MANAGEMENT TYPES TO SHARE DECISION MAKING WITH EMPLOYEES

Faraj Mansour,

Health Ministry of Israel

Abstract: In this work paper, the author's goal is to examine and review the effects of participation of the employees in the determination of the policy of the organization they belong to– phenomenon that gains acceleration and is expressed in various places, especially in the times of globalization and distant working from home at times of Covid-19 crisis. To make a team be united, decision sharing is a must.

Key words: Management types; sharing (joint) management; federation; formal collaboration, participative management.

INTRODUCTION

The professional literature discusses some types of management – one of them is the sharing (joint) management.

Sharing and common management is expressed in different ways, whether it is the management of natural resources and land, or management of schools.

In this review the author liststhegenerally known existing models, and how they have been implemented in practice - when later he will try to use and implement these models in her field of research.

In the next paragraph,the author describes three different ways of common management, in the field of schools (Josselin and Marciano, 2006):

1. Federations.
2. Formal Collaborations.
3. Sharing Management.

FEDERATIONS

The principle of federation was founded in the "Law of Education"of 2002 and updated by school management regulations of 2012. The federation brings a change in the status of the school principal. It is defined in the law as two or more schools that act under the same manager,

and under the same management entity, with the CEO who controls the leadership and the management of the federation (Josselin and Marciano, 2006).

Although it is typically limited to five schools, de facto, there is no real limit of the number of schools that can join the federation.

Such common management comes as the upgrade of the partnership between schools that want to make their collaboration an official matter. If the collaboration between schools was successful, the policy making entities can move further to the next step, of the process of creation of federation.

A federation is a matter that holds for many years, it is a long-term commitment - and it cannot be considered as a short-term solution. It is an arrangement that determines a lot, rather than a formal partnership (Arnold, 2006).

The benefits of the federation include:

- The support of the schools through common leadership and labor agreements, which lead to the improvement of teaching and learning, behavior and the academic results of the children.

- Improved opportunities for the children, including richer and wider curriculum of arts, sport, music, sciences and more.

- Improved opportunities for the staffof participation of good practices and expertise, joint planning and assessment, richer professional developing and richer practice, more successful recruitment of the staff, better career progression and the opportunity to work in a variety of schools and in a variety of contexts.

- Better leadership developing and talents management through talents detection and developing of support of future leaders, with opportunity to work over the federation and acceptance of mentoring from experienced leaders.

- Strengthening of the management and the control.

- Saving of costs due to joint use of managerial functions.

FORMAL COLLABORATIONS

The informalterm of this type of collaboration is "soft federation" (Arnold, 2006). Generally, this is an agreement of understandings, which sets out a common purpose and direction, and includes

the creation of a common committee of managers, which will report back to the principals of each school individually (Arnold, 2006).

The Committee has authorities that are delegated for it, and enable it to engage with the issues of salary and performance management of the acting principal. It also has authorities regarding economic arrangements during the period of collaboration, including additional responsibilityof the heads of theschools.

The corporate entities caninformallyagree about proposals of collaborations, and different arrangements of membership in the panel. Any recommendation should go through the relevant entities.

Such arrangements come when for example there is a problem to achieve a permanent appointment for the principal. For example, principal of another school can be appointed as acting principal of a specific school, to be responsible for all aspects, in addition to continuation of her role as a principal of the school which he/she manages formally.

Another possibility is that schools with small and decreasing numbers of pupils can think about participation of their management arrangements, in order to save the staff costs.

Sometimes such arrangements are only tightening of the collaborations that take place now and over the time.

Such arrangements are usually temporary, and they are limited to about two years.

Alongside with the benefits of these arrangements, there are also many disadvantages - it is actually two managerial entities, and it affects the attention of the principal who now has to cope with two managerial entities.

The principal himself/herself was not physically at the two schools, but only at one –something that affects his/her management ability.

Also, because during the time there were actually reduced the costs of one of the schools, there is a real danger that the financing institutions (government agencies) will get used to the budgetary situation - and therefore with the end of the arrangement there will be a budgetary problem to achieve a new principal for the school.

At the end of the period, they return to the model of a one principal for each school - or, alternatively, a federation is established between the two schools.

SHARING MANAGEMENT

The sharing management is an alternative to school leadership that is different from the traditional model of "One school –one principal".

Management of this type occurs when more than one person is required to fulfill the position of a school principal fully (Coleman, 2004).This model is sometimes called "collaborative management","connective management" or "management under partnership".

The decision to accept the sharing management is accepted only in the managing entity.The parents and school management members should be sure that this model will have a positive impact on the school's standards and on the achievements, the health and the safety of the pupils.

The main question is whether the leadership arrangements are appropriate to the needs of the school in the terms of assurance of the best quality for the pupils.The authorities of each principal are clearly divided by members of the school management, in advance, in order to avoid disputes.

However, in the case that although this, serious disputes are created, there is a need for mediation. The school management should determine in advance who is a mediator and in which issues, including when there is a need for professional consideration, whether to call for an external consultancy.

