INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-10,266

REGER, Roger Glenn, 1933-
AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS THAT AFFECT BUILDING PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES UNDER SIMULATED CONDITIONS.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1974
Education, special

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

AN ANALYSIS OF FACTORS THAT AFFECT BUILDING PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES UNDER SIMULATED CONDITIONS

by

Roger Glenn Reger

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1974

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Percy Bates, Chairman
Assistant Professor Leonard C. Burrello
Professor William C. Morse
Assistant Professor Lawrence Turton

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special acknowledgements are extended to members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Percy Bates, Dr. William C. Morse, Dr. Leonard Burrello, and Dr. Lawrence Turton. In addition, Dr. Robert Guarino of the Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities was especially helpful in the initial stages of the dissertation. Dr. Daniel D. Sage of Syracuse University merits special acknowledgement.

Special acknowledgements also to Clifford N. Crooks, District Superintendent, and members of the Board of Education of the Board of Cooperative Educational Services of Erie County, New York, for allowing me the opportunity for time to pursue the dissertation.

To Richard Allers and David Vernon of The University of Michigan for assistance with the data.

To David Sabatino, Jack Barnett, Lou Danielson, and Lee Heron of The Pennsylvania State University for advice on statistical procedures.

To the building principals in Michigan who so kindly allowed the use of their responses when they participated in the workshops where the data for this dissertation were obtained.

And finally to my three children, John, Jane, and Karl, who were without a father during extensive periods of time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

LIST OF APPENDICES viii

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem
Middle Managers
The Method

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 7

Decision-making
Definitions
Simulation
Definitions
Uses of Simulation
SEATS and Present Research

CHAPTER III: METHOD 27

Context of the Study
Procedure for Classifying Data
In-Basket Items
Sources of Data
Definitions
Descriptions and Sources of Issues
Descriptions of Types of Decisions
Statistical Procedures
Summary

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS 44

Table 1
Table 2
Table 3
Table 4
Table 5
Table 6
Table 7
Table 8
Table 9
Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION 62

Highest Contributing Cells
Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates
Implications
Training
Practice
Research
Limitations
Summary

APPENDICES 77

REFERENCES 90

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Classification of Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Sources of Issues and Decisions Made by Building Principals	45
2.	Classification of Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Sources and Decisions Made by Building Principals, Minus Two Columns of Decisions	47
3.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates in Relation to Referral to Superordinates, Subordinates, Groups, and Peers	49
4.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates in Relation to Immediate and Delayed Personal Decisions	51
5.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates in Relation to Combined Personal Decisions and Combined Referrals to Others .	53
6.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates in Relation to Immediate Personal Decisions and Referrals to Groups	55
7.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates, Subordinates, and Peers in Relation to Immediate Personal Decisions and Referrals to Groups	56

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
8.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates in Relation to Referrals to Groups and Referrals to Peers	58
9.	Observed and Expected Frequencies and Chi-Square of Responses of Building Principals for Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates in Relation to Referrals to Superordinates and Referrals to Subordinates	60

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix — Page

A. Personal Characteristics of Principals 77

B. Workshop Agenda 80

C. Description of 37 Issues 82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The primary concern of this research was to examine the structural characteristics of decisions made by a randomly-selected group of public-school principals under simulated conditions. In this instance, the focus was on the topology of decisions made, their structural aspects as examined in the context of a simulated, semi-controlled setting.

The decisional process has been extensively examined by a multitude of professional thinkers, as will be illustrated in the following chapter. No studies have been found that show how decisions can be strapped to the operating table and dissected to show what is inside. All studies to this time have looked at decisions in motion as they proceed from one point to another point. Unlike the ubiquitous frog in college biology laboratories, the decision has not yet been captured and placed into a pickling solution to await the student's scalpel. A method has not been available to take a decision at its end-point and see what its structure is like, what made it into what it finally became.

The Problem

The major objective of this research was to examine the way public school building principals, as middle managers, make decisions under simulated conditions. The building principals assumed the role of another middle manager, a director of special education in a fictituous school district. Another objective in the study was to examine the method used to classify and analyze decisions that emanated from different sources. In effect, what does the building principal, as a middle manager in a school system, do when confronted with problems from different sources?

Up to this point, the "decisional frog" has been studied in the field, in laboratories, and in various mathematical models and theories, but always as a process rather than from a structural viewpoint. Theoreticians and researchers have watched decisions in natural and artificial habitats as they move about, behaving first one way and then another. The problem raised in this study was to see if the decisional creature could be examined not as it was alive and in process, but instead after it already had existed under certain conditions. The structure or topology of the decision was examined, not the process.

The following major questions were examined:

1. Under simulated conditions, how do building principals react to issues presented to them? Are their decisional responses random, or can differences by detected?

A. Do building principals typically make immediate personal decisions to resolve issues?

B. As middle managers, do building principals refrain from resolving problems, or issues, and instead refer them to superiors, peers, or groups, such as committees?

2. Under simulated conditions, what effect if any does the source of an issue have on the way building principals make decisions? The following possibilities are examined:

A. As middle managers, do building principals act most responsively to issues arising from their superiors?

B. As middle managers, do building principals act most responsively to issues arising from their subordinates?

C. As middle managers, do building principals playing the role of another middle manager act most responsively to their clients or to the community they serve?

Middle Managers

Building principals typically are considered to be "middle managers" (Drucker, 1974). Under the simulated conditions of this study, the building principals played the role of another middle manager, the newly-appointed

director of special education in a medium-sized public-school district.

As middle managers, building principals or directors do not have complete autonomy in the way they deal with problems, especially those of a complex nature or those with broad implications. More than top management they must live and function within established and codified policies, procedures, contracts, and other regulating factors.

As a middle manager, how does the building principal, playing the role of a director, deal with issues that confront him or her? Obviously, something must be done when a problem arises. What are the choices? Does the middle manager personally resolve most problems by making immediate, personal decisions? Or does this person typically react as if the position does not allow for personal decisions, but instead requires some other course of action, such as deflecting issues to the well-worn committee process or referring them upward to the top level of management, the superintendent?

On the other hand, are there certain issues that the middle manager will handle personally and others that will be referred elsewhere for resolution? If so, what are some of the differences?

Sage (1967), using the same simulation procedure as employed in this study but with a different group of participants, examined the relationships sought with others

within the role of the director. Sage assumed that the role requirements of the director of special education would require forming relationships with (a) teams or groups of people, (b) non-school personnel such as clinic staff members, and (c) peers (Sage, 1967, pp. 9-10). The results did not show the predicted relationships.

In the present study it was assumed prior to the beginning that the middle manager would be responsive to issues emanating from top management, from his or her administrative superiors. But would he or she be more responsive to this source than to other sources? It also was assumed that the middle manager would be responsive to issues emanating from administrative subordinates, primarily because dealing with such people is commonly understood to be one of the functional responsibilities of the middle manager. As shown in Chapter IV, the first assumption was supported by the data, but the second assumption was not.

No other prior assumptions were held about how the middle managers in this study would respond to different sources of issues. The two assumptions just mentioned were based on what might be anticipated from experience. There were no reasons, either from "intuition" or previous data, to support any other assumptions.

The Method

A search of the literature, reviewed in the following chapter, revealed no previous research using the method

employed in this study for analyzing decisions. While simulation has been widely used to study human behavior, including decisional processes, no relevant analysis was found of the structure or topology of decisions.

The method used was to categorize each issue that arose in the simulated conditions according to its source, and record each issue along with the decision made by the middle manager, either in the form of a personal decision or some other disposition. By using a table with 48 cells (six rows and eight columns), all responses were classified in columns according to the appropriate row-cells indicating their sources.

This method allowed for a statistical comparison of what kinds of decisions were made depending upon issues arising from different sources. In effect, the method allowed for an examination of what the middle managers considered to be issues of high priority and which were considered to be of low priority.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter surveys relevant literature on decision-making and on simulation. There are two major objectives in reviewing previous research or published opinions on decision-making. One is to demonstrate the range of thinking about decision-making, how it has been studied within various disciplines, experimentally, in practical applications, and as a target of training attempts.

The other major objective is to show that it is the process that has been the focus of previous attention, and not the structure or topology of decision-making. If the concern of this review were solely on the literature of the structure or topology of decision-making, there would be scant literature to review. Even so, it seems appropriate to show illustrative samples of the state of the art in its broad perspective because by so doing the relevance of the present research takes on more meaning as it is compared with the total picture.

Relevant literature on simulation is examined primarily to demonstrate the appropriateness of the method

for the present study, and to clarify just what simulation is and what it is not.

Both "decision-making" and "simulation" are terms that frequently elicit the fiction of general understanding, a common hazard in research. Both terms do have different meanings to different people, and thus it is necessary to establish definitions as understood in this study.

Decision-making

Definitions

Because decision-making is such an important part of being human there are many meanings associated with the term. Decision-making frequently is used synonomously with such terms as problem-solving or thinking. Typical dictionary definitions relate decision to such synonyms as purpose, resolve, decree, verdict, choice, fix upon, settle, judge, and determine. The 1966 unabridged edition of Webster's Third International Dictionary defines a decision as the act of forming an opinion or of deciding upon a course of action.

Many definitions of decision look very similar to what Dewey offered as a definition of the thinking process. To paraphrase Dewey (1933, p. 107), there are five steps in the thinking process: (1) suggestions that come to mind; (2) a feeling of perplexity that is recognized as a problem to be solved; (3) the development of various suggestions or hypotheses to guide observation and the collection of data;

(4) the mental elaboration of the idea finally selected; and (5) testing the idea or hypothesis by overt or imaginative action.

Most discussions about decisions, or definitions of decisions, refer to the process or the steps taken in reaching a decision, just as Dewey's definition of thinking refers to the process. Griffiths (1959) says "The concept decision-making process . . . is construed to mean not only the decision but also the acts necessary to put the decision into operation and so actually affect the course of action of an enterprise" (p. 76).

Shrenk (1969) defines decision-making as "the selection of an alternative response to an inferred environmental situation about which complete certainty is lacking" (p. 545), and further that "It is possible to regard virtually all aspects of human behavior as involving decision making" (p. 544).

Blakenship and Miles (1968) see decision-making "visualized as a complex process in which an individual or a group of individuals moves through a series of interrelated substeps including (1) the recognition of a problem requiring some response, (2) the investigation of the problem and its environment in an effort to collect relevant information and to generate solutions, and (3) the selection of a course of action based on an analysis of the available information and solutions" (p. 107).

Drucker (1968), on the other hand, says that most of what people refer to as decisions are only dispositions. He says that "Good administrators make few decisions. The fellow who makes a great many decisions is a poor administrator" (p. 30). Drucker especially sees many daily routine events as outside the realm of decision-making; he observes that many years ago a decision was required for a school principal to hold a fire drill but today this is routine. He defines routine as "something that makes it possible for a donkey to do today what it took genius to do yesterday" (p. 37).

Bates (1954) describes a "model for the science of decision making" (p. 326), but his model is production-oriented, relating to the probability of reaching a certain output goal. He says by way of definition, "A decision-making process involves a decision-maker, an environment in which the decision-maker operates, a set of actions available, and a set of goals to be accomplished" (p. 339).

Vaughan and Mavor (1972) say there are "two main categories of behaviors in behavioral decision-making: diagnosis of the state of the system, and selection of a course of action" (p. 267). Fisher and Sealey (1973) say there are two kinds of decision-making: "There is practical decision making and theoretical decision making. There are decisions about what to do and there are decisions about what is true" (p. 10).

Bridges (1967), Dimock (1958, p. 140), Eilon (1969), Ference (1970), Gibson (1968), and Roberts (1970) present definitions, or more accurately descriptions, of decision-making as a step-wise process, as a series of stages that people go through to accomplish a decisional end result.

In summary, about the best definitions of decision come by way of synonyms which can be obtained from a standard dictionary. The typical "definition" in the literature is more of a description of the process of decision-making than of the term or concept itself. As a consequence of this situation, a definition--or description--will reflect the purposes of the particular author writing about the topic. To one author a decision is a rare event involving only a complicated change in directions, while to another author every move made is a reflection of a decision. Referring to the "decisional frog" mentioned in the first chapter, this creature is defined by the moves it makes as it is examined in its selected habitat.

