjects spent a substantial proportion of time on
promotion phase activities. One might expect promotion phase
activities to follow initiation or intelligence phase activities
in most cases.

As the discussion in the previous section suggests, however,
activities in any one phase of the decision process are not
necessarily linked in any immediate way to activities in other
phases. For example, Subject C spent time preparing a letter to
the board of education advocating the purchase of microcomputers
for instructional use. Initiation and intelligence phase activities related to this pending decision had occurred months previously.

It was also suggested in the preceding discussion that the activities of any one actor in any particular phase of decision are not necessarily tied to the activities of that same actor in another phase of decision. Subject A, for example, spent time "selling" other staff members on the importance of applying for a grant to develop an exemplary arts program. Initiation of this idea came from actors outside the school organization.

It must also be re-emphasized that it is not always necessary or useful to consider the various phases of the decision process in linear and sequential fashion. Subject B, for example, met with his superintendent on one occasion to encourage his support for continuing a particular curricular program. The impetus for this meeting came not from initiation or intelligence phase activities but from problems being experienced in implementing this long-established program. Promotion activities were in this case preceded by application phase activities.

**Prescription Phase Activities**

The finding that each of the subjects spent very little time on prescription phase activities suggests the organizational parameters within which their decision-related activities must fall. Prescription is the phase which embodies the decision itself. The authority to prescribe for school districts, is for many purposes, vested legally in certain actors. The most conspicuous actors
with formal authority to prescribe are superintendents, members of district boards of education and members of state boards of education. The curriculum leader may play an important role in the decision processes of the school organization; but, that role is often to inform or support decisions which are finally enunciated by others. An example is the time spent by Subject A preparing a budget for his district's summer school program. His activities served to inform the decision process but the power to accept, reject or modify the budget rested clearly with the district board of education as did the authority to actually allocate resources.

The ability of the subjects to prescribe in areas where authority is not formally limited, is at times constrained by informal mechanisms operating within the organization. On one occasion, Subject C was asked by representatives of a local church to permit a member of their religious group to speak at a high school assembly. They assured Subject C that the content of the presentation would address only secular concerns related to substance abuse and provided him with an audio tape of a previous lecture. Subject C who at least ostensibly had authority within the organization to approve the request did not make a decision immediately. Instead, he forwarded the tape to another member of the superintendent's senior staff for an opinion. This happened early in the week of observation and a decision still had not been reached when the observation period ended.
Two of the subjects were, by job description, vested with "line authority" for matters related to curriculum and instruction. Each of the subjects, however, acted in a manner more consistent with that of one who holds a "staff" position. Again, it should be noted that the finding that the subjects spent little time on prescription phase activities should not be taken as evidence that they do not participate in important and effective ways in decision-making. It does, however, contribute to our understanding of the particular nature of that participation.

Invocation Phase Activities

The invocation phase of the decision process involves activities necessary to prepare others for the implementation or application of a decision. The subjects spent very little time on activities in this category. Subject B, in fact, did not participate in invocation phase activities.

Two explanations might be considered. First, it might be that the subjects simply did not consider activities in this category as important as other kinds of activity. The evidence seems to suggest otherwise. Two of the subjects did participate in invocation phase activities at appropriate times and for important reasons. A considerable number of Subject A's activities during the week of observation were related to the upcoming implementation of the district's summer school program. He took time during the week to make sure that teachers and other staff members would be prepared.
Subject C spent a considerable amount of time during the week working on tasks associated with an emerging, district-wide, curriculum program. A number of these tasks were undertaken to prepare various individuals and groups to assume responsibilities in these programs.

The second possible explanation directs attention to the nature of the contextual conditions which surround the subjects' work. The context within which they work consists mainly of pre-existing programs, policies and practices. It is likely that the finding that each of the subjects spent little or no time on invocation phase activities is due to the fact that there are few new programs, policies or practices for which others need preparation on an every day or every week basis.

This explanation is also consistent with the findings discussed in the preceding sections. Given settings which characteristically include large numbers of pre-existing programs, policies, and practices, one would expect, perhaps, to find little evidence of initiation, promotion and prescription phase activities. And one might expect to find that intelligence phase activities are often undertaken in relation to routine decisions of somewhat narrow scope. One might also expect to find considerable attention given to application phase activities and it is to a discussion of such activities that attention now turns.

Application Phase Activities

The application phase of the decision process involves implementing decisions or making sure decisions are carried out.
Activities in this category included: (1) receiving, gathering, forwarding or exchanging general information about policy compliance or program implementation; (2) checking on the status or progress of program implementation; (3) implementing or negotiating implementation of programs; (4) interpreting or disseminating existing policy statements; and, (5) checking on compliance with a particular policy or procedure.

