

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 612

EA 031 122

AUTHOR Wettersten, Jill A.  
TITLE Challenging Changes: Responses of Three Upper Secondary Schools to Sweden's Decentralization Process.  
PUB DATE 2001-00-00  
NOTE 51p.  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Decentralization; Educational Administration; Educational Change; Foreign Countries; High Schools; School Organization; School Policy; School Restructuring  
IDENTIFIERS \*Sweden

## ABSTRACT

Sweden is undergoing a school decentralization process from a formerly centralized system. This report examines how school personnel are adapting to the changes. Schoolteachers, administrators, and staff members were interviewed, and, where appropriate, responses were coded for numerical assessment. Additional data include school-reform plans for each school, local newspaper articles describing school changes, and other publications related to change initiatives. Findings revealed common concerns among interviewees about increased workload and stress, and less time to accomplish new tasks in addition to preparing for classes; the lack of clarity in how to organize and implement interdisciplinary courses; the success of students with limited abilities and motivation in the uniform national courses such as mathematics, Swedish, and English; the value of team organization; and adequate state and local financial support for school reform. A major obstacle to the comprehensive change process lies in the perceived disadvantage teachers and administrators have in the reform process compared to national and local authorities. Lack of power to influence changes, lack of communication between educators and politicians, and limited resources for implementation plague collaborative work between schools and community groups. Appendices contain summaries of coding processes and coding identifications for the three schools studied. (Contains 26 references.) (RT)

## Challenging Changes: Responses of Three Upper Secondary Schools to Sweden's Decentralization Process

By Jill A. Wettersten, Ph.D.  
North Park University

"Some people working in a team have a reluctant attitude. They need to get into the team and then they develop. They can work in the same classrooms and they discover that they are good at something. They should be allowed to develop and allowed to fail. They can learn how to handle conflicts by expressing their positions. People know what you think. Most people like to work together. They like being together. Swedish people may be more egalitarian and not as individualistic. We have more of a collectivist society."

Karl, Olof Palme Gymnasium, 29 years of teaching

"We are looking for students who go their own way. We do not want "A" students who are too focussed and spend all their time in the books. We want more independent students ... "This is a big problem for the community. They cannot own or control us. They want all schools to be like each other." Mikel, consultant for the new William Gates Gymnasium, a private school to open autumn, 2000

### INTRODUCTION

While the United States has always had a decentralized school system, interest has been growing among U.S. political and economic leaders for more uniform standards and accountability. Ironically, while the nation has moved towards national assessments, many major cities in the United States have been in the process of decentralizing their large local, but centrally controlled, school systems. Sweden's experiences can inform others who are going through the process of decentralization.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine effects of the school decentralization process in three high schools or gymnasium schools in a mid-sized city in Sweden. By conducting a series of interviews with teachers, administrators, and school staff members in each of three schools, three case studies were developed that present multiple but related perspectives on how school personnel are adapting to the numerous national and local mandates for change in Sweden's educational system.

Findings of this qualitative study reveal that respondents from each of the schools have similar concerns about their school decentralization experiences. These issues are:

1. Teachers, administrators and staff members in all three schools most often cite the increasing, often stressful workloads associated with their jobs as the main response to the decentralization reform expectations of central and local officials. The increased number of tasks with students and meetings with colleagues to interpret and implement reform mandates take time away from lesson planning and exploring creative teaching ideas and materials.
2. Teachers, rectors, and staff members express doubts that the growing number of students with limited motivation, skills, and academic self-confidence can be successful in theoretical courses currently mandated by state officials.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Teachers are divided in their views about whether team organization is a positive structural change within the school. All teachers are divided into program teams based on specified national study programs for students.
4. Teachers in all three schools suggest that lack of clarity and lack of examples of implementation strategies for required changes and lack of models for achieving practical outcomes of the reform mandates inhibits efforts to convince more teachers to more fully support the changes.
5. Teachers and rectors in all schools cite lack of adequate financial resources for implementation of school reform initiatives as a disincentive in developing such initiatives.

### Organization of the Study:

Following the introduction, methodology and data collection procedures will be explained. These will be followed by findings of the study that will be presented by describing each of the three cases. Findings within each case will include references to the appendices for tables related to each case. Afterwards, in this order, is the remainder of the study: a cross-case comparison of the three cases, discussion of the findings, a summary of the findings and implications of the findings, limitations to the study, a conclusion, acknowledgements, references, and the appendices.

### Background of the Study in Sweden

Sweden began a series of continuous school reform programs in the early 1990's to prepare students for the increasingly complex global economies and international political and social environments (OECD, 1995; Skolverket, 1999, Swedish Institute, 1999). Beginning in 1991, decentralization of administration and decision-making from the central government to local municipalities enabled Sweden to shift its national role from central planning and administration of schools to one of assistance and evaluation (OECD, 1995). The decision allows for more local choices of school types, including private schools, and freedom for local communities to develop programs and teaching strategies more appropriate to local needs. Finally, local authorities now have the added responsibility to supplement the national block grants for school finance. National school funding is distributed on the basis of local population needs; but it does not sustain all school expenses. Local taxes must make up the difference which is a new obligation for local communities in the decentralization process (OECD, 1995).

The stated goals of the national school reform plans and those of complementary local municipal reform plans are widely available to schools and the community. However, plans for how to implement these wide ranging goals are intentionally left to local schools and communities. National and local directives to teachers and administrators within the past five years have been extensive. Since 1995, schools in Sweden have experienced changes in goals, curricula, teaching roles, teaching methods, student assessment and grading procedures, and compensation criteria and salary agreements. An extended school day for teachers is being implemented to enable them to meet more often with students and to allow time for regular meetings with colleagues in to plan interdisciplinary courses. Implementation of current reforms began in two of the

schools in this study in autumn, 1999. The additional school in the study began the process in 1997. All gymnasium schools in Sweden were expected to have new plans and agreements in place by 2000. However, additional national curriculum and assessment reforms are scheduled for the autumn, 2000.

In the autumn of 1997, while I was a guest teacher at a folkhögskola (comparable to a community college) in the same community in which this study was done, I was surprised at the number of changes anticipated in the decentralization process for Swedish schools, particularly the upper secondary schools. The ÖLA Agreement of 1995 (a national agreement between teachers and local community officials specifying new working conditions and salary increases) was being discussed among teachers and administrators. Participation in the program required individual school plans for implementation of the agreement. Individual school plans would be negotiated between local community officials and the teachers' unions and would eventually be approved by both groups.

As an incentive to participate as early as possible in the reform program, local teachers were promised an immediate raise of 1000 Swedish crowns per month (approximately \$120.00) as soon as they signed an agreement with their local community. Teachers also assumed that this stipend would be part of an over all salary increase of between 10% and 20% which they would receive over a five year period from 1995 to 2000.

School reorganization included: curriculum alignment with national and local goals, team organization for implementing the national study programs, new teaching methods, new student grading procedures, and new individual salary guidelines. Also, the administrative structure was moving from a pyramid model to a "flat plan" which was to encourage more teacher participation in school decision-making and in formal leadership roles.

School reorganization and reform, particularly among low performing schools, has been a subject of much interest in the United States for many years. This has also been true in Sweden (Lander & Ekholm, 1998). However, beginning in 1991 with the abolishment of state control of schools, Sweden, in order to accelerate the change process, mandated many changes at one time without providing or asking for specific implementation guidelines (OECD, 1995).

Changes in school administration models, teaching methods, assessment procedures, and curriculum have been common in the United States, but are generally singular in focus and specified in terms of implementation. Sweden was engaging in "whole school", "systemic" or comprehensive reform by dismantling its traditional top-down, central authoritative system and replacing it with local control of planning and implementation. Responsibility for implementation was left to local political and educational authorities in each community.

### Comprehensive School Change Literature

Comprehensive school change, also called holistic or systemic change, is intended to influence the entire school environment by altering many aspects of that environment. Research in these areas of school improvement, restructuring, and the change process offer numerous strategies, models, and frameworks for initiating, implementing, and monitoring fundamental alterations in school working environments (Fullan, 1991, 1993; Hargreaves, 1994; Stoll & Fink, 1996; Husen, 1998; Miron, 1998; Smylie, 1998). The acceptance of changes by individual teachers and a collaborative work culture in which to plan and implement the changes are often cited as a key indicators to successful change initiatives (Hargreaves & Fullan (1996) Liberman & Miller (2000); Nolan & Meister, 2000). Because of the extensiveness and rapidity of Sweden's change mandates, I have chosen to focus on criteria for models or designs for successful comprehensive change as one aspect of change theory.

In 1998, the United States Government began a Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program that made funds available to elementary and secondary schools which were willing to undertake not minor changes but "heart and lung transplants" (Olson, 1998). In order to receive a grant, the model chosen by a school had to have certain characteristics. These include: high standards for students, inclusion of all subject areas and grade levels, a research based and tested design, a common vision and goals, professional development provisions, appropriate resources for grade levels and subject areas, and strategies to promote parent and community involvement (U.S. Department of Education, 1998).

Because research has shown that faculty, staff, and parents must support the changes for them to be successfully implemented, most developers will not work with a school unless at least 60 percent of the teachers vote to adopt the reform design (McChesney & Hertling, 2000). The design should also show evidence that improved student achievement occurs as a result of that design (Education Commission of the States, 1998). Developers are also expected to help schools create assessment tools to monitor the progress of the reforms.

These criteria and "safeguards" do not guarantee success for all schools participating in U.S. comprehensive reform programs. According to a study by the RAND Corporation, a non-profit institution that researches and analyzes policies and policy-making decisions, after two years, only about half of the schools working with designs were implementing key aspects of those designs (Berends, 1998).

In 1997, I began a series of interviews with teachers and administrators in this community as a way of trying to understand the scope and sequence of events related to the school reform program in their community and the ÖLA Agreement in particular. In the spring of 2000, I returned to Sweden to find out how the people who were experiencing these changes were affected by them.

As I analyzed the responses of teachers, administrators, and staff members to the numerous mandates for changes in their workplaces, the theoretical framework of

exchange theory guided my understanding of how my informants addressed the expectations of central and local authorities in Sweden. Perceptions of most teachers and administrators were that more was being asked of them and than what was being returned.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Exchange theorists suggest that social behavior is based on the desire for personal rewards and the weighing of costs (Blau, 1964m 1989; Ritzer, 1988). Rewards for teachers and administrators can be tangible such as increased salaries, budget allotments, professional development opportunities or approval of new projects. They can also be intangible such as respect, trust, and cooperation. Relationships between teachers, school administrators, and national and local community authorities can be adversarial or consensual depending on to what extent all parties share the same values (Anderson, 1991; Ball, 1987; Blasé, 1991; Greenfield, 1991; Willower, 1991).

## METHODOLOGY

I am using the case study method of qualitative inquiry to determine effects of extensive school reform measures associated with the decentralization process within three community upper secondary schools (comparable to U.S. high schools) in a community of approximately 300,000 people in Sweden. I spent 10 weeks in Sweden between April 1 and June 5 conducting a series of interviews with 35 upper secondary teachers, and 24 administrators and staff members. Three Swedish teachers representing each of the schools in the study acted as "agents" and assisted me in soliciting volunteers for the study. I also interviewed six additional individuals associated with district and local school administrations.

Each subject was asked the following questions:

1. What is your understanding of the school reform plans in Sweden, from 1991-1995, particularly the OLA Agreement of 1995?
2. What changes have taken place within your own school as a result of these reform initiatives?
3. Have you personally been involved in developing any of the new plans or programs at your school? If so, in what ways?
4. How has your job been affected, if at all, by any of these changes?

Teachers and administrators and staff members varied in age, gender, and years of experience in their positions. Most volunteers in each school were given the interview questions prior to their participation in the interviews that were conducted in English. All subjects were asked to sign consent forms and pseudonyms were used throughout the study. Contents of hand-written field notes were reviewed with subjects at the end of the interview to clarify issues.

Table 1, below, provides a profile of the respondents in each school. Because all new school plans in the community reflect reorganization, many of the rectors (comparable to assistant principals in the United States) and headmasters (principals) are new to their jobs, one as recent as January, 2000. Some of the rectors and headmasters have been within their schools as teachers longer than the time in which they have been rectors. This can be reflected in the table. Other school staff members such as nurses, social workers, etc. were not affected by these changes.