Literature on decision studies. The field of economics has produced the most sophisticated thinking about decision-making. Edwards (1954; 1961; 1969) has been the most prolific disseminator of work produced in this area. "Economic man" was constructed as a focus for theorizing in economics, a creature who is "completely informed . . . infinitely sensitive /and/ rational" (Edwards, 1954, p. 381). Other "men" have since been offered to serve as focal points

for economic theory. Simon (1964) refers to a "satisficing man", one who wants a decision yielding enough rather than one yielding maximum benefits. Shrenk (1969, p. 548) offers a "reasoning man" rather than a rational man.

The field of psychology has long produced research related in various ways to decision-making. Einhorn (1970) compares nonlinear mathematical models to the clinical judgment of psychologists, while Vaughan and Mavor (1972) compare simple, linear, additive models to such judgment. Smith (1968) compared clinical judgment to how a computer works, concluding that "human thinking can be defined as a complex network of simple binary choices" (p. 324). Goldberg (1968) found no evidence of accuracy in clinical judgments, without respect to any model of decision-making or thinking.

Vidmar (1972) explored decisions made in simulated jury trials, and Luginbuhl (1972) examined the effects of giving subjects a choice (versus no choice) in how they felt about completing complicated tasks.

Cahoon (1972) studied decision-making under simulated high altitude conditions. Tanner and Swets (1954) and Guralnick (1972) related a statistical decision theory to studying visual detection behavior, while Pitz and Downing (1967) looked at dice-playing under varying conditions of behavior.

Decision-making has been studied in the legal field (Allan, 1966), sociology (Deising, 1962; Demerath and

Thibaut, 1956), and as it relates to values (Dahlke, 1969; Ericson, 1969; Monahan, 1969; Neff, 1968).

Administration or management is increasingly being viewed as a unique function, with more similarities than differences wherever practiced, whether in medicine, education, business or industry (Drucker, 1974). Dimock (1958) says that "Chester Barnard was probably the first to call attention to the decision-making process as a significant element of administration" (p. 136).

Theories of management decision-making in business and industry have been reported by Bridges (1970), Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972), Copeland (1955), Cummings and Harnett (1968), Dean (1958), Eilon (1969), Gore and Silander (1959), Hartley (1969), Litchfield (1956), Marshall (1967), Mueller (1969), Odiorne (1969), Simon (1964), Wickens (1960), and Williams (1968).

Decision-making has been studied in real business, industrial, and governmental contexts by Blakenship and Miles (1968), Carter (1971), Coch and French (1948), Cyert, Dill, and March (1958), Dickson (1970), Dufty and Taylor (1962), Globerson (1968), Golomb (1968), Hill (1973), Loasby (1968), Richie and Miles (1970), and Takagi (1969).

The use of computers in decision-making has been discussed--with no observable research--by Chernoff and Moses (1959), Clarke (1970), Davidson, Suppes, and Siegal (1957), Findlay (1971), Gleser and Collen (1972), Gulick and Urwick (1937), Holder and Ehline (1967), McEachern (1969),

Peterson (1971), Rhind (1968), Saindon (1969), Schoderbek (1965), Thrall, Coombs, and Davis (1954), and Warner, Olmstead, and Rutherford (1972).

Attempts have been made to experimentally train people to improve their decision-making skills. Evans and Cody (1969) showed that eighth-graders improved their decisions after directed training, as compared with non-guided learning. Guetzkow, Forehand, and James (1962) showed no changes in decision-making among managers after training. Hall and Williams (1970) produced improvements in decision-making among subjects who were trained, as did Hill and Martin (1971), Maier and Thurber (1969), and Schmuck, Runkels, and Langmeyer (1969).

Academic training programs to improve the decision-making skills of future administrators is the subject of discussion by Dooher and Marquis (1952), Odiorne (1969), and Spaghy (1965). The general thrust of these discussions is a cautious suspicion about the usefulness of academic training.

The relationship between personal characteristics and various measures of decision-making has been studied by Block and Petersen (1955), Fogarty and Gregg (1966), and Shrenk (1969), with vague or equivocal results.

Research or opinions reported about decision-making in education is limited (Dill, 1964). The involvement of teachers and students in school decision-making has been

discussed by Alutto and Belasco (1971), Blumberg, Wayson, and Weber (1969), Conway (1973), Dawson (1968), Foley (1970), Hamilton (1972), Hammill and Wiederholt (1972), Luce and Volksdorf (1973), and Sarthory (1968).

Summary. Gore and Silander (1959) estimate that there may be 5,000 references on decision-making in the literature, although they mention that little is available on topology or on models for the study of decisions. Wasserman and Silander (1958; 1964) published several bibliographies on decision-making although Edwards (1961) says the first bibliography omitted a significant portion of the literature. An examination of these reviews as well as those by Dill (1962; 1964), Edwards (1954; 1961; 1969), and Shubik (1956) reveals no models or discussion of studies on the structure of decision-making.

The present research. A need thus remains for a way to classify and statistically examine decisions and the sources or issues from which they arose. The theories and opinions referenced in this chapter show the process of how decisions supposedly are made. The research referenced typically shows, at most, how certain events are produced by the casual effects of a few controlled conditions, with the decision merely being the assumed intervening factor that accounted for the outcomes.

It is probable that every decision, whether made in a controlled experiment or in real life, is influenced by

both the conditions and events preceeding it as well as the anticipated consequences. A decision is made to jump from a burning building only after considering (a) the extent of the conflagration and (b) what will happen if one does or does not jump. A decision is made to purchase a new car after considering (a) all conditions existing at present, such as old car, salesman and advertising influence, etc., and (b) anticipated consequences of having the new car. Deciding to jump from a burning building involves a limited range of variables; buying a car involves a multitude of variables, all different for different people.

A simulated situation attempt to portray as closely as possible real-life conditions, with a maximum of standardization of conditions and a minimum of control of how individuals respond to the conditions. Other than standardization for all participants, there generally is no preconceived manipulation of conditions designed to produce a restricted range of predetermined responses. The simulation participant does not produce Response "A" or "B" as a result of being exposed to Condition "X" or "Y". The potential for responding in most simulation exercises is unlimited, as it is in real life.

Simulation

As with examining the different meanings of decision, the term simulation is used in different ways. Following are

definitions that attempt to differentiate the meaning of simulation from terms that sometimes are used interchangeably in order to clarify what is meant by simulation in this study.

Definitions

Games, models, and play are terms frequently used synonomously with simulation; in fact, Sage (1967) uses the term "SEATS Game" as in the title to the simulation exercise he developed.

Games. There are many kinds of games, some that can be used for instructional purposes as is common in primary school grades, and some that are used simply for play and fun. Generally, all games have an element of competition involved, either with other people as in poker or baseball, or with oneself (or "fate") such as in the card game of solitaire.

Play. Play may or may not involve a game. For an adult, play is a form of physical or "mental" exercise and relaxation with an occasional side benefit of learning such as increasing accuracy in throwing a bowling ball. For adults, play is subject to attitudinal components, where one person "plays" a game of poker for sheer fun and another engages in the game in serious hope of winning money.

Models. David (1972) defines a model as "a symbolic or numerical counterpart of the empirical problem that aids in describing the situation and in investigating the

essential behavior of the process" (p. 53). Sagar and Dick (1971) define a model as "a representation of a real system" (p. 23). These definitions are quite narrow.

A model is most frequently considered a conceptual abstraction of a real situation, much like a road map or a figurative representation of various units of behavioral structure or of various physical units. A toy train is a model of a real or an idealized version of a train; a miniature structure of a city is a model of a real or planned version of a city; a figurative depiction of the way a person or an organization behaves in certain circumstances is a model that allows the perceived to "see" the behavior in conceptual or idealized form.

In more popular usage, a model is an idealized version of what ought to be: a model city is constructed, an attractive "model" displays new clothing, a father "models" his behavior for his son's benefit. In its conceptual forms, models are static and abstract; in its concrete or behavioral forms, models do not involve the active participation of the putative benefactor. The participants in a style or fashion show or the son whose father is modeling his behavior are expected to copy the observed behavior as closely as possible.

Simulation. Simulation frequently involves play or self-competitive and gaming aspects, depending in large part upon the attitudinal set of the participant. Simulation

also may involve modeling if the participant feels an attempt should be made to match a standard of behavior perceived as desirable in the course of the simulation exercise. At times, simulation is considered to be the serious component of a game, or the active utilization of a model.

Generally, simulation for adults is similar to what play is for children: it is a process of engaging in real behavior in an artificial setting or with artificial materials and/or demands. For children, the doll is a baby in need of a change of clothing; for adults in a simulation exercise, the memorandum from the boss is a command for action. The "baby's" clothes are changed, and the "boss's" order is followed; but there is no baby and there is no boss. It is all make-believe, but the child has gained experience in changing a baby's clothing and the simulation participant has gained experience in reacting to the boss.

Uses of Simulation

Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen (1962) reported research that used simulation as a method of providing standardized conditions for examining the characteristics of elementary building principals. They note that during the period 1948-1959 research on educational administrators shifted "from emphasis on traits of administrators to emphasis on the behavior of administrators in school situations" (p. 3). With the aid of an increasing variety of programs for simulating actual working conditions, research on "real" problems has become more and more manageable.

Simulation as a method for reproducing reality in controlled and miniature form has existed for some time. The military has used this process for years, dating back at least to Napoleon's war games or even to the origins of the game of chess (Riley and Young, 1957). According to Ohm (1966), the American Management Association was instrumental in introducing simulation to business and industry, examples of which are outlined by Marting (1957).

Sage and Sontag (1970) indicate that "As early as 1962, over 100 business simulations were in use" (p. 20). In 1969 a quarterly journal devoted to simulation was introduced, Simulation and Games, subtitled "An International Journal of Theory, Design, and Research." Another newsletter in existence is S^3--Simulation in the Service of Society.

The simulation procedure formally entered the academic world (Greenlaw, Herron, and Rawdon, 1962) and became part of training programs for practicing educators and social scientists (Cruickshank, 1969; Fattu and Elam, 1965; Guetzkow, 1962; Hesseling and Konnon, 1969; Van Dyck, 1968). Weinberger (1965), as summarized by Sage and Sontag (1970, p. 31) reports that by 1965 simulation as a training vehicle was being used by 90 school administration training programs involving 125 professors of educational administration.

Simulation can be used to achieve several objectives. Because the procedure attempts to approximate real-life conditions, it can be useful as a training device. The

student in a particular field can obtain experience without threat of failure, where mistakes and successes are turned to instructional advantage and analyzed for their components. The experienced practitioner can temporarily shed his characteristic behaviors and try new ways of looking at and dealing with problems in his own field or in other fields.

Because the participant in a simulation exercise is actively behaving to confront issues and solve problems there are many opportunities for self evaluation. Perhaps a major advantage of simulation is that the participant can try a new behavior without concern for the kinds of consequences that could result if he or she actually "experimented" with the new behavior in a real-life situation and it failed. For example, many newcomers to middle-management administrative positions frequently are tempted to "stand up to the boss," a behavior that probably is best tested and analyzed under the safe conditions of a simulation exercise. A newspaper report (Buffalo Courier-Express, 1973) mentioned a simulation exercise called "The Marriage Game: A Simulation of Marital Decision Making"; presumably, prospective marriage partners can get an advanced taste of what they are getting into.

Simulation offers unique opportunities for research on a wide range of human behaviors. The standardized format of most simulation exercises offers a common set of stimuli for all participants where individual or subgroup similarities and differences in responding can be assessed. The quantity

of behaviors that can be measured for standardization or comparative purposes is almost unlimited.

One example of the fertility of using simulation and games can be found in a journal report by Coleman, Livingston, Fennessey, Edwards, and Kidder (1973) which briefly describes a seven-year research program conducted by The Johns Hopkins University. The final report of that research lists 37 publications emanating from the seven-year program (Livingston, Fennessey, Coleman, Edwards, and Kidder, 1973). An example of the extent to which simulation and games are utilized in practical application can be illustrated by a 501-page book listing literally hundreds of simulations and games that can be used for instructional purposes in education, urban planning, sociology, ecology, history, and other fields (Zuckerman and Horn, 1973). The book lists the addresses of 53 agencies that can be contacted for further information about simulation/gaming.

