

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

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 copyright 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 original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 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.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9303954

**The relationship of teachers' involvement in participative
decision making at different career stages and teacher career
satisfaction**

Stowe, Frances Gail Dixon, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHERS' INVOLVEMENT IN PARTICIPATIVE
DECISION MAKING AT DIFFERENT CAREER STAGES AND
TEACHER CAREER SATISFACTION

by

Frances D. Stowe

A Dissertation Submitted
to the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1992

Approved by



Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

C.M. Acullles

Committee Members

Mary W. Olson

[Signature]

[Signature]

1/15/92
Date of Acceptance by Committee

12/12/91
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Charles Achilles go my deepest thanks both academically and personally. More than an advisor, he has been a supporter and guide. Without him this study would not have been completed.

To David Shellman, my friend and companion in this endeavor, I owe a special debt of appreciation. His enthusiastic support was indispensable.

Nor could I fail to mention my entire family for their continued patience and support even when the going got tough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview of Participative Decision Making	1
Statement of Problem	7
Purpose of The Study	8
Research Questions	8
Significance of the Study	9
Theoretical Framework	10
Limitations	11
Definitions	12
Overview of the Study	15
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
Decision Theory	17
Defining Participatory Decision Making for Educational Organizations	24
Reforms Moving Education Toward Participatory Decision Making (PDM)	26
Purpose of Participatory Decision Making	39
Advantages and Disadvantages of PDM	41
Job Satisfaction	42
Teacher Work Attitudes and Career Satisfaction	46
A Synopsis of PDM Reforms in North Carolina	53
Summary	56
III. OUTLINE OF PROCEDURES	58
Population And Sample	58
The Instrument	60
Instructional/Technical Domain Issues	62
Schoolwide/Managerial Domain Issues	63
Validity and Reliability	67
Data Collection	69
Analysis of Data	70

IV. PRESENTATION AN ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	75
Description and Analysis of the Data	75
Independent Variables	76
Dependent Variable	82
Personal and Situational Variables	82
Career Stages	83
Statistical Analysis of the Data	89
Study of the Research Questions	89
Research Question 1	93
Research Question 2	96
Research Question 3	97
Research Questoin 4	98
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	100
Overview of the Study	100
Summary of the Findings	102
Conclusions Related to the Research Questions	103
Conclusion One	103
Conclusion Two	105
Conclusion Three	106
Conclusion Four	108
Implications for Practice	111
Implications for Further Research	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	115
APPENDICES	126
APPENDIX A	127
APPENDIX B	130
APPENDIX C	141
APPENDIX D	143
APPENDIX E	144
APPENDIX F	160
APPENDIX G	167

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE SCHOOLS 59
4.1	RELIABILITY (INTERNAL CONSISTENCY) COEFFICIENTS REGARDING DECISION INVOLVEMENT SCALES 76
4.2	OVERALL MEAN DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ACTUAL, DESIRED, AND DISCREPANCY SCALES 78
4.3	OVERALL FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR INTEREST SCALE 80
4.4	OVERALL FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR EXPERTISE SCALE 81
4.5	MEANS FOR VARIABLES BY CAREER STAGE 84
4.6	JOB SATISFACTION SCALES BY CAREER STAGES 86
4.7	PERSONAL VARIABLE FREQUENCIES BY CAREER STAGE 87
4.8	CORRELATION MATRIX FOR SURVEY SCALES 90
4.9	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR MODIFIED DECISION SCORES 92
4.10	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR INTEREST SCORES 93
4.11	DECISION CONDITION RANKING 94
4.12	ONEWAY ANOVA FOR ACTUAL INVOLVEMENT AMONG THREE GROUPS: ESTABLISHMENT, ADVANCEMENT, MAINTENANCE 96
4.13	CORRELATIONS OF DECISION CONDITION SCORE WITH JOB SATISFACTION SCORE BY CAREER STAGE 98
4.14	TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE CAREER STAGES 99

STOWE, FRANCES DIXON, Ed. D. The Relationship of Teachers' Involvement in Participative Decision Making at Different Career Stages and Teacher Career Satisfaction. (1992) Directed by Dr. Charles M. Achilles. 175 pp.

The purposes of the study were to investigate the involvement of teachers in the building-level participative decision making process and to determine if the different stages of teacher career development affect involvement in the decision making process and/or job satisfaction.

The focus of the literature review agrees that participation does increase feelings of self-worth and self-confidence. As a change strategy, participation may enhance results, but it is not a necessary condition for change. Most studies support the proposition that participation in organizational decisions increases satisfaction with the organization and the job. Satisfaction is a function of the type of decision that participants are involved in as well as their degree of involvement. The amount of desired participation by teachers is influenced by their career stage and experience.

A survey methodology was used to gather data by means of a questionnaire that measured teachers' decision condition, zone of acceptance, and level of job satisfaction. The instrument also included personal data reflecting teachers' stage of career development. The primary analytic procedures used were ANOVA, Pearson product-moment correlation, and t-tests.

The major findings show that: (1) a significant positive relationship exists between teachers' decision condition and their level of overall job satisfaction, (2) there is no significant relationship between the teacher's stage of career development and his/her actual or desired involvement in decision making, (3) teachers are not as actively involved in decision making as they would like to be , and (4) teachers have greater interest in instructional matters than managerial matters.

The findings support the conclusion that building level administrators interested in positive change should concentrate on involving all teachers, regardless of career stage, in technical decisions.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Participative Decision Making

In the past two decades there have been some definite negative trends in education.

"Currently, American education is plagued with high staff turnover, chronic absenteeism, discipline problems, lack of commitment, declining pupil competence, permissiveness, teacher burn-out, low self-esteem, sense of helplessness, frustration, and disappointment." (Chapey, 1983, p.394).

