A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INSERVICE TEACHERS' EXPRESSED PERCEPTIONS OF SHARED DECISION MAKING

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
WILLIAM D. CHEANEY

1975

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 00096 8960

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A Comparative Study of Inservice Teachers' Expressed Perceptions of Shared Decision Making

presented by

William D. Cheaney

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Higher Education & Administration

Joseph H. McMillan

Major professor

Date 9-10-75

O-7639

34 243

V 255

289

212

FEB 1 8 1999.

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INSERVICE TEACHERS' EXPRESSED PERCEPTIONS OF SHARED DECISION MAKING

By

William D. Cheaney

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions (attitudes) of inservice teachers toward sharing educational decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with other members of the school social system--e.g., parents, students, and other community residents. The teachers were classified according to ethnicity (white and nonwhite), program accountability levels (high, medium, and low), and their perceptions of sharing educational decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with other members of the school social system were examined.

Procedures

A review of research pertaining to teachers' attitudes toward sharing decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with other members of the school social system yielded findings that indicate inservice teachers do not respond favorably to such community involvement.

The population from which the samples were drawn consisted of those employees of the Grand Rapids, Michigan, School System, certificated by the State Board of Education as elementary school teachers, and actively performing as full-time classroom instructors in the "inner city." The high accountability sample included the entire Follow-Through staff of 33. The medium accountability sample included the total "Outside" Contract Learning staff of 34. The low accountability sample included 39 teachers randomly selected from the remaining teachers in the population group. The only information of a demographic nature gathered from the sample was ethnicity--white or nonwhite.

The null hypotheses were tested using a 2 x 3 multivariate analysis of variance. All hypotheses were tested using the .05 alpha level with the appropriate degrees of freedom.

Conclusions

An analysis of the data resulted in the following conclusions:

1. Teachers assigned to programs featuring high, medium, and low accountability did not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

2. Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds did not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

3. Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds within specified accountability groups (high, medium, and low) did differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities relative to the following nine items:

> 6. The more a teacher has the students use the community's resources, the greater the relevance of the instructional program.

White teachers in the low accountability program and nonwhite teachers in the high and medium accountability programs were more positive in their attitudes toward the use of community resources than were nonwhite teachers in the low accountability program and white teachers in the high and medium accountability programs.

> 7. Parents should have a role in hiring the school personnel (teachers, principal, other staff).

For this item, the clustering of mean scores fell into three groups: (1) nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group and white teachers in the low accountability group indicated the most positive attitudes, (2) white and nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group were less positive, and (3) white teachers from the high accountability group and nonwhite

teachers in the low accountability group were the least positive.

9. Teachers can be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning when the parents cooperate.

The nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability program were more positive in their perceptions than were nonwhite teachers in both high and low accountability programs and white teachers in high, medium, and low accountability programs.

13. The students should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.

White teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were more positive in their attitudes toward student involvement in the determination of academic assignments than were white teachers in the high and medium accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability groups.

19. Parents should be permitted to observe in the classroom without prior consent of the teacher.

Collectively, white teachers in the medium and low accountability programs and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability program were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the high accountability program and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability programs.

23. Students should have a role in hiring the school personnel.

Collectively, white teachers in the high and low accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the high and medium accountability groups were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the medium accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group.

26. School administrators and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes.

For this item, the clustering of mean scores fell into three groups: (1) white teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group indicated the most positive attitudes, (2) white and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were less positive, and (3) white teachers in the medium accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group were the least positive.

27. The school administrator should protect his teachers from parental criticism.

Collectively, white teachers in the high and medium accountability programs and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability programs were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the low accountability program and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability program.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INSERVICE TEACHERS' EXPRESSED PERCEPTIONS OF SHARED DECISION MAKING

By

William D. Cheaney

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration
and Higher Education

1975

Copyright by
WILLIAM D. CHEANEY

1975

This manuscript is dedicated to the most wonderful lady who ever lived, my mother (deceased), Flossie A. Cheaney. Her love, teachings, encouragement, and total sacrifice made it all possible. My love for her cannot be adequately expressed in words. May she rest in peace.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. Joseph McMillan, my guidance committee chairman, and Drs. Samuel Moore, Donald Nickerson, and James McKee, guidance committee members, I extend my deep appreciation for their support and encouragement throughout this academic experience.

I am further indebted to Dr. Lawrence Lezott for his special assistance throughout the project; and to Mrs. Annie N. Gregory for her sincere concern and constant support.

A very special thanks to my brother, Hodges O. Cheaney, and other members of my family, for their understanding and support; and to my father (deceased) who taught me the value of self respect and fair play.

Thanks and appreciation for their support and friendship go to Mr. LeRoy Davis, Mrs. Carol Davis, Ms. Doris Kelley, and Mrs. Joyce Webb.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF NEED

Increasing reference is being made in the literature, as well as in verbal statements, to the importance of accountability in education. Mention educational accountability to a group of parents and educators, and one gets a variety of reactions--mostly negative. Administrators and teachers express their displeasure in numerous ways, and parents, generally, look confused.

Trying to get a definition of the issues involved in accountability is like trying to net an elusive butterfly. Simply stated, to most people educational accountability focuses on holding educators responsible for the students' achievement. Ideally, if everyone is doing his job in the educational system correctly, a parent can pay his taxes, send his child to school and expect him to come home having achieved at his full potential. Unfortunately, this is not happening in school communities. Thus, educational accountability has become a controversial subject.

As a result of pressures being brought to bear across the nation, superintendents of school systems and educational leaders at all levels of education, since the latter part of the 1960s, have been striving to develop models of accountability.

Earlier product-oriented models are viewed by school personnel with great apprehension, because they use such phrases as management by objectives, rate of learning, ratio between input and output, and unit cost --all of which are perceived to have punitive overtones. Under these models, it is further perceived that the accountable parties are the "product producers"--that is, teachers and others responsible for some part of the delivery system.

If the issues involved in accountability are not approached in a sensible manner, they can have a devastating effect, as witnessed by the Detroit, Michigan, School System during the school year 1973-1974. In 1973 the Detroit Board of Education reported,

> Present measures of achievement show Detroit to have about its share of students scoring in the middle or average range on national tests but far fewer than its share above the middle group and far more than its share below.[1]

As a result of the Detroit report, the following questions emerged: Whose fault is it? Who is to

---

[1]Detroit Free Press, November 18, 1973.

be held accountable? System administrators held that to improve the instructional program, the performance of teachers had to be improved. To do this, they proposed a new teacher evaluation system that would measure an individual teacher's effort to meet goals set by the teacher and the school principal. Teachers' raises would depend upon the evaluation they received from their principal.

Teachers became dissatisfied. They felt the school board was trying to blame them for all the ills of the school system. They were afraid teacher accountability would be, in the extreme, a tool allowing principals to fire teachers at will. Teachers felt others in the lives of the children--administrators, parents, and other members of the community--should also share the responsibility for the students' achievement.

In the fall of 1973, the Detroit Board of Education refused to settle a contract with the teachers' union without agreement on new procedures by which to evaluate teachers. The teachers rejected the board's proposal and a six-week-long strike ensued. The strike did not end until the board dropped its teacher evaluation demands, which it called accountability. In the aftermath came: (1) a school year extended to July 12, 1974; (2) exhausted students, teachers, parents, and administrators; (3) additional costs to the school

system; (4) disrupted summer plans for work, schooling, and vacations; and (5) a large number of irritated citizens.

Relative to the concept that others in the lives of children should share the responsibility of their education, a new approach to educational accountability has been suggested by such writers as Talmage,[2] Ornstein,[3] and Monroe.[4] This basic concept, increasingly referred to in today's literature, is called the social system model. According to this model, accountability emerges from a relationship among groups. It is a two-way process that indicates not that one part is the receiver and the other the giver, but rather that each has something to give as well as something to receive. Grobman's findings that ". . . the child and his learning patterns are inextricably related to his total school and non-school environment"[5] support Thomson's argument that accountability should reflect

---

[2]Harriet Talmage and Allan C. Ornstein, "Teachers' Perceptions of Decision-Making Roles and Responsibilities in Defining Accountability," Journal of Negro Education 41 (Spring 1973): 212-221.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Harriet Talmage and George E. Monroe, "Accountability as Negotiation of Perceived Expectations," Contemporary Education 43 (April 1972): 245-250.