Baker and Hamlin (1971) illustrate another way of using simulation: solving a practical organizational problem. They were interested in improving the use of medical staff in a clinic, and devised a model that was intended to make more efficient use of time. The model was tested in a simulated experience and then was put into actual practice, with savings noted in time and services rendered.

SEATS and Present Research

Sage (1967; 1970) adapted the simulation method for use with administrators of special education programs or those general education administrators who wish to become more familiar with the role and problems of special education administrators. The acronym SEATS refers to Sage's adaptation: Special Education Administration Task Simulation.

During the past several years the SEATS game has been used with various groups of school administrators in New York, Georgia, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and other states (Graeb and Gaughan, 1972; Lillian, 1971). The SEATS game also is used as a training vehicle for graduate students in administration in many general and special education university training programs.

The SEATS game was the source of data for the present research. SEATS was developed in the mid-1960's because "The proliferation of public school programs for exceptional children has created increasing attention to the need for competent administrative personnel to provide leadership for such programs at all levels and in a wide variety of organizational structures (Sage, 1967, p. 3).

The immediate model for the SEATS game was the original simulation of Hemphill, Griffiths, and Fredericksen (1962), where a "typical" elementary school (the "Whitman

School") was used as a basis for the simulation. In developing SEATS, Sage developed a composite school district representing many "typical" districts, rather than using one district as a model and then disguising it, as was done in the Hemphill, et al (1962) study.

In developing the SEATS game, Sage was assisted by graduate students and the original materials were tested with students attending summer sessions at Syracuse University. Most of these students were teachers; thus, the middle manager, whether building principal or director, was not included except incidentally in the formulating stages of the simulation exercise. Since the original exercise was developed, some modifications in content have been made but the general design and format remain the same.

The SEATS materials include information designed to acquaint the participant as much as possible with the simulated setting: The Dormit School District with 14,000 students, just outside the seaport city of Metropolis in Jackson County, State of Lafayette.

The participant in the SEATS game is provided with a paper written by a "graduate student" giving the history of special education in the district. In addition, a handbook with district policies and procedures related to special education is provided. Also, a document summarizing State laws and regulations on handicapped children is part of the materials provided.

Participants in SEATS game also find tape-recorded presentations, films, and telephones used to enhance the realism of the exercise. Photographic slides show the area, including some schools and classrooms, as well as landmarks of historical interest. Films portray scenes that present problems, which become the basis for discussion and decision. During the course of the exercise, participants find themselves called to the telephone to deal with problems that might be found in a real setting.

The central figure in the SEATS game is Lee Blank, a newly-appointed director of special education. Each participant in the SEATS exercise assumes this role; everybody is "Lee Blank." During the course of the exercise Lee Blank encounters a number of people in the Dormit School District. There is the superintendent, heard from but never seen; there is the assistant superintendent, who is seen but who makes little contribution to the comfort of Lee Blank. There is the Director of Personnel, the Director of Transportation, and building principals, each displaying different reactions to Lee Blank.

There is a peculiar administrative arrangement for Lee Blank in Dormit, although while peculiar it is not unusual. There are special education teachers who come to Lee Blank with problems, but it is not clear just how much authority Lee Blank has with these people. There are teachers who create various problems and there are psychologists and

parents who want their opinions accepted and their problems solved. Interviews and group conferences are held.

The major vehicle for the SEATS game is a workbook containing memorandums and letters. The SEATS participant reacts to the issues presented in the workbook by writing responses to the issues posed in the memorandums and letters. As the workshops usually are held over a period of several days, the workbook contains sections that can be completed during specific time periods. As each section is completed, the responses of the participants to the issues they have confronted can be collected and used as a basis for discussion in the next session, and/or for research.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities (ISMRRD) at The University of Michigan sponsored a series of ten simulation workshops using the SEATS game from October, 1972, through early February, 1973. Data for the present study were collected from SEATS-game responses produced by those participants in the workshops who attended each complete session. The workshop participants were informed that their responses would be used for research purposes; no objections were found to this.

Context of the Study

The workshops were held in isolated conference centers in mid-Michigan and typically began in the early evening with an introduction to familiarize the participants with the SEATS format. A sample copy of the agenda given to each workshop participant is shown in Appendix B on pages and

The intention of the opening evening's session was to set the climate, to encourage the participants to pretend they had just taken a newly-created position as director of special education in a fictitious city called "Dormit." The

Dormit School District, in the State of Lafayette, was in a suburban setting just outside the larger city of Metropolis. Each participant was asked to assume the same role, that of a person called Mr., Mrs., Miss, Ms., or Dr. Lee Blank.

The first session during the initial evening began with an introduction by the workshop leader. Immediately following that, a narrated photographic slide tour of Dormit and surrounding area was presented, complete with an historical sketch and commentary on present conditions in the area. After the "tour," the participants were introduced to their first problems, or issues. As Lee Blank imaginatively moved into his new office he found phone messages to return, memorandums awaiting answers, and finally a call from his new superior, the assistant superintendent, with a summons for an immediate meeting. The "interview" between Lee Blank and his new boss culminated the events of the first evening.

For Lee Blank, this first interview hopefully would clarify his or her role, define responsibilities, provide some tips on who to approach and who to avoid, and offer other needed information. As it turned out, however, the design of the SEATS game presented the new boss to Lee Blank as evasive in his opinions, vague in definitions, uncertain about responsibilities, and very cautious and even negative about any suggestions concerning finances or changes of any

kind in the status quo. Lee Blank typically left the interview in a state of frustration.

Throughout the following day, including the evening, and until noon of the third day, Lee Blank was faced with a series of issues. He/she received phone calls, letters, and memorandums; he/she presided over case conferences, and through audio-visual media observed a classroom and saw a lawyer's challenge to procedures used in placing handicapped children into special education programs.

Each participant used a SEATS workbook. Contained in the workbook were the memos and letters to which his/her responses were invited. Also in the workbook were response sheets; it was these sheets that provided the source of data for the present research. Periodically throughout each workshop the response sheets were collected. Each participant had a code number that was recorded on the response work-sheets. Letter and memorandums were answered, phone messages were disposed of, and other problems were dealt with--all in writing on the workshop response sheets.

It was not possible for the participants to respond to each issue that arose; these particular SEATS workshops were devised so time was too short for them. (It is possible for the length of the SEATS workshops to be extended sufficiently so each participant has time to respond to every issue, but such was not the case here.) It was

necessary, therefore, for the participants to establish priorities as to which of the issues required action and which were to be left undone. As there were periodic group discussions scheduled after each segment of the workshop process, some participants verbalized that they gave priority to communications from superiors, others to problems concerned with students, and still others to matters relating to parents or influential members of the community.

Procedure for Classifying Data

Prior to the time the workshops were completed, response data from similar workshops held in other sections of the country were obtained from the files of the Division of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Syracuse University. These data were examined by the author and samples were classified to tentatively select the appropriate decision categories to be used in the present study. The appropriateness of various categories was studied, and those that seemed to best contain the sources and issues were selected on a tentative basis for inclusion in a table.

Following the completion of the ten Michigan workshops, three individuals from ISMRRD again classified a sample of responses into the decision categories, this time using the actual data obtained from the Michigan workshops. The purpose of this was threefold: (1) to finalize the appropriateness of the categories into which (a) sources and

(b) decisions would be sorted; (2) to determine if the three persons could substantially agree on the way responses were categorized, and (3) to help the author clarify his understandings of the classification process because he would be responsible for the classification of all responses.

It was determined that there were six possible categories among the 37 issues, and eight possible kinds of decisions that could be made about the issues; accordingly, a six-by-eight table was developed to classify the responses.

No statistical comparisons were made of the way the three persons classified the sample of responses. There was a total of five sets (i.e., responses from five workshop participants) of responses completed in this fashion. During the classification process, discussion was held among the three classifiers to elaborate upon the mutually-agreeable reasons for classifying responses into the various cells of the six-by-eight table that was developed. It was felt that with this orientation, any one of the three classifiers would have independently classified the remaining responses in a manner consistent with the other two classifiers. Because the remaining classifications took approximately 70 hours, it was not possible to obtain independent classifications from each of the initial classifiers.

In-Basket Items

There were 37 issues to each SEATS workbook to which the participants could have responded. Appendix C, page 82,

gives a listing of the sources of press and the types of possible decisions that could be made to the 37 issues.

There were six sources from which issues could emanate. Each of the 37 issues could be sorted into one of the "issue" categories. For instance, some issues were presented to Lee Blank by his superiors, some from perceived external authorities, some from subordinates, some from peers, some from clients (such as parents), and some from members of the general public.

There were eight possible responses that could be made by Lee Blank to each of the 37 issues. The responses could have been an immediate personal decision, a delayed personal decision, referral for a decision(or more correctly, a resolution) to another person or group, etc.; these are listed and described in detail below.

To code responses each issue was examined for (1) its source, and (2) the type of decision made. For instance, if an issue arose from a communication from a subordinate, and the decision was to refer the issue to a group such a committee of school personnel, the appropriate cell in the table was credited.

Sources of Data

Approximately 200 elementary and secondary public-school building principals were invited to participate in

the SEATS workshops. Ten workshops were planned with an anticipated enrollment of about 20 principals at each workshop. As it turned out, there were 157 principals who actually made an appearance at the workshops.

Of the 157 principals who attended all or part of the workshop sessions, there were 124 who participated to the extent that useable data were obtained. These 124 participants attended the workshops from beginning to end as evidenced by responses to all sections of the SEATS reponse sheets. The remaining 33 participants were those who either missed the beginning sections of the workshops, or who left the workshops before they were completed, or in some cases, both. The 33 principals who made an incomplete appearance at the workshops did not produce SEATS responses that could be used for coding.

The school districts that sent participating principals were randomly selected from among middle-sized cities in central and lower Michigan. Within each district, a random selection of building principals was made for participation in the workshops while the remaining principals in each district were placed into a control group category and were asked to complete certain forms at the same time their colleagues were involved in the workshops. The control group was used for other research and was not relevant to the present study.

Each participating principal completed a brief personal data form with such personal characteristics as age, sex, and experience. Appendix A tabulates this information. Summarizing the salient characteristics of the 124 building principals, the majority were males, middle-aged, held a master's degree, and had more than five years of general classroom teaching experience. Also, the majority of the principals had held administrative positions in general education for at least five years, most of it in the school districts where they currently were employed. There was minimal experience in this group with either teaching or supervision in special education.

Definitions

In the course of conducting this research and developing categories for use in classification, it became apparent that clarity in definition of terms used is necessary. The following section presents definitions of the major terms used in the study as well as descriptions of the six categories of issues developed and the eight categories of decisions used.

Following are definitions of key words used or implied in the study: decision-maker, issue, decision, and resolution.

Decision-maker is the actor who is the pivotal agent in disposing of an issue, demand, problem, question, or matter presented for resolution.

Issue refers to a demand, problem, question, or matter requiring resolution, either by a direct decision by the original individual presented with the issue or by another agent to whom the original individual may refer the issue. In the present study there were 37 possible issues to which each participant could respond.

Decision refers to an action, or lack of action, taken by a decision-maker to either personally resolve an issue, dispose of it by referring it elsewhere, or ignoring it. Any time a decision-maker is presented with an issue he or she must make a decision, even if the decision is to do nothing. A decision may or may not resolve an issue. For instance, the decision-maker may be presented with an issue of his or her secretary requesting to leave early from work; the decision-maker could grant permission, deny permission, delay a decision, do nothing, or refer the issue to a superior or even to a peer, such as a personnel officer. Some actions resolve an issue, others do not.

Resolution refers to a decision that terminates an issue. The decision may answer a question, solve a problem, settle a dispute, or it may be to take one source of action rather than another, hire or fire, spend or save. The resolution may be correct or incorrect, good or bad.

Sometimes an issue is resolved immediately by a personal decision, sometimes it is resolved without a decision (e.g., when a grievance is withdrawn), and sometimes a series of decisions may take place prior to a resolution. It is possible for an issue never to be resolved even though many decisions have been made (in popular form referred to as "buck-passing").

Descriptions of Sources of Issues

In the 37 issues presented to the principals who provided a source of data for this study, it was determined that six sources were behind the issues. That is, the 37 issues could be classified into six categories. These sources are referred to as "presses," or identified sources of pressure that produced the issues.