The benefits of such management are:

- Assists to maintain professional principals in the system.
- Attracts new principals.
- Supports leadership continuity.
- Provides creative and collaborative leadership in the school.

The disadvantages of such a management are:

- Skepticism among the staff, the parents and the supervisors.
- The supervisors do not always support the applying for the deputies of principals.
- There are complaints regarding the reduced accountability and erroneous decisions making.
- Engagement with the issues of salary.

The term "sharing management" is actually made up of some theories about governance and resources sharing.

Sharing management is a comprehensive set of terms that includes –staff management, participatory management and collaborative management and management under collaboration– all of them can describe alternately the type of management that has become popular in the management of various systems - ranging from natural resources systems to schools.

The definition of sharing management is something that changes over the years, but at this time, this definition which is accepted by most researchers is the following one:

"Partnership in which two or more players, collectively negotiate, agree, promise and implement a fair sharing of management functions, benefits and responsibility for a particular field" (Shibish, 2015).

As a case study, it is worthwhileto examine what happens in Australia, in the case of national parks - the issue is relatively new, and integrates the governmental management together with the native inhabitants of the place.

This is under the joint management of the government with the native inhabitants (Aborigines), on the basis of the assumption that these inhabitants have rights for the land and rights to settle it. In fact, the first successful arrangements were only after the recognition of the demands of rights of indigenous to the land. This negotiation was culminated with the arrangements between the Aboriginal people and the Government –in the "Cockatoo" National Park and in "Grieg Gonak Barlow" National Park (the only park that combines the sea and the land).

Lori Ann Shibish (2015) point out that "joint management arrangements in Australia are usually very significant outcome of negotiations between the Australian Government and the Australian indigenous inhabitants".This trend continues even more by most Australian states, which amendthe existing legislation or create new legislation that encourages joint management initiatives.

Western Australia recently presented changes of some laws that enable to public parks to apply themselves joint management arrangements.Shibish (2015) mentions also the"Cockatoo" Park and the joint management:

"Joint management is only one aspect of the liquidity of the country, in which there is a demand that comes from below for the decentralization of authorities and autonomy demand of citizens meets a supranational need in the context of the control over resources and access to them".

Under this decentralization process, the researcher notes, "Ideally the indigenous groups and the agency (in this case the state itself) will benefit both from the joint information, from the values and from the experiences".

As happened throughout the whole Australia, Western Australian Government responded to calls of the native population for greater access to decision making processes that are related to their traditional land.

There is no doubt that this is a good thing to involve local stakeholders in efforts to maintain the parks - and therefore the changes in Australian legislation were made in order to enable the ability to enter arrangement of joint management of the parks. The legislation includes new managerial purposes in order to manage the parks according to the values, the culture and the heritage of the native population - Hence the need to consult with people of Aboriginal origin about these issues, was created.

All studies which Shibish reviewed, showed the importance of establishing of joint management agreements for the parks, and recognize the importance of indigenous cultural heritage regarding to environmental management.

There is a general recognition the bureaucracysometimes imposes barriers on the way of progress, particularly in the field of access to financing. Five of the nine studies that were review by Shibish, identify the lack of financial ability, a lack of human resources and a lack of knowledge –as the main barriers for success.Shibishalso argues that studies that were conducted in the past 20 years about the joint management defined its various aspects and illuminatedsomeroles in the joint management that were emerged duringthe moving: organizational mediation, knowledge creation and social learning.Other benefits that joint management produces, in the context of land management, are employment, protection of land and obtaining rights on the land and cultural rights, improved management of parks and environmental outcomes.

Shibish brings the studies of Hill (2011) and Zurba et.al. (2012) whoargue thatthe abilities of co-building, respect, and honesty are key components in the success of arrangements of joint management.They argue that a common vision and common purposes are the main part of the success of joint management.

It was argued that the negotiation for joint managementis significantly difficult when some of the data are not overt or are not known (Hill, 2011; Shibish, 2015). Therefore, researchers

recommend a maximal disclosure of information, in order to create trust in the negotiation process towards a joint management.

PARTICIPATORY (PARTICIPATING) MANAGEMENT

Kearneyet.al. (2007) claim that governmentalstructures underwent a change that is based on a realistic working hypothesis that more open public participation in the decision-making processes lead to more successful and more sustainable processes.

Participatory approaches have international importance, such as signingon the agreements at the Earth Conference in Rio by 178 countries. Management of multiple values and different approaches brings complex problems that require complex system –that should be managed by people whose lives are strongly related to this system.

In theory, participatory management enables different people to share their attitudes and to negotiate about agreed results. Theories of joint management argue that these arrangements can fall within a continuum, which ranges from consultation to participatory governance. The ideal scenario is a balance, somewhere in the middle of the continuum, inside the real relationship in which each party brings unique strengths and insights to the table.

The researcherColeman (2004) mentions "many benefits ofpower sharing in organizations. However, a common obstacle to power sharing is theunwillingness of those with power to share it". The study of Coleman (2004) proposes thatchronic differences in implicit power theories (the degree of competitive vs.cooperative beliefs and ideals regarding organizational power relations) willaffect managers' decisions to share or withhold power. Managers' beliefs in cooperation and hierarchy importance cause them to behave in a certain manner. The more the managers in the Coleman's (2004) survey believed in competition theories, the less they were ready to share power, information and decision making with their employees.