Table 1. Background Information about Respondents and Their Schools

Topics	Gymnasium #1	Gymnasium #2	Gymnasium #3
<b>1. Student population</b>	1400	1359	930
<b>2. No. of Teachers (Full Time/Pt. Time)</b>	148	100	86
<b>3. Teachers: Years at this school</b>	n=14	n=12	n=10
a. 1-5 years	8	5	3
b. 6-15 years	1	3	4
c. 16-25 years	4	2	2
d. 26+ years	1	2	1
<b>4. Teachers: Total years of teaching exp.</b>			
a. 1-5 years	2	0	2
b. 6-15 years	1	1	1
c. 16-25 years	6	5	3
d. 26+ years	5	6	4
e. Average no. of years of teaching exp.	20	23	19.5
<b>4. Adm./Staff: Years in current position at this school</b>	n=8	n=10	n=6
a. 1-5 years	4	6	4
b. 6-15 years	4	2	2
c. 16-25 years	0	2	0
d. 26+ years	0	0	0
<b>5. No. of years administrators taught in this school</b>			
a. 1-5 years	1	1	0
b. 6-15 years	0	0	1
c. 16-25 years	1	0	0
d. 26+ years	1	0	1

### Data Collection

Data consist of transcribed interviews, coded for common themes both within schools and between schools. As respondents replied to each question, I coded their

mentioning of each topic or category only once per respondent per question. Tables were constructed to display the comparisons of coded responses for each school, separating teachers from administrators and staff members for additional comparisons. A table of composite codes was developed for teachers and administrators and staff across all three schools.

The coding process applies to only Questions # 1, #2, and #4 (See page 5). Responses to Question #3 ("Have you personally been involved in developing any of the new plans or programs at your school?") did not solicit responses comparable to the other questions. Responses indicated that very few individuals had a direct role in planning significant aspects of the reform agenda. Only union representatives and rectors were involved in the negotiations of the ÖLA Agreement. This was not surprising since mandates come directly from the national authorities. Almost all teachers participated in some aspect of the implementation process in terms of course or curriculum design and creation of team projects. Responses to Question #3 will be summarized separately in each case study.

Additional data include: printed documents such as school reform plans for each school, local newspaper articles describing school changes, and other publications from central authorities related to change initiatives. A minimum of two weeks was devoted to each school for data collection. In addition to the interviews, I met informally with a variety of teachers, administrators, and staff members in school lunchrooms, faculty meetings and in social gatherings after school. I attended classes in each school and talked informally with teachers and students. Prior to leaving Sweden, exit interviews were arranged with all three rectors and the three teachers who were key informants to confirm my preliminary findings. I also asked several other teachers and administrators from the schools to verify the findings.

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The following case studies include: 1) a brief description of the school setting, 2) a table summarizing coded responses to interview questions #1, #2, and #4 (See Appendix A, 3) a description of the codes (See Appendix B), 4) a summary of key issues from each school with quotations from respondents, and 5) a summary of suggested topics for further exploration based on the interviews.

### Case #1: Gustav Adolf Gymnasium

Gustav Adolf gymnasium, built in 1910 and completed in 1912, is a historical landmark as one of the earliest gymnasium schools in the city. It is named after a famous Swedish king of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and has maintained its prestige and reputation as a strong academic institution, particularly in the social sciences, Swedish, foreign languages, and the arts. It is the only gymnasium in the city with an International Baccalaureate Program, a media program, and an aesthetics program. Many of its students have gone on to universities upon completion of their gymnasium certificate or shortly thereafter.

The school is well cared for by its teachers, students, administrators, and staff who are proud to be members of its community and who work hard to maintain high standards of quality work. Students enjoy the school's fine reputation but also it's proximity to the center of the city that provides a convenient change of scene from academic and social pressures. The state does not offer a humanities program that specializes in the reading and writing of literature although I was told that Gustav Adolf gymnasium has a humanities theme within one aspect of its social science program. (This appears unusual for a country that awards a Nobel Prize for literature each year.)

Fourteen teachers were interviewed over a two week period from programs or subject areas in social science, foreign languages, Swedish, music, art, physical education, mathematics, theater, and both physical and biological science. Teaching experience ranged from 2 years to over 30 years. Many teachers had spent their entire careers at this school. Included in the interviews were: the headmaster, and two rectors as well as members of the support staff in nursing, social work, records, technical support, and building maintenance. Each was asked the same questions.

In addition to the interviews, I talked with teachers, staff, and administrators informally in classrooms, faculty lounge, lunchrooms, and social gatherings. I visited classes and spoke with students both formally and informally. I attended a musical performance, graduation ceremony, and helped chaperone students on a two day field trip.

During the time I was at Gustav Adolf School, the second ÖLA Agreement, ÖLA II), was voted down by 83% of the combined vote of members of the two national teachers unions. This decisive rejection by Gustav Adolf teachers was anticipated. Many had met earlier with their local union representatives to discuss their dissatisfaction with what had happened over the past 5 years under the original agreement. Some of their views will be included in excerpts from the interviews.

According to Table 2., "Summary of the Coding Process for Gustav Adolf Gymnasium" (see Appendix A), the topics of More Work, Less Time, Team Groups, Student Social Problems, Less Money for Schools, and Lower Ability Students were suggested by 30% or more of both teachers and administrators and staff as issues of concern regarding the impact of ÖLA and other reform measures.

According to the Codes Descriptions Chart (See Appendix B, Table 3.), most of the topics or categories were considered to be negative responses. The category Evaluation of Teachers which was considered a negative topic by teachers was seen as a positive topic by administrators who were already working on constructive ways to evaluate teachers. While this was the only area of disagreement in attitude between teachers and rectors seen in the codes, this fact slightly alters the Administrators and Staff emphasis in the summary of codes. Teachers and Administrators and Staff members also differed in their emphasis of some specific categories as indicated by the different percentages in the summary of the coding process.

## Common Themes at Gustav Adolf Gymnasium

The following themes emerged from the interviews with teachers, administrators and staff members at Gustav Adolf Gymnasium. They are supported by quotations from teachers, administrators, and staff members.

### 1. More Work, Less Time, and Stress

A. The frequency of “more work” and “less time” contributes to frustration and stress for teachers, rectors, and staff members.

“I believe that the reform (ÖLA) in theory or on paper looks good. However, I also believe that it is also hard to make it function. The main objective, what it says, is that teachers should not work more than before. The older teachers whom I speak with here disagree. They say that they are working harder than before. I don’t want to feel this burden of more and more expected. I feel that I don’t want to stay in this type of work if it is going to be that... The work-load is enough now. It is hard to estimate what more can be done.

Luke, 2 years of teaching

“The employer (local municipality) tries to put more work on teachers. The reason for this is that there is an impression that teachers work only half time.”

Bjorn, Admin./Tchr., 15 years teaching

I feel as if the faculty is in a negative spiral downward... Our headmaster seems to have no choice in this matter to make things better. Students are stressed and see that we are stressed. We have to cover a lot of knowledge by the end of the semester so that students make good grades.... I don’t want any more work than I have now.”

Jennie, 2 years of teaching

“Teachers seem more stressed and this affects us all.”

Lars, Staff

B. Teachers comment that there is less time to prepare lessons and less time to be creative.

“I teach more hours every week. I take more responsibility writing criteria for our local plans. I work on individual development plans as required by the national agreement. I spend a lot more time with our local development agreements. I actually teach less – prepare less. My free time is more limited which affects the quality of my teaching. I give fewer tests and may be shortchanging my students. Things are more superficial, more on a general level..”

Axel, 21 years of teaching, a union representative

C. Implementation of school reforms, including ÖLA related reforms, creates extra work, especially when new initiatives come from local and central authorities which invalidate previous work. Unclear guidelines require frequent and often time consuming meetings

“We made a plan for the A course in English but the Skolverket (National Agency for Education) gave us new instructions and it had to be changed... There is more stress for teachers. They find it is difficult to get time to prepare lessons, and correct papers. Teachers want to do a good job. They are stressed because they find they have less time

to prepare for teaching. Our workload consists of student conferences and staff conferences. I have extra meetings a few times a week. We are not content. We can't do all we should do.”  
Emma, 22 years of teaching

“They keep us longer in school...Authorities, our bosses, have us sit from 2 p.m. until 4 p.m. and they have noticed that we can not just be here. They have arranged conferences or meetings. We have team meetings with other colleagues. It is not natural. We have more work and things are less well organized. To work in teams is not a bad idea. We have good and bad teams, however. The bosses need to have a plan or strategy. You can't just put us in groups. ... We are not used to working in teams. There are many strong wills. It takes time.”  
Lance, 20 years teaching

## 2. Teachers question whether the quality of teaching and learning will be improved by numerous and simultaneous changes in school structure.

A. Teachers believe that student learning will suffer if teachers must give up practices that they believe are effective without conviction that the alternatives are equally effective.

“The best way for working with some students may be old fashioned but students today seem to have more problems. Direct instruction may be better for students who are slower learners, who have difficulties. These students lose if teachers do not have time to work with them independently...I worked with a group of students this year and made a big mistake with them. They were in the business program. Many were truant, did no work, and were distracted. Five (in the group) wanted to do a good job. These five wanted to pass. I had a plan for every lesson. We did project work. We had a contract plan. It didn't work...They were fed-up with school. It was better for them not to be here. They did not want to study...the struggle is what is the best learning environment for all types of students?  
Margaret, 32 years of teaching

B. Teachers who have experimented with new methods, including group projects, see potential in these practices but want the option of using a variety of teaching strategies depending on the composition of the classes and needs of the students.

“We have more lessons and more students in each class. I am sorry to say that knowledge of math is lower. Every year the new groups need some more help in order to be the same. Maybe they learn other things but I need to teach them what they should have learned before. ...I was surprised that fractions were still a problem.

”We always hear that good teachers can't talk too much. They don't want the teacher to be in the center...I don't think they (students) will learn if they do whatever they like. Teachers need to help them with their thinking. They can't read a book and learn by copying. They must discuss more. My students want me to show them what to do, not work by themselves. I've tried new methods. It's fun. When asked what they think, students have also said that it's fun for a change, but not all of the time.  
Christina, 24 years of teaching

C. Teachers lack applicable models or evidence of past studies of student achievement (particularly of poorly motivated students) which would be helpful and reassuring to justify time spent on team organization and planning interdisciplinary curricula.

“We have goals for each program and show how subjects such as Swedish, English, math, and physical education are infused in the programs. We also use PBL (Problem-Based Learning). I have tried it and use it with 2 other colleagues. We combine history, social science, and Swedish. We have the goals and we need to write all the details by last December 1. ...How do we write implementation plans across subject areas and within programs?. We may have to educate local politicians about why everything cannot be done in teams.”...Some basic courses can be confined to one program and lose a broader view than if they were in communication with counterparts in other programs within the same discipline. I have played with many models trying to make it work.”

Axel, 21 years of teaching

“I asked a number of colleagues a while ago if they would like to make a good course to integrate history, art history, Swedish, etc. and we are willing to collaborate. We think students can get a better view of subjects and see how they are related to each other by developing a theme. However, the rektor said that there are problems with schedules, classrooms, and time. ...We do not have room for experimentation. We need to try out some small program groups. But, we do not have time to try out new ideas. Students need to explore how to learn and the different ways of learning.”

Jon, 13 years of teaching

“ Every teacher is in several different groups. They are in too many. Math, Swedish, and English service all programs, 4 or 5 of them, with the exception of aesthetics. For me its okay, I meet many different children. ...I talk on different levels...science program is the highest, business is the lowest. The math department works together a lot...this is very important – to be with other math teachers. We have our ideas and we discuss. This is more important than talking with, say a music teacher. With that teacher we can talk about our students in common, we cannot talk about the student who is not proficient in math. We need to meet with math teachers more than to be with other teachers.”

Christina, 24 years of teaching

D. Teachers lack clear guidelines regarding the implementation of their new advising and counseling responsibilities and the extent of these responsibilities, particularly with gymnasium students who have social and emotional problems.

“From my point of view, all students with problems could get more help if the teacher manages to have energy. It takes more to work with decision-making. I have students who come in and wish they could have a ‘normal’ family. They want someone who tries to understand them. Someone to say ‘I love you’...It is easy to come here with a ‘medical problem’ which can disguise a need to talk to someone.”

Dagmar, nurse, 30 years

“I know that teachers are more responsible for the social situations of each student. There is more responsibility for their study plan and problems that they observe. They want student to feel right. Before, they told me to contact parents and I did. Now, they make the initial calls and ask me when they are stuck. ...There is more contact with teachers on my part now. I help them and they help me with students. Some teachers take too much responsibility, others take not enough.”

