Educational Considerations

Volume 20 | Number 1 Article 4

9-1-1992

Administrators' Perceptions of School-Based Management

Stephen L. Jacobson

Beth E. Woodworth

Recommended Citation

Jacobson, Stephen L. and Woodworth, Beth E. (1992) "Administrators' Perceptions of School-Based Management," *Educational Considerations*: Vol. 20: No. 1. https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.1486

The findings of this study suggest that the compatibility between the vision and reality of SBM in small rural districts make these sites ideal candidates for further analysis of the dynamics of increased school site autonomy. As our nation's larger districts begin experimenting with decentralization, the experiences of these smaller districts may help to inform their decisions and expectations.

Administrators' Perceptions of School-Based Management

Stephen L. Jacobson and Beth E. Woodworth

Introduction

Over the past few years there has emerged a growing body of literature that challenges long-held beliefs about optimal size for units of organizational governance. For example, Peters and Waterman (1982) found that in the private sector unusually effective corporations were more commonly characterized by chunking (i.e., breaking into smaller, more manageable units) than their less successful competitors. Similarly, research on public education over the past decade has serious questions about the long-held assumption that "bigger is better" when it comes to school-size units of governance (Coleman, l986; Goodlad, 1984; Haller & Monk, 1988; Lamitie, 1989; Walberg & FG 1987). Advantages previously thought attainable only through economies of scale (Conant, 1959) are now believed achievable, and even outweighed by the academic and social benefits of smaller, more manageable educational units (Walberg, 1989). As Coleman (1986 observed, "It seems likely that relatively low unit sizes make it easier to create and sustain a positive district ethos."

An emergent "small is beautiful" orientation coincides with and may have helped to promote, important changes in the governance structures of many school districts across the U.S. Under the "school-based management" (SBM), some of the largest school districts in the U.S. have begun experimenting with decentralization through increased school site autonomy. The Chicago City School District, for example, has shifted considerable authority from its central bureaucracy to local school councils in each of its nearly 600 public New York City; on the other hand, participation in SBM is selective, and in 1990, while 400 of the district's 1,021 elected to apply, only 80 (8%) were finally selected for local decisionmaking (Cooper, 1990).

In contrast to these very large, multi-site, urban school districts, small rural districts are more often comprised of but one or two geographically isolated schools. Perhaps not surprisingly, Clune & White (1988: 11) found that SBM is, "more common in smaller districts, and larger districts seem to confront more obstacles to decentralization". Indeed, it seems reasonable to suggest that in many small districts SBM may simply be a reality of practice rather than a carefully considered policy. So, while SBM may be relatively new for many urban and suburban districts, there are some who believe that, "School based decision-making is what rural schools are all about" (Swanson & Jacobson, 1989: 42).

The purpose of this paper is to report the perceptions of administrators in small rural districts about SBM, and compare them with the perceptions of administrators in larger, non-rural districts. The study is based on the assumption that administrators in small rural settings are more likely than their counterparts in larger, non-rural districts to have first-hand experience with site autonomy, whether or not their district is formally, engaged in SBM. To test this, we compared administrators perceptions of what *should* occur in terms of SBM with what they perceive *does* occur if their district is presently engaged in SBM. If our assumption holds, we would expect to find less difference between the SHOULD—DOES perceptions of administrators in small rural districts than of administrators in larger non-rural districts. Furthermore, if administrators in small rural districts are more experienced with site autonomy, then their observations should be helpful in informing the decisions of administrators in other sites contemplating or engaged in implementing SBM.

Structural Compatibility and Organizational Stability

Cooper (1990) has suggested that a shift from central management to school-site control in American public education represents a new organizational paradigm in the making. Furthermore, he argues that such a shift can be expected to bring with it potentially troublesome periods of transition, as participants in the process realign their respective role-relationships. Specifically, Cooper examines the relationship between the organizational structure of school district administrative control and that of the teachers' union with which it negotiates. He postulates a 2 X 2 matrix from which four union/district relationships can be derived:

(A) centralized/centralized,
(B) centralized/decentralized,
(C) decentralized/centralized, and
(D) decentralized/decentralized.