An Israeli researcher D.Vanza (2005) described the fight of the Pelephone company for involving the employees in decision making in the organization, which made lots of organizations to deal with development of advanced models for creating more productive work relations between the workers' committees and the employers, in order to build up a fruitful cooperation in in the strategy processes of management, in resolving conflicts in a way of talk and agreement. One of the most important models in the field, according to Vanza (2005), is "The model of sharing workers and business sustainability" proposed by Israeli center of state

Macro-economics. According to this model, a company survival in the complicated economic field makes a direct cooperation between the management and the employees crucial. Such a cooperation will be maintained by establishing a common council for management and employees' representatives, in the framework of which the employees' major contributions to the process of making decisions and economic success of the organization will be expressed.

Between the issues the model suggests, according to the Macro Center, there are mechanisms allowing agreements in many domains, in addition to basic conditions which were agreed upon in the collective agreements. One of them are agreements on rewards and money grants for excellence at work, agreements in the matters of welfare, working norms and productivity, promotion path and fit between the functions and the positions, agreements about work hours flexibility, relocation of employees and employment security, agreements about the ways of work in a corporation and its organizational structure, outsourcing etc.

However, there are voices proposing to participate workers at higher levels. Unfortunately, many managers in Israel disagree with this level of sharing, since this approach has a vision to involve workers in forums and departments like the management council and in meetings of the organization management, where the most important organizational decisions are made. This high level of sharing causes employers to object, since it might cause serious changes in the decision making.

It is commonly known (Vanza, 2005) that the most powerful workers' committee is the German one, since in Germany counselling and sharing decision with employees is a must. Anything that moves in a company there, should be agreed. It is true they have no right to strike, but do have an obligatory arbitration, so this is the most fair workers' committee in the world. The French who have the right to strike still envy the German workers' committee, who is the strongest one. Any managerial decision has to be approved by the workers' committee. The common decision is not only on the management level, but also on the managerial council, fifty percent of which are employer's representatives and the other fifty percent are the employees' representatives. Ordinary employees sit in the council, in the front of the managers, and talk not only about the work issues, like salaries, welfare, but also about strategies, products and business activity of the organization.

Vanza (2005) describes the situation in his book: "I knew they will not agree, so I asked that in any management meeting there will be two employee's representatives. They will be the

minority and will not be able to cancel decisions, but they still will be participating in decision making, involved. If there is a touch decision about firing some workers, we will first talk if there is a real need to do it. We should conduct everything the right way from the very beginning."Vanza also describes a real life story of a company who decided to fire thousands of employees. The workers' committee's representative asked "Why?" and were answered that the situation at the market is quite difficult now. Then the representatives proposed not reduce the salaries in 5% for half of year, since the company is in the crisis, and then they proposed to raise it back, when the situation is better. This way, thousands of fires were prevented. "There are some steps that can be undertaken, there are ways and solutions, there is only a need to be creative and to think together, both the management and the workers" (Vanza, 2005).

In Israel, most of the model of workers' participation are welcome when they talk about welfare issues, but are stubbornly refused when they deal with managerial issues. Lots of Israeli managers do not agree with the German model and do not think it is right for their organizations (Vanza, 2005).

SUMMARY

To summarize, employees today to not agree just to follow rules and makes what they told without asking about the managerial decision, they will also demand to be active partners in getting decisions. This brings about importance of this review of managerial types and forms of decision sharing and employees' involvement.

BIBLIOGRAPGY

1. Arnold, R. (2006). Schools in Collaboration: Federations, Collegiates and Partnerships, EMIE at NFER.

2. Coleman P.J.(2004). Implicit Theories of Organizational Power and Priming Effects on Managerial Power-Sharing Decisions:An Experimental Study. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34, 2, pp. 297-321

3. Hill, R. (2011). Towards Equity in Indigenous Co□Management of Protected Areas: Cultural Planning by Miriuwung□Gajerrong People in the Kimberley, Western Australia. Geographical Research, 49(1), 72-85.

4. Josselin, J. M. and Marciano, A. (2006). "How the court made a federation of the EU". *The Review of International Organizations*. 2: 59. <u>doi</u>:<u>10.1007/s11558-006-9001-y</u>

5. Kearney, J., Berkes, F., Charles, A., Pinkerton, E., &Wiber, M. (2007). The Role of Participatory Governance and Community-Based Management in Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management in Canada. Coastal Management, 35(1), 79-104.

6. Shibish, L. (2015). The evolution of joint management in Western Australia parks and the indigenous tourism nexus. Retrieved from https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses/1694

7. Vanza, D.(2005). Revolution and justice. Story of working union of Pelephone employees. Zameret books, Israel: p.302. (Hebrew)

8. Zurba, M., Ross, H., Izurieta, A., Rist, P., Bock, E. &Berkes, F. (2012). Building co-management as a process: problem solving through partnerships in Aboriginal country, Australia. Environmental management, 49(6), 1130- 1142.