

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

**ProQuest Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**



## **NOTE TO USERS**

**Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.**

**60**

**This reproduction is the best copy available.**

**UMI**



## VITA

Therese Howe was born on April 3, 1950 in Speedway, Indiana. She attended parochial elementary school and moved from Speedway to Indianapolis where she attended Sacred Heart High School through January of 1967. She graduated from George Washington High School (IPS, Indianapolis, IN) in 1968. Prior to beginning her doctoral work in the spring of 1998, she attended Butler University, Indianapolis, IN where she completed an M.S. degree in Education Administration. Her B.S. degree in Education with a major in Biology and a minor in Chemistry was earned from with distinction from Indiana University in Bloomington, IN in 1986.

She taught biology, chemistry and general science at various levels at Martinsville High School, Martinsville, IN from 1986 to 1990. She was science department chairman and teacher at Lebanon High School, Lebanon, IN, from 1990-1995. In 1995 she became principal of Eastern Jr/Sr High School in Greentown, IN. She became principal of Eastbrook Jr. High School, Marion, IN, in the fall of 1998 through the fall of 1999. She is currently principal of Tri Central Jr/Sr High School, Sharpville, IN. In addition she is an adjunct faculty member of Indiana Wesleyan University.

She is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, National Association for the Supervision and Development of Curriculum, Indiana Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Indiana Middle Level Educators and the National Middle School Association.



**A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF TEAM MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN  
PUBLIC SCHOOL AND PRIVATE SECTOR ENVIRONMENTS**

---

**A Dissertation**

**Presented to**

**The School of Graduate Studies**

**Department of Educational Leadership,**

**Administration, and Foundations**

**Indiana State University**

**Terre Haute, Indiana**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment**

**of the Requirements for the Degree**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

---

**by**

**Therese Howe**

**May 2001**

UMI Number: 3029937

UMI<sup>®</sup>

---

UMI Microform 3029937

Copyright 2002 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

---


Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company  
300 North Zeeb Road  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Therese Howe, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 860, under the title *A Comparison of Perceptions of Team Management Practices in Public School and Private Sector Environments* is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

April 18, 2001  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Director of Dissertation

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Member

6/7/2001  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
For the School of Graduate Studies

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare management practices as they relate to team management in both private sector companies and public school corporations. Areas measured related to the team's use of task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills.

An initial letter was sent to 250 companies registered with the Indiana Chamber of Commerce. These companies had employee populations between 100 and 250. A similar letter was sent to school corporation superintendents who student populations numbered 1000 - 2000. Included in this letter was a post card to return with two questions to check off pertaining as to whether the respondent used teaming in their management. A second letter and the survey instrument were sent to positive respondents.

The survey instrument used was the "Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory" (TOBI) developed in 1983 by Goodstein, Cooke and Goodstein. Demographic information collected included: was the participant a CEO or a superintendent; did the participant have formal training in team management practices?

The descriptive analysis indicated there were no significant differences in the mean values in areas of task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills between CEOs of Indiana companies and superintendents of Indiana schools.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation and thanks to those persons who have assisted me and encouraged me during my doctoral endeavor at Indiana State University.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert Boyd who served as my dissertation chair. His support, guidance and patience with me made it possible for me to successfully complete my degree. Appreciation is also extended to my committee members, Dr. Gregory Ulm and Dr. Jerry Summers. They too were very helpful in refining and completing my work.

My thanks also goes to Dr. Christy Coleman for her assistance with completing my statistical work.

I would also like to thank Jan Krackenberger and Judy Barnes in the ELAF office for being my "long distance support" during my years working on this degree.

Thanks goes to Dr. Gerald Novak, Superintendent of Northern Community Schools, Tipton County. His encouragement and support gave me the incentive to finish.

Finally and most importantly I would like to thank my husband, David Howe, for the tremendous support and patience he has given to me not only with this degree, but throughout all of my educational endeavors. Along with him, I would like to thank my family (especially my sister Jeanne), friends and colleagues who encouraged me all along the way.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	iv
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	vi
<b>Chapter</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>Statement of the problem</b> .....	7
<b>Purpose of the study</b> .....	7
<b>Research questions</b> .....	8
<b>Null Hypothesis</b> .....	8
<b>Definition of terms</b> .....	9
<b>Limitations</b> .....	9
<b>Delimitations</b> .....	10
<b>Significance of the study</b> .....	10
<b>2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE</b> .....	11
<b>Introduction</b> .....	11
<b>History of management</b> .....	12
<b>History of school administration</b> .....	20
<b>Effective team management practices</b> .....	24
<b>The Team Orientation and Behavior Survey</b> .....	33
<b>Summary</b> .....	35

<b>3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY.</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Research questions.</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Null hypothesis.</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Description of the sample.</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Description of the survey instrument.</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Data collection procedures.</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Method of data analysis.</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>Statistical analysis : correlation.</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>Analysis of research questions.</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.</b> .....	<b>45</b>
<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>45</b>
<b>Findings of the study.</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>Conclusions.</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Recommendations for further study.</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<b>APPENDIXES.</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>A. QUESTIONNAIRE: THE TEAM ORIENTATION     AND BEHAVIOR INVENTORY.</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>B. INITIAL LETTER TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS -     SUPERINTENDENTS.</b> .....	<b>59</b>
<b>C. INITIAL LETTER TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS -     CEOS.</b> .....	<b>60</b>

D. INITIAL SURVEY CARD - SUPT.....61

E. INITIAL SURVEY CARD - CEOS.....62

F. LETTER SENT TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS - SUPT.....63

G. LETTER SENT TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS – CEOS.....64

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
<b>Table</b>	
4.1 Correlation among Scale Factors. . . . .	42
4.2 Descriptive Statistics for the Four Dependent Variables. . . . .	43
4.3 ANOVA Summary Table for Task Values. . . . .	43
4.4 ANOVA Summary Table for Task Skills. . . . .	43
4.5 ANOVA Summary Table for Maintenance Values . . . . .	44
4.6 ANOVA Summary Table for Maintenance Skills. . . . .	44

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

Indiana's school administrators have never been under more scrutiny than now. By the passing of Public Law 221, "the accountability law," a message has been sent to schools that calls for expectations of strong leadership involving teams of leaders working together for the continual improvement of schools (PL 221).

There is current information being shared with the media that indicates Indiana schools are failing. In a recent report "Indiana Education: On Shaky Ground" published by the Education Policy Center of the Hudson Institute (Garber, Heet, & Styring III, 1999) criticism is aimed at education for continued low performance at higher and higher cost to taxpayers. A concluding statement of this report reveals that "The problems are inside Indiana's current public education system. No amount of tinkering at the margins of that system will bring about genuine improvement" (Garber et al., p. 4).

By comparing the effectiveness of private sector management teams of successful companies with the effectiveness of school administrative teams, this researcher found information that will benefit school administrators by revealing practices more widely used by management teams in the private sector. The examination and comparison of team management practices rather than the roles of individuals was chosen by examining research that demonstrated the effectiveness and success of the team model of management (Deeprise, 1995).



The practice of management throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century has changed and evolved in both the public sector of education as well as the private sector of business. What both institutions have shared are the challenges of managing complex organizations in rapidly changing markets and times as this statement by Peter Drucker (1982) points out:

Most people do not hear 'management'; they hear 'business management.' Management as a function, as an organ of authority and responsibility, and as a discipline was indeed first seen, identified, and studied as a part of business enterprise. But this is hardly more than a historical - and primarily American - accident. Management is the specific organ of any modern institution. The people in management may be called by different names - schools and hospitals, for instance, prefer to speak of administrators. But what all of them do is manage. What all of them practice is management. ( p. 295)

The classical approach to management utilized what was termed a scientific manner and managers practicing this method sought "the one right way" (Montana & Charnov, 1994). Another early method of management was dubbed the 'behavioral approach' or the human resources approach. Early researchers such as Frederick Taylor and Henri Fayol studied the complex science of how to manage people and based their ideas of the principles of management identified by Fayol (the developer of administrative theory in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century). These principles included such things as division of labor, authority, discipline, unity of command and direction, subordination of the individual, remuneration, centralization, scalar chain, order, equity, stability of personnel, initiative and Espirit de Corp (p. 15). The functions of managers, according to Fayol, are: 1)planning, 2)organizing, 3)commanding, 4)coordinating and 5)controlling ( p. 16).

Scientific management, developed by management theorist Frederick Taylor, (Peters & Waterman, 1982) a contemporary of Fayol, worked well in factory assembly

lines and fast food restaurants . Managers were able to perform Fayol’s functions and adhere to the principles he stated in these environments. Attempts at addressing the human side of management were introduced at this time as well by Mary Parker Follett, a pioneer in the collaborative approach to solving problems (Montana & Charnov, 1994).

In the 1970's, private businesses became impacted by competition from Japan. A management style, entitled Total Quality Management (TQM), was being practiced in Japan (Montana & Charnov, 1994). W. Edwards Deming (1991), a contributor to the design of TQM, purported that teams were crucial to the success of business. “Everyone can take part in a team. The aim of a teams is to improve the input and the output of any stage.... Everyone on a team has a chance to contribute ideas, plans, and figures ... a good team has social memory” ( p. 89-90).

