Chapter One: What it is and where it comes from.

- The Transformation of the Education Policy Environment
  - The way it used to be:
    - Until the advent of the Reagan Administration, state governments delegated most of their authority over public education to local school districts without requiring them to do much to demonstrate accountability. In state legislatures, education policy was commonly developed within what was called “an iron triangle,” consisting of the education committees of the legislature, the state department of education, and the major education lobbying groups. Educators were considered experts with valuable opinions about education policy.
  - The new policy environment
    - State governments have asserted their authority over public schools by issuing a bewildering array of new policies and policy proposals. More often than not, they have not asked public school educators for input into these reforms. Instead, they have defined educators as a major part of the problem rather than as professionals qualified to offer solutions and have sought input from business leaders and think-tank researchers instead.

- Reasons for these changes
  - Economic Changes
    - As the twenty-first century began, more and more children in the U.S. were growing up in poverty. Educating poor children well is costlier than educating those whose families have abundant or adequate resources. Thus, the schools find themselves shouldering additional burdens at a time when their own resources are declining. This fact contributes to the overall sense of crisis in education (Berlin & Biddle, 1995; Phillips, 1994; Reich, 1991; Thurow, 1992)
  - Demographic Trends
    - Baby boomers are starting to retire and political leaders are concerned about financing their retirements as well as health care costs. Significant funds, both private and public, will have to be invested in the aging baby boom generation thereby reducing the money available for schools. Moreover, older people tend to be poorly attuned to the needs of education because they have o young children. This means that political support for schools, which has been declining with the aging of the population, will probably decline still further. (Rosenblatt, 1996)
    - Increasing diversity of the population. Racial, ethnic, religious, and linguistic diversity are an important part of the context in which public schools operate and in which political decisions about them are made (Rosenblatt, 1996)
  - Ideological Shift
    - In general, the focus of education politics has shifted from equality issues to issues relating to excellence, accountability, and choice (Boyd & Kerchner, 1988) Traditional conservatives have begun to play an active role in policy development. The tone of U.S. politics has changed, becoming increasingly harsh. Not only are Americans advancing new ideas, but they are advancing them more aggressively and dogmatically than before. For school leaders who grew up when political discourse was more courteous, this harsh tone can be disconcerting.

Changed Roles of School leaders

- Reallocation of Authority
  - The federal government has less authority over education than it did in 1980. In the new configuration of education authority, then, the federal and district levels have lost power, and state and building levels have gained it (Fowler, 2000)

- District Leadership
  - Kowalski (1995) argues that today, effective superintendents must understand politics at three levels: school, district, and state. She asserts that fighting for funding may well include “organizing coalitions of local leaders to petition legislators in the state house” and “challenging a finance committee’s inadequate budget allocation for education”. Superintendents and their central office teams must understand how their district interfaces with “government, business, community groups, and social agencies” They must monitor developments in these arenas and be prepared to enter them on behalf of their districts when necessary.

- Building Leadership
  - Other, current reform movements imply a need for greater sensitivity to the state policy environment on the part of building leaders include interdistrict open enrollment, charter schools, and state mandated standards.

- Public Leadership
  - Public school administrators are being transformed from bureaucratic leaders into what Bryson and Crosby (1992) call “public leaders.” They are called upon to act outside their districts and to function as leaders in networks of organizations. In these networks they have no hierarchical status; rather, they must rely on such leadership tools as persuasion, coalition building, and political strategies. Effective action in such arenas requires an understanding of the broader socioeconomic context within which schools are located and an awareness of the policy environment. In short, it requires the understanding of policy issues and processes.

Definition: Public policy is the dynamic and value laden process through which a political system handles a public problem. It includes a government’s expressed intentions and official enactments as well as its consistent patterns of activity and inactivity. In this definition, government includes elected and appointed public officials at the federal, state, and local levels as well as the bodies or agencies within which these officials work. Thus, school board members, school administrators, and classroom teachers in public schools are all part of government as are such individuals and groups as governors, judges and Congress.

Policy and Expressed Government Intentions – Racial Segregation

To a great extent politics is about communication, both written and spoken.

Policy, Law, and Racial Segregation

Policy and Statutes
  - Statutes are laws enacted by legislatures. Law and policy are not identical and not every policy appears in statutes.
Policy, Rules and Regulations

Most statutes are worded in general terms, and many of the details needed to put them into practice are not written in the statute itself. These details are usually provided by rules and regulations that government agencies develop. At the state level, the state department of education and state board of education usually exercise this responsibility. As with statutes, these rules and regulations provide important clues as to what the policy really is.

Policy, Court Decisions

Under the U.S. judicial system, courts have the right to review statutes in order to interpret them and to evaluate their constitutionality. Courts can also overturn earlier court decisions. This means that court decisions are part of the law; in fact, they are called case law.

Policy, Budgets

In order to determine what policy a government is pursuing, considering both the initial funding level and funding trends over time is essential.

Implementation, Policy

Policies are usually developed close to the top of the political system. Policies are put into practice close to the grass roots. In education, the implementers of most policies are superintendents and their staffs, principals, and classroom teachers. All policies are therefore mediated through the context in which they are implemented, and change in the process. These changes may take the form of minor adjustments or major transformations, but policies are always altered during implementation (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989). In determining what the real policy is, then, considering how the policy is implemented is essential.

The Policy Process: the policy process is the sequence of events that occurs when a political system considers different approaches to public problems, adopts one of them, tries it out, and evaluates it. The process is driven by policy issues (Bryson & Crosby, 1992).

Policy Issues

Controversial Elements

A policy issue is, by definition, controversial. An issue exists only if social groups disagree about how government should approach a given problem (Coplin & O’Leary, 1981).

Public Element

Many disagreements about how children should be socialized are not policy issues, either. Policy issues are problems that the government can legitimately address.

Examples of Education Policy Issues

School choice: voucher plans, intradistrict and interdistrict open enrollment, and charter schools. School choice has many opponents also. They argue that choice will weaken public education and increase the segregation of schools along race and class lines (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Cookson, 1994). National curriculum standards: They would provide clear criteria for excellence throughout the country and reduce the negative impact of mobility on children’s schooling. Opponents of such a policy believe that it would weaken local control of education and lead to an undesirable standardization of education throughout the country. Both school choice and a national curriculum are policy issues because they are controversial and because they are policies that the government might adopt.

Applying the Stage Model to Standards-Based Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Definition</th>
<th>Agenda Setting</th>
<th>Policy Formulation</th>
<th>Policy Adoption</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 1.1 A diagram of the policy process

Issue definition is the first stage in the process chronologically, however, the red arrows move from right to left because sometimes a policy issue advances for a while and then moves back to an earlier stage. The process functions selectively; at each successive stage fewer issues or policies are involved.

Issue Definition

Example: Learning that most developed countries had national content standards and tests, they began to redefine the problem of the supposedly poor quality of education in the United States as the lack of clear curriculum standards and tests to assess curriculum mastery (Ravitch, 1995).

Agenda Setting

Not every problem defined as an education policy issue is acted on by a government. In order to have a chance of eventually becoming policy, an issue must be placed on the policy agenda, or “list of subjects or problems to which governmental officials, and people outside government closely associated with those officials, are paying some serious attention at any given time” (Kingdon, 1999, p. 3). The policy agenda is usually set by powerful politicians, such as presidents, governors, and legislators.

Policy Formulation

Before a policy can be formally adopted, it must be expressed in written form. The first written text developed is usually a bull, a draft of a proposed statute. Bills may be developed by members of the legislative staff, by lawyers retained for that purpose, or by advocacy groups who support the legislation. Rules and regulations are written after statutes have been adopted. They, too, may pass through several drafts before becoming official.
Policy Adoption
In order for a policy to take effect, its written formulation must be officially adopted by the appropriate body. Statutes are adopted by a majority vote in Congress and state legislatures. In public education, rules and regulations are adopted by authorized officials within agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education, state departments of education, and local school districts. Some district policies, but not all, require a majority vote by a school board.

Implementation
Education policies must be implemented at the grassroots level—by district administrators, principals, and classroom teachers. The success of implementation depends upon motivating educators to implement the new policy and providing them with the necessary resources to do so.

Evaluation
Ideally, policies are evaluated in order to determine if they work the way they are supposed to. Evaluation is a form of applied research designed to achieve this purpose.

Policy Analysis: has been defined as the “evaluation of alternative government policies or decisions in order to arrive at the best (or a good) policy or decision in light of given goals, constraints, and conditions” (Nagel, 1984, p. xiii) Today, analysts also develop methods for implementing, evaluating, and terminating policies. Thus, their work frequently involves the study of both values and the political environment (Weimer & Vining, 1992)

A Brief History
Economists began to research policy alternatives for the federal government in the early twentieth century, when science and “experts” were idealized. Policy analysis did not come into its own until after World War II. The late 1960s saw the emergence of a large number of social issues and the passage of pioneering legislation. The federal education policies that were part of the War on Poverty stimulated the rapid growth of education policy analysis, much of it carried out by think tanks rather than the government. Analyst produced several important studies of education policy during the 1970s. Since the education reform movement began about 1983, education policy analysis has become increasingly important. Cibulka (1995) observed that policy studies in education had largely replaced the studies of education politics that were popular in the 1960s and 1970s. The growing importance of education policy analysis is suggested by the fact that in 1996 the American Educational Research Association established a new division to specialize in policy studies and the politics of education.

Objectives of Policy Analysis
The overall objective of policy analysis is to improve the quality of public policy. It is based on the well-founded premises that the policy process is not fully rational and that politicians, if left to themselves, often develop unsound policies. An undisputable strength of policy analysis is that it offers everyone who is interested in policy a variety of frameworks they can use in thinking about it.

Types of Policy Analysis
Coplin and O’Leary (1981) identify four types of policy analysis:

a. Monitoring: When researchers monitor, they systematically collect data relevant to a policy domain and to the ongoing policy process.
b. Forecasting: Drawing on large data banks, policy researchers try to predict what policy issues will be important in five to ten years.
c. Evaluations: When researchers evaluate a policy or program, their objective is to provide information about how well the policy is achieving the purposes for which it was designed. Coplin and O’Leary (1981), studying a policy in depth to determine what values underlie it.
d. Prescriptive: Prescriptive policy analysis outlines the options open to policy makers and may recommend which would be most desirable.

The School Leader and Policy Studies
Administrators as Policy Makers
School administrators play a major role in the development of rules and regulations. School boards, administrators, and classroom teachers are responsible for filling many of the details of the broad framework of legislation. Their policy making takes such forms as recommending a policy revision to the school board, developing a manual of rules for classified staff, or writing a student discipline code for a school. No matter what the situation, a knowledge of policy and the policy process is helpful to administrators in their policymaking role.

Administrators as Implementers of Policy
School administrators also play a major role in implementing new policies. Whether the new policy originated at the federal, state, or local level, they will be expected to develop a plan to carry it out, motivate teachers and others to cooperate, marshal the necessary resources, and provide feedback about the process. Change is always difficult, so administrators who are responsible for implementing a new, possibly unpopular, policy find themselves in a challenging situation.

Administrators as Followers of Policy Issues
Following policy issues is essential for school leaders. They need to be aware of the major changes occurring in their social and economic environment and of how those changes may eventually give rise to education policy issues. They also need to follow the legislature process at the federal and state levels. It is essential for school leaders to be professionally active and informed.

Administrators as Influencers of Policy
In their capacity as public leaders (Bryson & Crosby, 1992), school administrators are in a position to exercise influence on the policy process at the state and federal levels. This influence can take many forms.

Chapter 2: Power and Education Policy
Defining Power
A “Contested” Concept
Power is an “essentially contested” concept (Lukes, 1974, p. 9), which means that one’s understanding of it is shaped by one’s theory of human nature and society, leading social scientists from different theoretical traditions to argue about its meaning.
Political scientist Robert Dahl developed one widely used definition: “A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do” (Lukes, 1974, pp.11-12).

A Working Definition of Power

The starting point for this definition is Muth’s (1984) statement that power is “the ability of an actor to affect the behavior of another actor” (p.27). The term actor includes both individuals—such as superintendents, governors, and teacher union presidents—and groups—such as school boards, state legislatures, and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs). The ability to exercise power depends on possessing appropriate resources, such as money, social status, and information. The ability to exercise power includes the willingness to deploy resources. Behavior can be affected in many ways, using one or more general types of power. Possible effects include causing an actor to act, preventing an actor from acting, and shaping the nature of the actor’s action. An actor may be conscious, unconscious, or partially conscious of the use of power (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Delpit, 1988). Because power is a relationship, it always exists in a concrete social context. An actor who is relatively powerful in one context may not be in others. Power relationships may be symmetrical or asymmetrical. In symmetrical relationships, people commonly use persuasion and bargaining with economic resources. Actors with significantly different amounts of resources have an asymmetrical power relationship. Power may be exercised either distributively or facilitatively (Mann, 1992). In using power distributively, one actor exercises power over the other. Power may be exercised facilitatively to “create or sustain favorable conditions, allow[ing] subordinate to enhance their individual and collective performance” (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991, p. xx) Power can be easily abused, but it is ethically neutral. Leaders can exercise power in an ethical manner.

Discourse and Power

School Administration as Talk

As Corson (1995) puts it: “All kinds of power are directed, mediated, or resisted through language” (p.3) Language is important in school leadership. To a great extent school administration is achieved through talk: talk in meetings, talk in random hallway encounters, talk on the telephone, talk to the media, and talk on the grapevine. When school leaders exercise power or experience its pressure on their own behavior, that power is usually communicated through language.

Texts

According to Fairclough (1995), every instance of discourse has three aspects. The first is the text, which can consist of written, spoken, or a combination of written and spoken language. Looking at this text alone may provide important clues to power relationships in central office and the community. One would expect district policy to reflect this influence and the values implicit in it.

Discourse Practice

The second aspect of any instance of discourse is the discourse practice that governs the production of the text. Because meetings are frequent occurrences in U.S. society, rules and traditions shape them. Each organization has its own traditions about meetings. These traditions may include how items are placed on the agenda and how long the meeting can last. All of these formal and informal rules and traditions constitute a discourse practice (Fairclough, 1995). The discourse practice influences what can be said and done as the text is produced. In order to interpret a text accurately, one must not only have the text but understand the discourse practice that produced it. Knowing how items were placed on the agenda and who appointed the committee chairs would provide important clues to power relationships.

Social Practice

The third aspect of discourse is the social practice in which both the text and the discourse practice are embedded. U.S. culture includes ideas about how men and women and people of different races should relate to each other. All of these elements—and many others—constitute the social practice in which a meeting is situated. They, too, must be taken into account in developing a sensitive interpretation of what happens at meetings. Conversations, meetings, and official documents provide important clues to organizational power relationships and behind-the-scenes happenings.