Cooper suggests that when the organizational structures are compatible, as in A and D, there is stability, whereas the incompatible relationships depicted by B and C are unstable, transitional states that emerge as schools move from centralized, hierarchical decision making to decentralized, shared local decision making.

Cooper's model is helpful in attempting to anticipate administrator responses. Small rural districts, particularly those that have but one or two sites, can be perceived as existing in both quadrants A and D. That is, these small districts can, on the one hand, be seen as highly decentralized across organizational structures since decision making of both administration and the union, by necessity, is reduced to the school site. Yet, at the same time, though these "smaller, less bureaucratic systems ha(ve) more unions, with less routinization of procedures, small rural districts may still retain a hierarchical, "rule-centered structure", characteristic of highly centralized decision making, because "all unions strive to standardize operat-

Stephen L. Jacobson and Beth E. Woodworth, Department of Educational Organization, Administration and Policy, Graduate School of Education, State University of New York at Buffalo

ing procedures" (Cooper, p.12). In other words, though their size may suggest decentralized organizational structures, small rural districts may in fact be operating in just as highly centralized a fashion as their larger suburban and urban counterparts, although on a reduced scale.

Whether they are considered functionally decentralized or centralized, Cooper's model suggests that the organization of these small rural districts is likely to be perceived as highly compatible and relatively stable. Larger, non-rural districts, other hand, particularly those desirous of chunking into smaller units of governance, would more likely be perceived as structurally incompatible and organizationally unstable.

Comparing the perceptions of school administrators from rural districts with those of administrators in larger, districts should provide insight as to whether this argument holds. Although our questions do not address perceptions of structural compatibility and organizational stability directly, as noted earlier, we use the SHOULD— DOES perceptions of administrators as proxies for these variables. Specifically, we expect to find less difference between the SHOULD—DOES perceptions of administrators in smaller districts given that they function within organizations that are predicted to be more compatible and stable. Furthermore, these predicted stable, compatible relationships between school administrations and teachers' unions should make labor relations appear to be less of an obstacle to shared decision making for administrators in small rural districts than in larger, non-rural districts.

Study Design

In order to examine the perceptions of rural and non-rural school administrators about SBM, responses originally collected for the 1989 *Executive Educator* (Heller, et al., 1989) nationwide survey of school were reanalyzed. This third annual survey reported demographic and perceptual data from school administrators across the U.S. The survey itself was an 81 item questionnaire mailed to a stratified random sample of 4,800 administrators drawn from a population of more than 110,000 by an independent education data-base firm. There was a 31.4% return rate, yielding responses from 1,509 administrators representing every state with the exception of Hawaii. In our secondary analysis of the data we categorized respondents on the basis of district size and demographics, producing two groups: (1) 195 administrators from small rural districts with enrollment less than 1000; and, (2) 913 administrators from non-rural districts with enrollment greater than 1000[1] In all, 49 states are represented in this sample.

For this study, we focused on five key questions asked administrators in the original survey:

(1) Who *should* participate in SBM?
(2) Who, presently, *does* participate in decision-making?
(3) What areas *should* a school have authority over?
(4) What areas *does* your school have authority over?
(5) What are the most serious obstacles to SBM?

Only those administrators who indicated that their districts currently have SBM in effect were asked to respond to questions #2 and #4. For these two questions the number of respondents was reduced to 85, or 43.6% of the sample from small rural districts, and 534 or 58.5% of the sample from the larger, non rural districts.

For the first two questions, i.e., who SHOULD and DOES participate in SBM?, respondents were asked to check either 'yes' or 'no' to each of the following individuals or groups: (1) principals, (2) teachers, (3) parents, (4) students, (5) community members, (6) the school board, and (7) the superintendent. For questions three and four, i.e., what SHOULD and DOES your school have authority over?, respondents were asked to say yes or no to each of the following 13 areas: budgeting, hiring, staffing, curriculum, textbook selection, purchasing, scheduling, length of the school day, school calendar, starting salary, pay raises, maintenance, and teacher evaluation. Finally, question five asked respondents to identify the most serious obstacle to SBM from among: (1) labor contracts, (2) state law, (3) board policies, (4) accreditation, or (5) other. Respondents who selected "other" were then asked to identify the obstacle.

