

Presenting Model of Rotation from Centralization to Reducing of Focus on the Field of Formality and Power in Decision-Making of Staff Levels in Education in Tehran

Meysam Heydari¹, Heidar Toorani^{2*}, Ghodsi Ahghar³

1. PhD Student of Educational Management, Department of Educational Sciences, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.
2. Associate Professor, Institute of Education Studies, Tehran, Iran.
3. Professor, Institute of Education Studies, Research and Educational Planning Organization, Tehran, Iran.

Article history:

Received date: 2021/03/7

Review date: 2021/08/11

Accepted date: 2021/08/23

Keywords:

Centralization, Formality, Power,
Decision-making, Education

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this research was presenting model of rotation from centralization to reducing of focus on the field of formality and power in decision-making of staff levels in education of Tehran.

Methodology: Present research in terms of purpose was applied and in terms of implementation was quantitative. The study population was the principals and employees of the staff level of education ministry and the principals and teachers of secondary high schools of Tehran city in the academic years of 2018-19, which based on Cochran's formula from them, were selected 440 people by simple random and multi-stage cluster sampling methods. To collect data was used from 37-items researcher-made questionnaire that its content validity was confirmed by experts and the structure validity of instrument was confirmed by factor analysis and its reliability was calculated 0.94 by Cronbach's alpha method. Data were analyzed with exploratory factor analysis and structural equation modeling methods in SPSS and AMOS software.

Findings: The findings showed that the model of rotation from centralization to reducing of focus on the field of formality and power in decision-making had six components of formality, power in decision-making, horizontal communication, delegation of authority, information technology and school-based. Also, the mentioned model had a good fit and all six components of formality, power in decision-making, horizontal communication, delegation of authority, information technology and school-based had a significant direct effect on the rotation from centralization to reducing of focus ($P < 0.05$).

Conclusion: Regarded to the results of the present study through improving the components of formality, power in decision-making, horizontal communication, delegation of authority, information technology and school-based can be achieved from centralization to reducing of focus on the field of formality and power in decision-making.

Please cite this article as: Heydari M, Toorani H, Ahghar Gh. (2021), Presenting Model of Rotation from Centralization to Reducing of Focus on the Field of Formality and Power in Decision-Making of Staff Levels in Education in Tehran, *Iranian Journal of Educational Sociology*. 4(2): 105- 113.

* Corresponding Author: heidar_toorani@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

Today, the globalization and emergence of information and communication technologies has turned the world into small villages, and this issue, along with the complexity and unpredictability of the environment, causes organizations with a hierarchical structure focused on more flexible and agile organizations to respond to change (FarhadiRad, Shahi & Tahmasebi, 2019). All organizations, including educational organizations, make decisions in a distributed and centralized manner in order to carry out current affairs and chart their future horizons. In distributive decision making, as opposed to centralized decision making, all members of the organization participate in decision making (Haghighi, 2012). The study of educational systems in different countries indicates two currents; one is decentralization in centralized educational systems and centralism in decentralized educational systems (Guerra & Lastra-Anadon, 2019). The discussion of centralism and decentralization in the history of curriculum studies has always been one of the most challenging issues in educational systems, including the education system (Ovseiko & Buchan, 2015). In general, there is no absolute focus or decentralization, but to better understand these two concepts, they can be considered as two ends of a spectrum. In absolute concentration, all authority at various levels, including educational levels, is in the hands of the central government, and no decision-making power is given to smaller units, all of which implement the policies of the central government. However, in absolute decentralization, all authority at various levels, including educational levels, is in the hands of smaller central government units (Aasland & Soholt, 2020).