[5]Hulda Grobman, "Accountability for What: the Unanswered Question," Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 67.

the joint aspirations of parents, students, and society --as mirrored through its teachers.[6]

Few data are currently available on how teachers say they would react to a social systems model of accountability. Little is known about their attitudes toward the elements of such an approach; therefore, a study of teachers' attitudes is needed.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions (attitudes) of inservice teachers on sharing educational decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with other members of the school social system--e.g., parents, students, and other community residents.

The teachers will be classified according to ethnicity (white and nonwhite) and program accountability levels (high, medium, and low--see Definition of Terms, this chapter), and their expressed perceptions of sharing educational decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with other members of the school social system will be investigated.

---

[6]Scott Thomson, "How to Custom Cut Accountability to Fit the Needs of Students and Parents," Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 48.

Statement of the Problem

How do teachers actively engaged in the formal process of educating our young in a variety of situations react to sharing their decision-making roles with others in the community? For example, should students be consulted about the procedures used to evaluate their academic work? Should parents have an active role in hiring school personnel? Should students, parents, and other community residents take an active role in evaluating individual teachers? and Should nonteachers participate in curriculum development?

More specifically the study will attempt to ascertain teachers' perceptions of decision-making roles and responsibilities in defining accountability.

Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses to be tested are:

1. Teachers assigned to programs featuring high accountability, medium accountability, and low accountability will differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

2. Teachers of majority and minority ethnic backgrounds will differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

3. Teachers of majority and minority ethnic backgrounds within specified accountability groups--

high, medium, and low--will differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

Statement of Significance

Individualization of instruction is the watchword of today's formal educational process. The procedures involved in individualizing instructions are: (1) diagnose, to determine the nature of the problem in an effort to remove the guesswork about the aptitude and needs of the children in question; (2) prescribe the activities (treatment) that should correct the given situation; (3) administer prescribed treatment; and (4) reexamine the subjects to evaluate the effects of the treatment. Hopefully, this procedure would be a continuous cycle, ever spiraling upward in a constant quest for a totally "educated" society.

It is the writer's contention that a similar approach should be used with teachers in our nation's effort to establish educational accountability. Heretofore, accountability models have been developed at the top (central administration) and thrust downward without adequate input from those feeling most of the "pressure," e.g., classroom teachers. In future model construction, it is imperative that developers of such models be cognizant of the decision-making roles and responsibilities of community groups and individuals

that influence the academic development of our children, and also their perceptions of decision-making roles and responsibilities of others in the educational social system.

In this study, the expressed perceptions of only one such group (teachers) are investigated. Knowledge of their perceptions is invaluable to the development of accountability models that will be more readily accepted by all parties involved.

Definition of Terms

1. High, medium, and low accountability programs: These programs, for the purpose of this study, are designed by the same criteria (supervisory structure) used by Dr. Edsel Erickson in Experiments in Early Education, a study conducted in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in August, 1971.

   a. High accountability (Follow-Through Program): Supervision of the Follow-Through Program is highly structured. Teachers are supervised not only by their principal, but also by Engelmann-Becker Associates, creators of the Program model. The Follow Through Program has its own staff of personnel to supervise and evaluate the weekly testing of children, the teaching practices of teachers, and general

classroom operation. Follow-Through personnel hold dual positions within the school administration, being employees of the school system with the responsibility for administering the Follow-Through program. As such, Follow-Through supervisors are accountable to and directed by Engelmann-Becker Associates as well as the Grand Rapids school administration.

Students in Follow-Through are tested weekly or bi-weekly, and the supervisors discuss each child's progress with the teacher. Teaching sessions are videotaped regularly and sent to Engelman-Becker Associates at the University of Oregon for evaluation and direction.

Thus, Follow-Through teachers are very closely supervised and held directly accountable for their performance. The individual teachers are accountable to both their principals and lower-level Follow-Through supervisory staff, who in turn are accountable to the Follow-Through project director, the school system, and Engelman-Becker Associates. Any problems in teaching are immediately brought to the attention of the supervisor for resolution.

b. Medium accountability ("Outside" Contract Learning Programs): These programs are more

organizationally complex than Basal Reading, but not nearly as complex as Follow-Through. The teachers are accountable to and supervised by a coalition of two supervisory structures: primarily the school administration, but also the representative of the outside agency.

c. Low accountability (Basal Reading Program): The structure of the Basal Reading Program is more conventional than that of the other two programs; the teachers of each school report only to their principal, who has primary responsibility for their supervision.

2. Social systems model of accountability: This term refers to accountability derived from the negotiation of perceived expectations among those groups participating in a school/community social system. The following attributes define the concept:

a. reciprocal relationships,

b. mutual though differeng responsibilities,

c. involvement of many groups in responsible decision making about education,

d. interaction among the responsible groups,

e. articulated perceptions of expectations, and

f. accountability as a process of negotiation.[7]

---

[7]Talmage and Monroe, "Accountability," p. 246.

Limitations of the Study

Two limitations of the study should be identified. First, the teacher samples are from a single city; therefore, the ability to generalize the findings to teachers in other cities is limited. The results will have limited application elsewhere, except to the extent that other populations are comparable to the population of interest in this study. Second, the routine limitations associated with all studies of this type apply to the present study as well--e.g., reliability of the instruments and the responses of the teachers.

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter I contained an introduction to the study and a statement of need and purpose. The significance and purpose of the study were also discussed.

A review of the literature relating to past and present approaches to accountability, two contrasting accountability models, and two studies directly related to the present research is found in Chapter II.

Chapter II contains a discussion of the methodology used in the study. Included are a description of the sample, and the instrument used, an explanation of the study design, and a statement of the hypotheses.

Data gathered in the study are analyzed in Chapter IV.

Presented in Chapter V are the summary and conclusions of the study, implications, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the latter part of the 1960s a voluminous amount of material has been written about the many aspects of accountability in education. This chapter includes a general review of the past and present approaches to accountability, an in-depth review of two contrasting accountability models, and a review of two studies that are directly related to the focus of the present research.

General Review of Past and Present Approaches to Accountability

Past Approach

The request by the public that the educational system base corrective action on the results of evaluation is not a new phenomenon. In the first decades of the twentieth century, the rise of "scientism" brought a demand for more efficiency in education and a greater exactness in reporting test results. The methods that were proving to be so effective in the factory production line were prescribed for education. Schools were seen as needing efficiency experts; studies of

"educational output" were conducted but resulted in few long-lasting pedagogical changes. However, three important differences between today's movement for accountability and that of the early 1900s may make today's movement more fruitful: (1) the power structure is different; teachers then had little or no collective power, whereas today they are organized into powerful unions; (2) the emphasis is on the educational deficiencies of the disadvantaged; and (3) responsibility for failure has shifted from the individual to the school.

Other countries have also attempted to make educators accountable. Most of their attempts were abandoned either because they were not effective enough to be worth the trouble or because they were too difficult to administer. Most of these efforts took the form of merit pay for teachers. At the University of Bologna in the fifteenth century, student-enacted statutes required that the "professor start his lectures at the beginning of the book, cover each section sequentially, and complete the book by the end of the term." If the professor failed to achieve this schedule, he forfeited part of the funds he himself had deposited at the beginning of the term.[8] In 1870, the Education

---

[8]R. T. Lennox, "Accountability and Performance Contracting," paper presented to American Educational Research Association, New York, February 1971, p. 3.

Code of Sierra Leone provided for a result grant of sixpence for each pass in the three R's examination. This policy was an imitation of the English system, which was abandoned in England in 1897.[9] During the years from 1876 to 1882 in Ontario, Canada, payments to high schools were largely dependent on the number of students who passed an intermediate exam after a year or two of attendance. Although standards were raised according to adopted criteria, this practice was ended in 1883 after a protest against the sacrifice of all other educational values for the attainment of this goal.[10]

In the 1950s, New Zealand and Japan both experimented with merit pay. The Japanese Teacher's Association, with 520,000 members, became engaged in a bitter struggle with the Ministry of Education over the merit ratings, and in 1958 they called a nationwide strike over the issue.[11]

In the United States, there have also been examples of "paying for results" in education before the present push for accountability. As early as 1819,

---

[9]H. C. Sherman, "Accountability Not New," Phi Delta Kappan 52 (1970): 253.