Responses of the administrators from the small rural districts were then examined and compared to those of their counterparts from larger, non-rural districts using the chi-square test for differences in probabilities. In essence, each question became a 2 x 2 contingency table with the administrator sample groups on one axis and their yes responses on the other[2] For example, the question whether teachers should participate in SBM would be summarized in the following 2 x 2 table:

	Yes	No
Rural<1000	N (%)	N (%)
Nonrural>1000	N (%)	N (%)

Figure 1. 2 x 2 Contingency Table

Next we used the McNemar test for significance of changes to examine within-group differences in the SHOULD—DOES categories. In this case, the resulting 2 x 2 contingency tables summarize each administrator sample group's paired responses to the two questions. For example, the response of administrators in small rural districts to the paired questions of whether teachers should and do participate in SBM would be summarized in the following 2 x 2 contingency table:

Rural<1000	
N Should/Does	N Should/Does not
N Should not/Does	N Should not/Does not

Figure 2. McNemar Contingency Table

The test statistic for the McNemar test was then used to determine the probabilities of the cells that indicate disagreement, i.e., Should/Does not, and Should not/Does. As noted earlier, we expected to find less disagreement between the SHOULD—DOES perceptions of administrators in larger non-rural districts.

https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations/vol20/iss1/4
DOI: 10.4148/0146-9282.1486

Findings

(1) Who *should* participate in SBM?

Table 1A reports the percentage of respondents from each administrator grouping who believe the following individuals or groups should participate in SBM: principals, teachers, parents, students, community members, the school board, and the superintendent. From high to low in order of frequency, administrators in small rural districts selected principals (99.5%), teachers (93.8%), the superintendent (81.4%), the school board (69.6%), parents (68.0%), students (53.1%), and the community (52.6%), as participants in SBM.

Administrators from larger, non-rural districts also named principals (99.1%) and teachers (98.0%) most often, although these administrators selected teachers significantly more often ($p < .01$) than their rural counterparts. After these first two choices, a number of interesting differences appear in the frequency of selections between these two groups of administrators. For example, 82.5% of the non-rural administrators thought parents should be participants in SBM, which is significantly more than the rural administrators ($p < .01$). Furthermore, only 49.1% of non-rural administrators named the school board, significantly less than their rural counterparts ($p < .01$), making this the lowest rated category and the only one across both groups that received less than a majority.

Finally, although the superintendent was selected by two-thirds of the non-rural administrators (66.6%), this was significantly less than the support the position received from rural administrators. Indeed, 15.9% fewer non-rural administrators named the superintendent than parents, while 13.4% more rural administrators named the superintendent than parents.

(2) Who *does* participate in decision-making?

Table 1B reports administrator perceptions of who does participate in decision making in those districts where SBM is currently in effect. We find that the rank–order of the participants for administrators from both groups is identical. From high to low by order of frequency (with rurals reported first in each pair), administrators identified principals (98.8%, 98.3%), teachers (90.6%, 83.3%), the superintendent (84.7%, 71.0%), the school board (68.2%, 45.3%), parents (36.5%, 40.4%), students (32.9%, 26.0%), and finally, the community (27.1%, 23.4%) as participants in SBM decision making. The only differences of note were that both the superintendent and the school board were selected significantly more often ($p < .01$) by the rural administrators.

When we compare the SHOULD—DOES perceptions of administrators from small rural districts we find that the rank–order of the participants is identical. In other words, for these administrators, participation in SBM is pretty much what they believe it should be, although there is some disagreement over the participation of parents, students, and community (see Table 1C). In each of these categories, a significantly greater percentage of rural administrators felt that these three groups of individuals should participate in decision making than is presently the case ($p < .01$). While not statistically significant, it is interesting that a greater percentage of rural administrators note superintendent involvement in decision making than they believe should be the case.

In contrast, the SHOULD—DOES perceptions of the non-rural administrators reveal significant differences in every category except the principal and the school board. Like their rural counterparts, a significantly greater percentage of these administrators felt that parents, students, and the community should participate in decision making than is presently the case ($p < .01$). In addition, a significantly greater percentage would like to see teachers participate in SBM ($p < .01$). Non-rural administrators also perceive significantly more superintendent involvement in decision making than they believe there should be ($p < .01$).

