

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" × 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" × 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



Accessing the World's Information since 1938

300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8900044

**An investigation of factors relating to teachers and shared
decision making in selected Michigan high schools**

Hicks, Thomas Allan, Ph.D.

Michigan State University, 1988

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

U·M·I

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS RELATING TO TEACHERS
AND SHARED DECISION MAKING IN SELECTED
MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOLS

By

Thomas Allan Hicks

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1988

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS RELATING TO TEACHERS AND SHARED DECISION MAKING IN SELECTED MICHIGAN HIGH SCHOOLS

By

Thomas Allan Hicks

The researcher's purpose in this study was to describe the degree to which teachers were involved in school-wide decision making, assess their preference or desire for increased involvement, explore the extent to which they perceived their involvement in school-wide decision making as necessary or advantageous, and seek an explanation of these issues. More specifically, it was an investigation of the differences in involvement and perceptions of involvement in shared decision making of high school teachers categorized on the basis of the following factors: sex, age, educational status, classroom teaching experience, type of community, size of school, degree of job satisfaction, teaching assignment, and teacher perception of the principal's administrative style.

Twenty-two high schools in a three-county area of western Michigan were selected. All of the teachers in these high schools were contacted, over 1,000 in all. Four hundred thirty-five teachers responded.

Thomas Allan Hicks

High school teachers' perceptions regarding involvement in shared decision making were expressed through a two-part questionnaire administered during the second semester of the school year. The first part of the survey instrument contained questions through which teachers expressed their opinions about shared decision making in their schools and provided information concerning their involvement in school-wide decision making. The second part elicited demographic information about the respondents, their schools, and their perceptions of their principals' leadership styles. The results of this study indicated that:

1. High school teachers were currently involved in shared decision making in the following areas: curriculum, extracurricular activities, school improvement, school rules and discipline, professional development, the coordination of teaching with other teachers, and school policy.

2. The involvement of high school teachers in shared decision making was related to the number of years of classroom teaching experience, the principal's leadership style, job satisfaction, and the type of community in which the school was located.

3. Teachers' willingness to invest time in shared-decision-making activities was significantly influenced by educational status, the type of community in which the school was located, and teaching assignment.

To Jean, my best friend.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wrote this dissertation!

Writing a dissertation was for me a paradoxical experience, for it required me to work alone while needing the technical, psychological, and emotional support of countless significant others. It was reminiscent of that feeling of being alone in a crowded room.

Thanks to my grandmother for wondering why I "needed" a Ph.D. Her questioning stirred in me that childlike rebellion symbolized by wanting desperately what your elders questioned or forbade.

Thanks to Hallie Snyder. She believed in me, mothered me through the experience like the second son she never wanted, and typed four different proposals and numerous revisions of Chapters I, II, and III. She was there when I was tempted to abandon my dream--there to tell me that I didn't have permission to quit.

It was Dr. Joseph Hesse III who applied subtle pressure on a weekly basis, challenging me to finish before he did. He won, but with his persistent nagging I finished second!

Kathy Klouw typed the early format of the many tables and provided many hours of typing help at a moment's notice for revisions and drafts. In her spare time she was my secretary.

John Bird provided a listening ear and perspectives on reality throughout the project.

Dr. Samuel Moore II became the advisor/chairperson I needed to finally finish the task. He was sure I could write a dissertation; inherited me on the rebound from another chairperson; treated me like a person of worth; and provided effective, efficient coaching in a timely fashion.

Finally, I express my deep appreciation to my wife, Jean; sons, Tom and Christian; and daughter, Cara. From the moment we met, Jean knew that someday I might amount to something, and she has loved me through the adolescence of my career. Tom, Christian, and Cara lost for a few years relationship time with their dad, and I with them. This is the stuff of which parental guilt is made.

We wrote this dissertation!

PREFACE

This dissertation is about people--people who daily make decisions about high school students and their education. It is also a study in power, authority, and responsibility, for power rests with those who exercise the authority to make decisions in our institutions.

My hunch is that when teachers are empowered with the authority to share in the decision-making process with administrators, both teachers and principals will also share the responsibility for developing an effective learning environment and finding solutions to the persistent problems of public secondary education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	xi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	8
Implications	12
Population	12
Limitations of the Study	13
Operational Definitions	13
Overview of Succeeding Chapters	14
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Domains of Educational Decision Making	16
Instructional Coordination	17
Curriculum Development	18
Professional Development	20
Evaluation	21
School Improvement and Personnel	24
Rules and Discipline	26
General Administration	27
Policy Making	28
Summary	29
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	31
Identification of Variables	31
Design of the Instrument	35
Selection and Description of Respondents	37
Administration of the Questionnaire	42
Data-Analysis Procedures	43
Hypotheses	46

	Page
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	48
Current Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making	48
Perceived Results of Involvement in School-Wide Decisions	57
Perceived Ability to Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions	66
Perception of Overall Degree of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making	72
Expressed Desire to Become Involved in School-Wide Decision Making	80
Investment of Time	81
Preference for Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making	87
Perceptions of Potential Benefits, Costs, or Hindrances to Involvement in Shared Decision Making	89
Perceived Benefits of Involvement in Shared Decision Making	89
Perceived Costs of Involvement in Shared Decision Making	96
Perceived Hindrances to Involvement in Shared Decision Making	103
Chi-Square Test of Association	111
Current Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making	112
Expressed Desire to Become Involved in School-Wide Decision Making	120
Perceptions of Potential Benefits, Costs, or Hindrances to Involvement in Shared Decision Making	121
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	127
Summary	127
Major Findings (Descriptive)	128
Major Findings (Statistical)	139
Conclusions	142
Implications for Action	143
Recommendations for Further Research	144
APPENDICES	
A. THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO GATHER DATA FOR THE STUDY .	145
B. LETTER TO PRINCIPALS	152

	Page
C. LETTER TO ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS	153
D. POSTCARD RETURNED BY PRINCIPALS	154
BIBLIOGRAPHY	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of High School Sample Pool and Sample by Size Classification	37
2. Age and Sex of Respondents	38
3. Educational Status of Respondents	39
4. Classroom Teaching Experience of Respondents	39
5. Type of Community in Which Respondents Were Employed .	40
6. Size of School in Which Respondents Taught	40
7. Job Satisfaction of Respondents	41
8. Teaching Assignment of Respondents	41
9. Respondents' Perceptions of Principals' Administrative Styles	42
10. Teacher Involvement in School-Wide Decisions	49
11. Teacher Involvement in School-Wide Decisions, by Sex .	50
12. Involvement in School-Wide Decisions by Teachers of Varying Ages	51
13. Involvement in School-Wide Decisions by Teachers With Varying Classroom Teaching Experience	51
14. Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	52
15. Involvement in School-Wide Decisions by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	53
16. Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in School With Varying Student Enrollments	53
17. Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	55

	Page
18. Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	56
19. Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	57
20. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making, by Sex . .	58
21. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making, by Age . .	60
22. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Classroom Teaching Experience . .	60
23. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	61
24. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	62
25. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments .	62
26. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	63
27. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction . . .	64
28. Teacher-Perceived Positive Results From Actual Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	65
29. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions, by Sex	66
30. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers of Varying Ages . . .	66

	Page
31. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers With Varying Classroom Experience	67
32. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	68
33. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	69
34. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments	69
35. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	70
36. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	71
37. Teachers' Belief That They Can Affect the Outcome of School-Wide Decisions by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	72
38. Perceived Extent of Teacher Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making, by Sex	73
39. Perceived Extent of Teacher Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers of Varying Ages	74
40. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Classroom Teaching Experience	75
41. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	75
42. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	77
43. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments	77

	Page
44. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments .	78
45. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	79
46. Perceived Extent of Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	79
47. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making, by Sex	81
48. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers of Varying Ages	81
49. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Classroom Teaching Experience	82
50. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	83
51. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	83
52. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments	84
53. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	85
54. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	85
55. Perceived Willingness to Invest Time in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers with Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	86
56. Teachers' Preferences for Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making	87

	Page
57. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making, by Sex	89
58. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers of Varying Ages	90
59. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Classroom Experience	90
60. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	91
61. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	92
62. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments	92
63. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	93
64. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	94
65. Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	95
66. Teachers' Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making, by Sex	96
67. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers of Varying Ages	97
68. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Classroom Teaching Experience	97
69. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	98
70. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	99
71. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments	99

	Page
72. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	100
73. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	101
74. Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	102
75. Teachers' Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making, by Sex	103
76. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers of Varying Ages	104
77. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Classroom Teaching Experience	105
78. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Educational Status	105
79. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Varying Types of Communities	106
80. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers in Schools With Varying Student Enrollments	107
81. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Teaching Assignments	108
82. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Degrees of Job Satisfaction	109
83. Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making by Teachers With Varying Perceptions of Their Principals' Administrative Styles	110
84. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Current Involvement of Teachers in Shared Decision Making	112

	Page
85. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teachers' Perceptions of the Results of Their Involvement in Shared Decision Making	115
86. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teachers' Perceptions of Their Ability to Affect the Outcome of School- Wide Decisions	117
87. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teacher-Perceived Extent of Involvement in Shared Decision Making	119
88. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teachers' Perceptions of Willingness to Invest Time in Shared Decision Making	120
89. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teachers' Ratings of Potential Benefits of Shared Decision Making	122
90. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teachers' Ratings of Potential Costs of Shared Decision Making	123
91. Summary of Chi-Square Test for Teachers' Ratings of Potential Hindrances to Involvement in Shared Decision Making	125

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A recurring theme in the literature of education and business is employee participation in decision making. Organizational theorists such as Chester Barnard (1938), Max Weber (1974), Frederick Taylor (1947), and James March and Herbert Simon (1958) addressed the various aspects of individual participation in organizational decision making.

The importance of employee participation in decision making in determining acceptance of organizational changes was studied by Coch and French (1948). They noted a positive correlation between participation in decision making and productivity and reduced resistance to change. Sharma (1955) found that teachers expressed an interest in becoming involved in decision making associated with instruction.

Patchen, in his 1970 study of Tennessee Valley Authority employees, suggested that increased individual participation in organizational decision making leads to greater job satisfaction and work achievement as well as a higher level of integration into the organization.

Lammers (1967) argued that allowing participation in decisions over which employees have no control may be as damaging as a total

lack of participation. Gouldner (1954), Tannenbaum (1968), and Mulder (1971) contended that allowing employees to participate in decision making broadens the employer's or supervisor's influence over the performance of individual role performers.

Implicit in the writing of these researchers is the notion of a workplace democracy or the right of employees to control their own labor at least to the extent that production is not negatively affected. Blumberg (1969) summarized the literature concerning the relationship between worker decision-making power and job satisfaction as follows:

There is scarcely a study in the entire literature which fails to demonstrate that satisfaction in work is enhanced . . . by a genuine increase in workers' decision-making power. . . . The participative worker is an involved worker, for his job becomes an extension of himself; and by his decisions he is creating his work, modifying and regulating it. (p. 121)

Scott (1966) supported this view, noting that "a worker who performs the entire task will be more willing and better able to assume responsibility for the control of his performance than will the worker who carries out only a portion of the task and whose performance may in various ways be dependent on the work of others" (p. 267).

Pateman (1970) suggested that workplace democracy is in the best interest of both the individual and society. She noted that:

People who have a sense of political efficacy are more likely to participate in politics than those in whom this feeling is lacking; and it has also been found that underlying the sense of political efficacy is a sense of general, personal effectiveness, which involves self-confidence in one's dealings with the world. (p. 46)

Schools, however, vary in a variety of ways from the industrial examples that were the focus of these studies. Duke (1980) questioned whether there is, in fact, a direct relationship between workplace democracy and productivity in the school setting. Researchers such as Duke; Hollaway; Miskal, Fevurly, and Stewart; Hoy and Forsythe; and Ratsoy have sought to understand the dimensions of teacher commitment to school-wide matters. Among other things, they suggested that school should not be thought of as a productive unit, but rather a cover organization that holds a number of discrete teaching-learning activities. That may help explain some of the teacher reluctance to join in school-wide endeavors because it is not in the "school" that the major business of teaching and learning takes place. The notion of further committing teachers to the school, as opposed to merely the classroom, raises the question: What is it that schools do or do not do that seems to elicit higher levels of commitment from teachers? Commitment has usually been phrased by these researchers in terms of perceived satisfaction, low absenteeism, and a willingness to participate in school-level activities.

Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) reported that most teachers felt less than anxious to participate in school decision making and derived little satisfaction when they did participate. Twenty-two percent of the teachers claimed that their noninvolvement in school decisions was not the result of a lack of opportunity but a function of personal choice. Those who reported that they did participate said they benefited little from involvement and further indicated

that administrators were less than sincere when they solicited teacher involvement. That is reminiscent of Lortie's (1975) "good day" issue where he reported that for teachers positive events and outcomes are linked to two sets of actors--the teacher and the students. He found that negative allusions were made to parents, the principal, the school nurse, and colleagues--in fact, to anyone and everyone who "intrudes on classroom events" (p. 106).

Holdaway (1978) used Herzberg's theory to study teacher satisfaction and found that for teachers the "facet associated most frequently with overall satisfaction . . . was 'the work itself'--that label applied to classroom activities, especially interaction with the students" (p. 45). It may be that organizational structure in terms of bureaucracy is only part of the problem, but Ratsoy (1979) reported that teacher satisfaction on the average was lower in schools where they perceived a high degree of bureaucracy. That was not supported by Miskal, Fevurly, and Stewart (1979), who reported that more effective schools (as perceived by teachers) were characterized by more participative processes, less centralized decision making, more formalized general rules and more complexity, and high professional activity--in other words, where there was a definite but not oppressive bureaucracy.

Hoy and Forsythe (1981) reported their theory that an individual's organizational status will influence his isolation from others on a variety of organizational dimensions. But isolation from formal control and isolation from perceived actual control were

not related to increased work alienation. Theoretically, individuals could be excluded from power networks in the organization and yet not perceive their work as lacking intrinsic meaning or value. On the other hand, Zielinski and Hoy (1983) reported that isolation was highly related to alienation in elementary schools. They concluded that pride in one's work is related to teachers' beliefs that they can make a difference in both the operation of the school and in classroom activities, and further that the link between a faculty member's powerlessness and self-estrangement is both substantial and significant. That would support Conway (1976), who found that the majority of teachers desire participation in the organization and that deprivation of that participation leads to their negative perceptions of the organization. He concluded that there is a great need for obtaining greater participation in schools.

This is encouraging for those who generally like to think in terms of improving performance and satisfaction with the human-relations techniques of cooperation, openness, participation, and collegiality. But it is questionable whether it supports the work of Lortie and Waller (1975) and Duke (1976); or Hoy, Newland, and Blazovsky's (1977) findings that job codification is directly and significantly related to teacher spirit. The more carefully the job is specified through the use of rules and regulations, the higher the spirit among the teachers. It does support the work of Alluto and Belasco (1973), who reported that teachers were already participating in school-wide matters more than they wanted.

However, it is not in keeping with Cusick's (1983) study of high schools, where the teachers were quite content to leave the running of the enterprise to the administrators and whomever the administrators could get to help them. To Cusick, when teachers did enter into the larger arena of school decisions, it was to protect their own operating fields, which centered on their individual set of classes, activities, and events that each one had spent some time and effort constructing. The forays that one made into the larger school were made for the purpose of protecting and expanding that set. It appeared to Cusick that as teachers became more exposed to the realities of the schools, their ideologies shifted toward the more custodial, tough minded, and realistic. Further, if the job demands tough-mindedness and a custodial approach to students, these might well mitigate against effective participation and a democratic approach to decision making.

Miskal, McDonald, and Bloom (1983) suggested an additional limit to the participatory model when they reported weak structural links between teachers and specialists but strong links between teachers and building administrators, particularly over the matter of discipline. They suggested that that may be the strongest element contributing to teacher satisfaction, for if, for example, building discipline is good, teachers are happier.

On the other hand, Raywid (1983) reported that the key to a more involved and effectively related faculty may be a uniquely different school structure. He asserted that it is the alternative

type of school wherein teachers display "real ownership" in the program and where 90% are willing to take on even more professional activity and obligation.

In addition, it may be that, as Cohen (1981) suggested, teaching particularly at the secondary level is not a very attractive option, as evidenced by the small number of talented people who enter the profession, the unwillingness of laid-off teachers to return to teaching after finding jobs in sales and service positions, unimaginative preparation programs, and the limited pay and career opportunities. From reading Cohen, Waller, Lortie, and Duke, one might suggest that the failure of administrators to get more teacher involvement is a result of there being little in the way of positive inducements the profession can offer.

Teacher commitment to the larger organization does seem to say some things about school structure. Worthy (1970) viewed worker affiliation with the organization as always problematic. He believed that while differences are most likely to occur between management and line employees, in school there are some patterns to those differences. Teachers resist management's attempt at uniformity and a further control of classroom processes. Teachers are differentially affiliated with the larger organization. Attempts to increase or at least regulate their affiliation have varying outcomes. At that point, for Worthy, the issue becomes one of structure. 'Is the structure such that normative commitment to the school is actively discouraged? Is the structure of individual

classrooms so compelling that one is discouraged from participating in the larger school?

Miskal, Fevurly, and Stewart; Zielinski and Hoy; Conway; and Raywid suggested that employee participation in the organization and involvement bring greater satisfaction and greater effort. Duke, Duke and Showers, Ratsoy, Holdaway, Cusick, and Worthy indicated that teachers are differentially affiliated with the school, that attempts to make them more involved have unclear results, and that teachers seem to resist involvement in school-wide endeavors.

The issue of employee involvement in shared decision making has been of interest to researchers since the 1930s, but there appear to be unclear findings regarding the extent of teacher involvement in the decision-making process and conflicting findings relative to how such involvement influences teacher performance or affects the classroom environment in which they work.

Purpose of the Study

With this problematic condition in mind, the researcher's purpose in this study was to (a) describe the degree to which teachers are involved in school-wide decision making, (b) assess their preference for increased involvement in school-wide decision making, (c) explore the extent to which they perceive their involvement in school-wide decisions as necessary or advantageous, and (d) seek some degree of explanation to all of these issues. More specifically, this researcher sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what degree are high school teachers involved in school-wide decisions?
 - a. What decisions are they presently involved in?
 - b. What are the decision areas in which they are not involved?
 - c. How much of their effort is presently expended on out-of-class endeavors?
2. To what degree do high school teachers wish to become involved in school-wide decisions?
 - a. Do they see themselves as being able to affect decisions outside the classroom?
 - b. What decisions do they see themselves as affecting?
 - c. How much effort are they willing to expend in out-of-class endeavors?
3. Do high school teachers see themselves as benefiting from involvement in school-wide decision making?
 - a. What are the benefits?
 - b. What are the disadvantages?
 - c. What hinders their involvement?
4. Are there significant demographic differences associated with teacher involvement in school-wide decision making?