The idea of decentralization is based on delegating responsibility to human society and giving them the right to participate in decision-making (Eva, Sendjaya, Prajogo & Madison, 2021). The centralist organization is the organization that often has the decision-making power in the hands of the highest level of organizational managers, and the decentralized organization is the organization in which decision-making powers are scattered in different levels of the organization (Khandelwal & Detroja, 2020). Decentralization is a process in which powers; decisions, responsibilities, and tasks are referred from high to low levels, gradually reducing the degree of concentration and increasing decentralization or decentralization (Gershberg, Gonzalez & Meade, 2012). One of the reasons for the claims of decentralization in educational systems is that by delegating decision-making rights and accountability to schools, the quality of education can be improved. Because in this case, principals, teachers, parents and students will have a greater share in selecting curriculum content and improving the quality of education (Laudams, 2013). If students feel that they are allowed to interfere in policy-making and national policy-making through decentralization, they will choose from the different ideas the ones that are more reasoned and documented. Decentralization, then, is a humane, rational, and efficient response to the needs of learners who are eager to study in the education system (Jeong, Lee & Cho, 2017).

One of the concepts that makes sense in the discussion of centralism and decentralization is the concept of formality, and in centralist organizations the discussion of formalization and observance of hierarchy is observed more, but in decentralized organizations the discussion of formality and observance of hierarchy is less observed (Pertusa-Ortega, Zaragoza-Claraez-Sa -Cortes, 2010). Transferring decision-making power from the level of subject matter specialists and curriculum planners and curriculum center managers to lower levels at the district and school levels and more to teachers and administrators is one of the indicators of decentralization (Hammami, Frein & Albana, 2020). Another issue in decentralization is the issue of horizontal communication, where decentralization reduces vertical communication and induces top-down commands, and people in the organization communicate with each other in a friendly and emotional environment (Giannoccaro, 2018). Another concept that makes sense in the discussion of decentralization is the concept of delegation, which means the delegation or delegation of formal authority and operational responsibility in relation to the performance of a particular task (Martin, McKelvie & Lumpkin, 2016). Information technology is another concept in the discussion of decentralization that plays an important role in appropriate, rational and sensible decisions. This concept affects the structure and design of the

organization and organizations need to use information technology to ensure their survival (Gordon, 2020). One of the needs of educational organizations, including education, is the development of information technology in educational programs, which can lead to a qualitative change in the goals, programs, methods and effectiveness of this system. Because information technology helps educational systems to develop their structures in line with the changes of time and take on new responsibilities related to scientific development and its democratization and reduction of focus on it (Daft, 2017).

Another concept in the discussion of decentralization is the concept of school-centeredness, which introduces the school itself as the main factor in improving the quality of education and indicates the need to increase the school's authority to produce curriculum content and self-fulfillment, motivation and sense of teacher progress based on this type is the curriculum (Nir, 2020). Decentralization means delegating more authority to schools and empowering staff to participate in decision-making and reducing the gap between principals and employees to achieve efficiency and effectiveness (Harper, Hopper, Keating & Harding, 2020). The move towards school-centered management is one of the most prominent developments in educational systems in the last two decades, and school-centered management is an effective strategy in decentralization and strategic guidelines and a plan to improve the education system by transferring authority and decision-making and empowering the school and its staff (Oecd, 2016).

The results of FarhadiRad, et al (2019) showed that Ahwaz education is not ready to implement decentralization policies and its factors can be the generality and ambiguity of the decentralization perspective, the lack of justification of its necessity and importance for implementers, inadequate selection and appointment system. Managers pointed out the low quality of managers' empowerment programs. Vaezi & Abbasi Harafteh (2018) while researching concluded that the decentralization model in the calligraphy process of the Iranian educational system has 12 main themes including identifying the educational calligraphy process, understanding the environment of the educational calligraphy process, documenting the educational calligraphy process, analyzing the educational calligraphy process environment Creating a flowchart of the existing educational planning process in Iran, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the educational planning process in the country, re-engineering the educational planning process in the direction of decentralization, preparing a flowchart of the decentralized educational planning process, training, communication and gathering feedback, initial process model The implementation was a centralized process of educational policy-making and evaluation and reporting of results. In another study, Camelia, Vladimir-Aurelian & Catalin (2014) reported that decentralization was on the agenda as a basic need to improve the education system, but did not provide a platform for decentralization in society. Also, Mirkamali & A'alaamee (2009) while researching concluded that most teachers and school principals are ready to create decentralized structures, participate in school affairs, accept power and authority, localize and flexibility of programs, have professional and professional staff. , Responsibility and accountability have a favorable opinion. In addition, Bjork (2004) concluded in a study that decentralization in the curriculum depends on freedom and creativity, and that now education system employees, unlike in the past, sought to follow self-determination and independence in policy-making and program-making and are school policies.