(3) What areas *should* a school have authority over?

Table 2A reports the percentage of administrators who believe a school should have authority over each of 13 areas. From high to low in order of frequency, administrators in small rural districts selected schedule (92.1%), purchases (78.0%), texts (74.9%), curriculum (73.8%), staffing (72.8%), budgeting (69.1%), maintenance (66.5%), hiring (59.2%), evaluations (47.1%), school calendar (26.7%), length of day (26.2%), pay raises (17.3%), and starting salary (14.7%).

Administrators from larger, non-rural districts also named schedule (94.6%) and purchases (85.6%) most often, although these administrators selected purchases significantly more often than their rural counterparts ($p < .01$). Other areas non-rural administrators named significantly more often were budgeting (84.4%, $p < .01$) and staffing (80.6%, $p < .05$). Areas non-rural administrators named significantly less often ($p < .01$) were curriculum (55.6%), texts (54.0%), length of day (10.9%), calendar (9.3%), starting salary (3.9%), and teacher evaluations (33.8%) .

(4) What areas *does* your school have authority over?

Table 2B reports the percentage of administrators who believe their schools already have authority over each of the 13 areas. From high to low, administrators in small rural districts selected schedule (91.7%), purchases (84.5%), texts (84.5%), curriculum (78.6%), staffing (72.6%), maintenance (66.7%), budgeting (63.1%), hiring (44.0%), evaluations (42.9%), school calendar (29.8%), length of day (26.2%), pay raises (22.6%), and starting salary (21.4%). Administrators from larger, non-rural districts also named schedule (90.4%) and purchases (84.1%) most often, and the response frequency of the two groups was not significantly different. The only other reasons that were not significantly different from those of rural administrators were responses to hiring (35.8%) and staffing (61.8%). Budgeting (75.8%) was named significantly more often ($p < .05$) by non-rural administrators, while curriculum (44.4%), texts (44.6%), length of day (4.0%), calendar (5.9%), starting salary (0.9%), pay raises (2.1%), maintenance (49.6%), and teacher evaluations (16.7%) were named significantly less often ($p < .01$).

Perhaps the most interesting findings come from the within-group comparisons reported in Table 2C. For the administrators from small rural districts, the only significant differences that exist between what they perceive schools should have authority over and what their schools do have authority for occurs in the areas of hiring ($p<.01$) and length of day ($p < .05$). When it comes to hiring, a significantly greater percentage of these administrators feel that their school should have more authority over this area than is presently the case. The second area, length of day, requires some further explanation since the percentage of respondents reported for the separate categories of SHOULD and DOES are identical. The results of the McNemar test indicate that even though these percentages are identical, a significantly greater number of rural administrators feel that their school *should* have control over the length of the school day but *does not*, than those who believe that their school *should not* have control over the length of the school day but *does*.

Another interesting, though not statistically significant finding from the rural respondents is that there are several areas which these administrators believe their schools have more authority than they should have. Specifically, these areas are curriculum, texts, purchases, calendar, starting salary, and raises.

In contrast, the responses of administrators from the larger, no rural districts revealed significant differences between the SHOULD—DOES categories across all 13 areas ($p < .01$). Furthermore, these differences were all in the same direction, i.e., they believe that school-sites should have more decision making authority than they presently do.

(5) What are the most serious obstacles to SBM?

Figure 3A reports the percentage of rural administrators who perceive each of the five categories as obstacles to SBM, and includes a description of those obstacles identified as 'Other.' From high to low, administrators in small rural districts identified labor contracts (30.2%), school board policies (21.9%), state law (20.1%), Other (18.9%), and accreditation standards (8.9%). Within the 'Other' category, the most frequently identified obstacle was resistance to change, followed by lack of resources and accountability.