Britt, social worker, 24 years

“Do we engage in the lives of our students? How much? Whatever it takes?”

Jon, 13 years of teaching

E. Teachers, staff, and rektors are uncertain as to how a growing number of students with limited motivation, skills, and academic self-confidence can be successful in current theoretical courses mandated by state officials.

“The goals for the courses and program leave a gap between goals and reality. The group is very big. There is stress among the staff and students who may or may not be up to the challenge of the goals. There is a lack of time with which to work this out. ... There is no rationale for the point system or what differences exist between a 50, 100, and 150 point course. Sweden has 17 different programs in the national gymnasium curriculum. Students must take basic courses in math, natural science, English, Swedish, religion, etc. no matter what program they are in. All students, regardless of background and interests or differences in programs must pass the same course... We have students who will not pass these classes if the course is entirely the same for everyone. Their Swedish is bad (even if they are native speakers) and they don't care if they do not pass.”

Lynx, 26 years of teaching

“What is sad is that we are responsible for students' performances on tests. If a student does not do well, are you responsible? I am not sure what that means. This is why I get more suspicious. There is no plan for how we are to be responsible for these students. All of us are supposed to be responsible, whatever that means.”

Emma, 22 years of teaching

### 3. Teachers want clearer guidelines for reform mandates affecting their working environment and opportunities to discuss them with authorities

A. Some have recommended discussions with local politicians who are critical of current teaching practices and who pressure schools for tangible signs of planning for fulfillment of state and community school goals.

“I have written letters over the past 3 to 5 years to try to force local authorities who are politicians to see the main problems and to fund practical solutions. ... In my most recent letter we are demanding that they sit down and discuss with us the problems to find a means to a solution.”

Lynx, 26 years of teaching

“Local politicians created a skolplan (local school goals) with great pretensions. They want everything to be done... Yet, they expect us to accomplish these things with shrinking resources.”

Axel, 21 years of teaching

“We can make recommendations to the community and politicians but they make the decisions. There is nothing other than to discuss and ask them to give money. We are back where we started. There is no plan to implement things in a familiar way.”

Bjorn, Adm./Tchr., 15 years of teaching

A. They are concerned that teachers' experiences and opinions are absent in decisions by central authorities in Stockholm who are also critical of current school practices and who continue to send mandates to local schools and communities without examples or models to illustrate desirable outcomes.

“Skolverket is the government authority. This body has been anti-school systems. They believe that the school systems have not succeeded in areas of social competence, literacy, sex education, and in not enabling students to reach their highest level. ... The national department has not taken responsibility for current issues. The local governments

do not have the expertise to help us. ... Before, the services could be handled at a business lunch. Now, the process is an education in itself.”

Axel, 21 years of teaching

“They (Skolverket) wants to reform the schools. They do not have the knowledge of how to do it...it is not clear how they work...After working on a curriculum in 1995, they are in a position to understand it now. However, they have changed it all around without reflecting on the experiences of the results of the previous changes. They listen to the result of the old reforms after they have written the new reforms. Can they learn from experience?”

Jon, 13 years teaching

“Teachers are unsatisfied. They didn’t have much to say about it (ÖLA Agreement). It was discussed at the central level and teachers got feedback about the agreement. “

Robert, Business Manager, 10 years experience

**B. They would like clearer indications of how the authority and decision-making powers will be distributed or shared between teachers, staff and rectors within the gymnasium.**

“We want a voice in curriculum and instruction and in professional development conditions.”

Hans, 19 years of teaching

“Our opinion is that no one listens to us. One way communication is all we get. They need to listen to people who handle youngsters every day. Rectors may be sympathetic with teachers. The plan forces the rectors to be out in the school more and to know all the pupils. Some one is supposed to have eyes on you and to care about you... They reduced the number of headmasters for economic reasons. (Now) They are all busy with administrative matters... The bosses should be involved in the daily process. Why aren’t they? They should be with us... They may not know what to do.”

Lance, 30 years of teaching

“We have good rectors here. I can discuss with him (the rector for his program who has been cited as a model for other programs in terms of leadership skills). He has confidence in you as a teacher; he can be a critic of education; he is not interfering. He is competent to discuss things with. We can speak out and express our views, he listens, has a discussion, and makes up his mind. He listens to you.”

Jon, 13 years of teaching

“According to ÖLA, schools have responsibility for money allocated to the schools and the school can use it for different programs. Groups of teachers from each program should have the right to make decisions as to how to use the money, courses we are going to give, the number of pupils for each course, etc. Right now, the headmaster and rectors make those decisions. We complain but the rectors are in the same boat; no power to change this. Those in charge are not keen to let us develop this power.

Tomas, 27 years of teaching

“My job is complicated...I ‘hold everything together’. I try to delegate tasks, which is part of the decentralization process. I have a responsibility to the staff in the Superintendent’s office... People need someone to listen. In the city government they need more money in the budget; teachers want less hours, pupils want to understand; the politicians want to save money. We have not reached agreement as to what is best for the schools.”

Gustav, Administrator, 27 years of teaching

Responses to Question # 3: Have You Personally been Involved in Developing and of the New Plan or Programs at Your School? If so, in what ways?

Table 4. Positive Responses to Question # 3

Role in Reforms	Teachers n = 14	Admin./Staff n = 8
ÖLA Group	2 – 14%(of 14)	2 - 25% (of 8)
Implementation of ÖLA	11 - 79%	3 - 38%
Member of the Local School Board	1 - 7%	3 - 38%
Not involved in the above	2 - 14%	3 - 38%

Because state and local officials outside local schools determine the state and local mandates, teachers, rectors, and staff members at Gustav Adolf Gymnasium have little direct input into the contents of those mandates. This is reflected in responses to Question # 3. Teacher, administrator, and staff member participation is reflected in implementation of the reforms rather than the creation of them.

Discussion of the Findings of Case # 1, Gustav Adolph Gymnasium

Both the coding summary and comments from teachers suggest that the themes most often mentioned in relation to decentralization reforms are:

- 1) Increased workload and less time to accomplish new tasks in addition to preparing for classes
- 2) Lack of clarity in how to organize and implement interdisciplinary courses
- 3) Concern for the success of students with limited abilities and motivation in the uniform national courses such as mathematics, Swedish, and English.

Additional issues and future actions mentioned in the interviews with teachers include:

- 1) Looking for or developing appropriate models for gymnasium schools that illustrate the team concept, PBL, and increased student achievement and motivation.
- 2) Organizing departments such as Swedish, English, foreign languages, mathematics, physical education into existing national study programs. for which they provide service courses
- 3) Clarification of teacher workload and means by which to fairly evaluate “teacher work” for individual salary evaluations.
- 4) Pursuing strategies for increasing financial support in order to implement all of the school reform mandates.

Administrators and staff members reflect many of the same concerns:

- 1) More work and less time to accomplish tasks
- 2) Implementation problems
- 3) Concern for students with academic and social problems

The administrators and staff members emphasized two additional issues more strongly than the teachers:

- 4) Less money for schools The increased stress levels among teachers, their own staff, and themselves.

### Case # 2, Alfred Nobel Gymnasium

Alfred Nobel Gymnasium, named after the inventor of dynamite and for whom the famous prizes for excellence are awarded in Sweden each year, once housed a school of engineering that extended beyond the regular (at that time) 2 or 3 year programs. As the gymnasium programs increased within the buildings, eventually dominating the school, the engineering program moved to the local university to join schools of business, nursing, and education in expanding the university system. The sprawling campus of multiple buildings or wings emanating from a central administration center reaches out in several directions: toward the city's major lake; the east end of the central city's shopping area, and a large high tech company almost adjacent to the campus. The campus also beckons students from a neighboring city who may take advantage of the strong science program at Alfred Nobel Gymnasium. Nobel also attracts students interested in vocational programs such as business, health care, and energy. They also have a program of Individual Study for students who do not as yet qualify for participation in the national study programs. Starting in the autumn, Nobel gymnasium will introduce an IT program as an additional national program.

Twelve teachers and were interviewed over a two week period from programs or subject areas in foreign languages including English, Swedish, the social sciences, business, biology, chemistry, physics, pre-engineering, mathematics, computer science, nursing, and technical subjects related to engineering and energy. Teaching experience ranged from 6 years to over 30 years. Several teachers of over 25 years of experience had spent their entire teaching career at Alfred Nobel. The headmaster and three of six additional rectors were interviewed as well as a counselor, nurse, business manager, librarian, lunchroom coordinator, and human resources director. The total number of administrators and staff members interviewed was 10. Each subject was asked the same interview questions.

In addition to the interviews, I talked regularly with teachers, staff, and administrators in the lunchroom, classrooms, offices, and faculty lounges. I visited a class and talked formally and informally with several students. I also

attended a faculty meeting and a presentation for teachers about choosing a retirement plan.

According to Table 5, Summary of the Coding Process for Gymnasium # 2, (Alfred Nobel Gymnasium) which is located in Appendix B, the most commonly selected categories by both teachers and administrators and staff pertaining to the decentralization process and the ÖLA Agreement(s) were: More Work and Less Time, Teams and Projects, Implementation problems with several reform mandates, and concerns about Lower Ability Students or students limited abilities, motivation, and academic self-confidence who are considered to be “at risk” in passing required courses.

According to the Code Descriptions, Table 6, (See Appendix D), the responses to many of the changes or the change process were largely negative. I coded the categories of Projects and Teams as neutral because of divided views among teachers and some administrators regarding that topic. All other topics marked “neutral” reflect descriptive views rather than judgmental ones. Some programs use team planning and project assignments more frequently than others depending on the students and subject areas. These comments will be reflected in the interview responses below.

### Common Themes at Alfred Nobel Gymnasium

The following themes emerged from the interviews with teachers, administrators, and staff members at Alfred Nobel Gymnasium. They are supported by quotations from teachers, administrators, and staff members.

#### 1. More Work, Less Time to Accomplish Tasks

A. The increasing expectations of local officials, parents, students, supervisors, and colleagues for additional work coupled with decreasing time in which to complete it leads to frustration, anxiety, and stress among teachers, rektors, and staff.

“We have too much to do. We are in a situation that is not good. We need to make corrections to make it better. Everything can be corrected, I hope.

Greta, Adm./Tchr., 7 years of teaching

“We spend more time in school. I have a feeling that we spend more and more time doing other things. We talk with parents and do paper work for the administration that we had not done before. The paper work comes from mentoring students. Reducing our teaching by 24 hours doesn’t really compensate for our extra work.”

Ann, 17 years of teaching

B. Teachers emphasize that the number and length of meetings with colleagues, the increasing number of meetings with students for advising, counseling, and tutoring leaves less time for creative preparation for classes.

"I work very much more. My best enjoyment is when I am working with my students. That is where I want to be and whom I want to work with and what I have been educated for. I do not want a lot of paper work. I do not want conferences that do not lead to anything. Often I sit in a conference and think, 'when will I do my work? When will I find time for ...

Gösta, 30 years of teaching

"People are working too much. This causes 'burn out'...I believe being a teacher is something like an artist. It takes imagination and it takes time to think out new ways and duties for students to learn. Sitting with colleagues in meetings takes time from real tasks and forces us to have to do more at home."

"When we work with a group, in a given block of time, we need to share the tasks and it is necessary to work with each other. This will change the way we work. We must change the way we work. This is not what is happening from the teachers' standpoint at this school. We are dominated by the leaders of the meetings (rectors) who just take information and give it to us. This could be concentrated in a more efficient way so that we could get on with our work. "

Mia, 19 years of teaching

"We have old models and we need to change some of them. We received no guidelines on how to change. We have to know on our own, know all of it; and we have to decide the most elementary rules in leading our groups."

Birgit, Admin/Tchr., 8 years of teaching

B. Staying within the building all day increases accessibility of teachers to colleagues and students but does not guarantee productivity for lesson planning or work requiring concentration or reflection which must be done at home.

"The most obvious thing is that you can't do what you have to do (prepare your lessons, correct tests, etc.) at home or at school. We must be here at school a certain number of hours. We can't leave at the end of our classes and go home. We can't do that today. That effects me the most...I guess they want to check on us a little.

Britta, 26 years of teaching

"It helps that teachers are here later. We can find them more easily."

Malen, staff

"I feel that it is no problem. I like an 8-5 work schedule. This is because I think those subjects can't be managed during the school day unless colleagues and students can meet. Students can come and find me between classes. There isn't much time between classes in my schedule so I can see more students overall sometime during the day... To plan work and do additional jobs here it is necessary to work afterwards at home. I also work on weekends. With a family, it means a lot of compromising.