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.1 The Three Dimensions of Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Dimension: Explicit Exercise of Power</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.1 summarizes the three dimensions of power. Although the three dimensions of power, types of power, and power resources are presented separately, real life is more complex than textbook models. In most social setting, all three dimensions operate simultaneously, and several types of power are used.

The First Dimension of Power: Explicit Uses of Power

The first dimension of power consists of explicit exercises of power, which are often directly observable.

Types of Power

Four general types of power operate in the first dimension: force, economic dominance, authority, and persuasion. Real-life instances of each type will include most, but not necessarily all, of the characteristics of the ideal type. Moreover, in real life, two or more types of power can be used simultaneously.
Two kinds of force exist: physical force and psychic force. Exercising power through physical force involves using, or threatening to use, physical actions to impose one’s will on others. Psychic force is employed to damage another person’s self-concept.

**Economic Dominance**

Involves using one’s influence over the jobs, careers, or economic prosperity of others to affect their behavior. Using one’s influence over such working conditions as schedules, job assignments, and vacation dates to encourage people to comply with one’s wishes.

**Authority**

Authority is operational when one observes “unquestioning recognition by those who are asked to obey; neither coercion nor persuasion is needed” (Arendt, 1986, p. 65). Authority depends on legitimacy, the belief that the person in authority has a right to special power. Patriarchal authority is parental authority. Legal authority, which is conferred upon those who hold positions of responsibility within an organization. Legal authority is usually described and limited by official documents such as policy manuals and job descriptions. To a great extent, the relationships among teachers, principals, and district office administrators are based on legal authority (Bendix, 1960). Competent authority is often the only type of power professionals use with their clients. Examples: doctors, lawyers, some educational figures are unquestioned. Charismatic authority is based on purely personal qualities. This is the most unstable form of authority.

**Persuasion**

The overt attempt to affect the behavior of others by convincing them that the desired behavior is good. A common form of persuasion is socialization, which can be offered in several formats: induction or training programs. Rational persuasion in which one marshals arguments and pertinent facts in order to convince another to take a course of action. Manipulative persuasion withholds important facts from the actors they are trying to affect. Most often, the hidden information relates to the persuader’s true goal or to the potentially harmful impact of the suggested course of action (Wrong, 1979). Manipulative persuasion is always unethical.

**Power Resources**

**TABLE 2.2 Major Power Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Resources</th>
<th>Social Resources</th>
<th>Knowledge Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over careers and working conditions</td>
<td>Access – to money, the media, the legal system</td>
<td>Control over information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Control over votes</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money (cash or credit)</td>
<td>Numbers - allies or followers</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronage</td>
<td>Official position</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Understanding how the system works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next</td>
<td>Personal impact</td>
<td>Verbal ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Legal system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power depends on resources (Mann, 1992). Therefore, people who wish to build a power base do so by amassing appropriate resources for the arenas in which they wish to exercise power. Table 2.2 summarizes the major power resources.

**Material resources**

Material resources are essential to most exercises of power. Most important is money because its possessors can easily convert it into other resources (Dahl, 1986; Wrong, 1979). Using control over hiring to build and exercise power, or patronage, is unfortunately still an important source of power in many places (Dahl, 1986). Time is a material resource because of the relationship between time and money (Wrong, 1979).

**Social Resources**

Even if one has abundant material resources, having social resources is important as well. People who lack significant material resources can compensate for this deficiency by building and deploying social resources. One of the most important social resources is numbers, or numerous allies and followers. The impact of numbers can be magnified by effective organization. An organization is effective when it has skillful, committed leaders; respected decision-making procedures; and a planned, systematic communications system (Mann, 1992).

**Knowledge Resources**

French philosopher Michel Foucault’s term power/knowledge, which equates power and knowledge, vividly demonstrates the importance of knowledge as a source of power (Fillingham, 1993). In almost any arena, people can build power by gathering pertinent information. Accurate information facilitates the development of realistic plans and programs. Those who exercise control over information gain power because they can choose with whom they will share their knowledge and also when and how they will use it strategically (Wrong, 1979).

**Discursive Power in the First Dimension**

The possession of many knowledge resources can give a person considerable discursive power. In the first dimension, people exercise power through language or discourse. In the first dimension, language is obviously used as an instrument of power, and the actors are usually aware of it. One frequently used discursive power technique is to produce a text designed to limit the scope of a discussion at a meeting.

**The Second Dimension of Power: The Mobilization of Bias**

Understanding the Second Dimension: Race

In contrast to the first dimension, in which exercises of power are explicit, power exercised in the second dimension is implicit. In this dimension, few or none of the actors may realize that power is being exercised. Exercises of power in this dimension usually limit the meaningful participation of certain groups or restrict the issues that can be raised for debate through devices
The Power of Education Policy Actors

Second Dimension of Power in Education: Parent Involvement

Because most adults were barely literate in the early 1800s, schoolteachers were often the most educated people in the community. Therefore, the founders of public schools did not think that building in mechanisms for broad parent or community participation was necessary. As a result, the organization of public schools also mobilizes bias in favor of professional educators and against other stakeholders. In the typical U.S. public school, bias is mobilized against parent participation in many ways. Educators often expect parents to participate in school activities on the school’s schedule. Parents who do come to school may have to park blocks away. On a first visit, they may find locating the entrance or the principal’s office difficult. When they finally find the office, it may lack a suitable waiting area. In the unlikely event that a teacher permits them to observe a class, adult-sized chairs may not be available. Most teachers and principals are unaware that their school mobilizes bias against parent participation. As Delpit (1988) writes, “Those with [second dimension] power are frequently least aware of – or at least willing to acknowledge- its existence” (p.282).

The Mobilization of Bias: Race, Gender, Class

Mobilization of bias and minority children

Minority children face a double task at school: learning the cognitive material that is explicitly presented to them and deciphering the implicit but unfamiliar “codes” in which it is embedded. This mobilization of bias against their effective participation in the classroom often leads to frustration, alienation, and failure. Delpit (1988) suggests that teachers should explicitly teach the cultural codes of the white middle class to minority children while simultaneously teaching them to understand and treasure their own cultural heritage. In that way children can overcome some of the bias that has been mobilized against them if they wish to do so.

Bias against women in school administration

Because teacher often functioned as “public mothers” (Wodak, 1995), women felt comfortable in classrooms. Today, most women do not sense much mobilization of organizational bias against them as long as they remain there. In fact, male classroom teachers probably encounter it more than females. School administration, however, have traditionally been a male-dominated field, its rules, customs, norms, and discourse have been shaped by several generations of men. Therefore, women who become administrators soon begin to feel the mobilization of bias against them. Harragan (1977): Most women are completely unaware that once they pass through the gates of management, they have entered an alien land with customs, traditions, security forces, and mores of its own. What’s more, the native speak a strange, oblique tongue, and the signposts are in cryptic ciphers. Although the terrain is crisscrossed with well-trodden paths, there are few visible directions to guide the unfamiliar strangers. (p. 33)

Bias in School Choice

Since 1981 one of the most popular education reform proposals has been school choice. Gewirtz, Ball, and Bove (1995) conducted a qualitative study of school choice in London. They found that the process of choosing a school mobilizes considerable bias against working – and lower class parents. At the most superficial level their place of residence, access to transportation, and work schedules severely limit the number of schools they can consider seriously. At the level of discourse, these parents find the promotional materials and test results put out by schools difficult to interpret. As a result, working- and lower-class children attend “better” schools less frequently than do middle-class children. The findings of this study suggest that, as choice policies become widespread in the United States, administrators will have to develop ways to help all parents make informed decisions about schools.

The Third Dimension of Power: The Shaping of Consciousness

Understanding the Shaping of Consciousness

Lukes (1974) asks, “Is not the supreme exercise of power to get another or others to have the desires you want them to have— that is, to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires?” (p.23). Several social institutions are especially important in shaping consciousness. The family is most crucial, in part because people first learn language within it. Language has long been recognized as a major shaper of consciousness, determining the basic categories of meaning that one imposes upon the world (Cherryholmes, 1988) The family also inculcates beliefs and values, and its patterns of interaction shape the child’s personality structure. The mass media are increasingly important today, bombarding everyone with a barrage of messages, both explicit and implicit (Giroux, 1999). Schools and religious organizations also play a major role in shaping the way people see the world (Berstein, 1996; Corson, 1995; Lemke, 1995). School leaders must understand that many of the people they deal with have been either unusually empowered or unusually disempowered through the shaping of their consciousness.

Unusual Empowerment

Among the most important messages communicated by institutions that shape consciousness are messages about who should hold leading positions in society and who should be dominated by others. School leaders will not find many people of this type within their school systems, either as students, employees, or parents. In their roles as public leaders in the broader community, however, they will encounter some. In working with them, keeping their socialization in mind will be helpful.

Unusual Disempowerment

At the other end of the social spectrum are people who have been unusually disempowered through the shaping of consciousness. They have grown up surrounded by messages that communicate their low status and unsuitability for leadership. Many public school leaders work in settings where they deal with people who have been disempowered to an unusual degree. School leaders should consider apathy, fatalism, self-deprecation, and other signs noted by Gaventa as symptoms of a deeper problem. Research suggests that the best way to handle such problems is to initiate projects in which the people can participate and in which they are empowered to make bona fide decisions. Through working in such projects, they gain self-confidence, skills, and knowledge. Progress will probably be slow, but it can be made (Bachrach & Botwinick, 1992; Gaventa, 1980).
Wise school leaders build their power by working to add to what the system provides them. Many administrators work to establish their competent authority, which can be done in several ways. Administrators can use other types of power and obtain other resources, but they are not given; they must be achieved.

**Analyzing Power Relationships**

The PRINCE System

Often one must analyze the power relationships in a decision-making context. Although many leaders do this continuously and almost intuitively, a systematic framework for analysis is helpful, especially in complex situations. One such framework is the PRINCE system of power analysis, which appears in Figure 2.1.

**Issue Statements**

Because power is relational and is never exercised in a social vacuum, the first step in the analysis is defining the issue, which should be as specific as possible. Coplin and O’Leary (1981) recommend beginning the statement of the issue with an active verb. Example: Pass a bond issue to build a middle school next year, or Defeat H.B. 128 to limit choice of textbooks.

**Identifying Actors**

After the issue has been carefully defined, one should list the actors who are interested in the issue or who may become interested. In developing this list of actors, one should include:

- Actors who have legal authority regarding the issue;
- Actors who are powerful enough to block a decision’ actors who will be significantly affected by any policy change; and
- Actors whose cooperation will be essential in implementing any proposed policy change.

Coplin and O’Leary (1981) recommend limiting the number of actors to no more than 10. In developing a list of actors, the goal is not to produce a perfect description; rather, it is to come up with “a configuration of actors that taken together constitute a reasonable picture of the overall power distribution” (Coplin & O’Leary, 1981, p. 161). Much reflection and input from others are necessary to achieve this objective.

**Identifying Positions**

After developing the list of actors, one should estimate the position of each on the issue. Positions range from strongly opposed (-3) to strongly supportive (+3). A neutral or undecided position is scored 0.

**Assessing Power**

The power of each actor regarding this issue is estimated next. Using the discussion of types and sources of power presented earlier, the analyst should determine each actor’s level of power and assign it a number from 1 (low) to 3 (high). The analyst must remember that power is relational and contextual.

**Assessing Priority**

The priority of the issue for each actor must be assessed. Because each actor has limited power resources and priorities for using them, any actor may decide not to deploy resources for a particular issue, even if it holds a strong position.

**Interpreting**

Each actor’s scores are multiplied together, yielding a total score. Then, scores for all supporters, all opponents, and all neutral actors are added. The relative scores of the groups indicate the most likely outcome unless the balance of power changes. The major value of the PRINCE exercise is not that it predicts the future but that it suggests strategies for altering an unfavorable balance of power.

**Ethical Issues Surrounding Power**

**The Dangers of Power**

Writing specifically about power in education, Burbules (1986) asserts: Power is a seductive, even addictive tonic, and anyone who takes it, ostensibly for a limited time and for a limited purpose, invariably finds it easier and easier to justify retaining and exercising it beyond these limits… Educators have been notably susceptible to this temptation. (p. 105) The refusal to exercise power because of its corrupting potential is itself an unethical exercise of power. Peck (1978): “Awareness…comes slowly, piece by piece, and each piece must be worked for by the patient effort of study and observation of everything, including [one’s self]” (p.285). School leaders should consider power a useful but potentially dangerous tool. Leaders should never fall into the habit of exercising power without thinking about what they are doing.

**Power as Means and End**

Wrong (1979):

- **Power as Individual Means**
  An individual may exercise power to pursue an individual goal. Monitor behavior closely to assure that pursuing personal goals is always consistent with district goals.

- **Power as Individual End**
  An individual may exercise power solely because of the sense of importance she experiences as she does so. Such a use of power as an end in itself is always unethical.

- **Power as Means for a Group**
  An individual may exercise power to advance the goals of a group. Assuming that the group’s goals are ethical, this use of power is the least susceptible to abuse.

- **Power as End for a Group**
  A group leader may exercise power to enhance his group’s power solely because the group enjoys being influential. This behavior feeds their sense of self-importance. Exercising power for such a purpose is unethical.

**Using Discursive Power Ethically**

Discourse, especially speech, has always been an important instrument of power for school leaders. With the introduction of site-based management in many districts, it is more important than ever. Robinson (1995) provides valuable guidelines for exercising discursive power ethically, suggesting that people must adhere to three values in responsible discourse:
Chapter Three: The Economy and Demographics

Why Analyze the Policy Environment?

Defining Policy Environment

Every public policy-including every education policy-is a response to a specific social setting that includes a wide range of phenomena studied by the social sciences: economic forces, demographics trends, ideological belief systems, deeply held values, the structure and traditions of the political system, and the culture of the broader society. Although these phenomena change over time, most of them also reveal historical continuity. The complex social dimensions of a specific place at a particular time constitute its policy environment.

Policy and Its Social Context

As public leaders, school administrators need to be keenly attuned to their social context and how it is changing (Bryson & Crosby, 1992). Such knowledge permits them to get ready to respond intelligently to relatively predictable changes in policy. Such knowledge can help school leaders avoid wasting time, energy, and resources as educational Don Quixotes tilting at policy windmills. Some school leaders, unaware of a changed environment, continue to push for policy changes that have become unrealistic. Understanding the relationship between the social environment and education policy helps school leaders conceptualize the broad direction of education policy. School leaders who have developed an intellectual framework to use in thinking about policy issues are equipped to interpret the flow of policy change. Such understanding builds confidence in their own ability to act constructively as public leaders in a changing world.