[10]F. J. Sciara and R. K. Jantz, Accountability in American Education (New York: Boston, Allyn, & Bacon, 1972), p. 6.

[11]New York Times, October 31, 1958.

accountability was a concern in Georgia. For many years correspondence schools have promised better jobs with higher salaries for their graduates; speed-reading courses "guarantee" increase in reading speed.

Present Approach

The new age of accountability is dawning in American education, and could well become one of the most important educational movements in the 1970s. It had its theoretical beginning in the latter part of the 1960s, and was subsequently transformed into a formidable force by the federal government, politicians, taxpayers, parents, and private learning corporations.

Although the term accountability is so new that a precise definition has not yet emerged, its general meaning and thrust are quite clear. Accountability is the condition of being accountable, liable, answerable, or responsible. To most people, accountability means that public schools must prove that students at various levels meet some reasonable standard of achievement, as well as show that funds are being used wisely. Some people, however, advocate a system of accountability that would hold both the school and community answerable for students' achievement.

School personnel are being pushed to prove that their programs are efficient. A new definition of the adequate school is in the making, based on public opinion. Public opinion polls over the past few years have consistently recorded substantial majorities favoring teacher accountability. No longer are most taxpayers satisfied with the triad of the past--qualified teachers, the latest equipment and methods, and modern school plants--as indicators of effective schools.

As educational budgets continue to spiral upward, taxpayers and parents have applied greater pressure for school accountability. With the largest portion of educational budgets allocated to salaries, people are questioning the relationship between school costs and student performance. Of the many issues brought into focus by this concern, the question of who is accountable--board members, administrators, or teachers--looms as one of the most important.

As a result of the pressures brought to bear on educational leaders, several models of accountability have been developed. Most of these models tend to place the responsibility on the

school. Examples are: (1) product management (input-output analysis relating educational resources to educational outcome), (2) school accreditation programs, (3) program planning and budgeting systems, (4) behavioral statements of instructional objectives and objectives reference testing, (5) school voucher systems, and (6) performance contracting. In the most recent literature a seventh model--social system--has emerged. This model places the burden of responsibility on the school and the community.

Two Accountability Models

To help the reader better understand the contrasting philosophies, a closer look at the product management model of accountability and the social system model of accountability is in order.

Product Management Model

Mr. Doug Matic, Superintendent
Post View School District
Hometown, U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Matic:

In the past years I have spent a great deal of time and energy bringing to the attention of the American public deficiencies in the products of our business world. It has recently come to my attention that the "education business" is larger and

more extensive than GM and Ford combined! In addition, it is clear from a brief initial survey that most of your products are poorly constructed, contain shoddy workmanship, and in many cases are hazardous to the well-being of society. In an examination of public school products, they were found to have the following defects:

1. A majority of the units read poorly and cannot do simple math.
2. Almost all units dislike reading and math.
3. Almost all units dislike school, teachers, and principals.
4. Few units, if any, are in a condition to start work directly off the assembly line.
5. Almost half of your products are rejected as defective before completion.
6. Almost all units have lost their love of learning.
7. Most units have a poor understanding, and almost all have no practice in democratic principles and actions.

We cannot understand this product performance, because your raw materials come to you in splendid form. Almost every unit has learned to talk (a very difficult feat) by himself; almost every unit loves to learn new things; almost every unit looks forward to learning in school; almost every unit has a fantastic capability to learn. We cannot justify your product performance, especially in the light of your production schedule. What other business spends eight hours a day, five days a week, 36 weeks a year, for 12 years, working on a product? This is ample time to produce a high-quality, finished unit.

In two weeks I am sending three of my "raiders" to your school for a product audit. Since you are a public institution, my staff will expect you to make available to them:

1. Complete financial records for your products and complete performance records of them.
2. Complete statements of your product goals and objectives, statements of how you intend to reach these goals, and statements on how you know when your product is completed.
3. A listing of your product defects and your procedures for correcting your mistakes.

> 4. Free access to your workers and products, so we can assess their feelings and their likes and dislikes concerning your school
>
> Don't try to bull my "raiders" into looking at buildings, grounds, new classrooms, swimming pools, the football stadium, or the new auditorium. Don't give us your rhetoric of office. Your company will be judged only on the basis of your product and the cost of producing that product.
>
> Following our educational audit I will be placing your company on public record. I will compare your raw materials with your finished products. I will compare the salaries of your workers to determine if top learning priorities are being supported. I will examine the lives of your rejects. I will compare your actions with your words.
>
> Get ready. I am coming.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> /s/ Ralph Rader[12]

Most discussions of educational accountability employ a product-management model for defining the variables associated with accountability and explaining the relationships among the variables. Such a model focuses on a product-delivery system. The product is the achievement level of the learner, measured subsequent to a given period of exposure to formal education. The criteria for evaluating the product are cost and efficiency. The accountable parties are the producers, i.e., those members of the formal education process who are responsible for some part of the delivery system.

Most of the initial and recent literature on accountability has reflected the product-management

---

[12] School Management 16 (April 1972): 18.

model. Kennedy pointed out that accountability is a management theory of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling components of the system or organization for the purpose of obtaining specific results. The strategy is to transfer this management endeavor to the school enterprise.[13]

Nottingham and Zeyen spoke of accountability in systems terminology. They proposed a nine-step model that included the following: (1) identify overall goals of education, (2) identify indicators for each goal, (3) determine degree of attainment of each goal (needs assessment), (4) identify problems (discrepancies between 2 and 3), (5) develop solution strategies, (6) determine resources available, (7) select solution strategies, (8) implement solution strategies, and (9) evaluate processes and products.[14] Deterline related accountability to the instructional process rather than to the school organization. According to him, "quality control" can be maintained if the exact specifications are defined, i.e., what is being accomplished by each component of the instructional process,

---

[13]John D. Kennedy, "Planning for Accountability Via Management by Objectives," Journal of Secondary Education 45 (1970): 348-354.

[14]Samuel Brodbelt, "The Impact of Educational Accountability Upon Teachers and Supervisors," High School Journal 56 (1972): 55-66.

and if the procedures to accomplish each specification are also identified.[15]

Lieberman et al. spoke of accountability in terms of objectives, achievement, and effectiveness. The accountable party was seen as the school personnel.[16] Lessinger defined accountability as

> . . . an independent, unbiased review, feedback, and report of effectiveness; that is, the extent to which an enterprise or any definable part of the enterprise achieves its objectives.[17]

Once objectives are carefully specified as a major component of accountability, it is not difficult to translate the above-mentioned concepts of accountability into performance contracting and merit pay.

Performance contracting is a prime example of the product management model, Texarkana, Texas, and Gary, Indiana, being two excellent sites for study.

Social System Model

The educational system, by its very nature, is a highly intricate social system. The product management model does not reflect the dynamics of such a

---

[15]William A. Deterline, "Applied Accountability," Educational Technology 11 (1971): 15-20.

[16]Myron Lieberman, "An Overview of Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan 52 (1970): 194-195.

[17]Leon Lessinger, "Robbing Dr. Peter to 'Pay Paul': Accountability for Our Stewardship of Public Education," Educational Technology 11 (1971): 11-14.

system. The product is not static, nor is it ready to receive whatever molding has been predetermined by the producers, whether stated as behavioral or nonbehavioral objectives.[18]

Some educators recognize the impact of student, teacher, and school characteristics on achievement. Barrio developed a multiple regression procedure for ascertaining the relationships among student, teacher, and school characteristics.[19] Dryer added to the input characteristics a broader participatory base in defining objectives. He acknowledged the social forces currently making an impact on the educational institution by suggesting that goals be derived from a cooperative effort of teachers, administrators, board members, parents, and students.[20]

Miller stated that schools are not the only factor in a pupil's education. Much of what a student learns depends on experiences provided in other settings (the home or community), over which the school has little control. It is also unfair and unrealistic to expect a teacher to be accountable for goals he has

---

[18]Talmage and Ornstein, "Teachers' Perceptions," pp. 212-221.

[19]Stephen M. Barrio, "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 52 (1970): 196-205.

