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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

America's public schools have been subjected to increasing criticism during the last few years. Taxpayers have been quick to deny many school districts across the country increased revenues as school bond elections became increasingly difficult to pass and tax reform affecting education adversely was pushed to the forefront in state after state. "Time" featured a cover story describing the multifaceted crisis of America's public schools and typified much of what is written about education today:

Like some vast jury gradually and reluctantly arriving at a verdict, politicians, educators and especially millions of parents have come to believe that the U. S. public schools are in parlous trouble. Violence keeps making headlines. Test scores keep dropping. Debate rages over whether or not one-fifth or more adult Americans are functionally illiterate. High school graduates go so far as to sue their school systems because they got respectable grades and diploma but cannot fill in job application forms correctly. Experts confirm that students today get at least 25% more As and Bs than they did 15 years ago, but know less. A Government-funded nationwide survey group, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, reports that in science, writing, social studies and mathematics the achievement of U. S. 17-year-olds has dropped regularly over the past decade (19, 1980, p. 54).

The public was disenchanted with what it perceived to be an insatiable appetite for tax monies by the educational bureaucracy while the quality and/or success of public school declined. Taxpayers refused to accept explanations from educators for academic failures, poor discipline, grade inflation, or ill-prepared students for the world of work. Instead, the public demanded that
trustees and administrators, teachers and students, prove that society was getting value for dollars received by demonstrating success and being accountable (25, 1975, p. 4).

The rising cost of education underscored several other phenomena contributing toward public dissatisfaction and taxpayer revolt. As the schools were asked to increase their responsibility for teaching and providing social services, the ability of schools to deliver was reduced as the mission of the schools became more diversified. Federal government demands, public health requirements, food service programs, demands for specific curriculum content from a variety of groups, and parent apathy were only a few of the demands placed on educational institutions; yet, the community expected positive results for every dollar spent.

As school operations have grown more and more complex, administrators, school boards and state and federal agencies have realized changes in management techniques were required if educators were to evaluate the effectiveness with which education was meeting the needs of society. Techniques that permitted proper evaluation of alternative courses of action in maximizing utilization of scarce resources were essential. The increased involvement of students, teachers, parents and community in the decision-making process made the development of such improved techniques even more imperative.

As part of a movement to increase educational accountability, many school districts have adopted a particular kind of management process referred to as Management by Objectives (MBO). This trend resulted from the realization MBO was used successfully in the corporate world (53, 1974, p. 1). By the
late 1970's, MBO had become one vehicle educators could utilize to measure results and employ meaningful systems of accountability (16, 1977, p. 38).

MBO, as applied to education, was a system or process of management in which objectives were developed and utilized to mark progress toward the fulfillment of the district's goals. Boston emphasized that MBO:

... gives the responsibility and authority for achieving district goals to the individuals who must do the work at every level in the school organization. ... provides the required direction, assistance, and backing by district management to help administrators and teachers succeed to the best of their individual and collective abilities.

Boston continued by referring to two basic principles commonly applied to MBO:

1. The more clearly the school organization knows what it is trying to accomplish, the greater the probability that the district will achieve its goals.

2. Progress toward accomplishment of goals is increased when the school organization has a means of measuring where it is in relationship to where it wants to get (7, 1973, p. 1).

Most authors writing about MBO referred to Odiorne's definition:

The system of management by objectives can be described as a process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of the results expected of him, and use those measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members (63, 1965, p. 55).
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to examine selected business and education MBO models and identify the common elements contained in these models to be used in the construction of a consensus MBO model. This consensus model could be compared with any educational MBO accountability system, and specifically with the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools, to determine if all necessary MBO elements are included. A consensus MBO model may provide developers of accountability systems based on MBO with information that may save considerable research and planning time. Problems in implementing a new MBO system may be reduced if all the underlying principles and elements common to MBO were included in the accountability model finally adopted.

The intent of this study was to provide an answer to the following:
What agreement existed between MBO models and the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools:
The study addressed itself to the following specific questions:
1. What are the theoretical bases for MBO?
2. According to the literature, which MBO models can be identified that have applicability for a system of educational accountability?
3. What common elements from several MBO models in business and education can be identified that will serve as a basis
for comparison?

4. How does a consensus MBO model agree with the elements of the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools?

5. What implications for further study of the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools exist?

In addition to answering the questions in this research, the following further delineated the intent of this study:

1. Analyze the Clark County School District's Elementary Management and Accountability System and develop a graphic MBO model.

2. Analyze the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools and develop a graphic MBO model.

The Elementary MBO model was established and operational for several years in the Clark County School District. Because it was an existing, operational MBO model, it was included in this study as one of the models used to develop the consensus MBO model. The Secondary model was developed considerably later and constituted a distinct, separate use.

An underlying assumption of this study was that management by objectives was a viable and appropriate management process for use in school districts. Although limitations were reported, such as individuals not ready to assume
increased responsibility and self-discipline, lower levels not allowed full participation in setting objectives, increased paperwork, emphasis on quantitative evaluation, and difficulty in measurement of education's abstract goals, many proponents claimed the use of MBO in school administration was a significant contribution to the theory and practice of educational administration.

MBO proponents argued that MBO enhanced individual motivation to work by appealing to higher order needs, communications between superiors and subordinates was improved, organizational goals were stated in terms of achievement, evaluation was based on results instead of personality, job improvement and personal growth was provided for, and the organization's objectives were clearly communicated and understood by all.

It was clear MBO was used extensively in business but also in healthcare institutions, government agencies, religious orders, institutions of higher education, and public school districts. This study surveyed many MBO models and identified those elements useful for validating existing MBO models or as a point of reference for entities contemplating implementation of an MBO management process.
ASSUMPTIONS

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. The Clark County School District's policies and regulations required the superintendent to carry out the District's goals through assessable elements of quality (objectives).

2. The Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools will be used by secondary school principals indefinitely.

3. Revisions of the existing Clark County School District system will be made yearly.

4. All divisions of the Clark County School District will eventually utilize a district-wide MBO system.

5. The absence of effective accountability in local school districts could prompt state lawmakers to legislate and impose a less effective accountability system.

LIMITATIONS

For the purpose of this study, the following limitations were found and needed consideration when reviewing the findings of this research:

1. The MBO consensus model was developed from MBO models in business and education reported in the literature.

2. The study was limited to the comparison of the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for...
Secondary Schools to the resultant consensus MBO model.

3. The research design employed was descriptive in nature and required translation and interpretation of the author's descriptions to common terms selected for this study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Accountability. An accounting of the efficient operation of an educational institution in terms of principal, teacher, and program.

Accountability Systems. The management process used in the operation of an organization.

Consensus MBO Model. A model developed from common elements identified from MBO models reported in the literature.

Common Element. An activity within an MBO model appearing in several models studied.

Element. An activity within an MBO model.

Evaluation. A process to determine the quality of service for a teacher or administrator.

Management. A process of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling objectives through people.

Management by Objectives (MBO) Model. A series of management procedures consistent with the established management by objectives process and representing a cycle of management activity.

Management by Objectives (MBO) Theory. A theoretical bases upon which the MBO management process was derived.
Operational MBO Model. A model containing all elements appearing at least once in models surveyed in this study and used to identify common elements.

PROCEDURE

The study was a descriptive survey utilizing content analysis. The research methodology included a review of the literature, construction of MBO models for comparison purposes, and development of graphic MBO models depicting the elementary and secondary accountability systems used in the Clark County School District. An operational MBO model was developed from elements in all MBO models identified in the literature. This operational model was used as the basis for comparison and construction of a consensus MBO model which was analyzed to determine the agreement with the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools. Comparison charts were utilized to identify common elements for the MBO consensus model and the agreement between the MBO consensus model and the Clark County Secondary System. Graphic models were developed based on the existing accountability systems used in Clark County School District.