Each of the subjects spent a substantial proportion of time participating in application phase activities. As suggested in the preceding section, this finding is one which might be expected given a work environment which consists largely of pre-existing programs, policies and practices. As the list above indicates, much of the time the subjects devoted to activities in this category was spent meeting information needs of one sort or another and monitoring program operations. As mundane as such activities might seem, they are responsive to the needs of school organizations as they exist.

Appraisal Phase Activities

The appraisal phase of the decision process involves judging the effectiveness of decisions. In school organizations, examples of appraisal phase activities might include testing to determine levels of student achievement, evaluations of particular curricular programs or groups of programs or conducting research to determine the effectiveness of a particular instructional practice. The
subjects spent very little time on such activities. Subject C, in fact, did not participate in appraisal phase activities during the week of observation.

One explanation of this finding, of course, would be that the subjects or their organizations did not see the importance of or did not choose to emphasize appraisal or evaluation activities. This explanation is not compelling given that it is well known that student testing programs are commonplace in all school districts and that even newspaper accounts attest to the fact that school districts evaluate programs and practices periodically.

A more reasonable explanation is that appraisal efforts are undertaken in an orderly manner and, as suggested above, that they are undertaken at certain and specified times. Such activities might easily be underrepresented in an examination of every day activities. The finding does raise questions, however, about when such activities occur and how the subjects participate in such activities and how the results are used. These questions are particularly important given the fact that both the prescriptive literature and the survey literature on curriculum work note the importance of evaluative aspects of the curriculum leader's job.

**Termination Phase Activities**

The termination phase of the decision process cancels a prescription; that is, it represents the point where a prescribed program, policy or practice is ended. The termination phase may
precede or follow appraisal of the program, policy or practice in question. In some cases formal appraisal is foregone altogether.

As was the case with the initiation phase, activities in this category are rare in any organization. This may be because terminations tend to be disruptive and threatening to the orderliness of organization operations. Also, established programs, policies and practices tend to develop, over time, constituencies which are pre-disposed to their continuation. The spectre of termination is, perhaps, much more commonly experienced in organizational life than termination itself. And, the spectre of termination leads sometimes (and often for the reasons suggested above) to activities in other phases of the decision process.

For example, Subject C, on one occasion received word in a senior staff meeting that the termination of a particular high school auto body program was being considered. He immediately undertook information-gathering (intelligence) activities to determine the impact this might have on curriculum division programs in general. Subject B, at one point, took notice of reduced levels of participation in a district-wide arts program he supported and interpreted this to mean the program itself was threatened. He immediately began promotional activities with the superintendent and several principals to engender support for the program and to counter the momentum toward termination.
The Utility of the Lasswellian Conceptual Framework

In Chapter II, numerous studies (O'Dempsey, 1976; Peterson, 1978; Crowson and Porter-Gehrie, 1980; Martin and Willower, 1981; Morris, et al, 1981; Pitner, 1978; Duignan, 1980; and, Larson, et al, 1981) were referenced to show that the Mintzberg method of data collection and data analysis (Mintzberg, 1973) has become the dominant method used to study the work activities of persons occupying administrative positions in school organizations. Also in Chapter II, it was determined that while the Mintzberg method has proven useful in ascertaining the "form" that administrative work takes, the categories he used to describe the "roles" assumed by administrators and the "content" of their work have proven to be problematic for most researchers. (Pitner, 1980) Particularly lacking in the Mintzberg-like studies was adequate attention to the decisional activities of school administrators.

The present study represented an attempt to build on the foundation provided by previous studies of administrative work activities and to overcome some of the shortcomings of the Mintzberg method. Mintzberg's method of data collection was accepted and used with some modification in the present study. It was decided, however, that given the purposes of the research, the method used to analyze and interpret the data should (1) take into account the participatory nature of curriculum making and (2) focus on the particular contributions that curriculum leaders make to the various decision processes in which they participate.
The Lasswellian conceptual framework, designed to guide analysis and interpretation of the observational data, proved to be well suited to these tasks. As noted earlier in this chapter, there is evidence to suggest that the Mintzberg-like studies have tended to underestimate decisional activity. The use of Lasswell's "decision phase analysis" categories (Lasswell, 1973) to analyze and interpret the data in the present study seems to have successfully addressed this problem. Because the decision phase categories directed attention to the constituent elements of decision processes, it was possible to describe the nature of each subject's participation in decision processes in relation to the range of possible types or kinds of participation. This, in turn made possible the description of the particular contributions that each made to decision processes.

Use of the Lasswellian conceptual framework also made it possible to identify some phases of the decision process in which the subjects did not participate and to identify other phases where the subjects' participation was minimal. The Mintzberg and Mintzberg-like studies of administrative work activities have begun with the question, "What does the administrator do?" While it is important to know what administrators do, it is of equal value to know what they do not do and what they do only in limited fashion. A similar idea has been expressed by Cobb and Elder (1972) in relation to agenda-building by decision-making bodies in a variety of institutions. They suggest that too much attention has been paid to items which reach the agenda, leaving important questions to be answered about
which items do not reach the agenda and why. An important value of the Lasswellian conception of the decision process is that it directs attention to what is not done as well as to what is done.