[20]Talmage and Ornstein, "Teachers' Perceptions," p. 212.

had no role in setting, when he cannot choose or control the methods used to accomplish the task, and when the resources necessary to do the job are not available. It is equally inappropriate to expect a student to work resolutely toward reaching objectives he has had no part in setting. Under a sensible system of accountability, many individuals (citizens, parents, students, teachers, and administrators) are involved in the governance of the school.[21]

Buchan felt the product management model of accountability revolved around too narrow a definition of the concept. This is particularly evident when one considers the distinction that must be made between "schooling" on the one hand and "education" on the other. The former term has a fixed and limited connotation, embracing all those planned learning experiences that take place at the initiation of educators and are supervised by them.

Education, on the other hand, is a broad construct, embracing all those conscious influences that build a child's conceptual framework, mold his attitudes, enhance his skills, modify his values, reinforce his habits, and broaden his interests in the world around

---

[21]William C. Miller, "Accountability Demands Involvement," Educational Leadership 29 (April, 1972): 613-617.

him. Certainly, a large part of this broad experience takes place outside the school. How, then, can one equate educational accountability with holding professionals responsible for the end product of schooling?[22]

Scribner advocated returning much of the administrative and decision-making process to the community. "Local school boards within large cities, parents and even pupils can go a long way toward producing an educational system that can meet the future needs of students," he wrote.[23] In any school district, each school should involve parents in setting goals before the beginning of a school year; then, at the close of the year, parents and staff should have an accountability session. Scribner also said the amount of learning would increase if pupils were given a role in making decisions about their learning.[24]

Selden pointed out that accountability is a two-way street. If teachers are to be accountable to the public, the public must also be accountable to teachers. James Coleman identified most of the major influences

---

[22]William Buchan, "Educational Accountability: The Parents' Role," Education 93 (September-October 1972): 22.

[23]Carole Martin, "Educator Says It's Up to Public to Press for Needed School Reform," Louisville Times, June 27, 1973, p. A-11.

[24]Ibid.

on pupil achievement, and by far the most potent were environmental factors. Teachers must be given the resources to overcome the crippling effects on children of the defects in our society. If we are really interested in increasing productivity rather than merely finger-pointing and scapegoating, ways must be developed in which teachers can share policy-making responsibilities.[25]

As the participatory base in school decision making is broadened, the model of accountability in education is viewed more as a social system and less as a product-management model; however, this model is largely based on theory and commentary--not empirical research. Each actor in such a system brings his own expectations of responsibility and decision making, both in regard to his own role and that of the other actors. The identifiable participants, who hold varying degrees of power and have varying channels for voicing their needs, include school personnel, students, parents, and the community. Within each group a range of perceived expectations can be anticipated.[26]

Talmage and Monroe defined accountability in an educational social system framework. Accountability

---

[25]David Selden, "Productivity, Yes Accountability, No," Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 56.

[26]Talmage and Ornstein, "Teachers' Perceptions," p. 213.

is derived from the negotiation of perceived expectations among those groups participating in a school/community social system. As a process, accountability is characterized by six attributes:

1. It involves a reciprocal relationship.
2. It recognizes each party as having differing responsibilities relative to the other groups.
3. It acknowledges that relationships exist between the various groups and the educational institution.
4. It holds that relationships exist among the various groups.
5. It maintains that these interacting relationships carry differing expectations of the other's role.
6. It assumes that through the process of negotiation the interacting groups can bring their differing perceptions into closer congruence.[27]

Through the process of negotiation, the responsibility and decision-making roles relative to the education of children are mutually established, thus leading to accountable roles and behavior. Thus, accountability, responsibility, and decision making are interdependent terms. When a participant in a social system has decision-making obligations, he tends to accept responsibilities that form the basis for being held accountable.

The social psychology literature affirms that when a group of people has decision-making functions the people tend to carry out their responsibilities.

---

[27]Talmage and Monroe, "Accountability," p. 246.

This concept of accountability carries the relationship one step further. Through negotiation among the groups, it identifies the areas of responsibility each group is willing to assume. Until responsibility is fixed by being mutually perceived as a given group's function in school decision making, accountability cannot be made operational.[28]

Review of Two Related Studies

The first study to be reviewed was conducted by Alma Seniors,[29] a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University. The basic purpose of the study was to describe the attitudes of selected prospective teachers toward the broad range of community participation in school affairs.[30]

The subjects used in this study were 68 full-time students enrolled in the course Education 450 of the College of Education at Michigan State University. Each student had completed student teaching experiences and was fulfilling final requirements for the bachelor's degree in either elementary or secondary education.[31]

---

[28]Ibid., p. 214.

[29]Alma L. Seniors, "Attitudes of Selected Prospective Teachers Toward Community Participation In School Affairs" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974).

[30]Ibid., p. 8.

[31]Ibid., p. 39.

According to Seniors, the students were selected because they had spent a prescribed length of time in internships as student teachers in public schools, they planned to become public school teachers, and as such had certain beliefs about the role of the school in the community and the corresponding roles, if any, of lay people in planning and implementing school programs.

One of the instruments used was the Community Attitude Scale, developed by Bosworth,[32] which was designed to measure an individual's degree of progressive attitudes on community life in such areas as community improvement, living conditions, and business. The second instrument used was the Teacher Attitude Scale Toward Community Participation, developed by Seniors,[33] which was designed to solicit teacher attitudes toward five types of community involvement in schools:

1. advisory roles
2. decision-making roles
3. social participation
4. educational participation
5. employee participation[34]

---

[32]Ibid., p. 41.

[33]Ibid., p. 42.

[34]Ibid.

The second area, decision-making roles, was divided into the following ten subareas:

1. procedures for disciplining students
2. selection of district-wide superintendent
3. use of school facilities
4. evaluating teachers
5. teacher qualifications
6. teacher-aide selection
7. curriculum
8. educational objectives
9. hiring of teachers
10. selection of principal

Seniors findings concerning the attitudes of prospective teachers toward community participation in decision making at the local level were that, of the ten subareas of decision making listed, the respondents responded favorably only to areas one and two. The remaining eight were not acceptable to the respondents as forms of community involvement in decision making at the local school level.[35]

The second study was an exploratory one, conducted by Harriet Talmage and Allan Ornstein. It examined the perceptions of one of the accountable parties within a social system model of accountability

---

[35]Ibid., p. 75.

in education, as defined by Talmage and Monroe.[36] The perceptions of teachers on their own decision-making roles and responsibilities of other partners in the educational social service system were examined.

The subjects used were inservice teachers (n = 102), student teachers (n = 100), and preservice teachers (n = 103) enrolled in four universities in a large urban city. A 30-item instrument was developed to measure teachers' role perceptions and their perceptions of the decision-making roles of others in the school social system. Instrument items included perceptions about the following three topics of concern to all the groups: curriculum, instruction, and evaluation concerns; teacher personnel matters; and academic and overt behavior standards. The 30 items were classified into the three categories by three specialists in curriculum. Significant rater agreement was obtained at the .01 level of probability. The items (n = 30) in the instrument constituted the dependent variables. Five independent variables were studied: (1) teacher group, (2) sex, (3) teaching level, (4) ethnicity, and (5) actual or desired school location. Talmage and Ornstein reported the following findings:

---

[36]Talmage and Monroe, p. 246.

1. Teachers disagreed strongly on how much involvement in school decision making other groups should have.

2. Student teachers favored more mutual decision making than did inservice or preservice teachers.

3. Inservice teachers were more positive in their attitudes concerning involvement of pupils in self-evaluation of academic work than were student teachers or preservice teachers.

4. Sex had no significant influence on study results.

5. The ethnic factor did not yield significant results.[37]

The authors concluded, "If the study has a single message, it may be that white student teachers in suburban elementary schools aren't running scared of accountability."[38]

Summary

This chapter included a general review of past and present approaches to accountability,

---

[37]Allan Ornstein, "Teacher Accountability," Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 49.

[38]Ibid.

examples of both product management and social system models of accountability, and a review of two studies directly related to the focus of this study.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Sample

The population from which the three samples were drawn was those employees of the Grand Rapids, Michigan, School System who were certificated by the State Board of Education as elementary school teachers and were full-time classroom instructors in the "inner city." The school year in question was 1974-75; actual data gathering took place during December 1974 and January 1975.

The high accountability sample included the entire Follow Through staff of 33. The medium accountability sample included the entire "Outside" Contract Learning staff of 34. The low accountability sample included 39 teachers randomly selected from the remaining teachers in the population group.