SUMMARY

Chapter 1 presented an overview and background for the problem and purpose of the study. A statement of the problem, questions to be answered, assumptions, limitations, and definition of terms were included. Chapter 2 was an extensive review of the literature which established the status of MBO in education and allowed for identification of MBO models surveyed and necessary
for the development of the consensus MBO model required in this study. Chapter 3 outlined the project design and included the ten business and education models interpreted and translated into common terms. Chapter 4 included the analysis and evaluation of data. Each MBO element was clarified and analyzed on the comparison chart. The consensus MBO model, critical to this study, was located in this chapter. Chapter 5 listed conclusions and recommendations and a summary of findings. Appendices and a bibliography followed to conclude the dissertation.

This study was intended to develop practical information useful in the accountability systems of the Elementary and Secondary Divisions of the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada. Specifically, graphic MBO models may be appropriate to communicate accountability intent and provide a basis for teacher and administrator orientation and inservice. The consensus MBO model developed will validate the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools as a system based on an MBO management process when agreement between the two is determined.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

ACCOUNTABILITY AND MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES

The first exercise in accountability might center on the care and nurture of our children. We are stewards of their education and training. . . . we have gradually dispatched more and more of our personal responsibilities for the young to paid and professional strangers. In the 1970's, we shall account for the stewardship (36, 1970, p. v).

Lessinger was mentioned repeatedly in the accountability movement literature. His words focused on the mood of the times manifested in the late 1970's as educational accountability became a reality at all educational levels. The basic purpose of accountability was to hold educators accountable for the product (30, 1978, p. 449).

Huge sums of money were spent in this country to assure a good education for students; tax dollars were spent for school construction, teacher training, salaries, educational materials, and equipment. Education became one of the nation's largest and most costly industries, yet, the quality of the product was judged increasingly low (37, 1979, p. 257).

Conable reported that schools were headed for serious trouble in the 1980's as the public increased its expectations for accountability. The schools accepted an extraordinary range of goals. The idea of "schools for everything" had a significant impact on the increased public demand for accountability (10, 1976, p. 26).

Bortner stated the demand for educational accountability was an emerging fact of life and listed several reasons for this phenomenon:
1. Tax bills reflected the rising cost of education.
2. The public was dissatisfied with learning results.
3. Education was increasingly necessary for employment.
4. Social changes increased the "tasks" given to schools.

Public mistrust of educational institutions was well documented during the last decade and continued to be expressed as educators struggled to defend themselves. Public dissatisfaction could not be rationalized away; it was based on demands for excellence in educational services (11, 1976, p. 60).

Wellington expressed concern in a booklet entitled "American Education, Its Failure and Future." Education had not provided the quality of learning expected. For the time, effort, and money expended each year, American education failed. This view of education became widespread among lay people interested in education (62, 1977, p. 527).

A need for emphasis on accountability was traced to the ever increasing demand for educational dollars. While the federal government spent billions of dollars, negotiated teacher contracts increased demand on local dollars. Congressional representatives, taxpayers, school board members, and school patrons became concerned over value received and asked the question, "What are we getting for our money?" Educational leaders and teacher organizations assured the public increased financial support meant better schools; however, identifiable educational results did not match educational promises. Attempts at
accountability were manifested in such movements as national assessment, performance contracts, differentiated staffing, and taxpayer reluctance to support education. Bills introduced into state legislatures required statewide testing programs (60, 1979, p. 44).

Accountability reached an extreme in New York State when the State Board of Education announced public high schools could be put on probation and/or lose their state registration for failure to meet minimum performance standards. Junior and senior high schools were expected to maintain minimum dropout and truancy rates (44, 1979, p. 84).

According to Drago, educational accountability was seen as a panacea for solving the concerns of society with national and community well-being (12, 1978, p. 1).

Faced with a demand for educational accountability, Reed reported many school districts in the nation turned "with hope" to a new concept of management referred to as Management by Objectives (MBO). This trend stemmed from a recognition MBO was used in business and industry for several years; success was demonstrated where managers were required to account for company resources (53, 1974, p. 1).

Educational administrators had difficulty determining methods to identify and manage ideas and resources affecting outcomes in education. MBO was seen as a process of management to satisfy the need for accountability in educational organizations (5, 1972, p. 49).

MBO was process oriented and espoused a general approach applicable
to many types of institutions including education. Knezevich reported school administration was described in the literature as a process about 35 years ago. As educational administration emerged as a field of study, many critics categorized administrators as vague and unable to articulate goals of the organization. MBO provided a system for educators to be specific in accounting for educational results (31, 1972, p. 12).

After instituting an MBO system in HEW, Terrel stated school districts could gain much from utilization of this management system as a means for attaining performance accountability. His successful implementation of MBO in a large Utah school district provided administrators with a vehicle for accountability. The inherent requirement for staff involvement in decision making helped utilize the collective wisdom of the entire staff in pointing the direction desired as a school district (2, 1974, p. 355).

Educators throughout the nation realized changes in management techniques were necessary as school operations became more complex. The demand for more effective management caused school districts to consider results-oriented management systems to account for educational programming with limited resources. Boston claimed MBO was a "prudent and responsible plan enabling us to solve actual problems within the school district" (6, 1978, p. 9).

Hitt (23, 1973, p. 103) maintained school systems, like business, needed clearly defined goals. Swainston (58, 1975, p. 6) added MBO offered many advantages to educators and educational institutions as a means for improving management efficiency. By 1977, Guiliano (17, 1977, p. 38) stated MBO had
become one accepted vehicle educators could select to lead them toward meaningful systems of accountability. Hoy concluded MBO became a salient and pervasive innovation and could no longer be considered a fad (27, 1978, p. 126).

The MBO concept reached the proportions of a movement. Several hundred school districts studied, implemented, and operated results-oriented management systems. The literature reported general agreement MBO had tremendous potential for improving the effectiveness of an educational organization (35, 1977, p. 411). In addition, this trend established itself among government units, hospitals, health-care institutions and religious organizations (46, 1976, p. 3).

Methods used to evaluate teachers were judged increasingly inadequate. Gorth reported instruction could be improved by incorporating MBO concepts as a basis for teacher evaluation (16, 1976, p. 81). Performance based objective evaluations became more common. Issues such as merit pay, promotion, tenure, and attention to self-actualizing needs increased the utility of MBO as a process of management (22, 1977, p. 81).
MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES—BACKGROUND AND DEFINITION

Peter Drucker first used the term "Management by Objectives" in his 1954 book, the Practice of Management. The process became a reality in business and industry after World War II as rapid expansion demanded efficiency in management. The increased size of corporations made them unwieldy and provided acceptance for Drucker's concept of decentralization in organizational management. Conglomerates accepted the necessity for MBO in order to exist (34, 1979, p. 7).

The findings of McGregor and Likert in behavior research justified the concept of results management in the business enterprise. Entities among industrialized nations found MBO effective in managing productivity (49, 1974, p. 1).

Credit must be given to Odiorne as the first author to depict MBO as we know it (28, 1965, p. 1). The research by Locke reported goals improved performance and motivated people to work. Coupled with McGregor's and Likert's work, additional motivating factors such as involvement in decision making, shared responsibility, and self-appraisal were evident in the MBO process (9, 1973, p. 2). This prompted a turn to the systems approach defined by Churchman as "a set of parts coordinated to accomplish a set of goals."

Decision making became more complex as it was affected by the growing use of "systems." The behavioral studies forged by McGregor, Likert, and Locke linked behavioral science to the decision making process inherent in MBO. Odiorne asserted these two influences (systems approach and behavioral science) produced a demand that management be functional (get the job done efficiently)
and developmental (meet the human needs of the organizations and people in them). MBO provided for these demands (50, 1979, p. 10).

The progression of MBO was well depicted by a series of analyses universally quoted. Drucker called MBO a philosophy related to a conceptual view of job management and recognized the importance of human action and motivation (14, 1973, p. 442). Terry agreed with the idea motivated people were the most important element required to establish and achieve objectives. He defined management as follows:

"Management is a distinct process consisting of planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling, performed to determine and accomplish stated objectives by the use of human beings and other resources" (59, 1972, p. 4).