The use of the Lasswellian conceptual framework in conjunction with the "constant comparative method of qualitative analysis" (Glaser, 1969) proved to be particularly effective. Problems which otherwise might have been experienced in maintaining the discrete nature of each of the "decision phase" categories were not experienced. The constant comparison of incidents coded into the various categories led to refinements to some categories and more precise definitions. These refinements should prove useful to researchers who use Lasswell's categories in future observational studies, and they pave the way for future refinements to the categories.

In summary, the utility of the Lasswellian conceptual framework as a guide to making sense of observational data was confirmed by successful application in the present study. The study, therefore, contributes to the literature on research methodology and suggests directions for future research.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The study presented here should be considered exploratory in nature. The study should be replicated using a larger sample and longer periods of observation. Selection of subjects should take into account the types of districts they work in. While the subjects showed remarkable similarities in most areas of activity, differences noted were often between the subject working in the
larger district and the two subjects working in the similar medium-size districts. An effort should be made to ascertain the effects different types of organizational environments might have on curriculum leaders' work activities.

Also, studies should be undertaken to re-examine the work activities of principals and superintendents using the methodology employed in the present study. Previous studies have found that principals and superintendents spend little time in decisional activities, particularly decisional activities related to curriculum and instruction. The findings of the present study suggest that those studies may have underestimated decisional activity and may in some cases have misrepresented work content.

In addition, studies should be undertaken to investigate the ways various actors in the school organization participate in decision processes in relation to one another and the various phase of the decision process. The methodology employed in the present study might be readily modified for this purpose. One way to do this would be to choose a particular decision or policy and examine the particular contributions that various actors make to the decision process in terms of phase participation. Which actors participate in which phases? What is the nature of each actor's participation?

**Conclusion**

Lindblom (1959) has suggested that organizational change is, for the most part incremental. That is, changes occur in small steps. Furthermore, incremental change is functional; major value
conflicts are avoided and the potential for making major errors in decision-making is reduced. The findings of the present study suggest Lindblom's description is applicable to school organizations as well as others.

The decision-related activities of curriculum leaders seem to be conditioned by the contextual features of their work environments. And, the decision processes in which they participate are often directed toward modest changes to pre-existing programs, policies and practices. Their activities seem most often to serve the information and maintenance needs of their organizations. They might best be characterized as decision-facilitators rather than decision-makers.

The findings, however, do not diminish the importance of the curriculum leader's role in the school organization. In light of the findings of previous studies they are, perhaps, the only administrative actors in school organizations who attend directly, particularly and influentially to curriculum and instruction concerns. The fact that they often do so indirectly does not reflect negatively on their work. It does suggest the constraints within which they must work. Their work environments are considerably less dynamic and malleable than much of the prescriptive literature on curriculum work suggests.
Appendix A

Coding Form
Decision Phase and Other Categories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>C/NC</th>
<th>Ordeal</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Date
Subject
Page of PES
Appendix B

Decision Phase Analysis
Coding Guides
Initiation

Phase Description: "Focuses attention on the prime, influential persons or groups making an input into the decision process - takes into account those who have initiated some course of action or expressed some type of demand."

Educational Illustrations: The curriculum leader:

Attends a conference and learns of a new instructional method which might be used in the district's science programs.

Introduces the instructional method into the district.

Develops a process for involving teachers in district-wide curricular decisions. Teachers were previously uninvolved in district-wide curricular decisions.

Key Question: To what extent are the curriculum leader's activities characterized by initiating new actions or expressing new demands?
Intelligence

**Phase Description:** "includes the gathering, processing and dissemination of information for the use of all who participate in the decision process."

**Educational Illustrations:** The curriculum leader:

Researches alternative methods of teaching multiplication.

Consults with business representatives about features and costs of computers which can be used in classrooms.

Consults with university personnel to determine ways to improve pre-professional field experiences for college students.

Receives input from parents about unmet needs of students.

Routes information to principals and teachers.

Invites resource person for in-service training session for teachers.

**Key Question:** To what extent are the curriculum leader's activities characterized by the gathering, processing and dissemination of information for use by the self and other actors in the decision process?
Promotion

Phase Description: "Promotion usually follows the gathering of intelligence. Advocacy develops as participants in the decision process make their case relative to the decision problem or plan to those who will make (or influence) the decision, adopt the policy or the plan."

Educational Illustration: The curriculum leader:

Meets with superintendent to recommend his/her support for a new program in elementary social studies.