The only information of a demographic nature gathered from the sampled teachers was racial group membership--white or nonwhite. See Table 1.

Instrument

The 30-item instrument used was an adaptation of an instrument developed and used by researchers

TABLE 1.--Racial Group Membership of Teacher Samples.

Ethnicity	High Accountability	Medium Accountability	Low Accountability
White	19	21	28
Nonwhite	14	13	11

Talmage and Ornstein at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.[39] It was designed to measure teachers' role perceptions and their perceptions of the decision-making roles of others in the school social system.

The items included statements on the following topics: (1) curriculum, instruction and evaluation; (2) teacher personnel matters; and (3) academic and overt behavior standards. According to Talmage and Ornstein, the 30 items were classified into three categories by three specialists in curriculum; a significant rater agreement was obtained at the .01 probability level. The researchers also claim a Hoyt ANOVA Reliability equal to .70.[40]

Each item had a score from one to five points. The midpoint item score was 3.0. A subject could therefore have a total low score of 30, a midrange score

[39]Talmage and Ornstein, "Teachers' Perceptions," p. 215.

[40]Ibid.

of 90, or a high score of 150. The assumption was that the higher the total score, the more likely teachers would be to have positive perceptions about permitting students, parents, and community persons decision-making roles and responsibilities in school concerns. Responses to the test items were analyzed both as a total score and by item (with scores ranging from 1-5). Analysis by items guarded against losing information that might have been canceled out in analyzing data solely by total score.

To avoid response set, items in the administered instrument had positive and negative polarity. For statistical analysis, the negative polarity was removed by proper keying of the data.

Design

The teachers in the three sample groups were all actively performing as full-time classroom instructors in the "inner city" of Grand Rapids, Michigan, during the 1974-75 school year. The instrument was administered to each group and the responses analyzed to provide information relative to the hypotheses of the study. The responses of the sample groups were compared to determine any differences that might exist concerning how the teachers indicated they would react

to sharing decision-making roles with others in the school social system.

Graphically, the design was as it appears in Table 2.

TABLE 2.--Graphic Design of the Study.

Ethnicity	Accountability Levels		
	High	Medium	Low
White	n	n	n
Nonwhite	n	n	n

The sampling frame included:

1. all Follow Through teachers (n = 33),

2. all "Outside" Contracting Learning teachers (n = 34),

3. thirty-nine (n = 39) Basal Text Program teachers (N = 214) randomly selected from a computer printout (roster) by means of a table of random numbers. The total sample size was 106 teachers.

Graphically, the sampling frame was as indicated in Table 3.

Questionnaires were sent to 106 subjects. The first wave of returns numbered 63 or 59 percent. A follow-up mailing was deemed necessary, and 43

TABLE 3.--Graphic Design of Sampling Frame.

Ethnicity	Accountability Levels		
	High Follow Through	Medium Outside Contract Learning	Low Basal Text
White	19	21	28
Nonwhite	14	13	11

additional questionnaires were dispatched. To summarize, of the 106 questionnaire contacts made, an overall return of 92 or 87 percent was received. See Table 4.

TABLE 4.--Observed Final Cell Frequencies.

Ethnicity	Accountability Levels		
	High	Medium	Low
White	17	17	26
Nonwhite	13	8	11

Statistical Hypotheses

The major hypotheses tested in the study concerned the similarity or dissimilarity of specified teacher groups relative to their indicated reactions to the sharing of decision-making responsibilities with

others in the community. It was hypothesized that: (1) teachers assigned to programs featuring high accountability, medium accountability and low accountability will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities; (2) teachers of majority and minority ethnic backgrounds will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities; and (3) teachers of majority and minority ethnic backgrounds within specified accountability groups--high, medium, and low--will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

Analysis

The hypotheses were tested by comparing opposing groups' responses. An analysis of the responses was made within a 2 x 3 factoral design using a multivariate analysis of variance. In all cases, a .05 level of significance was used to reject the null hypotheses.

Summary

During the school year 1974-75, white and nonwhite classroom teachers actively performing as full-time instructors in a high accountability program, a medium accountability program, or a low accountability

program were compared as groups relative to their perceptions of their role and their perceptions of the decision-making roles of others in the school social system.

Using the responses to items on an instrument designed and developed by Talmage and Ornstein, group perceptions were compared to determine the degree of similarity of dissimilarity among groups. An analysis of the responses was made within a 2 x 3 factoral design using a multivariate analysis of variance; a .05 level of significance was needed to reject the null hypotheses.

An analysis of the data is contained in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In this chapter, the data obtained from the administered instrument are presented and analyzed. Each hypothesis is stated, followed by an elaboration on the data relative to the test of that hypothesis.

The instrument (see Appendix) used was an adaptation of one developed and used by Talmage and Ornstein. According to the researchers, the instrument items were classified by three specialists in curriculum, and a significant rater agreement was obtained at the .01 level of probability. The researchers also claimed a Hoyt ANOVA Reliability equal to .70.

Each item had a score from one to five points. The midpoint item score was 3.0. A subject could therefore have a total (across all items) instrument low score of 30, a midrange score of 90, or a high score of 150; or an individual item low score of 1, a midrange score of 3, or a high score of 5. The assumption was that the higher the score the more likely teachers would be to have positive perceptions about permitting students, parents, and other community residents decision-making

roles and responsibilities in school concerns. Responses to the test items were analyzed both as a total score and by item, to guard against losing information that might have been canceled out in analyzing data solely by total score.

Hypotheses Tests

The test chosen to analyze the data and report statistical findings was an analysis of variance. Such a test can be used for almost any number of independent variables, but is usually used for two, three, or four. For the study in question, there were two independent variables (ethnicity and level of program accountability). When using a factorial design that includes an independent variable, moderator variable, and dependent variable the size of the analysis of variance is equal to the number of independent and moderator variables, called factors. If one independent variable and one moderator variable exist, then a two-factor analysis of variance should be used. Such was the case for the study in question. The independent variable was level of program accountability with three levels (high, medium, and low). The moderator variable was ethnicity with two levels (white and nonwhite). The test then used was a 3 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance. It was desirable, in this case, to determine the effects of level

of program accountability, the effects of ethnicity, and the effect of both variables in interaction. The dependent variables were the scores derived from the testing procedure. All hypotheses were tested using the .05 alpha level with the appropriate degrees of freedom.

Hypotheses

The testable form of Hypothesis 1 was stated as follows:

Null Hypothesis 1: Teachers assigned to programs featuring high accountability, medium accountability, and low accountability will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

The multivariate analysis of variance of means yielded an f-ratio of .9170 (degrees of freedom 60 and 114), which was not significant at the P = .6399 level. A nonsignificant multivariate f-ratio can be interpreted to mean that the mean scores for the three groups were not significantly different from each other on any of the dependent measures being simultaneously analyzed. Since the range between the scores of the three groups was not significant at the .05 alpha level, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The testable form of Hypothesis 2 was stated as follows:

Null Hypothesis 2: Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

The multivariate analysis of variance of means yielded an f-ratio of 1.1615 (degrees of freedom 30 and 57), which was not significant at the P = .3075 level. A nonsignificant multivariate f-ratio can be interpreted to signify that the mean scores for the two groups (white and nonwhite) were not significantly different from each other on any of the dependent measures being simultaneously analyzed. Since the range between the scores of the two groups was not significant at the .05 alpha level, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The testable form of Hypothesis 3 was stated as follows:

Null Hypothesis 3: Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds within specified accountability groups (high, medium, and low) will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

The multivariate analysis of variance of means yielded an f-ratio of 1.8116 (degrees of freedom 60 and 114), which was significant at the P = .0034 level. A significant multivariate f-ratio can be interpreted to mean that the mean scores were significantly different from each other on at least one of the dependent measures being simultaneously analyzed. To locate the particular

items on which mean differences were evident, a univariate analysis of variance of each of the dependent variables was subsequently conducted. A summary of the univariate analysis of mean scores of Ethnicity x Group Interaction where significant differences were indicated is reported in Table 5. The two-way interaction effect responses were significantly different for the following items:

Items	Univariate F-Ratio	P
6. The more a teacher has the students utilize the community resources, the greater the relevance of the instructional program.	5.8513	.0042
7. Parents should have a role in hiring the school personnel (teachers, principal, other staff).	6.3658	.0027
9. Teachers can be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning when the parents cooperate.	3.1873	.0463
13. The students should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.	5.4882	.0058
19. Parents should be permitted to observe in the classroom without prior consent of the teacher.	3.5416	.0333
23. Students should have a role in hiring the school personnel.	3.4521	.0362
26. School administrators and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes.	6.6224	.0022

Items	Univariate F-Ratio	P
27. The school administrator should protect his teachers from parental criticism.	3.560	.0300

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 6 is reported in Table 6 (page 48).