Odiorne defined MBO in his 1965 book, Management By Objectives. His definition was universally quoted as MBO literature expanded:

"The system of management by objectives can be described as a process whereby the superior and subordinate managers of an organization jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of the results expected of him, and use those measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members" (28, 1965, p. 55).

Olson (51, 1968, p. 12) and Mali (41, 1972, p. 1) emphasized MBO as a strategy for moving the organization in the direction management desired. Traditional processes of management, characterized by "hunches" or "fads" were rejected in favor of the MBO approach. Humble extended the behavioral science view by referring to a manager's need "to contribute and develop himself personally" (52, 1973, p. 4). Albrecht rejected MBO as a system or procedure to one of a basic mentality in terms of a concept and philosophy designed to
accomplish stated ends. MBO served as a framework for the process of management (1, 1978, p. 4).

During the early stages of evolvement, MBO focused on evaluating supervisors; a relatively simple process, usually directed by the personnel department. MBO extended into the organization's planning and control process with objectives increasingly reflecting budgets. Finally, MBO emerged as a total system designed to integrate key management processes and activities in logical and consistent patterns including the development of organizational goals, problem-solving, decision-making, performance appraisal, executive compensation, manpower planning, and management training (1, 1978, p. 4).

Carroll and Tosi reported most authorities agreed the MBO approach involved the establishment and communication of organizational goals, setting of individual objectives related to the organizational goals, and the periodic and final review of performance as related to the objectives. Other aspects of agreement included effective goal setting at top management levels, organizational commitment to MBO, mutual goal setting, and degree of freedom in developing means for attaining objectives (9, 1973, p. 3).

Mali evolved four basic elements in the MBO concept. Included were goals or objectives, coordination toward identified goals, personal motivation by involvement, and a time strategy or schedule of events. These elements formed the basis of the fundamental principles of managing by objectives. These principles were:

1. Unity of managerial action is more likely to occur when there is
a pursuit of a common objective.

2. The greater the focus and concentration on results one wants to achieve on a time scale, the greater the likelihood of achieving them.

3. The greater the participation in setting meaningful work with an accountability for a result, the greater the motivation for completing it.

4. Progress can be measured in terms of what one is trying to make progress toward (40, 1975, p. 5).

As management styles evolved in business and industry an almost tandem process occurred in the educational community. Educators' interest in MBO began in the early 1970's. Bernabei (3, 1972, p. 11), Boston (7, 1973, p. 1), and Lewis (39, 1974, p. 35) agreed MBO was a process or system of educational management requiring common objectives measured over a period of time. Knezevich emphasized results management was an inherent quality of MBO and described it as:

"... a participative management style that bears a similarity to democratic school administration. Objectives are jointly determined by the subordinate and superior administrators" (33, 1975, p. 196).

A consensus on concept and value of objectives in human enterprise was evident. Clear objectives provided the basis for authority and accountability relationships. Harvey listed three (3) basic elements describing MBO as a concept of management.

1. Planning included setting specific objectives.
2. Managing was designed to accomplish stated objectives.

3. Evaluating objectives was necessary.

The measurable standards of performance were linked to the organization's goals providing administration with a system to be specific and accountable (18, 1976, p. 4).

Educators gradually adapted MBO for use in educational institutions. The underlying principles of MBO in education as reported by Bernabei were:

1. To develop a logical, systematic communication network.

2. To develop mutually agreed upon goals to pursue in the support services for the learner.

3. To identify alternate methods for achieving these goals.

4. To determine the costs related to effective strategies best suited.

5. To appraise more objectively the purpose for each job position within the system (3, 1972, p. 5).

Odiorne included educators in his 1979 book, MBO II. He stated MBO was deceptively simple in its underlying assumption that the first step in managing anything "is to define your objective before you release any resources or spend any time trying to achieve it" (50, 1979, p. 3).

Schools have steadily increased their utilization of MBO. These management techniques were said to hold great significance for assisting management in education.

"MBO holds great promise as a management tool. It is just a process, but the rewards that can accrue to students are well worth the effort of making it work..." (15, 1979, p. 416).
MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES--THEORY

MBO as a management process assumed if employees were allowed increased responsibility for developing personal goals in relation to the organizations' goals, autonomy in achieving those goals, and methods for evaluating their achievement, workers would have more commitment and be more effective in their jobs. The conditions prevailed in Maslow's higher order needs, Herzburg's motivator factors, and McGregor's Theory Y. This research established a theoretical base for MBO (27, 1978, p. 128).

A framework to explain the strength of certain needs was developed by Maslow and a hierarchy existed into which human needs arranged themselves. This hierarchy is represented in Figure 1 which follows (52, 1974, p. 87).
Figure 1. The Hierarchy of Needs

Physiological Needs
- Sex
- Thirst
- Hunger

Security Needs
- Shelter
- Safety

Social Needs
- To belong
- To love
- To be loved

Ego Needs
- Esteem of others
- Esteem of self

Self-Actualizing Needs
- To fulfill one's potential
- To grow and develop
- To be creative
Physiological needs were the most basic to man. Until these needs were satisfied, nothing else occurred. Higher level needs were inoperative when lower needs were not fulfilled. Once psychological needs were met, security needs began to dominate behavior and motivation. These were safety needs, essentially self-preservation and protection against danger and deprivation. Social needs created a desire for gratification in worthwhile associations with others. These social needs created a feeling of deprivation if not satisfied. Above social needs were ego needs. The need for independence, accomplishment, self-worth, competence, reputation, appreciation, and status needed satisfaction. Ego needs were never really satisfied as man continuously sought to satisfy ego once it became important. The capstone of man's hierarchy was the need for self-actualization or self-fulfillment. Realizing one's full potential and developing through challenging and creating were considered important. As Maslow expressed it, "What a man can be, he must be" (45, 1954, pp. 80-91).

An individual's behavior at a particular moment was usually determined by his strongest need. Managers, therefore, needed a better understanding of the hierarchy of needs. The prominence of specific motives among employees was useful; however, not all people were motivated in the same way and individual differences needed consideration (21, 1972, p. 38).

Herzberg's "dual-factor" approach provided management with additional insight into the relationship between the individual and his work environment. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory resulted from a series of studies about job attitudes in various organizations. Herzburg concluded man has two sets of needs.
The first stemmed from an "animal nature" and included an inherent drive to avoid unpleasantness. The other set of needs was characterized by the necessity to achieve and to experience psychological growth. The "dual-factor" theory postulated that one set of factors (motivators) produced satisfaction, but another set (hygiene) produced dissatisfaction.

Motivator factors included achievement, recognition for achievement, the nature of the work itself, responsibility, and opportunity for growth and advancement and contributed most to job satisfaction and superior performance. Motivators provided an opportunity for individual growth, improved performance, and were intrinsic to the job itself.

Hygiene factors included company policies and administration, technical supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, money, status, or security. They were extrinsic to the job and related to the conditions under which the work was done. When satisfied, hygiene factors eliminated or prevented dissatisfaction but did little to motivate an individual.

Herzberg's hygiene factors related to Maslow's lower-level needs (social, security, and psychological) while motivators related to higher level needs (ego and self-actualization) (52, 1974, pp. 92-95).

Bernabei discussed Herzberg's "Dual Factors." The two dimensions of job attitudes reflected a two-dimensional need structure:

1. A need system for personal growth.
2. A need system for avoidance of unpleasantness.

Positive job attitudes were directly related to psychological growth and
the fulfillment of self-actualizing needs. Growth was dependent on achievements; achievement required a task. Attention to hygiene needs was important because without it, organizations tended to reap unhappy personnel. The error lay in the assumption "... prevention will unleash positive feelings and manpower efficiency" (3, 1972, pp. 3-4).

McGregor's classic work, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, pointed out the need to tap the unrealized potential of human resources. Successful management recognized that organizing and directing people's efforts toward company goals was important. McGregor stated that, "every managerial act rests on theory."