Many state authorities have attempted to address these trends by developing new educational policies.

Numerous alternative solutions to these problems have been suggested. One solution is to empower teachers to participate in the decision-making process. "Tight state control promises accountability, but we cannot achieve excellence if all schools are required to meet rigidly controlled mandates that deny the individual differences of students and suppress the creativity of teachers." (Boyer, 1988, p. 3). One rationale behind participative decision making is the belief that the closer a decision is made to those served by the decision, the more likely that those influenced by the decision will buy into, or feel a part of, the decision. Thus, empowered teachers tend to feel a sense

of ownership in their schools' successes and failures (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Scholarly interest in employee participation began as long ago as World War II. A diverse set of practices and studies addresses this construct. Coch and French in 1948 published their manuscript on overcoming resistance to change. During World War II, Lewin presented forceful findings on the impact participation can have on attitude change. Worthy (1950), in his study of Sears, Roebuck, and Co. in the area of employee attitudes and morale, found that organizations with a simplified structure and a greatly decentralized administration lend themselves to better employee morale and better operating efficiency. Other more recent reports take a much more applied focus on participation, for instance, dealing with organization of human resources (e.g., Bowers, 1976; McConkey, 1980; Bello & Clevereley, 1980; and Wingis, 1981). There appears to be considerable interest in the outcomes of participation (Locke, 1979; Latham & Yukl, 1978; Dickson, 1982). For example, Locke identified four broad categories of decisions. Alutto and Belasco (1972) studied a conceptualization of participation that was based on the balance between the influence that an employee would like to have on the job, and the influence that was available to him/her. Vanek (1975) addressed the importance of a description of the types of decisions that fell into the

realm of a participatory system. Studies by Neider (1980) confirmed a positive linear relationship between participation and satisfaction.

An examination of the teaching career suggests that teaching is different from many other careers. The initial image of teaching is that teachers have substantial autonomy to run their classrooms as they wish. That is often not the case. Teachers are cut off from their colleagues much of the day. Within their classrooms many teachers operate within a rather complex set of expectations about what and how much material they must cover. What initially appears as autonomy is felt by many teachers as isolation (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1981; Sarason, 1971). Job challenge is limited as teachers may be teaching the same courses over and over. Teaching new students each year poses some challenge; yet, after several years even that challenge can dull and give way to routine (Sarason, 1971). Furthermore, financial compensation for teachers tends to be tightly tied to seniority. As Lortie (1975) describes it, teaching is unstaged and front loaded. That is, teachers know what they will earn and that long service brings limited salary increases. Special performance or merit is seldom recognized through financial reward.

The look at the teaching profession that emerges from the "Second Gallop/Phi Delta Kappa Poll of Teacher Attitudes Toward the Public Schools" (Elam, 1989) is not admirable.

"Teachers tend to regard themselves as martyrs. Overwhelmingly, they believe that they are unappreciated and underrewarded." (Elam, 1989, p. 785). Teachers see their own services as more valuable than most other occupations, but they place their prestige at the bottom of the list. Teachers are convinced that they do not have enough control over such things as setting discipline policies for their schools, establishing grading policies, and determining academic standards.

Now, as to how much decision-making teachers want to do, I think that while they are mainly interested in curriculum and instruction - that's the stuff they know and care about - the specifics of running the school will have to be worked out over the long haul as new structures are developed. We can't any longer just make a list of duties: the principal does this, teachers do that. This will take changing behaviors and attitudes on all sides, which is uncomfortable and threatening for all concerned. But because it is difficult doesn't mean it cannot or should not be done.

We must learn to use teachers' strengths in a lot of different ways. It is very different for teachers to be put on committees by administrators, as has been customary, rather than being in control of - and responsible for - the changes they themselves initiate or take on (Lieberman, 1989, p. 25).

Teachers who assigned more importance to their leadership activities as a basis for judging their own professional successes were less satisfied with their careers; those who operated in a leadership role were more satisfied with their careers (Chapman & Lowther, 1982). Job challenge for a teacher can be quite constrained by the structure of the schools (Super & Hall, 1978). Leadership and new learning bring few external rewards within the

school and, therefore, are not particularly effective ways for teachers to advance their careers. Because of the cellular nature of the schools (Lortie, 1975), a teacher's advances in these areas may not even be noticed by others in the school. When they are noticed, leadership activities may lead to conflict with school officials who may see this advancement as a threat to their own leadership and career advancement (Pauly, 1978). In his classic study on competition and cooperation in a bureaucracy, Blau (1954) found that in the absence of a united group, strong competition developed as each individual strove for outstanding performance as an alternative way of relieving anxiety over status. Sarason (1971) reported that those in his study who had been teaching for five or more years, without exception, admitted that they no longer experienced their work with the enthusiasm, excitement, and sense of mission and challenge they once did. Grumet (1989) stated that when teachers were provided with conditions that permitted and encouraged them to work together and to address issues that really faced them and their students, they could and did bring important changes to schools.

The reward structure of the school may be out of line with the source of a teacher's own sense of satisfaction and accomplishment. The organization of the school appears to work against the needs of the teacher. Theory and previous research support the idea that increased opportunities for

teachers to exercise leadership and to continue their learning might foster greater career satisfaction. This suggests a need for a fundamental examination of the impact of participative decision making on the teacher.

Increasing the challenge of jobs has been an objective of organizational theorists for many years. This emphasis has been expressed by those advocating greater participation in decision making (e.g., Likert, 1961). Others have advocated redesign of the job itself (e.g., Herzberg, 1966). In each case, the emphasis has been upon reducing the repetitiveness in jobs and upon increasing opportunities for creativity and autonomy in decision making.