Prepares a position statement for the board of education citing reasons why a special program should not be cancelled.

Encourages teachers to encourage their professional association to endorse a proposal for a curricular innovation.

Key Question: To what extent are the curriculum leader's activities characterized by advocating certain decisions to others?
**Prescription**

*Phase Description:* "Prescription (is) the decision itself. The prescription is made by an individual or group that has the power and authority to enunciate a decision, adopt a policy or endorse a plan. Within a school system it could be the Board of Education, the Superintendent, a principal, or administrative cabinet."

**Educational Illustrations:** The curriculum leader:

- Denies permission for a guest speaker to address a high school assembly.
- Establishes a mandatory in-service program for elementary science teachers.
- Casts a vote on a decision in a senior staff meeting.
- Allocates funds for a staff development retreat.

**Key Question:** To what extent are the curriculum leader's decisional activities characterized by adopting certain decisions, unilaterally or with others?
Invocation

Phase Description: "The act of characterizing a concrete situation in terms of its conformity or nonconformity to prescription. This phase incorporates the work necessary to prepare for implementation or application."

Educational Illustrations: The curriculum leader:

Meets with middle school principals to explain rationale and requirements of a newly adopted testing program.

Sends notice to parents advising them of the elimination of a course of study.

Addresses a meeting of curriculum specialists to discuss how a new policy regarding reduction in force will affect them.

Key Question: To what extent are the curriculum leader's decisional activities characterized by preparing others for decision implementation?
Application

Phase Description: "Application is the implementation of the decision. If the decision were for example to adopt a middle school pattern of organization, application would refer to the installation of the new organization."

Educational Illustrations: The curriculum leader:

 Writes a letter to subordinates establishing the effective date and the procedures to be followed for a new program.

 Requests reports from building principals regarding the status of the ongoing language arts program.

 Hires a director for a new federal project in the district.

Key Question: To what extent are the curriculum leader's decisional activities characterized by implementing new decisions or making sure decisions are carried out?
Appraisal

Phase Description: "Appraisal involves judging the effectiveness of the decision. The evaluation is produced on the basis of data collected for that purpose and is shared with those who have a stake in the decision under review."

Educational Illustrations: The curriculum leader:

Participates in a formal evaluation of a district-wide, secondary mathematics program.

Reviews test scores to determine the effectiveness of an elementary reading program.

Conducts interviews with teachers to secure information necessary to judge the effectiveness of a new instructional method being employed in elementary science courses.

Prepares a self-assessment tool for use by curriculum specialists working with a special education project.

Key Question: To what extent are the curriculum leader's activities characterized by judging the effectiveness of decisions?
Termination

Phase Description: "Cancels a prescription. Termination is that point where a decision process is relatively complete. Although the process of decision implementation is complete, it does not mean that the sequence of decision phases stops. The process is ongoing and includes a final phase, appraisal."

Educational Illustrations: The curriculum leader:
Issues a phase-out directive for a program for which funding has been discontinued.

Key Question: To what extent are the curriculum leader's decisional activities characterized by overseeing or terminating implementation?
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Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Course of Study Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into
the Course of Study Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:

- reviews grant application offering funds for development of exemplary arts education programs (desk work, 16 min.)
- discusses planning for summer school program with secondary education consultant (meeting, 17 min.)
- discusses sixth grade camping program with elementary school teacher (meeting, 5 min.)
- "sells" elementary principals on the importance of applying for a grant to develop an exemplary arts education program (meeting, 5 min.)
- works on a proposal to the State Department of Education justifying changes to a reading program (desk work, 26 min.)
- receives and discusses a report from the elementary education consultant that some teachers are not complying with district policy on math instruction (meeting, 7 min.)
- meets with a teacher to discuss compliance with district policy on teaching long division (meeting, 5 min.)
- meets with the secondary education consultant and discusses ways to resolve problems with the media course of study (meeting, 40 min.)
- reviews an elementary school principal's written response to a State Department of Education evaluation of elementary programs (desk work, 4 min.)
- requests information from a university vice president regarding district graduates enrolled in remedial courses for a report on the effectiveness of the district's college preparatory programs (call, 4 min.)

Subject B:

- secures information from a speech/hearing therapist needed for development of grant application (call, 11 min.)
- gathers and assembles information necessary for development of grant application (desk work, 23 min.)
- same as last item (desk work, 4 min.)
- same as last item (desk work, 13 min.)
- same as last item (desk work, 22 min.)
- secures information from the Special Education Resource Center (SERC) necessary to development of grant application (call, 5 min.)
- recommends to the junior high school principal that a local social service agency be used in a drug education assembly rather than the local sheriff's office (call, 4 min.)
- exchanges information about learning styles project with the project coordinator (meeting, 22 min.)
- picks up posters made by children to advertise local arts festival (tour, 2 min.)
- same as last item (tour, 2 min.)