The Economic Environment

Importance of the Economy

Two of the most important aspects of the policy environment are the structure of the economic system and the current economic climate. In fact, some thinkers believe that ultimately, the economy is the only aspect of the social environment that matters and that all other social phenomena are determined by it. (not position of this book: it does assume that economic environment is important.) In trying to understand why a policy has been proposed or what its real purpose is, one should always consider the economic dimension of the social environment first. Economic systems are not stable; they change over the short term, the intermediate term, and the long term. Although economic changes are somewhat predictable, economics is no an exact science like chemistry. Economics is closely intertwined with politics. Ultimately, most economic decisions have political implications, which is why economics cannot be ignored in the study of any area of public policy, including education policy. Tracking the local economy in informal ways is also wise because national and regional trends do not always predict local economic situations. Alert school leaders know where new subdivisions are being built in their districts and how much the houses cost. In thinking about the economic environment, they consider information that they have gathered both from the media and from observation. (Figure 3.2: Analyzing the economic environment p. 62)

Demographics and the Policy Environment

The Importance of Demographics

Those who which to understand education policy must pay as much attention to demographics as they pay to the economy. Demography is the scientific study of the characteristics of human populations and how they change over time. School leaders must be aware of broad demographic trends not only in the nation, but also in their own geographical area because, as demographer Harold Hodgkinson (2000/2001) puts it: “Nothing is distributed evenly across the United States [emphasis in the original]. Not race, not religion, not age, not fertility, not wealth, and certainly not access to higher education”(p.6) (Figure 3.3 chart on p. 66 on demographic environment).

Long – Term Demographic Trends

An Aging Population with a “Mini Baby Boom”

In the U.S., as in most developed countries, the population is aging: the average age is increasing, and higher and higher percentages of the population are found in older age groups. The U.S. Department of Education predicts that the number of school age children will increase through 2005, dip slightly between 2005 and 2010, and then expand rapidly through 2020. The growth will not, however, be evenly distributed across the country. Metropolitan areas will grow more rapidly than rural and small-town ones, and some states will see huge growth while others will actually see their school-age population decline. According to figure 3.4 page 67 New Jersey is one of the states that will see most of this growth.

Immigration and Migration

We live in a period of enormous population movement. The immigrants of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries do not usually come from Europe, but from Latin America and Asia; the three countries, which have contributed the most to this growth, are Mexico, the Philippines, and Vietnam. A great deal of internal migration has occurred as well. Table 3.4 on p. 69 The Ethnic Composition of the School-Age Population in 2000 and 2020.

Suburbanization

Another internal population shift that has been occurring for decades is suburbanization. The rural population has been in decline for a long time; but, as the twenty-first century begins, the urban population is also dwindling. Older suburban areas have taken on many of the characteristics of the inner city. Not surprisingly, then, for twenty-five years child poverty has
increased most rapidly in suburban areas, growing by 76%. By the mis-1990s, 14% of suburban children were living below the poverty line (Cohen, 1994; DeWitt, 1994; Hodginkson, 2000/2001; Olson, 20000; Roberts, 1993).

Increasing Diversity
Because of both immigration and differential birth rates, the U.S. population is becoming more diverse ethnically, linguistically, and religiously. The fastest-growing ethnic groups are Hispanics and Asians/Pacific Islanders. The 2000 Census found that 35.2% of U.S. schoolchildren belong to a minority group: for the first time, Hispanics outnumbered the African American ones. The challenges of ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity are spreading as the new immigrants and their children migrate out of the states which originally welcomed them (Archer, 1996; Henry, 1990; Newton, 1992; Roberts, 1993; Rosenblatt, 1996).

Changing Family Life
Changes in the U.S. family provided much fuel for political fires in the 1980s and 1990s. Between 1980 and 1990, births to unwed mothers increased by 76%; most of this increase was caused by an increase in births to unmarried white women, and many of these mothers were in their 20s and 30s rather than in their teens. In 1994, 24% of children in the U.S. lived in fatherless homes, four times as many as in 1950. Because such children are more likely to be poor to drop out of school, to be placed in foster care, to commit crimes or felonies, and to become teenaged parents than children with a father in the home, this trend has raised widespread concern. A related fact recently documented by the Urban Institute is that approximately 4,000,000 children between the ages of 6 and 12 are unsupervised by adults for part of the day (Jacobson, 2000; Outtz, 1994; Trotter, 2001; Vobejda, 1995). Figure 3.5 Labor force participation of U.S. women, 1979 – 99, page 71.

Conclusions
The U.S. population and its lifestyle are changing rapidly. As a result, today's children are growing up in a world that differs substantially from the world in which school administrators-even relatively young ones-grew up. The experience of the children of 1990 was somewhat different from the experience of their younger siblings in 2000. Wise school leaders read newspaper and magazine articles about changing demographics with keen interest asking themselves: What does this mean for children? For schools and teachers? For districts and administrators? What policy changes are needed in order to better deal with this trend?

Implications for Education Policy
Implications for the Business Cycle
Because tax revenues expand and contract with the business cycle, that cycle has important implications for the level of funding that is likely to be available for public education. Reform periods were sparked by a catalyst such as the launching of Sputnik or the release of a commission report and "an upbeat economy undergird[ed] enactment or initiation. "It may well be that economic buoyancy is a precondition of widespread change" (Guthrie and Koppich 1987 p. 38). This finding has both reactive and proactive implications for school leaders. The reactive implication is that, although "economic buoyancy" does not always stimulate reforms in education, reform periods almost always occur against the backdrop of a strong economy. Thus, whenever the national, state, or local economy enters a strong expansion, school leaders should anticipate that proposals for major changes in education policy may be made. Leaders who wish to work for changes in education policy should lay the groundwork for such changes during relatively slow economic times and try to catch the groundswell of the next expansion as they start to push publicly for reform. With more public resources available and an upbeat mood in the air, they will find persuading others to support their proposed policy change easier. Even more important, if their timing is right, they will not only have a better chance of getting the policy change adopted, but may also have sufficient funding for the early years of implementation.

Implications of Long-Range Trends
The Economic/Demographic Scenario
The demographic trends suggest that the task of public schools is going to become increasingly difficult. First of all, about one out of every five school-children is growing up in poverty with all its associated problems: poor nutrition, inadequate health care, transience, and stress. Moreover, many children-and not just poor ones-have special social and educational needs. These needs might include bilingual or English-as-a-second-language programs; activities to introduce their parents to the expectations of U.S. schools; academic curricula that include more coverage of Asia, Africa, and Latin America; before- and after-school programs; tutors to help with homework; remediation; and mentoring. Finally, discipline problems and violence in school have increased and are likely to continue to do so. Finally, although few people admit it openly, the changing social, racial, ethnic, religious, socioeconomic, and linguistic composition of the school-age population probably makes identifying with today's children and feeling any responsibility for their education or general welfare hard for some Americans.

“Do More with Less”
Those who hold this position believe that public schools already receive more money than they need; the real problem is that educators waste it. "There is no consistent relationship between the resources applied to schools and student performance" (Hanushek, 1994, p. 464). He argues that the incentive structure in education needs to be changed, not the amount of money available. Many of the reforms of the 1980s and 1990s can be understood as attempts to alter the incentive structure in order to encourage more effective educational practices. More recently, the desire to change the incentive structure in education has led to numerous school-choice proposals. Many proponents of school choice believe that if schools have to compete for students (and money), their staffs will be motivated to improve their programs. Moreover, competition will force educators to use their resources more efficiently than they do now (Chubb & Moe, 1990). Ultimately, schools will both be better and cost less.

“Do a Lot More with a Little More”
Others are willing to provide more money for schools, but only if it is used in certain ways. Clune (1994a) argues both for a funding level that would promote "high minimum outcomes" for all children and for curricular and structural changes to support such outcomes. Additional funding would be "targeted": low-performing districts—whether poor or not—would be eligible for extra financial support, but only if they used it to implement specific improvement plans (Clune 1994a, 1994b). Indeed, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 provides an excellent example of this approach. Proposed and actual education policies that reflect ideas similar to Clune’s include: standards-based reform; authentic assessment’ school-linked services’ curricula that emphasize higher order thinking skills; and professional development to support new curricula and pedagogies. Many people who hold this position are also interested in improved education for at-risk children. Three nationally known and well-researched programs for elementary schools that serve such children are Slavin’s Success for All Schools, Comer’s...
Chapter Four: The Political System and Political Culture

The Importance of the Less Obvious

Other aspects of the education policy environment are considerably less obvious to casual observers and may even seem insignificant at first glance: the political system and political culture. Political system: School leaders must understand this system’s strengths and limitations in order to work intelligently with it. Political culture: Daniel Elazar (1994) defines political culture as “the particular pattern of orientation to political action in which a political system is embedded” (p. 109) He has identified three basic political cultures in the U.S.: individualistic, moralistic, and traditionalistic.

The U.S. Political System

Federalism

Because education is a major function of state government, the New Federalism had a great impact on education policy. At the most tangible level, it meant decreased federal funding. Under Reagan, the federal government streamlined the administration of education funds by consolidating 37 programs into a single block grant entitled Elementary and Secondary Education. Under this new approach, federal guidelines for spending education funds were relaxed, empowering state governments to make decisions about the direction of education policy in several new areas (Kaplan & O’Brien 1991). The overall effect of the New Federalism was to reduce the relative importance of the federal government in education policy making while increasing the relative importance of the states. Another factor that led to increased state power over education policy was Baker v. Carr, a 1962 U.S. Supreme Court decision, which affirmed the one person-one vote principle, it required the reapportionment of state legislative districts, king state legislatures more representative of the general population. As these bodies became more representative, they also began to attract young, well-educated people. This new breed of state officials worked hard during the 1970s and 1980s to professionalize state government. As a result of these changes in state government, state leaders were able to spearhead the national education reform movement, which began in 1983. Although the federal government played an important role—notably by sponsoring the 1983 commission report A Nation at Risk—governors such as Lamar Alexander and Bill Clinton worked through the National Governors’ Association to push steadily for the reform of public education. In many states their efforts led to the adoption of such policies as increased graduation requirements, proficiency tests, career ladders, and school choice. Such an intense and coordinated level of activity in education policy on the part of state governments was unprecedented in U.S. history (Bowman & Kearney, 1986; Mazzoni, 1995; Nathan, 1993). Historically, states have delegated much of their authority over education policy to local school districts. However, since about 1980 this traditional allocation of power has progressively shifted. The major reason is that local government is often in crisis. As a result, state governments are playing a more active role than ever in spelling out how districts should educate children and in monitoring their activities (Bowman & Kearney, 1986; Mazzoni 1995).

Separation of Powers

Another important characteristic of U.S. government is that it is based on the separation of powers rather than on a structure of fused powers. How does one build coalitions across the system in order to bring about needed change? Cohen and Spillane (1993) observe that the greatest challenge in developing education policy in the U.S. is “bridging vast political chasms artfully designed to frustrate central power” (p.43).

Fragmentation of Governance

Fragmentation of Local Government

Public leadership in the U.S. is further complicated by fragmentation, both the fragmentation of local government and the proliferation of governance structures. Figure 4.1: Five types of local government p. 85. Most U.S. school districts are special districts, which are governed by an elected school board. Although some states do not use all five types of local government, many do. As a result, school leaders must deal not only with the different branches of government at the state and federal levels, but also with numerous local governments whose geographic borders may overlap those of the school district and whose officials may perceive the school district as a competitor rather than an ally (Bowman & Kearney, 1986; Fuhrman, 1993; Hanson, 1996) The relationship between a school system and local government can take one of two general forms: independence or dependence. Ninety-two percent of U.S. school districts are independent. This means they are completely autonomous in relationship to other local governments; in particular, it means they are financially autonomous, or fiscally independent. The school board of an independent district also develops its own budget and is not required to submit it to any other unit of local government for approval. One of the drawbacks of independent districts is that an independent school district lacks a natural ally at the local level. Leaders in independent districts must work especially hard to build positive relationships with other units of local government; not infrequently they find themselves alone when the time comes to increase school taxes (Bowman and Kearney, 1986). Only 8% of school districts are dependent; however, this pattern is more important than the percentages suggest because many of the largest districts in the nation are dependent. In five states (Alaska, Hawaii, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia), all school districts are dependent. Fiscal dependence is especially common in the South. A fiscally dependent school district is actually an education agency operated by a unit of local government, usually a city or county. Its school board does not have the power either to raise taxes or to approve its own budget; instead, it depends on the controlling government unit to do so. Although this approach has obvious drawbacks, it also has one great advantage: the school system has a natural ally among local government.

Fragmentation Through Separate Structures

A second aspect of the fragmentation of U.S. school governance is the splitting of responsibility among various official or semiofficial boards and agencies. In an attempt to depoliticize, school governance, Progressive reformers established separate boards, especially at the state level. However, scholars have also identified a more general tendency in the U.S. to establish separate governance structures, both in education and in other policy domains. What happens is that leaders, working within an already fragmented system, become frustrated with its unresponsiveness, so they establish new structures. The result is a proliferation of boards, agencies, and commissions. In education these structures often cluster around specific policy areas or professional interests. The most important of these areas is evaluation. A large percentage of the tests used to make major decisions about students and teachers are developed by private organizations such as the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Another area of evaluation that has been largely given over to private groups is school and district accreditation (Cohen & Spillane, 1993; Fuhrman, 1993; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1995).
Focus on Elections
Another unusual characteristic of our political system is its focus on elections rather than on governing, a phenomenon that has been nicknamed “the permanent campaign” (Fuhrman, 1993, p. 9).

Judicial Review
A final characteristic of the U.S. political system is that courts have the power of judicial review, meaning that they can declare legislation unconstitutional. Although most democratic countries have procedures for evaluating the constitutionality of legislation, because of the power of judicial review, courts in the U.S. are unusually influential in the policy-making process. “State supreme courts are policy makers of considerable and wide-ranging importance,” insists political scientist Lawrence Baum (1993, p. 1149), identifying education policy, as a domain in which state courts are particularly active.

Frequently, legislators are more than willing to let judges make unpopular decisions, for in their ever-recurring electoral campaigns they can blame the black-robed justices. Because judges are subject to less electoral pressure than legislators, they are often willing to take some political heat for them (Baum, 1993).