Figure 3B reports the responses of the non-rural administrators. For these administrators, labor contracts (44.2%) and school board policies (20.6%) are also most frequently seen as obstacles to SBM, while Other (16.4%) and state law (14.3%) reverse positions when compared to their rural counterparts. Accreditation standards (4.7%) remains the least frequently mentioned obstacle across groups. within the 'Other' category, the most frequently identified obstacles were again resistance to change and lack of resources. Additionally, in rough order, these administrators named the desire for standardization, and difficulties with politics, accountability, communications, lack of trust, and apathy.

Summary and Conclusions

The findings of this study indicate that marked differences exist in the perceptions of administrators from small rural districts and those of administrators from larger, non-rural districts when they are queried about what SBM should be. Administrators from these districts differ both in who they believe should participate in SBM and what areas *should be* governed at the school site. Yet, in those districts where SBM has been implemented, there appears to be far less discrepancy between the perceptions of administrators from the two groups. In other words, the findings suggest that (1) the reality of SBM is more consistent across districts than administrators' expectations of what it should be, and (2) that there is far greater compatibility in the perceptions of administrators from small rural districts than those of administrators from larger, non-rural districts between what SBM should be and what SBM is.

Thus, while rural administrators believe there should be greater participation by parents, students and community members in SBM than exists at present, when compared to the participation of principals, teachers, the superintendent, and the school board, the relative involvement of these three constituencies appear to be pretty much as rural administrators perceive they should be, as noted by the fact that the rank orders are the same across the SHOULD and DOES categories. In contrast, administrators from larger, non-rural districts idealize a far greater level of participation for teachers, parents, students, and the community than the reality of SBM appears to allow. Furthermore, for these administrators, the superintendent appears to be a participant in SBM significantly more often than they would prefer.

Arguably, administrators across most districts perceive SBM as an organizational approach that should have as broad a base of participation as possible. In the larger, non-rural districts this seems to become idealized to an extent that may simply be incompatible with the reality of SBM. Note, for example, that while administrators in the two groups desire and perceive principals and teachers as being SBM's key players, non-rural administrators are next most desirous of parental involvement, while rural administrators rank both the superintendent and school board ahead of parents. Yet, in the light of practice, both groups more often report superintendent and school board participation in SBM than parental. We speculate that because of district size, parents and community members in small rural districts have greater access to the superintendent and school board. As a result, they can participate in decision making indirectly, thereby making their involvement less formal. Whether or not SBM has been officially adopted as district policy, rural administrators appear to recognize the indirect participation of parents and the community as a reality of their workplace.

The obverse would suggest that because of district size, parents and community members in larger, non-rural districts typically have less access to their superintendent and school board. Therefore, in order to participate in decision making, administrators from these districts believe that the involvement of parents and community members should be formalized. But once SBM is instituted, and authority decentralized, traditional decision makers such as the superintendent and school board become more accessible. And, as in the small rural districts, parents and community members can participate in decision making informally. This finding is consistent with Clune and White's (1988: 28) observation about SBM that, "decision-making authority is not necessarily redirected within the school, but instead is simply given to people who have traditionally been in charge.

As noted previously, administrators from the two groupings also differed in terms of the areas they believe should be governed at the school site, as well as those areas they perceive are governed when SBM has been implemented. Moreover, our findings revealed far greater compatibility in the perceptions of administrators from small rural districts about what SHOULD occur in SBM and what DOES occur, than for the perceptions of administrators in larger, non-rural districts. Recall that this study was based on the assumption that, due to district size, administrators in small rural settings are more likely to have first-hand experience with site autonomy, whether or not they were formally engaged in SBM. The findings tend to support our assumption.

Furthermore, the discrepancies in the SHOULD—DOES perceptions of administrators from the larger, non-rural districts are consistent with Cooper's conception of instability and transition through shifts in organizational control. While administrators in these districts would like to see greater school-site authority over all 13 areas, they are pressured by both the teachers' union and the community to standardize policies and practices across sites. Note that while administrators from both groups ranked labor contracts first in terms of obstacles to SBM, it was identified far more frequently in the larger, non-rural districts (44.2%) than in the small rural districts (30.2%). Furthermore, the issue of standardization was mentioned only by administrators from the larger districts. Two administrators comments perhaps best capture this concern, i.e., "Citizens want 'sameness' in all elementary schools in town", and "Equity issues are central because of the size of our district—over 130,000 pupils."