In recent years, decentralization in the Iranian education system like other countries has been considered by officials and planners and even in compiling the generalities of the education system of the Islamic Republic of Iran, generalities of the new secondary education system, educational management commission, and educational management follow-up committee. Education, Draft National Education Document, Basic Strategic Document of the Deputy of Primary Education and Document of Fundamental Transformation of Education There is a lot of emphasis on decentralization as one of the contexts of modern education (FarhadiRad & et al, 2019).

In addition, decentralization in education as a global phenomenon is one of the major issues in education today and one of the main challenges in the curriculum is the issue of decentralization and decentralization. In recent years in the Iranian education system decentralization and more authority to

schools to improve quality Education has increased dramatically. According to the proposed concepts, it is appropriate to take effective steps to decentralize and thus improve the quality of the education system. As a result, the aim of this study was to present a model of rotation from centralism to reducing the focus on formality and power in decision-making at the staff level in Tehran.

2. Methodology

The present study was applied in terms of purpose and quantitative in terms of implementation method. The study population consisted of two sections: managers and staff of the Ministry of Education and the principals and teachers of secondary schools in Tehran in the 2018-19 academic years. To determine the sample size, Cochran's formula was used, based on which the sample size of 440 people was calculated. A simple random sampling method was used to sample the first part of the community, ie managers and staff of the Ministry of Education. For this purpose, first 44 managers were selected from the headquarters after preparing their list and from each manager, 4 employees were selected after preparing their list in a simple random method. Therefore, 44 managers and 176 of their employees, ie 220 people from the Ministry of Education, were selected. Also, multi-stage cluster sampling method was used to sample the second part of the community, ie principals and teachers of secondary schools in Tehran. For this purpose, first the city of Tehran is divided into five districts: north, east, south, west and center and two districts are randomly selected and two districts from each district and 11 schools from each district are selected by simple random method and one principal from each school and four secretaries were elected. Therefore, 44 principals and 176 teachers, ie 220 principals and teachers of secondary schools were selected. A total of 88 principals (44 staff members and 44 school principals) and 352 employees (176 staff members and 176 teachers) ie 440 people were selected as a sample.

Criteria for entering research at the staff level of the Ministry of Education include studying in one of the majors in the field of management and information technology, at least a master's degree and at least three years of service and criteria for entering the research at the school level including studying in one of the majors in management and information technology , At least a bachelor's degree and at least three years of service and exclusion criteria in both sections included a reluctance to participate in the study. In order to conduct this research, after coordination with the Ministry of Education and the Tehran Education Organization, sampling was performed and then the purpose, importance and necessity of the research were stated for the samples and they were assured about observing ethical points and asked to be careful and patient. Answer the researcher-made questionnaire. The average response time to the researcher-made questionnaire was about 10 to 15 minutes. To collect the data, a researcher-made questionnaire was used, which had 37 items, which was scored using a five-point Likert scale from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). The tool had six components: formality, decision-making power, horizontal communication, delegation, information technology, and school-centeredness. The content validity of this instrument was confirmed by experts and the construct validity of the instrument was confirmed by factor analysis method and its reliability was calculated by Cronbach's alpha method of 0.94. Data were analyzed by exploratory factor analysis and structural equation modeling in SPSS and AMOS software.

3. Findings

In this study, 440 people with an average age of 37.86 years were present, whose number and percentage of demographic information, including gender, education and age were presented in Table 1.