Implications of the Political System for School Leaders

Competition Among Governance Bodies
Nature of the competition
Dutch sociologist Geert Hofstede (1987) conducted a cross-cultural study of organizational behavior in IBM offices in 67 countries, finding that Americans prefer an organizational structure that he described metaphorically as a “village market.” The structure of the U.S. political system establishes a sort of “village market” among the various components of government, leading to competition among the three levels, the three branches and the many local governments, and various quasi-independent governance bodies. These political entities primarily compete for two things: resources and power. Sometimes policy decisions that make little sense from a purely rational perspective make a great deal of sense when interpreted as the outcome of a competition among a set of specific government actors striving for resources and power.

Identifying and Monitoring Competitors
Clear-headed thinking by school leaders thus depends on accurately identifying actual and potential competitors. Figure 4.2 Government entities that often compete with public schools. Page 88. Simply identifying one’s competitors is not enough, however, monitoring them is also important. One way to do this is to regularly read local newspapers. Another way to monitor competitors is to establish a good network of local contacts and maintain positive relations with them. School leaders’ general goal should be a sensitive awareness of all the local demands on public resources most likely to be made in the near future. Such awareness can facilitate their intelligent planning in a number of areas and help them avoid mistakes.

Multiple Veto Points
The complex, multi-tiered structure of the U.S. political system creates numerous sites in which a policy proposal can be sidetracked or defeated. As a result, school leaders who wish to influence education policy must be persistent and must also build a broad strategic base of support for their ideas. They should not expect that they as individuals or the professional groups in which they are active will be able to influence policy in a short time. They should anticipate a process that will take several years (OSU, 1991) Usually, policy makers must be educated, support among key policy actors must be built, and negotiations with other stakeholders must take place.

Timing Policy Concerns with Elections
Given the tendency of the U.S. political system to focus on elections, school leaders must be closely attuned to the electoral cycle. First, they need to know precisely when all the elections that could affect them will occur at the federal, state, and local levels. Second, school leaders need to know the electoral status of every public official with whom they interact.

Selecting the Time and the People
Both research and years of practical experience suggest that timing is often the key to successfully influencing policy. The electoral cycle is an important aspect of this timing (Kingdon, 1995) School leaders who wish to bring about a policy change that is likely to provoke opposition from a segment of the electorate should reflect carefully before asking elected officials for support. Democratic politicians and legislatures controlled by the Democratic Party are ore likely to support increased spending on public education than are Republicans. Thus, school leaders should consider the presence of Democrats in office an opportunity to work for policy changes with significant price tags attached. On the other hand, Republicans are usually more sympathetic to management, including school management, than are Democrats. School leaders should therefore consider the presence of Republicans in office an opportunity to work for policy changes that enhance their own power, such as changes in the tenure and collective bargaining laws.

Windows of Opportunity
John Kingdon (1995) has found that success in influencing policy often depends on recognizing the opening of a “window of opportunity,” or a period during which both politicians and the public will be especially receptive to a specific policy idea. One predictable policy window is related to the electoral cycle; whenever a change in administration occurs, an opportunity to seek innovative policy changes occurs. Politically alert school leaders are aware of impending changes in administration, especially at the state level. Well before such an election, school leaders working through their professional organizations and other networks-should begin to discuss needed education policy changes that might appeal to a new administration.

Network and Coalition Building
Because of the fragmentation of U.S. educational governance, effectiveness in the policy realm requires building both networks and coalitions. As Kaplan and Usdan (1992) observe: To function largely in isolation—which has been the norm in some sectors of education, is to volunteer for obscurity—even extinction…Finding and making common cause with people and groups of similar purpose and vision and so rising above the professional roles and governmental jurisdictions is a necessity. (p. 672) In thinking about building networks and coalitions, education leaders will find Bryson and Crosby’s (1992) concepts of forums and arenas helpful. A forum is a venue in which ideas are presented, discussed, and debated. People who do not participate in forums where policy issues important to them are discussed are excluded from an important phase of the policy process-some would say the most important phase. Arenas are venues in which decisions about policies are made. Arenas are far more restricted domains of activity than are forums. Forums and arenas are connected with each other because the people who make decisions in arenas also participate in numerous forums.
Building Relationships With Education Professionals

The fragmentation of education in the U.S. into 15,000 school districts in 50 states means that education leaders must deliberately develop ways to establish and maintain relationships with other professionals in their field. In Bryson and Crosby’s (1992) terms they must find (and sometimes create) forums in which the educational ideas and problems that concern them can be discussed. Often, however, forums in which educators can discuss ideas do not exist at the local or regional level. Therefore, I order to address local or regional policy issues effectively, education leaders may need to create a forum first, which can take many forms.

Building Relationships with Other Government Agencies

Unfortunately, the relationship between local government agencies tends to be a competitive one, more often marked by the determination to “protect turf” than by a desire to cooperate in serving the public (Garvin & Young, 1994). As a result, agency programs often overlap and duplicate each other, wasting precious resources. For more than a decade, both federal and state governments have encouraged local agencies, including school districts, to work together more collaboratively. Pressure to collaborate will most likely continue; additionally, if resources remain meager, officials in public service agencies will increasingly understand the rationale for cooperating rather than competing. However, launching and sustaining collaborative efforts are notoriously difficult, in part because of the absence of appropriate forums and arenas at the local level.

Political Culture

Defining Political Culture

A political culture, then, is a collective way of thinking about politics that includes beliefs about the political process, its proper goals, and appropriate behavior for politicians. A political system consists of a set of formal structures and constitutional laws. Political scientists identify three basic political cultures in the United States: the traditionalistic, the moralistic, and the individualistic.

Traditionalistic Political Culture

One major characteristic of this culture is ambivalence toward the market and unrestrained commercial enterprise. A second major characteristic is the belief that an established elite should provide political leadership. Membership is achieved through family and social ties. Government is seen as a positive force in society—as long as it restricts its activity to maintaining the status quo. Traditionalistic areas have a one party system, and major issues are fought out between factions of the dominant party. On the other hand, kinship, social connections, and personal relationships are extremely important. Politicians are expected to have and steadily maintain a wide-ranging network of personal relationships. Domination by corrupt elites is sometimes a problem. Its skepticism about unrestrained commercial activity sometimes causes its representatives to raise important questions, and its concern for continuity provides needed balance in a rapidly changing society. Elite political systems occasionally produce courageous, even brilliant, leaders. Are able to take unpopular stand, secure in the knowledge that they would be reelected. Its resistance to change has been a major factor in perpetuating racism, and its elitism discourages widespread political participation, including high vote turnout (Elazar, 1994).

Moralistic Political Culture

Members of this culture believe politics is (or should be) “a public activity centered on some notion of the public good and properly devoted to the advancement of the public interest” (Elazar, 1994, p. 232). Because they see government positively, as an important way to improve life for everyone, people in a moralistic political culture favor an activist government that initiates new programs when necessary. Participation in politics should be as widespread as possible. Ideas and issues are important and its members often debate them with great intensity. View government bureaucracies and civil service systems positively because they believe that they encourage the fair and impartial implementation of government policies. Clean government is of great importance in this culture, and political corruption is seen as a shocking betrayal of public trust. Representatives of the other two cultures often perceive them as too idealistic and out of touch with the realities of practical politics (Elazar, 1994).

Individualistic Political Culture

Politics is understood as a type of marketplace in which the government should serve utilitarian—primarily economic—purposes. Members of this culture believe government should keep to a strict minimum its intervention in “private” spheres such as business, the family, and churches; however, they do want it to provide the framework needed to keep the economy working efficiently. Politics is seen as a business like any other; individuals enter it in order to advance themselves socially and financially. The political process is based on an exchange of favors that exists within a system of mutual obligation. Loyalty and strict respect for the system of mutual obligation are what really count. Politics in this culture operates in a smooth, efficient, and businesslike manner; at its worst, it becomes corrupt. More susceptible to corruption than are the other two cultures. The individualistic political culture is vulnerable to the criticism that its practitioners have no principles and believe that everything is for sale to the highest bidder (Elazar, 1994).

Political Culture and Education Policy

Marshall et al. (1989) made two major findings with regard to political culture and education policy. First, they discovered that powerful national policy movements can overwhelm the importance of political culture in state level policy making. Example: bilingual education and special education. The second major finding, however, was that in the absence of a national movement, policy differences related to political culture do emerge. Political culture seems to be an important variable in education policy making at the state level, but it is limited and constrained by the national education policy agenda.

Implications for School Administrators

Suggestions for Identifying Political Cultures

Because school leadership involves considerable interaction with local and state politicians, education leaders will find reflecting upon the political culture in which they work and also upon their own cultural assumptions helpful. Figure 4.4 page 99 provides a framework for such reflection. In using this framework, however, leaders should be careful not to approach these issues in a simplistic manner. Recognizing that the traditionalistic, moralistic, and individualistic political cultures are examples of what social scientists call ideal types is important. An ideal type is an abstract description of a social phenomenon that depicts that phenomenon in a simple, purified form. Some evidence suggests that well-educated people, no matter where they live or originally came from, tend to accept the values of the moralistic political culture (Elazar, 1994).
Leading in a Traditionalistic Setting
First, in a traditionalistic setting, identifying the members of the local elite is essential. To a great extent, success in the traditionalistic setting depends upon gaining and keeping the support of this group. In addition, school leaders must recognize that personal contacts and social ties provide the basis for political effectiveness in this environment and must invest their energies accordingly, paying special attention the ruling elite and its close allies. Leaders should never spring unexpected policy surprises on the elite; rather, they should use their social network to prepare for change, laying a foundation through many conversations, offhand comments, articles in newsletters, and other channels. Finally, school leaders should make a point of finding out what the local education traditions are; and, when arguing for needed changes, they should draw on these traditions to justify them.

Leading in a Moralistic Setting
In a moralistic environment, school leaders usually have the advantage that citizens consider education an important commitment. Order School administrators should bear in mind that people in this culture tend to have a pragmatic, economic orientation. One of the leader’s highest priorities should therefore be running a smooth, efficient, and businesslike operation that offers area taxpayers a good value for their tax dollars. School leaders would do well to develop strong relationships with local business leaders and with local business organizations. In developing long-range plans for education, leaders should be sure to consider the needs of the local economy and the job market. Education leaders in this environment should keep a low profile when they engage in political activity or meet with well-known political figures. Educators should bear in mind that the individualistic political system operates on the basis of mutual obligation and the exchange of favors.

Chapter 5: Values and Ideology
The Importance of Ideas
In the early twenty-first century, politics in the U.S. can no longer accurately be described as nonideological, nor is it any longer realistic to ignore values when studying policy (Boyd, 1984; Lowi, 1995). As a result, today’s school leaders need a general understanding of the political ideas that swirl around them in order to think intelligently about education policy. “Ideas operate as the proximate driving force in American politics, in particular in domestic affairs and consequently in the politics of education at every level of American government,” insists Iannacocone (1988). Ideas, beliefs, and values are important for at least two reasons: they shape the way people define policy problems. Americans’ individualistic orientation encourages them to understand problems in terms of personal rather than social responsibility. In the area of childcare, Americans are most likely to define the problem as “too many working mothers” rather than as “inadequate social support for young families.” Second, ideas, beliefs, and values constrain people’s ability to perceive possible solutions to policy problems. Marshall et al. (1989) found that policy makers will not consider ideas “that diverge from the prevailing dominant values” (p. 42) because advocating such ideas makes them sound “irrelevant.” Due to the importance of ideas in the development and implementation of education policy, no policy or policy proposal can be fully understood without considering the values and ideological system that undergird it. In thinking about education policy, therefore, school leaders must ask questions such as: What values led people to propose this policy? Are any value conflicts inherent in it? What assumptions about society, government, and economics lie behind it? With what broader ideological position is this policy consistent?

Basic Values in U.S. Politics
Self-Interest and Other Values
According to utilitarian philosophy, all human behavior is determined by self-interest; therefore, the only values operative in the policy environment are those that directly advance the interests of particular individuals or groups (Fowler, 1995b). Many political scientists have challenged the utilitarian position, producing research evidence in support of their contention that other values also shape political behavior (e.g., Jackson & Kingdon, 1992; Kelman, 1988; McDonnell, 1991). Weber used a railroad metaphor to compare the relationship between self-interest and other values, describing self-interest as the fuel that made the engine’s operation possible and the other values as the switchmen who decided on which tracks the train would actually run (Schroeder, 1992).

Self-Interest Values
Economic
Many people are motivated almost entirely by their own economic interests or by the economic interests of a group with which they identify. Moreover, very few people act without considering how their behavior will affect their economic situation. Figure 5.1 p. 109 summarizes some of the more common economic benefits related to education policy; the most common economic penalties are the reverse of these benefits.

Power
Individuals and groups also often act to increase their power. Therefore, additional questions that should always be asked early in the analysis of an education policy proposal are: Who will gain power as a result of this policy? Who will lose power? Figure 5.2 p. 110 summarizes some major policy devices for increasing power.

General Social Values
General social values pervade a society and are held by virtually all people, regardless of their ideological, philosophical, or religious commitments.
Order
Coplin and O’Leary (1981) consider order an overarching value of such central importance that it is a high priority in every society-developed and developing, democratic and nondemocratic, Eastern and Western. The reason is clear: Human beings want and need to live in an environment win which they are relatively safe from physical harm and in which their property is
relatively secure. Order is also a major education policy concern. Explicitly or implicitly, the high value that most Americans including practicing educators place on orderly schools is always an important influence on education policy.

Individualism

“Individualism lies at the very core of American culture,” wrote Bellah et al. (1996) in their modern classic, Habits of the Heart. Hofstede (1987) found that Americans were the most individualistic. Valuing individualism means both tending to consider the single person and her needs before those of the group and emphasizing self-reliance. Bellah and his co-authors describe two forms of U.S. individualism: Utilitarian individualism refers to the belief that people can— and should—take the initiative to advance their own economic success even at the expense of other worthwhile pursuits such as family life, friendship, and community involvement. Expressive individualism is in many ways a reaction against this emphasis on one’s economic interests; expressive individualists stress the “deeper cultivation of the self” (p. 33) and the freedom to express that self and its feelings with minimal restraint from social conventions. U.S. education policy reflects the underlying individualism of the culture and tends to swing between the utilitarian and expressive forms of the value. Although strong rational arguments can be advanced for a more group-oriented— or “systemic”—approach to education policy, the deeply ingrained individualism of U.S. culture makes the adoption and implementation of such polices difficult.

Democratic Values

Many of the value conflicts in democratic countries and in their education policies center around these values, liberty, fraternity, equality—around what they mean and how they can best be achieved, protected, or expanded.