Increasing a job's complexity results in higher challenge. This has been credited with leading to higher job involvement (Hall, 1976) and higher organizational identification (Brown, 1969). Still others (e.g., Dunnette, Arvey, & Banas, 1973) have found that job challenge early in a person's career was important to developing commitment both to the organization and to the career in later years.

There may be situations or conditions under which increasing a job's complexity will lead to confusion, ambiguity, and perhaps frustration. Evidence exists to suggest that these variables may vary systematically with a person's career stage (Hall & Mansfield, 1975). There is also evidence that there are identifiable career stages through which teachers progress and that needs are different

during various career stages (e.g., Erikson, 1959; Sheehy, 1976; Levinson, 1978; and Oja, 1980). Stumpf and Rabinowitz (1981) found that career stage has an important moderating effect on facets of job satisfaction and that role perception was related to performance.

Participants at the Northeast Regional Conference on Joint Decision Making held at Hofstra University (Hempstead, N. Y., 1989) agreed on the major advantages and disadvantages of school-based management. Some advantages included increased job satisfaction among teachers and administrators, enhanced continuity, better communication, and positive effect on student achievement. The following are a few of the disadvantages: strife among teachers, decrease in teacher morale, problems are solved slowly, and critical educational issues are by-passed.

Statement of Problem

Literature and research have shown that teachers are becoming less satisfied with their profession. Evidence regarding decision-making theory (Lipham, 1974) has shown the importance of involving those affected by a decision in the making of the decision. However, is it possible to over-involve individuals in the decision making process? Could over-involvement lead to lower levels of job satisfaction? Does career stage restrain or enhance the different aspects of job satisfaction as suggested by Gould

and Hawkins, 1978; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1981; and Stumpf and Rabinowitz, 1981?

Purpose of The Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the involvement of teachers in the building-level participative decision-making process. In addition, the stages of teacher career development were analyzed in order to identify possible relationships between teachers' involvement in the decision-making process at different career stages and levels of teacher career satisfaction.

The major issues of the study were first, to determine the educational reforms that led toward the use of participative decision making; second, to comprehend the pros and cons of using participative decision making; third, to understand the career stages experienced by teachers; and fourth, to ascertain relationships among teachers' years in the profession, participative decision making, and career satisfaction.

Research Questions

In order to address the purpose of this study I have sought to answer the following research questions:

1. In what areas of the decision-making process, if any, do teachers want to be involved?
2. Is the teacher's stage of career development a factor in his/her actual involvement in participative decision making?

3. What relationship exists between the teachers' zone of acceptance and decision condition?
4. What relationships exist between a teacher's decision condition and job satisfaction at the different career stages of teaching?

Significance of the Study

National reports issued in the last few years have pointed out that American education is not what it could be. The National Commission on Excellence in Education's report, A Nation at Risk (1983) listed our nation's teachers as causes for the "rising tide of mediocrity". Many problems stated earlier such as, chronic absenteeism, low self-esteem, and frustration, may be partially caused by lack of career satisfaction on the part of the teacher. Some scholars (e.g., Gould & Hawkins, 1978; Stumpf & Rabinowitz, 1981; and Slocum & Cron, 1985) state that career satisfaction depends on participative decision making and various career stages.

Some past studies have explored participative decision making and its effect on teachers, schools, and administration (Gouldner, 1954; Tannenbaum, 1968; Mulder, 1971; Alutto & Belasco, 1972). The present study will advance the knowledge base by investigating participative decision making at the various stages of teachers' career

development and how that relates to teachers' feelings of satisfaction toward their job at each stage.

The study results should contribute to a better understanding of teacher involvement in the decision making process. The results should enable education authorities to help teachers avoid such problems as boredom, frustration, lack of commitment, and a sense of futility. These findings should have relevance for school principals in their efforts to develop effective participative decision making structures and processes. Decision issues in which teachers desire greater, less, or even the same amount of involvement in the decision making process should be identified. Moderating variables which affect decision condition and career satisfaction should be pointed out. This study will provide a data base which will be useful in future research regarding teacher decision making. Finally, results should set the basis for continued use and growth of participative decision making in North Carolina schools.

Theoretical Framework

There has been general acknowledgement in the literature that participation of teachers in decision making yields substantial benefits both to teachers and to schools. Some theorists have hypothesized that the effect of participation is situational, depending on mediating factors such as individual career stage.

The population for this study included teachers from nine schools which were listed as North Carolina schools participating in pilot restructuring programs. The population consisted of 193 teachers from various levels and locations.

This descriptive study used standardized questionnaires to gather pertinent data. The data gathered determined the desired and actual extent of participative decision making, the degree of job satisfaction, and the career stage of each participant. A correlation between the decision condition scores and job satisfaction scores was determined for each career stage (see this definition on page 13). Finally, it was determined whether there was a significant difference between these correlations for each career stage.

Limitations

Limitations to the methodology of this study include:

1. the limited population. The population is limited only to teachers in those schools in North Carolina involved in some form of North Carolina Association of Educators' participative decision making. The entire population of each school was used. There was no attempt at random selection of schools or teachers. This limited generalization beyond the population considered.

2. the various facets of job satisfaction. Not all possible facets of job satisfaction were included in the study.
3. the identification of career stages. The literature does not yield a great number of procedures for assessing stages of teachers' careers; therefore, career stages were identified by the number of years in the teaching profession.
4. the 20 decision issues. These issues were only representative of the numerous decision issues which arise within the school setting.
5. the self reporting by respondents. The instrument used to determine the individual teacher's perception of the variables depended on the self report of the respondents.

Definitions

1. Actual involvement is the current extent of involvement in the decision making process regarding 20 selected decision issues as perceived by teachers (Thierbach, 1980).
2. Career satisfaction is the congruity between what a person thinks he/she should receive and what he/she feels he/she actually does receive for their efforts.
3. Career stages are normative phases in professional careers. For this study, career stages were determined by the subjects' years in the profession. The three

stages were identified as establishment (0 up to 4 years), advancement (4 up to 10 years), and maintenance (over 10 years) (Rush, Peacock, & Milkovich, 1980).