The related issues of sameness and equity are particularly helpful in explaining why site authority over length of day (4.0%), calendar (5.9%), starting salary (0.9%), and pay raises (2.1%) is uncommon in large districts that have SBM. In contrast, in small rural districts that may have only one or two sites, standardization is simply not an issue, and though length of day, calendar, starting salary, and pay raises were the areas least likely to be governed at the rural school site, each was noted by more than 20% of the respondents.

Clune and White (1988: 16) have suggested that for many districts SBM may be more a 'frame of mind' than a 'structured, technical system.' Whether one perceives decision making in small rural districts as highly decentralized or simply centralized on a reduced scale, our findings suggest that the existing structural and organizational realities of these districts produce remarkable similarities between the vision and reality of SBM. In contrast, the organizational complexity and hierarchical structure of larger districts seems to foster marked discrepancies between administrators' 'frame of mind' as to what

https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations/vol20/iss1/4
DOI: 10.4148/0146-9282.1486

SBM should be and their perceptions of SBM as a 'structured, technical system' once implemented.

One might imagine that for administrators in these larger, non-rural districts, the disparity between their vision of SBM and its practical reality may produce a sense of frustration if they are unable to reconcile the two. The findings suggest that while they feel there should be more teacher, parent, student, and community involvement in decision-making, there will probably be less than they desire. And, while they feel there should be less superintendent involvement in decision-making, there will probably be more. Furthermore, they need to reconcile themselves to the fact that SBM will probably yield less site autonomy across all areas of decision making than they anticipate. On the other hand, administrators in small rural districts formally implementing SBM will probably be pleasantly surprised to discover that their plans produce anticipated results in terms of both decision making participation and school site authority.

The findings of this study suggest that the compatibility between the vision and reality of SBM in small rural districts make these sites ideal candidates for further analysis of the dynamics of increased school site autonomy. As our nation's larger districts begin experimenting with decentralization, the experiences of these smaller districts may help to inform their decisions and expectations.

References

Clune, W. & White, P. (1988). *School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research.* Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) Research Report Series RR–008.

Coleman, P. (1986). The good school district: A critical examination of student achievement and per pupil expenditures as measures of school effectiveness. *Journal of Education Finance. 12*(1): 71–96.

Cooper, B. (1990). Unions, central management, and school-site control: Is a new organization paradigm in the making? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw–Hill.

Haller, E. & Monk, D. (1988). New reforms, old reforms, and the consolidation of small rural schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 24*(4): 470–483.

Heller, R., Woodworth, B., Jacobson, S., & Conway, J. (1989). You like school-based power, but you wonder if others do. *The Executive Educator, 11*(11): 15–21.

Lamitie, R. (1989). Research and action needs in rural school finance. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools, 3*(3): 29–39.

TABLE 1: Participation in School-Based Management

A. Who Should Participate

	Rural<1000 Freq. (%)	Rank	Nonrural>1000 Freq. (%)	Rank	Chi Square
	N=195		N=913		
Principal	193 (99.5%)	1	904 (99.1%)	1	0.259
Teachers	182 (93.8%)	2	894 (98.0%)	2	10.754**
Parents	132 (68.0%)	5	752 (82.5%)	3	20.719**
Students	103 (53.1%)	6	524 (57.5%)	5	1.240
Community	102 (52.6%)	7	487 (53.4%)	6	0.043
School Board	135 (69.6%)	4	448 (49.1%)	7	26.878**
Superintendent	158 (81.4%)	3	607 (66.6%)	4	16.623**

B. Who Does Participate

	N=85		N=534		
Principal	84 (98.8%)	1	525 (98.3%)	1	0.119
Teachers	77 (90.6%)	2	445 (83.3%)	2	2.921
Parents	31 (36.5%)	5	216 (40.4%)	5	0.484
Students	28 (32.9%)	6	139 (26.0%)	6	1.778
Community	23 (27.1%)	7	125 (23.4%)	7	0.537
School Board	58 (68.2%)	4	242 (45.3%)	4	15.419**
Superintendent	72 (84.7%)	3	379 (71.0%)	3	6.993**

C. Who Should and Does Participate in School-Based Management

	McNemar Value	McNemar Value
	N=85	N=534
Principal	1.000	0.059
Teachers	1.333	80.182**
Parents	26.947**	238.948**
Students	15.125**	170.017**
Community	23.059**	161.161**
School Board	0.040	2.492
Superintendent	0.800	10.330**

* P<.05 **p<.01

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence.* New York: Harper & Row.