Mia, 19 years of teaching

2. Teachers, rectors, and staff members are uncertain as to how a growing number of students with limited motivation, skills, and academic self-confidence can be successful in the current theoretical courses mandated by state officials.

A. Extra classes, Problem Based Learning methods, projects, and Individual Programs are only moderately successful with these students, especially those with multiple course failures.

“The student population is our biggest problem. Everyone cannot study the same courses... The politicians don’t understand that students are different. An engineering student is different (from an energy student)... Too many students come with lower abilities and it is hard for teachers to give lessons as they have to go back and teach material the students should have learned in the lower grades. Social problems are increasing and teachers must take care of all the problems. Students at the upper level are not given enough time and support. The politicians tell us to take care of the students at the bottom. . Some will benefit with extra lessons but I don’t see the point of it now.

Bjorn, Administrator, 16 years

“We have a new type of student – one who does not come to school with his eyes open eager to learn. About 30% of our students are here because they have to be here. They have no choice. They pass gymnasium with little effort or enthusiasm. Some come from complicated family backgrounds. Teachers have to face these students.”

Johanna, Administrator, 6.5 years

“If students do not have passing scores in all required subjects or if they fail courses in a regular program, they must take an Individual Program which is a repeat of basic skills preparing them for the regular programs. It is crazy for me to say that these students can complete a gymnasium program in 3 or 4 years when their problems have been with them since primary school. It is unusual for them to be able to catch up in just one year to the regular gymnasium programs.”

Lena, Staff, 12 years experience

B. Some teachers and rectors observe that pressure upon teachers and students to obtain “gokänd” or passing grades may eventually result in lower grading standards or a two-tiered curriculum within required courses.

“The main objective of the reforms was that targets were to be set locally. Standards are lower now, I believe, nationally. More than 90% of the students pass the gymnasium program. This is not bad in itself, but I assume that it is easier to pass, not that students are doing better. Everybody needs theoretical knowledge. Since there is no standard assessment, schools set their own standards for granting a gymnasium certificate. This is not altogether a drawback unless you don’t have good students. Then, you have to bend rules or fail many.

Sven, 28 years of teaching

“Politicians want all to pass; if not, it must be because of a bad teacher. Teachers are supposed to change their methods. More and more teachers give an easy pass ... ..I do a lot of talking to pupils. They need adults to talk to. Many families do not have dinner together... We need to take time to see people, to talk. We need to keep students on our side and to make them improve both in their behavior and in their studies.”

Veronica, 27 years of teaching

“I work with the Individual Program...the idea is to prepare students for the national programs. Pupils who have been in national programs and who have failed courses are also in this program...this group is increasing more and more. These students must have people advising them and supervising their work...the study advisor is responsible for these people. Some go out to do work and earn money equal to their study allowance (really, volunteer work). They can come back and retake tests. Some will leave school We can’t just say ‘goodbye’. We have to see that they have another organization that takes care of them.”

Greta, Admin./Tchr, 7 years of teaching

3. Teachers are divided in their views about whether team organization is a positive structural change within the school although many are willing to try to make it a successful experience.

A. While enjoying opportunities to meet new colleagues and to plan occasional projects with them, some teachers in the theoretical subjects are concerned that despite these advantages, interdisciplinary courses provide only a surface view of knowledge.

“ In the future, the curriculum will be more integrated. Yet, we still see subject areas. I’m divided. I see advantages of integration but we lose depth of understanding and get only a surface view with interdisciplinary study. I worked on a project in genetics with a geography teacher that worked well. I would like to do more but it is time consuming and you have to find the right person to work with.”

Linnea, 22 years teaching

“I work on a team. We have a little enterprise going, a simulation. Five or six teachers work together. ..The students experience different functions within the company... They apply knowledge to a business experience. Most will go to work after completing the gymnasium program. Some may study at the university, but most will go to work.

Birgit, Admin./Tchr., 8 years of teaching

B. Discussions within domains (or program teams) are just beginning but there is uncertainty as to the direction team organization is headed and what specific content outcomes are appropriate for an interdisciplinary gymnasium curriculum. More models or guidelines would be helpful.

“

“We are not used to this team work. It is new to us. Some teachers don’t like it so much. We don’t know it. We don’t know what to do. We are insecure.”

Britta, 26 years of teaching

“We are told to do this and we are encouraged to find projects crossing all subjects. Good projects are difficult to find. I do work with colleagues in other subjects but they are closely related: biology, chemistry, physics... This is a new way of organizing. We have to find the right focus. At this moment what causes this amount of work and stress is that we are trying to keep old systems as well as new systems. Our superior are afraid to let us go, to be let loose on the new system. They want to hold tight to everything. That will have to change if we shall succeed and if we shall get something good.”

Gösta, 29 years of teaching

C. Teachers who have experimented with and now use Problem Based Learning and group projects have seen potential in these practices but want the option of using a variety of teaching strategies depending on the composition of the classes and the needs of the students.

“The reforms are good if teachers take care of things in the right way. If you put work into it; if you want it to work... or you can sit on your rear end and put on the brakes and it will not work. I don’t think PBL is the only way to teach. I believe a mixture of methods is the best. This subject may need such a method; another subject may not use the same method that way.

Linnea, 22 years of teaching

“We had some lessons in PBL. I got used to it. I can’t always follow the model ... The main point is to get pupils active. It is very important in this system to note that this is very difficult for the weaker students. It is a good one for good students who can take it on their own. They don’t need you as much. The weaker students are the ones you spend more time with.”  
Lars-Erik, 17 years of teaching

“Ten years ago a new teacher and I discovered that we thought alike. We could cooperate in teaching English. We had one class in natural science and another in social science. I think the kids enjoyed it. Three years ago, in English, students came in and picked up a note and had to give a speech about that topic in English. They spoke and they became some of the best pupils. That was three years ago. I noticed this year that my English class would not work in that way  
Veronica, 27 years of teaching.

D. Teachers in core courses such as Swedish, English, and mathematics are uncertain as to what extent their subject areas retain their autonomy as they are blended into the domains. This is true also of other teachers such as modern foreign language teachers who do not find adequate time to meet and discuss their own programs that prepare students for national examinations.

“When we had departments we worked very well together and solved problems. The purpose of the domain is to develop curriculum centered on our students. When we had departments we had in-service training, contacts with colleagues in our field, and we kept up on the future developments in our subjects. We discussed the science of teaching and helped a new teacher. We had ideas and we worked together. This has completely stopped. We have no time for additional meetings. We meet every two weeks in our domain but we really need to meet more in English. We hurriedly decide which books to order and materials. There is no inspiration. People who bring up departments are considered reactionary. Domains waste people’s time; people lose hope and are negative. There is danger in these attitudes.”  
Johan, 26 years of teaching

“We have less time for subject meetings. There are 50 teachers; one takes responsibility for something; someone else does other things. We divide up responsibility but no one is the leader...I used to be a department chair and I miss it a little.

Lars-Erik, 17 years of teaching

#### 4. Teachers want clearer guidelines regarding implementation of the new reforms as well as more communication with authorities about decisions which affect their work environment.

“Decentralization was supposed to give us more freedom; that is what they told us. Teachers have freedom to do what they want. They said they were giving us more freedom, but they did not. They gave the local politicians more freedom.”

Sven, 28 years of teaching

“If politicians would let us make our own decisions and take on responsibility for our work, we could be really good. They politicians want to make all of the decisions.”

Mia, 19 years of teaching

“Politicians wanted to get cheaper education of the same quality but with a better use of money.”

Olle, 20 years of teaching

“The William Gates school (a private gymnasium devoted exclusively to IT and business programs which will open in the autumn) is producing a very good product. The city council does not think our product is as good as before. ... It makes people outside

ourselves interested and want to do this a little better than we do. I would certainly think so if I were they.”  
Gösta, 30 years of teaching

A. Teachers are concerned that teachers' experiences and opinions are absent in decisions by central authorities in Stockholm and local authorities both of whom are critical of current school practices and who continue to send mandates to local schools and communities.

“I feel a little lost, like I am not in control of events even in the classroom. It is frustrating. It seems that things are not mentally thought out. We are told to take on a new role as a teacher and we are told to accept that. We try to mix different kinds of teaching methods. Yet, we are too busy all of the time to learn different ways. I took a university course on teaching styles which was very helpful. ... Politicians challenge the knowledge of professional teaching. They are so far from most peoples' common sense. This is so irritating.”  
Mia, 19 years of experience

“Our community has one politician who must not have liked his teachers when he was in school. He wants to make sure teachers are working harder to help students do better. If one out of 5 fails, one out of 7 is better.”  
Bjorn, Administrator, 16 years

“Skolverket has traditionally been run as a political tool ... They way you vote is the way you get the answer.”

Johanna, Administrator, 4.5 years

B. Teachers would like clearer indications of how much more will be expected of them and to what extent rectors and headmasters can be responsive to teachers' views in the local school decision-making process.

“The headmaster says that what we are doing is not the way they (politicians) want it. She said that nothing can be done because it has all been decided. ... Teachers feel that no one is listening to us.”  
Mia, 19 years of experience

“The problem is that you can be an anonymous rector. ... They should be out more but they are out too little. We very rarely see them.”  
Lars-Erik, 17 years of teaching

“What I am afraid of is that our situation as teachers will not turn out right. We have hours we are supposed to work; the work is getting harder; there are more things to do. Rectors' work is getting passed down to us. We are divided or split. Our time is divided. We really don't know how it will turn out.”  
Linnea, 22 years of teaching

“Teachers are trying to sort things out. Sometimes you do; sometimes you don't. They are confused, tired, and disillusioned. Some are finding it (the reforms) interesting and others don't care about it at all. Yet, some are finding the new ways most effective.”  
Johanna, Administrator, 4.5 years

Responses to Question # 3: Have You Personally been Involved in Developing and of the New Plan or Programs at Your School? If so, in what ways?

Table 7. Positive Responses to Question # 3

Role in Reforms	Teachers n = 12	Adm./Staff n = 10
ÖLA Group	2 - 17%	2 - 20%
Implementation of ÖLA	11 - 97%	4 - 40%
Member/Officer of the Local School Board	2 - 17%	2 - 20%
Not involved in the above	1 - 8%	6 - 60%

Because state and local officials outside local schools determine the state and local mandates, teachers, rectors, and staff members at Alfred Nobel Gymnasium, like those at other gymnasium schools, have little direct input into the contents of those mandates. This is reflected in responses to Question # 3. Teachers, rectors and staff members participate in the implementation of the reforms rather than the construction of them.

#### Discussion of the Findings of Case # 2, Alfred Nobel Gymnasium

Both the coding summary and comments from teachers suggest that the themes most often mentioned in relation to decentralization reforms are:

- 1) Increased workload and less time to accomplish new tasks in addition to preparing for classes
- 2) Lack of clarity in how to organize team meetings and implement interdisciplinary courses
- 3) Concern for the success of students with limited abilities and motivation in the uniform national courses such as mathematics, Swedish, and English.
- 4) Realization that team organization has both advantages and disadvantages and new methods, including PBL can be useful depending on the needs and abilities of students.

Additional issues and future actions mentioned in the interviews with teachers include:

- 1) Finding alternatives for reducing the number of meetings and for making scheduled meetings more productive without sacrificing opportunities to meet “face to face” to discuss important and meaningful issues.
- 2) Continuing to explore ways of incorporating technology, groups projects, PBL, and interdisciplinary planning into the current curriculum while exploring new ideas for international travel and study for students.
- 3) Obtaining examples of how “new ways of working” will reduce the number of tasks, individual responsibilities, and conflicting demands on teachers and rectors.

- 4) Determining how teachers' work can be more clearly defined and evaluated in order to compensate teachers adequately and fairly.
- 5) Acquiring successful models or examples of team organizations of gymnasium schools to expedite planning within the domains.
- 6) Determining how Swedish, English, Mathematics and other subjects can be successfully integrated within the domains and still maintain comparable autonomy to that of the other disciplines within the reorganization plans.
- 7) Persisting to evaluate curriculum and pedagogy which can best meet the needs of students who lack preparation and motivation for required gymnasium courses.