According to Schmoker (1999), “Business literature from theorists such as Tom Peters and W. Edwards Deming is equally as emphatic about how teamwork benefits intellectual and professional capital. For Deming, ‘there is no substitute for teamwork’; without it ‘dissipation of knowledge and efforts, results far from optimum’ exists (1986, p.19)”(p. 12).

Senge (1994) describes the need for administrative teaming by stating:

There are at least two good reasons why the executive team leadership form is on the rise. First, the problems our organizations face today are enormously complex and have political ramifications within the company. The most difficult issues that an executive team faces are often cross-disciplinary or cross-functional...Second, within the past decade there has been a “sea change” in the governance of organizations. Leaders and managers, reconceiving their own job as setting forth broad visions and strategies, now grant subordinates much more power to plan and implement. In an organization led by influence, people are moved and convinced when they see a group of people at the top truly sharing a vision and strategy, and modeling it in their behavior. ( p. 436)

In the public sector, namely in the area of education, the management of schools began formally when the growth from the one-room schoolhouse expanded and the office of the superintendent was formed (Campbell, Bridges & Nystrand, 1977). These early educational leaders were also influenced by the management philosophies of Taylor, Fayol, Follett and May (Campbell et al., 1977). The demands on administrators have changed since these early days as Peter Drucker writes "...the battle cry ... will be the demand for performance and accountability...demand for education actually going up, not down. What is going down, and fairly fast, is demand for traditional education in traditional schools" (Drucker, 1982, p. 75). By these statements, Drucker (1982) illustrates the challenges of the public sector administrator now and in the future to continually change and improve.

Schlechty (1997), in his book Inventing Better Schools discussed the overall problems of administrative teams when he states the following: "Some business leaders found considerable comfort in saying, 'The Japanese culture is different from the American culture. The Japanese are more communal and less individualistic in nature than are Americans. Japanese management techniques may work in Japan, but they will certainly not work in America.' Such rationalizations should have a familiar ring to those who attribute the problems with America's schools to forces beyond the control of school leaders" (p. 53). This quote brings to mind the idea that in all effectively managed organizations there are similar models, goals and practices that are followed.

What constitutes an effective management team? In analyzing the practices of effective teams, such things as goals, skills, approach and accountability are basics

(Katzbach and Smith, 1993). Some traits falling under these categories taken from the research are:

**Team Goals:**

1. Team goals are as important as individual goals; members are able to recognize when personal agendas are interfering with the team's direction.
2. The team understands the goals and is committed to achieving them; everyone is willing to shift responsibilities.

**Team Skills:**

1. Each member understands the other's roles and skills.
2. Leadership is rotated; no one person dominates.

**Approach to teaming:**

1. Teams can easily convene and do frequently.
2. Communication with all members is easy and frequent.
3. Team discussions are open and interactive to all members.
4. The team climate is comfortable and informal; people feel empowered; individual competitiveness is inappropriate.
5. Communication is spontaneous and shared among all members; diversity of opinions and ideas are encouraged.
6. Trust has replace fear and people feel comfortable taking risks; direct eye contact and spontaneous expression are present.

**Team Accountability:**

- 1 Conflicts and differences of opinion are considered opportunities to explore new ideas; the emphasis is on finding common ground.

**2 Respect, open-mindedness, and collaboration are high; members seek win/win solutions and build on each other's ideas.**

**3 Decisions are made by consensus and have the acceptance and support of members.**

**(Katzenbach & Smith, 1993 ; Harrington-Mackin, 1994)**

**Since the challenges of both the public and private sector managers are similar, this researcher examined literature concerning qualities of management teams in both sectors to compare qualities found in effective management teams. While there is literature describing both private sector management teams and public sector management teams, there does not exist any research showing a comparison of these teams. Literature does not exist comparing effective management team practices between private sector managers and school administrators.**

**This study utilized the perceptions of CEOs of successful companies who use team management compared with the perceptions of school administrators, namely school superintendents who utilize the team concept. This was examined through a survey tool entitled the Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory (TOBI) (Goodstein, Cook, & Goodstein, 1983). This inventory evenly divides statements into two areas: task orientation of teams and maintenance orientation of teams. These two areas are further divided into two areas under each of these categories, namely task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills. This study used the four categories to compare perceptions concerning effective team management practices.**

Identifying and analyzing the differences and similarities that exist between these two management groups could reveal information that would be helpful to educational administrators in examining and possibly improving the outcomes of public schools.

### Statement of the Problem

Strong administrative teams allow a school corporation the advantage of the leadership skills of not just one effective leader but the collective talents of the group (Schmoker, 1996). The private sector of management has embraced this philosophy of teams as well (Senge, Ross, Smith, Roberts, and Kleiner, 1994).

A study seeking the perceptions of CEOs of successful companies in the private sector on effective team practices as described by the TOBI compared to results from the public sector responses of school administrators (superintendents) would allow leaders in education to evaluate their practices.

This study examined teams in the public sector, namely school superintendents and school administrators and management teams in the private sector of successful companies with respect to the perceived effectiveness of their management teams. Companies who were members of the Indiana Chamber of Commerce and whose employee population numbered between 100 and 250 were selected. Indiana school corporations whose student populations number between and 1000 and 2000 were surveyed. The study examined these two groups to identify any significant differences in their team management practices.

### **Purpose of the Study**

**The purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between private sector management teams and school administrative teams regarding the effectiveness of their team practices as perceived by CEOs and superintendents in four areas (as described by the TOBI): task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills.**

### **Research Questions**

**The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:**

- 1. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task values?**
- 2. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task skills?**
- 3. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance values?**
- 4. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance skills?**

### **Null Hypothesis**

**Ho 1. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task values.**

**Ho 2. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task skills.**

**Ho 3. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance values.**

**Ho 4. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance skills.**

### **Definition of terms**

**Effective management teams:** This term is identified through the literature to describe teams that practice best qualities in regards to goal setting, team skills, approach to teaming and team accountability.

**Private sector management teams:** For this study, the chief executive officer and middle managers of any non-public business.

**Public sector administrative teams:** For this study, the superintendent, central office administrators and other administrators of the school corporation.

**Chief executive officer:** The individual who is ultimately in charge of running a private sector business.

**Middle management:** Members of a private sector business who report directly to the CEO of the business.

### **Limitations**

1. Superintendents and CEOs were asked to respond on a voluntary basis. The findings were limited by the representation of surveys completed and returned.

3. The findings were limited to the degree of accuracy to which the survey participants identified their true perceptions.



### **Delimitations**

**The study was influenced by the following delimitations:**

- 1. The study will be conducted during the 2000 – 2001 school year.**
- 2. The study is limited to superintendents and CEOs in schools and businesses in the state of Indiana.**
- 3. The study is limited to businesses with 100 – 250 employees.**
- 4. The study is limited to schools with 1000 to 2000 students in the school corporation.**
- 5. The study will focus on perceptions as they pertain to management teaming, not other types of management organizations.**

### **Significance of the Study**

**With the passing of Public Law 221, principals and superintendents will find it increasingly necessary to utilize the most effective management tools to enhance the performance of their student population. Knowledge of the perceptions of effective team management practices within the private sector of successful companies will aid school administrators in reviewing their own management practices.**

.....

## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This review of the literature is organized into four parts. The first topic will involve a study of the history of management, focusing primarily on the private sector business manager. This section will illustrate the evolution of single person management to the more collaborative style of the present.

The second topic outlines the history of school administration. This section also gives examples of the similar influences certain management theorists had on the development of the current practices of school administrators. It will also describe how in recent years the idea of administrative teams has become a typical management model.

The third part of this literature review will discuss effective management/administrative team practices. Fourteen statements have been taken from two different publications: The Team Building Tool Kit: Tips, Tactics and Rules for Effective Workplace Teams by Deborah Harrington-Mackin (1994) and The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High Performance Organization by Katzenbach and Smith (1994). This researcher concluded these fourteen statements were representative of what was found in all of the readings and best summarized traits of effective teams. What this researcher will present is statements from the literature explaining these fourteen points

and support their significance in terms of representing qualities of effective management teams. The fourth section introduces the survey instrument, the Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory (TOBI) (Goodstein et al., 1983), which has been chosen by this researcher to survey the CEOs and superintendents.

This chapter will close with a summary bringing together the literature as it pertains to this study.

### History of management

Historically, the practice of collaborative or team management has evolved from different “sciences” developed on how to manage people effectively. The study of successful effective management practices is a relatively new science having its beginnings in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Montana and Charnov, 1993).

One can look back as far as Ancient Egypt to see examples of organized management in the construction of the pyramids (Robbins, 1997). “From the supervision of the construction of the Great Wall of China to the advice given to Moses by his father-in-law Jethro (1<sup>st</sup> Management consultant in Exodus 18:14-27), there have always been those who practiced effective management and gave management advice” (Montana & Charnov, 1993, p. 8).

However, according to Robbins (1997) it has only been the past several hundred years, particularly in the last century, that management has undergone systematic investigation, acquired a common body of knowledge, and become a formal discipline of study (p. 596).

Probably one of the earliest influences on the practices of management prior to the twentieth century was the industrial revolution (Robbins, 1997). Writers such as Charles Babbage predicted that due to industrial mechanized changes, it would become necessary to require a more systematic study of how people worked. Babbage's earlier ideas were elaborated upon by Frederick Taylor (1856-1915), who has been called the "Father of Scientific Management" (Montana & Charnov, 1993).