Liberty

Liberty is a major education policy value. As U.S. citizens, they have the constitutional right to speak out, to form organizations, and to assemble peacefully. Students’ and teachers’ civil liberties are not unlimited, however; they can be asserted at school only insofar as their exercise does not disrupt the learning process or infringe upon the freedom of other people. Figure 5.3 page 113 provides some questions to use in evaluating education policy that relates to freedom.

Equality

The second central democratic value is equality. Political equality is equal right to participate in the political system, whereas economic equality means equal wealth. Americans have great access to participation in the political system. The U.S. compares less favorably on measures of economic equality, however; of all developed countries, it has the largest gap between rich and poor. Equality can also be analyzed in terms of equality of opportunity and equality of results. Equal opportunity exists when everyone has a similar chance to get a good education or find a decent job, regardless of race, sex, handicapping condition, age, or national origin. Where equal opportunity really exists, unequal results are caused largely by factors under the control of the individual such as effort and extra study. Equality of results exists when the range from high to low is relatively narrow. Although many democratic countries use such policies to increase equality of results, the U.S. generally does not. According to Verba and Orren (1985), the major reason is that most Americans dislike the concept of equality of results because it is inconsistent with the ideal of individual achievement. “Equality of educational opportunity has appeared as a normative goal of education policy in the United States since the beginning of the republic,” writes Verstegen (1994, p. 366). Figure 5.4 page 115 provides some questions to use in identifying the implications of an education policy for equality.

Fraternity

The ability to perceive other members of one’s society as brothers and sisters, to have a sense of responsibility for the, an to feel that in difficult times one can turn to them for help. Fraternity has traditionally been a central goal of U.S. education policy, however; the nineteenth-century Common School Movement advocated that everyone attend public elementary schools I order to promote a sense of common identity among Americans (Spring, 1994). Especially at a time when fraternity is being weakened by several broad social trends, evaluating education policies to determine to what extent they foster brotherhood— and to what extent they weaken it—is important. Figure 5.5 page 116 provides some questions to use in evaluating the aspects of an education policy that relate to fraternity.

Economic Values

Like most developed countries, the U.S. has a democratic political system and a capitalistic economic system; a different set of values undergirds each. In some ways these values reinforce each other.

Efficiency

Efficiency means obtaining the best possible return on an expenditure or investment. Closely related terms are cost-effectiveness and output maximization (Boyd, 1984; Fowler, 1995b). An education system is efficient when it achieves high levels of student learning with relatively low expenditures. Education policy experts agree that efficiency is one of the most important of the values driving U.S. education policy (Boyd, 1984; Guthrie, Garms, & Pierce, 1988; Iannaccone, 1988; Kahne, 1996; Swanson, 1989). Figure 5.6 provides some questions to use in evaluating the aspects of an education policy that relates to efficiency. P. 117.

Economic Growth

An underlying assumption of every capitalistic economy is that the economy should expand; therefore, economic growth in and of itself is a major policy value. This growth can be achieved in three interrelated ways: by increasing production, stimulating domestic consumption, and expanding foreign trade. Education contributes to economic growth in various ways. First and most important is the fact that a modern economy requires a highly skilled workforce. A major task of the school system then is to guarantee the perpetuation of an educated workforce; otherwise, production will eventually drop and economic growth will slow. Schools are expensive enterprises that purchase large numbers of products: building materials, books, computers, buses, and so on. Recently the privatization of many school services as well as the privatization of school management in some places has also contributed to making education an area of economic growth. Economic growth is therefore an important value behind many education policies, whether this fact is made explicit or remains implicit. Fowler (1995b) found that economic growth was the value major thinkers associated with the Clinton Administration wrote about most. And in 2002, President Bush argued that a better educational system would stimulate economic growth and pull the country out of recession. Figure 5.7 provides some questions to use in evaluating the aspects of an education policy that relate to economic growth. Page 118.

Quality

Quality is a policy value that is frequently invoked in public rhetoric such as speeches and commission reports; often the closely related terms excellence and high standards are used instead. In contemporary political discourse, then, a concern about
the quality of education usually take the form of seeking higher, more intellectually demanding standards in schools. Policy proposals such as including essay questions on state proficiency tests, introducing portfolio assessment, developing curricula that stress critical thinking, and requiring more study of advanced mathematics reflect a concern for educational quality. Figure 5.8 page 120 questions for evaluating education policy related to quality.

Value Interacting with Each Other

Cyclical Shifts in Dominant Values

Americans differ not in whether they believe in these values, but in how they prioritize them. Because all the values cannot be simultaneously pursued with equal vigor, the set of dominant values behind education policy changes cyclically over time (Boyd, 1984; Boyd & Kerchner, 1987; Iannaccone, 1988). U.S. education policy tends to alternate between a focus on achieving more equality and an equally strong focus on advancing the economic values.

Important Value Conflicts

The Search for Balance

“The political problem of mankind is to combine three things: Economic Efficiency, social Justice, and Individual Liberty,” wrote British economist John Maynard Keynes in 1925 (as cited in Kuttner, 1984, p.1) A central goal of enlightened education policy making is therefore to establish a balance among the most important values so none is seriously compromised.

Conflicts Involving Freedom

If laws and social custom did not set limits on human behavior and enforce those limits when necessary, social order would completely break down. Freedom by its very nature requires choices, options, and the means to permit people to follow several paths; yet variety is more costly than a single, one-size-fits-all program. The fact that everyone is free to do his own thing does not mean that all those things will conform to high standards. (Quality) The goal in sound public policy, then, is not to pursue either freedom or equality to an extreme, but to seek a judicious balance between the two.

Conflicts Involving Efficiency

The dominant school of economics argues that limiting social equality is necessary in order to promote the efficiency of the economic system. (Milton Friedman, 1962, Okun, 1975) If the market is permitted to operate with minimal government regulation, people will receive economic rewards in proportion to how hard and how well they work. As a result, they will have an incentive to do their best-to exert a serious effort, to produce the best quality of which they are capable, and to work efficiently as they know how. One side effect of this operation of the market is that some people will achieve more than others, and inequality will inevitably result. In education policy, Friedman (1962) and others support introducing more market mechanisms into public education in order to increase its efficiency. The pursuit of efficiency can also undercut quality. No matter how one defines a high-quality education relentless pressures for efficiency will most likely undercut it because education is expensive. An overemphasis on efficiency can also weaken fraternity. Building relationships, developing a strong organization, and establishing a collegial atmosphere in a school all require time, and, as the saying goes, time is money. Yet, good communication and teamwork in schools and districts do not develop in a vacuum—they flourish in an environment where fraternity is valued enough to provide time for it.

Ideology

Alan Isaak (1987) defines ideology as “a fairly coherent set of values and beliefs about the way the social, economic, and political systems should be organized and operated and recommendations about how these values and beliefs should be put into effect” (p. 133). Because U. S. education policy is more ideologically driven than it used to be, school leaders need to have a general understanding of the ideological positions that they are likely to encounter.

Major U.S. Ideologies

The Divided House of Conservatism

Although several types of conservatism exist, two were dominant in the U.S. as the twenty-first century began: Business conservatism and religious conservatism.

Business Conservatism

Business conservatives believe human beings are motivated purely by self-interest, especially their own economic interests, and that the achievement of material well-being is the central goal of society. In their discourse and policy proposals, business conservatives emphasize two values: efficiency and freedom. They believe the free operation of the market produces a high level of economic efficiency. They have been leaders in the push for higher standards more accountability in schools, merit pay and proficiency testing—all policies designed to improve the economy. They also advocate policies that would turn education into a competitive market, such as vouchers, charter schools, monetary awards and publicity for high-achieving schools, and deregulation.

Religious Conservatism

The Religious Right has advanced its education policy agenda with some success. Like its conservative business allies, it supports school choice and wishes to abolish the USDOE. Moreover, adherents are against all school policies or programs that seem to reflect the relativistic values of “secular humanism” or undercut parental power, including some psychological testing and multicultural education (Boyd et al., 1996; Burton, 1994; Christian Coalition, 1995; Zitterkopf, 1994).

Liberalism

Another Divided House

Liberalism is the dominant ideology of the modern Democratic Party. Because two major variants of liberalism-New Politics Liberalism and Neoliberalism—are dominant, many conflicts within that party play out between these two ideologies.

New Politics Liberalism

New politics liberals tend to believe that many, perhaps most, of the problems in U.S. society result from a history of discrimination and oppression based on factors beyond individual control. These problems can be overcome by making it easier for members of oppressed groups to receive a good education, obtain good jobs, and in general enjoy the good things the U.S. has to offer. In education policy, new politics liberals advocate equal access to quality education for all children, regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, or handicap. They also support affirmative action in hiring, multicultural education, and programs that promote sensitivity to diversity issues (Davis, 1974; Lind, 1996; Shafer, 1983).
Neoliberalism

They believe that race-and gender identity politics has alienated working-class citizens and largely ignored growing economic inequality in the U.S. Fowler (1995b) found that they most emphasized the values of economic growth and fraternity. They understood progress toward realizing these values as the key to achieving greater equality, or equity, in U.S. society. Neoliberals advocate programs of national and community service for young people as one way to strengthen their sense of brotherhood. They are also interested in improved vocational and technical education as a way to stimulate economic growth. Their support for national curriculum standards and assessments reflects both their desire to improve education in order to spur the economy and their commitment to policies that build a sense of national unity (Fowler, 1995b; Lind, 1996; Peters, 1983).

Other Ideologies

Extremist Ideologies in the U.S.

Usually, extremist ideologies are not directly involved in mainstream policymaking; however, they often exercise considerable influence in the background. Moreover, in such areas a few policy makers are likely to have covert connections with extremist organizations. Therefore, education leaders need to be aware of extremist activity in their state and of its possible influence on education policy.

Left-Wing Extremism

The extreme Left tends to be suspicious of public education, seeing it as a major instrument of government and corporate propaganda. Insofar as it has an agenda for public schools, it supports “free” schools that impose minimal restraints on children and teachers (Rothman & Lichter, 1982; Sargent, 1995).

Right-Wing Extremism

Because public schools are agencies run by the hated government and have been a major force for racial integration, right-wing extremists are usually hostile toward them (Abanes, 1996; Sargent, 1995).

Ideologies in Other Countries

Social Democracy

Social democrats are supportive of public education, advocating policies such as extending compulsory education, abolishing tracking and ability grouping, and providing students with free books and materials. Equality and fraternity-understood as national solidarity—are the key values for social democrats, but they also advocate economic growth.

Christian Democracy

Their major values are fraternity and equality, understood as social justice. Although Christian democrats generally support public schools, they also advocate the right of religious organizations to operate private schools and to offer religious instruction in public ones.

School Leaders Caught in Ideological Crossfire

Schools ad Contested Terrain

English (1994): The “agenda of the Right” is a business conservative agenda, calling for the transformation of public education into a competitive market in which school leaders would become marketing experts. Because business conservatives want to deregulate public education through policies such as privatization and charter schools, they have little sympathy for school administrators, whom they perceive as inefficient bureaucrats who are central part of the problem. The “agenda of the Left” a new politics liberal agenda calling for egalitarian, participatively governed schools in which principals would play a minimal role. They are deeply concerned about equality issues especially as they relate to race, gender and sexual orientation—and they decry the school system’s tendency to reproduce the economic system through a “hidden curriculum” that confers advantages on those who are already privileged. They are likely to support a multicultural curriculum that is locally developed and to oppose curricula, tests, or standards developed at the state or national levels. The Religious Right tends to focus its efforts at the local level more than do the business conservatives and new politics liberals—who more often seek to influence education policy at the state level-local school leaders are more likely to encounter ideological conflicts with the Religious Right on what they consider their home territory. School leaders, then, need to know what types of ideological conflicts they developing genuine empathy for people who hold ideological views different from their own is important, having the courage to take a stand for the integrity of the school program and its governance processes is also crucial.

Dealing Effectively with Ideological Conflicts

An Ounce of Prevention

Most local conflicts over ideology relate to one of two things: curriculum policy or religious issues. Ensuring that all formal policies and procedures in these two areas are clear and consistent with current legal opinion is therefore essential for schools and school districts. Moreover, curriculum adoption policies—including the adoption of supplementary materials by classroom teachers—should provide opportunities for the general public or parents to provide input. Periodically, an attorney should review all these policies and recommend needed changes.

Today, public school educators walk a fine line between course content and attitudes that needlessly offend some students on the one hand, and their professional responsibility to provide an intellectually sound curriculum on the other. This line is fine indeed—but leaders must know where it lies and communicate its location clearly to teachers.

Recognizing an Ideological Conflict

School leaders should be on the alert for three indications that an ideological disagreement is at the root of a conflict. The first is the emotional intensity surrounding the issue. People feel as if everything they believe is under attack. A second sign to look for is faulty communication patterns. People involved in an ideological conflict often feel as if those on the other side are not really listening and that everything they say is falling on deaf ears. A final sign that an argument is basically ideological is that the participants make “strenuous efforts…to explain away the inconsistencies, incongruences, and practical failings” of the ideology (Paris & Reynolds, 1993, p. 209). Whenever school leaders notice similar behavior or other signs of ideological conflict they should ask themselves: Is this basically an ideological argument? What ideologies are involved?

Obtaining Information About an Ideological Issue

As soon as school leaders realize they are dealing with an ideological conflict, they should begin seeking information about the underlying ideological position. In all instances, giving challengers a chance to speak and listening to them attentively
Chapter Nine: Looking at Policies: Policy Instruments and Cost Effectiveness

Lowi’s Techniques of Control

In a 1964 article, Theodore Lowi advanced the thesis that three basic types of policies exist-distributive, regulatory, and redistributive-and that each generates a distinctive political arena.

Distributive Policies

Distributive Defined

Distributive policies bestow gifts on citizens; these gifts may be goods, services, or special privileges. Lowi and Ginsberg distinguish three: (1) subsidies, (2) contracts, and (3) nonregulatory licenses.

Subsidies

A subsidy may consist of “cash, goods, services, or land” (Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994, p. 389).

Contracts

Under a contract, a private firm agrees to provide a product or service to the government in exchange for a specific amount of money. Although the businesses that enter into contracts with school districts must perform work in exchange for their gift, nonetheless the school district is bestowing upon them a privilege with a substantial cash value attached. Ex. Custodial and transportation services.

Nonregulatory Licensing

“A license is a privilege granted by government to do something that it otherwise considers to be illegal” (Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994, p. 391). Licenses can be obtained by paying a fee without having to meet many requirements. Currently, nonregulatory licenses are rarely used in education.

Distribution as Control

At the state level, governments often provide flat grants based on enrollment to subsidize school services such as transportation and testing. Their distributions encourage districts to provide these services to children; otherwise, they might not. Figure 9.1 (page 242) lists some typical distributive polices used in education; this list suggests the many ways that distributive policies can shape behavior.