Involvement in shared decision making by high school teachers in selected public schools in Michigan was identified in this study. The differences were categorized on the basis of each of the following eight factors and their respective components:

1. Sex
 - a. Female
 - b. Male

2. Age
 - a. Under 30 years
 - b. 30-39 years
 - c. 40-49 years
 - d. Over 50 years
3. Educational status
 - a. B.A. degree
 - b. M.A. degree
 - c. Ed.S. degree
 - d. Ph.D. degree
4. Classroom teaching experience
 - a. 1- 5 years
 - b. 6-10 years
 - c. 11-15 years
 - d. 16-20 years
 - e. Over 20 years
5. Type of community
 - a. Rural
 - b. Small town
 - c. City
 - d. Suburban
6. Size of school
 - a. Under 319 students
 - b. 319-626 students
 - c. 627-1,204 students
 - d. Over 1,204 students

7. Degree of job satisfaction
 - a. Very satisfied
 - b. Satisfied
 - c. Dissatisfied
8. Teaching assignment
 - a. English
 - b. Mathematics
 - c. Science
 - d. Social studies
 - e. Art
 - f. Music
 - g. Home economics
 - h. Business
 - i. Industrial arts
 - j. Physical education
 - k. Guidance and counseling
 - l. Library/media
 - m. Special education
9. Teacher perception of building principal's administrative style
 - a. Exercises control over all school decisions
 - b. Exercises control over most school decisions
 - c. Exercises control over some school decisions
 - d. Exercises control over few school decisions

Implications

Much of the previous literature on teachers and shared decision making has focused on elementary schools. Given the increased recent interest in improving secondary education, it is hoped that this study can contribute to the extension of existing knowledge by identifying whether or not secondary teachers are interested in sharing the decision-making responsibilities that will accompany this reform effort.

From this information local school districts, state departments of education, and university schools of education can begin to sort out a direction in which to proceed with school improvement. Also, they can identify who will be involved in making the decisions that will ultimately reshape the structure of American secondary education.

Population

The teachers from 22 selected public high schools in the Ottawa, Kent, and Muskegon County Intermediate School Districts were the subjects of this study. The 42 high schools that are a part of these intermediate school districts were grouped by size, using the classification system of the Michigan High School Athletic Association. Schools from each size classification were selected at random. The total number of high schools chosen from each classification was determined by the percentage that classification represented of the 42 schools. The number of participants involved in this sampling was approximately 1,000.

The sample of buildings was selected by size within the county area to insure variety in (a) size of student population, (b) racial composition, and (c) size and type of community.

Limitations of the Study

One of the major questions that had to be resolved in the design of the survey instrument for this study was how to cover the broad range of possible decision areas. While open-ended, essay-type questions might provide the greatest latitude for response and allow for individual differences, such a strategy would complicate the task of trying to classify or standardize responses to permit comparison or analysis. The mechanics alone involved in having the respondents provide lengthy responses was seen as a serious handicap.

Several other limitations also warrant injection here:

1. The differences identified and the comparisons drawn in this research do not prove cause-and-effect relationships.
2. The findings of this study cannot be generalized in a statistical sense to a broad population. Implications can be drawn in a theoretical sense, however, to other populations of a similar description.
3. This study involved only secondary teachers. The findings may not necessarily be applicable to elementary teachers.

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, involvement refers to teachers' perceptions of their participation in the decision-making process in

their school. School-wide decision making and shared decision making are phrases that are used interchangeably in the study to refer to teacher participation in decisions that affect the entire school.

Overview of Succeeding Chapters

Literature pertinent to the study is reviewed in Chapter II. Data collection and analysis procedures are presented in Chapter III. Findings are presented in Chapter IV. A summary of the study, its conclusions, limitations, and recommendations for further research constitute Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Conway (1984) contended that for one to understand the results of participation in decision making in educational organizations, the concept must first be defined. He concluded that participative decision making comprises the intersection of two major conceptual sets: (a) the set of concepts associated with decision making and (b) the set of concepts associated with participation.

Locke and Schweiger (1979) defined decision making as any process wherein one or more actors determine a particular choice. Participation for them refers to the sharing by two or more actors in some action or matter.

Duke, Showers, and Imber (1978) concluded that attempts to involve teachers in the decision-making process typically rest on the notion that such involvement would have a positive effect on the productivity of schools. In their opinion, this position is based on two arguments. The first argument is that teachers, by virtue of their frequent contact with students, are in an ideal position to assess the educational needs of students in a given school and that such an awareness of student needs is an essential prerequisite to effective educational decisions.

The authors continued by identifying the second argument as one whose basis is found in psychology. This argument holds that people who are a part of the decision-making process will have a vested interest in the implementation of those decisions. Therefore, the argument continues, teachers who help make decisions will try harder to make those decisions work out well, and, in turn, students presumably will benefit.

Domains of Educational Decision Making

Duke (1978) noted four domains of decision making that provide an opportunity for teacher involvement. According to the author, the domain of classroom decisions has received the greatest attention in studies of teacher decision making. These decisions are easy to identify from those in other domains because their direct effect centers on individuals in a single classroom and are not necessarily coordinated with persons outside the classroom. The autonomy exercised by most teachers in this domain was questioned in a study by the National Institute of Education (1975) when its authors commented:

The traditionally organized school does not give sufficient support to the classroom teacher's instructional role. In that school the least supported or controlled decision is the decision on instructional strategy made by classroom personnel. Although the school, particularly the elementary school, has the appearance of a bureaucratic structure with the principal supervising the classroom teachers, analysis and research indicate that the classroom teacher is typically totally isolated in making important educational decisions. (pp. 8-9)

The second domain, professional organizational decisions, represents those teacher decisions or activities that are associated

with teachers' unions or other educational specialty groups. School system decisions make up the third domain. Teachers may be afforded some degree of input into these decisions, but generally they are made by central administrators or elected or appointed groups. The fourth domain encompasses those decisions that affect the operation of a single school.

Within these domains of educational decision making lie decisions that must be made about instructional coordination, curriculum development, professional development, evaluation, school improvement and personnel, rules and discipline, general administration, and policy making. The existing literature provides some insight into the opportunities for involvement in these decisional categories.

Instructional Coordination

One of the largest concentrated efforts at instructional coordination is the concept of team teaching. The focus of this activity belies the name in that its emphasis is primarily on planning together. Cohen (1976) noted that team teachers interacted more than nonteam counterparts and thought they exercised greater influence over their teaching tasks.

Johnson (1975) reported that teacher participation in instructional coordination actually led to involvement in other types of school decision making. He discovered that "the greater the intensity and extensity of teacher collaboration in daily work, the more likely it is that teachers will participate in school

decisions which in other schools are left primarily to principals" (p. 36).

Duckworth and Jovick (1978) warned that one should be cautious when predicting the effects of team teaching on instructional coordination. They concluded that there is a variety of ways to bring about instructional coordination, and each may affect teacher involvement in a different way.

In a study of schools that are made up of teacher work groups, Schmuck, Paddock, and Packard (1977) reported that teachers did not believe, either individually or as a staff, that they had increased influence over school decisions through involvement with these collaborative groups. While teachers have had some opportunity to help coordinate the instructional program, this involvement appears to have resulted in unclear findings in terms of its effect on teacher decision making.

Instructional coordination can take place as a result of processes other than teaming. Hanson (1978) broke schools down into assorted formal and informal coalitions, spheres of influence, and power bases. He believed that interest groups often form around particular issues and dissolve upon their resolution.

Curriculum Development

Teacher involvement in curriculum decision making has grown out of the mandate for educational change. Meyer and Cohen (1971), in a study comparing open and traditional schools, found that teachers in the open school collaborated more often on curriculum issues,

thought of themselves as able to exercise considerable influence in curriculum planning, and perceived their principal to exercise influence less often. Johnson (1975) surveyed 188 California elementary principals and discovered that three-quarters of them consulted or involved teachers in curriculum decision making. He also obtained indications that teacher involvement was somewhat greater in schools where teaming occurred. Unfortunately, Johnson's study included no general check on the perceptions of principals. It is conceivable that these individuals shared a perception of teacher involvement that differed from the teachers' perceptions.

Being involved in making, or being consulted about, curriculum decisions is not necessarily the same as exercising control over what decisions are made. Walker (1977), while acknowledging the relative autonomy of teachers "behind the classroom door," observed that "the teacher's role is constrained and limited by decisions made outside the classroom which are out of his or her control" (p. 19). Some of the external decisions cover such areas as the assignment of students, scheduling, textbook approval, and the selection of standardized tests.

Floden (1978) and a group of researchers at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching studied who controls what is taught in classrooms. They noted that teachers should not be regarded as autonomous curriculum decision makers if the content choices they make are based on a limited range of options (i.e., a district list of approved textbooks).

A National Education Association poll reported that 62% of the teachers surveyed felt they were as involved in curriculum decision making as they wanted to be. Alutto and Belasco (1972) and Conway (1976) found that some teachers had more involvement in curriculum decision making than they desired. Kirst and Walker (1971) observed that since teachers have failed to bring curriculum issues to the bargaining table, involvement by teachers in curriculum decisions appears to occupy a relatively low priority. Imber (1978) suggested that involvement in curriculum decisions could make the job of teaching more challenging, responsible, and stimulating.

Professional Development

Teachers are staying and graying in today's teacher market. The question of how to provide this veteran teaching force with new knowledge and sharpened skills is the thrust of efforts in the professional-development area.

Traditionally, control over inservice education has rested with universities, school district officials, or building principals. McLaughlin and March (1978) noted that "teachers were invited to participate [in inservice experiences] without having significant decision making power and without time being given for them to participate meaningfully" (p. 91). Edelfelt (Far West Teacher Corps Network, 1976) suggested as one guideline for the control of professional development that "decisions are made by the people who are affected, and the decisions are made as close as possible to the situation where they will be operative."

Joyce (1976) concluded that no one group currently controls professional development, but there is some evidence to suggest that teacher involvement in this area is expanding. Legislation promoting and providing financial support for teacher centers is an important indication of progress in this area.

Duke (1977) and Lawrence (1974) noted that inservice programs with the best chance of being effective are those that involve teachers in the planning and managing of their own professional-development activities. Joyce et al. (1976) documented similar findings regarding teachers' perceptions of activities to be pursued, including opportunities to learn from other teachers, and the feasibility of on-the-job application and feedback.

Stephens (1975) reported that one of the decisions teachers are most interested in influencing is the designation of the priorities of professional-development activities. He suggested that teacher interest in this decision area is keen because training topics that are viewed as high priorities are not always the same as those that concern administrators or teacher educators.

Yarger et al. (1976) surveyed 1,200 teachers and found that most were interested in training that covered basic teaching strategies across content areas and general teaching skills.

Evaluation

Evaluation associated with teacher performance has generated an almost unmanageable volume of research. Teachers still continue to criticize the frequency of administrative observations as well as

the criteria and procedures involved in teacher evaluation. Collegial evaluation is one outgrowth of this teacher concern.

The case of collegial evaluation was put succinctly by Bruno and Nottingham (1976):

Teachers are in the best position to evaluate other teachers; and more importantly, they are more likely to get cooperation from poorer teachers toward increased performance since they are not placed in the adversary teacher-administrator role. (pp. 29-30)

Further argument for teacher involvement in evaluation came from a study by Vavrus (1978), who reported that teacher alienation may result in part from the perception of lack of participation in the evaluation of one's own work. A pilot test of collegial evaluation by Roper, Deal, and Dornbusch (1976) seemed to uphold Vavrus's conclusion. Most of the 30 teachers and teacher trainees reacted favorably to the experiment, gaining new ideas for self-improvement and feeling a sense of job control. The collegial evaluation model that was tested consisted of seven steps:

1. Choosing a partner
2. Selecting evaluation criteria
3. Self-assessment
4. Student assessment
5. Observations
6. Conference on evaluations
7. Development of an improvement plan

The first, second, and seventh steps require formal decisions to be made, although teachers are not involved in the first step. The principal is responsible for selecting collegial evaluation pairs.

The authors noted that the aspect of this model with the most radical implications for the school authority structure clearly is teacher determination of evaluation criteria. In the experiment, teachers found this phase the most difficult. Five guidelines were established for the selection of evaluation criteria:

1. The two teachers identify the pool of possible criteria using such sources as school goals, accountability guidelines, recent research, and their own philosophy.

2. Each teacher makes a list of four or five criteria and exchanges lists with his or her partner.

3. The two teachers agree on a list of four or five criteria.

4. The two teachers review the list to make sure each criterion is specific and observable.

5. The criteria are listed on the observation form.

Evidence on the effect of collegial evaluation appears to be mixed. Dornbusch and Scott (1975) reported on a study of 131 public school teachers in which it was noted that teachers were satisfied with teacher evaluation systems over which they exercised little control. Marram, Dornbusch, and Scott (1972) found that elementary teachers had little confidence in an appraisal of their teaching by other teachers. Meyer and Cohen (1971), however, found that teachers in an open school expressed a much higher level of confidence in collegial evaluation than did their counterparts in traditional schools.

Despite this mixed review of findings, decisions regarding the evaluation of teachers continue to be influenced most by those in administrative positions.

School Improvement and Personnel

Like teacher evaluation, school-improvement efforts have been an exercise in top-down management. Duke (1980) noted that these efforts have tended to address a number of changes, including alterations in the authority structure of the school. Two such school-improvement programs involving teacher decision making are the San Jose Teacher Involvement Project (TIP) and the Individually Guided Education (IGE) program sponsored by the Kettering Foundation.

The TIP was intended to achieve three primary outcomes (San Jose Teacher Association, 1977):

1. To encourage the processing of problems through local governance structure.
2. To continue and extend teacher involvement by providing a means by which teachers could use their professional judgment to influence and improve the instructional programs for students.
3. To provide funds for implementation of programs designed and managed by teachers to solve the problems identified through the governance structure.

While the IGE shares the TIP's basic concern for comprehensive school improvement, its differences may be seen in the basic beliefs that underlie the program:

1. The individual school is a strategic unit of educational change.

2. The culture of the school is central both to understanding and to effecting educational improvement.

3. Given existing social and educational constraints, most individual schools are not strong enough to overcome the inertia against change built into the typical school district.

4. Each school needs a process by which it can deal effectively with its own problems and effect its own change.

Duke (1978) noted that it seems clear from these examples that some attempt has been made to involve teachers in school-improvement efforts, but the extent to which decisions have had an influence on school improvement is unclear.

The view that seems to prevail among those who have studied the problems associated with school improvement was expressed by Bredo and Bredo (1975):

Strong administrative leadership may be an effective approach to implementing major change, particularly in the case of resistance from some of the organization's members. Administrators may bolster their position by enlisting increased support from superiors. . . . If such support is not forthcoming, and if an administrator is weak or no longer has the confidence of the staff, attempts to impose changes are not likely to meet with success. (p. 21)

Duke (1978) concluded that the state of the art in the area of school improvement continues to be a view from the top down rather than from such grass-roots elements as local teachers.

Johnson (1975) observed that personnel decisions typically are one of the school decisions in which teachers are least involved.

He reported that seldom are teachers included in decisions regarding the determination of personnel needs, the establishment of recruitment criteria, or the actual selection of teachers, administrators, or other school staff. Declining enrollment and uncertain financial conditions may force school systems to hold fast.

Rules and Discipline

Duke, Donmoyer, and Farman (1978) and Duke (1979) cited student behavior problems as the decision area of greatest interest to teachers. They believed that often out of desperation and fear teachers are forcing their unions to bring school discipline issues to the bargaining table. The authors concluded that some frustrated teachers may even ignore school-wide problems and concentrate on establishing order in their individual classrooms.

The kinds of decisions that have to be made if teachers wish to deal with student behavior problems at the school, rather than the classroom, level include the determination of rules, consequences for breaking rules, and mechanisms for resolving conflicts between students and teachers. Duke (1977) and Francis (1975) supported the need for a high degree of teacher involvement in making all of these decisions, believing that the odds of getting effective enforcement are greatest when those who must see that rules are obeyed are involved in making them, along with those subject to the rules. Elsewhere, though, Duke (1979) noted that teachers are not involved very much in making decisions regarding school rules and

discipline policies. It seems ironic that teacher authority for making these decisions appears to be eroding at the same time that public expectations that teachers will exercise tight control over student conduct are increasing. Johnson (1975) and Meyer and Cohen (1971), however, noted that open-space schools with team teaching are characterized by greater teacher influence and less administrator influence over disciplinary decisions than schools with self-contained classrooms and low levels of teacher interaction.

Whether the preceding findings are applicable to secondary schools as well as elementary schools remains unclear. Duke and Perry (1978), in a study of alternative high schools, hypothesized that small size is a major factor in explaining why these alternatives seem to experience fewer discipline problems than large high schools nearby. It would seem that the demand for rules and policies for handling behavior problems is greater in secondary schools than in elementary schools.

General Administration

The allocation of resources, settlement of minor grievances, determination of extracurricular programs, and on-site budgetary matters make up the decision category general administration. This category is easily identifiable as one that traditionally falls within the purview of the building principal. Duke (1980) commented:

Within the context of conventional public schools there is little evidence of teacher involvement in general

administration decision-making. Sometimes in small elementary schools, often located in rural districts, one teacher may be designated a "teaching principal," but this practice typically bespeaks more of a concern with economies of scale than a commitment to teacher leadership.

One occasionally reads or hears about a school in which teachers exercise some control over decisions in the area of general administration, but it is safe to conclude that the overwhelming majority of these decisions rest with the building principal.

The one area in which teacher involvement in general administration decision making might be studied empirically is alternative schooling. Duke (1978) noted that many alternative schools have been created by teachers dissatisfied with conventional public education. Typically an organizational structure for these schools is selected that provides for collaborative decision making among all staff and often among students and parents as well. Full-time administrators are rare, and, where they exist, they tend to be facilitators or coordinators rather than classical administrators. McConahay et al. (1973), in a study of one such alternative school, discovered that teachers varied in their desire to do administrative tasks. Some spent more than 10% of their time in general administration, whereas others spent almost no time, preferring to counsel students or teach additional classes.

Policy Making

A review of the history of educational policy making reveals a teacher corps removed from the very heart of the process. Corwin (1970) found that a desire for more influence over school policy

accounted for much of the teacher militancy and dissatisfaction he found in the 28 high schools he studied.

Duke (1980) maintained that, traditionally, teachers interested in becoming involved in policy making had to contend with local boards of education and administrators who jealously guarded their prerogatives. Today there are indications that teachers may have to contend with different forces if their voices are to be heard during the determination of school policies. Legislation like California's Proposition 13, ostensibly a grass-roots effort by believers in local control, actually may foreshadow the end of decentralized decision making at the district and school levels.

Summary

A historical perspective of teachers and shared decision making was the focus of this chapter. Throughout this chronology, researchers seemed to question the extent to which teachers are involved in the decision-making process and the degree to which such involvement influences the nature of their work or the environment in which it takes place.

Much of the research on teachers and shared decisions used elementary teachers as the subjects of the study. This study differs from most of those reviewed in that its focus is secondary teachers and, more specifically, high school teachers. Another important difference is the inclusion of a broad spectrum of decision areas and their relationship to the costs and benefits of

involvement, as well as teachers' perceptions of their influence in the decision-making arena.

What appears in the literature seems to be incongruent with the current press to reform public education. The critics' finger of blame and feelings of hope for speedy reform appear to rest heavily on the basic human element in the instructional process, classroom teachers, and their involvement in decisions to change existing practices seems critical to a successful reform effort.

Most of this criticism appears to be directed at high schools, and most of the suggestions and recommendations for change involve aspects of schooling in which high school teachers share a vested interest. A restructuring of public secondary education appears to be a national priority for the 1980s. It seems that the spotlight of reform is aimed and focused on almost every aspect of this institution, and the critics and philosophers stand ready to extol the virtues of their plans of action.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The researcher's purpose in this study was to identify the extent to which high school teachers are involved in school-wide decision making and to relate various aspects of this involvement to a number of variables. The intention of this chapter is to describe how the variables were selected, how the instrument to identify the degree of teacher involvement was developed and administered, how the sample schools were chosen, and how the data were collected and analyzed.

Although the major function of descriptive studies has as its primary focus a concern with finding out "what is," it was this researcher's purpose to describe the current status of teacher involvement in school-wide decision making as the first step toward the development of ideas for change and improvement.

Identification of Variables

The instrument developed to gather information for this study had two major parts. The objectives were:

1. To gather demographic and descriptive information about the respondents.

2. To determine the decision areas in which teachers are involved in school-wide decision making.

3. To determine teachers' perceptions of the "results" of their involvement in school-wide decision making in various decision areas.