However, he recognized managers or supervisors operated from a gut level without regard to theory in terms of human behavior. This practice of proceeding without explicit examination of theoretical assumptions led to remarkable inconsistencies in managerial behavior. McGregor advocated using new knowledge in the social sciences to assist in the process of management (47, 1960, p. 9).

Traditional organization with its centralized decision making, super-subordinate pyramid, and external control of work was based upon assumptions about human nature and motivation. McGregor's Theory X assumed most people preferred to be directed, were not interested in assuming responsibility, and wanted safety above all. This philosophy included the assumption people were motivated by money, fringe benefits, and the threat of punishment. Theory X managers attempted to structure, control, and supervise employees closely. External control was appropriate for working with unreliable, irresponsible, and immature people (21, 1972, p. 46).
Theory X explained the consequences of managerial strategy and prevented the use of other more effective management strategies. Management by objectives was difficult to incorporate within Theory X because it was derived from inaccurate assumptions about human nature (47, 1960, p. 42).

McGregor felt that management practices needed consideration to understanding the nature of man and human motivation. McGregor's Theory Y assumed people were not, by nature, lazy and unreliable but rather basically self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. Management's essential task was to liberate this potential, assuming a properly motivated worker achieved goals best by directing his efforts toward organizational goals.

Managers who accepted Theory Y did not structure, control, and supervise the workers' environment closely, but attempted to help their employees mature by allowing less external control. Employees were able to satisfy Maslow's higher order needs (social, esteem, and self-actualization) in an environment reflecting Theory Y (21, 1972, p. 47).

"The assumptions of Theory Y point up the fact that the limits on human collaboration in the organizational setting are not limits of human nature but of management's ingenuity in discovering how to realize the potential represented by its human resources" (47, 1960, p. 48).

Jun reported existing literature supported the idea participative management increased individual motivation toward organizational objectives and increased job satisfaction. Participative management was not a panacea; but was compatible to the MBO process where results were expected (29, 1976, p. 3).

Bernabei concluded school systems using human beings effectively treated them in terms of their complete nature. Schools could not continue to perpetuate
a half-conceptual view of man since no institution remained successful if it over-
determined the control of man's creativity and his achievement nature (3, 1972, p. 4).

"Every managerial decision has behavioral consequences. Successful management depends—not alone—but significantly—upon the ability to predict and control human behavior" (47, 1960, p. 4).
Drucker believed self-control was a distinct advantage for implementing MBO:

"The greatest advantage of management by objectives is perhaps that it makes it possible for a manager to control his own performance. Self-control means stronger motivation: a desire to do the best rather than just enough to get by" (13, 1954, p. 392).

Knezevich asserted school administrators were busy but often preoccupied with the wrong things. Menial activities contributed to losing touch with the central purposes of an educational institution. MBO offered a way to minimize such tendencies by "switching the focus from activities to results" (31, 1972, p. 15).

Varney stated MBO added flexibility to the organization and allowed more involvement leading to increased productivity. Individuals understood the direction the organization was taking and developed a greater degree of commitment (61, 1971, p. 14).

Without setting goals and objectives for the educational institution, Hostrop maintained negative outcomes occurred. Results could not be assessed without clear expectations. Personnel could not function at maximum effectiveness since no one could succeed in the absence of directed purpose. MBO provided a means for professionals to measure their true contributions, improved problem solving, eliminated evaluation based on personality, determined span of control, and provided a basis for promotion and merit pay (25, 1975, p. 179).

Raia reported an MBO implementation in a Southern California school
district where overall productivity and communication increased by involving staff with identification of district goals. Sophisticated program assessment was realized as more orderly priorities were established and communicated (52, 1975, pp. 164-165).

Educators used MBO initially as a management tool for top administrators. Advantages for improving personnel evaluation surfaced quickly. Burke maintained clinical supervision of teachers required a systematic method of implementation to realize its potential benefits. Techniques and methodology inherent in the MBO process suggested great value in improving the "nature and rate of application of clinical supervision" (8, 1977, p. 29).

Spillane believed principals effected better control using MBO and reduced the tendency to blame problems on central administration. Tension associated with the supervisory process was relieved because supervisors and teachers knew what was expected. In dismissal cases, teachers were "at least aware the action was not capricious" (57, 1978, p. 25).

A Colorado school district reported many believed higher achievement test scores were due partly to results of MBO. The values of the MBO model were implemented in a day-to-day manner with great collective impact (42, 1979, p. 38). On the other hand, limitations were reported for some institutions utilizing MBO. According to Levinson, MBO was "one of the greatest managerial illusions." Personnel evaluation was self-defeating because it was based on a reward-punishment psychology serving to increase pressure on an individual while limiting his choice of objectives. Although not rejecting MBO, the
author contended improvement was possible by examining the underlying assumptions about motivation, extending group goal-setting and appraisal, evaluation of superiors by subordinates, and considering personal goals of the individual first (38, 1970, p. 134).

Steers reported in a 1974 study MBO was not equally effective for all employees. Clear, well-defined goals were established. By comparing goal attainment to personalities, individuals with high achievement needs performed better when faced with specific goals while those with a low achievement need did not improve. Other disadvantages included difficulty in measuring educational outcomes, lack of professional management expertise, fear of MBO accountability, and unwillingness to provide rewards and punishments for results (63, 1976, p. 112).

A position paper, "Is MBO The Way To Go?" published by the National Education Association, viewed MBO negatively. Teachers took a cautious stance citing reluctance in accepting MBO was due to administrators neglecting to involve teachers in the goal-setting process (56, 1976, p. 44).

Kennedy stated MBO was future-oriented and a margin of error existed in all forecasts. Other limitations included natural resistance to change, communicating to all levels, developing unified goals securing initial commitment, and fearing loss of individuality (42, 1979, p. 37).

Problems related to the implementation of MBO as discussed by Herman indicated school districts implemented MBO without adequate inservice. As MBO was adopted and traditional management systems were dropped, insecurities
among employees increased. Writing appropriate objectives was a difficult task for most administrators. Open and honest supervisory conferences sometimes proved difficult especially for those who commonly resisted any type of change (20, 1979, p. 56).

MBO critics claimed many individuals were not ready to assume increased responsibility and self-discipline. Administrators were burdened with increased paperwork. Abstract educational goals did not lend themselves to MBO and, finally, emphasis on quantitative evaluation resulted in neglect of other responsibilities (27, 1978, p. 131).

"There is a considerable amount of evidence that management by objectives is an excellent way to manage human and non-human resources. Properly implemented, it can improve organizational effectiveness and health. But it is not a panacea. Neither its successes nor its failures can be attributed to any single element or thing. Like any other management system, it can be no more effective than the way it is used" (52, 1974, p. 172).
Odiorne's, Spillane's, and Knezevich's works represented typical business and education MBO models reported in the literature. Odiorne's MBO model (1965) depicted a cycle of management by objectives universally quoted by authors writing about MBO in the business world. Odiorne's model was also referenced by education authors and a thread of commonality was evident throughout all models surveyed in this study. Odiorne used a graphic approach to communicate his model which follows:
Revisions in organization structure

Superior sets down goals and measures for subordinates

Subordinate proposes goals and measures for his job

Organization's common goals and measures of performance

Joint agreement on subordinate's goals

Feedback and Change

Feedback of interim results against milestones

New Inputs

Cumulative periodic review of subordinate results against targets

Knockout of inappropriate goals

START AGAIN

Review of organization performance

5(b)
Some MBO models reported in the literature were presented in graphic form, however, some like Spillane used an outline format listing basic steps in the New Rochelle (New Jersey) School District MBO accountability system as follows: (57, 1978, pp. 19-21).

1. Annual district-wide goals are set by the board of education in consultation with superintendent, principals, central office, staff, students, and community.

2. Principals submit their goals during budget preparation so that institutional goals are compatible with available resources.

3. Goals and objectives are set for each school. Principals and the teachers each identify their objectives.
   a. Routine objectives (daily operation).
   b. Problem solving objectives.
   c. Innovative objectives (new approach, new curriculum).
   d. Personal objectives.