Regulatory Policies

Regulatory Defined

Regulatory policies are formalized rules expressed in general terms and applied to large groups of people.

Types of Regulatory Policies

Most regulatory policies take the form of laws or administrative rules that explicitly require or prohibit certain behaviors. A special type of regulatory policy is regulatory licensing. A regulatory license makes practicing a profession illegal until people have met specific requirement set by the government. Figure 9.2 (p. 243)

Regulatory Politics

Regulatory policies create a political arena different from that generated by distributive ones. Several social groups with conflicting interests are usually concerned about regulatory policies. These conflicts, however, are largely nonideological with most participants willing to concede points in order to make a deal.

Redistributive Policies

Redistributive Defined

A Redistributive policy is one that shifts resources or power from one social group to another. By doing so, the government “seek[s] to control conduct…indirectly by altering the conditions of conduct or manipulating the environment” (Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994, p. 397).

Types of Redistributive Policies

Redistributive policies fall into two broad categories: those that shift economic resources and those that shift Power. Social Security taxes “redistribute wealth from higher to lower income people and from workers to …retirees” (Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994, p. 401). Redistributive policies may also shift power, usually by granting new rights to a large social group. Redistributive policies are often used in education. (Figure 9.3 page 244)

Redistributive Politics

Redistributive policies are usually controversial and “cut closer than any others along class lines” (Lowi, 1964 p. 707); therefore, they generate a political arena marked by conflict. Although most redistributive policies do not spark violence, all redistributive political arenas are marked by sharp divisions and ideological intensity.

Do Lowi’s Categories Overlap?

Lowi (1964; Lowi & Ginsberg, 1994) anticipates this criticism, arguing that these categories should be understood as describing the short term, rather than the long. Because most citizens and politicians think and act in the short term, the categories describe short-term perceptions of policies. In the long term all policies are both regulatory and Redistributive.

Using Lowi’s Categories in School Leadership

Managing Policy Change

Analyzing policy ideas using Lowi’s techniques of control can help leaders at the district level plan several policy changes over a period of years. Generally, one should not introduce too many policies of the same type simultaneously, especially if the changes are redistributive. In general, then, wise education leaders should plan a gradual introduction of several changes, taking care to use a judicious mix of policy types. Above all, they should avoid: (1) making too many policy changes of the
same type close together; (2) making too many policy changes that will activate the same individuals and groups at about the same time; and (3) making a combination of changes that will activate too many people and groups in the policy arena at the same time.

Planning Influence Strategies
Education leaders should play an active role in policy adoption and formulation, contributing their professional knowledge and bringing their influence to bear on those issues that concern them. But because different policies establish different political configurations, leaders need to select appropriate strategies.

Strategies for Distributive Arenas
Distributive policies generate stable arenas in which little conflict exists; the recipients of “gifts” focus most of their attention on the distributor rather than on each other. The superintendent should work to develop and maintain a good relationship with those in the state agency who will administer the program.

Strategies for Regulatory Arenas
The superintendent should first tentatively identify the competitors and their probable positions. The superintendent should contact her professional association to gather information about its position and discuss her views with the lobbyists who will work on this bill. Offer to help the association in its efforts to see that the final law reflects administrators’ concerns. Do not lose interest after the bill is passed. The groups that worked to influence the law will compete to influence its accompanying rules. Only after rules have been formally adopted should she and her association relax their vigilance.

Strategies for Redistributive Arenas
Identify who is most likely to join each side of the issue. Such an analysis would suggest where she is most likely to find individuals and groups who share her position. Building a strong coalition will require much ideological work such as developing appropriate slogans, flyer, news releases, and speeches. Ideological battles are often won by the side whose discourse most resonates with the public. Getting this policy adopted may require a campaign of several years during which supporters will have to educate legislators and the public, build an effective organization, and raise funds to support their efforts. Long-term persistence is often the key to passing redistributive policies.

McDonnell and Elmore’s Policy Instruments
McDonnell and Elmore (1987) argued that four “alternative policy instruments, or …mechanisms [exist] that translate substantive policy goals…into concrete actions” (p. 134). Those four instruments are mandates, inducements, capacity building, and system changing.

Seven years later, McDonnell (1994) added a fifth instrument to the framework: hortatory policy, or persuasion. Lowi’s categories can be understood as a wide-angle lens for looking at policies, bringing the whole society into view. McDonnell and Elmore’s resembles a close-up lens, permitting a detailed view of how a particular policy type functions.

Table 9.1 McDonnell and Elmore’s Policy Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Instrument</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Best Context</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Major Drawback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inducements</td>
<td>1. Short-term transfer of resources 2. Guidelines</td>
<td>Diverse behavior desirable</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Excessive diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-Change</td>
<td>Shift of authority</td>
<td>Existing institutions unwilling to respond</td>
<td>Countering resistance</td>
<td>Unpredictable results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortatory Policy</td>
<td>1. Information 2. Symbols, images 3. Appeal to values</td>
<td>Target population most likely to act on information</td>
<td>Disseminating information</td>
<td>Danger of manipulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Combining Policy Instruments
Although for analytical purposes McDonnell and Elmore distinguish five policy instruments, education leaders must understand that in practice, policy instruments are often combined. Indeed, combining several instruments within a single policy can work quite effectively to bring about change.

Using McDonnell and Elmore’s Ideas in School Leadership
Diversifying Policy Instruments
Benveniste (1986) argues that for many reasons policy formulators overuse mandates with negative penalties. They often regard such policies as foolproof, are ignorant of the contexts in which their policies will be implemented, and find devising punitive mandates easy. McDonnell and Elmore’s theories about policy instruments provide a way to conceptualize policy alternatives and also suggest criteria for assessing their probable effectiveness.
Combining Policy Instrument in School Leadership
Chrispeels (1997), suggests ways that education leaders can combine policy instruments for maximum impact. The effective combination of several instruments depends upon coherence: all instruments must be used to achieve the same broad policy goal. In schools, as in California, the simultaneous use of several instruments can “create multiple leverage points and a common language” (Chrispeels, 1997, p. 471).

Cost Analysis and cost-effectiveness Analysis
Thinking About Costs
Many school leaders adopt new policies without realistically analyzing either their cost or their cost-effectiveness. Leaders need ways to analyze costs in order to choose wisely among education alternatives. Costs are related to benefits. A benefit is “anything you gain by undertaking a particular course of action” (Coplin & O’Leary, 1981, p. 129). A cost is “anything you must give up in order to obtain those benefits” (Coplin & O: Leary, 1981, p. 129). In thinking through the potential costs and benefits of a policy, considering both the tangible and the intangible ones is essential (Coplin & O’Leary, 1981).

Cost Analysis
Levin and McEwan’s Ingredients Method
Levin and McEwan (2001) recommend a system for estimating the tangible costs of a policy or program. It requires calculating the expenditures and opportunity costs involved in providing five ingredients: personnel, facilities, equipment and materials, client inputs, and miscellaneous inputs.
Personnel
Includes all people who will work on the program, full time and part time, paid employees and volunteers. The cost of the services of each should be expressed in dollars.
Facilities
Include all space used to house the program, such as offices and classrooms.
Equipment and materials
Include necessary office machinery, audiovisual equipment, and furniture.
Required client inputs
This ingredient reflects costs imposed on the participants or their parents.
Miscellaneous inputs
They include utilities, maintenance, administrative overhead, and added insurance costs.
The Ingredients Method Applied
Tables 9.2 and 9.3, page 262, example of examining costs.

Analyzing Tangible and Intangible Costs and Benefits
As a supplement to Levin and McEwan’s (2001) ingredients method, leaders should also carry out the analysis of both tangible and intangible costs and benefits recommended by Coplin and O’Leary (1981). Example, Table 9.4 page 266. As Coplin and O’Leary (1981) warn: “A project should be undertaken only if its benefits are at least equal to its costs” (p. 130).

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis
Thinking About Effectiveness
An effective policy is one that leads to the intended outcomes, such as higher reading achievement scores, better attendance, or increased parent involvement. Cost-effectiveness analysis is a systematic way to compare alternative methods for reaching the same goal in terms of cost and effectiveness.

Steps in Cost-Effectiveness Analysis
Levin and McEwan (2001) outline several steps for a good cost-effectiveness analysis. The first, and most important, step is to accurately identify one’s true policy objective. Select an appropriate measure of the effectiveness of the available alternatives. After all the viable alternatives have been specified, a thorough cost analysis of each should be carried out. The effectiveness of each alternative should be carefully considered. After carefully comparing the costs and effectiveness of each alternative, one should make a choice.

Chapter Ten: Policy Implementation: Getting People to Carry Out a Policy
The Research of Implementation
Defining Implementation
It is “the process of carrying out authoritative public policy directives” (Nakamura & Smallwood, 198, p. 1). The major actors in the implementation arena are the implementers. Intermediaries are implementers to whom the formal implementers delegate the responsibility to help with implementation. Successful implementation depends upon developing and maintaining both the will and the capacity of the intermediaries. As with will, formal implementers must constantly keep in mind the capacity of the intermediaries (McLaughlin, 1987).

First Generation Research—The Difficulty of Implementation
Overview
First-generation implementation research focuses on the difficulty-in some cases the impossibility-of policy implementation. Researchers attribute the extreme difficulty of implementation to various causes. Jerome Murphy (1971) concluded that politics and federal bureaucracy had hindered the implementation of compensatory education programs. He found that USDOE was woefully understaffed and, even if it had employed enough personnel to oversee implementation, agency workers probably would not have supported the goals of compensatory education for ideological reasons. Seymour Sarason (1971) argued that most education reforms fail because reformers do to take school culture into account.

In-Depth Look at a Typical Study
Gross et al., 1971: In their analysis of the situation, the researchers identified five barriers to effective implementation. The first four caused the last one to develop. They were:
  1. The teachers never really understood the change.
  2. The teachers did not know how to use the new pedagogy.
  3. The materials needed to establish open classrooms were not available.
Like first-generation implementation research, the research of the second generation suggests that implementation is difficult. Rather, a process of ‘mutual adaptation’ had occurred in the successful projects. Mutual adaptation involved changes in both the implementers’ behavior and in the details of the policy design, which was modified to fit local circumstances (McLaughlin, 1976). Kirst and Jung, 1980, concluded that short-term implementation studies magnify the proportion of failures and argued that researchers should study a policy implementation over the course of a decade. Peterson, Rabe, and Wong (1986) argued that because redistributive policies are complex, they are eventually implemented only if those who direct the programs are highly skilled. Murphy (1990) the policies of the 1980s were regulatory; therefore, they were easier to implement than the policies of the 1960s and 1970s had been. Moreover, they built on existing school structures and “emphasized quantitative increases” (Murphy, 1990, p. 35).

In-Depth Look at a Typical Study

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Huberman and Miles (1984) conducted an USDOE-funded, three-year study of the implementation of various “school improvements.” In their book, Huberman and Miles (1984) divided the 12 schools they studied in-depth into four “families”: (1) highly successful implementations, (2) relatively successful implementation, (3) relatively unsuccessful implementations, (4) unsuccessful implementations.

Highly Successful

Initiated by central office administrators who were deeply committed to the new program. The new policy fit well into the district and was consistent with its philosophy. They offered strong assistance in the form of materials, training, and consultants throughout implementation. The researchers commented about these two schools: “Local administrators used muscle along with tutoring and tenderness” (Huberman & Miles, 1984, p. 277).

Relatively Successful

Because the new policies addressed well-recognized problems in these districts, a crusading atmosphere developed among the teachers. They were strongly committed to making the programs work in order to solve the problems. Both central office support and leaders’ preparation for implementation were adequate, but the real key to the success was the willingness of the teachers to work long hours to master new skills. As time passed, however, many teachers experienced burnout and opted to weaken the innovations.

Relatively Unsuccessful

Had adopted modest policy changes that demanded little of them. Their district leaders, who had been supportive at first, quickly lost interest after implementation began. They offered little assistance, and allowed principals and teachers to downsize the projects further. “The administrators ‘helped’ most by granting latitude to make changes,” Huberman and Miles (1984) observed (p. 265). The result, however, was that the policy changes were never truly implemented.

Unsuccessful

District-level administrators had launched policy changes as part of broader strategies for personal career development. The programs were poorly designed, and these leaders were never really interested in implementation. “In a sense, these two ‘failures’ can be seen as a successful effort by users to protect their schools against poorly conceived ideas” (Huberman & Miles, 1984, p. 269).

Lesson from the Second Generation

Like first-generation implementation research, the research of the second generation suggests that implementation is difficult. Many policies—perhaps most—are never really implemented. People responsible for implementation can never take it for granted that those under them will put a policy into effect simply because they are supposed to. Unlike the first-generation research, however, the research of the second generation suggests that implementation is possible. Although in successful implementations a process of “mutual adaptation” occurs, which changes both the design of the policy and the behavior of the implementers, the core and the spirit of the new policy do take effect (McLaughlin, 1976). Most important, second-generation research suggests why some implementations succeed whereas others fail.

How to Implement a New Policy

Implementing policies is one of school leaders’ most important tasks. Moreover, central office staff and principals play a crucial role in the implementation process; without their support implementations are likely to fail.

Mobilizing for Implementation

Mobilization

Mobilization is the most crucial stem in policy implementation. Leaders who hope to bring about a lasting change should pay careful attention to each step of mobilization: policy adoption, planning, and the gathering of resources. Huberman and Miles (1984) found that mobilization typically lasted 14 to 17 months.

Motives for Adopting a New Policy

Do we have good reasons for adopting a new policy? Policy changes for career building are not a good reason. Even when the hoped-for jobs never materialize, such implementations are usually poorly planned and consist of more image than substance (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 2001). Innovation for the sake of innovation also creates an atmosphere of skepticism about all change (Fullan, 2001). Experts find that not attempting any policy change is better than adopting a new policy for either of these poor reasons.
Only two good reasons exist for adopting a new policy (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). The first is that it will solve a bona fide, well-recognized problem. The second strong reason is to build the capacity of the implementers so they can eventually introduce other changes.

**Appropriateness of the New Policy**

Is this policy appropriate for our school or district? What is hard is determining which of these many possible policy changes are suitable for the specific context within which one works (Fullan, 2001). Figure 10.1 page 279, lists the major issues that should be considered. Some education leaders develop plans for policy changes as if they worked in a social vacuum. Another mistake is adopting a policy that does not match the resource level of a school or district. In trying to determine whether a policy is appropriate for their own setting, school leaders should consult several sources.