4. Decision condition is one of three general types determined by the discrepancy between perceived actual and desired extent of involvement:
 - a. decision deprivation - decision involvement less than desired,
 - b. decision equilibrium - decision involvement as much as desired, and
 - c. decision saturation - decision involvement more than desired (Alutto & Belasco, 1972).
5. Decision discrepancy is the difference between the actual and desired levels of involvement in the decision making process (Thierbach, 1980).
6. Decision domains are qualitatively different types of decisions made at the technical (decisions directly related to the operation of the school) or managerial (decisions regarding schoolwide issues) levels (Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978).
7. Desired involvement is the level or extent of involvement desired by teachers regarding 20 selected decision issues (Thierbach, 1980).
8. Expertise in decision making is an individual's perceived competence regarding a decision issue.

9. Extent of decision involvement is the degree to which a teacher perceives that he/she is involved in the decision making process in respect to a particular decision issue.
10. Interest in decision making is an individual's personal stake or interest regarding a decision issue as reported by the Decision Involvement Analysis.
11. Job complexity is the extent to which the job includes repetitiveness and routineness, provides opportunities for exercising independent judgement, and requires creativeness and originality in the performance of duties (Scott, 1966).
12. Participative decision making (PDM) is planned and systematic involvement of teachers in the school's decision making process.
13. Site-based Management (SBM) is a management operation which empowers school building principals with decision-making power to manage their schools backed up with the necessary money and the power to authorize the expenditure of that money. The principal is empowered to run the school based upon organized advice from faculty, parents, and students (Cawelti, 1989). In North Carolina a School Improvement Team is part of SBM.
14. Zone of acceptance is the range of behavior within which subordinates are ready to accept the decisions

made for them by others. The zone of acceptance, also known as the zone of indifference, is determined by a combined measure of an individual's interest and expertise (Clear & Seager, 1971).

Overview of the Study

This chapter presents the overview of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, a statement of the research questions, the significance of the study, the theoretical framework of the study, the limitations of the study, and the important definitions to the study. Chapter II includes a review of the related literature. Chapter III presents an outline of the procedures followed to complete the study. Chapter IV includes the data and analysis of the data and Chapter V presents a summary of the study and findings, conclusions, and implications for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Despite the promises and early successes of many school reform efforts, experts agree that reform will be difficult to sustain without powerful local initiatives. The current (early 1990's) reform effort is involving teachers in accordance with ideas expressed in the Carnegie Report (1987). That report concluded that teachers were not the problem in education but that they would be part of the solution. Unlike other "reforms" this one does promise to attend to some findings of social scientists over the past 40 years, such as job satisfaction, career stages, and participatory decision making (PDM) as possible ways to help the reform be successful. A popular catchword is "school-based (or site-based) management", or SBM. "The time is ripe to implement a school-based management strategy to sustain school reforms through active involvement of educators at the school building level." (Carr, 1988, p. 16).

Participation in decision making by those who are or will be influenced by the decision outcome has been and continues to be an area of significant concern for administrators in education and in other institutions, such as business.

This chapter presents a review of important research and literature on topics closely related to the present study. These topic areas that provide a base for the current study are: decision theory, defining PDM for educational organizations, reforms moving education toward PDM, involvement, the purpose of PDM, advantages and disadvantages of PDM, job satisfaction, teacher work attitudes and career satisfaction, and PDM reforms in North Carolina.

Decision Theory

Decision making relies on human judgement or conclusion. Therefore, decisions are subject to a number of factors that are difficult to control. Different interests, experiences, needs, and expertise all affect a decision. Recognition of these interacting variables has led to the development of various models for decision making.

March and Simon (1970) presented the concept of rationality in decision making. According to their assertion, the rational person makes optimal choices in a highly specified and clearly defined environment. The decision-making process should allow decision makers to (1) know most of the set of alternatives from which they will choose their action, (2) know the consequences that will follow the selection of each alternative, (3) rank the sets of consequences from the most preferred to the least

preferred, and (4) select the alternative leading to the preferred set of consequences.

Lipham (1974) described a model of decision making that dealt with the need for the formulation of alternatives within the decision-making process. This model allows the decision maker to enter the process at various points and includes other individuals in the decision making. Lipham's model is based on the premise that decision making is influenced by information and values when a problem is identified, alternative solutions are developed and compared, and a choice is made, implemented, and evaluated.

The aspect of Lipham's model that relates most closely to this study is decision involvement. Decision involvement deals with who is involved in decision making and to what extent. Groups who can be involved in education decision making include, for example, legislators, the board of education, central office staff, building-level administrators, teachers, students, parents, etc.

In 1975, Greenberg tried to clarify the major issues in the debates on workplace participation. Conway (1984) reported that Greenberg identified and discussed four major schools of thought that approach participation from clearly divergent perspectives:

1. The Management School that views participation in terms of productivity - that is, by increasing participation it is possible to reduce job

fragmentation and alienation, and to increase morale which in turn leads to higher worker output. The rationale of this school is expediency rather than humanitarianism; the goals are productivity, efficiency, and profitability.

2. The Humanistic Psychology School sees in the work environment a set of conditions that are not conducive to the healthy development of the individual. This school argues on the grounds of ethics as well as practical grounds for job enrichment, decision participation, and the like.
3. Democratic Theory provides the background of the third school. Here it is argued that the democratic personality cannot emerge in a setting that does not allow for participatory modes of behavior, particularly since democracy is built upon direct participation as its primary form of governance.
4. The Participatory Left is the fourth school and views participation as a means to educate the populace and the working class to an anti-capitalist, revolutionary consciousness. (p. 13).