Subject C:

- reviews the history of high school auto body training program with the elementary and secondary education directors - discusses options regarding potential phase-out of program (meeting, 18 min.)
- meets with superintendent's senior staff to plan for a meeting with area clergy - discusses curriculum concerns e.g. "creationism" as covered in textbooks (meeting, 66 min.)
- meets with the superintendent and others and provides information on curricular changes to be made at high school (meeting, 75 min.)
- meets with the elementary education director to prepare her for her role in the districts overall curriculum program (meeting, 11 min.)
- meets with the committee responsible for developing a K-12 social studies program (meeting, 51 min.)
- reviews materials for a curriculum council meeting (desk work, 19 min.)
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Listing of All Activities Coded Into the In-Service Education for Teachers Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into the
In-Service Education for Teachers Category

Subject A:
- secures information on State Department of Education media
course of study requirements to prepare media specialists
for in-service workshop (call, 2 min.)

Subject B:
- meets with an in-service workshop speaker prior to workshop
  (meeting, 86 min.)
- drives the workshop speaker to airport and discusses continuing
efforts to develop in-service education related to learning
styles (travel meeting, 180 min.)
- meets with the learning styles project coordinator to plan
  in-service workshops (meeting, 33 min.)
- meets with the in-service workshop speaker (meeting, 26 min.)
- works on plans for an in-service workshop (desk work, 21 min.)
- attends an in-service education workshop (meeting, 163 min.)
- same as last item, 2nd workshop (meeting, 159 min.)

Subject C:
- delivers the keynote address to curriculum-specialists and
teachers attending a curriculum planning in-service workshop
  (meeting, 15 min.)
- attends workshop session (meeting, 126 min.)
Appendix E

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Instructional Budgets Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Instructional Budgets Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:
- works on developing a budget for the summer school program (desk work, 17 min.)
- same as last item (desk work, 2 min.)

Subject B:
- approves elementary school materials purchase (call, 3 min.)
- processes a purchase requisition for workshop stipends (desk work, 6 min.)
- discusses a materials billing with supplier (call, 4 min.)
- answers a routine inquiry from a supplier regarding program funding (call, 2 min.)

Subject C:
- works on a draft of a letter to the board of education advocating purchase of microcomputers for classroom use (meeting, 58 min.)
Appendix F

Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Grading and Retention Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Grading and Retention Category

Subject A:

- secures information from an elementary school principal necessary to a decision about how to treat credit from summer school attendance for children who have failed grade (call, 6 min.)

- same as last item with the elementary consultant (meeting, 6 min.)

- same as last item with a middle school principal (call, 7 min.)

- same as last item with 2nd elementary principal (call, 1 min.)

- same as last item with the secondary consultant (meeting, 12 min.)

Subject B:

- chairs a meeting of kindergarten teachers working on revisions to pupil progress reports (meeting, 69 min.)

- chairs a meeting of a committee working on revisions to elementary grades pupil progress reports (meeting, 168 min.)

- solicits opinions from elementary principals regarding revisions to pupil progress reports (meeting, 7 min.)

- works on a mock-up of an elementary pupil progress report for use by committee (desk work, 21 min.)

Subject C:

- reports to the superintendent and the senior staff on an inquiry regarding a student who was denied graduation (meeting, 20 min.)

- recommends to the superintendent and the senior staff that the student's request to graduate be denied (meeting, 20 min.)

- prepares a final draft of a letter to the student and parents denying the request to graduate (desk work, 19 min.)
Appendix G

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into
the Instructional Staffing Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into
the Instructional Staffing Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:

- discusses a problem involving a foreign language student teacher
  with the student's faculty adviser (call, 12 min.)

- issues a memo to building principals prescribing staffing changes
  for media specialists (desk work, 8 min.)

- works on a newsletter announcement soliciting teachers for
  summer school positions (desk work, 2 min.)

- same as last item (desk work, 1 min.)

- calls an elementary principal to prepare him for changes in media
  specialists' assignments (call, 1 min.)

- checks on the status of an ill teacher to determine if a substitute
  is needed (call, 6 min.)

- receives a verbal report from an administrative secretary on
  substitute teachers replacing regular teachers (meeting, 2 min.)

- checks on the names of university interns placed with district
  teachers (desk work, 2 min.)

- accepts an application from a teacher applying for a summer school
  position (call, 1 min.)

- same as last item (call, 1 min.)

- arranges student intern placements with elementary school
  principal (call, 1 min.)

Subject B:

- meets with the superintendent and discusses problems associated
  with scheduling school visits of speech/hearing therapists
  (meeting, 23 min.)

- calls the director of the rehabilitation center to ask about the
  instructional implications of various methods of scheduling school
  visits of speech/hearing therapists (call, 7 min.)