The descriptions of the six sources of press are as follows:

A. Press from superordinate. Of the 37 issues, it was found that eight originated with a communication from an administrative superior.

B. Press from external authority. It was found that only two of the 37 issues originated from sources perceived by the decision-maker as coming from external authority. The external authority could be the governor's office, the mayor of the local city, or some other high-status individual.

C. Press from subordinate. Of the 37 issues, it was found that 13 originated from those lower than the decision-maker in the administrative hierarchy. Such persons could be secretaries, teachers, or anybody perceived as subordinate to the role of director of special education.

D. Press from peer. Of the 37 issues, it was found that seven originated from individuals perceived as peers. Peers could be other directors or building principals, those who could be seen as sharing a horizontal position in the administrative hierarchy.

E. Press from client. Four of the 37 issues were from clients. The clients could be parents or children served by the school under the jurisdiction of the director.

F. Press from obligation to maintain positive public relations ("PR"). Of the 37 issues, three were considered to have originated from pressures to maintain a positive, pleasing, or friendly image. Such pressure could have come from a community group asking to visit a school or from another school district asking for information about the school's educational programs.

Descriptions of Types of Decisions

In the 37 issues presented to the participants in the SEATS game workshops it was determined that there were eight kinds of decisions that could be made. Some of these decisions resolve the issues, some did not; some issues

were resolved by immediate decisional action and others were resolved by others to whom they were referred. Some decisions resulted in no resolution of the issues. The descriptions of the decisional actions and their definitions are as follows:

1. Made an immediate personal decision on an issue. This category was used when the decision-maker resolved an issue one way or another by making an immediate personal decision that terminated, or resolved, the issue. Immediate was defined as occurring prior to the end of the day that the issue came to attention.

2. Made a delayed personal decision on an issue. This category was used when the decision-maker indicated an intention to resolve or terminate an issue by making a personal decision at least one day after an issue was presented, but still within the foreseeable future. If the delay looked as if it was intended to be protracted, or if the decision made was to both delay and refer to another agent for resolution, then this category was not used. The purpose of having the two categories of "immediate" and "delayed" was to look for any possible indications of differences that might be related to impulsiveness or caution, decisiveness or indecisiveness.

3. Referred issue to superordinate for resolution. This category was used when the decision-maker did not make

a personal decision to resolve an issue but instead referred the issue to a superior in the administrative hierarchy for resolution. In the present study the director's superior would have been the superintendent or the assistant superintendent.

4. Referred the issue to a subordinate for resolution. This category was used when the decision-maker referred an issue "downward" to an individual lower in the administrative hierarchy for resolution. The subordinate could have been a teacher or secretary.

5. Referred the issue to a group for resolution. This category was used when the decision-maker referred an issue to any committee or group for resolution. The committee or group could be composed of peers or subordinates, or a combination of various individuals. Examples of committees or groups could include a case conference committee, a community study group, or an administrative council.

6. Referred the issue to a peer for resolution. This category was used if the decision-maker referred an issue to somebody who was a peer in the administrative structure for resolution. Examples of this could be referral to a director of personnel or a building principal. Generally, this category was used because issues were seen by the decision-maker as having been erroneously brought to his attention.

7. Action taken was vague or unclear. This category was used when the decision-maker's actions were not directed toward any visible means of resolution, either personally or via referral. Examples of this category could be when the decision-maker indicated an intention to file, ignore, or "take care of the matter sometime." If the decision-maker's reaction to an issue was expository, "philosophical," or rambling, this category was used.

8. No response either for lack of time or lack of interest in the issue; consideration of issue as low priority. This was the most widely-scored category, probably because of time restrictions built into the SEATS game workshops. The decision-making participants were required to select issues on a priority basis for the exception of the introductory issues that almost all participants reponded to for illustrative purposes.

Statistical Procedures

No expectations could be made about a normal distribution of the data obtained, and accordingly nonparametric analyses were made. Nonparametric analysis makes no assumptions about a normal or continuous distribution of data because "no assumptions are necessary about the shape of the population from which the sample is drawn" (Wiersma, 1969, p. 111). Each of the frequencies in the cells in the

following tables is independent of all others; no observation as recorded in the cells is dependent in any way upon any other observation(s).

There is a limitation to this method of data analysis in that it is not possible to determine whether each specific set of observations within the individual cells is statistically different from chance. To accomplish such a task, each cell would have to be treated as a separate statistical unit. However, because the chi-square within each cell depends upon a larger set of observations, it would be meaningless to assume that the statistic within each cell is totally independent, and thus subject to individual statistical treatment. While the observed frequencies within each cell are independent, the expected frequencies for the purpose of analysis are not.

Nevertheless, as will be shown there is a way to approximate individual cell analysis. This is by conducting chi-square analyses of sub-sections of the total set of observations, that is, by constructing smaller tables, looking only at certain cells combined into smaller tables.

Obtaining expected frequencies. The expected (E) frequency scores within each cell were obtained by multiplying each of the row and column totals and dividing this figure by the grand total of the observed frequencies of the table (Wiersma, 1969, p.124). To take a specific example from

Table 1 in the next chapter, Cell A-1 has an expected frequency of 212.97. This was obtained by multiplying the total of Column 1 (985) by the total of Row A (992), then dividing the result by the grand total of observed frequencies (4,588), thus obtaining 212.97.

Obtaining chi-square. The chi-square score within each cell was obtained by subtracting the expected (E) from the observed (O) frequencies in each cell. This figure then was squared (thus eliminating negative numbers) and divided by the expected (E) frequency score within the same cell. More briefly stated, the formula for obtaining the chi-square within each cell is:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

The overall chi-square for each table is the total score, a summation of all cells.

Testing for significance. To determine whether an obtained chi-square is significantly different from zero, a table in Wiersma (1969, p. 396) was consulted, "Critical values of chi-square."

Summary

Data were obtained from 124 building principals who participated in simulation workshops using the SEATS game. The workshops are described. Responses are recorded by

workshop participants were coded and placed into a six-by-eight table for analysis by the chi-square statistic. Descriptions were given of the six sources of issues presented in the SEATS workshops, as well as of the eight types of decisions that could be made to the issues presented.

CHAPTER IV-

RESULTS

There was a total of 4,588 potential responses to the 37 issues by the 124 building principals (124 x 37 = 4,588). Of this total, 2,100 were in the "no response" category, leaving a total of 2,488 other responses. Because making no response involved a decision--that is, a decision had to be made not to respond to an issue, for whatever reason--the "no response" category is included in part of the data analysis, that shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows all classifications of issues and decisions made. Tables 2 through 9 are portions of Table 1, extracted to more closely examine certain relationships between sources of issues and decisions made. Of particular interest are differences between issues arising from superordinates as compared with issues arising from subordinates.

All tables show a statistical significance at the .01 level with a two-tailed test of significance.

Table 1

The classification of the total sources and dispositions is presented in Table 1 on the following page.

TABLE 1

CLASSIFICATION OF OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF SOURCES OF ISSUES AND DECISIONS MADE BY BUILDING PRINCIPALS

SOURCES ("PRESSES")	Decisions	1 Immediate Personal Decision	2 Delayed Personal Decision	3 Referred to Superordinate	4 Referred to Subordinate	5 Referred to Group	6 Referred to Peer	7 Action Taken Vague or Unclear	8 No Response	TOTALS
(A) Superordinate	O	393	54	28	14	75	8	69	351	992
	E_2	212.97	41.30	19.46	13.19	119.35	47.35	84.32	454.05	992
	X^2	152.18	3.81	3.75	.05	16.48	32.70	2.78	23.39	235.24
(B) External Authority	O	40	1	1	2	9	1	16	178	248
	E_2	53.24	10.32	4.86	3.30	29.84	11.84	21.08	113.51	248
	X^2	3.29	8.42	3.07	.51	14.55	9.92	1.22	36.64	77.62
(C) Subordinate	O	188	87	10	36	299	109	158	725	1612
	E_2	346.08	67.11	31.62	21.43	143.95	76.95	137.93	737.84	1612
	X^2	72.21	5.90	14.78	9.91	56.90	13.35	3.21	.22	176.48
(D) Peer	O	212	21	11	5	91	88	80	360	868
	E_2	186.35	36.14	17.03	11.54	104.43	41.43	73.78	397.30	868
	X^2	3.53	6.34	2.14	3.71	1.73	52.35	.52	3.50	73.82
(E) Client	O	75	17	3	4	29	8	41	319	496
	E_2	106.49	20.65	9.73	6.59	59.68	23.68	42.16	227.03	496
	X^2	9.31	.65	4.66	1.02	15.77	10.38	.03	37.26	79.08
(F) Public Relations	O	77	11	37	0	49	5	26	167	372
	E_2	79.86	15.49	7.30	4.95	44.76	17.76	31.62	170.27	372
	X^2	.10	1.30	120.83	4.95	.40	9.17	1.00	.06	137.81
Totals	O	985	191	90	61	552	219	390	2100	4588
	X^2	240.62	26.52	149.23	20.15	105.83	127.87	8.76	101.07	780.05

$df = 7 \times 5 = 35$ $\quad X^2 = 780.05$ $\quad p > .01$

The top line in each row shows the categorization of the 4,588 observed (O) responses into each of the 48 available cells (six sources of issues times eight dispositional categories = 48 cells).

The second, or middle line, in each row shows the expected (E) frequencies within each cell.

The third, or bottom line, in each row shows the contribution of each cell to chi-square.

Analysis of Table 1. The overall chi-square obtained in Table 1 is 780.05. With 35 degrees of freedom, this is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence with a two-tailed test of significance.

It can be seen in Table 1 that a total of 15 of the 48 cells made the highest contributions to chi-square, with five of the cells scoring over 50 and the other 10 scoring between 10.38 and 37.26. The remaining 33 cells contributed between .03 and 9.91 to chi-square, which could be considered negligible.

Table 2

Table 2 on the following page includes all observed (O) frequencies from Table 1 with the exception of the last two columns: "Action Taken Vague or Unclear" (Column 7), and "No Reponse" (Column 8).

With 25 degrees of freedom, the obtained chi-square for Table 2 is 532.72, resulting in a .01 level of statistical confidence. Thus, there is a statistical difference between observed and expected frequencies in Table 2.

TABLE 2

CLASSIFICATION OF OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF SOURCES AND DECISIONS MADE BY BUILDING PRINCIPALS, MINUS TWO COLUMNS OF DECISIONS

SOURCES	Decisions	1 Immediate Personal Decision	2 Delayed Personal Decision	3 Referred to Superordinate	4 Referred to Subordinate	5 Referred to Group	6 Referred to Peer	TOTALS
(A) Super-ordinate	O	393	54	28	14	75	8	572
	E_2	268.55	52.07	24.54	16.62	150.50	59.71	572
	X^2	57.67	.07	.49	.42	37.88	44.78	141.31
(B) External Authority	O	40	1	1	2	9	1	54
	E_2	25.35	4.92	2.32	1.57	14.21	5.64	54
	X^2	8.47	3.12	.75	.12	1.91	3.82	18.19
(C) Sub-ordinate	O	188	87	10	36	299	109	729
	E_2	342.26	66.37	31.27	21.20	191.81	76.10	729
	X^2	69.53	6.41	14.47	10.33	59.91	14.22	174.864
(D) Peer	O	212	21	11	5	91	88	428
	E_2	200.94	38.96	18.36	12.44	112.61	44.68	428
	X^2	.61	8.28	2.95	4.50	4.15	42.00	62.49
(E) Client	O	75	17	3	4	29	8	136
	E_2	63.85	12.38	5.83	3.95	35.78	14.20	136
	X^2	1.95	1.72	1.37	.00	1.29	.00	6.33
(F) Public Relations	O	77	11	37	0	49	5	179
	E_2	84.04	16.30	7.68	5.20	47.10	18.68	179
	X^2	.59	1.72	111.94	5.20	.08	10.02	129.54
Totals	O_2	985	191	90	61	552	219	2098
	X^2	138.81	21.33	131.97	20.57	105.20	114.85	532.72

$df = 5 \times 5 = 25$ $\quad X^2 = 532.72$ $\quad p > .01$

By comparing Tables 1 and 2 it can be noted that the same directions of high and low chi-square scores exist within the same cells. Although Column 8 contains the highest number of frequencies of any other column, removing this column from the analysis did not alter the finding of a statistically significant difference in Table 2.