4. To determine teachers' perceptions of their involvement in general school-wide decision making.

5. To determine whether teachers perceive they can affect or influence the outcome of school-wide decisions.

6. To determine the degree to which teachers are willing to invest time in the activities of school-wide decision making.

7. To gather information on teachers' perceptions of the "benefits" or advantages of their involvement in school-wide decision making.

8. To gather information on teachers' perceptions of the "risks" or disadvantages of their involvement in school-wide decision making.

9. To gather information on teachers' perceptions of the factors that hinder their involvement in school-wide decision making.

A review of the literature and interviews with teachers, counselors, administrators, and university staff all played a role in defining those variables to be used in the study. The variables used were:

1. Demographic and descriptive information about respondents:
 - a. sex of respondent
 - b. age of respondent

- c. degrees held
 - d. classroom teaching experience
 - e. type of community
 - f. school enrollment
 - g. job satisfaction
 - h. teaching assignment
 - i. principal's leadership style
2. Decision areas in which teachers are involved in school-wide decision making:
- a. team teaching
 - b. curriculum
 - c. professional development
 - d. teacher evaluation
 - e. school improvement
 - f. personnel needs
 - g. hiring
 - h. school rules and discipline
 - i. budget
 - j. the settlement of grievances
 - k. extracurricular activities
 - l. school policies
3. Teachers' perceptions of the "results" of their involvement in school-wide decision making:
- a. positive
 - b. negative
 - c. neutral

4. Teachers' perceptions of their involvement in general school-wide decision making:
 - a. very involved
 - b. somewhat involved
 - c. not involved
5. Teachers' perceptions of whether they can affect or influence the outcome of school-wide decisions in these decision areas:
 - a. team teaching
 - b. curriculum
 - c. professional development
 - d. teacher evaluation
 - e. school improvement
 - f. personnel needs
 - g. hiring
 - h. school rules and discipline
 - i. budget
 - j. the settlement of grievances
 - k. extracurricular activities
 - l. school policies
6. The degree to which teachers are willing to invest their time in school-wide decision making:
 - a. a great deal of time
 - b. some time
 - c. little or no time

7. Teachers' perceptions of the "benefits" or advantages of their involvement in school-wide decision making:
 - a. increased teacher influence
 - b. a sense of accomplishment
 - c. a feeling of cooperation
 - d. increased workplace democracy
8. Teachers' perceptions of the "risks" or disadvantages of their involvement in school-wide decision making:
 - a. loss of time
 - b. reduction in personal autonomy
 - c. risk of negative reaction from colleagues
 - d. risk that collective-bargaining efforts may be jeopardized
 - e. risk that such involvement may affect future chances for advancement
9. Teachers' perceptions of the factors that hinder their involvement in school-wide decision making:
 - a. lack of time
 - b. lack of opportunity
 - c. principal's leadership style
 - d. peer pressure
 - e. personal philosophy
 - f. disinterest

Design of the Instrument

The variables of interest were identified by means of a two-part, seven-page questionnaire (see Appendix A). It was decided to provide respondents with a predetermined series of items, which would establish the central focus of the study, insure the uniform

coverage of specific important or key issues, and permit the systematic analysis of the data. Once this decision was made, it was necessary to determine what topics should be included in this structured format.

Building the content and format of the questionnaire became a six-step process:

1. Reviewing the literature.
2. Writing the first draft of the instrument.
3. Administering the instrument to a sample group for reaction.
4. Revising the rough draft.
5. Presenting the instrument to sponsoring committee members for reaction.
6. Developing a final copy of the questionnaire.

The review of the literature provided a view of what has been as the logical antecedent in the search for "what is." Through this review, the writer identified recurring themes that warranted inclusion in the present study.

Administering the instrument to a sample group of six individuals, including teachers, administrators, and counselors, helped provide breadth and depth through their pertinent questions and criticism. With their assistance, language used in the survey was simplified and modified to facilitate understanding and minimize redundancy. Sponsoring committee members reacted favorably to the revised rough draft and suggested the addition of several questions

in the demographic and descriptive information about the respondents.

Selection and Description of Respondents

High school teachers were the subjects studied in this research. In defining the sample, a random stratified process was chosen in an attempt to insure as varied a sample as possible. The sampling was actually based on the size classification system of the Michigan High School Athletic Association.

The 43 public high schools in Ottawa, Kent, and Muskegon Counties were grouped by size classification. From this sample pool, 23 high schools were selected at random. The number of high schools selected from each size classification was determined by the percentage that size classification represented of the 43 schools in the sample pool (see Table 1).

Table 1.--Summary of high school sample pool and sample by size classification.

Size Classification	Student Enrollment	No. of Schools	% of Sample Pool	Sample
A	1,205 or more	13	30	7
B	627-1,204	18	42	10
C	319- 626	9	21	5
D	Less than 319	3	7	1
Total		43	100	23

All of the teachers in the 23 high schools in the sample were contacted. Of the 1,030 contacted, 435 responded (a return rate of 42%).

A majority of the teachers who responded to the study were between 30 and 49 years of age. Twenty percent more males than females were represented (see Table 2).

Table 2.--Age and sex of respondents.

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Age (N = 432)		
<u>Age</u>		
Under 30	22	5.1
30-39	175	40.5
40-49	158	36.6
50 or older	77	17.8
Total	432	100.0
Sex (N = 431)		
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	255	59.2
Female	176	40.8
Total	431	100.0

Approximately 61% of those responding reported having at least a master's degree (see Table 3); 80% indicated that they had more than 11 years of classroom teaching experience (see Table 4).

Table 3.--Educational status of respondents (N = 433).

Degree	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
B.A.	170	39.3
M.A.	250	57.7
Ed.S.	10	2.3
Ph.D.	3	.7
Total	433	100.0

Table 4.--Classroom teaching experience of respondents (N = 433).

Years	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
1- 5	26	6.0
6-10	60	13.9
11-15	111	25.6
16-20	118	27.3
Over 20	118	27.3
Total	433	100.0

Slightly more than half of the teachers were employed in urban or suburban school districts (see Table 5). Approximately 60% of those responding reported teaching in a Class B high school with a student enrollment between 627 and 1,204 (see Table 6).

Table 5.--Type of community in which respondents were employed (N = 433).

Type	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Rural	50	11.5
Small town	153	35.3
Urban	114	26.3
Suburban	116	26.8
Total	433	100.0

Table 6.--Size of school in which respondents taught (N = 426).

Student Enrollment	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Under 319	9	2.1
320-626	64	15.0
327-1,204	255	59.9
Over 1,205	98	23.0
Total	426	100.0

Teachers were asked to indicate their degree of job satisfaction. Ninety percent of the respondents expressed satisfaction with their current job (see Table 7).

Table 7.--Job satisfaction of respondents (N = 430).

Degree of Satisfaction	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Very satisfied	142	33.0
Satisfied	245	57.0
Dissatisfied	43	10.0
Total	430	100.0

The respondents were also asked to indicate the subject area in which they taught. Four hundred twenty-four of the respondents taught in 14 subject areas. The largest number taught English, mathematics, social studies, science, and business-related subjects, in descending order (see Table 8).

Table 8.--Teaching assignment of respondents (N = 424).

Subject	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
English	78	18.4
Mathematics	57	13.4
Social studies	50	11.8
Science	48	11.3
Business	35	8.3
Industrial arts	28	6.6
Special education	21	5.0
Physical education	21	5.0
Home economics	17	4.0
Counseling	17	4.0
Library/media	12	2.8
Music	8	1.9
Art	6	1.4
Other	26	6.1
Total	424	100.0

The individual teachers surveyed provided information about their perceptions of their building principals' leadership styles in terms of the locus of control for building-level or school-wide decisions. Approximately 33% of the respondents indicated that the principal controlled most, if not all, school-wide or building-level decisions (see Table 9).

Table 9.--Respondents' perceptions of principals' administrative styles (N = 428).

Style	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Controls <u>all</u> decisions	118	27.6
Controls <u>most</u> decisions	260	60.7
Controls <u>some</u> decisions	47	11.0
Controls <u>few</u> decisions	3	.7
Total	428	100.0

Administration of the Questionnaire

The administration of the survey instrument became a series of tactical decisions, including (a) deciding the most effective time for administering the survey, (b) deciding how the survey would be administered, (c) soliciting the assistance of individuals to help administer the survey, and (d) conducting a follow-up.

The decision was made to administer the questionnaire in the spring of the year, affording respondents an opportunity to reflect on the school year as an indicator of their degree of involvement in

building-level decisions. The building principals from the 23 high schools selected for this study were contacted by telephone and asked to administer the questionnaire to every member of their teaching staff, collect the questionnaires, and return them to the researcher by mail.

Each cooperating principal was mailed a packet of materials that included (a) an explanatory letter (Appendix B), (b) a supply of questionnaires for distribution (Appendix A), (c) a letter of explanation addressed to the local association president (Appendix C), (d) a stamped and addressed envelope in which to return the completed questionnaires, and (e) a postcard to mail back separately (Appendix D). The postcard served a dual purpose. It enabled the researcher to maintain a follow-up procedure and still preserve the anonymity of the respondents. It also provided a means of estimating the return rate during the early stages of the study.

Data-Analysis Procedures

Data from the questionnaires were coded, quality checked, transferred to data-processing cards, and verified. The research techniques used were a comparison of mean response to note differences or similarities of response and the chi-square test of significance to note the association between response variables and to determine whether relationships existed between variables in the total population. The independent variables selected were:

1. Sex
 - a. Female
 - b. Male
2. Age
 - a. Under 30 years
 - b. 30-39 years
 - c. 40-49 years
 - d. 50 years of age or older
3. Educational status
 - a. B.A. degree
 - b. M.A. degree
 - c. Ed.S. degree
 - d. Ph.D. degree
4. Classroom teaching experience
 - a. 1- 5 years
 - b. 6-10 years
 - c. 11-15 years
 - d. 16-20 years
 - e. Over 20 years
5. Type of community
 - a. Rural
 - b. Small town
 - c. City
 - d. Suburban

6. Size of school
 - a. Under 319 students
 - b. 319-626 students
 - c. 627-1,204 students
 - d. Over 1,204 students
7. Degree of job satisfaction
 - a. Very satisfied
 - b. Satisfied
 - c. Dissatisfied
8. Teaching assignment
 - a. English
 - b. Mathematics
 - c. Science
 - d. Social studies
 - e. Art
 - f. Music
 - g. Home economics
 - h. Business
 - i. Industrial arts
 - j. Physical education
 - k. Guidance and counseling
 - l. Library/media
 - m. Special education
 - n. Other

9. Teacher perception of building principal's administrative style
 - a. Controls all decisions
 - b. Controls most decisions
 - c. Controls some decisions
 - d. Controls few decisions

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses that were tested at the .05 and .10 levels of significance were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers of varying ages concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of male and female high school teachers concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers with varying educational status regarding their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers with varying classroom teaching experience concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers employed in varying types of communities concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers employed in schools of varying sizes concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 7: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 8: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers with teaching assignments in varying subject areas concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

Hypothesis 9: There are no significant differences in the perceptions of high school teachers with varying beliefs about their principals' leadership styles concerning their involvement in shared decision making.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The research findings reported in this chapter fall into three major areas: (a) the current level of involvement of high school teachers in school-wide decision making, (b) the expressed desire of high school teachers to become involved in school-wide decision making, and (c) the perceptions of high school teachers regarding the costs and benefits of or hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making. The differences in the responses of high school teachers were categorized on the basis of nine factors (independent variables). Also included is a brief discussion of responses to the open-ended question included in the survey instrument as they relate to major findings of the study. The research findings for these areas are reported in this chapter as a summary of descriptive statistics and an analysis of the relationship between variables using the chi-square test for association.

Current Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making

The differences in the current level of involvement in school-wide decision making by high school teachers categorized on the basis of nine factors are presented in this part of Chapter IV.

Those who indicated involvement in these decision areas were more often involved in curriculum, extracurricular activities, school-improvement efforts, school rules and discipline, and professional-development activities. Teachers reported limited involvement in decisions regarding hiring, the resolution of grievances, and the school budget (see Table 10).

Table 10.--Teacher involvement in school-wide decisions.

Decision Area	% of Teacher Involvement	Rank
Curriculum	73.7	1
Activities	63.4	2
School improvement	61.8	3
Rules/discipline	60.2	4
Professional development	57.0	5
Coordination of teaching	55.4	6
Policy	54.4	7
School personnel	30.7	8
Teacher evaluation	18.1	9
Budget	17.1	10
Grievances	14.1	11
Hiring	13.3	12

In an effort to establish a focus for interpreting the differences in the responses of high school teachers to the 12 decision-making categories and to measure those responses against the nine independent variables, the decision-making categories in which 50% or more of the high school teachers indicated involvement were used for analysis. Those decision-making categories were:

curriculum, activities, school improvement, rules and discipline, professional development, coordination of teaching, and policy.

In all seven of these decision-making categories, a higher percentage of men than women indicated that they were involved in school-wide decisions. The percentage difference between male and female respondents ranged from .9% to 5.5% (see Table 11).

Table 11.--Teacher involvement in school-wide decisions, by sex.

Decision Area	Sex	
	Male	Female
Curriculum	76.0	70.5
Activities	63.8	62.9
School improvement	62.7	60.3
Rules/discipline	61.4	58.3
Professional development	58.4	54.9
Coordination/teaching	56.5	53.7
Policy	56.3	51.7

Teachers between the ages of 30 and 39 recorded the greatest percentage of involvement in school-wide decision making in four of the seven decision categories, followed closely by teachers between the ages of 40 and 49 (see Table 12).

Individuals who reported having more than 20 years of classroom teaching experience led all other groups in the curriculum decision area. Teachers with 11 to 16 years of classroom experience recorded the highest percentage of involvement in the activities, school improvement and policy decision areas (see Table 13).

Table 12.--Involvement in school-wide decisions by teachers of varying ages.

Decision Area	Age			
	< 30	30-39	40-59	> 50
Curriculum	63.3	72.4	79.1	68.8
Activities	61.9	74.1	60.1	48.1
School improvement	40.0	65.7	59.5	63.6
Rules/discipline	47.6	61.5	60.8	61.0
Professional development	40.9	52.6	62.0	60.5
Coordination/teaching	45.5	53.7	58.2	57.9
Policy	40.0	58.0	55.7	48.1

Table 13.--Involvement in school-wide decisions by teachers with varying classroom teaching experience.

Decision Area	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Curriculum	57.5	73.3	73.6	75.4	76.3
Activities	48.0	60.0	79.1	62.7	55.1
School improvement	33.3	61.7	65.8	64.4	61.0
Rules/discipline	44.0	46.7	62.7	67.8	61.0
Professional development	34.6	50.0	57.7	58.1	63.6
Coordination/teaching	38.5	46.7	56.8	55.1	63.2
Policy	25.0	48.3	63.6	55.9	53.4

The findings in these two areas appear to be fairly consistent with the belief that older, more experienced staff are more likely to be involved in the operation of the school and more active than younger, less experienced staff in decisions regarding such things as curriculum, policy, school improvement, and professional

development. In recent years the number of veteran teachers involved in extracurricular activities in some school districts has declined, forcing school officials to make greater use of community resource persons to supervise such activities. The respondents in this study seemed to indicate a much higher level of involvement in such activities than expected.

Teachers who reported having educational specialist's degrees comprised the group of individuals who recorded the highest percentage of involvement in school-wide decisions for the seven decision categories chosen for analysis. They were followed by teachers with master's degrees (see Table 14).

Table 14.--Involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Decision Area	Educational Status			
	B.A.	M.A.	Ed.S.	Ph.D.
Curriculum	71.6	74.8	90.0	66.7
Activities	64.3	63.6	60.0	33.3
School improvement	56.0	64.8	90.0	33.3
Rules/discipline	57.7	61.2	80.0	66.7
Professional development	52.4	58.6	90.0	66.7
Coordination/teaching	51.8	56.6	90.0	66.7
Policy	49.7	56.8	80.0	33.3

With regard to the issue of school size and location and their influence on teacher involvement in shared decision making, survey responses indicated that the greatest involvement in building-level

decision making by teachers in the seven decision categories occurred in high schools with enrollments of between 319 and 626 students that were located in rural areas (see Tables 15 and 16).

Table 15.--Involvement in school-wide decisions by teachers in varying types of communities.

Decision Area	Type of Community			
	Rural	Small Town	City	Suburban
Curriculum	79.6	73.9	68.4	76.7
Activities	68.8	66.7	64.0	56.9
School improvement	61.2	62.7	60.5	61.7
Rules/discipline	68.8	62.7	50.9	62.9
Professional development	60.0	53.9	47.4	69.0
Coordination/teaching	64.0	56.9	52.2	53.4
Policy	65.3	60.8	44.2	51.3

Table 16.--Involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Decision Area	Student Enrollment			
	< 319	319-626	627-1,204	> 1,204
Curriculum	88.9	76.6	73.2	72.4
Activities	55.6	68.8	61.7	67.3
School improvement	55.6	60.9	57.9	72.2
Rules/discipline	55.6	79.7	53.8	63.3
Professional development	44.4	68.8	53.9	59.2
Coordination/teaching	55.6	59.4	54.3	56.1
Policy	55.6	64.1	53.8	49.5

In exploring the relationship between the subjects taught by the respondents in this study and their involvement in school-wide decision making, the subject areas were grouped for convenience of reporting. The following grouping scheme was employed:

1. Core subjects
 - a. English
 - b. mathematics
 - c. science
 - d. social studies
2. Fine arts
 - a. music
 - b. art
3. Practical arts
 - a. home economics
 - b. business
 - c. industrial arts
 - d. physical education
4. Support staff
 - a. guidance and counseling
 - b. library/media
 - c. special education
5. Other

Teachers in the fine arts led all other teaching assignment groups in terms of percentage of involvement in shared decision making in four of the seven decision categories used for analysis.

They were second only to teachers with core subject assignments in the curriculum decision area.

Support staff recorded the second highest percentage of involvement in school-wide decision making in the activities, professional development and policy decision areas, and led all other groups in the school improvement and rules and discipline decision categories (see Table 17).

Table 17.--Involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Decision Area	Teaching Assignments				
	Core Subjects	Fine Arts	Practical Arts	Support Staff	Other
Curriculum	79.5	72.9	66.1	65.1	68.0
Activities	64.3	100.0	57.7	67.6	60.0
School/ improvement	61.8	56.2	59.6	74.2	64.0
Rules/ discipline	61.1	64.6	61.4	67.6	48.0
Professional development	53.2	75.0	63.3	63.6	48.0
Coordination/ teaching	62.4	40.1	50.6	46.3	60.0
Policy	55.4	64.6	52.9	61.6	52.0

When comparing the degree of job satisfaction expressed by the high school teachers surveyed with their involvement in shared decision making, those respondents who indicated that they were very satisfied with their jobs reported the highest percentage of involvement in school-wide decisions. Ranking second in this

category were teachers who reported being satisfied with their jobs. Seventy-two percent of the teachers who indicated that they were dissatisfied with their jobs reported involvement in the curriculum decision area (see Table 18).

Table 18.--Involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Decision Area	Degree of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Curriculum	79.4	71.0	72.1
Activities	72.3	60.0	52.4
School improvement	71.1	59.0	45.2
Rules/discipline	67.4	57.1	52.4
Professional development	65.5	54.1	46.5
Coordination/teaching	57.4	55.9	46.5
Policy	64.1	51.4	38.1

The relationship between teachers' involvement in school-wide decision making and the building principal's administrative style with regard to the amount of control he/she exercised over the decision-making process was also explored. The highest percentage of involvement by teachers in shared decision making occurred in schools in which teachers perceived that the principal controlled most or few of the decisions in the seven decision categories. A higher than expected percentage of involvement in school-wide

decision making was also reported by teachers who perceived that their principals controlled all decisions.