Item 6: "The more a teacher has the students utilize the community resources, the greater the relevance of the instructional program."

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 6 produced an f-ratio of 5.8513, which was significant at the P = .0042 level. White teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the high and medium accountability groups were more positive in their attitudes toward the use of community resources than were nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group and white teachers in the high and medium accountability groups.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 7 is reported in Table 7 (page 48).

Item 7: "Parents should have a role in hiring the school personnel (teachers, principal, other staff)."

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 7 produced an f-ratio of 6.3658, which was significant at the P = .0027 level. For this item, the clustering of mean scores fell into three groups. Nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group and white teachers in

TABLE 5.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Items Where Significant Differences Were Found.

Main Effects		n	Means and Standard Deviations $\bar{X}$/SD							
			Item							
Ethnicity	Groups		6	7	9	13	19	23	26	27
White	High Accountability	17	1.50 .72	3.40 1.28	2.60 .94	2.30 .77	1.80 1.01	4.20 .83	3.00 1.06	3.50 1.18
White	Medium Accountability	17	1.60 .70	3.80 1.07	2.90 .99	2.20 .81	2.60 1.50	3.90 1.05	2.80 1.25	3.30 .77
White	Low Accountability	26	2.20 .99	4.20 .75	3.10 1.11	2.80 .80	2.30 .84	4.40 .64	3.70 .85	3.00 .96
Nonwhite	High Accountability	13	2.10 .86	4.20 1.01	2.50 1.33	2.80 1.01	2.50 1.27	4.30 .63	3.30 .63	2.80 1.09
Nonwhite	Medium Accountability	8	2.10 .64	3.90 .35	3.50 1.07	2.30 .46	1.70 .71	4.10 .64	3.50 1.07	3.50 .76
Nonwhite	Low Accountability	11	1.60 .67	3.20 1.17	2.10 .70	2.10 .54	1.80 1.25	3.60 .92	2.60 1.21	3.60 .81

TABLE 6.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 6.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	1.5	.72	2.1	.86
Medium	1.6	.70	2.1	.64
Low	2.2	.99	1.6	.67

TABLE 7.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 7.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	3.4	1.28	4.2	1.01
Medium	3.8	1.07	3.9	.35
Low	4.2	.75	3.2	1.17

the low accountability group indicated the most positive attitudes. White and nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group were less positive, whereas white teachers in the high accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group were the least positive.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 9 is reported in Table 8.

Item 9: "Teachers can be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning when the parents cooperate."

TABLE 8.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 9.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	2.6	.94	2.5	1.33
Medium	2.9	.99	3.5	1.07
Low	3.1	1.11	2.1	.70

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 9 produced an f-ratio of 3.1873, which was significant at the P = .0463 level. On Item 9 (see Table 8), the attitudes of nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group were more positive than were those of nonwhite teachers in both the high and low accountability groups and white teachers in the high, medium, and low accountability groups.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 13 is reported in Table 9.

Item 13: "The students should help determine the nature of the academic assignment."

TABLE 9.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 13.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	2.3	.77	2.8	1.01
Medium	2.2	.81	2.3	.46
Low	2.8	.80	2.1	.54

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 13 produced an f-ratio of 5.4882, which was significant at the P = .0058 level. White teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were more positive in their attitudes toward student involvement in the determination of academic assignments than were white teachers in the high and medium accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability groups.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 19 is reported in Table 10.

Item 19: "Parents should be permitted to observe in the classroom without prior consent of the teacher."

TABLE 10.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 19.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	1.8	1.01	2.5	1.27
Medium	2.6	1.50	1.7	.71
Low	2.3	.84	1.8	1.25

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 19 produced an f-ratio of 3.5416, which was significant at the P = .0333 level. Collectively, white teachers in the medium and low accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the high accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability groups.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 23 is reported in Table 11.

Item 23: "Students should have a role in hiring the school personnel."

TABLE 11.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 23.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	4.2	.83	4.3	.63
Medium	3.9	1.05	4.1	.64
Low	4.4	.64	3.6	.92

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 23 produced an f-ratio of 3.4521, which was significant at the P = .0362 level. Collectively, white teachers in the high and low accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the high and medium accountability groups were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the medium accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 26 is reported in Table 12.

Item 26: "School administrators and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes."

TABLE 12.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 26.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	3.0	1.06	3.3	.63
Medium	2.8	1.25	3.5	1.07
Low	3.7	.85	2.6	1.21

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 26 produced an f-ratio of 6.6224, which was significant at the P = .0022 level. For this item, the clustering of mean scores fell into three groups. White teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group indicated the most positive attitudes. White and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were less positive, whereas white teachers in the medium accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group were the least positive.

A summary of the univariate analysis of Item 27 is reported in Table 13.

Item 27: "The school administrator should protect his teachers from parental criticism."

TABLE 13.--Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Ethnicity X Group Interactions on Item 27.

Group	Ethnicity			
	White		Nonwhite	
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD
High	3.5	1.18	2.8	1.09
Medium	3.3	.77	3.5	.76
Low	3.0	.96	3.6	.81

The univariate analysis of mean scores for Item 27 produced an f-ratio of 3.6560, which was significant at the P = .0300 level. Collectively, white teachers in the high and medium accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability groups were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group.

Summary

Three statistical hypotheses were generated and tested. Each hypothesis was tested using a 2 x 3 multivariate analysis of variance; the .05 level of confidence was established for determining significance. The three hypotheses were formulated to determine the effect of ethnicity (white and nonwhite), accountability groups (high, medium and low), and combinations thereof (interaction) on teachers' attitudes about permitting students, parents, and other community residents decision-making roles and responsibilities in school concerns. A summary of results of the statistical analysis is presented in Table 14. A discussion of the findings and their implications follows in Chapter V.

TABLE 14. Summary of Results.

Null Hypothesis	State of Rejection or Nonrejection
1. Teachers assigned to programs featuring high accountability, medium accountability, and low accountability will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.	Nonrejection**
2. Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.	Nonrejection**
3. Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds within specified accountability groups (high, medium, and low) will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.	Rejection*

*Significant at or above the .05 alpha level.

**No significant difference.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the expressed perceptions (attitudes) of inservice teachers about sharing educational decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with other members of the school social system--e.g., parents, students, and other community residents. The independent variables were ethnicity (white and nonwhite) and program accountability levels (high, medium, and low). Supervisory structure was the criterion used to designate program accountability levels (see Chapter I, Definition of Terms).

Of interest in this research were three basic questions. Given the hypothetical possibility of working within a social system model of accountability, how would teachers from differing ethnic backgrounds (white and nonwhite) say they would react to such a model? What would be the reaction of teachers presently working in programs of differing levels of accountability (high,

medium, and low)? What would be the interactionary effect of ethnicity and program accountability level on the teachers' indicated reactions? The all-encompassing question was, would the groups indicate agreement or nonagreement to working under such conditions?

The population from which the three samples were drawn consisted of those employees of the Grand Rapids, Michigan, School System, certificated by the State Board of Education as elementary school teachers and actively performing as full-time classroom instructors in the "inner city." Using supervisory structure as the criterion for determining level of program accountability, the Follow-Through Program was designated as being of high accountability, the "Outside" Contract Learning Program was considered medium, and the Basal Reading Program was classified as being of lowest accountability. The high accountability sample included the entire Follow-Through staff of 33 teachers. The medium accountability sample was comprised of the entire "Outside" Contract Learning staff of 34 teachers, and the low accountability sample was composed of 39 teachers randomly selected from the remaining teachers in the population group. A total of 106 teachers was originally involved in the study; 92 teachers responded to the instrument.