Table 3

In Table 3 an analysis is made of two rows and four columns:

Rows: (A) Superordinate
(C) Subordinate

Columns: (3) Referred to Superordinate
(4) Referred to Subordinate
(5) Referred to Group
(6) Referred to Peer

With three degrees of freedom, the obtained chi-square for Table 3 is 77.92. The level of significance is .01, thus indicating that the observed (O) and expected (E) frequencies in Table 3 are significantly different.

It can be seen from Table 3 that issues from superordinates significantly more often than expected were referred to superordinates, and significantly less than expected were referred to peers. With subordinates, significantly fewer issues than would be expected were referred to superordinates. The remaining cells showed only minor differences between observed and expected frequencies of response.

TABLE 3

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES IN RELATION TO REFERRALS TO SUPERORDINATES, SUBORDINATES, GROUPS, AND PEERS

SOURCES	Decisions	Referred to Superordinate 3	Referred to Subordinate 4	Referred to Group 5	Referred to Peer 6	TOTALS
(A) Superordinate	O	28	14	75	8	125
	E_2	8.20	10.79	80.74	25.26	125
	X^2	47.81	.96	.41	11.79	60.97
(C) Subordinate	O	10	36	299	109	454
	E_2	30.00	39.21	293.26	91.74	454
	X^2	13.33	.26	.11	3.25	16.96
Totals	O_2	38	50	374	117	579
	X^2	61.14	1.22	.52	15.04	77.92

$df = 3 \times 1 = 3$

$X^2 = 77.92$

$p > .01$

Table 4

This table examines two rows and two columns, as follows:

Rows: (A) Superordinate

(C) Subordinate

Columns: (1) Immediate Personal Decision

(2) Delayed Personal Decision

With one degree of freedom, the chi-square for Table 4 is 41.45. This value differs from zero at the .01 level of statistical confidence. Thus, there is a significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in Table 4.

It can be seen in Table 4 that in this comparison significantly fewer issues from superordinates were treated with a delayed personal decision, while significantly more issues from subordinates were treated to a delayed personal decision when compared with immediate personal decisions.

Table 5

Table 5 examines two rows and six columns combined into a 2 x 2 table, as follows:

Rows: (A) Superordinate

(C) Subordinate

TABLE 4

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES IN RELATION TO IMMEDIATE AND DELAYED PERSONAL DECISIONS

SOURCES	Decisions	Immediate Personal Decision 1	Delayed Personal Decision 2	TOTALS
(A) Superordinate	O	393	54	447
	E_2	359.70	87.30	447
	X^2	3.08	12.70	15.79
(C) Subordinate	O	188	87	275
	E_2	221.30	53.70	275
	X^2	5.01	20.65	25.66
Totals	O	581	141	722
	X^2	8.09	33.35	41.45

$df = 1 \times 1 = 1$

$X^2 = 41.45$

$p > .01$

Columns: (1, 2) — (Immediate Personal Decision
(Delayed Personal Decision

(3, 4, 5, 6) — (Referred to Superordinate
(Referred to Subordinate
(Referred to Group
(Referred to Peer

With one degree of freedom, the obtained chi-square for Table 5 is 212.05. This value differs from zero at the .01 level of confidence, thus indicating that the observed and expected frequencies in Table 5 are significantly different.

In Table 5 it can be noted that when combining immediate and delayed personal decisions into one category and comparing them with the combined categories of referrals to others (superordinates, subordinates, groups, and peers), differences are shown between issues from superordinates and subordinates. Far more issues from superordinates were given a personal decision as a response, and far fewer than expected were referred to others. Just the opposite happened with issues from subordinates, where fewer were treated with personal decisions and more observed than expected were referred to others.

Table 6

Here there are two rows and two columns:

Rows: (A) Superordinate

(C) Subordinate

Columns: (1) Immediate Personal Decision

(5) Referred to Group

TABLE 5

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES IN RELATION TO COMBINED PERSONAL DECISIONS AND COMBINED REFERRALS TO OTHERS

SOURCES	Decisions	Immediate Personal Decision / Delayed Personal Decision: 1 and 2	Referred to Superordinate / Referred to Subordinate / Referred to Group / Referred to Peer: 3, 4, 5, and 6	TOTALS
(A) Superordinate	O	447	125	572
	E_2	317.44	254.56	572
	X^2	52.88	65.94	118.82
(C) Subordinate	O	275	454	729
	E_2	404.56	324.44	729
	X^2	41.49	51.74	93.23
Totals	O	722	579	1,301
	X^2	94.37	117.68	212.05

$df = 1 \times 1 = 1$

$X^2 = 212.05$

$p > .01$

With one degree of freedom, the chi-square for Table 6 is 206.20. This value differs from zero at the .01 level of statistical confidence. Thus there is a significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in Table 6.

In Table 6 it can be noted that when comparing immediate personal decisions with referrals to groups, superordinates had more observed than expected immediate personal decisions made and far fewer observed than expected referrals to groups. Subordinates, on the other hand, had fewer than expected immediate personal decisions made on their issues, and far more observed than expected referrals to groups.

Table 7

Table 7 contains three rows and two columns:

Rows: (A) Superordinate
(C) Subordinate
(D) Peer

Columns: (1) Immediate Personal Decision
(5) Referred to Group

With two degrees of freedom, the chi-square for Table 7 is 219.08. This value differs from zero at the .01 level of statistical confidence. There is thus a significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in Table 7.

TABLE 6

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES IN RELATION TO IMMEDIATE PERSONAL DECISIONS AND REFERRALS TO GROUPS

SOURCES	Decisions	Immediate Personal Decision 1	Referred to Group 5	TOTALS
(A) Superordinate	O	393	75	468
	E	284.72	183.28	468
	X^2	41.18	63.97	105.15
(B) Subordinate	O	188	299	487
	E	296.28	190.72	487
	X^2	39.57	61.48	101.05
Totals	O	581.	374	955
	X^2	80.75	125.45	206.20

$df = 1 \times 1 = 1$

$X^2 = 206.20$

$p > .01$

TABLE 7

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES, SUBORDINATES, AND PEERS IN RELATION TO IMMEDIATE PERSONAL DECISIONS AND REFERRALS TO GROUPS

SOURCES	Decisions	Immediate Personal Decision	Referred to Group	TOTALS
		1	5	
(A) Superordinate	O	393	75	468
	E_2	295.01	172.99	468
	X^2	32.55	55.51	88.05
(C) Subordinate	O	188	299	487
	E_2	306.99	180.01	487
	X^2	46.12	78.66	124.78
(D) Peer	O	212	91	303
	E_2	191.00	112.00	303
	X^2	2.31	3.94	6.25
Totals	O	793	465	1,258
	X^2	80.98	138.10	219.08

$df = 1.x\ 2 = 2$

$X^2 = 219.08$

$p > .01$

It can be seen in Table 7 again that significantly more immediate personal decisions were made on issues stemming from superordinates, while significantly fewer immediate personal decisions were made when the issues came from subordinates--exactly the opposite form of treatment. Far more observed than expected issues from subordinates were referred to groups, where as the opposite happened when issues were referred from superordinates--far fewer were referred to groups. No differences can be noted between immediate personal decisions versus referrals to groups when peers were the source of the issues.

Table 8

Here there are two rows and two columns examined:

Rows: (A) Superordinate

(C) Subordinate

Columns: (5) Referred to Group

(6) Referred to Peer

With one degree of freedom, the chi-square for Table 8 is 11.09. This value differs from zero at the .01 level of statistical confidence. Thus, there is a significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in Table 8.

Table 8 examines differences in referrals to groups as compared with referrals to peers when the issues come from superordinates or subordinates. It can be seen that the only significant difference in this table is a lower

TABLE 8

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES IN RELATION TO REFERRALS TO GROUPS AND REFERRALS TO PEERS

SOURCES	Decisions	Referred To Group 5	Referred To Peer 6	TOTALS
(A) Superordinate	O	75	8	83
	E_2	63.22	19.78	83
	X^2	2.20	7.02	9.21
(C) Subordinate	O	299	109	408
	E_2	310.78	97.22	408
	X^2	.45	1.43	1.87
Totals	O	374	117	491
	X^2	2.64	8.44	11.09

$df = 1 \times 1 = 1$

$X^2 = 11.09$

$p > .01$

observed than expected frequency in response on issues from superordinates being referred to the peers of the decision-makers.

Table 9

Table 9 is another 2 x 2 table which examines the following two rows and two columns:

Rows: (A) Superordinate
(C) Subordinate

Columns: (3) Referred to Superordinate
(4) Referred to Subordinate

With one degree of freedom, the chi-square for Table 9 is 18.05. This value differs from zero at the .001 level of statistical confidence. Thus, there is a significant difference between observed and expected frequencies in Table 9.

Table 9 shows small but statistically significant differences between issues stemming from superordinates as compared with subordinates having these issues referred to superordinates or subordinates. More issues than expected from superordinates were referred to superordinates and fewer were referred to subordinates. Subordinates had fewer issues referred to superordinates, and more observed than expected of their issues referred to subordinates.

TABLE 9

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES AND CHI-SQUARE OF RESPONSES OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR ISSUES FROM SUPERORDINATES AND SUBORDINATES IN RELATION TO REFERRALS TO SUPERORDINATES AND REFERRALS TO SUBORDINATES

SOURCES	Decisions	Referred to Superordinate	Referred to Subordinate	TOTALS
		3	4	
(A) Superordinate	O	28	14	42
	E_2	18.14	23.86	42
	X^2	5.36	4.08	9.43
(C) Subordinate	O	10	36	46
	E_2	19.86	26.14	46
	X^2	4.90	3.72	8.61
Totals	O	38	50	88
	X^2	10.25	7.79	18.05

$df = 1 \times 1 = 1$

$X^2 = 18.05$

$p > .01$

Summary

Nine tables were constructed and analyzed by means of a nonparametric chi-square statistic and subjected to tests of statistical significance.

An analysis of the total set of responses indicated there was a significant difference between observed and expected responses. Selected combinations of cells were removed for analysis from the major table (Table 1), revealing a more clear picture of specific instances of differences between observed and expected patterns of responding.

The most significant findings were in the way the participating decision-makers were significantly more personally responsive to issues arising from their superordinates and much less personally responsive to issues coming from subordinates. A superordinate typically received an immediate personal decision to issues, while a subordinate found issues treated to referrals to groups, peers, or given no attention at all. Matters relating to public relations typically were referred by the decision-maker in the study to superordinates for decisions.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The initial focus of this discussion will center around Table 1, with reference made to other tables primarily to illuminate more specifically what can generally be observed in Table 1. Tables 2 through 9 are extracted portions of Table 1, with certain relationships examined more closely. Of special interest is the relationship between issues arising from superordinates when compared with issues arising from subordinates.

All chi-square values for the nine tables were statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence, with two-tailed tests of significance.

One note of clarification is in order. In the tables, some issues arise from a certain source and the decision is made to refer the issue to the same source. This may look contradictory, but it can happen for several reasons. By way of examples, a peer may ask a question or present a problem, and the decision could be made to refer the matter to another peer. Or, if a subordinate presented an issue and the decision-maker said, in effect, "I won't handle

this; it's your problem," then the referral would have been back to the same subordinate.

Highest Contributing Cells

Cell A-1 made the highest contribution to chi-square in Table 1, with significantly more observed than expected frequencies. The issues here came from a superordinate and the decisions made were personal and immediate. When the middle manager received an issue from his superior, the matter was given priority over all other issues and given immediate and personal attention.

The next highest contribution to chi-square in Table 1 came from Cell F-3, where the observed frequencies were far below the expected. This cell reflects issues coming from concern for public relations and the decision most often made was to refer the issues upward to a superordinate for resolution. Apparently the decision-makers felt that public relations were beyond their scope of responsibilities and should be handled at the highest administrative levels.

Third in contributing to the overall chi-square was Cell C-1, where issues coming from subordinates were not treated to expected frequencies of immediate personal decisions. Along with this, Cell C-5 shows a higher frequency than expected of referring issues from subordinates to groups for resolution. This will be discussed in more detail below.