These findings may be somewhat inconsistent with the human dynamics one might guess would be operational in schools in which principals exercise absolute or tight control over the decision-making process. Only .7% of the respondents reported that their principal controlled few decisions, and a substantial percentage of individuals teaching under that leadership style reported involvement in the decision-making process (see Table 19).

Table 19.--Involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Decision Area	Principals' Administrative Styles			
	Control All Decisions	Control Most Decisions	Control Some Decisions	Control Few Decisions
Curriculum	72.6	76.5	68.1	33.3
Activities	55.6	65.6	72.3	100.0
School improvement	50.8	68.2	53.2	100.0
Rules/discipline	42.7	68.7	63.8	33.3
Professional development	50.4	58.1	68.1	66.7
Coordination/teaching	50.4	57.3	63.8	33.3
Policy	39.3	60.5	59.6	66.7

Perceived Results of Involvement in School-Wide Decisions

High school teachers who indicated that they had been involved in shared decision making in the 12 areas were asked about their perceptions of the results of such involvement. They were asked to indicate whether their involvement in school-wide decisions yielded positive, negative, or neutral results. The major focus in reporting survey results in this area is on the responses of teachers who reported positive results from their involvement in shared decision making.

Between 61% and 79% of the males who indicated that they had been involved in school-wide decisions reported positive results from that involvement in the seven decision categories selected for analysis. This compared with 59% to 83% of the women respondents who indicated involvement in shared decision making (see Table 20).

Table 20.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making, by sex.

Decision Area	Sex	
	Male	Female
Curriculum	72.5	76.9
Activities	78.9	83.0
School improvement	69.4	70.7
Rules/discipline	74.4	59.8
Professional development	61.9	73.1
Coordination/teaching	76.9	81.5
Policy	67.3	62.9

Some reported neutral results from involvement in decision making are worthy of note in the professional-development and policy-decision categories. Approximately 30% of the male and female respondents indicated neutral results from their involvement in school-wide decisions related to policy, curriculum, and rules and discipline. Approximately 30% of male respondents reported similar results in the professional-development area.

Respondents over 50 years of age ranked first in perceived positive results from involvement in shared decision making in three of the seven decision categories. Teachers between the ages of 40 and 49 recorded the highest percentage of positive results from involvement in the curriculum and the coordination of teaching. Respondents in these two groups accounted for the highest percentages of positive results in five of seven decision categories. Teachers in the under-30 age group consistently reported the highest percentage of positive results from involvement in shared decision making in the activities and policy decision areas (see Table 21).

The high school teachers in the study with between 11 and 15 years of classroom teaching experience reported the highest incidence of positive experiences with their involvement in shared decision making in the activities and curriculum areas. Those who reported between 16 and 20 years of classroom teaching experience ranked first in perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making in the areas of curriculum and the coordination of teaching. Those with more than 20 years of

classroom experience recorded the highest percentage of positive results from their involvement with school-wide decisions in the coordination of teaching, curriculum, and rules and discipline (see Table 22).

Table 21.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making, by age.

Decision Area	Age			
	< 30	30-39	40-59	> 50
Curriculum	53.8	73.2	78.2	74.5
Activities	92.3	79.7	80.0	78.9
School improvement	62.5	64.9	72.8	78.3
Rules/discipline	66.7	62.3	72.3	78.3
Professional development	40.0	67.8	65.3	73.3
Coordination/teaching	80.0	74.7	83.1	79.1
Policy	87.5	63.4	64.8	68.4

Table 22.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying classroom teaching experience.

Decision Area	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Curriculum	64.3	59.5	73.4	80.9	77.3
Activities	91.7	85.7	77.4	79.5	80.0
School improvement	50.0	77.1	68.1	70.1	70.6
Rules/discipline	54.5	69.2	66.7	66.7	76.1
Professional development	40.0	70.0	69.4	67.7	64.9
Coordination/teaching	80.0	75.9	73.8	81.8	81.7
Policy	66.7	69.0	67.6	58.8	68.7

When comparing the perceived positive results from involvement in school-wide decision making with the educational status of the respondents, those holding specialist's degrees led all categories in four of the seven decision-making areas chosen for analysis. This group was followed by high school teachers who held a Ph.D. (see Table 23).

Table 23.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Decision Area	Educational Status			
	B.A.	M.A.	Ed.S.	Ph.D.
Curriculum	75.2	73.9	66.7	100.0
Activities	85.3	77.5	83.3	.0
School improvement	65.6	71.2	88.9	100.0
Rules/discipline	69.4	67.3	100.0	50.0
Professional development	59.1	69.7	77.8	100.0
Coordination/teaching	81.1	77.3	87.5	50.0
Policy	60.7	67.6	87.5	.0

The issue of the type of community in which the high school was located and the perceived positive results from teacher involvement in school-wide decision making yielded results that indicated that teachers who taught in schools located in suburban areas expressed the greatest percentage of positive experiences as a result of their actual involvement in school-wide decision making in four of the seven categories (see Table 24).

Table 24.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in varying types of communities.

Decision Area	Type of Community			
	Rural	Small Town	City	Suburban
Curriculum	71.1	68.5	77.6	80.5
Activities	81.8	80.0	78.6	81.8
School improvement	65.6	74.2	68.2	68.1
Rules/discipline	84.8	67.7	61.0	70.0
Professional development	53.3	66.7	72.2	67.1
Coordination/teaching	81.3	77.0	75.4	83.6
Policy	75.0	58.3	60.8	76.3

Teachers in schools with enrollments of less than 319 students (Class D) more often than any other group reported positive results from their actual involvement in school-wide decision making for the seven decision categories (see Table 25).

Table 25.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Decision Area	Student Enrollment			
	< 319	319-626	627-1,204	> 1,204
Curriculum	50.0	79.2	74.4	76.1
Activities	60.0	78.0	82.6	78.5
School improvement	100.0	70.3	71.0	64.2
Rules/discipline	100.0	86.0	62.7	68.3
Professional development	75.0	73.8	65.2	61.4
Coordination/teaching	60.0	84.2	77.1	83.3
Policy	80.0	71.4	65.9	59.2

High school teachers in the fine arts area (music, art) more frequently indicated positive experiences with school-wide decision making (see Table 26).

Table 26.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Decision Area	Teaching Assignments				
	Core Subjects	Fine Arts	Practical Arts	Support Staff	Other
Curriculum	76.5	80.0	69.1	74.0	70.6
Activities	78.0	77.1	82.8	87.8	80.0
School/ improvement	69.5	75.0	65.5	80.3	64.3
Rules/ discipline	68.8	77.5	69.2	68.7	66.7
Professional development	62.1	35.0	77.2	73.6	83.3
Coordination/ teaching	81.5	62.5	79.1	70.6	73.3
Policy	62.2	87.5	62.9	87.1	58.3

Of those individuals reporting positive results from their involvement in school-wide decision making, 71% to 85% were very satisfied with their jobs, 59% to 77% expressed satisfaction with their jobs, and 40% to 85% reported dissatisfaction with their jobs. It is interesting, however, that 85% of the respondents who reported being dissatisfied with their jobs experienced positive results from their involvement in school-wide decision making in the activities area (see Table 27).

Table 27.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Decision Area	Degree of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Curriculum	83.3	72.5	54.8
Activities	85.0	77.2	85.7
School improvement	80.0	65.0	57.1
Rules/discipline	79.8	65.9	40.0
Professional development	71.7	61.7	70.0
Coordination/teaching	87.7	77.5	55.0
Policy	76.9	59.8	52.9

Comparisons between high school teachers' perceptions of their building principals' administrative styles and their perceptions of positive results from their actual involvement in school-wide decision making appeared to indicate that of teachers who perceived their building principals as individuals who controlled all or most decisions, 64% to 82% reported positive results from their involvement in school-wide decision making for the seven decision categories chosen for analysis (see Table 28).

Table 28.--Teacher-perceived positive results from actual involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Decision Area	Principals' Administrative Styles			
	Control All Decisions	Control Most Decisions	Control Some Decisions	Control Few Decisions
Curriculum	74.4	74.4	77.4	50.0
Activities	82.0	79.4	84.8	33.3
School improvement	72.4	73.4	50.0	.0
Rules/discipline	70.0	69.4	65.5	100.0
Professional development	69.5	64.4	73.3	.0
Coordination/teaching	75.0	81.8	74.2	50.0
Policy	66.7	67.3	55.6	50.0

Perceived Ability to Affect the Outcome
of School-Wide Decisions

The high school teachers involved in this study were asked whether or not they thought that through their involvement they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions in the 12 decision areas. Between 69% and 77% of the respondents indicated a belief in their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions through involvement. This belief was held by 64% to 79% of the male respondents and 34% to 80% of females for the seven decision categories chosen for analysis (see Table 29).

Table 29.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions, by sex.

Decision Area	Sex	
	Male	Female
Curriculum	74.2	80.7
Activities	72.2	75.0
School improvement	79.1	74.9
Rules/discipline	72.9	75.4
Professional development	66.3	71.2
Coordination/teaching	65.9	73.7
Policy	64.5	34.3

The age group that appeared to be most predominant in their belief that they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions was made up of those individuals under 30 years of age, followed closely by teachers between the ages of 30 and 39 (see Table 30).

Table 30.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers of varying ages.

Decision Area	Age			
	< 30	30-39	40-59	> 50
Curriculum	61.9	77.1	82.1	71.6
Activities	76.2	77.8	72.2	66.2
School improvement	85.0	82.8	73.0	71.4
Rules/discipline	85.7	76.9	70.4	72.6
Professional development	75.0	71.9	71.1	68.1
Coordination/teaching	76.2	70.1	70.4	63.0
Policy	77.8	69.6	59.7	66.2

High school teachers who made up the groups of individuals who had taught 11 years or more reported percentages between 60% and 82% in terms of their belief that they could influence the outcome of school-wide decisions (see Table 31).

Table 31.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers with varying classroom experience.

Decision Area	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Curriculum	66.0	77.2	75.0	78.8	79.1
Activities	68.0	73.7	82.2	69.0	70.8
School improvement	83.3	80.7	82.2	73.9	72.5
Rules/discipline	76.0	76.3	76.1	73.7	70.8
Professional development	69.6	70.7	75.9	73.9	63.4
Coordination/teaching	79.2	66.1	72.1	63.7	71.1
Policy	72.7	69.0	70.4	63.2	60.0

When considering the educational status of the respondents and their belief that teachers could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions, between 60% and 78% of those with a master's degree recorded a positive response. Individuals holding a specialist's degree recorded the highest percentage of any group expressing that belief (see Table 32).

Table 32.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers with varying educational status.

Decision Area	Educational Status			
	B.A.	M.A.	Ed.S.	Ph.D.
Curriculum	77.6	76.5	80.0	66.7
Activities	75.3	72.6	80.0	.0
School improvement	75.6	78.2	80.0	66.7
Rules/discipline	74.8	73.9	80.0	.0
Professional development	66.2	73.7	90.0	33.3
Coordination/teaching	72.0	66.8	80.0	66.7
Policy	73.7	60.3	80.0	.0

High school teachers who thought they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions most often taught in schools with enrollments of between 627 and 1,204 students that were located in small towns. Teachers in rural schools led all others in the percentage of teachers who believed that they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions in six of the seven categories chosen for analysis (see Tables 33 and 34).

Table 33.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers in varying types of communities.

Decision Area	Type of Community			
	Rural	Small Town	City	Suburban
Curriculum	83.0	76.9	74.5	77.0
Activities	81.3	76.2	74.1	66.1
School improvement	81.3	81.4	70.6	76.4
Rules/discipline	81.6	79.2	70.0	67.9
Professional development	78.3	77.0	58.2	72.3
Coordination/teaching	75.0	70.0	71.8	62.8
Policy	79.2	69.4	63.4	56.8

Table 34.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Decision Area	Student Enrollment			
	< 319	319-626	627-1,204	> 1,204
Curriculum	75.0	84.1	76.1	75.0
Activities	75.0	73.0	73.6	73.7
School improvement	75.0	82.5	76.2	75.8
Rules/discipline	62.5	84.1	72.5	73.7
Professional development	87.5	76.2	70.4	69.5
Coordination/teaching	75.0	70.0	71.8	62.8
Policy	79.2	69.4	63.4	56.8

Between 56% and 86% of the 435 respondents who taught in the various subject areas expressed the belief that they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions for the seven decision

categories chosen for analysis. Teachers in the core subject areas represented the largest number of individuals surveyed but did not always express the belief that they could affect the outcome of decisions at a rate greater than other teachers when considering their proportion of the responses. Teachers in the fine arts recorded some of the highest percentages of response for the issue of their perceived effect on the outcome of decisions (see Table 35).

Table 35.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Decision Area	Teaching Assignments				
	Core Subjects	Fine Arts	Practical Arts	Support Staff	Other
Curriculum	82.0	77.1	68.1	86.5	62.5
Activities	76.0	91.0	67.2	75.5	65.2
School/ improvement	75.8	84.5	74.7	77.1	75.0
Rules/ discipline	73.1	92.5	75.6	72.5	79.2
Professional development	69.0	78.5	70.6	76.5	75.0
Coordination/ teaching	72.0	56.2	68.5	62.6	84.4
Policy	64.9	76.2	65.1	71.7	66.7

Between 63% and 79% of the high school teachers who indicated a belief in their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs. Those individuals who were very satisfied with their jobs led all other

groups, followed by teachers who indicated that they were satisfied with their current employment. For the seven decision categories chosen for analysis, between 5% and 7% of the respondents who believed they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions were dissatisfied with their current employment (see Table 36).

Table 36.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Decision Area	Degree of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Curriculum	79.6	76.3	70.7
Activities	77.5	73.6	58.1
School improvement	79.6	77.0	69.0
Rules/discipline	76.1	74.2	65.1
Professional development	78.5	68.1	62.5
Coordination/teaching	73.7	68.9	53.5
Policy	72.3	63.2	53.7

High school teachers in the survey who believed that their principals controlled some of the school-wide decisions comprised the largest group of individuals who also expressed the belief that they could have some effect on the outcome of decisions. Between 62% and 77% of the teachers who believed that their principals controlled all school-wide decisions thought they had the ability to affect the outcome of decisions for each of the seven decision categories chosen for analysis (see Table 37).

Table 37.--Teachers' belief that they can affect the outcome of school-wide decisions by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Decision Area	Principals' Administrative Styles			
	Control All Decisions	Control Most Decisions	Control Some Decisions	Control Few Decisions
Curriculum	77.2	77.9	80.9	.0
Activities	72.8	73.3	80.9	33.3
School improvement	71.4	80.9	74.5	66.7
Rules/discipline	65.5	77.8	80.0	66.7
Professional development	67.3	73.1	72.3	33.3
Coordination/teaching	69.0	69.7	70.2	33.3
Policy	62.5	67.9	68.1	.0

Perception of Overall Degree of Involvement
in School-Wide Decision Making

The high school teachers who were the subjects of this study were asked to indicate their overall involvement in school-wide decisions. They were asked to rate their involvement in decisions of school-wide interest by characterizing themselves as very involved, somewhat involved, or not involved in school-wide decision making. While the respondents may have had a tendency to focus on the 12 decision categories included on the survey instrument, the general nature of this line of questioning was designed to encourage responses based on a broad definition of school-wide decisions and

to isolate teachers' perceptions of their degree of involvement in school-wide decision making.

Approximately 8% of the respondents reported being very involved in the decision-making process. The percentages of responses for men and women were equally divided in this category. Sixty-four percent of the male respondents indicated that they were somewhat involved in school-wide decision making as compared with 57% of females. Women slightly outnumbered men in the percentage of reported noninvolvement in the decision-making process. Thirty percent of the respondents indicated that they were not involved in school-wide decision making (see Table 38).

Table 38.--Perceived extent of teacher involvement in school-wide decision making, by sex.

Sex	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Male	7.1	64.6	28.3
Female	9.2	57.5	33.3

No high school teachers under 30 years of age indicated that they were very involved in decision making. Sixty-eight percent of those reporting that they were somewhat involved in school-wide decisions were between the ages of 40 and 49, followed closely by 62% of the individuals between the ages of 30 and 39. The largest

reported percentage of noninvolvement belonged to high school teachers over 50 years of age (see Table 39).

Table 39.--Perceived extent of teacher involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers of varying ages.

Age	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Under 30	.0	59.1	40.9
30-39	6.9	62.6	30.5
40-49	7.0	68.2	24.8
50 and older	14.5	47.4	38.2

Respondents who reported between 11 and 15 years and over 20 years of classroom teaching experience represented the groups with the highest percentage of overall involvement in school-wide decision making for the category very involved. The percentage rank order of those who were somewhat involved in decisions was led by high school teachers with 16 to 20 years of teaching experience, followed by nearly equal percentages of teachers with 11 to 15 and over 20 years of teaching experience. The percentage of those reporting noninvolvement in school-wide decision making was equally distributed in those groups with more than 11 years of classroom teaching experience; however, teachers in the under 30 group reported 50% noninvolvement (see Table 40).

Table 40.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying classroom teaching experience.

Experience	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
1- 5 years	.0	50.0	50.0
6-10 years	5.0	56.7	38.3
11-15 years	11.8	63.6	24.5
16-20 years	4.3	66.7	29.1
Over 20 years	11.1	60.7	28.2

High school teachers with master's degrees led all individuals in terms of the percentage of respondents who reported being very involved in school-wide decisions. The percentage of respondents who indicated that they were somewhat involved in the decision-making process included 66% of the individuals who held bachelor's or doctorate degrees. About one-third of the respondents in each degree category reported noninvolvement in school-wide decision making (see Table 41).

Table 41.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Educational Status	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
B.A.	3.0	66.9	30.2
M.A.	11.3	58.5	30.2
Ed.S.	10.0	60.0	30.0
Ph.D.	.0	66.7	33.3

When considering the type of community in which teachers taught and the size of their high school and its relative effect on involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers, respondents provided the following information:

1. Of those teachers who reported being very involved in the decision-making process, the greatest percentage taught in suburban or small-town schools. Teachers in schools with student enrollments between 627 and 1,204 led all other groups in terms of the percentage of teachers reporting that they were very involved in school-wide decisions.

2. The largest percentage of high school teachers reporting that they were somewhat involved in decision making were teachers in rural areas, followed by those who taught in small-town and suburban schools. The percentage leaders for this category (somewhat involved) were teachers in schools with enrollments under 319 students.

3. Teachers in city and rural schools reported the greatest percentage of noninvolvement in school-wide decision making. Those who taught in schools with enrollments between 627 and 1,204 students reported the largest percentage of noninvolvement (see Tables 42 and 43).

Table 42.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in varying types of communities.

Type of Community	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Rural	6.0	66.0	28.0
Small town	7.2	65.1	27.6
City	5.3	57.0	37.7
Suburban	12.3	60.5	27.2

Table 43.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Enrollment	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Under 319 students	.0	77.8	22.2
319-626 students	6.3	66.7	27.0
627-1,204 students	9.8	57.1	33.1
Over 1,204 students	5.2	69.1	25.8

When comparing high school teachers' involvement in school-wide decision making with the teaching assignment of the subjects of this study, support staff indicated that they were very involved more often than teachers in the other assignment categories. Sixty-seven percent of the teachers in the core subjects indicated that they were somewhat involved in the decision-making process, and 24% of

this group also reported noninvolvement in school-wide decision making (see Table 44).