4. Objectives must meet the following criteria:
   a. Resources needed to implement.
   b. How objective will be implemented.
   c. How objective will be measured.
   d. Target dates.
   e. Agreement on objectives with supervisor.
   f. Evaluation.
   g. Establish new objectives.

Knezevich developed a General MBO Model in his 1974 book, Management By Objectives and Results—A Guide For Today's School Executive, which was theoretical in nature. Although this was not an operational model in a public school system, it did represent one of the first MBO models to be reported in the educational literature (32, 1974, p. 17).
Figure 3. Knezevich MBO Model

- Define organizational goals
- Identify performance indicators and standards (for goals)
- Set division objectives consistent with goals
- Identify performance indicators and set standards (for objectives)
- Define operational objectives for units (or individuals); set performance indicators and standards
- Assess feasibility of performance objective (time, cost)
- Determine alternative strategies for performance objective
- Analyze feasibility of strategy
- Select operational strategy
- Refine work plans and tasks
- Design results management subsystem
- Monitor operations
- Evaluate performance and audit results

RECYCLING: Redefine goals, objectives, performance indicators and standards, assignments, alternatives, strategies and results management
SUMMARY

Educational accountability emerged as a fact of life for educational institutions as the public demanded excellence in the delivery of educational services. Concern that educational results did not match educational promises led many school districts to the concept of management by objectives as a process to demonstrate educational accountability. Success of MBO in business, industry, government entities, and educational organizations accelerated.

The theoretical basis for MBO originated in the works of Maslow, Herzburg, and McGregor. The concept of MBO and value of objectives in human enterprise reached consensus in the literature.

Although several limitations in implementing an MBO system as a process of management were reported, there were a great number of distinct advantages. By communicating the goals of the organization, employees were more likely to be committed and improved job performance; considerable evidence indicated MBO was an excellent way to manage human and non-human resources.
CHAPTER 3
PROJECT DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine the agreement between a consensus MBO model and the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools. Common elements in selected MBO models were identified in the research design to answer the questions of this study. MBO models commonly reported in the literature were used as representative models from business and education. This chapter identified the research approach and the procedures used to collect and analyze the data used to answer the problems stated in Chapter 1.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH APPROACH

A descriptive research approach was utilized throughout the study to systematically describe common elements in various MBO models. Identification of common elements using content analysis provided the basis for construction of a consensus MBO model to determine agreement with a model being utilized in the Clark County School District.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Because of the large number of MBO models reported in the literature, representative models were selected from business and education which were
commonly reported and developed by well-known authors. The study utilized five (5) business MBO models beginning with Odiorne's universally quoted model published in 1965 and five (5) education MBO models theoretical or operational in 1980.

An operational model was constructed composed of MBO elements which appeared at least once in any MBO model utilized in the study. The operational model thus served as a composite checklist or grouping of unique elements for the purpose of comparison with each of the ten models surveyed.

Using the operational model as a checklist, a comparison was done to determine the correspondence of each MBO element among the ten models utilized in the study. When an individual element appeared in at least six of the models, it was identified as a common element and became part of the consensus MBO model. This model was compared to the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools to determine agreement.

MBO MODELS SURVEYED

The literature reported MBO models in schematic outline or narrative form. To facilitate the formation of the operational checklist and the corresponding comparison, each MBO model utilized in the study was interpreted and translated into a numerical list of elements using common terms.

Shager, in his 1972 book, Fundamentals of Educational Research, regarded interpretation as a valuable contribution to research by stating analysis and des-
cription of patterns contributed toward formation of coherent educational theory (55, 1971, p. 56). Because of the different terminology employed by each author, a common term or statement was selected to communicate an identified common element from the models surveyed.

Business MBO models were selected for identification and comparison of common elements and included Odiorne's 1965 universally quoted model. Humble and Raia's models were theoretical in nature and were in close agreement with Odiorne. Mali and Albrecht were characterized as "how to" models and were specifically oriented towards establishing an MBO system in an enterprise.

1. George S. Odiorne, 1965—Model A.
2. John W. Humble, 1973—Model B.
3. Anthony P. Raia, 1974—Model C.
4. Paul Mali, 1975—Model D.
5. Karl Albrecht, 1978—Model E.

Education theoretical models were represented by Knezevich's contribution which also referred to Odiorne's original work. Bernabei and Hostrop presented theoretical models including specific implementation information while Spillane and Clark County School District were operational models used in public school systems.

1. Raymond Bernabei and Sam Leles, 1972—Model F.
2. Stephen J. Knezevich, 1974—Model G.

Elements in each model were interpreted for meaning and translated into common terminology. This process allowed for a comparison among models using the common terminology and was critical to the identification of common elements included in the consensus MBO model. The following models were reported in common terms and were identified by author and alphabetical character after Odiorne's Model A was reported in common terms. Any element not appearing in Odiorne's model or in subsequent models was asterisked to indicate first appearance. The original narrative or schematic drawing of each model was reported in the Appendix of this study.


1. Organizations' goals identified
2. Specific objectives for subunits stated
3. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
4. Organizations' structure revised to facilitate goals
5. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
6. Target dates selected
8. Cumulative evaluation of results
9. Review of organizations' performance
10. Recycle

11. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted


*1. Organization needs assessment conducted
2. Organization's goals identified
3. Specific objectives for subunits stated
4. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
5. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
6. Organization's structure revised to facilitate goals
*7. Action plan for achieving results formulated
8. Target dates selected
*9. Participation and motivation for achieving results solicited
10. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate objectives
*11. Personnel with potential for advancement identified
*12. Management training program planned
13. Cumulative evaluation of results
14. Recycle
*15. Managers' motivation increased by appropriate compensation and career planning
16. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted

1. Organization's goals identified
2. Specific objectives for subunits stated
3. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
4. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
5. Action plan for achieving results formulated
6. Target dates selected
7. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate objectives
8. Cumulative evaluation of results
9. Management training program planned
10. Manager's motivation increased by appropriate compensation and career planning
11. Recycle
12. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted


1. Organization's needs assessment conducted
2. Organization's goals identified
3. Specific objectives for subunits stated
4. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
5. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
6. Validation of objectives (risks and potential errors analyzed)
7. Action plan for achieving results formulated
8. Target dates selected
9. Participation and motivation in achieving results solicited
10. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate objectives
11. Management training program planned
12. Cumulative evaluation of results
13. Recycle
14. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted


1. Organization's needs assessment conducted
*2. Trends and change processes affecting organization identified
3. Organization's goals identified
4. Specific objectives for subunits stated
5. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
6. Superior and subordinate agree on objectives and measures of performance
7. Action plan for achieving results formulated
8. Target dates selected
9. Organization's structure revised to facilitate goals
10. Participation and motivation for achieving results solicited
11. Management training program planned
12. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate goals

13. Cumulative evaluation of results

14. Recycle

15. Manager's motivation increased by appropriate compensation and career planning

16. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted


1. Organization's needs assessment conducted

2. *Describe job functions

3. Organization's goals identified

4. Specific objectives for subunits stated

5. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated

6. *Weight and priority for each objective identified

7. Superior and subordinate agree on objectives and measures of performance

8. Action plan for achieving results formulated

9. Target dates selected

10. *Resources needed for each objective allocated

11. *Cost for each task determined

12. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate objectives

13. Cumulative evaluation of results
14. Recycle
15. Management training program planned
16. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted

MBO MODEL G—Knezevich, 1974.
1. Organization's goals identified
2. Specific objectives for subunits stated
3. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
4. Cost analysis completed for objectives selected
5. Target dates selected
6. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
*7. Alternative action plans formulated
8. Action plan for achieving results formulated
*9. Monitoring system designed
10. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate goals
11. Cumulative evaluation of results
12. Recycle
13. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted

MBO MODEL H—Hostrop, 1975.
1. Organization's goals identified
2. Revisions in organization's structure to facilitate goals
3. Specific objectives for subunits stated
4. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
5. Supervisors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
6. Target dates selected
7. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate goals
8. Cumulative evaluation of results
9. Review of organization's performance
10. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted
11. Recycle