Table1. Number and percentage of demographic information of the present study samples

Variable	Levels	Number	Percentage
Gender	Man	258	58/64
	Female	182	41/36
education	Masters	163	37/05
	Masters	237	53/86
	P.H.D	40	9/09
Age	30-26 years	57	12/95
	35-31 years	96	21/82
	40-36 years	133	30/23
	45-41 years	112	25/45
	50-46 years	42	9/55

According to the results of Table 1, most of the samples were male (58.64%) and had a master's degree (53.86%) and were aged 36-40 years (30.23%). The results of factor analysis to shift from centralism to reducing the focus on formality and power in decision-making staff levels in education in Tehran are presented in Table 2.

Table2. Results of factor analysis of the present research model

Components	Number of items	Factor load	Convergent validity	Cronbach's reliability
Official	6	0/53	0/57	0/91
Power in decision making	9	0/57	0/62	0/93
Horizontal communication	4	0/56	0/59	0/87
delegation of authority	6	0/60	0/68	0/90
Information Technology	5	0/62	0/74	0/85
School-centered	7	0/60	0/69	0/89

According to the results of Table 2 of the present research model, ie the model of rotation from centralism to reducing the focus on formality and decision-making power with six components of formality (with 6 items), decision-making power (with 9 items), horizontal communication (with 4 items), delegation Authority (with 6 items), Information Technology (with 5 items) and School-Oriented (with 7 items). Factor load all components were confirmed due to higher factor load values than 0.50 indicating appropriate factor load, dimensional content validity due to higher than 0.50 and their reliability due to higher Cronbach's alpha values than 0.70. The results of mean, standard deviation and normality of the components of the present research model are presented in Table 3.

Table3. Mean results, standard deviation and normality of the components of the present research model


Components	Average	Standard deviation	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistics	p Value
Official	19/31	3/46	1/08	0/18
Power in decision making	10/65	3/35	1/06	0/20
Horizontal communication	11/21	3/28	1/25	0/08
delegation of authority	22/54	3/97	0/97	0/13
Information Technology	20/75	4/52	0/77	0/58
School-centered	21/08	4/02	0/89	0/24

According to the results of Table 3, the hypothesis of normality of all six components of the present research model, namely the components of formality, decision-making power, horizontal communication, delegation, information technology and school-based, was confirmed. The results of fitness indicators of the present research model are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Fitness indices of the present research model

Indicators	χ^2/df	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	GFI	TLI
the amount of	2/74	0/04	0/03	0/98	0/98	0/97
Acceptable	<3	<0/08	<0/08	>0/90	>0/90	>0/90

According to the results of Table 4, the present research model had a good fit. The fitted model of the present study along with the standard coefficients of the paths is presented in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.** The fitted model of the present study along with the path coefficients

According to the results of Figure 1, all six components are the components of formality (0.23), decision-making power (0.27), horizontal communication (0.17), delegation (0.16), information technology (0.22) and school-centered (0.14) had a significant direct effect on the shift from centralism to a reduction in the focus on formality and power in decision-making at staff levels in education ($P < 0.05$).

4. Discussion

Today, unlike in the past, there is a great deal of emphasis on decentralization and a shift from centralism to reduced focus. As a result, the aim of this study was to present a model of rotation from centralism to reducing the focus on formality and power in decision-making at the staff level in Tehran. Findings of this study showed that the model of rotation from centralism to reducing the focus on formality and decision-making power had six components of formality, decision-making power, horizontal communication, delegation, information technology and school-based. Also, the model had a good fit and all six components of formality, decision-making power, horizontal communication, delegation, information technology and school-based had a significant direct effect on the shift from centralism to reduced concentration. These findings were in line with the findings of FarhadiRad et al. (2019), Vaezi & Abbasi Haraftah (2018), Camelia, et al (2014), Mirkamali & A'alaamee (2009) and Bjork (2004).