Table 44.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Teaching Assignment	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Core subjects	5.8	67.6	24.5
Fine arts	8.3	75.0	16.5
Practical arts	5.8	52.7	41.4
Support staff	20.0	51.7	28.1
Other	.0	100.0	.0

When comparing the degree of teacher involvement in school-wide decision making with high school teachers' relative degree of job satisfaction, approximately 14% of those who reported that they were very involved in the decision-making process said that they were very satisfied with their jobs. Those individuals who were somewhat involved in school-wide decision making and satisfied with their jobs represented 62% of the respondents in that category. Thirty-two percent of high school teachers reporting satisfaction with their jobs were not involved in the school-wide decision-making process (see Table 45).

Table 45.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Degree of Satisfaction	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Very satisfied	14.3	60.0	25.7
Satisfied	5.3	62.3	32.4
Dissatisfied	2.3	62.8	34.9

Approximately 65% of the high school teachers who reported being somewhat involved in school-wide decision making indicated that their principals controlled most of the decisions. Almost 8% of the respondents who reported that they were very involved in decision making noted that their principals controlled all or most decisions. As might be anticipated, a large percentage of reported noninvolvement in the decision-making process occurred with high school teachers who perceived that their principals controlled all decisions (see Table 46).

Table 46.--Perceived extent of involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Administrative Style	Perceived Extent of Involvement		
	Very Involved	Somewhat Involved	Not Involved
Controls <u>all</u> decisions	7.6	50.6	41.5
Controls <u>most</u> decisions	9.3	65.5	25.2
Controls <u>some</u> decisions	2.2	73.9	23.9
Controls <u>few</u> decisions	.0	33.3	66.7

Expressed Desire to Become Involved in School-Wide Decision Making

The differences in the expressed desire of high school teachers to become involved in school-wide decision making are presented in this section. Teachers were asked to indicate how much time they would be willing to invest in school-wide decision-making activities if they were provided with the opportunity for involvement. They were also asked to indicate what kinds of decisions they would like to be involved in at the school level by means of an open-ended question. The differences occurring between teachers' responses relative to their expressed desire for involvement in school-wide decision making and the nine independent variables chosen were examined by conducting an analysis of cell means.

Investment of Time

When questioned about their willingness to invest time in the school-wide decision-making process, the subjects of this study provided information concerning whether they were willing to invest a great deal of time, some time, or little or no time in school-wide decisions. Sixteen percent of the male and 12% of the female respondents were willing to invest a great deal of time in school-wide decision making, 78% of the female and 74% of the male respondents some time, and 8% and 9% of the male and female respondents little or no time in the decision-making process (see Table 47).

Table 47.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making, by sex.

Sex	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Male	7.9	74.7	16.2
Female	9.2	78.0	12.1

High school teachers who were 50 years of age and older led all other age categories in expressed willingness to invest a great deal of time or some time in the decision-making process. This group was followed in both response categories by teachers between the ages of 30 and 39 (see Table 48).

Table 48.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers of varying ages.

Age	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Under 30	4.5	81.8	13.6
30-39	7.4	76.6	15.4
40-49	9.6	76.3	12.8
50 and older	9.5	74.3	16.2

High school teachers with between 6 and 10 and 16 and 20 years of classroom teaching experience accounted for the highest percentage of respondents who indicated they would be willing to

invest a great deal of time or some time in school-wide decision making (see Table 49).

Table 49.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying classroom teaching experience.

Experience	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
1- 5 years	15.4	73.1	11.5
6-10 years	11.7	73.3	15.0
11-15 years	5.4	80.2	12.6
16-20 years	6.0	77.8	16.2
Over 20 years	10.5	72.8	14.9

Of those individuals who expressed an interest in investing time in the decision-making process, 88% who indicated they would be willing to invest some time taught in high schools that were located in rural areas. The largest percentage of high school teachers who indicated a willingness to invest a great deal of time in school-wide decision making taught in schools that were located in urban or suburban areas (see Table 50).

Teachers with bachelor's degrees led all other degree-status categories in the percentage of teachers expressing an interest in investing some time in school-wide decision making. They were followed by teachers with master's degrees, of whom 75% of the respondents expressed an interest in investing some time in the decision-making process. One-third of the high school teachers who

held a specialist's degree were willing to invest a great deal of time in the decision-making process (see Table 51).

Table 50.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers in varying types of communities.

Type of Community	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Rural	2.0	88.0	10.0
Small town	9.8	80.4	9.8
City	7.2	72.1	18.9
Suburban	10.5	69.3	18.4

Table 51.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Educational Status	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
B.A.	9.0	80.2	10.2
M.A.	7.3	75.4	16.1
Ed.S.	20.0	50.0	30.0
Ph.D.	33.3	.0	66.7

Respondents who worked in schools with enrollments of more than 1,204 students led all other enrollment categories in expressed willingness to invest a great deal of time in decision making (see Table 52).

Table 52.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Enrollment	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Under 319 students	.0	88.9	11.1
319-626 students	7.8	84.4	7.8
627-1,204 students	9.4	75.3	14.9
Over 1,205 students	7.5	71.0	18.3

Support staff registered the greatest interest in investing a great deal of time in school-wide decision making. The second highest percentage of individuals indicating that they would invest a great deal of time in the decision-making process were teachers in the core subjects representing the areas of English, mathematics, social studies, and science. Teachers in the practical arts and fine arts areas expressed the greatest interest in investing some time in school-wide decision making (see Table 53).

Of those high school teachers who indicated that they would invest a great deal of time in school-wide decision making, approximately 18% were very satisfied with their current jobs, 11% were satisfied, and 16% were dissatisfied with their current employment. Of teachers who indicated that they were willing to invest some time in the decision-making process, approximately 72% were very satisfied with their jobs, with 79% indicating

satisfaction and 67% dissatisfaction with their current jobs (see Table 54).

Table 53.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Teaching Assignment	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Core subjects	7.9	76.4	14.3
Fine arts	12.5	81.0	6.2
Practical arts	7.4	81.7	10.8
Support staff	2.7	68.0	29.2
Other	100.0	.0	.0

Table 54.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Degree of Satisfaction	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Very satisfied	7.9	72.9	18.6
Satisfied	7.9	79.8	11.6
Dissatisfied	14.0	67.4	16.3

When comparing the respondents' perceptions of their principals' administrative styles relative to decision making and their willingness to invest time in the decision-making process, 75% of the respondents said that they would be willing to invest some

time in school-wide decision making despite their perceptions that the principals of their schools controlled most of the decisions. Seventy-six percent of the respondents who indicated that their principal controlled all decisions would be willing to invest some time in the decision-making process (see Table 55).

Table 55.--Perceived willingness to invest time in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Administrative Style	Time Investment		
	Little or No Time	Some Time	A Great Deal of Time
Controls <u>all</u> decisions	7.6	76.3	16.1
Controls <u>most</u> decisions	8.6	75.8	14.8
Controls <u>some</u> decisions	8.7	78.3	10.9
Controls <u>few</u> decisions	33.3	66.7	.0

Preference for Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making

The high school teachers in this study were provided with an opportunity to indicate their preferences for involvement in school-wide decision making by responding to an open-ended survey question. This question was designed to provide the respondents with the opportunity to consider decision-making categories other than those included specifically in the survey instrument. Although 12 decision areas were included as a part of the questionnaire, teachers indicated an interest in becoming involved in school-wide decision making in 34 different decision areas (see Table 56).

Table 56.--Teachers' preferences for involvement in school-wide decision making.

Decision Area	Absolute Frequency	Rank
Curriculum	97	1
Rules/discipline	81	2
Personnel	44	3
Policy	39	4
School improvement	39	4
Budget	34	6
Teacher evaluation	26	7
Coordination of teaching	24	8
Professional development	24	8
Scheduling	16	10
Attendance policy	16	10
Extracurricular activities	16	10
Teaching assignments	15	13
All areas listed	12	14
Department matters	6	15
Class size	5	16
Graduation requirements	5	16
Textbook selection	5	16
Maintenance	3	19
School philosophy	2	20
Grade reporting	2	20
Grievances	2	20
Awards	2	20
Facilities	2	20
Parent involvement	2	20
Student teachers	1	26
School day	1	26
Building use	1	26
Scheduling of events	1	26
Communication	1	26
Administrative selection	1	26
Testing	1	26
Safety	1	26
Career planning	1	26

The highest frequency of response by teachers with regard to their preference for involvement in school-wide decision making was in the areas of curriculum, rules and discipline, personnel, school

improvement, and policy. The decision areas that ranked first through ninth in relative frequency were all among the 12 decision areas included on the survey instrument.

Perceptions of Potential Benefits, Costs, or Hindrances
to Involvement in Shared Decision Making

The perceptions of high school teachers relative to the potential benefits, costs, or hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making categorized on the basis of nine independent variables are presented in this section. For the purposes of this section, respondents were asked to react to a list of possible advantages, disadvantages, and hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making that were gleaned from the literature on shared decision making. Teachers were allowed to check more than one response in answering questions relative to their perceptions of advantages, disadvantages, and hindrances to shared decision making.

Perceived Benefits of Involvement
in Shared Decision Making

The high school teachers who were the subjects of this study were asked to select from a group of four predetermined responses those responses they viewed as advantages of their involvement in school-wide decision making. Their response choices were (a) increased teacher influence, (b) a sense of accomplishment, (c) a feeling of cooperation, and (d) increased workplace democracy. They were able to select as many responses as accurately reflected their feelings about the benefits of involvement in shared decision making.

Eighty-four percent of the female respondents and 78% of the male respondents reported that a feeling of cooperation (ownership) was the number one benefit of involvement in shared decision making. Increased teacher influence was cited by 69% of the female and 58% of the male respondents.

Both male and female teachers selected ownership as the major benefit of involvement in shared decision making. Male respondents indicated that increased teacher influence and a sense of accomplishment were equally important benefits, while women chose influence over accomplishment (see Table 57).

Table 57.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making, by sex.

Benefit	Sex	
	Male	Female
Influence	58.4	69.9
Accomplishment	58.4	57.4
Ownership	78.8	84.7
Workplace democracy	38.4	54.0

The teachers in the age groups 30 to 39 and 40 to 49 ranked the benefits of involvement in school-wide decision making in the following order: (a) ownership, (b) influence, (c) accomplishment, and (d) workplace democracy. Teachers in the 50 and older age category chose accomplishment over influence as a benefit of shared decision making (see Table 58).

Table 58.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers of varying ages.

Benefit	Age			
	< 30	30-39	40-59	> 50
Influence	63.6	62.9	65.2	58.4
Accomplishment	27.3	58.3	59.5	63.6
Ownership	72.7	85.7	79.1	79.2
Workplace democracy	45.5	36.6	50.0	51.9

Teachers in all classroom-teaching-experience categories except the 1- to 5-year and 11- to 15-year categories ranked the benefits of involvement in school-wide decision making with ownership being viewed as the greatest benefit, followed by increased teacher influence, a sense of accomplishment, and workplace democracy. Teachers with between 11 and 15 years of experience gave a slight edge to a sense of accomplishment over increased teacher influence as a benefit of involvement in shared decision making (see Table 59).

Table 59.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers with varying classroom experience.

Benefit	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Influence	69.2	61.7	58.6	65.3	63.6
Accomplishment	38.5	51.7	60.4	61.9	59.3
Ownership	80.8	83.3	87.4	83.9	72.0
Workplace democracy	42.3	43.3	40.5	42.4	52.5

Respondents who held doctorate degrees led all others in terms of the percentage of teachers who believed that ownership was the most important benefit of involvement in school-wide decision making. Respondents who held educational specialist degrees rated all four benefit categories as having virtually the same relative importance (see Table 60).

Table 60.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Benefit	Educational Status			
	B.A.	M.A.	Ed.S.	Ph.D.
Influence	57.1	65.6	80.0	100.0
Accomplishment	56.5	58.0	80.0	66.7
Ownership	78.2	83.6	70.0	100.0
Workplace democracy	35.9	49.2	80.0	66.9

Respondents who taught in rural, small town, urban, and suburban schools all reported agreement in their belief that ownership and influence were the primary benefits of involvement in school-wide decision making. Workplace democracy ranked as the least important of the four benefit choices (see Table 61).

Respondents who taught in schools in the A, B, and C student-enrollment classifications concurred with the rank order of benefits noted by teachers who taught in schools located in rural, small town, urban, and suburban areas. Teachers who taught in schools with enrollments of under 319 students reported that ownership and a

sense of accomplishment were the most important benefits of involvement in shared decision making. These two benefits were cited by these teachers as three to four times more important than increased teacher influence and workplace democracy (see Table 62).

Table 61.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers in varying types of communities.

Benefit	Type of Community			
	Rural	Small Town	City	Suburban
Influence	58.0	67.3	60.5	61.2
Accomplishment	50.0	59.4	60.5	56.9
Ownership	86.0	84.3	78.9	77.6
Workplace democracy	34.0	42.5	48.2	49.1

Table 62.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Benefit	Student Enrollment			
	< 319	319-626	627-1,204	> 1,204
Influence	22.2	71.9	64.7	57.1
Accomplishment	88.9	62.5	58.4	51.0
Ownership	100.0	75.0	85.1	73.5
Workplace democracy	22.2	37.5	45.9	48.0

High school teachers in all teaching-assignment categories rated ownership and increased teacher influence the number one and

number two potential benefits, respectively, of shared decision making (see Table 63).

Table 63.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Benefit	Teaching Assignments				
	Core Subjects	Fine Arts	Practical Arts	Support Staff	Other
Influence	61.5	43.7	61.7	74.3	56.0
Accomplishment	61.5	35.4	53.8	59.6	64.0
Ownership	80.1	87.5	79.7	87.8	88.0
Workplace democracy	43.3	20.8	41.8	56.5	60.0

When comparing teacher ratings of the potential benefits of shared decision making with reported degrees of job satisfaction, teachers who were very satisfied with their current employment viewed ownership as the chief benefit of involvement, with increased teacher influence and a sense of accomplishment ranking second and third. Teachers who reported being satisfied with their jobs clearly found ownership and increased teacher influence to be the primary benefits of involvement. Those who reported dissatisfaction with their jobs indicated that ownership and influence were equally important benefits of shared decision making, as were accomplishment and workplace democracy (see Table 64).

Table 64.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Benefit	Degree of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Influence	62.0	62.4	69.8
Accomplishment	60.6	56.7	55.8
Ownership	83.1	82.0	69.8
Workplace democracy	40.1	45.3	55.8

Respondents who indicated that their principals controlled all decisions viewed ownership and increased teacher influence as the major benefits of involvement in school-wide decision making. Teachers who indicated that their principals controlled most or some decisions recorded similar results. However, respondents who reported that their principals controlled few decisions rated influence and workplace democracy equally as the most important benefits of involvement in decision making, followed by ownership and accomplishment, which were also rated equally (see Table 65).

Perceived Costs of Involvement in Shared Decision Making

Teachers were asked to indicate which items from a list of predetermined responses represented potential costs of involvement in shared decision making. The predetermined responses were (a) time, (b) loss of autonomy, (c) collegial disfavor, (d) subversion of collective bargaining, and (e) threats to career advancement. The respondents were permitted to check as many of these responses

Table 65.--Ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Benefit	Principals' Administrative Styles			
	Control All Decisions	Control Most Decisions	Control Some Decisions	Control Few Decisions
Influence	67.8	58.8	74.5	66.7
Accomplishment	59.3	58.5	53.2	33.3
Ownership	83.1	81.9	76.6	33.3
Workplace democracy	51.7	40.8	44.7	66.7

as they believed would adequately express their feelings concerning the costs of involvement in school-wide decision making. The predetermined responses were chosen on the basis of their inclusion in the literature on shared decision making and their use in other studies involving employees and shared decision making.

The percentage of teachers who responded to this survey question about the costs of involvement in shared decision making was significantly lower than the percentage of teachers who responded to the question on the potential benefits of involvement in the decision-making process. The high school teachers who were the subjects of this study thought that the primary cost of their involvement in shared decision making was time. Time was followed by the potential for collegial disfavor, the loss of personal autonomy, the possible subversion of the collective bargaining process, and threats to career advancement.

The top three potential costs of involvement in shared decision making for men were time, collegial disfavor, and the possible subversion of the collective bargaining process. Female respondents' ratings mirrored males' for the first two potential costs, but females ranked loss of autonomy as the most important cost of involvement in shared decision making (see Table 66).

Table 66.--Teachers' ratings of potential costs of shared decision making, by sex.

Cost	Sex	
	Male	Female
Time	58.4	60.8
Loss of autonomy	10.2	10.8
Collegial disfavor	27.5	33.0
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	11.0	8.5
Threats to career advancement	7.8	9.1

Teachers representing the age groups from 22 to 49 years old all ranked time, collegial disfavor, and possible loss of autonomy as the major costs of involvement in shared decision making. Teachers over 50 years of age ranked subversion of the collective-bargaining process ahead of loss of autonomy in their responses (see Table 67).

Table 67.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers of varying ages.

Cost	Age			
	< 30	30-39	40-49	> 50
Time	59.1	58.3	57.6	64.9
Loss of autonomy	9.1	10.3	13.3	5.2
Collegial disfavor	18.2	33.1	28.5	28.6
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	.0	7.4	12.0	14.3
Threats to career advancement	9.1	9.7	8.9	5.2

The ratings of the potential costs of shared decision making by teachers with varying numbers of years of classroom teaching experience indicated that time and collegial disfavor were the two greatest costs of their involvement in shared decision making. Potential costs occupying the third, fourth, and fifth ranks varied with age group (see Table 68).

Table 68.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers with varying classroom teaching experience.

Cost	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Time	65.4	58.3	55.9	55.1	65.3
Loss of autonomy	11.5	8.3	10.8	11.9	9.3
Collegial disfavor	26.9	35.0	32.4	29.7	25.4
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	3.8	3.3	10.8	11.0	12.7
Threats to career advancement	15.4	10.0	8.1	9.3	18.9

High school teachers in all educational-status categories also ranked time and collegial disfavor as the two most prominent potential costs of involvement in the decision-making process. The ranking of the other predetermined potential costs varied with each group (see Table 69).

Table 69.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Cost	Educational Status			
	B.A.	M.A.	Ed.S.	Ph.D.
Time	61.8	56.8	70.0	66.7
Loss of autonomy	10.6	10.8	.0	.0
Collegial disfavor	28.2	31.2	20.0	33.3
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	8.2	11.6	.0	.0
Threats to career advancement	9.4	8.0	10.0	.0

Teachers in schools located in rural, small town, urban, and suburban areas all indicated that time and collegial disfavor were the greatest costs of their involvement in shared decision making. Loss of autonomy ranked third for teachers in schools located in rural and urban areas. Suburban teachers ranked the possible subversion of the collective-bargaining process as the third potential cost of involvement. Teachers in schools located in rural communities ranked both loss of autonomy and subversion of the collective-bargaining process as the third greatest cost of their involvement in shared decision making (see Table 70).

Table 70.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers in varying types of communities.

Cost	Type of Community			
	Rural	Small Town	City	Suburban
Time	66.0	63.4	53.5	56.0
Loss of autonomy	16.0	9.8	14.0	5.2
Collegial disfavor	32.0	33.3	28.1	25.9
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	16.0	11.8	4.4	10.3
Threats to career advancement	4.0	10.5	7.0	9.5

Respondents in schools in all student-enrollment categories ranked time and collegial disfavor as the greatest potential costs of involvement in the decision-making process (see Table 71).