In Taylor's book, The Principles of Scientific Management (1911), he describes how one uses the scientific method to define "one best way" for a job to be done (Robbins, 1997). Some examples of these principals can be found in the efficiency practiced in the factory assembly lines and fast food restaurants. These principles are:

1. Develop a science for each element of an individual's work, which replaces the old rule-of-thumb method.
2. Scientifically select then train, teach, and develop the work. (Previously, workers chose their own work and trained themselves as best they could.)
3. Heartily cooperate with the workers so as to ensure that all work is done in accordance with the principles of the science that has been developed.
4. Divide work and responsibility almost equally between management and workers. Management takes over all work for which it is better suited than the workers. (Previously, almost all the work and the greater part of the responsibility were thrown upon the workers.)(Robbins, 1997).

These principles defined the role of the worker and redefined the role of managers. Taylor's ideas were embraced by prestigious schools of business (such as Harvard) and became a standard.

Henri Fayol, a contemporary of Taylor's, went on to further define the role of manager by describing the functions of managers. These five functions and what they represent are:

1. **Planning** – This function consists of forecasting future events and determining the most effective future activities for the company.

2. **Organizing** – This function consists of the ways in which the organizational structure is established and how authority and responsibility are given to manager, a task called delegation.

3. **Commanding** – This function concerns how managers direct employees. Fayol addressed such activities as effective communications, managerial behaviors, the uses of rewards and punishments in discussing how a manager should command employees.

4. **Coordinating** – This function concerns activities designed to create a relationship between all the organization's efforts (individual tasks) to accomplish a common goal.

5. **Controlling** – This function concerns how managers evaluate performance within the organization in relationship to the plans and goals of that organization (Montana and Charnov, 1993).

These functions are common practices of managers today, but were quite revolutionary in Fayol's time.

Fayol also determined 14 principles of management that were meant to help in solving "real work problems" (Montana and Charnov, 1993). These principles and their purposes are:

1. **Division of labor** – when work is separated into its basic tasks and divided between individual workers or work groups that can specialize in the specific task, leading to work specialization.
2. **Authority** – this is the legitimate right to exercise power within the organization to obtain worker obedience. It is closely related to responsibility, which is the accountability for using authority. Authority and responsibility go together, and one without the other leads to managerial failure.
3. **Discipline** – the application of punishment for failure to act in accord with the desires of those who possess legitimate authority in the organization.
4. **Unity of Command** – each worker should receive orders from only one manager, a simplified view of an organization that assures a minimum of conflict and promotes clarity of communication.
5. **Unity of Direction** – the whole organization should have one common goal and seek to accomplish that goal in all its activities.
6. **Subordination of the individual** – the goal and interest of the organization are more important than the individual and therefore take precedence over the personal goals and interests of the individual.
7. **Remuneration** – each employee should receive compensation in accord with a general formula that is applied to all.
8. **Centralization** – the importance of subordinates is reduced as organizational power and the responsibility for decision-making is concentrated in managers. Managers are responsible for decision-making are accountable for those decisions.

9. **Scalar chain** – managers in a company exist in a chain of command that is scalar, or hierarchical. Authority and responsibility are delegated down the chain of command and become less the lower one goes in the chain of command.

10. **Order** – the resources of a company – its raw materials and workers – must be in the right place at the right time. This ordering of organizational resources ensures maximal efficiency.

11. **Equity** – employees should feel they are being treated equally and fairly.

12. **Stability of personnel** – successful firms retain good managers, and this should be the goal of the organization.

13. **Initiative** – management should encourage individual employee initiative, which is defined as additional self-motivated work effort undertaken for the good of the organization.

14. **Espirit de Corps** – management should try to encourage harmony and common interests, resulting in good relations among employees

(Montana & Charnov, 1993)

Fayol was considered the “Father of Administrative Theory” (Montana & Charnov, 1993). He is credited for establishing a system whereby management skills could be taught using the above mentioned skills.

Two other famous individuals who were pioneers in defining the roles of management were Mary Parker Follett (1868 – 1933) and Elton Mayo (1880-1949). These two individuals introduced theories of management that were close predecessors to the ideals of team management.

Mary Parker Follett was a contemporary of Taylor but Taylor and the others did not share her suggested practices of that management that were more focused on people rather than tasks. She is credited for being the first to see that organizations could not only be recognized by individual accomplishments but group accomplishments as well. She argued that individual potential remained potential until released through group association (Robbins, 1997). She is credited as a pioneer in conflict resolution (Montana & Charnov, 1993).

Harvard professor Elton Mayo made a discovery about managing people through his experiments with worker hygiene at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works plant outside Chicago, Illinois between 1924 and 1932 (Peters & Waterman, 1982). This experiment's original intent was to study working conditions (in particular levels of light) and its effect on productivity. What began as a study of environmental conditions became a study of the effects of human relations in companies. What Mayo concluded from his studies was that workers' production was more positively influenced by their "specialness" and their opportunity to work as a team with others than any physical change or monetary incentive. This phenomena today has been termed the "Hawthorne Effect" and Mayo's writings have been the basis for current human relations practices such as counseling and team based management practices in business (Montana and Charnov, 1993).

In 1960, Douglas McGregor (1906-1964) after observing Taylor's work and its conclusions, proposed that effective use of reward and punishment (a somewhat pessimistic view of workers) and using Mayo's psycho-social view of workers, wrote The Human Side of Enterprise. This book describes his Theory X and Y in which his



**Theory X views workers in a pessimistic light (low motivation, need for close supervision) and Theory Y has a positive view of workers that supports respect, rewards and shared authority (Montana & Charnov, 1993). This Theory Y has been termed the humanistic approach. In reality, Peters and Waterman state “You are neither and both at the same time”(Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 94).**

**Peters and Waterman (1982) classify Mayo and McGregor’s work as the “social actor style in a closed system” (p. 95). This social view of management assumes that choices are made without clear cut parameters. A closed system refers to the fact that businesses manage without clear cut parameters. A closed system also refers to the fact that businesses manage without taking outside influences into consideration. It would become necessary to abandon this style as the 1970’s arrived and strong competition from Japan began impacting how companies managed.**

**After World War II, Japanese industry began a reform of their management that took them from a business world that was almost destroyed to a powerful competitor in the world market. One of the designers of this approach was William G. Ouchi, developer of Theory Z. This theory is an obvious extension of McGregor’s theory X and Y, but it has as its central focus the idea of work groups and the practice of consensual decision making (Montana & Charnov, 1993).**

**Some thoughts supporting this style of management are:**

- The group has access to more data and personal experience.**
- Members of the group will “buy into” the group decision.**

- The group decision-making process screens out extremely good and extremely bad information, resulting in a decision that will be better than the individual's decision.

(Montana & Charnov, 1993)

Other management manifestations that have come from Theory Z have been the use of Quality Circles (QC), Quality of Worklife (QWL) approach and Total Quality Management or Total Quality Leadership (TQM or TQL) (Montana & Charnov, 1993). One of the leaders of TQM, W. Edwards Deming (1991), worked originally with the Japanese to implement the idea of using teams. His ideas were later utilized in the United States and an award entitled the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality award was established by the U.S. government to honor companies who practice TQM (Business America, 1997).

Deming's (1991) belief on teams was that their membership was for everyone and their aim was to improve the "input and output" of any stage of a management process. He believed their strengths came from the idea that they encourage everyone involved to exchange ideas and collaborate on solutions.

According to Schmoker (1999), "Business literature from theorists such as Tom Peters and W. Edwards Deming is equally as emphatic about how teamwork benefits intellectual and professional capital." (p. 12) Senge (1994) writes that the team management approach is "on the rise" because business problems are becoming more complex and require expertise in all areas - not just the thoughts of one person.

Today's companies utilize this concept of collaborative decision making universally. School administrators also practice this. This researchers found examples of these practices and qualities that measure the effectiveness management and administrative teams and will discuss these later in this document

### History of school administration

The history of school administration in some respects parallels the history of private sector management. Early management theorists such as Taylor and Fayol had influence on the practices of administrators.

What makes American schools unique is the extent of local autonomy. As Colonial America grew there developed schools that went from emphasizing mainly religion to a basic college preparatory curriculum. One of the widely held beliefs about education at this time was that there be local participation in the governing of schools. In the days of the one room schoolhouse there was little need for administration since usually just one teacher assumed all duties of teaching, discipline and maintaining the school (Campbell et al., 1977) .

There was a local board of laymen who opened the school and was responsible for the maintenance of the school building. It was not until the 19<sup>th</sup> century that the office of the superintendent was created (Campbell et al., 1977).

In larger urban areas where there were more students than one teacher could handle, there existed the position of "head teacher" or "principal teacher". In some areas they preceded the role of the superintendent and reported directly to the board.

It was not until 1827 that school government was differentiated from general government and years later before a school board of education was ready to hire a school administrator (Campbell et al., 1977). The first cities to have superintendents were Buffalo and Louisville in 1837. Duties of these first administrators varied greatly.

Cincinnati created the first principal teachers in 1838. In the beginning, the roles of these individuals were mainly clerical (Campbell et al., 1977).