- gives the information he has gathered about scheduling the school
  visits of speech/hearing therapists to superintendent (meeting, 3 min.)

Subject C: No Activities This Category
Appendix H

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Pupil Screening and Enrollment Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Pupil Screening and Enrollment Category

Subject A:

- observes the district's kindergarten pre-screening program in progress (tour, 15 min.)
- same as last item (tour, 5 min.)
- exchanges information with the elementary education consultant about a rumor suggesting teacher non-compliance with district kindergarten enrollment policy (meeting, 9 min.)
- same as last item with the superintendent (meeting, 1 min.)

Subject B: No Activities This Category

Subject C: No Activities This Category
Appendix I

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into
the Personnel Functions Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Personnel Functions Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:

- reviews administrative evaluation forms secured from other districts - research assigned by superintendent (desk work, 21 min.)

- same as last item (desk work, ¼ min.)

- same as last item (desk work, 16 min.)

- meets with the secondary education consultant and discusses State Department of Education requirements governing first and trained teachers in schools (meeting, 5 min.)

- asks a substitute teacher to sign a form acknowledging her contract will not be renewed (meeting, 1 min.)

- same as last item (meeting, 2 min.)

- same as last item (meeting, 3 min.)

- discusses personnel scheduling problems with the director of pupil services (meeting, 2 min.)

Subject B:

- as chair of the high school principal search committee, forwards the committee's recommendation to the superintendent (meeting, 7 min.)

Subject C: No Activities This Category
Appendix J

Listing of All Activities Coded Into the In-Service Education for Administrators Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into the
In-Service Education for Administrators Category

Subject A: No Activities This Category

Subject B:
- receives information from high school teacher about how to
develop a first aid/CPR training program for teachers (meeting,
6 min.)
- meets with county office in-service coordinator to discuss
announcements of an in-service workshop for principals (meeting,
9 min.)

Subject C:
- meets with a State Department of Education consultant to get
information about an upcoming "principals academy" (meeting,
26 min.)
- meets with the district in-service director to discuss ways to
prepare principals for participation in a summer leadership
seminar (meeting, 12 min.)
- meets with the district's senior staff and asks them to support
the summer leadership seminar (meeting, 10 min.)
- meets with university representatives to enlist participation
in summer leadership institute - arranges for service delivery
(meeting, 80 min.)
Appendix K

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the General District Administration Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into
the General District Administration Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:

- calls the special education director and provides information on a special needs pupil who will be entering kindergarten (call, 4 min.)

- in response to an inquiry from a teacher, interprets district policy on supporting indigent children at camp (call, 5 min.)

Subject B: No Activities This Category

Subject C:

- attends a meeting of junior high school principals and receives information on noncurricular concerns e.g. discipline, attendance policies etc. (meeting, 1 hr 2 min.)

- attends a senior staff meeting and receives information on non-curricular concerns e.g. community complaints, reductions in force, a recent audit etc. (meeting, 15 min.)
Appendix L

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into
the Intelligence Phase Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Intelligence Phase Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:

- secures information from a State Department of Education consultant regarding acceptability of new study skills course being developed - (call, 9 min.) - pre-decision to adopt course

- informs university administration of problem with student teacher and receives information about who to discuss problem with - (call, 8 min.) - pre-decision to terminate student teacher

- secures information from middle school principal for use in revising policy on art electives - (call, 2 min.) pre-decision to adopt new policy

- reviews grant application guidelines in advance of proposal development (desk work, 16 min.) pre-proposal

- secures information from subordinate necessary to establish criteria for employment of summer school teachers (meeting, 17 min.) pre-decision to adopt criteria

- meets with subordinate to discuss general planning of summer school program (meeting) pre-decision on program

- works on developing budget for summer school program (desk work, 17 min.) pre-decision by board

- same as last item

- exchanges information with teacher and teachers' union representative regarding state budget issues - (informal conversation, 7 min.)
general information gathering not related to program implementation

- secures information on child with tracheotomy problem which might affect kindergarten participation (meeting, 1 min.) pre-decision on placement

- reviews administrative evaluation forms secured from other districts - research assigned by superintendent (desk work, 21 min.) pre-decision on new district policy

- gives superintendent and update on progress of the review above (meeting, 4 min.) pre-decision on new district policy
- continues review of administration evaluation forms (desk work, 16 min.) pre-decision on new district policy

- secures information from subordinate regarding State Department of Education requirements governing first aid trained personnel in buildings (meeting, 5 min.) pre-decision to continue training

- secures information from elementary school principal necessary to decision about how to treat credit for summer school attendance for children who have failed grade (call, 6 min.) pre-decision on policy

- same as last item with elementary and secondary consultants (meeting, 12 min.) pre-decision on policy

Subject B:

- exchanges information with superintendent regarding budget estimates on instructional microcomputers (meeting, 23 min.) pre-decision to purchase