In interpreting the role of formality, it can be said that the effective factors to reduce concentration are legal channels that can be decentralized by shortening the links in the hierarchy of the administrative hierarchy and strengthening transverse movements. At present, education is focused both in terms of structure (hierarchy) and in terms of content (level of staff and queue authority). Where is the point between focus and decentralization, and what level of authority should be delegated so that both the center's goals and policies are not compromised and schools have the authority to perform their tasks

optimally? In general, as the level of formality in the education organization decreases, so does the focus on education, and this means that the formality component, ie rules and regulations, bylaws and directives, organizational rules and regulations, etc., is less issued and communicated by the organization and the center. Bureaucracies and sub-agencies can make more independent decisions and centralism is reduced.

Explaining the role of power in decision-making, it should be said that as the level of power in decision-making increases, the level of centralism in education decreases. Today, with the complexity and specialization of affairs, the level of decision-making power is considered as one of the main advantages in the management system. For their survival, all organizations, including the education organization, must make constructive and appropriate decisions in which there are new and innovative ideas. Because decision innovation not only enables organizations to gain a competitive advantage over competitors, but also provides useful tools for improving organizational performance. The more information and knowledge the employees of an organization have about the subject of decision making, the higher their decision-making power will be. People with high self-esteem have a lot of decision-making power and are able to make better decisions in critical situations.

In explaining the role of horizontal communication, it can be pointed out that horizontal communication reduces the focus on education. Horizontal communication plays an important role in any organization and as the amount and horizontal relationship between educational areas increases, so does the focus on education. Each educational area has different facilities, capabilities and capabilities, and having a connection between the areas will help managers to benefit from these facilities if necessary, and by exchanging opinions and experiences to provide the ground for others to benefit from these experiences.

In interpreting the role of delegation, it can be said that the delegation of authority in education has an important role in reducing the focus in this educational system. Delegating authority to managers strengthens self-confidence among managers and plays an important role in increasing their efficiency. In fact, delegation is a process in which power and authority are shared with subordinates, and when the work and occupation of the manager is beyond his capacity, he must divide his tasks and duties in order to maintain the optimal performance of the organization. By delegating authority, managers increase their capacity and manage more tasks, which give them the opportunity to address more important issues such as planning, organizing, evaluating, analyzing business opportunities, and so on. Conversely, delegating authority to subordinates instills in them a sense of importance and value, which results in increased employee motivation and job satisfaction and the creation of more desirable outcomes.

Explaining the role of information technology, it should be said that the use of information technology reduces the focus on education. Just as information and communication technology is used in many everyday business processes such as e-banking, e-commerce, e-mail and even e-government, the use of these technologies in education is inevitable. People in any place and time can get the latest information they need in any field, and without a doubt, information technology has the greatest role in changing educational environments. The application of information technology and its rapid change has led to many changes in the field of education and learning. Need learning resources.

In explaining the role of school-centeredness, it can be pointed out that school-centeredness reduces the focus on education. In recent decades, the use of participatory approach and school-based management plan has been welcomed in many countries. So that many countries put the school-based plan at the forefront of their important policies and pursue it as a national and strategic policy. School-based is based on decentralization and empowerment and decision-making and transfer or division of power in the school and is one of the most famous strategies in the field of reforming the educational system, improving the quality of learning, changing traditional patterns, values, structures and norms and educational excellence , Learning and nurturing students is formed. Collaborative or school-based decision-making is a school review that monopolizes decision-making power from a central area to a school to improve the school's

performance, and this process is toward increasing the level of school involvement and involvement in its management.

One of the limitations of the present study is the lack of a research background on the model of rotation from centralism to reduced focus and the study of effective factors for this purpose, the lack of standard tools to assess the rotation from centralism to reduced focus and the limited research community to managers and staff of the Ministry of Education. Principals and teachers of secondary schools in Tehran mentioned. Therefore, it is suggested that more research be done on reducing decentralization and examining its effects and consequences, standard tools for shifting from decentralization to reducing design focus, examining the infrastructure and contexts needed for decentralization, and the role of unwanted environmental variables such as rules and regulations, political outlook, The government's view and the prevailing ideology on the shift from decentralization to decentralization should be examined and appropriate solutions should be provided. According to the results of the present study, it is suggested that managers and planners to shift from centralism to reduce the focus on formality and decision-making power to improve the components of formality, decision-making power and horizontal communication, delegation, information technology and school-based.