Vroom (1959) identified administrative power and the need for independence as two personality variables that may be partially responsible for varying degrees of teacher involvement in decision making. In 1973, Vroom and Yetton attempted to determine the form and amount of participation in decision making that should be used at different times. Their research was based on whether or not the administrator utilized the appropriate person to help solve a problem. Vroom and Yetton developed a model which recognized the need for various forms of involvement when considering different issues. They found that managers used a less participative form of decision making when they possessed all necessary information, the problem was well structured, subordinates' acceptance of the decision was not critical for

implementation, or the personal goals of the subordinates were not compatible with the goals of the organization.

Bridges (1969) extended the early work of Vroom (1959) by developing a design for shared decision making based on Barnard's (1938) concept of the "zone of indifference". Barnard stated that subordinates had a zone of indifference within which an administrator's decision would be accepted without question. Bridges argued that many principals did not realize that they did not have to involve their staffs consistently in all decisions. Bridges developed the idea that administrators should apply a test of interest and expertise before seeking the aid of teachers in decision making. The combination of interest and expertise helps determine whether or not a decision issue lies in a teacher's zone of indifference. Bridges suggested two proposals regarding the zone of indifference. First, as the principal involves teachers in making decisions located in their zone of indifference, involvement will be less effective. Second, as the principal involves teachers in making decisions outside the realm of their zone of indifference, involvement will be more effective. The problem appears to be the need to recognize what issues fall within the teachers' zones of indifference.

Clear and Seager (1971) studied the zone of indifference calling it the "zone of acceptance". They found that when relating to either organizational

maintenance or to teachers' professional judgements, administrators' need for control was greater than the teachers' zone of acceptance.

Hoy and Miskel (1982) stated that if subordinates have a high level of interest in the issue and have knowledge that would help in making the decision then this fell outside the zone of acceptance and they should be involved in the decision-making process. However, if the issue was not of interest and they did not have considerable expertise in the matter, then the decision was within their zone of acceptance. Therefore, involvement in the decision may not be important and perhaps even should be avoided.

Another area that must be considered in decision making is how often an individual should be involved. Alutto and Belasco (1972) presented a theory of decision involvement based on the discrepancy between the actual and the desired levels of decision involvement. They stated that involvement could be measured by decision deprivation, a condition in which individuals were involved in fewer decisions than desired; decision equilibrium, a condition in which individuals were involved in as many decisions as were desired; and decision saturation, a condition in which individuals were involved in a greater number of decisions than desired.

Alutto and Belasco studied the relationship between the condition of decision involvement experienced by teachers

and their levels of satisfaction. They defined satisfaction as a willingness to remain within a school organization despite encouragement to leave. Earlier research themes assumed that denial of involvement in decision issues of importance could lead to lower levels of satisfaction. Alutto and Belasco supported this assumption and concluded that it was necessary for administrators to identify those small groups among teachers who were denied involvement and then to design a participative management program which met their needs.

Alutto and Belasco (1972) found that individuals considered in a condition of saturation scored lower in their perception of the system than those in a condition of equilibrium, but not as low as those in deprivation. These findings indicated the possibility of a curvilinear relationship between levels of involvement and job satisfaction.

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) examined involvement in decision making in relation to Parsons' (1951) technical (issues related to the operation of the school) and managerial (schoolwide issues) decision domains. Their findings supported Alutto and Belasco's theory that the desire by subordinates to participate in decision making was not evenly distributed throughout an organization. They concluded that teachers desired greater involvement in technical issues than in managerial issues. The findings of

Mohrman, et al., indicated that technical issues fell outside of teachers' zones of acceptance and managerial issues tended to fall within their zones of acceptance.

Speed (1979) indicated that in the two decision domains (technical and managerial) the discrepancy measures for decision condition explained more than twice the variance explained by the measures of actual involvement alone. Also, the extent of involvement discrepancy measure explained almost as much of the variance in job satisfaction as did the combined discrepancy measures of frequency and extent of involvement. Speed, therefore, concluded that teachers did not perceive these dimensions, frequency and extent of involvement in decision making, as being independent.

Thierbach (1980) attempted to combine the concepts developed by Barnard and expanded by Bridges on zones of acceptance, with the concepts regarding decision conditions by Alutto and Belasco (1972), Conway (1976), Mohrman, et al. (1978), and Speed (1979). Her survey instrument included scales to measure the discrepancy of extent of involvement and the zones of acceptance. Her set of 20 decision issues was basically the same as Speed's. The dependent variable of job satisfaction was measured by Speed's revised version of the Mendenhall (1977) Job Satisfaction Survey. Thierbach determined that a significant linear relationship existed between respondents' decision condition and level of job

satisfaction; as actual and desired participation equalize, satisfaction will level off before declining as saturation occurs; and that respondents felt most deprived regarding managerial decision issues. An important conclusion was that the point of saturation has not been reached so it is reasonable to assume that administrators may continue to increase teacher involvement in decision making before diminishing job satisfaction.

High and Achilles (1988) found that teachers do want to be involved in decision making. However, teachers were more likely to seek involvement in curriculum and instruction efforts rather than in "mechanical" or management areas or in personnel and student discipline areas.

Defining Participatory Decision Making for Educational Organizations

To understand participation in decision making within educational organizations, the concept must first be limited and defined. In a logical sense, PDM represents the intersection of two major conceptual sets: (1) the set of concepts associated with decision making, and (2) the set of concepts associated with participation. Decision making is any process wherein one or more persons determine a particular choice. In organizations, it is frequently restricted to policy choices by officials or non-officials, although all choice behavior is within the original set.