1. Organization's goals identified
2. Specific objectives stated for subunits
3. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
4. Cost analysis completed for objectives selected
5. Supervisors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
6. Action plan for achieving results formulated
7. Target dates selected
8. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate goals
9. Cumulative evaluation of results
10. Recycle
11. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted


1. Organization's goals identified
2. Needs assessment
3. Specific objectives for subunits
4. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
5. Supervisors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
6. Action plan for achieving results formulated
7. Target dates selected
8. Monitoring system designed
9. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate goals
10. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted
11. Management training program planned
12. Recycle

After the ten preceding models were interpreted and translated into common terms for reporting and comparison purposes, any elements that appeared at least once in the ten models reported were listed in an MBO operational model. This operational model was utilized as the point of comparison with the models in the study and displayed on an MBO comparison. The MBO operational model
was constructed as follows:

1. Trends and change processes affecting organization identified
2. Organization needs assessment conducted
3. Organization's goals identified
4. Job functions identified
5. Organization’s structure revised to facilitate goals
6. Specific objectives for subunits stated
7. Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated
8. Action plan for achieving results formulated
9. Alternative action plans formulated
10. Validation of objectives (risks and potential errors)
11. Resources needed for each objective allocated
12. Cost for each task determined
13. Weight and priority for each objective identified
14. Target dates selected
15. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance
16. Participation and motivation for results solicited
17. Monitoring system designed
18. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate objectives
19. Cumulative evaluation of results
20. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted
21. Personnel with potential for advancement identified

22. Manager's motivation increased by appropriate compensation and career planning

23. Review of organization's performance

24. Recycle

25. Management training program planned

For the purposes of comparison, the Clark County Secondary Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools model was interpreted and translated into common terms. This model was then compared to the consensus MBO model, to determine agreement for each element. A comparison displayed the agreement between the two models. The translated Secondary Clark County model follows:

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT—MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS, 1980 (44, 1980).

1. Organization's goals identified

2. Organization's needs assessment conducted

3. Specific objectives for subunits stated

4. Action plan for achieving results formulated

5. Measure of performance for goals and objectives stated

6. Target dates selected

7. Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance

8. Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal
of inappropriate objectives

9. Cumulative evaluation of results

10. Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted

11. Recycle

12. Management training program planned

This preceding model was used to determine agreement with the MBO consensus model and was displayed on a comparison chart.

**SUMMARY**

This chapter identified the research approach, listed the steps utilized in the research design, and reported the MBO business and education models interpreted and translated into common terms for use in this study.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

MBO models in business and education shared a commonality that was identified and reported. Data analyzed were displayed in a comparison chart utilizing elements taken from ten different business and education MBO models (See Figure 4). The common elements identified formed the consensus MBO model used to determine agreement with the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools.

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

Interpretation and translation of MBO models utilized in this study identified twenty-five elements each of which appeared at least once in the MBO models analyzed. Elements that appeared in six of the ten models studied constituted a simple majority and therefore were declared to be common and made part of the consensus MBO model. Each element is further elaborated upon, for clarity, on the following pages. The consensus MBO model follows, and a comparison of the consensus MBO model and the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools model concludes the chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>MODEL:</th>
<th>Common Element Consensus MBO Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Needs Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Goals of Organization</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Job Functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Revision Organization</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Objectives for Subunits</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Measures of Performance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Action Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Alternative Action Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Validation of Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Resources Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cost Per Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Weight/Prioritize Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Target Dates</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superiors/Subordinates</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Motivation Solicited</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Monitoring System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Interim Evaluation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Cumulative Evaluation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Personnel Performance</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Advancement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Compensation/Career Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Review Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Recycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Management Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELEMENT 1:

Trends and change processes affecting organization identified. Albrecht's and Mali's models were the only ones requiring examination of trends. Since management was future oriented, some margin of error existed if trends and change processes were determined too far in advance. The MBO cycle was completed and recycled annually in all models researched making prediction of trends difficult on a yearly basis. This was not a common element.

ELEMENT 2:

Organization needs assessment conducted. Six models designated needs assessment as necessary in order for other steps in the MBO process to occur. The planning function of management could not take place without attention to the status and evaluation of organizational effort. The last step in the MBO process was to recycle and renew the cycle; needs assessment was an integral part of the information base required to select new or ongoing organizational goals and objectives. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 3:

Organization's goals identified. All models required identification of organization's goals. A major premise of MBO was the concept of setting goals at the highest levels so specific objectives could be determined aimed at accomplishing the goals or mission of the organization.
This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 4:

Job Functions identified. Bernabei's model was the only one requiring identification of job functions. Since MBO was a process of management, an organization's personnel could implement MBO without drastic changes in individual job functions and responsibilities.

ELEMENT 5:

Revisions in organization's structure to facilitate goals. Although three business models and one education model called for revision in the organization's structure, this was not identified as a common element. The same rationale applied here as in Element 4, namely, MBO was a process of management and existing personnel could implement MBO without extensive changes in individual job functions or organization revision.

ELEMENT 6:

Specific objectives for subunits stated. All models required subunits to identify objectives based on the general goals of the organization. Sub-units included divisions, departments, schools, administrators, managers, or teachers. Specific objectives ranged from broad-based objectives to individual or personal objectives dependent on type or size of the organization. The essence of MBO as a process of management required the setting of objectives to ensure movement and progress toward an end;
the absence of which contributed to stagnation or nonproductive status for an organizational entity. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 7:

Measures of performance for goals and objectives stated. All models required an evaluation design for each goal and objective identified. In order to recognize whether or not an objective was accomplished, measurement was required stated in terms of profit, test scores, implemented plan, completed project, etc. Difficulty in measurement of educational goals and objectives was reported as a limitation of the MBO process in the literature. However, there were a large number of areas that did lend themselves to measurement making MBO a viable management process for service organizations, such as, government, health care institutions, religious orders, or educational institutions. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 8:

Action plan for achieving results formulated. Eight of the ten models surveyed required a specific, written plan for carrying out the identified goal or objective. An action plan allowed for discussion of logistics required to achieve an objective, hence pitfalls could be identified and alternatives used, if necessary. The action plan served as a means to illustrate the entire plan from beginning to end.

Careful planning at this point accomplished one of the advantages of
MBO— to cause planning in an organized manner that could be communicated to all levels of the organization. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 9:

Alternative Action plans formulated. Only two models called specifically for alternative action plans after the objective was identified. In order to select an action plan initially, various methods were considered which in reality constituted alternatives. Alternative action plans were not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 10:

Validation of objectives. One model required validation of objectives. Validation was used to predict risks or analyze potential errors in the objectives and action plans selected for implementation. This element was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 11:

Resources needed for each objective allocated. Two models required identification of resources as part of the action plan. Although not identified as a common element, this element received scrutiny when the objectives or goals were identified initially. All entities must operate within their allocated resources, to do otherwise would be mismanagement and not inherent in MBO as a process of management. This was not identified as a common element.
ELEMENT 12:

Cost for each task determined. Three education MBO models called for a cost per task in the action plan. This was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 13:

Weight and priority for each objective identified. Weighing and prioritizing each objective was called for in Bernabei’s model only. When objectives for subunits were identified, the MBO process generally required an analysis or needs assessment of the organization. Information revealed by a needs assessment tended to prioritize the direction of the organization and affected selection of objectives. This was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 14:

Target dates selected. All models surveyed mandated selection of target dates for goal or objective accomplishment. Introduction of the time element to focus attention on the action plan and draw closure for each stated objective was a crucial aspect of the MBO process. Although an objective could be recycled and continued, the time line served as a reference point for interim or cumulative evaluation of progress toward results. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 15:

Superiors and subordinates agree on objectives and measures of performance.
Agreement between supervisor and subordinate was essential based on the theoretical framework for MBO. The works of Herzburg, Maslow, Likert, and McGregor reinforced the concept of participatory management. All models in the study required agreement on the objectives selected and the measures of performance used to evaluate progress. The total action plan for each objective, in fact, was jointly reviewed, discussed, altered as appropriate, and therefore committed for positive action on the part of each subordinate with the respective superior. Odiorne recognized this requirement in his original model and the concept continued in all subsequent MBO models. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 16:

Participation and motivation for results solicited. All five business models identified participation and motivation as a formal step in the quest to obtain desired results. Although the five education models did not list this step, the theoretical base for MBO suggested that self-actualization and motivation to work towards the goals of the organization were inherent in the MBO process itself. The ability of private enterprise to use monetary rewards for effective participation and motivation was perhaps one reason why the business models required this element while the education models did not. This was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 17:

Monitoring system designed. Only two education models delineated a
formal monitoring system as a required step in the MBO process. However, interim evaluation in essence accomplished the same purpose. This was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 18:

Interim evaluation of progress toward results, new inputs, removal of inappropriate objectives. Interim evaluation was a necessary step in all models studied. This type of evaluation provided flexibility to the subordinate and the superior so that progress to date could be examined, as well as utilizing any new input to modify a particular objective. Any inappropriate objectives could be removed and new ones added without compromising the continuing MBO process. Inflexible objectives tended to violate the MBO theory of participative management; fear of making a mistake in initial selection of objectives would tend to reduce the creative aspects and contribute to a meaningless choice of objectives during the next cycle. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 19:

Cumulative evaluation of results. Cumulative evaluation was required in all models. One year was universally accepted as the logical time span; and resulted in evaluation of results for each objective selected plus a personnel performance appraisal for the individual. The MBO process required an evaluation of results based on specific action plans for each goal or objective. After cumulative evaluation took place, the
information was used to initiate a new cycle. Needs assessment data was coupled with the evaluation of each objective to generate the beginning of next year's MBO process. Cumulative evaluation was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 20:

Personnel performance appraisal based on objectives conducted. Historically the MBO process was essentially a performance appraisal system. This element remained intact and was required by all models surveyed. Performance appraisal based on results eliminated evaluation based on personality traits or environmental factors. Both superiors and subordinates understood the objectives being sought and could evaluate on that premise. This was identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 21:

Personnel with potential for advancement identified. Humble's model was the only one who required identification of personnel for advancement purposes as a formal step in the MBO process. This was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 22:

Managers' motivation by appropriate compensation and career planning completed. Three business models tied manager motivation, compensation, and career planning directly to the MBO process. The literature reported one limitation of MBO was the failure of educational institutions to make
decisions in these areas based on measured results. Although merit pay was not a widespread educational practice, a trend in this direction was evidenced especially at high administrative levels. This was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 23:

Review of organization's performance. Two MBO models required formal review of the organization's performance as a formal process before recycling. No needs assessment was called for in either model, thus a review of the organization's performance would include similar data regarding the direction to follow as the recycling process commenced. Therefore, needs assessment or review was required in eight MBO models. Review of organization's performance was not identified as a common element.

ELEMENT 24:

Recycle. All models surveyed required recycling of the entire MBO process, usually at year's end. Recycling provided for continuity, drew closure for cumulative evaluation, allowed for periodic needs assessment, and kept the organization moving towards its goals. Recycling was identified as a common element. Although recycle was stated toward the end of each MBO model, recycling could occur during the formation of the action plan as inappropriate or costly objectives were reviewed and deleted from actual implementation.
ELEMENT 25:

*Management training program planned.* Six MBO models required management training to facilitate the attainment of organizational goals and objectives. Corporate training and staff development in education were recognized as necessary with trends in both areas reflecting concern for improved training programs.

The twenty-five elements reported are displayed on the Comparison Chart, MBO Models. Elements were declared present or absent in each MBO model surveyed with elements represented in six models declared common, and, therefore, became part of the consensus MBO model.
The consensus MBO model, Figure 5, was developed from the operational model whose elements are listed in the comparison chart preceding. Nine of the twenty-five elements appeared in all ten MBO models surveyed in this study. These nine common elements formed the major part of the consensus MBO model and were listed as follows:

1. Goals of organization
2. Objectives for subunits
3. Measures of performance
4. Target dates
5. Superiors/subordinates agree
6. Interim evaluation
7. Cumulative evaluation
8. Personnel performance appraisal
9. Recycle

The other three common elements included in the MBO consensus model were:

1. Needs assessment (appeared in 6 models)
2. Action plan (appeared in 8 models)
3. Management training (appeared in 6 models)

Although some elements were not specifically identified as common elements, they were subsumed within an identified common element. As examples of this occurrence, trends were included in needs assessment. Job functions, revision of organization structure, personnel advancement, and compensation/
career planning were included in personnel performance appraisal or management training. Alternative action plans, validation of objectives, weight/prioritize objectives were part of the process when superiors/subordinates agree. A monitoring system was inherent in interim or cumulative evaluation.

The Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools was analyzed and a graphic model was developed (Figure 6). This model was compared to the consensus MBO model to determine agreement between MBO models and the Clark County School District model.

Results of the comparison, Figure 7, reveal total agreement between the consensus MBO model and the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools. This model, therefore, was compatible to representative MBO models from business and education.
Figure 5. Consensus MBO Model
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus MBO Model</th>
<th>CCSD Secondary System Model</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Organization's Needs Assessment Conducted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Goals</td>
<td>Organizational Goals Identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Objectives for Subunits</td>
<td>Specific Objectives for Subunits Stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Action Plan</td>
<td>Action Plan for Achieving Results Formulated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Measures of Performance</td>
<td>Measures of Performance for Goals and Objectives Stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Superiors and Subordinates Agree</td>
<td>Superiors and Subordinates Agree on Objectives and Measures of Performance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Target Dates</td>
<td>Target Dates Selected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interim Evaluation</td>
<td>Interim Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cumulative Evaluation</td>
<td>Cumulative Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recycle</td>
<td>Recycle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personnel Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>Personnel Performance Appraisal Based On Objectives Conducted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Management Training and Staff Development</td>
<td>Management Training Program Planned</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the purpose and findings, the procedures utilized to collect and analyze the data, and conclusions derived from this research. Recommendations are submitted with the purpose of improving the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools as a viable Management by Objectives process.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Management by objectives was used widely in educational institutions where accountability for results was required in response to ever increasing pressures from the general public. The purpose of this study was to develop graphic MBO models for existing management and accountability systems in the Elementary and Secondary Divisions of the Clark County School District. In addition, selected MBO models were analyzed to develop a consensus MBO model from business and education which could be used to validate any MBO accountability system, or specifically in this study, the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools. The critical questions pertaining to this study follows:

What agreement existed between MBO models and the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools?
In addition, the following specific questions were addressed:

1. What are the theoretical bases for MBO?

2. Which MBO models can be identified that have applicability for a system of educational accountability?

3. What common elements in business and education MBO models can be identified to serve as a basis for comparison?

4. How does a consensus MBO model agree with the elements of the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools?

5. What implications for further study of the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools exists?

The design of this study called for review of the literature for the purpose of establishing a background on educational accountability and to define and address management by objectives as a management process in educational institutions. MBO models in business and education were identified in the literature and used to form the basis of comparison for several models both theoretical and operational. In addition, the theoretical basis upon which MBO was derived was examined.

This research was a descriptive survey. Content analysis was used to translate and interpret common elements from ten business and education MBO models into common terms for the purpose of creating an operational model which was used to determine common elements for a consensus MBO model. A graphic
model of the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Elementary Schools was developed and became one of the models utilized in this study for comparison purposes. A comparison was used to identify the elements for the consensus MBO model. After the consensus MBO model was developed, the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools was analyzed and a graphic MBO model was designed. These two models were examined and compared to determine agreement between the two. The review of the literature and the findings in the comparisons formed the basis for the conclusions in this study.