References

- Aasland A, Soholt S. (2020). Agents of centralization? Local school administrations and contested school closures in Norwegian rural districts. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 80:595-605.
- Bjork C. (2004). Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Indonesia. *International Review of Education* 50(3):245-262.
- Camelia S, Vladimir-Aurelian E, Catalin DR. (2014). The impact of decentralization on the Romanian school. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 124:69-76.
- Daft RL. (2017). *Organization theory and design*. 7th Ed, South western: Thomson South western.
- Eva N, Sendjaya S, Prajogo D, Madison K. (2021). Does organizational structure render leadership unnecessary? Configurations of formalization and centralization as a substitute and neutralizer of servant leadership. *Journal of Business Research*. 129:43-56.
- FarhadiRad H, Shahi S, Tahmasebi F. (2019). An investigation into the requirements and circumstances of decentralization in Ahvaz education: viewpoint, leadership and human resource. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Administration*. 10(2):57-76.
- Gershberg A I, Gonzalez PA, Meade B. (2012). Understanding and improving accountability in education: A conceptual framework and guideposts from three decentralization reform experiences in Latin America. *World Development*. 40(5):1024-1041.
- Giannoccaro I. (2018). Centralized vs. decentralized supply chains: The importance of decision maker's cognitive ability and resistance to change. *Industrial Marketing Management*. 73:59-69.
- Gordon S R. (2020). Centralization and decentralization in ICT: Duality and complementarity. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*. 22(2):76-80.
- Guerra S C, Lastra-Anadon C X. (2019). The quality-access tradeoff in decentralizing public services: Evidence from education in the OECD and Spain. *Journal of Comparative Economics*. 47(2):295-316.
- Haghighi M. (2012). The role of decentralization and delegation of authority in the structure of education. *Journal of Educational Administration Research Quarterly*. 3(11):57-74.
- Hammami R, Frein Y, Albana A S. (2020). Delivery time quotation and pricing in two-stage supply chains: Centralized decision-making with global and local managerial approaches. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 286(1):164-177.
- Harper J, Hopper D, Keating B, Harding J. (2020). NM GRADS: Lessons learned from implementing a school-based program for young parents across New Mexico. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*. 24(2):163-170.
- Jeong D W, Lee HJ, Cho S K. (2017). Education decentralization, school resources, and student outcomes in Korea. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 53:12-27.
- Khandelwal S, Detroja K P. (2020). The optimal detuning approach based centralized control design for MIMO processes. *Journal of Process Control*. 96:23-36.
- Laudams V. (2013). Decentralization of education in LEA and the participation of pedagogues in its implementation. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 82:621-627.
- Martin W L, McKelvie A, Lumpkin G T. (2016). Centralization and delegation practices in family versus non-family SMEs: a Rasch analysis. *Small Business Economics*. 47:755-769.
- Mirkamali S M, A'alaamee F. (2009). Feasibility of using school-based management in Tehran elementary schools: teachers' views. *Quarterly Journal of New Thought on Education*. 5(1):147-171.
- Nir A E. (2020). Educational centralization as a catalyst for coordination: myth or practice? *Journal of Educational Administration*. 59(1):116-131.
- Oecd M. (2016). *New approached in education administration*. Paris: OECD Publication.
- Ovseiko P V, Buchan A M. (2015). Medical workforce education and training: A failed decentralisation attempt to reform organisation, financing, and planning in England. *Health Policy*. 119(12):1545-1549.
- Pertusa-Ortega E M, Zaragoza-Saez P, Claver-Cortes E. (2010). Can formalization, complexity, and centralization influence knowledge performance? *Journal of Business Research*. 63(3):310-320.
- Vaezi S K, Abbasi Harafteh B. (2018). Providing a model for decentralization in the process of policy-making for Iran's education system. *The Socio-Cultural Research Journal of Rahbord*. 7(26):67-85.