Cell D-6 with higher observed than expected frequencies made a significant contribution to chi-square in Table 1. This is a category for issues from the decision-makers' peers being referred to other peers. As was noted in Chapter III, this probably is because the decision-maker considered many of the issues as misdirected, so the decision was merely to re-route the issue to the appropriate person. For instance, a principal may ask the director to solve a problem in bus scheduling; the decision may have been to refer the issue to the Director of Transportation. Additionally, the decision-makers probably were not overly anxious to cross administrative territorial grounds among their peers, and preferred to pass these issues along whenever possible. Peers cannot demand action from each other, and yet there is no point to unnecessarily taking on a problem from this source.

Clients as a source of press had a lower than expected number of their issues referred to peers (Cell E-6) and a higher than expected number ignored (Cell E-8). In addition, they had a lower than expected number of their issues receive immediate personal decisions (Cell E-1).

The three remaining cells that contributed most to chi-square in Table 1 all came from superordinates (Row A). Here, there were lower than expected numbers of decisions to refer issues to groups or peers, or to do nothing (Cells A-5, 6, and 8).

Table 2. Table 2 is the same as Table 1 except that the last two columns are omitted from analysis: "Decision Vague or Unclear," and "No Response."

About the only differences in results between Tables 1 and 2 lie in two cells (C-3 and E-6). In Cell C-3, issues from subordinates show significantly fewer referrals to superordinates than was apparent in Table 1; this will be further examined below. In Cell E-6, issues from clients referred to peers no longer showed differences between observed and expected frequencies. In the overall context of the data, these differences between tables are of little consequence.

Issues from Superordinates and Subordinates

An examination of the tables shows a particular pattern of responding between the decision-makers and both their superiors and their subordinates. As middle managers the decision-makers were more responsive to their superiors than to any other source. There were more immediate personal decisions made when a superior presented an issue and there were fewer decisions than expected to refer these issues elsewhere or to ignore them.

Subordinates were treated in an entirely different manner. They were not necessarily ignored, because the "no response" cell (C-8) showed little difference between observed and expected frequencies of decisions. But subordinates consistently had their problems referred

elsewhere instead of receiving the personal decisional attention of the middle manager.

Table 3 looked at differences in issues from superordinates and subordinates in four referral areas: referrals to superordinates, subordinates, groups, and peers. The differences here, highlighted in further tables as discussed below, show that superordinates had more referrals than expected to superordinates and fewer than expected to peers, with about the same observed and expected referrals to subordinates and groups. Subordinates, on the other hand, had fewer than expected referrals to superordinates with about the same observed as expected referrals to others.

Table 4 shows that even in such an esoteric area as immediate versus delayed personal decisions, the subordinate was treated to more delayed decisions than the superordinate. Combining columns to compare both immediate and personal decisions with referrals to others (superordinate, subordinate, group, and peer) shows highly significant differences in treatment afforded to superordinates and subordinates, as shown in Table 5.

Looking more closely at whether there were differences between issues from superordinates and subordinates in immediate personal decisions versus referrals to groups, Table 6 again confirms the pattern. Superordinates had far more personal decisions made on their issues and far fewer referrals to groups, while subordinates received the

opposite treatment--far more referrals to groups and fewer personal decisions on their issues. Table 7 shows the same pattern except that issues from peers also are examined in the context of issues from superordinates and subordinates; peers were treated to about the same frequency of observed as expected frequencies in this examination.

Table 8 looks at issues from superordinates and subordinates to see whether there are differences in referrals to groups versus referrals to peers. The table shows that subordinates had about the same number of referrals made to both. Superordinates, on the other hand, had fewer than expected referrals to peers, and about the same observed as expected referrals to groups.

Table 9 looks at what happens when superordinates or subordinates present issues that are referred to superordinates or subordinates. While the differences are not great they are significant. Superordinates had more issues referred to superordinates than to subordinates. Subordinates had fewer issues referred to superordinates, and more issues referred to subordinates. In effect, if a superior asks a question he gets a direct answer; if a subordinate asks a question he is referred to somebody else.

Implications

In his most recent book, Drucker (1974) says that in the early 1950's there was an expectation that due to

computer and other technological innovations there was an expectation that middle managers would all but disappear within a few years. Instead, "the fifties and sixties brought in all developed countries a tremendous growth of middle managers" (p. 174). As for differences between the increasing numbers of middle managers, Drucker says that "unlike traditional middle managers, the new middle people are largely decision-makers rather than executors of decisions made on high" (p. 174).

For the purpose of the research reported here, "decisions" were defined as whatever action or lack of action was taken by building principals simulating the role of another middle manager, a director of special education in a fictitious public school district. As noted in Chapter III, most definitions of decisions are derived from the context of the theoretical or research endeavor undertaken by specific investigators. In another context, the definition of decision used here might not be relevant.

Nevertheless the data reported can be interpreted as having certain implications for training, practice and future research.

Training

Reviews by Burrello, Guarino, and Poinsett (1974) and Meisgeier and Sloat (1970), along with the literature reviewed in Chapter II, suggest little in the way of academic

or on-the-job training programs involving decision-making for prospective or practicing administrators.

At this time, nobody knows the makeup of an effective decision-maker, or what could make an ineffective decision-maker into an effective one (Odiorne, 1967). Effective decisions are those that produce the desired short-range as well as long-range results. But this information is not known until after the fact, and the trainee has no opportunity to observe the process and results.

It is possible to speculate on many desirable characteristics of the effective decision-maker. He probably should be reasonably intelligent, emotionally stable, and skilled in the business at hand. Training programs can do little or nothing about intelligence or emotional stability. The only area where training programs can have any effect is in developing skills. And the only way skills can be developed is to know what they are, or what they should be.

Simulation offers an opportunity for the trainee to obtain experience in decision-making without having to actually hold down a position where trial-and-error produce a form of haphazard "training." About the major criterion in education for an individual to measure his effectiveness in decision-making is whether or not he is fired from a job.

What has been lacking in simulation exercises so far, however, is a method to analyze the kinds of decisions made. Even in a simulation exercise the trainee does not know whether his decision was a good one. The opinions provided by other trainees and by the workshop managers are the major sources of the trainee's learning.

By constructing tables or matrices to classify decisions such as was produced in this research, a method is available for the simulation participant to look at his patterns of decisions. At this stage, it is not known if the patterns shown are correct or incorrect, effective or ineffective; that has to be the subject of future research. But at this time the trainee can at least see more objectively what he is doing. It is the first step.

Practice

Selecting middle managers. How does an employed select a middle manager? Typically, the criteria for such selection are based on credentials containing histories of previous employment and opinions about effectiveness, certificates bearing testimony to having been trained, and personal interviews (Sands, 1964). If certificates are required (such as certification in supervision), these usually are baseline requirements, that is, they allow the candidate to procede to the point of actually being considered. Of real import are the recommendations from previous employers, and the interview. Paper and pencil tests to

select administrative personnel (Mandell, 1950) are rarely used in practice.

Many, if not most, middle management positions, especially in the public schools, are not filled by persons with previous experience in middle management. The data on the personal characteristics of the 124 building principals reported in Appendix A show almost identical figures for two categories, "Professional experience in general school supervision and administration," and "Number of years as an administrator in present school district." The inference can be drawn that most of these participating principals went directly to principalships from teaching positions.

Thus, what remains for the employer of a school principal as a middle manager is the interview as the primary basis for selection. Previous teaching experience may or may not be relevant to success as a building principal. In fact, considering the "Peter Principle," where people are promoted to their highest level of incompetence, skill as a classroom teacher could very well be a dubious qualification for an administrative position.

Considering that a personal interview, then, is really the critical factor in the selection of many middle managers, it would seem that most employers would welcome some method for obtaining further information about job candidates. Employers want managers who are personable, mature,

intelligent, etc., but all of these characteristics can be subsumed under the major category of ability to make effective decisions. A manager can hardly make an effective decision if he is not personable, mature, etc.; the absence of such qualities in most cases would preclude the making of effective decisions.

The method developed in the present research opens opportunities to learn more about how individuals make decisions. The method could be used by means of pre-employment workshops, where employers could invite job candidates to participate in simulation exercises. As the employer observed the candidates and recorded their responses to issues confronting them, additional and useful information would become available about each candidate.

Another possible way the method could be used would be for a simulation exercise to be part of academic training programs in management. Following the completion of the exercise, each participant would emerge with a profile of how he made decisions. This profile then could become part of this credentials, similar to grade reports from universities.

The middle manager in action. Who is the school principal, as a middle manager? Is he a decision-maker, or does he function as a conduit to funnel problems to other people? Or is he, in fact, an extension of top management where his "decisions" are merely those he thinks the top

management would make, where his sole function is to save the time of top management by executing decisions made by his superior?

The data from the present research do not answer these questions. But what does emerge is a suggestion of uncertainty on the part of the middle manager. There are three major indicators of this uncertainty. First, Table 1 shows that when matters relating to public relations arose, the principals referred 37 of these issues to their superiors, where only seven would have been expected by chance. Second, the tables show an unusual degree of attention to superordinates, more so than to any other source, suggesting a lack of independence and a heavy reliance upon top management.

Third and probably most significant is the way the middle managers reacted to issues from their subordinates. It was indicated in Chapter I that the initial expectation was that the middle manager would be responsive to subordinates if for no other reason than that the functions of the job require attention to subordinates. In addition, the proximity of middle managers to subordinates is such that responsiveness could be expected. Instead, the middle managers in this study made significantly fewer personal decisions on issues emanating from subordinates, and made significantly more referrals of their issues to others--especially groups or peers. In effect, the middle manager

appeared to be unsure of himself as a decision-maker in the one area where certainty should be most clearcut.

Research

Marro and Kohl (1972) typify much of the kind of research currently being conducted in administration of special education. They conducted a national survey of special education administrators, with 1,066 respondents. The data produced are somewhat similar to the data reported here in Appendix A, with ages, incomes, previous experience, etc.

The method used in this study could provide a means to procure more meaningful information about administration. While decision-making is the heart and essence of administration (Barnard, 1945), less is known about it than about any other facet of administration.

Several suggestions for future research already have been mentioned. An immediate and pressing problem is to refine the method used in this research for classifying and analyzing decisions. Then, once the structure of decisions can be objectively displayed, the larger question is: Is this how it should be?

The data presented in this study showed how a group of building principals in a simulation exercise made decisions. Other studies could show similar data; this is the first step. The next step is to determine if the kinds of decisions made are effective, or if they should be the way

they are. If the answer is negative, then efforts could be made to alter the decision patterns. For instance, perhaps it would be desirable to train simulation participants to be more attentive to their subordinates or their clients.

The ultimate objective in training programs for managers should be toward making effective decisions. To reach toward that objective, a method is needed to classify decisions. Without such a classification, effectiveness cannot be measured. Classification of decisions does not produce measures of effectiveness, but is a prerequisite building block to such measurement.

Limitations

Certain limitations in this research were noted. First, an improved means is needed to identify the sources of issues, particularly because it is only the decision-maker who can really identify the value of some sources. This would be more critical in "real" settings than in simulated situations. For instance, to the researcher a building principal may be a "peer" to the director of special education, but to the decision-making respondent, the building principal may in fact be perceived as a subordinate, or even a superordinate.

And second, an improved means is needed to identify precisely what kinds of decisions are made by respondents.

This would be very difficult to do because to introduce controls of responses might reduce freedom of choice in responses, thus resulting in confounding artificiality. Nevertheless, in certain research freedom of choice may not be critical and a restricted response range might be more useful.

Summary

A six-by-eight table for classifying issues and the decisions made to deal with these issues was developed and statistically analyzed. The data were obtained from a randomly-selected group of 124 building principals who participated in simulation workshops held in mid-central Michigan. Results showed that it is possible to objectively classify issues and decisions and to examine the structure of the relationship between different sources of issues and different kinds of decisions.

APPENDIX A

Personal Characteristics of Building Principals

n = 124

(Numbers in parantheses indicate the number of respondents in the particular categories.)