Some of the early researchers in management had counterparts in educational administration. An example would be Frederick Taylor's counterpart in Franklin Bobbitt. Fayol's work was an inspiration to Sears. Educational administration was also influenced by the human relationship theories of Follett and Mayo (Campbell et al., 1977).

An illustration of Taylor's principles as interpreted by Bobbitt were:

The primary functions of educational directors and supervisors, as relating to methods, are therefore: first, the discovery of the best methods of procedure in the performance of any particular educational task; and second, the giving of these discovered best methods over to the teachers for their guidance in securing a maximum product. Since so few methods, demonstrably the best, have yet been discovered with entire certainty, it is impossible yet to devote any very large amount of time to the function of distribution of this information to the teachers. This leaves the major work at the present moment in the realm of discovery of best methods, it would appear. (Campbell et al., 1977, p. 98)

Other authors during the period of 1910 - 1930, namely Cubberly, Strayer and Reede did not seem to follow the management practices held by Taylor as faithfully as Bobbitt.

Sears was a follower of Fayol. High ideals for administrators (adapting it to the private sector business managers) were these stated practices: planning, organizations, direction, coordination and control (Campbell et al., 1977). Unfortunately for Sears, he

retired and was unable to achieve the amount of recognition and practice his ideas merited.

In the late 1940's organizations, such as the National Conference of Professors of Education Administrators, were formed. This group gathered to examine the training of school administrators and sought to improve the managerial skills of this group through educational programs. These programs were supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. This foundation supported the formation of Kellogg Centers with the intent of improving Educational Administration (Campbell et al., 1977).

The 1960's saw a greater involvement in improving training for administrators through the creation of a research and development center by the U. S. Office of Education. This early organization is still funded by the National Institute of Education as well the ERIC Clearinghouse. Other efforts that followed were by the Ford Foundation (Campbell et al., 1977).

The 1960's also saw an increase in the use of team management in response to collective bargaining (Lindelow, 1989).

According to Lindelow (1989):

In addition to instilling cooperation among educators, team management techniques can also encourage the formation of power-sharing coalitions. During the 1960s, when teachers associations sought to acquire powers formerly held by boards and administrators, superintendents saw their authority evaporating. 'Early in the negotiations game,' says Ray Cross, 'it became apparent that teachers and superintendents, by the very nature of their respective roles, were on opposite sides of the table.'

In response, superintendents 'reached out to enlist all of the allies that they could get - particularly principals.'(p. 136)

However, this idea of teams as “true” teams is not always successful. The American Association of School Administrators noted that some “work very well” while ‘others are merely labels attached to existing hierarchical structures’ (Lindelow, 1989, p. 137).

In administration, Erikson and Gmerich describe 3 models of management teams:

1. **Conventional:** This model includes three levels of administrators - a “policy team” that includes board of education members and superintendent; a “central management team” composed of the superintendent, representatives of the central office and staff, and all principals; and local teams that report to special area administrators, such as the business manager, the curriculum director, or the school principal.
2. **Cross-Breed:** This model features two teams – a policy team similar to the conventional model and a management team responsible for planning.
3. **Cocoon:** This model includes the policy team and management teams of the “cross-breed” model. But instead of having permanent representative of specialized groups, the “cocoon” model adds teams of specially qualified people studying specific problems. These single-purpose cocoons (or ad hoc teams), which present alternatives and make recommendations to the management, disband once their assignment is complete. (Lindelow, 1989, p. 138)

Gorton (1976) saw the principal’s role in a building level team as a facilitator involving everyone on the team. He proposed in his 1970’s model that there should exist 4 qualities: shared accountability, shared decision making, coordinated efforts and open communication (Gorton, 1976, p. 85). He proposed for an administrative team that included principal, asst. or vice principal, pupil personnel worker (eg. school psychologist), special program directors (media specialist), department heads and central office representative. These larger teams have decreased in the number of participants and are currently broken into smaller groups. This is the current model of administrative teams.

## Effective team management practices

This researcher gleaned fourteen statements taken from the literature that represented practices that common among successful teams. An examination of these practices and further research supporting these statements will also support the validity of the study.

The fourteen statements were taken from two publications: The Team Building Toolkit by Harrington-Mackin (1994) and The Wisdom of Teams by Katzenbach and Smith (1994). Both publications represent a compilation of team practices at different levels of business. They were both written and directed toward private sector business, however, the statements are “generic” enough to fit school administrative team practices as well. I have divided the statements into four categories: team goals, team skills, approach to teaming and team accountability. These categories were taken from the literature.

Team goals were described as:

1. Team goals are as important as individual goals; members are able to recognize when personal agendas are interfering with team’s direction.
2. The team understands the goals and are committed to achieving them; everyone is willing to shift responsibilities. (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 21)

According to Schmoker (1999) in his book Results: The Key to Continuous School Improvement, “Goals give teamwork meaning” (p. 22). In his book he cites many examples of how a common purpose or goal has been the driving force in school improvement in many districts. He uses the example of goals as being in a “symbiotic” relationship with a team. “Goals themselves lead not only to success, but also to the effectiveness and cohesion of a team” (p. 24).

John DiNatale (1994) writes “Effective school leaders raise their colleagues from a level of self interest to a level manifesting the common visions of a specific culture” (p. 82). In his article he states that the relationship between central office and the school should be one where time is spent together, but goals give this time meaning.

Bradshaw and Buckner (1994) saw goal setting in their study as opportunities for “practicing skills, sharing information receiving feedback”(p. 82).

Deming (1991) saw that goals were essential for “creating constancy of purpose”(p. 23). In his writing about Quality Management practices, he stated fourteen points for management. Point number seven states that “a group, a team, should have aim, a job, a goal...” (Deming, 1991, p. 23).

Peters and Waterman (1982), in discussing leadership and the qualities of effective leadership write in their book In Search of Excellence, that leadership goes beyond efficiency when it “1) sets basic mission and 2) when it creates a social organism capable of fulfilling that mission” (p. 99). This statement as it applies to team leadership supports the idea of commitment by all the team members to the collective goals of the organization and the team.

Senge (1994) supports this idea as well as believing effective team leadership must have “shared vision,” leading to the creation of common goals.

From these various observations, it is apparent to this researcher that management teams need to create clear goals that are understood and supported by each team member for an effective team organization.

Team skills as described by the literature were:



1. Each member understands the other's roles and skills (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 21 ; Katzenbach and Smith, 1994, p. 62)

Some "team basics" stated by Katzenbach and Smith (1994) include complimentary skills that allow the team to do the job. Some of these diverse skills might be technical interpersonal or cultural.

In examining models of administrative teams for schools, this researcher found different listings of members and their defined tasks. Leadership teams are comprised at the building level by principals and their assistants. Outlined roles for each of these individuals were:

- Principal - Facilitator of change, advocate of staff empowerment
- Assistant Principal(Curriculum) - Facilitator, a complement to the principal (Parkay & Oakes, 1997) .

These defined roles create expectations for those members of an administrative team.

The role of the superintendent in a relationship with school principals is described by DiNatale (1994) as: 1) Cooperation and teamwork through promoting instructional improvement 2) Shows fairness and equity by coordinating staff development programs and 3) shows reciprocity by mutual respect and exchange ( pp. 81 & 82).

Superintendent and principal roles on a team can be further defined by looking at the respective roles as leaders vs. managers. According to Dembowski and Ekstron (1998), leader roles are those activities central to "mission" and involve a number of stakeholders. Manager roles are more involved performing the supervision of day to day operation of a complex organization such as a school district. To illustrate further a superintendent's role as a leader is a community leader and chief professional (role

model) whereas a principal is the instructional leader. The manager role of a superintendent is the chief executive, office/manager and the principal being the facility manager. Understanding these differences in roles can benefit both positions.

Another team skill practice was:

2. Leadership is rotated; no one person dominates (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 21 ; Katzenbach and Smith, 1994, p. 162).

With the above statements and the defining of roles in the previous paragraph, rotation of leadership and non-domination are difficult with responsibilities of superintendents and CEOs.

Two reasons stated by Senge (1994) that make difficult to do this are:

1. ...the makeup of the executive team in and of itself, is a challenge. Typically executive teams are populated by aggressive “movers” who are used to getting what they want and getting things done. “Group maintenance” skills may be less developed, ironically, than they are elsewhere in the organization ( p. 439).
2. Finally, if you are a typical executive team, you operate in an environment that is particularly unforgiving. The organization longs for heroic leadership....is intolerant when executives make mistakes...following the all too human habit of seeking to place blame. (p. 439)

There is an attitude if this practice does not hold to state “the boss or owner will probably do what he or she wants anyway” (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 87).

DiNatale (1994) writes that supervisors tend to avoid give and take situations that would put some individuals or groups over another. The better idea is to allow principals to assume leadership roles and to empower them. This rotated leadership roles encourages collaboration.

Again, in order to become effective in these practices, many different actions can be taken by an effective team to overcome the resistance for shared leadership. Some

actions might require open discussion, promoting benefits, or even discipline (Harrington-Mackin, 1994).