Participation refers to the sharing by two or more persons in some action or matter (Locke & Schweiger, 1979). The combining of the two definitions limits the concept to participation by two or more persons in the process of reaching a choice. This restriction separates PDM from delegation which is the assignment of specific responsibilities to a subordinate in or outside the system. If, however, a subordinate participates in a decision-to-delegate, then PDM is present; otherwise, it is simply a separation of duties that is hierarchically determined (Locke & Schweiger, 1979).

PDM can be further defined as internal and external participative decision making. Internal PDM involves administrators with teachers and/or students. External PDM, refers to decisions where administrators participate with the members of the community. There are several variations of these types of PDM. Mandated versus voluntary PDM usually includes contractually required procedures or committees in contrast to requested committees and volunteer involvement. Formal versus informal PDM signifies linkages with unions, committees, associations, or other organizations in contrast to casual or planned interaction among administrators and the teachers, students, and/or community leaders. Direct versus indirect PDM is where an entire group enters the process of influencing choices as

opposed to representatives who act for a larger constituency (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Dachler & Wilpert, 1978).

Reforms Moving Education Toward Participatory

Decision Making (PDM)

A major reform topic moving educators toward PDM concerns the importance of decisional participation by employees. The idea of employee participation has been around for some time. The notion that participation is essential to the acceptance and implementation of some types of change decisions is well represented in the literature on educational change. This owes its background, at least in part, to the Coch and French studies on overcoming resistance to change in a factory workforce. Coch and French (1948) proposed that changes should be made by management to provide greater ownership in production and to provide better pay rates while employees learned their new jobs. Lewin (1951) presented findings which showed that greater participation improved employee attitudes about the quality of work performed. Motivation was heightened. However, the Melcher (1976) review placed some doubt on attributing the results of the Coch & French study to participation, and suggested that it was more likely associated with goal setting. Bartlem and Locke (1981) took another step toward showing that this earlier research was not necessarily clear. They indicated, first, that the PDM

operations in the original studies were rather weak, with employee inputs mainly being minor suggestions for work changes. Second, they noted that the operations were confused by different job rationales, different methods for setting rates, and variations in training. Third, they added that the comparisons within the experimental groups were also confused by differences in work load and size of groups. As a result of research on change in schools and in colleges, the Concerns-Based Adoption Model or CBAM (Hall, Wallace, and Dossett, 1973) was developed at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. The CBAM offers a unique approach to the study of change by focusing on the needs of individuals and describing their growth over time. Two dimensions describe persons as they first begin, and then gain more experience with a new educational process, product, or practice. These dimensions represent a conceptualization of the way the concerns and behaviors of individuals change as they become familiar with and involved in educational change.

An early result of CBAM research was the realization that all teachers faced with new situations have concerns that are identifiable and developmental. Seven Stages of Concern About the Innovation (Hall & Rutherford, 1976) were identified as a result of this research. These stages

include: Awareness (little concern about innovation), Informational (general interest in innovation), Personal (individual role with innovations), Management (use of innovation), Consequence (impact of innovation on students), Collaboration (coordination with others in the use of innovations), and Refocusing (exploring broader use of the innovation). Hord (1981) states that these stages are grouped so that they range from "initial self concerns" (Stages 1 and 2), to concerns related to "task" (Stage 3), and then to concerns for "impact" (Stages 4, 5, and 6) (p.3). Self concerns refer to how that individual will be affected by the innovation. Task concerns are thoughts on how an individual can make the innovation work. Impact concerns refer to how the innovation will affect the students.

Individuals experience a variety of concerns at any point in time. However, the degree of intensity of different concerns about an innovation will vary depending on the individual's knowledge and experience. Whether a person is using the innovation or not, whether he/she is preparing for its use, has just begun use, or is highly skilled with the innovation, will contribute to the relative intensity of the different concerns.

Hord summarizes the implications of change on teachers saying that educational change is a gradual process that

requires extended planned learning activities which respond to the changing concerns of the individual in order to be successful.

Huberman (1985) found that most often teachers were not the initiators of school-improvement projects. Teachers participated because they had little choice or because the project looked promising or because they saw in it opportunities for professional growth. Approximately half the teachers in Huberman's study were motivated to participate because the innovation would lead to desirable career shifts.

McLaughlin (1984) explored a topic that is still pertinent at this point. The teaching career is a relatively flat structure with few positions outside the classroom to "graduate" to and still focus on classroom instruction. Not all classroom teachers aspire to an administrative role since it does not focus on instruction. Therefore, the necessary motivation for the success of the program is minimal if teachers are not involved at a level of interest and with a sense of ownership. Similarly, after looking at the responses of teachers to reform policies initiated over the past 100 years, Cuban (1984) concluded "... teacher commitment and involvement seldom responds to mandates or coercive threats beyond brittle compliance.

Where classroom change occurred ... teachers seem to have been active collaborators in the process." (p. 265).

In other reports there is a clear focus on participation and its outcomes. For example, Locke (1979) had previously predicted that performance improvement would be greater with participative goal setting than with assigned goal setting. Alutto and Belasco (1972) studied the usefulness of a definition of decisional participation based on the discrepancy between a system member's actual and desired rates of participation rather than simply on the absolute current rate of decisional participation. Vanek (1975) studied the importance of delineating the type of decisions that fell into the realm of a participatory system. Latham and Yukl (1976) stated that teacher performance was typically better with difficult goals than with easy goals, as long as these difficult goals were agreed upon by the teacher. Locke (1979) referred to the participative decision making (PDM) experience and identified four broad categories of decisions: personal functions, work planning, working conditions, and company policies. Locke argued that a different area of PDM implied a different perspective on the nature of the participatory experiences. He stated that if participation was to be used as a means for furthering man's happiness and well-being, then those involved must recognize individual differences in

knowledge and ability and the importance of reason over feelings in organizational decision making. Bello and Cleverley (1980) presented the ideas of increasing worker participation by giving workers or their representatives a voice in the decision-making of the firm and to give the worker a proportionate share in the wealth which she/he helped to create. Neider (1980) showed that increasing productivity and effort levels should occur only when the participation process clearly identified the effort. She confirmed that there was a positive linear relationship between participation and satisfaction.