**Adequate Support**

Does the policy we are considering have sufficient support among key stakeholders? Therefore, assessing the level of support of the proposed policy enjoys is important (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 2001). Above all, considering the level of support among the major implementers is essential. Berman and McLaughlin (1978) found that top-down implementations “generally met with indifference or resistance at the school level” (p. 15). The adoption process should include an ongoing dialogue with all the groups and individuals who will be asked to play a role in implementation or who could derail it. As Fullan (2001) observes: Do not assume that your version of what the change should be is the one that should or could be implemented. On the contrary, assume the one of the main purposes of the process of implementation is to exchange your reality of what should be through interaction with implementers…(p. 108) Not until the proposed policy change has gone through this transformative process should leaders move to adopt it officially.

**Planning for Implementation**

Although planning is essential, the research somewhat paradoxically suggests that leaders can also overplan (Fullan, 2001; Louis & Miles, 1990). Leaders should engage in what Louis and Miles (1990) call evolutionary planning. As the project evolves, they should modify their plan, adapting it in response not only to experience but also to changes in the environment such as altered levels of resources or shifting political configurations.

**Who Should Participate in Planning?**

One approach is to form a large steering committee that represents all the stakeholders interested in the project. The other approach is to form a smaller steering committee, comprising a few people who have volunteered to work on the project and who are strongly committed to it. The large, broad-based steering committee is most effective in settings where the stakeholders share a general consensus about education policy and work harmoniously together. In contexts with a history of conflict, the smaller committee will probably work best. Regardless of which form is chosen, eventually it must include representatives of two key stakeholder groups: building principals and teachers. If representatives of the school board and community are not included in the initial planning group, then systematic channels of communication between the planners and those two groups must be established at the start and maintained throughout. Otherwise, the steering committee will appear to be acting secretly (Louis & Miles, 1990).

**Planning by Forward Mapping**

The group in charge of planning should try to anticipate all the major prerequisites for beginning the implementation. One technique for identifying implementation needs ahead of time is forward mapping (Weimer & Vining, 1992). The first step is developing a written scenario that describes what the new policy will look like when fully implemented. Once the participants have reached agreement on the scenario, they use it as the basis for developing practical questions about it. Table 10.1 page 283, presents an example. Those questions are then used by the group to develop a plan, which should be a general outline rather than a detailed blueprint (Example in figure 10.2 on page 284). At tentative draft should be presented to all building principals and a representative sample of the teachers who will be involved in implementation. After their suggestions have been used to revise the plan, it should provide a useful guide for the next and final stage of mobilization. It may also provide some clues for things that will need to be done during implementation itself.

**Gathering Resources for Implementation**

The third aspect of mobilizing for policy implementation is gathering resources. As Table 10.2 page 285, indicates many of the problems in implementation are caused by insufficient resources. In fact, of all the major problems that principals in Louis and Mile’s (1990) study mentioned, fully two-thirds of the major problems (lack of time, lack of money, inadequate staff development, and poor facilities) and one minor problem (lack of skills) related to resources. A frequent cause of implementation failure is the lack of or unwise allocation of resources (Fullan, 2001; Louis & Miles, 1990; Miles & Huberman, 1984). This means that leaders who wish to bring about genuine policy changes must carefully analyze what resources will be necessary and obtain them both before and during implementation.

**Money**

This resource is important because it can be used to obtain other resources. Although a certain amount of money is essential, many education leaders overestimate the importance of abundant fiscal resources (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Even more crucial than the total budget available is how money is spent.

**Time**

Time is another crucial resource (Fullan, 2001; Louis & Miles, 1990; Prestine & McGreal, 1997). Do not expect implementers to add to their hours. Solving the time problem is always a challenge, but a combination of realism and creativity will enable leaders to do so.

**Personnel**

One important personnel decision is the selection of a project director or coordinator. Louis and Miles (1990) found that a major predictor of success was the presence of someone who had assumed major responsibility for the project. Louis and Miles recommended that the project director work at least halftime on coordinating the implementation.
Ongoing Assistance

In Louis and Miles’s 1990 study, two thirds of the principals who responded to their survey identified “constraints of the school’s physical plant” (p. 146) as either a major or a minor problem during implementation. The checklist in Figure 10.3 page 286 can be used to assess how appropriate the existing space is for the project and to determine how it needs to be altered.

Equipment and Materials

Policy changes often depend heavily on the availability of specific machines and materials.

Implementation Proper

Implementation itself should begin only after a solid foundation has been laid during the mobilization period.

Stages of Implementation

Early Implementation

In their comparative study of twelve implementations in education, Huberman and Miles (1984) found that the early months of implementation are invariably rough. The reason for this difficulty is that the grassroots implementers must learn how to act in new ways. Three factors stand out as predictors of ultimate success: (1) a rough start, (2) pressure by leaders to continue trying the new approach, and (3) ongoing assistance of various kinds. In short, the key to surviving early implementation with both the policy change and the implementers intact is a judicious combination of pressure and support.

Late Implementation

The nature of late implementation depends on the extent to which early implementation has been successful. In this case, success means making a genuine change in an education policy. As Louis and Miles (1990) caution their readers, “Implementing serious change…is a problem-rich enterprise…Problems of the program itself are easiest to solve; ‘people’ problems come next; and ‘setting’ problems of structures and procedures are most difficult to solve” (p. 272) Thus, late implementation is not a time for school leaders to relax and congratulate themselves, even if their project has been successful. Problems still exist that they must face. Most of all, as we shall see, they must resolve some critical issues if their policy is to endure or be institutionalized.

Cross-Cutting Themes

Most studies identify three components that run through successful implementations from beginning to end: (1) monitoring and feedback, (2) ongoing assistance, and (3) coping with problems.

Monitoring and Feedback

Successful implementations depend on continuous monitoring and feedback. The research indicates the importance of pressure from above in successful policy changes. This means that principals and central office leaders should not only stay well informed about the course of the project, but should also be visible at the sites where implementation is occurring. Their presence, questions about progress, and encouraging words will communicate an important message to the implementers about the seriousness of their efforts (McLaughlin, 1987). A final reason exists for involving administrators. Principals and central office leaders should be actively engaged in the evolutionary planning process that characterizes good implementations (Fullan 2001; Louis & Miles, 1990). Only leaders who are in touch with the implementation will be able to revive old methods and develop new ones, making needed changes as the process unfolds.

Ongoing Assistance

Although pressure is essential in successful implementation, so is support. Probably the most important form of support is assistance (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 2001; Louis & Miles, 1990). Figure 10.4, page 290 lists some of the most widely used. What is essential is that the assistance be relevant to the problems the implementers are experiencing.

Problem Coping

Multiple problems are inherent in every policy implementation. According to Louis and Miles (1990), they can be divided into three categories: (1) program related, (2) people related, and (3) setting related. Table 10.3, page 290, summarizes the most common problems of each type. As soon as they detect new problems, implementers, begin to work to resolve them. They do not procrastinate or waste time looking for someone to blame. Nor do they eliminate problems by midgetizing their project (Fullan, 2001; Louis & Miles, 1990). Louis and Miles (1990) found that in the most successful change, project leaders used a wide range of coping strategies and chose actions based on a deep, rather than a shallow, analysis of the problem. They also selected approaches that were appropriate to the specific problem with which they were dealing. Table 10.4, page 291, lists several ways to cope, divided into three broad categories. Technical strategies involve carefully analyzing the problem area and targeting the necessary resources to it. Political strategies involve mobilizing power to encourage people to act in desired ways. Cultural strategies “focus on the shared beliefs, values, and symbols that are the key to the problem” (Louis & Miles, 1990, p. 272). Good education leaders thoughtfully employ a mixture of all three.

Institutionalization

The final stage of implementation is institutionalization, “the period during which an innovation is incorporated into the organization” (Gross et al., 1971, p. 17). Figure 10.5, page 292, provides a checklist about institutionalization. It can be used to assess the extent to which a policy has already been institutionalized, and it can serve as a planning guide, suggesting the next steps in the institutionalization process. If advocates of the policy are alert, early in the implementation they identify all areas of the organization’s routine procedures that do not support their project. Therefore, as late implementation begins, they are ready to watch for opportunities to institutionalize their new policy a little at a time. Policy advocates must work conscientiously to move every essential component of their innovation from soft money to a line item in the regular budget of the organization. The struggle to move the policy into the regular budget will probably be as difficult as any other part of implementation. Even so, only when it has been incorporated into the regular budget does the new policy have a chance to be fully institutionalized and, therefore, fully implemented (Firestone & Corbett, 1988; Huberman & Miles, 1984).

Implementing Unpopular Policies

Why Some Policies are Unpopular

Self-interest

Implementers are unlikely to support policies that they perceive as contrary to their own self-interest (McDonnell, 1991). In particular, they will almost certainly oppose changes that appear to threaten their job security, chances for promotion, or status in the workplace.
Professional Values

Educators are also likely to oppose implementing policies that conflict with their basic professional values (McDonnell, 1991). McDonnell (1991) argues that in the United States such value conflicts, whether recognized or not, are at the root of many incomplete or failed policy implementations.

Issues Surrounding Resistance

Exit, Voice, and Disloyalty

Weimer and Vining (1992), drawing on Albert Hirschman’s classic Exit, Voice, and Loyalty (1970), argue that three responses are possible when asked to implement a policy with which one disagrees: (1) exit (leaving the organization), (2) voice (speaking up about problems), and (3) disloyalty (quietly or openly failing to conform to the policy). Of course, a single individual may combine these approaches. Other choices include compliance, token compliance (Bardach, 1977) implement part of policy, or delayed compliance (Bardach, 1977) implementing policy late.

Coping with Resistance

Because much resistance is covert, school leaders should suspect its presence any time that one thing after another just “happens” to go wrong with an implementation. School leaders, then, must be prepared for resistance and should have devised some ways to head it off or to minimize its impact. First strategy to use with strong opponents of the policy is persuasion. If attempts at persuasion are successful, then leaders should be sure to maintain good channels of communication with these people throughout implementation to detect other misunderstandings early. Another possible approach is to modify the policy to meet some objections. Modifications to meet the legitimate objections of some implementers may be part of the necessary mutual adaptation. Finally, moving strong opponents out of the implementation or excluding them from the outset is often possible.

Choosing to Resist

A school leader’s decision to resist implementing a policy with which she disagrees is not one that she should take lightly. School administrators are not ethically obligated to obey every order; they are, however, obligated to carefully think through their situation, their motives, and the possible effects of their resistance before deciding to take such a strong stand. Ask: Is this objectionable policy just a symbolic one? If, however, the evidence suggests that the new policy was motivated by substantive reasons, resistance becomes more serious, especially if the degree of compliance will be aggressively monitored. In this case, leaders contemplating must think through their own motives. Finally, anyone considering resistance should think through the probable outcome. Ask, “Will resistance force the abandonment or major amendment of the policy? Principled resistance to implementation should always be the fruit of much reflection and soul-searching. Leader should be prepared to lose their jobs because of it.

Chapter 11: Policy Evaluation: Determining if the Policy Works

A Nervous-Making Topic

Like every other stage of the policy process, evaluation is difficult, in large part because it is political; the major reason is that it threatens people. School leaders cannot take a smooth, problem-free policy evaluation for granted any more than they can take a smooth, problem-free implementation for granted. But neither can effective leaders avoid or ignore policy evaluation. Stufflebeam (1983): We cannot make our programs better unless we know where they are weak and strong...We cannot plan effectively if we are unaware of options and their relative merits; and we cannot convince our constituents that we have done good work and deserve continued support unless we can show them evidence that we have done what we promised and produced beneficial results. For these and other reasons, public servants must subject their work to competent evaluation...(p. 140).

Definitions Associated with Policy Evaluation

Evaluation is “the systematic investigation of the worth, or merit of an object” (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation [Joint Committee], 1994, p.3). A policy evaluation is a type of applied research in which the practices and rigorous standards of all research are used in a specific setting for a practical purpose: determining to what extent a policy is reaching its goals. Policies are often first put into effect through projects, which are “educational activities that are provided for a defined period of time” (Joint Committee, 1994, p.3). When projects are institutionalized, they become programs: “educational activities that are provided on a continuing basis” (Joint Committee, 1994, p.3). In any evaluation, a number of stakeholders exist: “individuals or groups that may be involved in or affected by a program evaluation”(Joint Committee, 1994, p.3).

A Brief History of Educational Policy Evaluation

Early Evaluation

Ralph Tyler’s idea that educational programs should be evaluated in terms of their objectives was widely influential, encouraging most of the evaluators who followed him to adopt the same perspective (Madaus, Stufflebeam, & Scriven, 1983; Popham, 1988).

Characteristics of Policy Evaluations

The Evaluation Process

All policy evaluations follow the same general procedures. After district leaders receive the report, they should use it to either modify the policy or terminate it (Brainard, 1996; Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980).

| 1. | Determine the goals of the policy |
| 2. | Select indicators |
| 3. | Select or develop data-collection instruments |
| 4. | Collect data |
| 5. | Analyze and summarize data |
| 6. | Write evaluation report |
| 7. | Respond to evaluators’ recommendations |

Figure 11.1 Basic steps in the policy evaluation process.

Criteria for Judging Evaluations

Education leaders need to know how to assess the quality of a proposed or completed evaluation. If they have contracted for an evaluation to be implemented, they need to know if the recommended research design is sound. If they are using a completed evaluation, they need to be able to determine how seriously to take it. In 1975, to meet the need for recognized criteria for evaluation, 12 research associations established a joint committee, assigning it the task of developing standards for assessing educational evaluations; the result
of its work was published in 1981. Revised during the early 1990s to reflect new trends in evaluation, the most recent version appeared as Program Evaluation Standards in 1994. The 30 standards were grouped under four broad categories, which serve as general criteria: (1) usefulness, (2) feasibility, (3) propriety, and (4) accuracy. (Joint Committee, 1994).

**Usefulness**

In order to be useful, an evaluation must be conducted by an individual or team well qualified to do evaluations. The usefulness of an evaluation also depends to a great extent on stakeholder identification and the collection of meaningful data. Interim and final evaluation reports should also be useful. The major findings should be clearly related to practical situations, and all recommendations should be specific rather than general. Finally, reports should not be excessively long and should include an executive summary at the beginning.

**Feasibility**

The evaluation must be doable without imposing unreasonable strains on the school or school district. An important aspect of feasibility is practicality. Another dimension of feasibility is political. This means that evaluations are always political. A good evaluation does not ignore this fact, but rather plans the evaluation with this in mind. One way to minimize the political controversy that often erupts around an evaluation is for the evaluation to meet with all the interest groups and stakeholders during the planning process to discuss their concerns and hear their suggestions. Finally, a feasible evaluation is financially responsible. It has a definite budget, which is sufficient to carry out the study but not exorbitant in relation to the environment.