Approach to teaming concepts were described as the following:

1. Teams can easily convene and do frequently (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994, p 62).
2. Communication with all members is easy and frequent (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994)
3. Team discussions are open and interactive for all members (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994 ; Harrington-Mackin, 1994).
4. The team climate is comfortable and informal; people feel empowered; individual competitiveness is inappropriate (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994 ; Harrington-Mackin, 1994).
5. Communication is spontaneous and shared among all members; diversity of opinions and ideas are encouraged (Katzenbach and Smith, 1994)
6. Trust has replaced fear and people feel comfortable taking risks; direct eye contact and spontaneous expression are present (Harrington-Mackin, 1994)

Senge (1994), in his discussion of team learning tactics, cites an example of the Boston Celtics basketball team when he discusses team learning. Their winning ways came through the team learning that was “built into the Celtics’ everyday practice” (Senge et al., 1994, p. 351). Not all organizations have this luxury, but days that are structured to allow frequent interaction with team members support effective teams.

In conversation with Jean Hoagland (personal communication, February, 2000), former director of Total Quality Management with Ameritech, she cited effective use of

conference calls, e-mail and regularly scheduled meetings that lasted long enough to resolve issues. This easy access to team members was crucial to the success of her management team achieving their goals.

Dialogue, according to Senge (1994), can be seen in various stages. In order for teams to communicate easily, they should become skillful at dialogue.

Education seems to be a very isolated business, according to Schmoker (1999) and to break this barrier of isolation, teams must strive for effective communication when they are able to meet.

According to Harrington-Mackin (1994), we are trained not to be open about our feelings and opinions in a business setting, however, not expressed, these feelings do not go away. "The more feelings remained unexpressed, the more energy will be devoted toward something other than the team's goals" ( p. 93).

According to Schlecty (1994) "Human beings also learn from the experiences of people other than themselves, including the experiences of people who lived so far in the past that their names have been forgotten. The term culture, properly understood, embodies what has been learned from those people and from the meaning they give to what they learned" (p. 41). This statement also applies, on a smaller scale, to what effective team members can learn from one another by respecting the culture of other team members.

Greenleaf (1991) wrote in Servant Leadership that leaders, who act as servants first, become "natural" servants through the discipline of learning to listen and "their listening builds strength in other people"(p. 17).

If we respect culture, the next step for a team to work toward is establishing trust.

Senge (1994) gave an example of trust and its impact in the following:

Not long ago, I saw the power of intimacy at a high-tech manufacturing company. Previously, any question about customer needs had to go through sales. But now, a group began meeting regularly over a project—the design, construction, and installation of one of their key customer’s factories. The customer had a unique and complex request: to develop a group of interacting robots that would “read” each others’ work as the product rapidly moved down the assembly line. Because the team members had spent time getting to know each other personally, they knew when to defer to each others’ questions and opinions. They did not make promises the team could not keep. Their separate conversations with the customer didn’t contradict; when misunderstandings or disagreements popped up, they could investigate without feeling paralyzed. They were a single unit committed to serving their customer, not a collection of egos and expertise vying for recognition and control of the situation. ( page 70)

True empowerment will come as trust is developed. Deeprouse (1994) in her book The Team Coach, describes through case studies various aspects of successful team practices. She relates how a company named Titeflex went from a culture of managers “wearing six-guns” to empowered teams of workers and managers (p. 11). This evolved through a culture change from small items such as time clocks to big items such as joint management teams who then provided an atmosphere of productive teamwork.

The opposite of fear for a team is trust (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 82). Trust can be lost by the following:

- Team members fail to deliver on promises or complete assignments or make empty promises
- Team members have hidden expectations about what will or won’t be achieved.
- Members talk about each other outside meetings.
- Members do not surface problems when they occur but instead collect injustices.
- There is competition among teams in the same organization. (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 84)

Team accountability was described by the literature in the following:

1. Respect, open-mindedness, and collaboration are high; members seek win/win solutions and build on each other's idea (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 21 ; Katzenbach and Smith, 1994, p. 140).

Win/win is a term best remembered from the writings of Stephen Covey (1994) and his book The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People. The essence of win/win, according to Covey, is that in almost all situations, "cooperation is far more productive than competition" (p. 211). Win/win is seeking mutual benefit in all interactions.

People ordinarily believe there is a need to have a "winner" in decision making. This will automatically result in a loser. In a true team environment, helpful behaviors involve considering other viewpoints and seeking alternatives that all can agree to (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 58).

One problem pointed out by Senge (1994) with executive level teams is the idea that "one person getting ahead often means another getting left behind, a phenomenon particularly evident around the issue of succession. Lip service to collaboration notwithstanding, this is a very real dynamic on many executive teams"(p. 439). Collaboration is a crucial quality on management teams for progress to occur.

Other items describing team accountability were:

2. Conflicts and differences of opinion are considered opportunities to explore new ideas; the emphasis is on finding common ground (Harrington - Mackin, 1994, p. 21).

3. Decisions are made by consensus and have the acceptance and support of members (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 21).

Conflict can and should be a tool to create, as Katzenbach and Smith (1994) call it, an opportunity to revisit the basics. “One of the primary messages of our book is that no team can re-think its purpose, approach and performance goals too many times. All teams – and certainly stuck teams – benefit from going back to ground zero, and spending the time to uncover all hidden assumptions and differences of opinion that when assessed by the full team, might provide the foundation for clarifying the team’s mission and how to accomplish it”( p. 160). They further state it is good to be stuck for a while without using outside help to increase the team’s learning power.

Covey (1994) wrote: “Shared vision becomes the constitution, the criterion for decision making in the group. It bonds people together. It gives them a sense of unity that provides great strength in times of challenge” (p. 219).

One of the problems of executive teams who do not have the aforementioned qualities is that decision making becomes difficult. Senge (1994) writes “...on the executive team there is generally no appellate court - no tie breaker or higher court of last resort...if caught in a dysfunctional conflict...the CEO or executive team leader, who may or may not be impartial makes the final decision” ( p. 439).

In education settings whereby principal and superintendent are teamed, DiNatale (1994) writes “The central office must seek ‘mutual support’ and encourage heightening awareness among the members of the school setting by openly acknowledging that contradiction may exist, thereby shifting role conflicts from individuals to the group and helping to resolve ambiguities in a broader context” ( p. 81).

Harrington - Mackin (1994) describes when to use consensus decision making by the following:

- When the issue being considered is an important one and the unity gained is worth the time.
- When a sense of synergy among team members is a priority
- When a number of alternatives and courses of action should be explored and considered. (p. 110)

In other words, in practically all important decisions involving the team.

She further describes attitudes and behaviors required for consensus:

- Ability to speak for oneself – “I prefer, I need”
- Enough self-discipline to stay focused on the task and process
- Clear, honest, and direct speech in terms of who, what, when, where
- Ability to restate concerns. (Harrington-Mackin, 1994, p. 110)

All of the above qualities and others repeat the skills that have been mentioned for effective team communication. This is an important process that assesses the effective decision making abilities of a management team.

#### The Team Orientation and Behavior Survey

In 1983 psychologists Leonard Goodstein, Phyllis Cook and Jeanette Goodstein developed an inventory to examine effective and productive team practices (Goodstein, Cook, & Goodstein, 1983). In their efforts to measure team effectiveness they examined traits that define the major purposes of effective team building. Some of these traits were: 1) To set goals or priorities, 2) to analyze or allocate the way work is performed according to team members' roles and responsibilities, 3) to examine the way the team is working - norms, decision making, conflict management, etc. and 4) to examine relationships among team members (p. 103).



These four areas upon which the inventory is developed, support the four areas this researcher discovered as defining the practices of effective teams, namely: team goals, team skills, approach to teaming and team accountability.

The survey was developed from research done by Bales (1950) and Benne and Sheets (1948). These researchers identified three major classes of roles for team members: those necessary to accomplish the task, increased cohesion of the group, and satisfying of personal needs. They labeled these areas as general classes - group task roles, group maintenance and individual roles, minimizing the last category (Goodstein et al., 1983).

The authors, adding this research to theirs, developed a definition of effective team development and team building: Team development is the analysis of the relative strength of group task and maintenance roles in functionally interdependent teams for the purpose of establishing, restoring or maintaining an adequate balance between these two roles in order for the team to function at its maximum potential (p. 104).

Uses of the TOBI include finding differences across teams. These differences can be assessed and compared. Thus, it will be useful to utilize this survey to compare the perceptions of CEOs and superintendents. Also, the TOBI can be used to examine group profiles in various work settings (p. 107). This will aide in looking at both private sector businesses and public school settings. The survey also has established reliability and validity through statistical testing and independent observers.

## Summary

The purpose of the literature review was first to examine the practice of management from its early history. Through this examination a basis of knowledge was established to give the reader an understanding of how team management practices have evolved in the world of private sector business.

Because this study compared private sector business management teams with school administrative teams, the second part of this review focused on the history of school administration. Parallels were pointed out in the writings that showed many similarities that brought the researcher to the current practice of administrative teams.

The third section dealt with a list of qualities gleaned from the literature that are statements supporting effective team practices. These statements were taken individually and discussed using the literature to support their validity. The goal of this section was to clarify what the literature supported as effective practices of management teams.

Finally, the last section introduced and explained the TOBI, an inventory to be used to survey the two groups, CEOs and superintendents. This inventory was developed to examine the perceptions of individuals as they relate to the practices of effective teams.