Another area of research concentrated on interactions between the decisional participation rates of subordinates and the perceived relative influence of administrative superiors.

Gouldner (1954), Tannenbaum (1968), and Mulder (1971) have argued that by allowing subordinates to participate in decision making, superiors gain influence over the actions of individual role performers. As a participation franchise is extended and superiors relinquish complete control over decisions, they gain both increased certainty concerning the actions of their subordinates (encouraging commitment through involvement) and increased influence over a wide-spread set of decisional issues (gaining in the legitimate exercise of authority). It is suggested that one clear consequence of shared decision making is increased administrative control. (Alutto and Belasco, 1972, p. 117).

Dickson (1981) wrote that participation was considered part of organizational structure.

Another area of study, PDM and productivity in education, is difficult to work with because the concept as derived from private sector applications usually implies: a concern for higher profits, increased worker production, and quality of products. These are difficult to measure operationally or even to define conceptually in education.

Drucker, in The Age of Discontinuity, (1969) made two crucial observations. He said that the economic race would be won by countries that invested in education and in training and retraining their people. Secondly, he observed that America's management knew very little about managing scholars and teachers and that our economy would be in serious trouble unless management could create work environments where these education professionals could be productive. Since products of scholarship are harder to quantify than the products of manual work, Drucker predicted a need to redefine outputs and invent new measures to gauge performance in knowledge work organization. Drucker's principles aptly apply to the theme of school reform (Tucker, 1988).

With respect to teachers, two studies were identified as relevant. Huff, Lake, and Schalman (1982) determined competencies that characterized outstanding performers among public elementary and secondary school principals in Florida. All of the participating schools showed that a

participatory style of management was, to some degree, expected.

Greenblatt, Cooper, and Muth (1983) hypothesized that the more a school management system demonstrated qualities of participation (A), the more likely teachers would show higher quality in their teaching behaviors (B) and, through that higher quality, higher academic attainment in their students (C). That is $A > B > C$. Their study suggested that the students appeared to identify as effective those teachers who were freed to teach rather than to attend to administrative tasks, yet who were still consulted on issues that directly concerned the classrooms.

The cumulative evidence at this point seems to indicate that mid-level participation is desirable for both effective teaching and for student achievement (Conway, 1984).

Educational policy has typically been an area of concern for the general public as well as for educational personnel at all levels. To improve the learning opportunities for all students, the teaching profession must be improved. Taking risks with traditional procedures can lead to the restructuring of the profession in ways that promise more productive schooling (Urbanski, 1987). In The Self Managing School, Caldwell and Spinks (1988) addressed concerns with the concept and theories of restructuring

schools. Also, Alioto and Jungherr (1971) presented the theoretical framework for school reform in Operational PPBS for Education: A Practical Approach to Effective Decision Making. Talbot (1987) attempted to research the possibilities of making generalizations about the effects of participative management. He found that it was impossible to identify "facts" about participation. But despite his absence of irrefutable evidence, he concluded that managers should consider participative management for philosophical reasons. Sirotnik and Clark (1988) viewed the traditional model of school as that in which the knowledge comes from experts and is handed to the practitioners rather than the school becoming a center of inquiry with educators becoming involved in focusing on the problem and its solution.

Brubaker (1982) stated that schools reflected the values of state, local, and federal governments by implementing the goals and objectives of these governments. Another important note is that the distinction between government and other organizations is the wholly political nature of government (Appleby, 1949). School administrators, such as superintendents and principals, are duly concerned with political matters and public support. This consideration sometimes becomes more important than the educational soundness of a particular decision (Brubaker and Nelson, 1974). Those operating schools at the policy levels

-- State Departments of Public Instruction, Governors and legislatures, the Commissioners and local school boards are political first and educators second. This has a major impact on the problem -- political mandates prescribed to "solve" education issues.

The bureaucratic forms of governance are concerned with matters that are concrete, distinct, and measurable. On the other hand, curriculum and instruction issues tend to be more abstract. Therefore, these issues mostly use nonmeasurement evaluation procedures (Brubaker, 1982). Efficient operation of schools depends on many skills that vary continuously. Qualified decisions by education professionals must govern these operations rather than the orders of distant superiors to achieve efficiency (Blau and Scott, 1962). In short, if educators really want to pursue more abstract goals, such as providing the conditions for self-development, effective citizenship, and healthy attitudes, the bureaucratic model is both inefficient and ineffective (Brubaker, 1982). Furthermore, Nations (1989) recalls a time when scholars took over the schools, their reasoning being that education was too important to turn over to the teachers. Then the test-makers took over the schools and educators had to "teach to the test." Recently the governors and legislators have taken over the schools. Is it time for the teachers to take some control? If so,

this can be achieved through restructuring of schools and, therefore, empowerment of teachers (Dumont, 1989).

Across the nation the search for equal educational opportunity has dominated many educational policy agendas since 1955. The idea of school-based management (SBM) was proposed in the late 1960's. SBM was proposed as a means of offsetting the state's increased authority and the centralization of funding that the push of equity in school finance had called forth. Proponents of SBM believed that an expanded state role could be balanced if those in local schools were given greater decision making authority (Guthrie, 1986). Caldwell and Wood (1988) perceived that the school organization and school districts were where decision making and renewal should focus on individual schools. School district personnel interact with their social and political environments. The school as an organization should be a site for day-to-day action. Education personnel and students should be challenged with proper motivation and support.