Swanson, A., & Jacobson, S. (1989). a response to R.E. Lamities's research and action needs in rural school finance. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools, 3*(3): 40–45.

Walberg, H. (1989). District size and student learning, *Education and Urban Society, 21*(2): 154–163.

Walberg, H., & Fowler, W. (1987). Expenditures and size efficiencies of public school districts. *Educational Researcher, 16*(7): 5–15.

[1]Note that from the original survey we lose 408 administrators who work either in rural districts >1000 or non-rural districts <1000.

[2]This categorization meets the following required assumptions:
(1) each sample is a random sample;
(2) the two samples are mutually exclusive; and
(3) each response can be categorized as either yes or no.

TABLE 2: Areas of Authority

A. School Should Have Authority

	Rural<1000 Freq. (%)	Rank	Nonrural>1000 Freq. (%)	Rank	Chi Square
	N=191		N=908		
Budget	132 (69.1%)	6	766 (84.4%)	3	24.562**
Hiring	113 (59.2%)	8	500 (55.1%)	7	1.073
Staffing	139 (72.8%)	5	732 (80.6%)	4	5.902*
Curriculum	141 (73.8%)	4	505 (55.6%)	6	21.586**
Texts	143 (74.9%)	3	490 (54.0%)	8	28.236**
Purchases	149 (78.0%)	2	777 (85.6%)	2	6.804**
Schedule	176 (92.1%)	1	859 (94.6%)	1	1.737
Length of Day	50 (26.2%)	11	99 (10.9%)	10	31.417**
Calendar	51 (26.7%)	10	84 (9.3%)	11	44.599**
Starting Salary	28 (14.7%)	13	35 (3.9%)	13	34.093**
Raises	33 (17.3%)	12	62 (6.8%)	12	21.819**
Maintenance	127 (66.5%)	7	608 (67.0%)	5	0.016
Evaluations	89 (47.1%)	9	307 (33.8%)	9	11.959**
	School Does Have Authority				
	N=84		N=528		
Budget	53 (63.1%)	7	400 (75.8%)	3	6.042*
Hiring	37 (44.0%)	8	189 (35.8%)	8	2.119
Staffing	61 (72.6%)	5	327 (61.8%)	4	3.642
Curriculum	66 (78.6%)	4	235 (44.4%)	7	33.822**
Texts	71 (84.5%)	2.5	236 (44.6%)	6	46.188**
Purchases	71 (84.5%)	2.5	445 (84.1%)	2	0.009
Schedule	77 (91.7%)	1	478 (90.4%)	1	0.145
Length of Day	22 (26.2%)	11	21 (4.0%)	11	54.740**
Calendar	25 (29.8%)	10	31 (5.9%)	10	49.758**
Starting Salary	18 (21.4%)	13	5 (0.9%)	13	84.052**
Raises	19 (22.6%)	12	11 (2.1%)	12	65.560**
Maintenance	56 (66.7%)	6	262 (49.6%)	5	8.435**
Evaluations	36 (42.9%)	9	88 (16.7%)	9	30.769**

C. Areas of Authority School Should and Does Have

	McNemar Value	McNemar Value
	N=84	N=528
Budget	3.556	44.495**
Hiring	9.800**	98.256**
Staffing	2.130	92.627**
Curriculum	0.250	49.199**
Texts	0.333	47.641**
Purchases	0.333	10.051**
Schedule	0.400	19.692**
Length of Day	5.762	36.213**
Calendar	0.529	15.680**
Starting Salary	0.067	10.714**
Raises	0.000	16.030**
Maintenance	0.529	76.475**
Evaluations	1.500	69.511**

* P<.05 **p<.01

https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations/vol20/iss1/4
DOI: 10.4148/0146-9282.1486