Table 71.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Cost	Student Enrollment			
	< 319	319-626	627-1,204	> 1,204
Time	66.7	60.9	62.0	51.0
Loss of autonomy	11.1	15.6	8.2	13.3
Collegial disfavor	55.6	34.4	30.2	24.5
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	.0	15.6	8.2	12.2
Threats to career advancement	11.1	9.4	7.1	12.2

Teachers in all teaching-assignment categories also ranked time and collegial disfavor as potential costs. Teachers of practical arts ranked the possible subversion of the collective-bargaining process ahead of loss of autonomy as a potential cost of their involvement in shared decision making (see Table 72).

Table 72.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Cost	Teaching Assignments				
	Core Subjects	Fine Arts	Practical Arts	Support Staff	Other
Time	61.6	70.8	55.6	49.8	60.0
Loss of autonomy	12.1	6.2	5.2	9.0	8.0
Collegial disfavor	28.3	16.6	28.1	37.5	24.0
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	9.5	8.3	10.8	8.3	8.0
Threats to career advancement	7.4	.0	5.5	9.1	8.0

High school teachers who reported being very satisfied with their jobs cited time, collegial disfavor, and the possibility of subversion of the collective-bargaining process as the three major potential costs of involvement in the decision-making process. Teachers who indicated that they were satisfied with their current employment ranked the costs of involvement as time, collegial disfavor, and loss of autonomy, in that order. Those reporting dissatisfaction with their jobs viewed time, collegial disfavor, and

possible threats to career advancement as the chief costs of their involvement in shared decision making (see Table 73).

Table 73.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Cost	Degree of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Time	56.3	61.2	58.1
Loss of autonomy	7.0	11.0	18.6
Collegial disfavor	23.2	33.1	30.2
Subversion of collective-bargaining process	9.2	9.8	14.0
Threats to career advancement	3.5	9.0	23.3

Teachers reporting that their principals controlled all decisions ranked the potential costs of involvement in school-wide decision making in the following order: time, collegial disfavor, and the possible subversion of the collective-bargaining process. Those with the perception of their principals controlling most of the decisions chose time, collegial disfavor, and loss of autonomy as the three greatest potential costs of involvement. On the other hand, teachers who reported the perception of their principals controlling few decisions viewed time, loss of autonomy, collegial disfavor, and the possible subversion of the collective-bargaining process as equal potential costs of their involvement in shared decision making (see Table 74).

Table 74.--Ratings of potential costs of shared decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Cost	Principals' Administrative Styles			
	Control All Decisions	Control Most Decisions	Control Some Decisions	Control Few Decisions
Time	57.6	58.8	68.1	33.3
Loss of autonomy	9.3	11.5	6.4	33.3
Collegial disfavor	33.1	28.1	34.0	33.3
Subversion of collective- bargaining process	10.2	10.4	6.4	33.3
Threats to career advancement	8.5	7.7	12.8	.0

Perceived Hindrances to Involvement
in Shared Decision Making

The subjects of this study were asked to choose from among a list of predetermined responses those items that for them represented potential hindrances to their involvement in shared decision making. The response options were (a) lack of time, (b) lack of opportunity, (c) the principal's leadership style, (d) peer pressure, (e) personal philosophy, and (f) disinterest.

Fifty-eight percent of the male and 65% of the female respondents viewed lack of time as a potential hindrance to involvement in school-wide decision making. Approximately 50% of those responding cited lack of opportunity as a potential hindrance to involvement. Twenty percent or less of the respondents chose the four other predetermined responses as potential hindrances to

involvement in shared decision making. In rank order those hindrances were reported as the principal's leadership style, personal philosophy, disinterest, and peer pressure.

Both men and women ranked lack of time as the chief hindrance to involvement in shared decision making and lack of opportunity second (see Table 75). This finding was also consistent with every age-group category except those respondents who were 50 years and older. That group chose lack of opportunity over lack of time as the chief potential hindrance to involvement in school-wide decision making. The principal's leadership style did not seem to be an important consideration as a potential hindrance for respondents under 30 years of age. All other age groups viewed it as the number three hindrance (see Table 76).

Table 75.--Teachers' ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making, by sex.

Hindrance	Sex	
	Male	Female
Lack of time	58.8	65.3
Lack of opportunity	52.5	50.6
Principal's leadership style	22.3	18.8
Peer pressure	4.3	8.0
Personal philosophy	17.3	11.4
Disinterest	14.9	8.5

Table 76.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers of varying ages.

Hindrance	Age			
	< 30	30-39	40-59	> 50
Lack of time	72.7	64.6	58.9	57.1
Lack of opportunity	45.5	52.6	48.8	58.4
Principal's leadership style	9.1	17.7	24.7	23.4
Peer pressure	13.6	5.7	6.3	2.6
Personal philosophy	13.6	16.6	13.9	13.0
Disinterest	4.5	11.4	14.6	11.7

Of those respondents who viewed lack of time as the chief potential hindrance to involvement in shared decision making, the largest percentage were individuals with 1 to 5 years of teaching experience. Approximately the same percentage of teachers with between 11 and 15, 16 and 20, and more than 20 years of teaching experience felt that lack of time was the greatest potential hindrance to involvement in school-wide decision making. Lack of opportunity continued to rank second as a potential hindrance for all teaching-experience groups (see Table 77).

Teachers with bachelor's degrees led all other educational-status groups in terms of the percentage of teachers who held the belief that lack of time ranked as the number one potential hindrance to involvement in shared decision making. This educational-status group also reported the highest percentage rating for peer pressure as a potential hindrance to involvement in school-wide decision making (see Table 78).

Table 77.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying classroom teaching experience.

Hindrance	Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	> 20
Lack of time	80.8	65.0	61.3	58.5	58.5
Lack of opportunity	46.2	50.0	53.2	51.7	52.5
Principal's leadership style	19.2	13.3	20.7	23.7	22.0
Peer pressure	3.8	8.3	6.3	6.8	3.4
Personal philosophy	7.7	13.3	15.3	19.5	11.9
Disinterest	3.8	16.7	9.0	11.9	15.3

Table 78.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying educational status.

Hindrance	Educational Status			
	B.A.	M.A.	Ed.S.	Ph.D.
Lack of time	70.0	56.8	40.0	33.3
Lack of opportunity	47.6	54.4	50.0	66.7
Principal's leadership style	18.2	22.8	10.0	33.3
Peer pressure	5.9	6.0	.0	.0
Personal philosophy	15.9	14.0	20.0	.0
Disinterest	10.6	13.2	20.0	.0

High school teachers who taught in schools located in rural, small town, or suburban areas reported lack of time as the chief potential hindrance to involvement in school-wide decision making, followed by lack of opportunity and the principal's leadership

style. Teachers who taught in schools located in urban centers thought that lack of opportunity was the greatest potential hindrance, followed by lack of time (see Table 79).

Table 79.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in varying types of communities.

Hindrance	Type of Community			
	Rural	Small Town	City	Suburban
Lack of time	66.0	69.9	54.4	55.2
Lack of opportunity	44.0	50.3	61.4	47.4
Principal's leadership style	20.0	22.9	16.7	22.4
Peer pressure	4.0	7.2	2.6	7.8
Personal philosophy	18.0	13.1	14.9	15.5
Disinterest	16.0	11.8	9.6	13.8

These findings were also consistent for teachers in schools of varying sizes. Teacher respondents in all school sizes except large high schools (more than 1,205 students) viewed lack of time as the greatest potential hindrance to involvement in shared decision making. Teachers in large high schools reported lack of opportunity as the number one potential hindrance to involvement in school-wide decision making (see Table 80).

Table 80.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers in schools with varying student enrollments.

Hindrance	Student Enrollment			
	< 319	319-626	627-1,204	> 1,204
Lack of time	88.9	59.4	65.1	52.0
Lack of opportunity	33.3	53.1	48.2	59.2
Principal's leadership style	11.1	9.4	27.1	14.3
Peer pressure	11.1	12.5	5.1	3.1
Personal philosophy	44.4	15.6	13.7	15.3
Disinterest	22.2	17.2	10.2	12.2

Teachers in the core subject areas chose lack of time as the greatest potential hindrance to involvement in shared decision making, followed by lack of opportunity, their principals' leadership styles, and their personal philosophies regarding the activity. This ranking varied for teachers in the fine arts. They chose lack of time, their personal philosophies regarding shared decision making, and lack of opportunity as the three major hindrances to their involvement in school-wide decision making. Teachers in the practical arts area viewed the top three potential hindrances in the same rank order as teachers in the core subject areas. Support staff rated lack of opportunity as the number one potential hindrance to involvement in shared decision making (see Table 81).

Table 81.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying teaching assignments.

Hindrance	Teaching Assignments				
	Core Subjects	Fine Arts	Practical Arts	Support Staff	Other
Lack of time	65.5	77.1	56.8	45.1	64.0
Lack of opportunity	51.0	14.6	52.6	47.0	80.0
Principal's leadership style	20.8	.0	19.8	22.5	24.0
Peer pressure	4.9	.0	5.4	10.7	8.0
Personal philosophy	16.8	31.2	12.6	6.3	8.0
Disinterest	12.8	8.3	12.9	12.3	12.0

Respondents who reported being very satisfied or satisfied with their current employment ranked lack of time, lack of opportunity, and their principals' leadership styles as the three most probable potential hindrances to involvement in shared decision making. Those teachers who reported being dissatisfied with their jobs listed lack of opportunity as the greatest potential hindrance to their involvement in school-wide decision making, followed by lack of time and their principals' leadership styles (see Table 82).

Table 82.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying degrees of job satisfaction.

Hindrance	Degree of Satisfaction		
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Lack of time	65.5	60.8	51.2
Lack of opportunity	46.5	53.5	60.5
Principal's leadership style	15.5	21.6	34.9
Peer pressure	2.1	6.9	11.6
Personal philosophy	15.5	13.1	23.3
Disinterest	7.7	14.7	11.6

High school teachers who believed that their principals controlled all school-wide decisions ranked lack of opportunity as the greatest hindrance to their own involvement in school-wide decision making. Lack of time and their principals' leadership styles ranked second and third, respectively, for this group of individuals. Teachers who reported that, in their opinion, the principals of their schools controlled most decisions ranked lack of time as the chief potential hindrance to their involvement in shared decision making, followed by lack of opportunity, their personal philosophy regarding the activity, and their principals' leadership styles. Those individuals who reported that their principals controlled only some of the school-wide decisions viewed lack of time and lack of opportunity as the number one and number two hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making. Personal

philosophy regarding this type of involvement and disinterest were of equal importance as hindrances for this group and ranked third (see Table 83).

Table 83.--Ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making by teachers with varying perceptions of their principals' administrative styles.

Hindrance	Principals' Administrative Styles			
	Control All Decisions	Control Most Decisions	Control Some Decisions	Control Few Decisions
Lack of time	55.9	63.1	68.1	66.7
Lack of opportunity	57.6	48.8	48.9	100.0
Principal's leadership style	40.7	13.1	14.9	.0
Peer pressure	5.9	5.0	10.6	.0
Personal philosophy	9.3	14.2	31.9	33.3
Disinterest	5.9	11.2	31.9	33.3

Chi-Square Test of Association

The research findings relative to the relationships between the nine independent variables and the responses of the subjects of this study regarding (a) the current level of their involvement in school-wide decision making, (b) their expressed desire to become involved in school-wide decision making, and (c) their perceptions concerning the costs and benefits of or hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making were analyzed using the chi-square test.

Because of the size of the sample (1,000+), the null hypotheses were tested at both the .05 and .10 levels of significance.

Current Involvement in School-Wide Decision Making

The differences in the current level of involvement in school-wide decision making by high school teachers categorized on the basis of nine factors are presented in this section. For the decision area curriculum, the chi-square scores indicated an association between teacher involvement in shared decisions regarding curriculum and the teaching assignment of the respondents, significant at the .05 level (see Table 84).

When comparing the nine independent variables with current teacher involvement in decisions regarding school activities, associations were found between the teachers' involvement in this decision area and (a) age, (b) teaching experience, and (c) job satisfaction at the .05 level of significance and between teacher involvement in shared decisions in the school-activities decision area and the principal's leadership style significant at the .10 level (see Table 84).

With regard to the current involvement of high school teachers in shared decision making in the area of school improvement, there was an association between teachers' job satisfaction, principal's leadership style, and involvement in this decision area significant at the .05 level and educational status and teaching experience at the .10 level of significance (see Table 84).

Table 84.--Summary of chi-square test for current involvement of teachers in shared decision making.

Variable	Decision Area						
	Curricu- lum	Activi- ties	School Improvement	Rules/ Discipline	Professional Development	Coordination of Teaching	Policy
Sex	1.367	.008	.161	.424	.541	.319	.696
Age	4.636	17.258*	5.630	1.543	5.728	1.772	3.961
Educational status	1.991	1.277	7.777**	2.217	6.324**	6.060	5.246
Teaching experience	4.034	18.096*	9.339**	10.501*	8.662	7.876**	13.196*
Type of community	3.072	4.431	.142	6.379**	11.848*	2.270	10.003*
Size of school	1.449	1.979	6.216	14.943*	5.347	.545	3.400
Job satisfaction	1.640	8.266*	10.898*	5.047**	6.949**	1.640	10.724*
Assignment	36.726*	11.268	17.134	10.059	18.497	15.582	11.268
Principal's lead- ership style	4.428	7.012**	13.845*	23.978*	4.656	3.449	15.250

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

When considering associations for the decision area school rules and discipline, chi-square scores indicated a relationship between current teacher involvement in this area and (a) teaching experience, (b) size of school, and (c) principal's leadership style at the .05 level of significance and type of community and job satisfaction at the .10 level (see Table 84).

Three variables emerged as significant determinants of involvement in professional-development activities. They were type of community at the .05 level of significance and job satisfaction and educational status at the .10 level (see Table 84).

For the decision area coordination of teaching, only teaching experience was found to be a significant indicator of current teacher involvement in shared decision making at the .10 level (see Table 84).

The responses of high school teachers regarding their involvement in decisions relative to school policy indicated associations with (a) teaching experience, (b) type of community, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) principal's leadership style, all at the .05 level of significance (see Table 84).

Perceived results of involvement in school-wide decisions. High school teachers who reported involvement in shared decision making were asked to indicate their perceptions of the results of such involvement. They were directed to report whether the results of their involvement in the decision-making process were in their opinion positive, negative, or neutral.

Chi-square scores for the decision area curriculum indicated an association with teacher job satisfaction at the .05 level of significance and number of years of classroom teaching experience at the .10 level (see Table 85).

For the decision area activities, only the teachers' educational status was related to their perceptions of the results of their involvement in shared decision making (see Table 85).

Teachers' perceptions of the results of their involvement in school improvement decisions were associated with their job satisfaction and their principals' leadership styles at the .05 level of significance and with age at the .10 level (see Table 85).

For the decision area rules and discipline, a correlation was found between teachers' perceptions of the results of their involvement in that decision category and sex and job satisfaction at the .05 level and type of community and size of school at the .10 level of significance (see Table 85).

Comparing teachers' perceptions of the results of involvement in shared decision making in the area of professional development with the nine independent variables resulted in chi-square scores that indicated only a relationship between perceptions of results in this decision area and the principal's leadership style at the .05 level of significance (see Table 85).

Scores for comparisons between teachers' perceptions of the results of involvement in the coordination of teaching with other teachers and the nine variables produced associations between perceptions of results in this decision area and job satisfaction

Table 85.--Summary of chi-square test for teachers' perceptions of the results of their involvement in shared decision making.

Variable	Decision Area						
	Curriculum	Activities	School Improvement	Rules/Discipline	Professional Development	Coordination of Teaching	Policy
Sex	.851	.764	.351	6.176*	3.203	2.794	.540
Age	8.714	2.394	10.985**	4.967	6.763	3.556	4.204
Educational status	2.037	56.247*	3.089	5.695	6.396	4.238	5.429
Teaching experience	13.398**	3.758	9.160	6.479	5.546	5.793	10.076
Type of community	4.540	2.294	6.052	11.046**	5.105	4.659	7.291
Size of school	6.600	4.458	5.672	12.321**	4.479	3.841	3.783
Job satisfaction	15.197*	3.261	10.431*	17.194*	4.055	14.651*	8.545**
Assignment	23.364	26.798	24.490	20.723	27.872	35.462	39.967**
Principal's leadership style	9.266	7.183	54.694*	1.342	23.569*	26.556*	3.198

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

and the principal's leadership style at the .05 level (see Table 85).

Teachers' perceptions about the results of their involvement in school decisions regarding policy were associated with their levels of job satisfaction and their perceptions of the principal's leadership style at the .10 level of significance (see Table 85).

Perceived ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions. The subjects of this study were asked to indicate whether or not they thought that through their involvement in shared decision making in the seven decision categories selected for analysis they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions. A relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of an ability to affect the outcome of school decisions in curriculum and teaching assignment at the .05 level of significance and the principal's leadership style at the .10 level (see Table 86).

An association was noted between the perceptions of teachers' ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions in the activities decision area and their teaching assignment at the .10 level of significance (see Table 86).

In the school improvement decision area, only one correlation was found between teachers' perceptions of their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions and the age of the respondent at the .10 level of significance (see Table 86).

Table 86.--Summary of chi-square test for teachers' perceptions of their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions.

Variable	Decision Area						
	Curriculum	Activities	School Improvement	Rules/Discipline	Professional Development	Coordination of Teaching	Policy
Sex	2.897	.997	1.015	.445	5.805*	2.903	2.156
Age	7.674	5.442	6.603**	3.906	.530	2.711	5.234
Educational status	.985	6.835	.606	6.228	6.398**	1.862	15.779*
Teaching experience	4.918	8.706	4.541	7.238	4.910	7.529	6.593
Type of community	4.054	7.417	4.591	7.798	12.638*	6.719	11.184**
Size of school	5.289	.713	1.287	11.006**	2.022	11.899**	9.531
Job satisfaction	3.766	7.181	2.009	2.694	6.096*	7.545	7.485
Assignment	43.877*	38.919**	17.690	18.417	12.112	25.893	26.765
Principal's leadership style	11.454**	4.496	4.435	11.485**	3.412	5.278	8.524

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

An association was found between the perceptions of high school teachers concerning their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions regarding school rules and discipline and the size of school and the principal's leadership style at the .10 level of significance (see Table 86).

Chi-square scores indicated relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions concerning professional development and (a) sex, (b) type of community, and (c) job satisfaction at the .05 level of significance and the teachers' educational status at the .10 level (see Table 86).

In the decision category coordination of teaching, a correlation existed between teachers' perceptions of their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions in this area and the size of the school at the .10 level (see Table 86).

A relationship was also found between teachers' perceptions of their ability to affect the outcome of school-wide decisions regarding school policy and the educational status of the teacher at the .05 level of significance and size of school at the .10 level (see Table 86).

Perception of overall extent of involvement in school-wide decisions. The high school teachers in this study were asked to rate their overall level of involvement in school-wide decisions, characterizing their activity in this area as very involved, somewhat involved, or not involved. Based on the result of the chi-square test, a relationship was found between teachers' perceptions

of the extent of their overall involvement in shared decision making and (a) age, (b) number of years of classroom teaching experience, (c) teacher job satisfaction, (d) teaching assignment, and (e) teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership style (see Table 87).

Table 87.--Summary of chi-square test for teacher-perceived extent of involvement in shared decision making.

Variable	Perceived Extent of Involvement
Sex	2.266
Age	13.801*
Educational status	10.289
Teaching experience	15.722*
Type of community	7.833
Size of school	7.063
Job satisfaction	12.567*
Assignment	60.853*
Principal's leadership style	16.237*

*Significant at $p < .05$.

Expressed Desire to Become Involved in School-Wide Decision Making

The differences in the expressed desire of high school teachers to become involved in school-wide decision making are presented in this section. Teachers were asked to indicate how much time they would be willing to invest in shared-decision-making activities if they were provided with the opportunity for such involvement.