1.	Sex	a. Male	(98)
		b. Female	(26)
2.	Age	a. 20-24	(1)
		b. 25-34	(18)
		c. 35-44	(43)
		d. 45-54	(42)
		e. Over 54	(20)
3.	Amount of educational training		
		a. B. A.	(2)
		b. Master's	(91)
		c. B. A. + 60 hrs.	(26)
		d. Doctorate	(5)

(Appendix A, continued)

4. Professional experience in general classroom teaching

a.	0 years	(1)
b.	1 year	(3)
c.	2-4 years	(15)
d.	5-9 years	(45)
e.	Over 9 years	(60)

5. Professional experience in general school supervision and administration

a.	0 years	(3)
b.	1 year	(7)
c.	2-4 years	(23)
d.	5-9 years	(31)
e.	Over 9 years	(60)

6. Professional experience in special education teaching

a.	0 years	(108)
b.	1 year	(2)
c.	2-4 years	(9)
d.	5-9 years	(3)
e.	Over 9 years	(2)

(Appendix A, continued)

7. Professional experience in special education supervision and administration.

a.	0 years	(86)
b.	1 year	(7)
c.	2-4 years	(17)
d.	5-9 years	(5)
e.	Over 9 years	(9)

8. Number of years as an administrator in present school district.

a.	0 years	(3)
b.	1 year	(11)
c.	2-4 years	(24)
d.	5-9 years	(32)
e.	Over 9 years	(54)

APPENDIX B

AGENDA

GRAND RAPIDS WORKSHOP
WALDENWOODS CONFERENCE CENTER

WALDENWOODS TIME		DORMIT TIME
Wednesday, January 30		
4:30 p.m.	Registration	
5:00	Welcome and Introduction	
5:30	Orientation - Section A	August 15
6:00	Dinner - Independent study and reaction to Section A	
7:30	Tour of Dormit	August 15 (and last spring)
8:00	Feedback Session - "What's Rotten in Dormit?"	August 16-10:00
9:00	Overnight Assignment - Completion of Section A	
Thursday, January 31		
8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	
8:30	Section A - Goals	September 30
9:00	Work Session - Section B In-Basket	
10:15	Break	
10:30	Feedback B	
11:00	Program Planning Committee	
12:30 p.m.	Lunch	

(Appendix B, continued)

WALDENWOODS TIME		DORMIT TIME
Thursday, January 31 (continued)		
1:30 p.m.	Work Session - Section C In-Basket	February 15
2:45	Break	
3:00	Feedback C	
3:30	Classroom Observation (audio-visual)	February 20
4:00	Discussion	
4:30	Dinner Break (Dinner is served at 5:30)	
6:30	Video Tape	
6:50	Discussion	
7:15	Role Play	
7:45	Report Out	
8:00	Overnight Assignment	May 15
Friday, February 1		
8:00 a.m.	Breakfast	
8:30	Feedback D	
9:15	Case Conference Committee	May 20
10:00	Analysis of Group Roles	
10:15	Film	
10:30	Discussion	
11:00	Conference Evaluation and Summary	
12:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

APPENDIX C

Following is a brief narrative description of each of the 37 issues to which the 124 subjects in this study were offered an opportunity to respond.

The word or phrase at the beginning of each description identifies how the issue was classified for its source, or press.

(1) B-10 (Subordinate) A memorandum from a teacher on the staff complaining that a child is misplaced in her class, asking for a review of the placement.

(2) B-11 ("PR") A letter from the chairman of the local Association for Retarded Children complaining about lack of graduation procedures for retarded children when they leave school.

(3) B-12 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the assistant superintendent asking that a committee be formed to work on guidelines for a new special education program.

(4) B-13 (Subordinate) A memorandum from a speech teacher complaining about the uneven distribution of case-loads as well as the inequitable amount of work expected.

(Appendix C, continued)

(5) B-15 (Subordinate) A memorandum from a teacher complaining of being assigned to playground duty, saying other teachers do not have this responsibility.

(6) B-16 (Subordinate) A memorandum from a teacher complaining about being housed in her school's basement and not having an opportunity for her students to interact with other childre; also, complaining about the unresponsiveness of the principal.

(7) B-17 (Client) A letter from a parent complaining about the way her child's teacher dresses, saying his casual appearance is not professional.

(8) B-18 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the central office asking for a review of tuition costs for children placed in programs in other districts or agencies.

(9) B-19 (Subordinate) A memorandum from the transportation office asking if routes could change to pick up more children and thus reduce total travel time; however, the new routing would create other problems.

(10) B-20 (Subordinate) A memorandum from a teacher complaining that the other teacher who works with her is not sharing the burden of supervising students during physical education periods.

(Appendix C, continued)

(11) B-21 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the superintendent asking for a list of proposals he could present to a group to press for legislative action.

(12) B-22 (External Authority) A memorandum from the State Education Department with a reminder that federal funds are available, with suggestions on priorities for project proposals.

(13) C-30 (Peer) A memorandum from the director of secondary curriculum mentioning that he knows of a male high school teacher offering home teaching to a 17-year-old girl who is home alone.

(14) C-32 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the superintendent asking for recommendations on how a presentation about special education might be made to a meeting of the local Chamber of Commerce.

(15) C-33 (Peer) A memorandum from a principal asking for clarification on who is responsible for evaluating the speech teacher in the building.

(16) C-35 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the superintendent suggesting that visits and other preparations be made for forthcoming programming for children who are emotionally disturbed.

(Appendix C, continued)

(17) C-36 (Peer) A memorandum from a principal announcing that he had just refused permission for staff from a neighboring school district to visit the special education classrooms in his building, claiming that such visits were becoming disruptive.

(18) C-37 (Subordinate) A memorandum from a staff school psychologist mentioning that too many students are potential candidates for classes for the emotionally disturbed and listing other problems, asking for suggestions.

(19) C-39 (Subordinate) A memorandum from the same teacher as in B-20, this time complaining about the misplacement of a child in her class, observing that the child's parents are influential.

(20) C-40 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the assistant superintendent for business mentioning that at his bowling game the previous evening "the boys" mentioned that one of them could arrange for rental of a local religious facility for classrooms for the proposed new programs for children who are emotionally disturbed.

(21) C-42 (Peer) A memorandum from the personnel officer with a reminder that the new teachers' contract permits classroom teachers to refuse to work with problem children because the district is supposed to provide programming for children who are emotionally disturbed.

(Appendix C, continued)

(22) C-43 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the assistant superintendent asking for an opinion on a bill in the State Senate that would establish intermediate school districts.

(23) C-44 (Peer) A memorandum from a principal about two teachers who are having a disagreement, asking what should be done.

(24) C-45 (Client) A letter from a parent whose child has serious problems, asking for support for a legislative bill that would pay parents for sending their children to private schools.

(25) D-50 (Subordinate) A letter from a local program supervisor asking if a child with orthopedic problems could be placed into a regular class, noting, however, that the child's ability in many ways was limited.

(26) D-51 (Subordinate) A memorandum from the school psychologist mentioning that a child presently placed in a class for the retarded has just "tested" above that level and should be removed, an action opposed by the child's teacher.

(27) D-53 (Peer) A memorandum from a principal mentioning that a special education teacher and an English teacher are having problems concerning the lunchroom, asking what might be done.

(Appendix C, continued)

(28) D-54 (Client) A letter from a parent of a first-grader, complaining that no speech service is being provided.

(29) D-55 (Subordinate) A memorandum from the secretary saying that an irate parent had called because her child's teacher had made personal inquiries into the parent's home lives. Also mentioned was that the parents are involved in politics.

(30) D-56 (Superordinate) A memorandum from the superintendent saying that estimated costs for the new program for children who are emotionally disturbed are twice the original estimate, asking that plans be made to "sell" the new program to the Board of Education if necessary.

(31) D-58 (Client) A letter from a parent mentioning that his wife would be available for a job as a teacher aide in the new program for children who are emotionally disturbed, indicating it would be convenient if a job were open in the child's classroom, and also mentioning that they were active in getting the program started.

(32) D-59 (Subordinate) A memorandum from the teacher with the child who was the subject of the psychologist's memorandum (D-51), complaining about the psychologist and indicating that removal of the child from her room would be "disastrous."

(Appendix C, continued)

(33) D-60 (External Authority) A letter from a consultant in the State Education Department announcing he was going to visit, indicating he had a special interest in reviewing the eligibility of students for certain special education programs.

(34) D-61 ("PR") A letter from a professor of special education at the local university, who resides in the district, complaining about rumors he has heard for plans to establish special self-contained classes for children who are emotionally disturbed; he prefers another approach.

(35) D-62 ("PR") A letter from a member of the local Association for Retarded Children stating disagreement with a speaker of the previous evening who recommended that "trainable" retarded children be housed in regular school buildings rather than in isolated facilities.

(36) D-63 (Subordinate) A memorandum from the chief nurse mentioning she had just talked with a board member, who happens to be an attorney, about giving medicines to children, especially in the proposed classes for children who are emotionally disturbed.

(Appendix C, continued)

(37) D-64 (Peer) A memorandum from a principal complaining about any plans to develop resource rooms instead of special classes, saying that teachers without a specific classroom assignment waste time, whereas special classes would relieve other teachers of problem children.

REFERENCES

Allan, Harry T. An empirical test of choice and decision postulates in the Cyert-March behavioral theory of the firm. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1966, 11, 405-413.

Alutto, Joseph A., and Belasco, James A. Decisional deprivation, equilibrium and saturation as variables in educational research. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York, 1971.

Baker, Duke H., and Mamlin, Joseph J. Simulation modeling--A tool for medical planning. The Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine, November 1971, 78, 836. (Abstract of proceedings.)

Barnard, Chester. The Functions of the Executive. Boston, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Bates, James. A model for the science of decision. Philosophy of Science, 1954, 21, 326-339.

Blakenship, L. Vaughn, and Miles, Raymond E. Organizational structure and managerial decision behavior. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1968, 13, 106-120.

Block, Jack, and Petersen, Paul. Some personality correlates of confidence, caution, and speed in a decision situation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, July 1955, 51, 34-41.

Blumberg, Arthur, Wayson, William, and Weber, Wilford. The elementary school cabinet: Report of an experience in participative decision-making. Educational Administration Quarterly, Fall 1969, 5, 39-52.

Bridges, Edwin M. Administrative man: Origin or pawn in decision making? Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1970, 6, 7-25.

Bridges, Edwin M. A model for shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1967, 3, 49-61.

Buffalo Courier Express. Game simulates decisions faced in marriage. Tuesday, December 25, 1973, p. 42.

Burrello, Leonard C., Guarino, Robert L., and Poinsett, Sallyann. Research and practice: The changing role of the special education administrator. In Mann, Lester, and Sabatino, Davis (eds.) The Second Review of Special Education. Philadelphia: JSE Press, 1974, pp. 351-375.

Cahoon, R. L. Simple decision making at high altitude. Ergonomics, March 1972, 15, 157-163.

Campbell, Donald T., and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966 (paper).

Carter, E. Eugene. The behavioral theory of the firm and top-level corporate decisions. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1971, 16, 413-428.

Chernoff, Herman, and Moses, Lincoln E. Elementary Decision Theory. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Clarke, Lawrence J. Decision models for personnel systems. Personnel Administration, July-August 1970, 33, 34-40.

Coch, Lester, and French, John R. P. Overcoming resistence to change. Human Relations, 1948, 1, 512-532.

Cohen, Michael D., March, James G., and Olsen, Johan B. A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1972, 17, 1-25.

Coleman, James S., Livingston, Samuel A., Fennessey, Gail M., Edwards, Keith J., and Kidder, Steven J. The Hopkins Games Program: Conclusions from seven years of research. Educational Researcher, August 1973, 2, 3-7.

Conway, James A. Participative decision making and perceptions of organization: Refinement and test of a decisional deviation index. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973.

Copeland, Melvin T. The Executive at Work. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Cruickshank, Donald R. The use of simulation in teacher education: A developing phenomenon. The Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1969, 20, 23-26.

Cummings, Larry L., and Harnett, Donald L. Managerial problems and the experimental method. Business Horizons, April 1968, 11, 41-48.

Cyert, R. M., Dill, W. R., and March, J. G. The role of expectations in business decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1958, 3, 307-340.

Dahlke, H. Otto. The significance, inter-relationships, and ordering of value systems. The Journal of Educational Thought, August 1969, 3, 98-121.

David, Beatrice Donaldson. Systematic management of food service: A model for decision making. Hospitals, August 1, 1972, 46, 50-55.

Davidson, Donald, Suppes, Patrick, and Siegal, Sidney. Decision-making: An Experimental Approach. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Dawson, John E. New approaches to decision making: implications for the elementary building principal. National Elementary Principal, May 1968, 47, 62-69.