The instrument used (see Appendix) was an adaptation of an instrument developed and used by Talmage

and Ornstein at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. The instrument items were classified by three curriculum specialists, and a significant rater agreement was obtained at the .01 level of probability. The researchers also reported a Hoyt ANOVA Reliability equal to .70. Each item had a score of one to five points. The mid-point item score was three. The assumption was that the higher the score the more likely teachers would be to have positive perceptions (attitudes) about permitting students, parents, and other community residents decision-making roles and responsibilities in school concerns. Responses to the test items were analyzed both as a total score and by item. Analysis by item guarded against losing information that might have been canceled out in analyzing data solely by total score.

The null hypotheses were tested using a 2 x 3 multivariate analysis of variance. Scores derived from the testing procedure were used as the dependent variables. All hypotheses were tested using the .05 alpha level with the appropriate degrees of freedom. For any given hypothesis in which signficant differences were found, a univariate analysis of each of the dependent variables was conducted to locate the particular items on which mean differences existed.

Selected relevant literature was discussed in Chapter II, which included examples of historical and

recent attempts to develop accountability models, reasons why the demand for accountability is so strong, and summaries of related studies.

Discussed in Chapter III were the site, population, samples, and the instrument used. The procedure for conducting the study was explained and described. Terminating the chapter was a statement of statistical hypotheses and analysis procedures.

In Chapter IV were presented the observed data obtained from the study. The rationale for using the multivariate analysis was discussed in this chapter. The accompanying analysis and presentation of data was in the form of stated hypotheses to which the data were related. The hypotheses were tested individually, and statistical tests based on procedural statistical decision rules were employed to reach a decision of significance of each hypothesis. The chapter was concluded by a statement of each hypothesis and the resulting decision.

Findings

Hypothesis 1: Teachers assigned to programs featuring high accountability, medium accountability, and low accountability will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

With respect to Hypothesis 1, it was found that there was not a significant difference in the mean scores

of the three groups on any of the dependent measures being simultaneously analyzed. Since the range between the scores of the three groups was not significant at the .05 alpha level, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 2: Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

With respect to Hypothesis 2, it was found that there was not a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups (white and nonwhite) on any of the dependent measures being simultaneously analyzed. Since the range between the mean scores of the two groups was not significant at the .05 alpha level, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3: Teachers of majority (white) and minority (nonwhite) ethnic backgrounds within specified accountability groups (high, medium, and low) will not differ significantly in their perceptions of decision-making responsibilities.

With respect to Hypothesis 3, it was found that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of at least one of the dependent measures being simultaneously analyzed. Since the range between mean scores of at least one of the dependent measures was found to be significant at the .05 alpha level, the null

hypothesis was rejected. To locate the particular items on which mean differences were evident, a univariate analysis of variance of each of the dependent variables was conducted. The two-way interaction effect responses were significantly different for the following items:

Item 6 was concerned with the use of community resources relative to their effect on the relevance of instructional programs. White teachers in the low accountability program and nonwhite teachers in the high and medium accountability programs were more positive in their attitudes toward the use of community resources than were nonwhite teachers in the low accountability program and white teachers in the high and medium accountability programs.

Item 7 was concerned with parental involvement in hiring school personnel. For this item, the clustering of mean scores fell into three groups: (1) nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group and white teachers in the low accountability group indicated the most positive attitudes, (2) white and nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group were less positive, and (3) white teachers from the high accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group were the least positive.

For Item 9, relating to teachers being expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning when the parents cooperate, the nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability program were more positive in their perceptions than were nonwhite teachers in both high and low accountability programs and white teachers in high, medium, and low accountability programs.

Item 13 was concerned with perceptions of student involvement in determining academic assignments. White teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were more positive in their attitudes toward student involvement in the determination of academic assignments than were white teachers in the high and medium accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability groups.

Item 19 concerned parents being permitted to observe in classrooms without prior consent from teachers. Collectively, white teachers in the medium and low accountability programs and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability program were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the high accountability program and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability programs.

Item 23 concerned student involvement in hiring school personnel. Collectively, white teachers in the high and low accountability groups and nonwhite teachers in the high and medium accountability groups were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the medium accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group.

Item 26 was concerned with school administrators and teachers consulting with students before initiating curriculum changes. For this item, the clustering of mean scores fell into three groups: (1) white teachers in the low accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the medium accountability group indicated the most positive attitudes, (2) white and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability group were less positive, and (3) white teachers in the medium accountability group and nonwhite teachers in the low accountability group were the least positive.

Item 27 concerned the idea that a school administrator should protect his teachers from parental criticism. Collectively, white teachers in the high and medium accountability programs and nonwhite teachers in the medium and low accountability programs were more positive in their attitudes than were white teachers in the low accountability program and nonwhite teachers in the high accountability program.

The two-way interaction effect responses were not significantly different on the remaining 22 items, indicating there was no interaction relative to ethnicity x level of program accountability for these items.

Additional Findings

The following are additional findings of interest and relevance to the study.

First, according to the review of literature, inservice teachers did not respond favorably to the concept of sharing decision-making roles and/or responsibilities with others of the school community. An analysis of the data gathered in this study revealed the same pattern with respect to the inservice teachers who participated in this study.

Second, as indicated in the literature, teachers disagreed on how much involvement other groups should have in school decision making. An analysis of the nine items on which significant differences were indicated revealed the same pattern with respect to the subjects in this study.

Third, the multivariate analysis of variance of each item mean score from the grand mean yielded an f-ratio of 65.4737 (degrees of freedom 30 and 57), which was significant at the P = .0001 level. The purpose of the test was to determine whether or not the teachers (n = 92) as a group, item by item, expressed perceptions

significantly different from the midpoint of three (3)/ uncertain. There was a significant difference. After computing the mean score for each item, it was determined that the mean scores for two of the items fell at midpoint, eight fell above, and nineteen fell below.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that the type of program, relative to level of accountability (high, medium, and low), to which teachers were assigned had no significant impact on their perceptions of sharing decision-making roles and responsibilities with other members of the school community. Ethnicity (white and nonwhite) was not a significant factor affecting teacher perceptions.

One two-way interaction was significant at the .0034 probability level, involving the factors ethnicity and program accountability level. The two-way interaction effect responses were significantly different on eight items (see page 62).

Implications and Explanations

How may the findings in Hypothesis 1 be explained? There was no significant difference among the indicated perceptions of the teacher groups designated by levels of program accountability (high, medium, and low). It could be that the teachers did

not perceive themselves as being placed in programs with varying degrees of accountability. It could be that the teachers were aware of program differences but reacted similarly to the concept of permitting parents, students, and other community residents decision-making roles in school affairs for very different reasons. One reason might have been the age or tenure factor. Based on the writer's observations, Follow-Through teachers tended to be somewhat younger and had less tenure than teachers in the other programs of interest. A replicatory study might consider tenure to be a variable in need of investigation.

Observe the two extremes--the Follow-Through and Basal Reading programs. Follow-Through teachers are accountable (under constant supervision) to both their principals and lower-level Follow-Through supervisory staff, who in turn are accountable to the Project Director, the school system, and Engelman-Becker Associations, developers of the program model. The structure of the Basal Reading Program is more conventional; the teachers of each school report only to their principal, who has primary responsibility for their supervision. Follow-Through teachers, because they are under constant supervision from several directions, may not want the added burden of negotiating with students and parents. On the other hand,

Basal Reading teachers, because they are not so closely supervised, might react in the same way, but for very different reasons. For example, they may have indicated disagreement to the concept of role sharing because they felt that only "professionals" should have the role and responsibility of decision making. Therefore it is suggested that future researchers look at reasons why teachers tend to have the same opinion about sharing decision-making roles, regardless of the fact that their working conditions seem to be different.

If present educational systems are to produce a better product (a student at or above grade level upon completion of high school), parents, students, and other community residents must take a more active role in the educational decision-making process, by means of the social system model of accountability. Obviously, teachers at this time are not agreeable to such intervention; therefore, it is the responsibility of educational leaders and institutions of higher learning to initiate teacher inservice and academic programs aimed at breaking down this resistance. Schools and their respective communities must be brought together.

How may the findings concerning Hypothesis 2 be explained? It could be that teachers consider themselves classroom instructors first and members of ethnic groups second. If this is the case, it is not surprising that

there were no significant differences between whites and nonwhites. It is desirable that teachers see themselves as teachers and students as students, and not as white or nonwhite.