Investment of time. The results of the chi-square test for teachers' perceptions of willingness to invest time in shared

decision making indicated that a relationship existed between teachers' willingness to invest time in the school-wide decision-making process and their educational status and teaching assignment at the .05 level of significance, and type of community at the .10 level (see Table 88).

Table 88.--Summary of chi-square test for teachers' perceptions of willingness to invest time in shared decision making.

Variable	Willingness to Invest Time
Sex	1.941
Age	3.113
Educational status	18.259*
Teaching experience	9.726
Type of community	15.167**
Size of school	11.849
Job satisfaction	6.874
Assignment	63.783*
Principal's leadership style	5.684

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

Perceptions of Potential Benefits,
Costs, or Hindrances to Involvement
in Shared Decision Making

Differences in the perceptions of teachers relative to the potential benefits, costs, or hindrances to involvement in school-wide decision making categorized on the basis of nine independent variables are presented in this section. For the purposes of this analysis, respondents were asked to choose from

among a list of potential advantages, disadvantages, and hindrances to their involvement in shared decision making.

Perceived benefits of involvement in shared decision making.

High school teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions of the potential benefits of their involvement in shared decision making from a predetermined list that included (a) increased teacher influence, (b) a sense of accomplishment, (c) a feeling of cooperation, and (d) increased workplace democracy. A relationship was found between the teachers' perception that increased teacher influence represented a benefit of involvement in shared decision making and the sex of the teacher and the size of the school at the .05 level of significance, and the educational status of the teacher at the .10 level (see Table 89).

No relationship was noted between teachers' perceptions of the benefit category a sense of accomplishment and any of the nine independent variables (see Table 89).

For the benefit category ownership, only an association between teachers' perception of that category as a benefit and size of school existed at the .10 level of significance (see Table 89).

Teachers' perception of workplace democracy as a benefit of involvement in shared decision making was found to be associated with (a) sex, (b) age of the respondent, and (c) the teacher's educational status, all at the .05 level of significance (see Table 89).

Table 89.--Summary of chi-square test for teachers' ratings of potential benefits of shared decision making.

Variable	Benefit			
	Influence	Accomp- lishment	Ownership	Workplace Democracy
Sex	5.869*	.047	3.266	10.177*
Age	1.016	9.686	4.951	8.115*
Educational status	6.282**	2.242	5.527	13.014*
Teaching experience	1.682	6.123	11.749	4.073
Type of community	2.210	1.807	7.962	4.120
Size of school	10.356*	6.036	10.900**	3.747
Job satisfaction	.941	.627	4.916	3.379
Assignment	8.770	15.251	19.156	18.675
Principal's leader- ship style	5.762	1.302	7.106	4.536

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

Perceived costs of involvement in shared decision making. The high school teachers who were the subjects of this study were asked to indicate which items from a predetermined list of responses represented in their opinion potential disadvantages or costs of their involvement in shared decision making. Their potential-cost choices were (a) time, (b) loss of autonomy, (c) collegial disfavor, (d) subversion of the collective-bargaining process, and (e) possible threats to their career advancement.

Chi-square test scores did not indicate an existing relationship between teachers' perception of a loss of time or collegial disfavor as a cost or disadvantage of their involvement in

shared decision making and any of the nine independent variables (see Table 90).

Table 90.--Summary of chi-square test for teachers' ratings of potential costs of shared decision making.

Variable	Costs				
	Time	Loss of Autonomy	Collegial Disfavor	Subvert Bargain Process	Threat to Career Advancement
Sex	.241	.040	2.774	.700	1.577
Age	1.278	3.694	3.203	6.406	2.074
Educational status	1.609	1.559	2.467	2.758	2.014
Teaching experience	3.559	.750	4.080	5.268	4.596
Type of community	4.080	6.764**	7.332	6.575**	8.044
Size of school	3.806	3.959	5.669	4.638	3.579
Job satisfaction	.916	4.897**	4.501	.870	16.744*
Assignment	14.831	19.394	20.525	16.900	25.883
Principal's leadership style	2.501	2.981	2.540	2.533	2.876

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

An association was found between the teachers' perception of loss of personal autonomy as a cost of involvement in shared decision making and type of community and job satisfaction at the .10 level of significance (see Table 90).

Subversion of the collective bargaining process was associated with type of community at the .10 level of significance as a

teacher-perceived cost of involvement in the shared decision-making process (see Table 90).

A correlation existed between threat to career advancement as a potential cost of teacher involvement in the shared-decision-making process and teacher job satisfaction at the .05 level of significance (see Table 90).

Perceived hindrances to involvement in shared decision making.
The high school teachers were asked to select potential hindrances to their involvement in shared decision making from a predetermined list selected from the literature. The response options were (a) lack of time, (b) lack of opportunity, (c) the principal's leadership style, (d) peer pressure, (e) personal philosophy, and (f) disinterest.

An association was found between lack of time as a perceived hindrance to teacher involvement in shared decision making and type of community at the .05 level of significance and the teachers' educational status at the .10 level (see Table 91).

Lack of opportunity was correlated with type of community and teaching assignment as possible hindrances to teacher involvement in the shared-decision-making process at the .10 level of significance (see Table 91).

A relationship was noted between the principal's leadership style as a potential hindrance to teacher involvement and the size of the school at the .05 level and the teachers' degree of job satisfaction at the .10 level of significance (see Table 91).

Table 91.--Summary of chi-square test for teachers' ratings of potential hindrances to involvement in shared decision making.

Variable	Hindrance					
	Lack of Time	Lack of Opportunity	Principal Leadership Style	Peer Pressure	Personal Philosophy	Dis-interest
Sex	2.999	.164	2.283	3.187	2.858**	3.929*
Age	3.598	2.351	5.223	5.481	.755	2.127
Educational status	11.543**	2.129	3.859	1.562	1.021	1.625
Teaching experience	6.980	.517	4.624	5.330	4.038	4.892
Type of community	14.361*	6.455**	7.369	6.544	.818	1.663
Size of school	8.828	4.642	14.993*	10.511	6.463	3.319
Job satisfaction	3.543	3.177	7.951**	8.782**	3.063	4.091
Assignment	23.259	22.395**	15.801	34.083	16.890	17.219
Principal's leadership style	4.188	5.453	40.465*	3.119	14.479*	22.979*

*Significant at $p < .05$.

**Significant at $p < .10$.

Peer pressure was found to be associated only with the degree of teacher job satisfaction as a possible hindrance to teacher involvement in shared decision making at the .10 level of significance (see Table 91).

Personal philosophy as a potential hindrance to teacher involvement was related to the principal's leadership style at the .05 level and the sex of the respondent at the .10 level of significance (see Table 91).

Teachers' rating of disinterest as a hindrance to involvement in shared decision making was associated with both the sex of the respondent and the teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership styles at the .05 level of significance (see Table 91).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The responses of 435 high school teachers in selected public schools in western Michigan were examined in this study. More specifically, the study was designed to (a) determine the shared decision areas in which high school teachers were currently involved, (b) seek information about their desire for increased involvement in school-wide decision making, (c) explore possible explanations for involvement or noninvolvement in shared decision making, and (d) investigate the differences in responses among groups of teachers categorized on the basis of nine factors: age, sex, classroom teaching experience, educational status, type of community, student enrollment, teaching assignment, job satisfaction, and principal's leadership style. The data collected were grouped in terms of nine categories, which became the central issues of this study.

In determining the current involvement of high school teachers in shared decision making, the issues raised were the degree of teacher involvement in shared decision making, the kinds of decisions they were involved in, and the result of their involvement in terms of its positive effect.

It seemed important to explore not only the "what" when considering the question of current involvement in shared decision making but also to discover how much time (a little, some, a lot) teachers were spending on this type of activity and whether their experiences or investments of time were perceived as positive.

The issues that most closely aligned themselves with the desire for increased involvement in school-wide decision making were the willingness on the part of teachers to invest time in the activity, and the individual choices of decision areas for involvement cited by teachers when responding to the open-ended question included in the survey instrument.

In seeking some explanation for teacher involvement or noninvolvement in shared decision making, the issues derived from a selective grouping of survey questions were whether teachers believed they could affect the outcome of decisions, their perceptions of the costs of their involvement in the decision-making process, teachers' perceptions of the possible benefits of their involvement in shared decision making, and whether certain factors exist that might hinder their involvement in the decision-making process. Together, these issues represented a systematic method for organizing the data for analysis and establishing a focus.

Major Findings (Descriptive)

Current involvement in shared decision making. The current involvement in shared decision making of the high school teachers who were the subjects of this study indicated the greatest

involvement in decision areas that were closely associated with and affected their classroom teaching experiences or general interest in students. These decision areas, in rank order, were (a) curriculum, (b) extracurricular activities, (c) school improvement, (d) rules and discipline, (e) professional development, (f) coordination of teaching, and (g) school policy. This finding is consistent with Cusick's (1983) in that it seems to support the contention that when teachers become involved in school-wide decision making it represents a desire on their part to protect activities or events in which they have a vested interest or have invested considerable time and energy.

The finding that high school teachers were involved most in curriculum development was also consistent with the existing literature. The percentage of teachers in this study reporting involvement in decisions regarding curriculum development (73%) was similar to that reported by California elementary principals in Johnson's (1975) study.

Current involvement in extracurricular activities is a natural extension of the secondary teacher's interaction with high-school-age students. Since extracurricular activities are viewed as an integral part of high school programming, it logically follows that teachers at this level would be involved in and possibly think of extracurricular activities as a part of their job responsibility. In many instances teachers are paid to direct such activities, and so one might expect that they would, in fact, be involved in decisions in this area.

Teachers' involvement in decisions regarding school-improvement efforts has been viewed in the literature as an exercise in top-down management not usually involving teachers in any significant number. Approximately 62% of the teachers in this study indicated that they were or had been involved in decisions regarding school improvement. One might surmise from this finding that many school-improvement efforts are currently being implemented in the schools--efforts that involve decision-making groups comprised of a large number of teachers. Such a finding was inconsistent with the research of Duke (1978, 1980) and indicated a greater degree of teacher involvement in decisions regarding school improvement than previously noted.

This increased involvement by teachers in the decision-making process is a particularly important finding in light of the public pressure for high schools to consider the changes associated with the volumes of recent national studies and public criticism of the secondary school. The individual school has been identified as the most effective unit of change, and an increase in shared decision making in the area of school improvement could have a direct influence on any efforts toward such improvement.

Duke et al. (1978) and Duke (1979) cited student behavior problems as a decision area of great interest to teachers. Duke (1979) noted, however, that teachers are not involved very much in making decisions that deal with school rules and discipline. Sixty percent of the high school teachers in this study indicated that they had been involved in decisions regarding school rules and

discipline. Since the focus of Duke's study was the elementary school, the question of the applicability of his finding to the secondary school noted in the literature review appears to have been partially answered. Duke (1977) and Francis (1975) supported the need for such involvement by teachers as a means of assuring more effective enforcement of established rules, believing that those individuals who must enforce the rules should have a hand in developing them.

Fifty-seven percent of the high school teachers noted that they were involved in decisions regarding professional-development activities. Although the literature indicated that school district officials or building principals have traditionally controlled this decision area, this finding seems to indicate an increase in the level of involvement of teachers in this important activity. It also is in keeping with Duke's (1977) and Lawrence's (1974) finding that the professional-development programs that have the greatest chance for success are those that involve teachers planning and managing their own professional-development activities.

Fifty-five percent of the 435 respondents indicated that they were involved or had been involved in decisions regarding the coordination of teaching in their schools. It may be that involvement in this area is an important link to involvement in other school-wide decision areas. Johnson (1975) reported that the greater the degree of teacher participation in instructional coordination, the more likely it is that teachers will become involved in decisions that are usually left primarily to principals.

Lack of involvement in policy decisions was cited by Corwin (1970) as a major source of teacher dissatisfaction and militancy for the high schools he studied. Slightly more than 50% of the high school teachers in this study indicated that they were involved in policy decisions. One might infer, given Corwin's finding, that teacher dissatisfaction and militancy might be minimized by involvement in policy decisions, and, in fact, the degree of dissatisfaction with current assignment/employment expressed by teachers who were the subjects of this study was minimal (10%).

The teachers who were most likely to become involved in these seven decision areas were between the ages of 30 and 39 and had teaching assignments in the fine arts. They taught in Class C high schools located in rural areas, were satisfied with their current employment, and believed that their principals controlled all or most of the school decisions.

A vast majority (59% to 83%) of the teachers who indicated that they were involved in shared decision making in these seven decision areas reported such involvement ended with positive results. One might infer from such information that generally teachers view their involvement in the decision-making process as a positive professional or personal experience.

A profile of the teachers who most frequently perceived positive results from their actual involvement in the school-wide decision-making process revealed that most often this individual was a female between the ages of 40 and 50+. This teacher was assigned

to a fine arts subject in a suburban high school. She was generally satisfied with her job and perceived her principal as an individual who controlled all or most of the school decisions.

Thirty percent of the teachers in this study were not involved in school-wide decision making in their respective schools. Only 7% of the males and 9% of the females characterized themselves as very involved, leaving slightly more than 60% somewhat involved in the shared-decision-making process.

Desire for increased involvement. Sixteen percent of the male and 12% of the female teachers in this study indicated they would be willing to invest a greater amount of time in shared decision making if given the opportunity for such involvement. An additional 74% of the men and 78% of the women were willing to invest some time. From these data, one might infer that high school teachers are interested in becoming involved in decisions that affect the operation of the school.

The teacher most willing to invest a great deal of time in the shared-decision-making process was once again a man over 50 years of age with an advanced degree, assigned in a support-staff position in a school with a student enrollment over 1,204 that was located in an urban or a suburban area, satisfied with his job, and who viewed his school administrator as the person who made all or most of the decisions regarding the operation of the school.

When the teachers in this study were given the opportunity by means of an open-ended question included in the survey instrument to indicate those decision areas that represented their preference for

involvement in the decision-making process, they generally chose decision categories from among those included in the survey. Their major preferences, in priority order, included (a) curriculum, (b) rules and discipline, (c) personnel, (d) policy, (e) school improvement, (f) budget, (g) teacher evaluation, (h) the coordination of teaching with other teachers, (i) professional development, (j) scheduling, (k) attendance, and (l) extracurricular activities. Of this list of preferences, only scheduling and attendance were not included in the survey instrument. Curriculum and school rules and discipline were by far the most frequently cited preferences of teachers for involvement in school-wide decision making.

While it appears that there was considerable interest or desire on the part of high school teachers to become involved or more involved in shared decision making at the school level, it should be noted that their preferences for involvement were within the range of decision categories generally included in the literature on shared decision making and incorporated in this study. Even when presented with the option of expressing a desire to become involved in any aspect of decision making at the school level, the teachers in this study continued to focus on decision opportunities most closely associated with or influencing their daily activity of teaching students.

A very small percentage of teachers indicated any special preference for involvement in shared decision making in their answer

to the open-ended question. For example, only about 20% of the teachers expressed a preference for involvement in curriculum development and school rules and discipline, which were by far the most frequent decision areas mentioned. Less than 10% listed such decision areas as policy, school improvement, budget, and professional development.

In short, there appears to be at least some information to suggest a desire on the part of high school teachers to be involved in decisions affecting select aspects of the operation of their schools. Their selection of decision areas for involvement again appeared to support Cusick's claim that teacher involvement in school-wide decisions is a function of the need to protect the integrity of their classroom teaching environment.

Factors related to involvement. An individual's belief that he/she can affect the outcome of a decision through his/her participation in the decision-making process seems key to his/her desire for involvement in such a process. Between 62% and 83% of the high school teachers in this study expressed the belief that through their involvement in school-wide decision making they could, in fact, affect or influence the outcome of such decisions.

The profile of the teacher most apt to hold that belief parallels that of the other major finding categories in that this individual was a male between the ages of 22 and 39, possessed a master's degree, was satisfied with his job, and harbored the opinion that his school's principal controlled most or all of the decisions regarding the general operation of the school.

It is interesting that one of the decision areas in which teachers thought they had the greatest possibility of affecting the outcome of decisions was the area of school improvement. This finding is of special interest when considering the current clamoring for secondary school reform and the need to involve classroom teachers in the effort and focus reform activities on individual schools as the most productive units for change.

Eighty-four percent of the female teachers and 78% of the male teachers expressed the belief that a feeling of cooperation or ownership was the primary benefit derived from involvement in shared decision making at the school level. The potential for increased teacher influence and a personal sense of accomplishment were the next most important perceived benefits of involvement in school decisions for these teachers. Fifty-four percent of the female teachers and 38% of the male teachers listed workplace democracy as a benefit of their involvement.

All four benefit choices received a high response rate from teachers as potential benefits of involvement in the school's decision-making process. Such a positive response rate may indicate that these four factors are at least important considerations for teachers when contemplating possible involvement in the decision activities of the school.

The rank order of these potential benefits was similar for all groups and categories included in the nine independent variables. This indicated the universal appeal of these benefits to

the high school teachers in the study and promoted the possibility that the general population of teachers shares the belief that these four benefits are important factors in determining involvement in the shared-decision-making process.

When considering the potential costs of involvement in the shared-decision-making process, teachers found time and the possibility of collegial disfavor the major costs of their involvement in school decisions. Of these two costs, only time received a high response rate, being cited by a vast majority of the respondents as a cost. Only about 30% of the teachers viewed collegial disfavor as a potential cost of involvement. The rank order of these two factors was consistent for the nine independent variables and their subdivisions.

The response rate was 11% or less for the cost choices loss of autonomy, subversion of the collective-bargaining process, and threats to career advancement. Teachers did not see these factors as potential costs of their involvement in the shared-decision-making process.

Time was the major cost associated with teacher involvement in the decision-making process. Seventy percent to 90% of the teachers who were the subjects of this study did not consider the four other cost choices, including collegial disfavor, significant costs of involvement.

Teachers rated lack of time for involvement in shared decision making and lack of opportunity for such involvement as the chief hindrances to their involvement in decisions at the school level.

Fifty-eight percent of the males and 65% of the females responding viewed lack of time as a major hindrance to involvement. Approximately 50% of the men and women considered a lack of opportunity for involvement in school decisions as a major hindrance. The rank order of these factors was consistent for all nine independent variables and their various subdivisions.

The response rates for the other potential hindrance choices, (a) principal's leadership style, (b) peer pressure, (c) personal philosophy, and (d) disinterest, were 22% or less.

As with the potential costs of involvement, time again surfaced as a major hindrance for teachers when considering involvement in the shared-decision-making process. The fact that a lack of time and a lack of opportunity were both seen by teachers as major hindrances to their involvement might appear to suggest that, at least in some instances, even if opportunities were available to teachers for increased involvement in the decisions of the school, teachers may have thought they lacked the time for actual involvement in this activity.

Although it seems clear that teachers saw several benefits to their involvement in the shared-decision-making process, the potential costs and hindrances, particularly time considerations and the lack of opportunity, might have mitigated against their entry into the larger arena of school decisions.

Cusick's (1983) contention that high school teachers are content to leave the running of the enterprise to administrators or

whomever administrators can get to help them may not be a totally accurate assessment when considering the major findings of this study. The high school teachers who were a part of this study appeared to be involved in shared decision making and expressed a desire for such involvement, believed there were some benefits to be derived from their involvement, had generally experienced positive results from this involvement, and seemed to share the belief that they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions.