This study should aid future school administrators in examining their practices as they team together as compared to the practices of management teams in the private sector from companies deemed successful.

## **Chapter 3**

### **PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY**

**The purpose of this study was to identify if differences exist between private sector management teams and school administrative teams regarding the effectiveness of their team practices in four areas: task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills. These were measured by the responses of CEOs of companies with employee populations of 100 to 250 and superintendents with school corporation student enrollments between 1000 and 2000.**

**This chapter contains an explanation of the methodology that was used to conduct the study. Included in the chapter are discussions concerning the sample, the data gathering instrument and the procedures for collection of the data.**

#### **Research questions**

**The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:**

- 1. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task values?**
- 2. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task skills?**
- 3. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance values?**

**4. Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance skills?**

#### **Null hypothesis**

**Ho 1. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task values.**

**Ho 2. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task skills.**

**Ho 3. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance values.**

**Ho 4. There is no significant difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance skills.**

#### **Description of the sample**

**For this study the private sector population included businesses listed with the Indiana Chamber of Commerce whose employees number between 100 and 250. This list is comprised of approximately 2,500 companies. From this list a sample of 250 companies was selected using a systematic sampling procedure in which every tenth company was selected. An introductory letter to the study and postcard inquiring whether the CEO used team management were sent.**

**The school administrative population included school superintendents in the state of Indiana whose student population is between 1,000 and 2,000 . This numbered 137**

school corporations. An introductory letter to the study and a postcard were sent inquiring whether the superintendent used team management.

#### Description of the survey instrument

The Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory (TOBI) (Goodstein, Cook, & Goodstein, 1983) was used for this study. This inventory is comprised of 56 questions that are evenly divided into four areas that measure effective team practices: task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills. The questions are stated in present tense as to reflect the respondent's perceptions of current team management practices. The questions use a 7-point response scale: "Strongly disagree (very unlike me)," "Disagree (unlike me)," "Slightly disagree (somewhat unlike me)," "Neither agree nor disagree (neither like nor unlike me)," "Slightly agree (somewhat like me)," "Agree (like me)," and "Strongly agree (very like me)." Some items in the survey were reverse coded. Responses were totaled within each of the four areas.

Question number 26 was inadvertently deleted from the surveys that were sent, therefore, means were calculated for each area. Participants were allowed to miss one item per factor. One participant failed to respond to question 13 and another failed to respond to question 40.

The reliability of scale score (alpha coefficients) for the categories were: .74 for task values, .79 for task skills, .81 for maintenance values, and .83 for maintenance skills (Goodstein et al., 1983).

### Data collection procedures

The study was conducted during the 2000-2001 school year. An initial letter explaining the purpose of the survey and inquiring as to whether the private sector company or the school corporation uses teaming in their management practices was sent. A post card with a check-off response was included to return. The questions checked pertained to whether the company or school corporation does or does not use the concept of team management.

Following the initial letter, the survey instrument with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey was sent to those private sector businesses and school corporations who responded positively to the use of team management.

### Method of data analysis

Prior to analyses of research questions, Pearson correlations among the four dependent variables (task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills) were performed. This was done to ascertain the degree of relationship among the dependent variables and determine if a Bonferroni correction factor should be used for the analyses of the research questions in order to control for Type I errors.

Each research question was analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance to make comparisons of mean scores on task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills between CEOs and superintendents. These tests were used to determine if significant differences were evident in these two groups' perceptions of the stated characteristics of effective team management practices gleaned from the literature.

## Chapter 4

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to identify if differences exist between private sector management teams and school administrative teams regarding the effectiveness of their team practices in four areas: task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills. The Team Orientation Behavior Inventory was mailed to positive respondents to the initial inquiry as to whether CEOs of a sample of 250 companies in Indiana (employees numbering 100-250) or superintendents of school corporations numbering 1000 to 2000 students used team management.

The total number of cards returned by superintendents numbered 109 or 80%. Cards indicating the superintendent did not use team management practices numbered 45 or 41%. Cards returned stating that the superintendent used team management numbered 64 or 59%. Surveys (TOBI) sent to these positive respondents yielded 47 (73%) return. Of the superintendent respondents, 4% were female and 96% were male. Sixty-eight percent of the 47 superintendents responded that they had formal training in team management.

The total number of cards returned by CEOs numbered 98 or 39% of 250. Cards indicating the CEO did not use team management practices numbered 43 or 44%. Cards returned with a positive response as to whether the CEO used team management numbered 55 or 56%. Surveys (TOBI) sent to these positive respondents yielded 27 (49% of the 55) return. Respondents to the survey had the following positions with their

respective companies: president (28%), owner (24%), administrator (17%), manager (14%) and plant manager (7%). Other titles mentioned only once were CEO, executive director and vice president. Of the 27 CEO respondents, 85% were male and 15% female. Seventy percent of the 27 CEOs responding to the survey said they had formal training in team management.

#### Statistical analysis: correlation

Pearson Correlations were conducted among the four scale factors (task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills) to determine the relationship among these four dependent variables. Task values, as defined by Goodstein, Cooke and Goodstein (1983), involve areas whereby a group member holds a strong value toward helping the group accomplish the task. There were 14 items on the inventory that supported this area: 5, 11, 14, 18, 19, 20, 32, 36, 38, 41, 45, 47, 49, and 53 (See Appendix A). Task skills relate the specific group skills such as summarizing and creating agendas that allow teams to complete tasks. Specific questions that supported this area were: 3, 9, 12, 17, 30, 33, 34, 39, 40, 44, 46, 48, 55, and 56 (See Appendix A). Maintenance values relate to areas such as gatekeeping or checking on feelings for teams (Goodstein, Cooke and Goodstein, 1983). Maintenance values are supported by the following questions: 4, 6, 8, 13, 16, 21, 24, 27, 29, 31, 37, 52, 50 and 51 (See Appendix A). Finally, maintenance skills enhance the maintenance function of teams in areas such as compromise and relevancy of information. Maintenance skills are supported by these questions: 1, 2, 7, 10, 15, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 35, 43, 52, and 54 (See Appendix A). The



preliminary analysis showed that there were significant correlations among the four variables (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1

Correlation among Scale Factors

	Task Values	Task Skills	Maint. Values	Maint. Skills
Task Values				
Task Skills	.58			
Maint. Values	.77**	.53**		
Maint. Skills	.62***	.75***	.65***	

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

These correlations showed a strong relationship in the responses to questions concerning maintenance values and task values (see table 4.1). This indicated that when superintendents and CEOs responded at a certain value for questions in one area, they tended to respond at that same level in the other area. Other areas also showed similar correlation. Because of the moderate to strong correlations among dependent variables (task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills), a Bonferroni correction factor ( $\alpha/\text{number of tests} = .05/4 = .0125$ ) was used for the analyses of the research questions in order to control for type I error.

#### Analyses of research questions

Four one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine if there were significant differences in responses by the Superintendents and the CEO on the four areas. Table 4.2 shows the descriptive statistics.

Table 4.2

## Descriptive Statistics for the Four Dependent Variables

	Superintendent (n=47)		CEOs (n=26)	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
Task Values	5.4833	.5839	5.4396	.4910
Task Skills	5.735556	.5096	5.7143	.4953
Maintenance Values	5.5881	.5096	5.4434	.6787
Maintenance Skills	5.6727	.4789	5.7189	.6541

Research Question number 1: Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task values?

Table 4.3

## ANOVA Summary Table Task Values.

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position	.032	1	.032	.105	.747
Error	21.713	71	.306		
Total	21.745	72			

No significant difference between CEOs and superintendents task values was found.

$F(1,71)=.105, p=.747$  (Table 4.3)

Research Question number 2: Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to task skills?

Table 4.4

## ANOVA Summary Table for Task Skills.

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position	.007	1	.007	.030	.992
Error	18.081	71	.255		
Total	18.088	72			

No significant difference between CEOs and superintendents on task skills was found  $F(1,71)=.030, p=.992$  (Table 4.4)

**Research Question number 3: Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance values?**

**Table 4.5**

**ANOVA Summary Table for Maintenance Values.**

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position	.351	1	.351	.759	.387
Error	32.825	71	.462		
Total	33.176	72			

No significant difference between CEOs and superintendents on maintenance values was found.  $F(1,71)=.759, p=.387$  (Table 4.5)

**Research Question number 4: Is there a difference between private sector management teams and school administrative teams with respect to maintenance skills?**

**Table 4.6**

**ANOVA Summary Table for Maintenance Skills.**

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Position	.036	1	.036	.120	.730
Error	21.247	71	.299		
Total	21.283	72			

No significant difference between CEOs and superintendents on maintenance skills was found.  $F(1,71)=.120, p=.730$  (Table 4.6)

## Chapter 5

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

**This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section presents a summary and rationale for the study. The findings of the study are summarized in the next section. The third section lists conclusions drawn from both the survey results and the review of literature. Finally, recommendations based on the study and for future studies are presented.**

**The purpose of this study was to seek the perceptions of CEOs of companies listed with the Indiana Chamber of Commerce whose employee population numbered between 100 and 250 using the Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory (TOBI)(Goodstein, Cook, & Goodstein, 1983). These perceptions were compared to Superintendents in the state of Indiana whose school corporations numbered between 1000 and 2000.**

**An initial letter was sent to 250 CEOs and 137 superintendents. A response card was included and returned by 98 CEOs (39%) and 109 superintendents (80%). Fifty-five CEOs responded positively to the question of whether they used team management and surveys (TOBI) were sent to them. Twenty-seven usable surveys were returned (49%). Sixty-four superintendents responded positively to the question of whether they used team management and surveys (TOBI) were sent to them. Forty-seven usable surveys were returned (73%).**

From the questionnaire demographic information was asked as to whether the respondent had formal training in team management practices. Seventy percent of the CEOs had formal team management training while sixty-eight percent of the superintendents had formal team management training.