Administrators and staff members reflect many of the same concerns:

- 1). More work and less time to accomplish tasks creates stress for administrators and staff members as well as for teachers.
- 2) How best to prepare students with limited abilities, motivation or academic self-confidence for successful completion of gymnasium programs.
- 3) How to implement the numerous state and local reform mandates

The administrators and staff members emphasized two additional issues more strongly than the teachers:

- 1) How to help teachers adjust to an all day schedule that is productive but not exhausting
- 2) Meeting needs of the increasing number of students with family and other social problems whom are not successful in school.

### Case # 3: Olof Palme Gymnasium

Olof Palme Gymnasium was built in 1970 in a city adjacent to the city in which Gustav Adolf Gymnasium and Alfred Nobel Gymnasium are located. It has a spectacular view of the large lake along which both cities are located. The school is built on high bluffs above the lake and its cluster of separate and adjoining buildings are situated in a park-like setting. Olof Palme Gymnasium has the most vocational programs of the schools in the study although it also has the two standard university preparation programs, natural science and social science. The vocational programs include: child and recreation, energy, and vehicle engineering. There are also two Individual Study Programs in the Child and Recreation and Vehicle Programs. This autumn, Palme Gymnasium will introduce an IT program which emphasizes PBL teaching methods and off-site internships. Finally, there is a sports program at Palme Gymnasium that attracts athletes from both regional and national boundaries depending on the type of sport. These athletes may choose one of the national study programs available at Palme Gymnasium.

Olof Palme was Sweden's Prime Minister from 1969 until 1976 and again from 1982-1986 when he was assassinated in Stockholm. He represented the Social Democratic Party as a strong leader of social reforms in healthcare, employment, and education. He was also an outspoken opponent of racism, the Viet Nam War, and other

forms of social and political injustices. He was one of Sweden's best known international politicians.

Olof Palme Gymnasium has a reputation for being a school that experiments with new ways of teaching, particularly those students who are not academically strong. The school has a larger number of students than the two previous schools who are immigrants or children of immigrant parents and a larger number of vocational students than the other schools in the study. Approximately half of Palme's teachers volunteered to participate in a three year national program designed to train teachers in methods of indirect instruction similar but not identical to Problem Based Learning. This program introduced teachers to some of the teaching concepts recommended in the school reform mandates. Also, because Palme Gymnasium signed its agreement with the local municipality three years ago, this school has had several years of experience in team organization and project work compared to the other schools in this study. This experience has been helpful to teachers who work with students of varying academic abilities and interests as well as academically capable and talented students

The Child and Recreation Program is a model for schools interested in using PBL teaching and learning methods. The director of the program and a colleague who teaches Swedish, English and computing have written a book with 2 other educators about PBL and its applications to classroom settings. Teacher initiated professional development in PBL as well as in project learning has been consistent and positive at this school.

Ten teachers were interviewed over a two-week period from the week of May 8 – through May 18, 2000. These teachers represented programs or subject areas in Swedish, English, other foreign languages, science, child development, physical education, and car and truck mechanics. Staff members included the head master, 3 rectors, a librarian, social worker, and substitute teacher. I interviewed five students from the Child and Recreation program who were completing their gymnasium program this spring. I visited classes and spoke with teachers, staff members, and administrators both formally (at a faculty meeting) and during lunch periods and free periods in the faculty-staff lounges.

According to Table 8, Summary of the Coding Process for Olof Palme Gymnasium or Gymnasium # 3 (See Appendix E), the topics of Projects/PBL, More Work, Lower Ability Students, and Teams were suggested by 38% or more of the teachers and administrative/staff members as issues of importance and concern regarding the impact of the ÖLA Agreement and other school reform issues.

According to Table 9, the Codes Descriptions chart, (See Appendix F), the negative values were less frequent than in previous cases. The neutral values indicate descriptive qualities rather than ambiguous (both negative and positive) responses from informants. This category was the largest of any of the case studies.

## Common Themes at Olof Palme Gymnasium

The following themes emerged from the interviews with teachers, administrators and staff members at Olof Palme Gymnasium. They are support by quotations from teachers, administrators, and staff members.

### 1. Although the number of Projects, Problem Based Learning activities, and Team groups have increased, so have other tasks.

#### A. Collaborative planning takes time as do other tasks such as meetings with students, covering classes for teacher absences, routine faculty and team and subject area meetings.

“In the last five years I have seen a lot of things happen. We have had to work harder. Two to four people go down with health problems, emotional problems, those kind of problems.. In the last five years they have had changes and they are tired and unhappy or upset. It is popular to call it ‘burn-out’. Both teachers and rector have had this. I personally have had more salary and feel good about that but we as a school have had less money and yet we do not do less work. Other groups have had the same problems: extended work, less people to help – being short of staff. The reason they say is there is less money.”  
Clara, 30 years of teaching

“Many are very tired. Some have lost their visions and it was very different (the changes over the past five years). Their whole life changed.”

Eva, Staff , 12 years

“The main thing is that we work more. We’re paid more but we work more. We teach more classes and do more administrative work. We are supposed to talk to pupils more often than we did before. But, now that we are regulated, we talk to them less often because there is no time to talk. Before, I had time to “pop up” and visit them in other classes.”  
Izabel, 30 years of teaching

“ The politicians say that changes had to be paid for with the 10 to 20% raises. But, they had to be made with no extra costs. Teachers had to work more.”

Karin, Administrator, 15 years

#### B. Teachers believe that they are being asked to work more without limits to what they are asked to do.

“The first year I had less to do than I do compared to now. My colleagues give me more things to do now. I have more extra work each year. I say ‘okay, I can do that’. ... That’s a problem. It could be a problem in the schools as bigger responsibilities for each and every teacher will increase working time.”

Nick, 3 years of teaching

“Here there is more team work. This was in place when I started. Coming here as a new teacher I had a lot of support from my team. Teams are very important. Colleagues were very generous with their materials and we discussed teaching ... We have meetings on Wednesdays based on what week of the month it is. Since I am in three programs I meet with all three. The problem is that is hard to find time to meet with French and Swedish colleagues. We are so busy meeting with our other team members to discuss pupils that it is hard to meet with the Swedish and French people. ... We have little time to work on our lessons since we have so many meetings. We also have to mentor students. ...Every

teacher has had a raise...but, we have not defined what a full time job is.”

Greta A., 2 years of teaching

“Teachers were asked to do things for which they were not rewarded. They were to make the best of it. There was more money for more work ... but there was less described. There needs to be a limit on some demands in all reality.”

Marlena, Admin./Tchr., 30 years teaching

**2. Teachers are unwilling to offer identical theoretical courses to both students of lower ability and motivation and more able students despite mandates from higher authorities that all students have the same courses.**

**A. Teachers believe that they must adapt their academic expectations to individual student needs and abilities in order to help all students become more successful as learners.**

. Every student has to pass national exams within 3 years in English, Swedish, and math. Also, they want to make school ‘more equal’ ... Many teachers are afraid of new reforms. If I have seen here (in the teachers’ lounge) signs of new reforms, I think it has led to a lot of changes in the school. I find teachers not complaining about students as much as before. Now, the students are not so bad. Discussions are mostly positive. It started with the new plan for the schools...even if many people do not like it. Other changes are that we are growing .... We have begun work between different departments and programs. This takes up a lot of learning, life long learning. It is focussed on how students learn; how learning affects them. ...Mechanics must do this (pass the national exams). Teachers in Swedish, English and math were forced to find new ways to teach these students..”

Ann, Staff, 12 years

“Before, the vocational students had Swedish and English for only 1 or 2 years and there were different goals: those for theoretical courses and those for vocational courses. This is a hard task to solve. It is confusing and frustrating for teachers to attain the same goals and I am not sure that we are doing that. ... I have a bad conscience with my car mechanics students. They are poor Swedish and English learners. They have to obtain “gokänt” (pass). I teach in both the natural science and the car mechanics program. (Teachers teach in at least two different programs.) ... Swedish B is a literature course. There is a lot of literature, history, and reading of arguments. We do this in the science program. It is impossible to do this in the car mechanics program. We work very slowly and carefully and choose materials very carefully according to what they can read.

Barbro, 27 years of teaching

“In 1995, all programs were 3 years. ÖLA was a new way of thinking. All students shall have an equal possibility to learn. But, it seems that the politicians don’t realize that we aren’t equal and perhaps it is society that is more complex.”

Emma, substitute teacher

**B. PBL is successful with many students regardless of their learning abilities and learning styles; however, teachers must use a variety of teaching methods in order to meet students’ individual needs rather than rely exclusively on PBL.**

“In this school we have an after school childcare training program which has used PBL, exclusively, since they started. We were curious about it. It was quite successful with

unmotivated students. Students don't just sit and read, they are active and they provide work for themselves." Per, 25 years teaching

"In PBL we develop problems surrounding us. In the environment course we use research which has language that is easy to handle and we have students go out and generate problems. In mathematics there are not as many problems to generate. Some courses are better for problem-based learning than others." Clara, 28 years of teaching

"I do not always work with PBL; perhaps 60 or 70% of the time. When students meet this work, they really don't understand it as they are used to other things. Over three years things become natural to them. I got an email from an old student who is now at the university. He said that the kind of work we did makes things come more naturally to him, especially group work. When he has group assignments, he knows how to solve problems and does not spend a lot of time trying to learn how to work in a group." Karl, 29 years of teaching

"We enjoy projects but we don't want them all of the time. We like to go back to the traditional or old teaching style. We do not want to have to plan all of our work. We like the teachers to give us regular lessons, also."

Sara, Student from the Child and Recreation Program

C. Students who have social and emotional problems that detract from their learning success will need extra time and professional help in many of their courses to become "godkänd"

"Now we have students who do not want to be here. It is like having a 15 or 16 year old here instead of an 18 year old. ... It is difficult to motivate them to be here. They have few options. They can't work. It is a daycare for some." Eva, Staff, 29 years

"Before, we could have a student not get a grade in the class if he did not complete it. He could come back and complete it. We have to give a grade right now. Many teachers do not want to give a failing grade. We also have to keep records of what students are missing in their courses so they know what they have to complete. The computer makes this easier. I make sure my students have a print out of exactly what they owe me. ... My colleagues are sometimes too nice to their students by giving them a pass instead of IG. That gives students a message." Olof, 20 years of teaching

"Some students have 15 weeks of work with children (Child and Recreation Program), retarded children, and older people. These pupils are tired and they need to grow up and act like adults. In school they are not motivated. They are tired, absent, and not on time. For some students, school is not the real world. Outside is the real world. They are not on time the whole year. However, outside the school, they are different. They feel that if you don't do it outside ... you are not good enough. You have only yourself to blame. You are responsible to those children and their parents. We prepare them to go out. They are thinking about how to behave even if they do not like it all the time."

Greta B., 10 years of teaching

"I can think more for myself. I can organize things. We can work without anyone having to tell us what to do... Teachers can tell if you are working after a while. They are able to evaluate us pretty well. We also know how hard we have been working and if we deserve the grade we receive." Brian, a student from the Child and Recreation Program

3. Lack of adequate financial resources to implement school reform projects limits teachers' incentives to develop new projects.

A. Cutbacks in school spending are counterproductive to the success of the reform program

"The economic problem is the school development. The local politicians make all the decision and approve school plans. The school should mean progress but it is a mix. There are many demands but fewer resources. Most teachers don't like it."

Clara, 28 years of teaching,

"All communities have been saving money on schools. The government gives money to the community, which is supposed to support the schools, and the community is free to use the money as they wish. Most of the money goes to fill holes in the community budget. They have not used it in the schools. ... Most people agree that schools cost money and that the local community should stop cutting." Per, 25 years of teaching

The state wants to save money and make the community pay for a lot of school expenses. There is a small amount to spend per student but there is not enough money. The school expenses have drained the community economy. There is also a new way of counting, in a funny way, the school expenses. The school monies are co-mingled with city funds. After the change to local funding, we were charged rents by the technical branch of the local government where before we were not (the school owned the buildings). We pay 20-30% of our budget in rents." Karin, Administrator, 15 years

B. Department heads in core courses (Swedish, English, mathematics, etc.) function in essential roles without compensation and autonomy, unlike their counterparts in other program leadership. The elimination of leadership in these departments impedes the development of these subject areas for successful student performance on national tests in these subject areas.

"I am the department chair in English and for that I teach less. I organize the work and try to save money. We will now divide up all the work between the English teachers and not have a head. ... The government officials meant for the core subjects to be important (English, Swedish, Math, etc.) but they did not assign them a national program. Being positive, the authorities are not stupid enough to decrease these subjects. The Social Democrats mean well. They want students to be well educated; but they did not figure the consequences of the organization they created in secondary education. Having the programs force these subjects into the "A" courses (beginning level courses for programs) may prove that these subjects are important. But, working as a language teacher, what happens if the teacher is not a strong character and is overruled in questions of money? All money may be put into the programs rather than the core subjects."