Dean, Burton V. Application of operations research to managerial decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1958, 3, 412-428.

Deising, Paul. Reason in Society: Five Types of Decisions and Their Social Conditions. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1962.

Demerath, Nicholas F., and Thibaut, John W. Small groups and administrative organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1956, 1, 139-154.

Dewey, John. How We Think. New York: D. C. Heath, 1933.

Dickson, Gary W. A generalized model of administrative decisions: An experimental test. Management Science, September 1970, 17, 35-47.

Dill, William R. Administrative decision making. In Mallick, Sidney, and Van Ness, Edward H. (eds.) Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1962, pp. 29-48.

Dill, William R. Decision-making. In Griffiths, Daniel E. (ed.) Behavioral Science and Educational Administration: The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, Chapter IX, pp. 199-222.

Dimock, Marshall. A Philosophy of Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Dooher, M. Joseph, and Marquis, Vivienne (eds.). The Development of Executive Talent. New York: American Management Association, 1952.

Drucker, Peter F. Decision-making and the effective executive. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1968, 52, 24-39.

Drucker, Peter F. Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Duffy, N. F., and Taylor, C. M. The implementation of a decision. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1962, 7, 110-119.

Dunsire, A. The Making of an Administrator. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1950.

Edwards, Ward. The theory of decision making. Psychological Bulletin, July 1954, 51, 380-417.

Edwards, Ward. Behavioral decision theory. Annual Review of Psychology, 1961, 12, 473-498.

Edwards, Ward. A Bibliography of Research on Behavioral Decision Processes to 1968. Memorandum Report No. 7. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Human Performance Center, 1969.

Eilon, Samuel. What is a decision? Management Science, December 1969, 16, B172-B189.

Einhorn, Hillel J. The use of nonlinear, non-compensatory models in decision making. Psychological Bulletin, March 1970, 73, 221-230.

Ericson, Richard F. The impact of cybernetic information technology on management value systems. Management Science, October 1969, 16, B40-B60.

Evans, John R., and Cody, John J. Transfer of decision-making skills learned in a counseling-like setting to similar and dissimilar situations. Journal of Counseling Psychology, September 1969, 16, 427-432.

Fattu, Nicholas A., and Elam, Stanley (eds.). Simulation Models for Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1965.

Ference, Thomas P. Organizational communications systems and the decision process. Management Science, October 1970, 17, B83-B96.

Findlay, Donald C. Application of the CIPP evaluation model to a center with multiple program areas and levels. Educational Technology, October 1971, 11, 43-47.

Fisher, James E., and Sealey, Ronald W. The analytical pragmatic structure of procedural due process: A framework for inquiry in administrative decision making. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973.

Fogarty, Bryce A., and Gregg, Russell T. Centralization of decision making and selected characteristics of superintendents of schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1966, 2, 62-72.

Foley, Walter J. The future of administration and educational evaluation. Educational Technology, July 1970, 10, 20-25.

Gibson, R. Oliver. A general systems approach to decision making in schools. Journal of Educational Administration, May 1968, 6, 13-32.

Gleser, Malcolm A., and Collen, Morris F. Towards automated medical decisions. Computers and Biomedical Research, April 1972, 5, 180-189.

Globerson, Arye. Weaknesses in management decision making regarding probationary employment. Journal of Management Studies. October 1969, 6, 293-301.

Goldberg, Lewis R. Simple models or simple process? American Psychologist, July 1968, 23, 483-495.

Golomb, Naphatali. Managing without sanctions or rewards. Management of Personnel Quarterly, Summer 1968, 7, 22-28.

Gore, William J., and Silander, Fred S. A bibliographical essay on decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1959, 4, 98-121.

Graeb, Thelma, and Gaughan, Joseph P. (eds.). Proceedings: A Special Study Institute: Urban Issues in Special Education. Albany, New York: The New York State Education Department, Division for Handicapped Children, 1972.

Greenlaw, Paul S., Herron, Lowell W., and Rawdon, Richard H. Simulation in Industrial and University Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Griffiths, Daniel D. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959 (paper).

Guetzkow, Harold S. (ed.). Simulation in Social Science. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Guetzkow, H., Forehand, G. A., and James, B. F. An evaluation of educational influence on administrative judgment. Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1962, 6, 483-500.

Gulick, Luther, and Urwick, L. (eds.). Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.

Guralnick, Michael J. Observing responses and decision processes in vigilance. Journal of Experimental Psychology, May 1972, 93, 239-244.

Hadar, Josef. On expectations and stability. Behavioral Science, November 1968, 13, 445-454.

Hall, Jay, and Williams, Martha A. Group dynamics training and improved decision making. Applied Behavioral Science, January-February-March 1970, 6, 39-68.

Hamilton, Norman K. The decision making structure of a school system. Educational Leadership, May 1972, 29, 668-671.

Hammill, Donald D., and Wiederholt, J. Lee. The Resource Room: Rationale and Implementation. Philadelphia, Pa.: Buttonwood Farms, Inc., 1972.

Hartley, Harry J. Santayannan-Weberian reason in administration. Journal of Educational Administration, May 1969, 7, 45-56.

Hemphill, John K., Griffiths, Daniel E., and Frederiksen, Norman. Administrative Performance and Personality: A Study of the Principal in a Simulated Elementary School. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Hesseling, Pjotr, and Konnen, Erik. Culture and subculture in a decision-making exercise. Human Relations, February 1969, 22, 31-51.

Hill, Henry W. Curriculum legislation and instructional decision-makers. The Elementary School Journal, May 1973, 73, 407-411.

Hill, John, and Martin, William R. Training for educational decision-making. The Journal of Teacher Education, Winter 1971, 22, 443-447.

Holder, H. D., and Ehling, W. P. Construction and simulation of an information-decision model. Journal of Communications, December 1967, 17, 302-315.

Litchfield, Edward H. Notes on a general theory of administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, 1, 3-29.

Livingston, Samuel A., Fennessey, Gail M., Coleman, James S., Edwards, Keith J., Kidder, Steven J. The Hopkins Program: Final Report on Seven Years of Research. Baltimore, Md.: The John Hopkins University, 1973, Report No. 155.

Loasby, Brian J. The decision-maker in the organization. Journal of Management Studies, October 1968, 5, 352-364.

Luce, Terrence S., and Volksdorf, Norman R. Relevance in Education: Feast or famine? Intellect, February 1973, 101, 297-299.

Luginbuhl, James E. R. Role of choice and outcome on feelings of success and estimates of ability. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, April 1972, 22, 121-127.

Maier, Norman F., and Thurber, James A. Innovative problem-solving by outsiders: A study of individuals and groups. Personnel Psychology, Autumn 1969, 22, 237-249.

Mandell, Milton M. The administrative judgement test. Journal of Applied Psychology, June 1950, 34, 145-147.

Marro, Thomas David, and Kohl, John W. Normative study of the administrative position in special education. Exceptional Children, September 1972, 39, pp. 5-13.

Marshall, Jon C. Bayesian decision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, July 1967, 14, 342-345.

Marting, Elizabeth (ed.). Top Management Decision Simulations: The AMA Approach. New York: American Management Association, 1957.

McEachern, A. W. SIMBAD: A System for Computer-Aided Probation Decision Making. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Public Systems Research Institute, 1969.

Meisgeier, Charles A., and Sloat, Robert. Special education administration and supervision--A review of relevant literature. In Meisgeier, Charles H., and King, John D. eds.) The Process of Special Education Administration. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1970, pp. 390-409.

Monahan, William G. Some limitations and cautions in the use of quantative techniques in decision-making. Educational Technology, September 1969, 9, 31-36.

Mueller, Robert K. The managerial gap--traditionalists vs. scientists. Personnel, November-December 1969, 46, 8-21.

Neff, Frederick C. On analysis, decision-making, and education. Educational Theory, Spring 1969, 18, 143-150.

Odiorne, George S. Reality in management. Michigan Business Review, November 1967, 19, 18-23.

Odiorne, George S. Management Decisions by Objectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Ohm, Robert E. Games and instructional simulation: An exploratory model. Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring 1966, 2, 110-122.

Peterson, Marvin W. The potential impact of PPBS on colleges and universities. The Journal of Higher Education, January 1971, 1-20.

Pitz, Gordon F., and Downing, Leslie. Optional behavior in a decision-making task as a function of instructions and payoffs. Journal of Experimental Psychology, April 1967, 73, 549-555.

Rhind, Ridley. Management information systems. Business Horizons, June 1968, 11, 37-46.

Richie, J. B., and Miles, Raymond E. An analysis of quantity and quality of participation as mediating variables in the participative decision making process. Personnel Psychology, Autumn 1970, 23, 347-359.

Riley, V., and Young, J. P. Bibliography on War Gaming. Chevy Chase, Maryland: Operations Research Office, The John Hopkins University, 1957.

Roberts, W. Glyn. How to apply a systems analysis approach to education. Education Canada, September 1970, 10, 9-13.

Sagar, R. G., and Dick, L. K. A computer simulation of ambulance services: A decision making aid for the administrator. Canadian Hospital, May 1971, 48, 23-26.

Sage, Daniel D. The Development of Simulation Materials for Research and Training in Administration of Special Education. Final report, project number 6-24f6. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1967.

Sage, Daniel D. Functional emphasis in special education. Exceptional Children, September 1968, 35, 69-70.

Sage, Daniel D. The SEATS game--An experimental instrument. In Meisgeier, Charles H., and King, John D. (eds.) The Process of Special Education Administration. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1970, pp. 448-460.

Saindon, L. J. CPM--An introduction and application. Advanced Management Journal, October 1969, 34, 83-90.

Sands, Edith. Toward better executive selection. Michigan Business Review, November 1964, 16, 5-9.

Sarthory, Joseph A. Some sociological considerations for decision-making. Educational Administration Quarterly, Fall 1968, 4, 60-69.

Schmuck, Richard A., Runkels, Philip J., and Langmeyer, Daniel. Improving organizational problem solving in a school faculty. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Fall 1969, 5, 32-36.

Schoderbek, Peter B. PERT--Its promises and performances. Michigan Business Review, January 1965, 17, 25-32.

Shrenk, L. P. Aiding the decision maker--A decision process model. Ergonomics, July 1969, 12, 543-558.

Shubik, Martin. Studies and theories of decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1958, 3, 289-306.

Simon, Herbert A. On the concept of organizational goal. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1964, 9, 1-22.

Smith, Robert D. Heuristic simulation of psychological decision processes. Journal of Applied Psychology, August 1968, 52, 325-330.

Spaght, Monroe. Management at home and abroad. Michigan Business Review, November 1965, 17, 20-24.

Takagi, Paul T. The effect of parole agents' judgments on recifivism rates. Psychiatry, May 1969, 32, 192-199.

Tanner, Wilson P., Jr., and Swets, John A. A decision-making theory of visual detection. Psychological Review, November 1954, 61, 401-409.

Thrall, R. M., Coombs, C. H., and Davis, R. L. (eds.). Decision Processes. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1954.

Van Dyck, J. J. J. Understanding of the organization process via the management game. Journal of Management Studies, October 1968, 5, 338-351.

Vaughan, W. S., and Mavor, Anne Schumacher. Behavioral characteristics of men in the performance of some decision-making task components. Ergonomics, May 1972, 15, 267-277.

Vidmar, Neil. Effects of decision alternatives on the verdicts and social perceptions of simulated jurors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, May 1972, 22, 211-218.

Warner, Homer R., Olmstead, Charles M., and Rutherford, Barry D. HELP--A program for medical decision making. Computers and Biomedical Research, February 1972, 5, 65-74.

Wasserman, Paul, and Silander, Fred S. Decision-making: An Annotated Bibliography. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958 (paper).

Weinberger, M. J. The Use of Simulation in the Teaching of School Administration. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1965, No. 66-6561.

Wickens, J. D. Management by objectives: An appraisal. Journal of Management Studies, October 1968, 5, 365-379.

Wiersma, William. Research Methods in Education: An Introduction. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott, 1969.

Williams, J. G. The concept of authority. Journal of Educational Administration, October 1968, 6, 152-161.

Zukerman, David, and Horn, Robert B. The Guide to Simulations/ Games for Education and Training. Lexington, Mass.: P. O. Box 417, Information Resources, Inc., 1973.