**Propriety**

Issues of propriety are legal and ethical; a good evaluation must conform to accepted norms for research. The final report should fully disclose the findings of the evaluation, even if evaluators include the discovery of financial fraud or other questionable behavior.

**Accuracy**

An evaluation should be accurate. In the report, evaluators should explain exactly how they reached their conclusions and specify the data upon which each conclusion is based.

**Purposes of Evaluations**

**Summative Evaluation**

They assess the quality of a policy that has been in force for some time, especially when it has reached a critical juncture in its history. The primary purpose of summative evaluation is to hold the implementers of a policy accountable, which is why the stakes are high when summative evaluations are conducted and why external evaluators are normally used. However, although summative evaluation was popular in the 1960s and 1970s, more recently, formative evaluation has been preferred (Popham, 1988).

**Formative Evaluation**

The purpose of a formative policy evaluation is to enable the implementers of a policy to make necessary changes throughout the life of a policy in order to improve it. As a result, formative evaluation is an ongoing, recurrent process. Because a formative evaluation is designed to help implementers make good decisions about what they are doing, it is not as threatening as a summative evaluation. And, because the stakes are not as high, sometimes internal evaluators are used (Popham, 1988).

**Pseudo-evaluations**

Often, what appears on the surface to be a bona fide evaluation is actually what has been called a pseudo-evaluation (Stufflebeam & Webster, 1983). Pseudo-evaluations are of two types. The first is “the politically controlled study” (p.25). Such an evaluation is politically motivated; its purpose is usually communicated, directly or indirectly, to the evaluators, who must then decide if their ethical standards permit them to continue with the project. In such a pseudo-evaluation, the data collection and dissemination of the final report are carefully controlled to create the desired impression of the policy. The desired conclusions about the policy may be either negative or positive, but they reflect not the truth about the policy’s success, but the outcome that those who commissioned the evaluation sought for political reasons. The second type of pseudo-evaluation is the public relations evaluation. Its purpose is to “create a positive public image for a school district, program, or process” (Stufflebeam & Webster, 1983, p. 26). Those who commission a public relations study usually clearly indicate what the findings must be. In this case, the conclusions in the final report not only must be positive, but also must add luster to the public image that has already been created. Needless to say, either commissioning or participating in a pseudo-evaluation is unethical.

**Methodologies Used in Policy Evaluation**

**Quantitative Methodologies.** Quantitative research designs involve the collection and statistical analysis of numerical data. Quantitative policy evaluations are sometimes based on experimental or quasi-experimental designs that investigate the statistical differences between a group that participated in a program and a group that did not. Quantitative evaluations have several advantages. The most important is the high level of credibility of a well-constructed quantitative study. A second major advantage is that quantitative evaluations can often be carried out relatively quickly and at a relatively low cost. The major disadvantage is that because of its tight structure and precise research questions, it is not well suited for discovering unexpected facts about the policy under study (Brainard, 1996; Stufflebeam & Webster, 1983).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scores</th>
<th>Retention rates</th>
<th>Attendance figures</th>
<th>Dropout rates</th>
<th>Per-pupil expenditure</th>
<th>Teachers’ salaries</th>
<th>Teacher-pupil ratios</th>
<th>Percentage of students on free and reduced lunch</th>
<th>Enrollment figures</th>
<th>Percentage of teachers with master’s degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 11.2 Examples of quantitative educational data.**
Qualitative Methodologies

Although almost all early policy evaluations were quantitative, in recent decades qualitative approaches have become popular (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Qualitative research designs involve the collection of verbal or pictorial data.

- Transcripts of interviews
- Transcripts of focus group discussions
- Notes on observations
- Open-ended surveys
- Personal statements
- Diaries
- Minutes from meetings
- Official reports
- Legal documents
- Books and materials
- Photographs

**Figure 11.3 Types of qualitative data.**

Qualitative research designs often involve collecting several types of data and comparing the, a process called triangulation. When the policy under consideration is very new or is a pilot program, a qualitative study can yield valuable insights into a problem. The major disadvantage of qualitative evaluations is that they are more time consuming than quantitative ones and therefore more costly. Additionally, because most people trust numbers more than apparently subjective findings based on interviews and observations, qualitative evaluations are less credible than quantitative ones (Brainard, 1996; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Stufflebeam & Webster, 1983).

Holistic Evaluations

Designing evaluations that include both quantitative and qualitative elements is possible; these are sometimes called holistic evaluations. The major advantage of a holistic evaluation is implied by its name; it provides a holistic view of what is happening. This means that the findings are often more valid than the findings of a study that uses only qualitative or only quantitative data. The major drawback is the time and cost required for the collection and analysis of qualitative data. No one best type of evaluation exists; the choice of methodology depends on the purpose of the study and the nature of the questions asked (Brainard, 1996; Joint Committee, 1994; Wolf, 1990).

Indicators

“An indicator is an individual or a composite statistic that relates to a basic construct in education and is useful in a policy context” (Shavelson et al., 1987, cited in Nuttall, 1994, p.18). This definition excludes qualitative evaluations. Nuttall suggests that indicators can be qualitative, but that even so they must be quantified to a certain degree in order to be meaningful. The purpose of all indicators, quantitative and qualitative, is to provide reliable information about the quality of a policy so that well-informed decisions can be made about it. In designing an evaluation, selecting indicators for each policy objective and, if possible, using more than one indicator in relation to each is important. The way to avoid setting up an unintended pathological dynamic in which misguided indicators drive a program is to use several types of indicators and to discuss them and their probable effects with important stakeholders (Joint Committee, 1994).

Facilitating Meaningful Policy Evaluations

The leader’s responsibility is simultaneously to facilitate a useful evaluation and to provide ongoing guidance for the overall educational program – no easy task. Moreover, the leader’s environment will probably be more turbulent than usual because evaluations threaten the status quo and thus almost always “occur in a hostile setting” (Brewer & de Leon, 1983, p. 361).

The Politics of Evaluation

Why Evaluation is Political

“The politics of program survival is an ancient and important art” (Weiss, 1988, p. 49). Evaluations are political for three reasons. First, programs and projects are the products of the political process; second, evaluation reports influence what happens in the political arena, often affecting whether a policy is continued and how much funding it receives. Finally, the careers, professional reputations, and educational benefits of many individuals depend on the outcome of any evaluation (Weiss, 1988). Wise education leaders do not deny the political aspects of the process, hoping they will not emerge in their setting. Instead, they anticipate and plan for them (Joint Committee, 1994).

The Players in the Evaluation Arena

The Policy Makers

Usually the policy makers are the people who have requested the evaluation and will use it to make important decisions about the future of the policy. Therefore, policy makers are not necessarily interested in seeing that a technically excellent evaluation is carried out, but rather in guaranteeing that the program is maintained if it is popular with their constituents or cut if it is not (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980).

The Policy Implementers

The policy implementers are all those within the school district who are involved in putting the policy into practice. Their professional reputations, chances of career advancement, and (in some instances) jobs may depend on the results of the evaluation. Therefore, they want it to be favorable (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980).

The Clients

Although students are the direct clients of most policies in education and of the programs or projects that embody them, their parents are the indirect, behind-the-scenes clients. If the policy confers, special benefits or status on their offspring, they will probably want a favorable evaluation just as the implementers do. Even if the program is failing to achieve its official objectives, they will be reluctant to see it changed in significant ways or discontinued because even if ineffective it does provide some special services for their children and may save them a certain amount of money (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980).

The Evaluators

Finally, the evaluators themselves have an interest in the outcome of the evaluation. In many instances this means that they seek to produce a sophisticated, technically correct evaluation report that will impress their colleagues and future clients rather
Selecting Indicators

Choosing Evaluators

Building in Data Collection

Communicating with Stakeholders

Suggestions for Achieving a Sound Evaluation

Building Evaluation in Early

Even if outside evaluators will be used, school leaders should select indicators to monitor at the beginning of an implementation, fully realizing that the evaluators will probably add others. Selecting indicators early will reassure the implementers' behavior is important. Open discussions with all stakeholder groups will help leaders avoid serious errors in implementation and an external one to do all summative evaluations. As a result, when the time comes to make major modifications in the policy or even to terminate it, school leaders will have a broad range of data available to them that comes from different sources, thereby increasing their ability to make informed decisions (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).

Maneuvers to Prevent a Good Evaluation

Because all the players may use maneuvers to reduce the chances of a good evaluation, education leaders need to be aware of the standard approaches to derailing a successful study. The first broad tactic is simply to block the evaluation and prevent it from occurring at all. Those school leaders who do want a fair evaluation of a program should therefore be on the lookout for evidence that lobbying against the evaluation is occurring and move quickly to present the case for a serious study to policy makers. A second tactic is to so shape the criteria that are to be used for the evaluation that the desired outcome is virtually guaranteed. A third approach is mobilizing the clients against the evaluators. Their objective is to incite conflict between the clients and the evaluators and also to persuade the clients to contact the policy makers to voice their complaints. The fourth scheme is to make data gathering impossible or difficult for the evaluators. Finally, after the evaluation has ended and the report has been issued, any of the stakeholder groups (except the evaluators) may choose to attack the quality of the evaluation.

Two important reasons exist for communicating freely with stakeholders. First, good communication helps head off major political problems. Leaders should also make sure that the final evaluation report is understandable to stakeholders and should hold one or more meetings with them to discuss its implications for them (Joint Committee, 1994). A second reason is that it improves the validity and worth of the final evaluation. As Guba and Lincoln (1989) state: The findings of an evaluation are not “facts” in some ultimate sense but are, instead, literally created through an interactive process that includes the evaluator...as well as the many stakeholders that are put at some risk by the evaluation. What emerges from this process is one or more constructions that are the realities of the case. (p.8).

Selecting Indicators

Even if outside evaluators will be used, school leaders should select indicators to monitor at the beginning of an implementation, fully realizing that the evaluators will probably add others. Selecting indicators early will reassure the implementers and also make determining what data to collect easier. Choosing indicators that will not distort the implementers' behavior is important. Open discussions with all stakeholder groups will help leaders avoid serious errors in determining the best indicators (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).

Building in Data Collection

School leaders should not defer data collection until the summative evaluation is due. Just as indicators should be selected early, data collection should be ongoing because it can be used as part of formative evaluation throughout implementation. Later, when a formal, summative evaluation is conducted, the evaluators will have a rich existing information base to use in conjunction with the data that they generate themselves (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).

Choosing Evaluators

1. Internal evaluation conducted by the implementers. The great advantage of this approach is that insiders have access to a great deal of information about the policy, are more willing to act on negative findings than they will if someone else has been in charge. Disadvantages: the implementers may lack the research skills needed to carry out a high-quality evaluation. Most outsiders will feel skeptical about their evaluation findings because of the strong probability that they are biased in favor of the policy.

2. Internal evaluators from a specialized evaluation staff. Many large districts, and some medium-sized ones, have a research office with personnel trained in evaluation. Such evaluators are well qualified in research methodologies and will also be more impartial that the implementers. However, some credibility problems may surface with such an evaluation; after all, the evaluators and the implementers work for the same employer and may even know each other personally. In addition, a negative evaluation could possibly incite conflict within the district.

3. Outside agency or consultant. Universities and specialized evaluation firms are the most usual sources of researchers to conduct such evaluations. The advantages of using an external service are that the researchers are qualified and, as outsiders, will have considerably more credibility than any insiders. However, certain drawbacks exist. First, outside evaluators will not know the sociopolitical environment in which the policy has been implemented. Second, they may design an evaluation oriented toward making themselves look like experts in the eyes of their colleagues rather than toward providing truly useful information to their clients. Finally, their services are costly.

4. Organization that has funded the new policy evaluates it. The major advantage of this option is that such organizations usually employ skilled, professional evaluators who are capable of doing a good study. Their evaluation is likely to be more credible than any internal one. However, the drawback is that the funding body may have its own evaluation agenda. The result may be an evaluation that is not useful to educators or one that is patently unfair to the policy and its implementers.

In making this decision, school leaders must weigh many factors including the political situation, the nature of the information that they want about the policy, and the amount of money available for evaluation. Often the best solution is to choose not one but two evaluators: an internal one to conduct formative evaluations throughout implementation and an external one to do all summative evaluations. As a result, when the time comes to make major modifications I the policy or even to terminate it, school leaders will have a broad range of data available to them that comes from different sources, thereby increasing their ability to make informed decisions (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).
Acting on an Evaluation Report

After school leaders have received and studied an evaluation report, they must decide what to do about it. The first step in this process should be carefully assessing the quality of the report. Leaders should never uncritically accept them but should instead attempt to determine how good the study was. Only then can they know how seriously they should take its findings and recommendations. The second step should be convening the major stakeholders to discuss with them their perceptions of the report’s quality. Basically, four courses of action are open to them: (1) do nothing, (2) make minor modifications, (3) make major modifications, or (4) terminate the policy (Brewer & de Leon, 1983; Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).

Inaction

Often, the wisest course of action is to do nothing, thus maintaining the current policy in place. Two reasons: in the judgment of the leaders and other stakeholders, the evaluation was questionable and they therefore do not wish to accept its recommendations, solid justification for inaction on an evaluation is that it is not politically feasible. Sometimes waiting for a propitious moment to act on the recommendations of an evaluation is necessary (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).

Minor Modifications

Deciding to make only minor modifications in a policy, either because only a bit of fine-tuning was recommended in an evaluation report or because more sweeping changes are impossible for political reasons, is also possible. Because minor modifications do not alter the substance of the policy or threaten the jobs of stakeholders, they are relatively easy to make (Brewer & de Leon, 1983).

Major Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>A new program that has the same objectives is put in place of the old program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>Two or more entire programs or parts of programs are put together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting</td>
<td>One aspect of the program is removed and developed into a separate program or project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrementing</td>
<td>A substantial cut in funding is imposed on the program by reducing the amount of money available to most components of the old program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Arranged so that the first one is the least thoroughgoing and each successive change is increasingly serious. When trying to bring about major changes after an evaluation, leaders should anticipate political turbulence and plan for dealing with it (Brewer & de Leon, 1983).

Termination

Terminating policies is extremely difficult because most of the stakeholders will fiercely resist discontinuation and fight hard to protect the policy. Figure 11.4 lists several situations favorable to terminating policies (Brewer & de Leon, 1983; Hogwood & Gunn, 1984).

- When the administration changes
- When the economy turns down
- When budget difficulties happen
- When other jobs are available within the organization
- When the old program can easily be replaced by a new one

Figure 11.4 Situations conducive to policy termination.