The survey was composed of 55 items with seven response categories with the headings of "Strongly disagree (very unlike me)," "Disagree (unlike me)," "Slightly disagree (somewhat unlike me)," "Neither agree nor disagree (neither like nor unlike me)," "Slightly agree (somewhat like me)," "Agree (like me)," and "Strongly agree (very like me)." These questions related to four categories: task skills, task values, maintenance skills and maintenance values.

The treatment of the data involved four two-way ANOVAS comparing the responses of the CEOs and superintendents in the four categories: task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills. A Pearson correlation showed high correlations between the categories. The data were collected in December of 2000.

A review of the literature was conducted which provided a knowledge base as to the history of management in both the private sector as well as the public sector. This review also revealed the effective practices of team management. These effective practices were reflected in the questions asked in the TOBI.

### **Findings of the study**

The findings related to the perceptions of CEOs and Superintendents as they relate to effective team management practices. The four research questions were analyzed statistically using analyses of variance.

Research question number one investigated the differences between the perceptions of CEOs and superintendents relative to task values in management teams. The analysis revealed there was no significant difference in the responses of CEOs and superintendents.

Research question number two investigated the differences between the perceptions of CEOs and superintendents relative to task skills in management teams. The analysis revealed there was no significant difference in the responses of CEOs and superintendents.

Research question number three investigated the differences between the perceptions of CEOs and superintendents relative to maintenance values in management teams. The analysis revealed there was no significant difference in the responses of CEOs and superintendents.

Research question number four investigated the differences between the perceptions of CEOs and superintendents relative to maintenance skills in management teams. The analysis revealed there was no significant difference in the responses of CEOs and superintendents.

### Conclusions

The review of the literature in chapter two and the data analysis in chapter four supports the following conclusions:

- 1 CEOs of companies that have similar numbers of employees as Superintendents in the state of Indiana define effective team practices in the areas of task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills. These areas are supported by the research of

Harrington-Mackin (1994), Senge (1994), Katzenbach and Smith (1994), Schmoker (1999).

According to Senge (1994):

There are at least two good reasons why the executive team leadership form is on the rise. First, the problems our organizations face today are enormously complex and have political ramifications within the company. The most difficult issues that an executive team faces are often cross-disciplinary or cross-functional...Second, within the past decade there has been a “sea change” in the governance of organizations. Leaders and managers, reconceiving their own job as setting forth broad visions and strategies, now grant subordinates much more power to plan and implement. In an organization led by influence, people are moved and convinced when they see a group of people at the top truly sharing a vision and strategy, and modeling it in their behavior. ( p. 436)

Harrington-Mackin (1994) and Katzenbach and Smith (1994) both define effective teams practices similarly by placing emphasis on teams skills. These items were addressed in the Team Orientation Behavior Inventory in various questions pertaining to team skills (See Appendix A, questions 3, 30, 7, and 15).

According to Schmoker (1999), whose writings apply to both public and private sectors, business literature (from authors such as Peters and Deming) say there is no replacement for effective teaming practices.

2. Management practices (in this case team management practices) are similar for CEOs with similar numbers of employees as superintendents. This is supported in literature by Schlechty (1994) and Drucker (1983). This is also supported by the similar historical beginnings of management influence by Taylor and Fayol (Campbell, Bridges, & Nystrand, 1977).

Drucker (1983) states:

Most people do not hear ‘management’; they hear ‘business management.’ Management as a function, as an organ of authority and responsibility, and as a

discipline was indeed first seen, identified, and studied as a part of business enterprise. But this is hardly more than a historical - and primarily American - accident. Management is the specific organ of any modern institution. The people in management may be called by different names - schools and hospitals, for instance, prefer to speak of administrators. But what all of them do is manage. What all of them practice is management. ( p. 295)

Schlechty (1994) observed that both private sector and public sector businesses were both reluctant in the 1970's to embrace the idea of teaming when pressured by Japanese businesses. This hesitation was later re-evaluated by both public and private sector businesses.

In doing research, Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1977) cite the influence of Frederick Taylor and Henri Fayol (The Father of Administrative Theory) both 19<sup>th</sup> century contemporaries, on the area of both school administration as well as the private sector. Both theorists laid the groundwork that was to become the current management practices in both private and public sectors.

#### **Recommendations for further study**

- 1. Studies that compare the perceptions of CEOs of large companies with Superintendents of large school corporations whose employee populations are similar concerning effective team management practices.**
- 2. Studies that compare the perceptions of CEOs of small companies with Superintendents of small school corporations whose employee populations are similar concerning effective team management practice.**



3. **Studies that compare the perceptions of other members of the private sector management teams as well as other members of school administrative teams as to effective team management practices.**
4. **Studies that compare similar sized companies and school corporations as this study on the perceptions of CEOs and Superintendents on management practices other than team management practices.**
5. **A study that analyzes the response of male vs. female CEOs and Superintendents and their perceptions of team management practices and their effectiveness.**
6. **A study could be conducted that identifies the differences in the management practices of CEOs of private companies and school superintendents.**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bradshaw, L. & Buckner, K. (1994) . Changing times, changing schools, changing leadership. NASSP Bulletin , 78 – 83

Campbell, R. , Bridges, E., & Nystrand K. (1977) . Introduction to Educational Administration .Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Covey, S. (1994) . The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People. New York: Simon & Schuster

Deepröse, D. (1995) . The Team Coach: Vital New Skills for Supervisors and Managers in a Team Environment . New York: AMACOM

Dembowski, F. & Ekstron, C. (1999). The managerial role of school administrators, EffectiveSchool District Management: A Self Review Instrument & Guide . Arlington, VA:Educational Research Services, 1 -4

Deming, W. E. (1986). Out of the Crisis. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology

DiNatale, J. (1994) . School improvement and restructuring: a threefold approach. NASSPBulletin , 79 - 83

Drucker, P. (1982) . The Changing World of the Executive. New York: Times Books

Four U.S. Companies are named as winners of 1997 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. Business America. 118 (11), 33

Garber, M., Heet, S. & Styring III, W. (1999) . Indiana education on shaky ground: a report of the Education Policy Center. Hudson Institute, Indianapolis, IN.

Goodstein, L., Cooke, P. & Goodstein, J. (1983) . The Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory (TOBI). Annual for Facilitators, Trainers & Consultants. University Associates, 103 - 114

Gorton, R. (1976) . School Administration, Challenge and Opportunity for Leadership. Dubuque, Iowa : Wm. C. Brown Company

Greenleaf, R. (1991) . Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness . Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press

Harrington - Mackin, D. ( 1994) . The Team Building Tool Kit: Tips, Tactics, and Rules for Effective Workplace Teams. New York: AMACOM

Hoagland, J. (2000). Assistant Vice President, Director Of Quality Management (retired), personal interview.

Indiana Chamber of Commerce, (2000). Business Research Center, Indianapolis, IN.

Indiana Public Law 221, Department of Education Information Center Website, <<http://doe.state.in.us/pl221/welcome.html>>.

Indiana School Statistical Report, (1999-2000), Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., P.O. Box 1290, Government Relations Division, Indianapolis, IN 46206

Katzenbach, J. & Smith, R. (1993). The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Lindelov, J. & Bentley, S. (1989). Team management. School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence . 135 - 151

McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise . New York: McGraw - Hill.

Parkay, F., Oakes, M. & Shindler, J. (1997). Creating a climate for collaborative, emergent leadership at an urban high school. International Journal of Educational Reform ,6 (1), 64 - 74

Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies . New York: Harper & Row

Rhodes, L. & Digate, G. (1995). Building capacity for sustained improvement. The School Administrator . March issue, 34 - 38

Robbins, S. (1997). The historical roots of current management. Management Today! New York: Prentice - Hall Publishers, 595 - 610

Schlechty, P. (1997). Inventing Better Schools: An Action Plan for Educational Reform . San Francisco, CA: Jossey - Bass

Schmoker, M. (1999) . Results: The Key to Continuous School Improvement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD

**Senge, P., Klein, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (1994). The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook: Strategies and Tools for Building A Learning Organization. New York: Doubleday**

**APPENDIXES**

**APPENDIX A**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Please check appropriate response.

Chief Executive Officer (private company) \_\_\_\_\_ School Superintendent \_\_\_\_\_

Have you had formal training in team management practices? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

The Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory

The following list of statements reflect team management practices in four areas: task values, task skills, maintenance values and maintenance skills.