These findings could have implications for higher education relative to teaching the philosophy that people from differing backgrounds (e.g., ethnicity) by virtue of their differences behave in certain ways and to the placement of student teachers when characteristics of students, teaching staff, and community may be deemed important relative to site selection for such placements. Too, central administrators of public school systems across the nation might take these findings into consideration when hiring and placing new and old inservice teachers. In the past, it has been common practice for personnel directors/their representatives to make such placements based on their personal perceptions of how they feel certain teachers may react to or perform in given situations.

How may the findings in Hypothesis 3 be explained? Relative to the 22 items on which no significant differences were found, the findings in Hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported. However, in regard to the nine items on which significant differences were found, it is the writer's opinion that these findings indicated a sense of individuality on the part of the teachers, as there was no

established pattern of responses. This individuality is desirable and should not be tampered with.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for further study:

1. This study should be replicated using the independent variable of school location with two levels--"outer" and "inner" city.

2. A longitudinal study should be conducted to determine any changes in perceptions as teachers gain more years of experience.

3. A study should be made comparing teachers' perceptions about shared decision-making roles and responsibilities with those of school administrators.

4. There should be an investigation of the reasons why teachers working under differing job conditions have the same opinions regarding the sharing of decision-making roles and responsibilities.

5. It is further recommended that researchers in the future examine the perceptions of students, parents, and other community residents about decision-making roles and responsibilities.

Comparison of the findings of such research should give school and community leaders invaluable information concerning their efforts to establish viable accountability relationships within a school social system.

APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Perceptions of School/Community Roles In Educational Accountability

DIRECTIONS:

A. Please use pencil with #2 or #3 lead only.

B. For item 1 only, you are to indicate racial/ethnic group membership.

--Fill in space #1 if white.
--Fill in space #2 if nonwhite.

C. Items 2-31. Record your response to each of the questions on the accompanying answer sheet. The term Local Community refers to adults who do not necessarily have children enrolled in the schools. Parents refers to adults who presently have a child enrolled in a local school.

There are no Right or Wrong answers.

The answer sheet should be marked as indicated below:

1) Strongly agree
2) Agree
3) Uncertain
4) Disagree
5) Strongly disagree

1. Please indicate racial/ethnic group membership.
   1) White
   2) Nonwhite

2. The students should be consulted on the procedures used to evaluate their academic work.

3. The student has the major responsibility for his own academic achievement.

4. The local community's participation in school affairs tends to lower the academic standards.

5. The teacher cannot be expected to improve the academic achievement of students if the family is not academically oriented.

6. The more parents participate in school affairs, the greater the confusion around the building.

7. The more a teacher has the students utilize the community resources, the greater the relevance of the instructional program.

8. Parents should have a role in hiring the school personnel (teachers, principal, other staff).

9. Teachers should be expected to justify to a parent the grades given to the parent's child.

10. Teachers cannot be expected to improve the attitudes of their students toward learning when the parents will not cooperate.

11. Teachers and administrators should be held accountable to the community for their effectiveness with the classes.

12. The teacher should expect the school administrator to defend him from criticism by the local community even if the teacher is ineffective.

13. Parents, serving as teacher aides, cannot be depended on to keep pupil personnel records confidential.

14. The students should help determine the nature of an academic assignment.

15. Students are not mature enough to evaluate the classroom performance of their teachers.

16. Parents should be held accountable for the behavior of their children in school.

17. A cooperative relationship between the teacher and the community will improve the behavior of the children in school.

18. People who do not have children attending a given school should nevertheless be permitted to participate in local school affairs.

19. Students should expect their teachers to take responsibility for the students' success in the classroom.

20. Parents should not be permitted to observe in the classroom without prior consent of the teacher.

21. Students cannot be expected to give their teachers a favorable rating.

22. The local community should be consulted on decisions concerning transferring a teacher.

23. Parents should be members of the school's curriculum committees.

24. Students should have a role in hiring the school personnel.

25. Local community members do not have the background to add to the school's academic program.

26. Teachers and school administrators should be required to consult with the local community before initiating curriculum changes.

27. School administrators and teachers should be required to consult with students before initiating curriculum changes.

28. The school administrator should protect his teachers from parental criticism.

29. The behavior of the children in the classroom is related to the attitudes of the teacher toward them.

30. Teachers should protect the school administration from local community criticism.

31. The local community could improve the behavior of the students by not criticizing the school personnel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrio, Stephen M. "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 52 (February 1970): 196-205.

Bowers, C. A. "Accountability From a Humanist Point of View." The Educational Forum 35 (May 1971): 479-486.

Brodbelt, Samuel. "The Impact of Educational Accountability Upon Teachers and Supervisors." High School Journal 56 (1972): 55-66.

Buchan, William. "Educational Accountability: The Parents' Role." Education 93 (September-October 1972): 22.

Deck, Linton, Jr. "Accountability and the Organizational Properties of Schools." Educational Technology 11 (1971): 36-37.

Deterline, William A. "Applied Accountability." Educational Technology 11 (1971): 15-20.

Detroit Free Press, November 18, 1973, p. A-1.

Dyer, Henry S. "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City." Phi Delta Kappan 52 (1970): 206=211.

Erickson, Edsel, et al. "A Comparative Assessment of Project Follow-Through, Project Read, and the Basal Reading Program." In Experiments In Early Education. Grand Rapids Public Schools' Office of Testing and Evaluation, August, 1971, pp. 19-30.

Esler, William K. "Accountability: The Teacher's Perspective." The Clearing House 46 (May 1972): 531-534.

Gloss, Gene V. "The Many Faces of 'Educational Accountability.'" Phi Delta Kappan 53 (June 1972): 636-643.

Grobman, Hulda. "Accountability for What: The Unanswered Question." Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 67.

Kennedy, John D. "Planning for Accountability Via Management by Objectives." Journal of Secondary Education 45 (1970): 348-354.

Lennox, R. T. "Accountability and Performance Contracting." Paper presented to American Educational Research Association, New York, February, 1971.

Lessinger, Leon M. "The Powerful Notion of Accountability in Education." Journal of Secondary Education 45 (1970): 338-347.

_____. "The Principal and Accountability." The National Elementary Principal 51 (1971).

_____. "Robbing Dr. Peter to 'Pay Paul': Accountability for Our Stewardship of Public Education." Educational Technology 11 (1971): 11-14.

Lieberman, Myron. "An Overview of Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan 52 (April 1970): 194-195.

Martin, Carole. "Educator Says It's Up to Public to Press for Needed School Reform." Louisville Times, June 27, 1973, p. A-11.

Miller, William C. "Accountability Demands Involvement." Educational Leadership 29 (April 1972): 613-617.

New York Times, October 31, 1958.

Ornstein, Allan. "Teacher Accountability." Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 49.

Popham, James W. "The New World of Accountability: In the Classroom." NASSP Bulletin 56 (May 1972): 25-31.

Porter, John W. "The Accountability Story in Michigan." Phi Delta Kappan 56 (October 22, 1972): 98-99.

Roush, Robert E., et al. "Accountability in Education: A Priority for the 70's." Education 92 (1971): 475.

School Management 16 (April 1972): 18.

Sciara, F. J., and Jantz, R. K. Accountability in American Education. New York: Boston, Allyn, & Bacon, 1972).

Selden, David. "Productivity, Yes Accountability, No." Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 56.

Seniors, Alma L. "Attitudes of Selected Prospective Teachers Toward Community Participation In School Affairs." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

Sherman, H. C. "Accountability Not New." Phi Delta Kappan 52 (June 1970): 253.

Sikula, John P. "Accountability: Some Teacher Misconceptions." The High School Journal 56 (December 1972): 154-157.

Talmage, Harriet, and Monroe, George E. "Accountability as Negotiation of Perceived Expectations." Contemporary Education 43 (April 1972): 245-250.

Talmage, Harriet, and Ornstein, Allan C. "Teachers' Perceptions of Decision Making Roles and Responsibilities in Defining Accountability." Journal of Negro Education 42 (Spring 1973): 212-221.

Thomson, Scott. "How to Custom Cut Accountability to Fit the Needs of Students and Parents." Nation's Schools 89 (May 1972): 48.

"We've All Got a Problem." Accountability Alert 1 (November 30, 1973): 23-27.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293000968960