Izabel, 30 years of teaching

C. Reductions in staff position is an economic advantage but an educational loss in terms of availability of teachers and staff members for assignments in both department and program teams.

"It takes some time to be able to teach those who need help. There are not enough resources in the Swedish economy to do it. There is only a limited amount."

Izabel, 30 years of teaching

“ They (local officials) want to cut down the costs of school. What they give with one hand they take away with the other. There are cutbacks. I couldn't put money into new programs that I wanted to develop. We have new ideas but little time to develop them. The main costs are in planning time. We cut costs and we cut time. The contract maintains that we teach 35 hours, we do not have a lot of energy. Even with more money (salary), we do not have enough time. People would like either more money or time off for all of the extra planning that is needed. We cut costs but pay for it in increased students and tasks.”

Ivar, 21 years of teaching

#### 4. Teachers believe that they have voice in the school's decision-making process affecting their working environment

##### A. Teachers applaud current efforts of rectors and headmaster to listen and communicate freely with them.

“We have changed from leadership of four rectors, including the headmaster, to program rectors who work under the headmaster. Rectors here are rectors one third of the time and teach two thirds of the time. This is flexible depending on how many teachers are in the program. ... We work with our program 'boss' who is responsible for people in the program, for conferences to suggest solutions for problems., for professional development conferences, and for pupils' problems. ... The new departments are open like an open door or window. Rectors know that we present lessons and teachers walk back and forth through our classes. The rectors are in our area of the building. Rectors do the hiring with the headmaster and members of the union and members of the subject areas. This is a committee.”

Clara, 28 years of teaching

“I listen to them (teachers). I hear what the problem is. I organize things to benefit the program. I persuade them to do things they aren't particularly happy about doing? How? I respond to reason. I make solutions, which are not always the best, but the best possible. There aren't many options. They may do it as a favor but next year they want something better. I try to remember that the next year.”

Marlena, Adm./Tchr., 30 years of teaching.

“The rector is one of us. Before, we live here and they sit down there. They didn't visit us. In one year they decided whether or not to buy equipment. It is easier to motivate one working beside you. We can say we need a new machine and he says, 'of course'. This is a much better arrangement that way.”

Olof, 20 years of teaching

“Before, the headmaster took more decisions such as the economics of the school and the development of the school. Now, there are six different rectors in charge of each program and 15 teachers under her. We feel more participation.”

Barbro, 27 years of teaching

##### B. Teachers are concerned that their experiences and opinions are absent in decisions affecting their work environment by local authorities. Yet, there are exceptions:

“The local community leaders do not see things the way we do and do not listen to our perspectives.”

Clara, 28 years of teaching

“They give goals that everyone should pass. Goals are there but there are no guidelines to implement them. The biggest frustration among teachers today is that we are

professionals of 25 years or more of teaching and are not the same teachers we were ten years ago.”  
Barbro, 27 years of teaching

“ I am currently working on a new IT program. We will implement it with PBL. ... The IT program will have a holistic attitude, not just IT. We will have a double competence: economy, technology and also science, music, drama, and physical education. We got money from the politicians and the new school (William Gates) will compete for money. I think competition is good. ... I went directly to the politicians with our plan. I called a meeting with them and that is what made it a success. We live across the street from 30 or more technical companies. We are not going to be just a computer programming school; we want to develop people who can learn and learn and learn.”

Karl, 29 years of teaching

**Responses to Question # 3:** “Have You Personally been Involved in Developing any of the New Plans or Programs at Your School? If so, in what ways?”

Table 11 Positive Responses to Question #3

Reform Roles	Teachers n = 10	Adm./Staff n = 6
ÖLA Group	2 - 20%	2 - 33%
Implementation of ÖLA	9 - 90%	2 - 33%
Member/Officer of the Local School Board	2 - 20%	2 - 33%
Not involved in the above	1 - 10%	2 - 33%

As in previous cases, few teachers and administrators took an active part in developing school reforms since they are given to them by national authorities or the local community. Most school personnel assist in the implementation of school reforms rather than the initial planning of them.

### Discussion of the Findings of Gymnasium # 3: Olof Palme Gymnasium

The coding summary and the interviews from teachers indicate that the most frequently mentioned topics or concerns are:

- 1) Increased workload and less time to complete additional tasks
- 2) Satisfaction with the collegiality and support of team organizational structure and a desire to encourage more teachers to participate
- 3) Concern among some teachers that core subjects for the national tests are not adequately represented within the program structure
- 4) Uncertainty that students with limited abilities will be able to be successful in the mandated uniform theoretical courses.

Additional concerns of teachers are:

- 1) Cutbacks in school funds that limit new program design in some subject areas and reduce accessibility to additional professional support staff for students with limited abilities.
- 2) Grade inflation among colleagues who feel pressured to give passing grades

Administrators and staff members reflect the same concerns as teachers: heavy workloads, students who do not pass courses, and satisfaction with team groups. Additional concerns or issues are:

- 1) Increased stress among teachers and administrators
- 2) Continued progress in the implementation of the new re-organizational structure consisting of rectors as program leaders
- 3) Adjustment of teachers to the extended-day schedule
- 4) Limited funds for schools despite increases in school tasks and program expenses

### Cross-Case Comparisons of Teachers, Administrators, and Staff Members

Tables 11 and 12, Summary of the Coding Process for Gymnasium #1, #2, and #3 (See Appendices G and H), indicates the following:

1. The categories of: More Work, Teams, Projects, Lower Ability Students, and Less Time are mentioned most frequently by 36% or more of the teachers when they respond to questions of school decentralization and school reforms.
2. The category of Implementation closely follows the above categories in terms of frequency. This series of categories has been consistently present throughout the study although most often in the first two schools. Differences among the three schools in terms of types of programs, composition of students, and especially experience with team organization and interest in PBL and group projects may account for fewer implementation concerns at Olof Palme Gymnasium.

Some differences occur which are worth noting:

- 1) The categories of Teams and Projects are mentioned more frequently in Cases #2 and #3 than in Case #1. Teachers in Alfred Nobel Gymnasium are more divided in their views of teams than Olof Palme Gymnasium which reflects more interest and enthusiasm according to interview data. Gustav Adolph Gymnasium is just beginning to structure teaching teams and is more skeptical of the merits of team organization.
- 2) Lower Ability Students are mentioned more frequently in interviews in Gymnasium #2 and #3 than in Gymnasium #1 where there are fewer of these students than in the other two schools.
- 3) Implementation is cited as of more concern in Gymnasium #1 than the other schools as it begins to try to find meaningful ways to interpret the reforms. Gustav Adolph Gymnasium was the most recent school to sign an agreement with the local community and to begin to implement their school plan.
- 4) All three schools note the conspicuous absence of guidelines from central and local authorities although some assessment guidelines are expected from the National Agency for Education in autumn, 2000.

Administrators and staff members mention the topic of Stress more frequently than teachers, although they appear to notice it not only within themselves but in teachers. The emphasis on More Work is even stronger within these respondents (58%) than the teachers (50%).

## SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

Findings of this study reveal that respondents from each of the schools had similar concerns about their school decentralization experiences. Each of the schools reported that:

- 1) More work and less time to complete tasks create stressful working conditions for teachers, administrators, and staff members. Pressure is intensified for teachers who find that they are losing preparation time for classes by having to attend numerous conferences with students or colleagues. Conscientious teachers work evenings and week ends to catch up on their work which, formerly, was completed during free time when teachers could leave school after their classes were over.

Implication: Teachers, administrators, and staff members who are given unlimited responsibilities and limited time and resources with which to fulfill them may eventually refuse to support new programs as indicated, for example, by the decisive rejection of the ÖLA II Agreement in April, 2000.

- 2) There is increasing number of lower ability students who attend gymnasium schools and who are expected to complete a gymnasium certificate in three years despite weak skills, poor motivation or social and emotional conflicts. Teachers who face these students are not confident that these students will be successful in passing mandated core courses in English, Swedish, and mathematics. Despite the perceived views of political authorities that claim "good teachers" can make this possible, "good" classroom teachers (and administrators) are not convinced.

Implication: Teachers and administrators may continue to search and experiment with methods and materials that can be successful with these students. Failing that, teachers may choose to cope with this problem by developing a two tiered system to accommodate these students. Secondly, they may engage in grade inflation, especially if teachers' work will be evaluated according to how few students fail their courses.

- 3) Teachers are divided in their views about the value of team organization, particularly teachers who are just beginning to explore this type of working arrangement. Teachers of English, Swedish, and mathematics who are not in a program of their own but who are subordinate to the other programs are unsure of their relationship to these programs. They indicate that they want to meet regularly with members of their own subject area as well as with their team members. Because implementation of team organization and structure

have been left to local schools (as have other aspects of the school reforms) schools are at different stages of progress in adjustment to this new way of working.

Implication; Again, it would be helpful if national, regional, or local educational authorities could provide a variety of models or examples of team organization and structure for teachers and rectors to analyze and apply to their own school environments. This type of collaboration in itself exemplifies team work between those who have knowledge about how changes will look and work and those who are trying to implement those changes. As Lance, from Gustav Adolf Gymnasium, said: "The bosses need to have a plan or strategy. You can't just put us in groups... We are not used to working in teams."

Teachers and rectors at Olof Palme continue to work on better forms of team organization as they experience increasing advantages of collaborative planning. But, as Barbro from Olof Palme said, "It is a slow process. It takes a really long time to make changes."

Teachers at Gustav Adolf and Alfred Nobel gymnasium schools are just beginning to create models for, and experiment with, interdisciplinary team planning, project learning, and PBL. They are creating their own models appropriate for their students and their colleagues. It is likely that they, too, will become models for other teachers to follow.

- 4) Teachers want clearer interpretations and guidelines regarding national reforms, especially models of applications suitable for gymnasium schools. They also want communication within their school and with officials within their community about decisions that affect their work environments.

Implication: Models and implementation guidelines, especially those discussed and approved collaboratively by participants in school reforms, are significant factors in successful changes and reforms. Without these guidelines, chaos (and increased stress) often results in the work place. Several teachers at Olof Palme Gymnasium were familiar with PBL and project methods prior to their agreement with the local community. This was helpful when their changes began three years ago. Also, teachers in the Child and Recreation Program provided a model of PBL for teachers who wished to observe, discuss and consider this new approach to learning. These factors contributed to teacher interest, confidence, and participation in these aspects of the school reforms.

The significance of teacher involvement in comprehensive school reform has been substantiated in the literature on school change. Opportunities for professional development, experimentation, and support throughout the initial and later phases of the change process contribute to successful implementation

of changes. Teachers in this study have indicated that leaders who are able to listen to teachers' professional opinions and utilize their expertise are more likely to attract "followers" than those who simply mandate compliance.

The confidence that teachers at Olof Palme exhibited in the leadership of their rectors, most of whom had been former department heads and/or respected teachers at Olof Palme Gymnasium, contributes to teachers' transition to the new organizational structure at that school. The collegiality which teachers see developing between headmaster, rectors, and teachers and staff at Palme enables teachers' voices to be both expressed and incorporated into school decisions. As one teacher said, "We feel more participation".

These patterns have also begun at Gustav Adolph and Alfred Nobel gymnasium schools as experienced, respected teachers become rectors and school leaders or as new rectors from outside the school begin to establish strong relationships with teachers and they with them.

- 5) Teachers and rectors believe that adequate state and local financial support of schools is an integral part of the implementation of the reform requirements.

Implication: Adequate resources to support school reforms are necessary ingredients according to the research literature for sustained interest in and successful implementation of reform projects. Without adequate resources for implementation of school reform initiative, it is unlikely that there will continue to be incentives to develop these initiatives.

#### LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

There are several limitations to this study. First, research was confined to only three schools within Sweden that limits generalizability of these findings. Secondly, the length of time in each school was two weeks during the final two months of the school year. Teachers, administrators, and staff members had had a long school year and were in the midst of trying to close the current school year. It is likely that they were more fatigued and frustrated than in the earlier months of the school year. Finally, the respondents were a convenience sample consisting only of those who were willing to be interviewed in English. It is possible that a language barrier may have created a barrier to a wider range of respondents.

#### ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS:

1. The role of support staff members such as: nurses, librarians, counselors, social workers, technical support people, registrars, etc., in assisting teachers and administrators in implementing school policies is often underrated or overlooked. In this study, these people offered helpful and insightful perspectives on student life and teachers' responsibilities. Students who cannot find teachers or rectors to talk with

often find that nurses, registrars, and technical support people and others on the staff will listen to them and often provide advice and support.

2. Teamwork evokes and involves collaboration. The process of decentralization of schools in Sweden is supposed to transfer the role of the national government from one of central planning and decision-making to one of assistance and evaluation. Perhaps this is an opportunity for teamwork. Schools are just in the beginning stages of realizing their own opportunities to engage in planning and decision-making on the local school level. This is also a form of teamwork. So far, national mandates have continued to develop and penetrate local schools. Positive responses to Question #3 (Have you personally been involved in developing any of the new plans or programs?) were few. Teachers and rectors have been involved only in the implementation of predetermined mandates. This is teamwork on the local level only.

However, the strengths of collaboration, planning, and decision-making are beginning to grow. Olof Palme developed a strong infrastructure of teacher leaders and followers over the past several years. At Gustav Adolph and Alfred Nobel teachers have made their voices heard in the past through their own teacher leaders, many of whom were department heads. Now, in both schools there exist individual rector/colleagues who listen to their teachers' concerns and solicit their opinions, and make decisions on the basis of this process. Perhaps team organization will encourage more of this. If so, the collaborative culture may extend across the city to local political officials with whom some teachers are anxious to work. Change has much to do with relationships in which all parties believe that they are receiving benefits for what they give.

## CONCLUSION

While schools in the United States struggle with application of national standards, state standards and local standards to individual classrooms, their counterparts in Sweden are doing much of the same thing. Separate traditions of decentralized and central authority have prepared both cultures to view new changes from different vantage points. In both cases, however, national political, social, and economic influences will affect the outcome of these changes. In both cases, on each local school level, the commitment of each school to the change process will be as strong as its most resistant participant.

A strong obstacle to the comprehensive change process lies in the perceived disadvantage teachers and administrators have in the reform process compared to national and local authorities. Lack of power to influence changes, lack of communication between educators and politicians, and limited resources by which to meet national and local expectations plague collaborative work between school and community groups. Increases in salaries for teachers do not appear to be adequate "rewards" for the current expectations of national and local expectations. Opportunities for more influence in the change process, more communication with local officials, and adequate resources to support changes have been suggested by both teachers and administrators as an

improvement if not a solution for current adversarial relationships between school and community officials.

Comprehensive school reform can result in chaos or collaboration (or perhaps a mixture of each). The challenge of change for teachers, rectors, and headmasters will be to define for themselves and, thus, for each other, the direction it will take.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. (1991). Cognitive politics of principals and teachers: Ideological control in an elementary school. In *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation*, J. Blasé, pp. 120-138. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ball, S. (1987). *The micropolitics fo the school: Towards a theory of school organization*. New York: Methuen.
- Blasé, J. (1991). . In *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation*, ed. J. Base, pp. 1-18. Ndwbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berends, M. (with Heilbrunn, J., McKelvey, C., & Sullivan, T.) (1998). *Monitoring the process of new American Schqols: A description of implementing schools in a longitudinal sample*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND)
- Daun, H. (1998). Comprehensive schooling at the intersection of market, state, and civil forces: Two Swedish case studies. In A. Tjeldvoll (Ed.), *Education and the Scandinavian welfare state in the year 2000: Equality, policy, and reform* (pp.305-333).
- Education Commission of the States. (1998). *Comprehensive school reform: Allocating federal funds*. Denver, CO:Author
- Fullan, M.. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M.. (1993). *Change forces*. London: Falmer.
- Greenfield, W (1991). The micropolitics of leadership in an urban elementary school. In *The politics of life in schools*, ed. J. Blasé, pp. 161-184. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (1996) *What's worth fighting for in your school*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Husen, T. (1998). The Swedish school reforms: Trends and issues. In A. Tjeldvoll (Ed.), *Education and the Scandinavian welfare state in the year 2000: Equality, policy, and reform*. (pp. 99-111), New York: Taylor Francis.
- Lander, R. & Ekholm, M. (1998). School evaluation and improvement: A Scandinavian view. In A. Hargreaves, A. Liberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins

(Eds.), *International handbook of educational change, Part II*, (pp. 1119-1134. Great Britain: Kluwer.

- Liberman, A. & Miller, L. (2000). Teaching and teacher Development: A new synthesis for a new century. In R. Brandt (Ed.), *Education in a new era*. (pp. 47-66). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McChesney, J. & Hertling, E. (2000, April). The path to comprehensive school reform. *Educational leadership*, 57 (7), 10-15.
- Miron, G (1998). Restructuring education in Sweden. In A. Tjeldvoll (Ed.), *Education and the Scandinavian welfare state in the year 2000: Equality, policy, and reform*. (pp. 151-171), New York: Taylor Francis.
- Nolan, J., Jr. & Meister, D. (2000). *Teachers and educational change; The lived experience of secondary school restructuring*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY.
- Olson, L. (1998, February 4). Will success spoil Success for All? *Education Week*, 42-45.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1995). *Reviews of national policies for education: Sweden*. Paris: OECD.
- Skolverket (The Swedish National Agency for Education) (1997). *A school for the future: the ideas underlying the reform of upper-secondary education in Sweden*. Stockholm: the Swedish government.
- Skolverket (1998). Upper Secondary School. Västervik: Ekblad. Available on line: <http://www.skolverket.se/english/system/upper.shtml>
- Smylie, M. & Perry, G., Jr. (1998) Restructuring schools for improving teaching: characteristics of the literature. In A. Hargreaves, et al., (Eds.) *International handbook of educational change, Part II*, (pp. 976-1006
- Stoll, L & Fink, D. (1996). *Changing our schools*. Buckingham: Open University.
- Swedish Institute (1998). *Upper secondary and adult education in Sweden*. Available on line: <http://www.si.se/eng/sverige/seceduc.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Profiles of successful schoolwide programs*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Willower, D. (1991). Micropolitics and the sociology of school organizations. *Education and urban society* 23: 442-454.

Appendix A

Table 2. SUMMARY OF THE CODING PROCESS FOR GYMNASIUM # 1

Numbers in Boldface Indicate Responses of 33% of the Total or Higher											
Q = Question followed by the question number	TEACHERS				ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF				Total n=22		
	n=14	Q. #1	Q. #2	Q. #4	Total n=42	Q. #1	Q. #2	Q. #4		Total n=24	
CODES											TOTAL n=66
1. MW	More Work	50% 7	57% 8	57% 8	55% 23	50% 4	88% 7	63% 5	67% 16		59% 39
2. LT	Less Time	29% 4	79% 11	57% 8	55% 23	0	50% 4	63% 5	38% 9		48% 32
3. I	Implementation	43% 6	57% 8	57% 8	52% 22	25% 2	50% 4	25% 2	32% 8		45% 30
4. TEAMS	Team Groups	50% 7	57% 8	43% 6	50% 21	25% 2	25% 2	0	17% 4		38% 25
5. STSS	Student Social Problems	36% 5	50% 7	21% 3	36% 15	8% 1	38% 3	38% 3	29% 7		33% 22
6. LM	Less Money for Schools	29% 4	43% 6	14% 2	29% 12	8% 1	63% 5	50% 4	42% 10		33% 22
7. LAB	Lower Ability Students	14% 2	50% 7	36% 5	33% 14	8% 1	38% 3	25% 2	25% 6		30% 20
8. N/L	National/Local Changes	64% 9	14% 2	14% 2	31% 13	38% 3	25% 2	0	21% 5		27% 18
9. PROJ	Use Projects, New Methods	29% 4	29% 4	36% 5	31% 13	25% 2	25% 2	8% 1	21% 5		27% 18
10. STRS	Stress	0	29% 4	14% 2	14% 6	0	88% 7	50% 4	46% 11		26% 17
11. CURR	Curriculum Changes	7% 1	43% 6	14% 2	21% 9	13% 1	8% 1	0	8% 2		17% 11
12. LPP	Local Political Problems	0	43% 6	21% 3	21% 9	0	0	25% 1	8% 2		15% 10
13. NV	No Voice (Teachers')	0	36% 5	21% 3	19% 8	0	8% 1	25% 1	8% 2		15% 10
14. TKS	Teachers Kept at School	21% 3	29% 4	14% 2	21% 9	13% 1	0	0	4% 1		15% 10
15. EVT	Evaluation of Teachers	7% 1	29% 4	7% 1	14% 6	0	25% 2	25% 1	13% 3		14% 9
16. RK	Rektors' Job	7% 1	36% 5	21% 3	19% 8	0	0	0	0		12% 8
17. TD	Teacher Decision-making	14% 2	21% 3	14% 2	17% 7	0	0	25% 1	4% 1		12% 8
18. PD	Professional Development	0	14% 2	7% 1	7% 3	13% 1	8% 1	25% 1	13% 3		9% 6
19. SR	Student Responsibilities	21% 3	0	0	7% 3	13% 1	8% 1	0	8% 2		8% 5
20. EVS	Evaluation of Students	0	14% 2	7% 1	7% 3	0	8% 1	0	4% 1		6% 4
21. LSS	Less Salary than Expected	0	21% 3	0	7% 3	0	8% 1	0	4% 1		6% 4
22. COLL	Collegiality (Teachers')	0	0	21% 3	7% 3	0	0	0	0		5% 3

**Appendix B**  
**Table 3. CODING IDENTIFICATIONS**  
 Gymnasium # 1 Study (April 3 – 14, 2000)

Code Identification	Code Description	Negative/Positive/Neutral
1. MW – More Work	More tasks for teachers and administrators and staff	Negative (-)
2. LT - Less Time	Teachers, staff, and administrators notice less time to complete all tasks.	Negative (-)
3. I – Implementation	Problems of clarity and direction in putting state and local goals into effect; unclear guidelines.	Negative (-)
4. TEAMS – Team groups	Expectations that teachers will work in diverse subject area teams	Neutral (no sign)
5. STSS – Student Social Problems	More teacher responsibilities for counseling and advising of students	Negative (-)
6. LM – Less Money for Schools	Local and national authorities are perceived to want to save money by providing less monetary resources through the reform movements.	Negative (-)
7. LAB – Lower Ability Students	Students with limited abilities or self confidence who are not successful in school	Neutral (no sign)
8.. NL – National to Local decentralization of tasks and some authority	Decision-making, funding, goes more to local political communities and schools.	Neutral (no sign)
9. PROJ. – Projects, New Teaching Methods	Strong recommendations by the state to use new, more indirect teaching methods to motivate students.	Neutral (no sign)
10. STR – Stress	Specifically stated feelings of duress, frustration, and illness related to work	Negative (-)
11. CURR – Curriculum Changes	Numerous state directed changes in program and/or course requirements.	Negative (-)
12. LPP – Local Political Problems	Difficulties with uninformed local politicians who are critical of school practices	Negative (-)

<b>Code Identification</b>	<b>Code Description</b>	<b>Negative, Positive, Neutral</b>
13. NV – No teacher Voice	Teachers are not consulted in decisions affecting their work.	Negative (-)
14. TKS – Teachers Kept at School	Policy to require teachers to spend a full day, each day, in school for meetings.	Negative (-)
15. EV - Evaluation of Teachers	Evaluations of teachers are perceived to be based on extra work and student performance.	Negative (-)
16. RK – Rektors jobs	Perceptions that rektors have little power to help teachers or are unwilling to consult teachers for input into decisions	Negative (-)
17. TD – Teacher Decision-making	More teacher influence in how changes and policies are made affecting the learning environments	Positive (+)
18. PD – Professional Development Opportunities	Opportunities for teachers to develop new skills and to learn new concepts	Positive (+)
19. ST – Student Responsibilities	Students are expected to have more choices and responsibilities for their work.	Positive (+)
20. EVS – Evaluation of Students	Students and teachers feel added pressure because of grading and “gokant” policies	Negative (-)
21. LSS- Less money for salaries than expected.	Perceptions that money which was anticipated in earlier discussions has not been allocated	Negative (-)
22. COLL – Collegiality	Opportunities for colleagues to work together in teams or special groups	Positive (+)

Summary of codes: 22 codes

N = 22 (Teachers: 14; Non-teachers, administrators: 8)

Negative values: 14 (64%)

Positive values: 4 (18%)

Neutral values: 4 (18%)

Total 22 (100%)