Please circle the number of the following survey items based on this scale:

- 1 = Strongly disagree (very unlike me)
- 2 = Disagree (unlike me)
- 3 = Slightly disagree (somewhat unlike me)
- 4 = Neither agree nor disagree (neither like nor unlike me)
- 5 = Slightly agree (somewhat like me)
- 6 = Agree (like me)
- 7 = Strongly agree (very like me)

1. I am often at a loss when attempting to reach a compromise among members of my group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am effective in ensuring that relevant data are used to make decisions in my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I find it difficult to summarize ideas expressed by members of the team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I believe that the existence of positive feelings among team members is critical to the team's efforts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. It often is important in my group to summarize the ideas and issues that are raised.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I think that, to be effective, the members of a team must be aware of what is occurring in the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I am able to convey my interest in and support for the other members of my team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. In my opinion, it is very important that team members be sources of support and encouragement for one another.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I am effective in establishing an agenda and in reminding the other members of it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I am particularly adept in observing the behaviors of other members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. When the group becomes bogged down, it often is helpful if someone clarifies its goal or purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I frequently keep the group focused on the task at hand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I think that testing for members' commitments is one of the most important components of group decision making.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. In my opinion, summarizing what has occurred in the group is unnecessary.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. One of the things that I contribute to the team is my ability to support and encourage others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I think that examining the assumptions that underlie the group's decisions is not necessary in terms of the groups' functioning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. It is difficult for me to assess how well our team is doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. In my opinion, work groups are most productive if they restrict their discussions to task-related items.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I believe that for the team to regularly evaluate and critique its work is a waste of time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. In my opinion, it is very important that team members agree, before they begin to work, on the procedural rules to be followed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I think that, to be effective, a group member simultaneously must participate in the group and be aware of emerging group processes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. It is really difficult for me to articulate where I think other members stand on issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I am effective in helping to ensure that all members of the group have an opportunity to express their opinions before a final decision is made.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I believe that one's feelings about how well the group is working are best kept to oneself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I am skillful in helping other group members to share their feelings about what is happening.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I believe that it is a waste of time to settle differences of opinion in the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I often am unaware of existing group dynamics.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I do not think that the participation of all members is important as long as final agreement is achieved.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. I am skillful in organizing groups and teams to work effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I feel that, to be effective, group members must openly share their feelings about how well the group is doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. In my judgement, sharing feelings about how the group is doing is a waste of the members' time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. When the group gets off the subject, I usually remind the other members of the task.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. One of the things that I do well is to solicit facts and opinions from the group members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Ascertaining the other members' points of view is something that I do particularly well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. I think that it is important that my group stick to its agenda.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. In my opinion, an inability to clear up confusion among members can cause a team to fail.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. I feel that it is important to elicit the opinions of the other members of the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. It is not easy for me to summarize the opinions of the other members of the team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. A contribution that I make to the group is to help the other members to build one another's ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. I believe that the group can waste time in an excessive attempt to organize itself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. I believe that it is very important to reach a compromise when differences cannot be resolved in the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. I am effective in helping to reach constructive settlement of disagreements among group members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. I am effective in establishing orderly procedures in which the team can work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. I think that effective teamwork results only if the team remains focused on the task at hand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. I am particularly effective in helping my group to evaluate the quality of its work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7



47. In my opinion, it is important that the team establish methods by which it can evaluate the quality of work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. I find it easy to express ideas and information to the other members of my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. In my judgement, searching for ideas and opinions is one of the criteria of an effective team.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. I believe that it is critical to settle disagreements among group members constructively.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. I believe that it is important that the members of the team understand one another's points of view.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52. I am adept in making sure that reticent members have an opportunity to speak during the team's meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53. I think that the synergy that occurs among group members is one of the most important components of group problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54. I rarely volunteer to state how I feel about the group while it is meeting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
55. When my group wanders from the task at hand, it is difficult for me to interrupt the members and attempt to refocus them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56. I am able to restate clearly the ideas that are expressed in my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please place this survey in the enclosed stamped envelope and return it by 12/31/2000.

Thank you for your assistance!

**APPENDIX B****INITIAL LETTER TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS:  
Superintendents**

**Dear School Superintendent,**

**My name is Therese Howe and I am a doctoral candidate with Indiana State University. I am currently seeking information in the area of management skills in both private sector businesses and school administration. The purpose of this study is to examine similarities and differences in team management skills specifically. Your participation will involve answering a preliminary question on the attached post card. If your response is positive, then you will be asked to respond to a brief survey. This study will conclude following this second survey. Your response to both questionnaires should pose no risk to you as an individual. I am hopeful that through the study, this should create information helpful to managers in both private and public sector companies.**

**I have enclosed a post card with two questions pertaining to whether you have used some kind of teaming in your management of your school corporation. A number in the upper corner of this post card will identify your school corporation and aid me in my research. All responses will be treated confidentially. No direct identification of you or your school corporation will be included in the study.**

**If you have any questions concerning this study feel free to contact me at 765-628-0520 or by e-mail at [thowe@ncstc.k12.in.us](mailto:thowe@ncstc.k12.in.us). My address is: 7132 East 50 North, Greentown, IN 46936. You may also contact Indiana State University, Department of Education at 1-800 - 444 - GRAD. Please ask for Dr. Robert Boyd in ELAF.**

**Your participation is strictly voluntary and refusal to participate will in no way cause you any harm. Also, if you decide not to continue participation, this will also not cause you any personal harm.**

**Any help that you can give me through your participation will be greatly appreciated. Please return the card by \_\_\_\_\_.**  
**Thank you for your assistance!**

**Sincerely,  
Therese Howe, Doctoral Candidate  
Indiana State University**

## **NOTE TO USERS**

**Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.**

**This reproduction is the best copy available.**

**UMI**

**APPENDIX D****INITIAL SURVEY CARD:  
Superintendents**

The following questions pertain to whether your school corporation has used teaming methods in managing your organizations. Please respond by putting a check mark on the line next to the answer that represents your current practices.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes, my administrative group utilizes teaming.

\_\_\_\_\_ No, my administrative group does not utilize teaming.

Please return this card by \_\_\_\_\_. Thank you in advance for your help in my research.

**Therese Howe  
Doctoral Candidate  
Indiana State University**

**Dr. Robert Boyd  
Dissertation Chair  
Indiana State University**

**APPENDIX E****INITIAL SURVEY CARD:  
CEOS**

The following questions pertain to whether your company has used teaming methods in managing your organizations. Please respond by putting a check mark on the line next to the answer that represents your current practices.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Yes, my management group utilizes teaming.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **No, my management group does not utilize teaming.**

Please return this card by \_\_\_\_\_. Thank you in advance for your help in my research.

**Therese Howe  
Doctoral Candidate  
Indiana State University**

**Dr. Robert Boyd  
Dissertation Chair  
Indiana State University**

**APPENDIX F****LETTER SENT TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS  
Superintendents**

**Dear Survey Participant,**

**My name is Therese Howe and I am a doctoral candidate working through Indiana State University. The topic of my research is management, specifically team management. I am comparing the perceptions of private sector management (specifically CEOs) and school administrators (specifically superintendents).**

**Recently, I sent an initial survey questionnaire to your school corporation inquiring whether you use teaming in your administrative group. You responded positively to this survey so I am asking that you further assist me by answering some questions concerning practices of your administrative team. These questions were taken from research and reflect collectively some of the current effective practices of management teams. The instrument I have chosen is entitled the "Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory" developed by Goodstein, Cook and Goodstein**

**Your responses will be treated confidentially, and individuals will not be identified. The only identification mark on this questionnaire is located in the upper right corner of the first page. This number will be used to record the receipt of your survey and to provide information to my dissertation committee regarding surveys returned and report summaries.**

**The questionnaire should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please respond to each item and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by December 31, 2000. I realize how busy you are and I am grateful to you for taking time to assist me. If you would like a copy of the findings of this survey, please indicate this at the top of your questionnaire.**

**Thanks you again for your assistance!**

**Sincerely,**

**Therese Howe, Doctoral Candidate  
Indiana State University**

**Dr. Robert L. Boyd, Dissertation Chair  
Indiana State University**

**APPENDIX G**  
**LETTER SENT TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS**  
**CEOS**

Dear Survey Participant,

My name is Therese Howe and I am a doctoral candidate working through Indiana State University. The topic of my research is management, specifically team management. I am comparing the perceptions of private sector management (specifically CEOs) and school administrators (specifically superintendents).

Recently, I sent an initial survey questionnaire to your company inquiring whether you use teaming in your management group. You responded positively to this survey so I am asking that you further assist me by answering some questions concerning practices of your management team. These questions were taken from research and reflect collectively some of the current effective practices of management teams. The instrument I have chosen is entitled the "Team Orientation and Behavior Inventory" developed by Goodstein, Cook and Goodstein

Your responses will be treated confidentially, and individuals will not be identified. The only identification mark on this questionnaire is located in the upper right corner of the first page. This number will be used to record the receipt of your survey and to provide information to my dissertation committee regarding surveys returned and report summaries.

The questionnaire should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please respond to each item and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by December 31, 2000. I realize how busy you are and I am grateful to you for taking time to assist me. If you would like a copy of the findings of this survey, please indicate this at the top of your questionnaire.

Thanks you again for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Therese Howe, Doctoral Candidate  
Indiana State University

Dr. Robert L. Boyd, Dissertation Chair  
Indiana State University