A series of recommendations is also offered in this chapter to strengthen and improve the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Research findings and answers to questions posed in this study were determined by a review of the literature or content analysis of business and education MBO models compiled in appropriate comparisons. The review of the literature provided the following summary data:

1. Public education was under intense pressure from taxpayers and parents to provide accountability for results which were characterized as poor and inappropriate in comparison to the tax dollars spent to support educational institutions.

2. Faced with a demand for educational accountability, educational entities in increasing numbers adopted a management by objectives
management style in order to communicate educational goals and results to the public while improving the internal management process of the institution.

3. The continued success of MBO in the business world demonstrated to educators the high possibility for success with this management concept.

4. MBO as a management process was based on the system's approach and findings in behavioral science which stressed the necessity for nurturing human resources in order to get the job done functionally and efficiently.

5. Although limitations for using MBO as a management process existed, the advantages were abundant and especially useful to an educational institution.

6. Numerous business and education models existed in the literature from which comparisons and consensus could be derived.

The comparisons provided the following summary data:

1. Twenty-five elements were identified from among ten business and education MBO models and formed the operational MBO model.

2. Nine elements were common to all MBO models surveyed and formed the basis for the resultant consensus MBO model.

3. Different authors used a variety of terms to delineate specific elements in their respective MBO models but further clarified
their intent and purpose for each element in the narrative.

4. Odiorne's MBO model, originally published in 1965, was modified by several authors, however, the major part of his work was represented in all MBO models surveyed.

5. A consensus MBO model containing twelve elements was developed from among the ten business and education models analyzed in this study.

6. All elements in the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools were included in the consensus MBO model developed in this study.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions reached in this study resulted from a review of the literature and the compilation of comparisons utilizing business and education MBO models. The following conclusions were reached:

1. A management process based on the principles of management by objectives derived from the business world was a suitable means for managing schools and communicating results to the public.

2. The importance of people to an organization was judged as critical. MBO provided a means to deal effectively with people on a professional and productive basis while accomplishing the goals and objectives of the organization.

3. Each element of the Clark County School District's Management
and Accountability System for Secondary Schools was in agreement with the consensus MBO model developed in this study. Therefore, the Clark County School District's Secondary model was verified as a legitimate MBO model. Elements common to ten different business and education MBO models were part of the Clark County School District Secondary Division management process and compatible with management processes used in business as well as educational institutions or other organizations incorporating MBO.

4. The Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools was developed and is consistent with the theoretical framework upon which the MBO management process was derived. Management strategies consistent with the system's approach and utilization of human resources compatible with the theories in modern motivational research were present in the Clark County School District's Secondary model studied.

5. The resultant consensus MBO model developed in this study should be considered by school districts seeking to incorporate an MBO management process or by other divisions in the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada, planning to implement an MBO approach to management.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School districts or other entities should develop an MBO management process based on the organization's policies and regulations instead of allowing different divisions or subunits within an organization to develop separate and distinct management models.

2. School districts or other entities should examine the theoretical bases for an MBO management process carefully and determine its participatory management style as acceptable before adopting and implementing any MBO management model.

3. Secondary principals in the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada, should be surveyed to determine their agreement with the theoretical principles and assumptions upon which an MBO system is based. Results of this study should be used to develop a staff development program.

4. Management by objectives in the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada, secondary schools should be extended to include the classroom teacher. Appropriate staff development and priority objectives should be required. The consensus model and the Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools model should be presented as part of the orientation.

5. A single MBO model should be adopted by the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada, and implemented district-wide. A complete staff development program for teachers, line administrators, central office personnel, and board of trustees members is recommended. As the MBO
program becomes operational, a strong public relations effort should be instituted to acquaint the public with the goals and objectives of the Clark County School District and the degree of success in attaining those goals and objectives.

6. Investigations and evaluations should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of an MBO management process directly on students and the instructional program.

7. The consensus MBO model developed in this study should be used to validate management and accountability systems in school districts or other institutions requiring results-oriented management systems.

8. Further research is recommended on the various categories of objectives espoused by various MBO systems. Clarification and definition of objective categories would be useful in designing specific MBO accountability systems and staff development programs.
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APPENDIX A

Humble MBO Model
(28, 1973, p. 34)
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APPENDIX B

Raia MBO Model
(52, 1974, p. 16)

The Essential Elements

The Major Steps

1. Formulate long-range goals and strategic plans.
2. Develop specific overall organization objectives.
3. Establish departmental objectives.
4. Set individual job objectives.
5. Formulate action plans.
6. Implement and take corrective action.
7. Review progress toward objectives.
8. Appraise overall performance, reinforce behavior, and strengthen motivation through:
   a. Manager training and self-development
   b. Compensation
   c. Career and manpower planning

Goal Setting

Action Planning

Self-Control

Periodic Reviews

RECYCLE
APPENDIX C
Mali MBO Model
(40, 1975, p. 11)
Albrecht discussed the MBO process by referring to an organizational strategy. He defines the following "basic steps" as required of management:

(1, 1978, p. 108)

1. Evaluate the current state of the organization's environmental match.

2. Study the organization's environment and detect important trends and change processes.

3. Specify the nature of the environmental match they want the organization to have in the future and the strategic organizational "thrust" necessary to bring it about.

4. Set goals which spell out the desired end conditions for a selected point (or points) in time.

5. Decide what actions and organizational changes are necessary to achieve the new goals and make a strategic plan for achieving them.

Other elements were suggested throughout the narrative in his "action manual." Included were agreement of superiors and subordinates, motivation, evaluation, personnel appraisal, career planning, recycling, and management training. These elements utilized in the operational MBO model were identified by interpreting Albrecht's intent regarding his view of management by objectives.

* In addition to the five steps listed, other elements were included from the general text of Albrecht's *Successful Management By Objectives, An Action Manual*, 1978. A graphic model was not included in the book.
APPENDIX E
Bernabei MBO Model *

Bernabei describes the MBO cycle in an eleven (11) step process as follows: (3, 1972, p. 7)

| STEP ONE | - Describe your job function(s) |
| STEP TWO | - List the responsibilities characteristic of each function |
| STEP THREE | - Identify the Goal to reach: Learner, Program, Staff, Board/Community |
| STEP FOUR | - State the objectives in performance terms for each responsibility |
| STEP FIVE | - Determine the weight and priority for each objective |
| STEP SIX | - Identify and list the tasks or events necessary to achieve each objective |
| STEP SEVEN | - Allocate resources needed for achieving each objective |
| STEP EIGHT | - Determine the cost in doing each task or event |
| STEP NINE | - Conduct a monitoring and audit system for determining the achievement of each objective |
| STEP TEN | - Apply an appraisal system for each objective |
| STEP ELEVEN | - Discuss the accomplishment of each objective; reasons for not achieving the objective; and establishing new objectives or revising the old objectives. |

* In addition to the eleven steps listed, other elements were included derived from the general text of Bernabei’s, *Objectives Management Principles*, 1972. A graphic model was not included in the book.
APPENDIX F
Hostrop MBO Model
(25, 1975, p. 224)

1. Establishment of organization's common goals and measures of performance

2. Revisions in organization structure

3. Superordinate sets down goals and measures for subordinates
   - Subordinate proposes goals and measures for his job

4. Joint agreement on subordinate's goals

5. Feedback of interim results against measures

6. Cumulative quarterly reviews of subordinate's results against measures

7. Annual management appraisal of subordinates

8. Review of organization performance

New Inputs

Elimination of inappropriate goals
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The purpose of the study was to examine selected business and education management by objectives (MBO) models and identify the common elements. These elements resulted in a consensus MBO model which was compared to determine agreement with the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools. Educational accountability, the theoretical bases for MBO and MBO models in business and education were treated in the review of the literature. Graphic models developed in the study included the Clark County School District's Management and Accountability System for Secondary Schools and a consensus MBO model.

A management process based on the principles of management by objectives derived from the business world was reported as a suitable means for managing schools and communicating results to the public. The importance of people to an organization was judged as critical. MBO provided a means to deal effectively with people on a professional and productive basis while accomplishing the goals and objectives of the organization.