Major Findings (Statistical)

Current involvement in shared decision making. The current involvement of high school teachers in shared decision making for the seven decision categories chosen for analysis indicated that the number of years of classroom teaching experience, the principal's leadership style, job satisfaction, and the type of community in which the school was located appeared to have the most significant influence on teacher involvement in the shared-decision-making process. The number of years of classroom teaching experience was related to teacher involvement in five of the seven decision categories. Although curriculum was the decision category in which teachers indicated the greatest involvement, significant differences in this category were associated only with teaching assignment.

The most significant factors affecting teachers' perceptions of the results of their involvement in the shared-decision-making process for the seven decision categories reported in this study were teachers' job satisfaction and teachers' perceptions of their

principal's leadership styles. Job satisfaction was associated with teachers' perceptions of the results of their involvement in shared decision making in five of the seven decision categories chosen for analysis.

When considering the overall extent of teachers' involvement in shared decision making, five factors appeared to influence the degree of teachers' involvement. These factors were (a) age, (b) classroom teaching experience, (c) job satisfaction, (d) teaching assignment, and (e) teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership styles.

Desire for increased involvement. A willingness on the part of the high school teachers who were the subjects of this study to invest time in the shared-decision-making process appeared to be significantly influenced by their educational status, the type of community in which the school was located, and their teaching assignment. No significant differences were found in teachers' expressed willingness to invest time in the shared-decision-making process and the respondents' age or sex, classroom teaching experience, size of school, level of job satisfaction, or perceptions of their principals' leadership styles.

Factors related to involvement. The high school teachers' perception that they could affect the outcome of school-wide decisions through their involvement in the shared-decision-making process appeared to be most directly related to the factors of (a) teachers' educational status, (b) type of community, (c) size of school, (d) teaching assignment, and (e) the principal's leadership

style. None of these factors was associated with more than two of the seven decision categories selected for analysis. Teachers' perceptions of their ability to affect the outcome of decisions in the professional-development decision category was affected most by the factors, with chi-square scores indicating a relationship between this decision area and sex, educational status, type of community, and job satisfaction.

With regard to teachers' perceptions of the potential benefits of their involvement in shared decision making, there appeared to be a link between the benefit category increased influence and (a) sex, (b) educational status, and (c) size of school.

Teachers' perception that ownership represented a potential benefit of their involvement in the decision-making process was affected only by the size of the school.

Workplace democracy, when viewed as a potential benefit of involvement in shared decision making, was associated with the age, sex, and educational status of the teacher.

In the area of teacher-perceived costs of their involvement in the shared-decision-making process, relationships appeared to exist between the cost category loss of time and type of community and job satisfaction, subversion of the collective-bargaining process and type of community, and the possible threat to career advancement and job satisfaction. There were no significant differences in the teachers' ratings of the cost categories time and the possibility of collegial disfavor and the nine independent variables.

When considering the potential hindrances to teacher involvement in shared decision making, lack of time for involvement in shared decision making by teachers appeared to be related to the individual teacher's educational status and the type of community in which the school was located. A lack of opportunity for involvement seemed to be linked to the type of community in which the school was located and the teacher's perception of the principal's leadership style.

The possible noninvolvement of teachers in shared decision making as the result of peer pressure was correlated with the level of job satisfaction.

When teachers chose not to participate in the shared-decision-making process due to their personal philosophy or disinterest, such decisions were associated with their sex and perception of their principals' leadership styles.

Conclusions

1. Principals had a major influence on teachers' involvement in shared decision making. Their administrative behavior and commitment to participatory management were catalysts to such involvement on the part of their teaching staff. While teachers had had some experience with the process, their neutral responses to the potential costs, benefits of, or hindrances to involvement in shared decision making indicated that this process was not used as the primary decision model in their schools.

2. The involvement of teachers in a shared-decision-making process as a participatory-management strategy requires the altering of teachers' and administrators' mind sets about their respective roles in the institution. Traditional attitudes about leadership responsibilities inhibit principal and classroom teacher alike in their efforts to achieve this sharing of responsibility for school-wide decisions. Neither teachers nor administrators appear to have any real commitment to the concept of shared decision making.

Implications for Action

1. School administrators must involve teachers in the decision-making process in a more meaningful way. Ownership is an important element of this involvement.

2. School administrators and boards of education must begin to involve teachers in decisions that affect their classroom environment and influence their general responsibilities as teachers.

3. For teachers' involvement in the decisions of the school to be truly effective, and if the scope of their current involvement is to be broadened, administrators and school boards must find ways to minimize the cost of involvement or hindrances to involvement that are of primary concern to teachers.

4. School administrators must capitalize on teachers' interest in being involved in school-improvement efforts and professional-development planning. Meaningful involvement in these two areas could have a profound positive effect on the climate of the school.

5. School administrators and boards of education need to develop operational models for the involvement of teachers in school-wide decision making that increase the opportunities currently available to teachers for such involvement and assure a broader range of involvement across subject-area disciplines.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Assess and compare the current perceptions of building principals regarding teachers' involvement in shared decision making.

2. Conduct a study to identify teachers' perceptions of ways in which teachers' involvement in school-wide decision making could be increased or made more meaningful.

3. Conduct a study similar to the one reported here, investigating the perceptions of teachers in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.

4. Study the relationship between shared decision making and positive school climate.

5. Conduct studies of teachers' involvement in shared decision making in the school district and professional organization decision domains.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO GATHER DATA FOR THE STUDY

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY AND EXPLAIN
THE FACTORS RELATING TO TEACHERS
AND SHARED DECISION MAKING

PART I

In questions 1-9 you are asked to provide information about your involvement in decisions which directly affect the operation of your high school or to record your opinion about teacher involvement in school decisions. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE DECISIONS REFERRED TO IN THIS SURVEY ARE BUILDING-LEVEL DECISIONS AND NOT CLASSROOM OR SCHOOL DISTRICT DECISIONS.

1. Are you involved or have you been involved in building-level decisions regarding:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
a. the coordination of teaching with other teachers	___	___
b. building-level curriculum	___	___
c. professional development (in-service)	___	___
d. teacher evaluation	___	___
e. school improvement	___	___
f. school personnel needs	___	___
g. the hiring of school personnel	___	___
h. school rules and discipline	___	___
i. the school budget	___	___
j. the settlement of grievances	___	___
k. extra-curricular activities	___	___
l. school policies	___	___

2. If you checked Yes for any of the kinds of building-level decisions listed in question #1, what were the results of your involvement in these decision areas?

	<u>RESULTS</u>		
	<u>POSITIVE</u>	<u>NEGATIVE</u>	<u>NEUTRAL</u>
a. the coordination of teaching with other teachers	_____	_____	_____
b. building-level curriculum	_____	_____	_____
c. professional development (in-service)	_____	_____	_____
d. teacher evaluation	_____	_____	_____
e. school improvement	_____	_____	_____
f. school personnel needs	_____	_____	_____
g. the hiring of school personnel	_____	_____	_____
h. school rules and discipline	_____	_____	_____
i. the school budget	_____	_____	_____
j. the settlement of grievances	_____	_____	_____
k. extra-curricular activities	_____	_____	_____
l. school policies	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS: _____

3. In which kinds of building-level decisions would you like to be involved? (Your choices need not be from the list included in question #2.)

4. How would you describe your overall involvement in building-level decision making? (Check one.)

_____ Very involved _____ Somewhat involved _____ Not involved

5. Do you believe that you can affect the outcome of building-level decisions regarding:

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
a. the coordination of teaching with other teachers	_____	_____
b. building-level curriculum	_____	_____
c. professional development (in-service)	_____	_____
d. teacher evaluation	_____	_____
e. school improvement	_____	_____
f. school personnel needs	_____	_____
g. the hiring of school personnel	_____	_____
h. school rules and discipline	_____	_____
i. the school budget	_____	_____
j. the settlement of grievances	_____	_____
k. extra-curricular activities	_____	_____
l. school policies	_____	_____

6. If you had opportunities to become involved in building-level decision making how much time would you be willing to invest in this activity?

_____ A great deal _____ Some _____ Little or
_____ of time _____ time _____ no time

7. Which of the following do you view as advantages of involvement in building-level decision making? (You may check more than one.)

- a. increased teacher influence _____
b. a sense of accomplishment _____
c. a feeling of cooperation _____
d. increased workplace democracy _____

8. Which of the following do you consider possible disadvantages of your involvement in building-level decisions? (You may check more than one.)

- a. loss of time _____
b. reduction in personal autonomy _____
c. risk of negative reactions from colleagues _____
d. risk that collective bargaining efforts may be jeopardized _____
e. risk that such involvement may affect future chances for advancement _____

9. Which of the following factors hinder your involvement in building-level decision making? (You may check more than one.)

- a. lack of time _____
b. lack of opportunity _____
c. your principal's leadership style _____
d. peer pressure _____
e. personal philosophy _____
f. disinterest _____

PART II

Please respond to the following questions. They are designed to provide information which will be used in the interpretation of your responses in Part I of this survey.

1. Your sex: ☐ Female ☐ Male (Check one.)
2. What is your age? (Check one.)
☐ under 30 years of age
☐ 30-39
☐ 40-49
☐ 50 years of age or older
3. What is your educational status? (Check one.)
☐ Bachelors Degree
☐ Masters Degree
☐ Educational Specialist
☐ Doctorate
4. How many years of classroom teaching experience do you have? (Check one.)
☐ 1-5 years
☐ 6-10 years
☐ 11-15 years
☐ 16-20 years
☐ over 20 years
5. In what type of community is your school located? (Check one.)
☐ Rural
☐ Small town
☐ City
☐ Suburban

6. What is the student enrollment in your school? (Check one.)

_____ Under 319

_____ 319-626 students

_____ 627-1204 students

_____ over 1205 students

7. Which of the following statements most accurately describe your degree of job satisfaction? (Check one.)

_____ Very satisfied

_____ Satisfied

_____ Dissatisfied

8. What is your current teaching assignment? (Please check the area in which you spend the majority of your time.)

_____ English

_____ Mathematics

_____ Science

_____ Social Studies

_____ Art

_____ Music

_____ Home Economics

_____ Business

_____ Industrial Arts

_____ Physical Education

_____ Guidance and Counseling

_____ Library/Media

_____ Special Education

9. How would you categorize your building principal's administrative style? (Check one.)

_____exercises control over all school decisions

_____exercises control over most school decisions

_____exercises control over some school decisions

_____exercises control over few school decisions

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

18370 Country Avenue
Spring Lake, Michigan 49456
January 1985

I am conducting a study in cooperation with Dr. Samuel Moore, Department of Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University, which will identify and explain the degree of teacher participation in school decision making.

As a part of this process, I am requesting your assistance in the gathering of data for this study. To facilitate the work of this study, I am asking that you:

- (1) distribute the enclosed questionnaires to all of the teachers on your staff for completion
- (2) collect the questionnaires completed by your staff
- (3) place all completed questionnaires in the stamped, self-addressed envelope and return them to me by February 11

This questionnaire is designed to be completed quickly and easily. Please ask your teachers to avoid placing their names on the survey. Please be assured that all information provided will be confidential.

So that I can keep track of who has returned the study and still maintain complete anonymity, a post card is enclosed to return at the time you return the questionnaires. Please mail this post card separately.

I know that this is not the most ideal time of year to intrude on your time, but it is prime time in which to gather the reflections of your staff regarding their involvement in school decision making.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Hicks, Principal
Spring Lake Jr-Sr High School

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS

18370 Country Avenue
Spring Lake, Michigan 49456
January 1985

Dear Association President:

In recent months the spotlight of public attention and concern has fallen upon our public high schools. A multitude of reports and recommendations for reform have accompanied this attention. Decisions concerning which of these recommendations will be implemented will be made by local school districts across the country. The degree to which teachers are involved in these decisions may ultimately determine the success of such efforts.

I am conducting a study in cooperation with Dr. Samuel Moore, Department of Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University, which will identify and explain the degree of teacher participation in school decision making.

The subjects of this study are high school teachers in Ottawa, Muskegon, and Kent Counties.

High school administrators have agreed to assist me in the distribution of the survey instrument to high school teachers in your district. You have my assurance that the information provided by teachers in your district will be kept in strict confidence.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to contact me at (616) 846-5500, Extension 56; or evenings at (616) 842-4523.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Hicks, Principal
Spring Lake Jr./Sr. High School

APPENDIX D

POSTCARD RETURNED BY PRINCIPALS

Our teachers have completed the survey on shared decision making, and I have put it in the mail.

Principal _____

School _____

Number of surveys distributed: _____

Number of surveys completed: _____

____ I would like to receive a copy of the results of this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alutto, Joseph A., and Belasco, James A. "A Typology for Participation in Organizational Decision Making." Administrative Science Quarterly 17 (March 1972): 117-25.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Function of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Blumberg, Paul. Industrial Democracy. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- Boyer, Ernest H. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Bredo, Anneke E., and Bredo, Eric R. A Case Study of Educational Innovation in a Junior High School: Interaction of Environment and Structure. Palo Alto, Calif: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1975.
- Bruno, James E., and Nottingham, M. A. Collegial Teams. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1976.
- Coch, Lester, and French, John R. P. Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations 1 (1948): 512-32.
- Cohen, D. "The Failure of High Schools and the Progress of Education." Daedalus (Summer 1981): 69-88.
- Cohen, Elizabeth G. Problems and Prospects of Teaming. Research and Development Memorandum No. 143. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.
- Conway, James A. "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision-Making and Their Perceptions of Their Schools as Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 1976): 130-39.
- _____. "The Myth, Mystery, and Mastery of Participative Decision Making in Education." Educational Administration Quarterly 20 (Summer 1984): 11-40.

- Corwin, Ronald G. Militant Professionalism: A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Cusick, Philip. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Dornbusch, Sanford M., and Scott, W. Richard. Evaluation and Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Duckworth, Kenneth, and Jovick, Thomas. "Task Interdependence, Communication, and Team Management Among Elementary School Teachers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1978.
- Duke, Daniel L. "Adults Can be Discipline Problems Too!" Psychology in the Schools 15 (October 1978): 522-28.
- _____. "Developing a Comprehensive In-Service Program." NASSP Bulletin 61 (April 1977): 66-71.
- _____. "Environmental Influence on Classroom Management." In Classroom Management. Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education. Edited by Daniel L. Duke. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- _____. The Retransformation of the School. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978.
- _____. "A Systematic Management Plan for School Discipline." NASSP Bulletin 61 (January 1977): 1-10.
- _____; Donmoyer, Robert; and Farman, Greg. "Emerging Legal Issues Related to Classroom Management." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 305-309.
- Duke, Daniel L., and Perry, Cheryl. "Can Alternative Schools Succeed Where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B. F. Skinner Have Failed?" Adolescence 13 (Fall 1978).
- Duke, Daniel L.; Showers, Beverly K.; and Imber, Michael. "Teacher Involvement in Organizational Decision-Making: A Research Proposal." Unpublished research proposal, 1978.
- _____. "Teachers and Shared Decision-Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement." Educational Administration Quarterly 16 (Winter 1980).
- Far West Teacher Corps Network. In-Service Education: Criteria for Local Programs. Bellingham: Western Washington State College, 1976.

- Floden, Robert E. "A Policy Capturing Study of Teacher Decisions About Content." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1978.
- Francis, Paul. Beyond Control? A Study of Discipline in the Comprehensive School. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1975.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press, 1954.
- Hanson, E. Mark. "Organizational Control in Educational Systems: A Case Study of Governance in Schools." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1978.
- Holdaway, E. "Facet and Overall Satisfaction of Teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly 14 (Winter 1978): 45.
- Hoy, W., and Forsythe, P. "Organizational Status and Work Alienation." Educational Administration Quarterly 17 (Spring 1981): 31-37.
- Hoy, W.; Newland, W.; and Blazovsky, R. "Subordinate Loyalty to Superior, Esprit and Aspects of Bureaucratic Structure." Educational Administration Quarterly 13 (Winter 1977): 71-85.
- Imber, Michael. "Teacher Power and Curriculum: A Potential for Reform." Unpublished manuscript, 1978.
- Johnson, Rudolph. "The Relationship Between Teacher Collaboration and Teacher and Principal Influence and Participation in School Decision-Making." Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.
- Joyce, Bruce R. et al. Issues to Face. In-Service Teacher Education Report I. Palo Alto, Calif.: In-Service Teacher Education Concepts Project, 1976.
- Kirst, Michael W., and Walker, Decker F. "An Analysis of Curriculum Policy-Making." Review of Educational Research 41 (December 1971): 479-509.
- Lammers, C. J. "Power and Participation in Decision-Making in Formal Organizations." American Journal of Sociology 73 (1967): 201-16.
- Lortie, David. School Teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- March, James, and Simon, Herbert. Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1958.

- Marram, Gwen D.; Dornbusch, Sanford M.; and Scott, W. Richard. The Impact of Teaming and the Visibility of Teaching on the Professionalism of Elementary School Teachers. Technical Report No. 33. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972.
- McConaham, John B. et al. "Evaluation of High School in the Community: New Haven, Connecticut, 1973." New Haven: Educational Research Service, 1973.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey Wall, and Marsh, David D. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record 80 (September 1978): 69-94.
- Meyer, John, and Cohen, Elizabeth. The Impact of the Open-Space School Upon Teacher Influence and Autonomy: The Effects of an Organizational Innovation. Technical Report No. 21. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1971.
- Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals and Michigan Department of Education. "Preliminary Report of the Michigan Commission on High Schools." September 1983.
- Miskal, C.; Fevurly, R.; and Stewart, J. "Organizational Structures and Processes, Perceived School Effectiveness, Loyalty and Job Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly 15 (Fall 1979): 97-118.
- Miskal, C.; McDonald, D.; and Bloom, S. "Structural and Expectancy Linkages Within Schools and Organizational Effectiveness." Educational Administration Quarterly 19 (Winter 1983): 49-82.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: April 26, 1983.
- National Institute of Education. Instructional Personnel Utilization. National Conference on Studies in Teaching. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.
- National Science Board. Educating Americans for the 21st Century. Report of the Commission on Pre-college Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, 1983.
- Patchen, Martin. Participation, Achievement and Involvement on the Job. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Pateman, Carole. Participation and Democratic Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

- Raywid, M. "Schools of Choice: Their Current Nature and Prospects." Phi Delta Kappan (June 1983): 686.
- Roper, Susan Stavert; Deal, Terrence E.; and Dornbusch, Sanford M. A Pilot Test of Collegial Evaluation for Teachers. Research and Development Memorandum No. 142. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.
- San Jose Teachers Association. The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project. San Jose, Calif.: San Jose Teacher Involvement Project, 1977.
- Schmuck, Patricia; Paddock, Susan; and Packard, John. Management Implications of Team Teaching. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Organizational Policy and Management, 1977.
- Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies--Areas of Conflict." In Professionalization. Edited by Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Sharma, Chiranjai Lai. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook 3(8) (1955).
- Stephens, Jo. "Some Current Issues for Teacher In-Service Education." In In-Service Education for Teachers' Centers. Edited by Elizabeth Adams. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1975.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. (ed.). Control in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Row, 1947.
- Vavrus, M. J. "The Relationship of Teacher Alienation to School Workplace Characteristics and Career Stages of Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.
- Walker, Decker F. "How Does a Curriculum Work?" Unpublished manuscript, 1977.
- Waller, W. The Sociology of Teaching. Cited in Licata, J., and Willower, D. "Student Brinkmanship and the School as a Social System." Educational Administration Quarterly 2 (Spring 1975): 1-2.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Glencoe: Free Press, 1947.

Worthy, J. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale."
American Sociological Review 15(2) (1970): 169-79.

Yarger, Sam J., et al. Creative Authority and Collaboration.
 Inservice Teacher Education Report IV. Palo Alto, Calif.:
 Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project, June 1976.

Zielinski, A., and Hoy, W. "Isolation and Alienation in Elementary
 Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly 19 (Spring
 1983): 27-45.