- gives superintendent information he has gathered about instructional implications of various methods of scheduling school visits of speech hearing therapists (meeting, 8 min.) pre-decision to alter schedules

- receives information from teacher regarding development of first aid/CPR program for teachers (meeting, 6 min.) pre-decision to adopt program

- secures information from speech/hearing therapist needed for development of grant application (call, 11 min.) pre-proposal

- gathers and assembles information necessary for development of grant application (desk work, 23 min.) pre-proposal

- same as last item (desk work, 4 min.) pre-proposal

- same as last item (desk work, 13 min.) pre-proposal

- same as last item (desk work, 22 min.) pre-proposal

- secures information from Special Education Resource Center (SERC) necessary to development of grant application (call, 5 min.) pre-proposal

- informs elementary principals of problems in developing new progress report cards and requests suggestions (meeting, 7 min.) pre-decision to adopt new reports
- meets with coordinators of talented and gifted programs from neighboring districts to exchange ideas on program development (meeting, 67 min.) general information gathering not related to program implementation

Subject C:

- reviews history of high school auto body training program with elementary and secondary education directors - discusses options regarding potential phase-out of program (meeting, 18 min.) pre-decision to continue program

- meets with teachers and principals developing a set of curriculum plans for their buildings - provides information based on meetings with central office curriculum committees - gathers information to take back to those committees (meeting, 93 min.) pre-decision to adopt plans

- secures opinion from superintendent's assistant regarding content of a proposed high school assembly presentation (meeting, 2 min.) pre-decision to permit assembly

- receives information from director of library/media services regarding parochial schools participation in Title I grant application process (meeting, 4 min.) pre-proposal
Appendix M

Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Promotion Phase Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into
the Promotion Phase Category

Subject A:
- "sells" the secondary education director on the importance of
  applying for a grant to develop an exemplary arts program
  for the district (3 meetings, 10 min.)
- same as item above with elementary education consultant
  (meeting, 5 min.)
- same as item above with two elementary school principals
  (meeting, 5 min.)
- meets with superintendent and advocates changing a personnel
  policy which he believes negatively affects teachers (meeting,
  3 min.)
- same as item above with an elementary school principal
  (meeting, 5 min.)
- works on a proposal to the state department of education
  justifying changes to a reading program (1 desk work sessions,
  51 min.)
- meets with the superintendent and advocates changing a board
  policy which limits substitute teachers' contracts to 180 days
  (meeting, 2 min.)
- meets with secondary education consultant and advocates changes
  to high school reading programs (meeting, 10 min.)
- calls officer of a professional organization and "sells" a
  pending proposal which will be voted on the organization
  (call, 10 min.)

Subject B:
- meets with superintendent and encourages support for continuing
  a district arts program (meeting, 6 min.)
- same as item above with school principals (meeting, 10 min.)
- meets with superintendent and advocates discontinuing a
  contractual relationship with a neighboring school district
  (meeting, 4 min.)
- meets with superintendent and encourages him not to move the junior high school principal to a position at the high school (meeting, 4 min.)

- as chair of the high school principal search committee forwards the committee's recommendation to the superintendent (meeting, 7 min.)

- recommends to the junior high school principal that a local social service agency be used in a drug education assembly rather than the local sheriff's office (call, 4 min.)

Subject C:

- arranges for a writing team to work on a letter to the board of education advocating purchase of microcomputers for classroom use (meeting, 8 min.)

- works with the writing team to draft the letter (meeting, 58 min.)

- writes the final draft of the letter advocating the purchase of microcomputers (desk work, 43 min.)

- works with a building curriculum committee to develop a plan which can be "sold" to the central office curriculum council (meeting, 31 min.)

- recommends to the superintendent that a students request to graduate be denied (meeting, 20 min.)
Appendix N

Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Prescription Phase Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into
the Prescription Phase Category

Subject A:
- issues a memo to building principals prescribing staffing changes for media specialists (desk work, 8 min.)
- discusses with the university faculty adviser a problem with a foreign language student teacher - they agree to remove the student teacher (call, 12 min.)

Subject B:
- denies a request from the junior high school principal to send accelerated math students to the high school for coursework (call, 4 min.)

Subject C:
- works with other senior staff members to develop procedures for informing the board of education of major equipment purchases - by agreement the existing procedures is changed (meeting 64 min.)
- prepares final draft of a letter denying a student's request to graduate - joint decision reached with a superintendent (desk work, 19 min.)
Appendix O

Listing of All Activities Coded Into
the Invocation Phase Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Invocation Phase Category

Subject A:

- works on making and correcting announcements to teachers informing them about summer school programs and position openings - to be communicated by newsletter and through principals (8 desk work sessions and calls, 11 min.)