Appendix C

Table 5. SUMMARY OF THE CODING PROCESS FOR GYMNASIUM # 2

CODES	TEACHERS				N=12				ADMIN/STAFF N=10				TN=22	
	n=12 #1	n=12 #2	n=12 #3	n=12 #4	Total n=36	#1	n=10 #2	n=10 #3	n=10 #4	Total n=30	GT n=66			
1.MW	25% 3	75% 9	25% 3	50% 6	50% 18	50% 5	20% 2	80% 8	50% 15	50% 33				
2. LAB	25% 3	58% 7	25% 3	66% 8	50% 18	40% 4	60% 6	20% 2	40% 12	45% 30				
3. TEAMS	75% 9	33% 4	75% 9	25% 3	44% 16	30% 3	30% 3	20% 2	27% 8	36% 24				
4. I	42% 5	42% 5	42% 5	25% 3	36% 13	20% 2	30% 3	30% 3	27% 8	32% 21				
5. LT	25% 3	58% 7	25% 3	66% 8	50% 18	10% 1	10% 1	10% 1	10% 3	32% 21				
6. PROJ	58% 7	25% 3	58% 7	33% 4	38% 14	20% 2	30% 3	10% 1	20% 6	30% 20				
7. CCH	8% 1	33% 4	8% 1	8% 1	17% 6	30% 3	40% 4	0	23% 7	20% 13				
8. TKS	50% 6	17% 2	50% 6	0	22% 8	40% 4	10% 1	0	17% 5	20% 13				
9. STSP	17% 2	8% 1	17% 2	17% 2	14% 5	40% 4	30% 3	10% 1	27% 8	20% 13				
10. STR	8% 1	25% 3	8% 1	8% 1	14% 5	0	30% 3	30% 3	20% 6	17% 11				
11. EV S	0	33% 4	0	25% 3	19% 7	10% 1	30% 3	0	13% 4	17% 11				
12. LM	25% 3	17% 2	25% 3	0	14% 5	0	30% 3	30% 3	20% 6	17% 11				
13. LPP	25% 3	17% 2	25% 3	0	14% 5	0	20% 2	10% 1	10% 3	12% 8				
14. EVAL T	33% 4	17% 2	33% 4	0	17% 6	10% 1	0	0	3% 1	11% 7				
15. N/L	42% 5	0	42% 5	0	14% 5	10% 1	20% 2	0	7% 2	11% 7				
16. RK	17% 2	17% 2	17% 2	17% 2	17% 6	0	0	0	0	9% 6				
17. ST	17% 2	0	17% 2	8% 1	8% 3	20% 2	10% 1	0	10% 3	8% 5				
18. COLL	0	8% 1	0	17% 2	8% 3	0	10% 1	10% 1	7% 2	6% 4				
19. NV	8% 1	8% 1	8% 1	8% 1	8% 3	10% 1	0	0	3% 1	6% 4				
20. TD	8% 1	8% 1	8% 1	8% 1	8% 3	0	0	0	0	5% 3				
21. LSS	17% 2	8% 1	17% 2	0	8% 3	0	0	0	0	5% 3				
22. PD	0	0	0	8% 1	3% 1	0	0	20% 2	7% 2	5% 3				

**Appendix D**  
**Table 6. CODING IDENTIFICATIONS**  
 Gymnasium # 2 Study (April 25 – May 5, 2000)

<b>Code Identification</b>	<b>Code Description</b>	<b>Negative/Positive/Neutral</b>
1. MW – More Work	More tasks for teachers, administrators, staff	Negative (-)
2. TEAMS – Team groups	Expectations that teachers will work in diverse subject area teams	Neutral (no sign)
3. PROJ- Projects. New Teaching Methods	Strong recommendations by the state to use new, methods to motivate students	Neutral (no sign)
4. TKS – Keep Teachers at School	Policy to require teachers to spend a full day, each day, in school for meetings.	Negative (-)
5. LAB – Lower Ability Students	Students with limited abilities or self-confidence who are not successful in school.	Negative (-)
6. SSP – Student Social Problems	More teacher responsibilities for the personal/social problems among students.	Negative (-)
7. LM – Less Money for Schools	Local authorities want to save money by providing fewer monetary resources for schools	Negative (-)
8. LPP – Local Political Problems	Difficulties with some local politicians who are critical of school practices.	Negative (-)
9. NV – No teacher voice	Teachers are not consulted in decisions affecting their work.	Negative (-)
10. STR – Stress	Specifically stated feelings of pressure and frustration	Negative (-)
11. N/L – National to local decentralization	Decision-making, funding, goes more to local political communities and schools.	Neutral (no sign)
12. EVS – Evaluation of Students	Students and teachers feel added pressure because of grading and “godkänd” policies.	Negative (-)

13. EVT – Evaluation of Teachers	Evaluations of teachers are perceived to be based on extra work and student performance	Negative (-)
14. PD – Professional Development Opportunities	Opportunities for teachers to develop new skills and to learn new concepts	Positive (+)
15. ST – Student Responsibilities	Students are expected to have more choices and responsibilities for their work..	Positive (+)
16. LT – Less Time	Teachers, staff, and administrators have less time to complete tasks.	Negative (-)
17. RK – Rektors' jobs	Perceptions that rektors' roles in providing leadership for changes are unclear	Negative (-)
18. COLL – Collegiality	Opportunities for colleagues to work together in teams or special groups	Positive (+)
19. CURR – Curriculum Changes	Numerous state directed changes in program and/or course requirements	Negative (-)
20. TD – Teacher Decision-making	More teacher influence in how changes and policies are made affecting the learning environments	Positive (+)
21. LM - Less Money for Salaries for Some	Perceptions that some teachers make less money than they expected	Negative (-)
22. I - Implementation	Problems behind the realization of mandated state and local goals; unclear guidelines	Negative (-)

Summary of codes: 22 codes  
N = 22 ( Teachers: 12; Non-teachers, administrators: 10)

Negative values:	15	(68%)
Positive values:	4	(18%)
Neutral values:	3	(14%)
Total	22	(100%)s

**Appendix E**

**Table 8. SUMMARY OF THE CODING PROCESS FOR GYMNASIUM # 3**

CODES	TEACHERS					ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF					N=6		Grand Total	
	#1	#2	#4	Total n=30	#1	#2	#4	Total n=16	n=48	Total n=16	n=48			
1.PROJ	60%	60%	60%	60%	17%	83%	60%	60%	17%	33%	50%	50%	54%	26
2.MW	40%	50%	50%	47%	17%	100%	47%	47%	17%	33%	50%	50%	46%	22
3.LAS	30%	50%	40%	40%	67%	67%	40%	40%	67%	33%	63%	63%	46%	22
4.TEAMS	30%	70%	50%	50%	33%	50%	50%	50%	33%	67%	19%	19%	38%	18
5.Less \$	50%	20%	10%	27%	33%	33%	10%	27%	33%	0	25%	25%	25%	12
6.RKT JOB	0	20%	20%	20%	0	17%	20%	20%	17%	50%	25%	25%	21%	10
7.COLL	10%	30%	30%	23%	0	33%	30%	23%	0	17%	19%	19%	21%	10
8.KTS	20%	20%	0	13%	33%	67%	13%	13%	33%	0	13%	13%	21%	10
9.STSS	10%	30%	10%	17%	17%	33%	10%	17%	17%	17%	25%	25%	19%	9
10.TD	20%	20%	20%	20%	17%	17%	20%	20%	17%	0	13%	13%	17%	8
11.EVALS	30%	30%	10%	23%	17%	0	10%	23%	17%	0	6%	6%	17%	8
12.LPP	20%	20%	20%	13%	17%	0	13%	13%	17%	0	6%	6%	15%	7
13.PD	0	10%	20%	10%	0	17%	20%	10%	0	33%	19%	19%	13%	6
14.STR	0	20%	10%	10%	17%	33%	10%	10%	17%	0	19%	19%	13%	6
15.N/L	30%	0	0	10%	17%	0	10%	10%	17%	0	13%	13%	10%	5
16.LT	10%	10%	10%	10%	0	0	10%	10%	0	17%	13%	13%	10%	5
17.I	0	20%	0	6%	33%	0	6%	6%	33%	0	19%	19%	10%	5
18.CURR	30%	10%	10%	17%	83%	0	17%	17%	83%	0	0	0	10%	5
19.EVALT	20%	0	10%	10%	17%	10%	10%	10%	17%	0	6%	6%	8%	4
20.NV	10%	10%	0	6%	0	0	0	6%	0	0	0	0	8%	4
21.LSS	10%	0	0	3%	17%	0	3%	3%	17%	0	13%	13%	6%	3
22.STR	0	0	0	0	17%	0	0	0	17%	0	13%	13%	4%	2

**Appendix F**  
**Table 9. CODING IDENTIFICATIONS**  
**Gymnasium # 3 Study (May 8 – May 18, 2000)**

Code Identification	Code Description	Negative/Positive/Neutral
1. Implementation	Problems behind the realization of mandated state and local goals; unclear guidelines	Negative (-)
2. TEAMS – Team groups	Team assignments designed to create more interdisciplinary planning	Neutral (no sign)
3. PBL/Projects	Expectations that teachers will initiate projects and new methods such as PBL	Neutral (no sign)
4. KTS – Keep Teachers at School	Teachers must be in the building all day	Negative (-)
5. LAB – Lower Ability Students	Students who are currently in gymnasium programs but are poorly prepared and poorly motivated.	Neutral (-)
6. STSS – Student Social situations	Increasing number of personal/social problems among students	Negative (-)
7. Anti-LP- Anti-Local Politicians/ Influence	Belief that local politicians are making unwise decisions for the schools	Negative (-)
8. NV – No teacher voice	Teachers are not consulted in decision affecting their work	Negative (-)
9. STR – Stress	Specifically stated feelings of pressure, frustration, and illness related to work	Negative (-)
10. N/L –National to Local decentralization	Increased decision-making and funding delegated from the state to local political communities	Neutral (no sign)
11. EVAL-S	Evaluation of Students by changes in the grading system	Neutral (no sign)
12. Rektors' Jobs	Restructuring of school leadership with rektors as program heads	Neutral (no sign)
13. TD – Teacher Decision-making	Teachers are given more influence in the decision-making process	Positive (+)

CODES	DESCRIPTIONS	VALUES: +, -, =
14. COLL – collegiality	Opportunities for colleagues to work together in teams, groups	Positive (+)
15. MW – More Work	More tasks for teachers, administrators, and staff	Negative (-)
16. LT – Less Time	Teachers, administrators, staff have less time to complete tasks	Negative (-)
17. CURR CHG - Curriculum changes	State reorganization of the curriculum in programs	Neutral (no sign)
18. LM - Less money available for schools	Perceptions that there has been less money for schools than anticipated	Negative (-)
19. LSS – Less Money for some teachers' salaries than expected	Perceptions that money which was anticipated in earlier discussions has not been allocated to all teachers.	Neutral (no sign)
20.EVAL-T Evaluation of Teachers	Evaluation of teachers are perceived to be based on extra work and student performance	Positive (+)
21.PD – Professional Development	Opportunities for teacher and staff development has increased	Positive(+)
22. ST – Student Responsibilities	Students are expected to have more choices and responsibilities for their work.	Positive (+)

Summary of codes: 22 codes

N = 16 (Teachers: 10; Non-teachers, administrators:6)

Negative values: 9 (41%)

Positive values: 5 (23%)

Neutral values: 8 (36%)

Total 22 (100%)



**U.S. Department of Education**  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



## REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

### I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Challenging Changes: Responses of Three Upper Secondary Schools to Sweden's Decentralization Process.</i>	
Author(s): <i>Jill A. Wettersten, Ph.D.</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>[Signature]</i>	Publication Date:

### II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  _____ <i>Sample</i> _____  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
<b>1</b>

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  _____ <i>Sample</i> _____  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
<b>2A</b>

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  _____ <i>Sample</i> _____  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
<b>2B</b>

Level 1

↓

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Level 2A

↑

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Level 2B

↑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

Signature: <i>Jill A. Wettersten</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Jill A. Wettersten, Ph.D.</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>NORTH PARK UNIVERSITY 3225 W. FOSTER AVE. CHICAGO IL 60625</i>	Telephone: <i>773-244-5732</i>	FAX: <i>773-244-4960</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>jwetterste@northpark.edu</i>	Date: <i>4-9-01</i>



(over)

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: <b>University of Maryland</b> <b>ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation</b> <b>1129 Shriver Laboratory</b> <b>College Park, MD 20742</b> <b>Attn: Acquisitions</b>
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**  
1100 West Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)