- calls elementary principals to prepare them for changes in the assignments of media specialists working in their buildings (2 calls, 6 min.)

- meets with middle school teacher who will direct summer school programs - prepares him for implementation (meeting, 21 min.)

- prepares notes for talk at meeting of teachers regarding summer school programs and positions (desk work, 63 min.)

Subject B: No Activities This Phase

Subject C:

- meets with the director of in-service education to discuss ways to prepare principals for a summer leadership seminar (meeting, 12 min.)

- meets with the district's senior staff and asks them to support the summer leadership seminar (meeting, 10 min.)

- meets with the elementary education director to prepare her for her role in the district's overall curriculum program (meeting, 11 min.)

- meets with junior high school principals and provides them with information on the role of the principal in an emerging district-wide curriculum program (meeting, 20 min.)

- makes a presentation to the local teachers' association officers informing them of the teacher's role in an emerging district-wide curriculum program (meeting, 15 min.)
Appendix P

Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Application Phase Category
Representative Listing of Activities Coded Into the Application Phase Category

Every Fourth Activity

Subject A:

- receives verbal report from administrative secretary on substitute teachers replacing regular teachers this day (meeting, 1 min.) checking on program implementation

- reviews with elementary consultant several ongoing district programs - e.g. kindergarten pre-screening, the young authors conference and the media course of study (meeting, 11 min.) exchanging information on program implementation

- secures information from the superintendent's secretary regarding existing substitute teacher contract non-renewal policy (meeting, 1 min.) gathering information about policy implementation

- asks substitute teacher to sign form acknowledging contract will not be renewed (meeting, 2 min.) implementing district policy

- same as last item (meeting, 3 min.) implementing district policy

- interprets district policy on maternity leave in response to question from special programs director (meeting, 27 min.) interpreting policy statements

- exchanges information with superintendent about problem with teacher on leave (meeting, 1 min.) exchanging information about policy implementation

- observes the district's kindergarten pre-screening program in progress (tour, 15 min.) checks on program implementation

- same as last item (tour, 5 min.) checks on program implementation

- meets with teacher to discuss compliance with district policy on teaching long division (meeting, 2 min.) checks on compliance with district policy

- discusses with the secondary consultant the problem of teacher compliance with district policy on teaching long division (meeting, 17 min.) gives information on policy compliance
- exchanges information with elementary principals about rumor suggesting teacher non-compliance with district kindergarten enrollment policy (meeting, 7 min.) exchanges information about compliance with district policy

- same as last item with day care center director (call, 5 min.) exchanges information about compliance with district policy

- accepts teacher's application for employment by summer school program (call, 1 min.) program implementation

- same as last item (call, 1 min.) program implementation

- arranges with elementary school the placement of ten university observation students in school classrooms (call, 7 min.) program implementation

- confirms university student placements with university personnel (call, 1 min.) program implementation

Subject B:

- discusses routine contract billing with business manager (meeting, 1 min.) program implementation

- same as last item (meeting, 2 min.) program implementation

- discusses computerized budget with payroll clerk (meeting, 1 min.) program implementation

- same as last item (meeting, 1 min.) program implementation

- meets with director of rehabilitative services agency to discuss agency programs (meeting, 18 min.) receives information about program implementation

- reports to principals on progress of the district's learning styles project (meeting, 10 min.) gives information about program implementation

- picks up posters made by children to advertise local arts festival (tour, 4 min.) program implementation

- same as last item (tour, 2 min.) program implementation

- attends in-service education workshop for teachers sponsored by the district's learning styles project (meeting, 163 min.) checks on program implementation
Subject C:

- Meets with university representatives to enlist participation in summer leadership institute - arranges for service delivery (meeting, 80 min.) program implementation.

- Attends meeting of junior high school principals and receives information about problems in implementing curriculum program (meeting, 20 min.) receiving information about program implementation.

- Meets with elementary education director to share information received in meeting with teachers union representatives - discusses program implementation problems (meeting, 4 min.) gives information on program implementation.

- Prepares information to be shared with curriculum council members at next meeting (desk work, 38 min.) gives information on program implementation.
Appendix Q

Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Appraisal Phase Category
Listing of All Activities Coded Into the Appraisal Phase Category

Subject A:

- works on the district's formal response to a State Department of Education evaluation of the district's elementary education program (desk work sessions and calls, 29 min.)

- reads evaluations of substitute teacher performance (2 desk work sessions, 19 min.)

- requests information from university vice-president regarding district graduates enrolled in remedial courses for report of effectiveness of the district's college preparatory programs (call, 4 min.)

Subject B:

- plans for participation in a State Department of Education on-site visit to evaluate the district's funded drop-out prevention program (call, 3 min.)

- participates in State Department of Education evaluation of the drop-out prevention program (meeting, 79 min.)

Subject C: No Activities This Phase
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