Peter McWalters, the acting superintendent in Rochester, New York (1985) engaged his education personnel as full partners to improve schools in Rochester. All major stockholders -- parents, administrators, teachers, and in high school, the students -- shared the governance for the process of decision making at the school level. Decisions

were made on the school dynamics, school budgeting, employment procedures, and instructional goals. Empowerment occurred where it mattered most - in the classroom and at school levels (Urbanski, 1988).

The effectiveness of a restructured program depends heavily on the collaborative efforts of the central office, administrative staff, and the teachers. To achieve this collaborative effort, teachers must learn more about their profession (Vann, 1989). In conjunction with this, Caldwell and Wood (1988) and Lewis (1989) specified several actions necessary for implementation of site-based management. They suggested that all principals should receive training; all school faculties must show that improvement goals related to research findings and student achievement; staff development and curriculum development must support each school's plan; central office personnel must identify procedures for planning; and entire school faculties would put approved plans into action. Other actions to accommodate change should involve the superintendent and board in revising policies and in developing an awareness of their changing roles.

As the knowledge of restructuring programs becomes more necessary, likewise, the attitudes of education personnel involved in the restructuring program will more greatly influence the success of the program. In Rochester, New

York, the principals interviewed in "New Roles for Administrators in Rochester", showed varying degrees of acceptance of the restructuring program. Elementary and secondary principals stated that with additional teacher involvement educational personnel exhibited more professional attitudes and better morale (Sheive, 1988). An administrator who is secure and confident in his/her abilities as an instructional leader will seek to share power with the staff members to make a more effective school (Vann, 1989).

Personnel in other school districts are emphasizing site-based decision making in varying degrees. In Dade County, Florida, the fourth largest district in the United States, a site-based decision making program was put in place with 32 school pilots (Dreyfuss, 1988). In addition, in Hammond, Indiana, a school improvement process program is underway which emphasizes the importance of decentralization, employee involvement in decisions that involve their work, and development of a feeling of ownership of those decisions (O'Rourke, 1987).

In the Carnegie Foundation's recent comprehensive survey about teacher involvement in shaping classroom and school policy, Boyer's (1988) analysis cited varying degrees of involvement from state to state. He recommended more teacher involvement in decisions that affect them and their

students as well as measuring progress against each school's own performance in the future. Perhaps Perelman (1988) summed up the need for change in teacher involvement in decision making best with the statement that public education cannot have progress without change. Action and boldness are essential.

Purpose of Participatory Decision Making

Site-based management continues to receive attention as a strategy for sustaining the momentum of school reform (Guthrie, 1986). SBM transfers operational decision making from the central district office to the school site. Importantly, SBM can also provide a context for fully empowering and involving teachers in professional matters that concern them. It could provide the impetus and the structure for better aligning the best professional teacher culture with the legalities of school policy making and administration. In theory, SBM provides the conditions for fully developing teaching as a profession and implementing participative decision making (PDM). Central to SBM and PDM is involving those "closest to the action" in goal-setting and other types of decision making. Key players must have the authority to do what is necessary to achieve established goals. Through participative decision making, SBM provides an opportunity for bringing the expertise and experience of

teachers to bear on educational problem solving and agenda determination (Mertens & Yarger, 1988).

A key to the understanding of professionalism is an appreciation for the importance of positive morale derived from confidence and pride in one's competence. A first step in the professionalization of teaching is to ensure that teachers use their authority to teach in accordance with the professional standards that pertain to their work and that have been developed through professional training and reinforced through the professional culture.

Much of the authority that teachers exercise is the perceived authority they have when they shut the doors to their individual classrooms. The top-down system gives boards of education and school administrators the prerogative and responsibility for determining what occurs in the classrooms. This means supervisory control, and it increasingly appears to presume standardization of practice and less respect for individual professional judgement (Mertens & Yarger, 1988). Lortie (1986) saw tension increasing as teacher education programs were made more rigorous yet the bureaucratic controls on the practice of teaching were being tightened.

Teaching will not be professionalized until teachers are involved in making decisions that affect not only their classrooms, but also their professional lives beyond the

classroom. Schools can improve as a function of teacher knowledge. Any plan to strengthen teaching as a profession must minimally provide formal structures for ensuring that (a) teachers are empowered, that is, have the basic authority and power to practice their teaching based upon professional knowledge, and (b) teachers are involved in the process of making decisions which affect the conduct of their professional practice (Mertens & Yarger, 1988).

Advantages and Disadvantages of PDM

Participative decision making (PDM) is becoming a new solution to the educational dilemma. The more obvious advantages of PDM are as follows: (1) increased job satisfaction due to the fact the teachers are experts for the first time in their school; (2) a positive effect on student achievement due to teachers being more committed to making their school the best; (3) enhanced continuity and decision making as a result of the teamwork required to operate the school which carries with it better communication among teachers and administrators (Lewis, 1989); and (4) members of the faculty are made to feel that their extra efforts on behalf of total school improvement are significant and valued through incentives, recognition, and rewards (Cawelti, 1989).

Though there are many advantages to PDM there are also many problems. Some of these are (1) the problem of devising a framework which allows maximum participation; (2) the problem of inducing most people to participate since only a relatively small proportion of individuals in any social organization will take up decision-making opportunities (Dickson, 1981); (3) PDM could lead to excessive intragroup or intergroup conflict caused by such factors as fundamental value differences or the resentment of members whose ideas are rejected; (4) "conformity and groupthink fostered by group pressures could lead to poor decision quality" (Wood, 1984, p. 42); (5) the time requirements could result in harmful delays and the by-pass of critical issues (Locke & Schweiger, 1979); and (6) the lack of proper teacher training in decision making (Lewis, 1989).

Job Satisfaction

Much PDM research has occurred in the area of job satisfaction. It seeks to establish the link in the human relations chain between the level of participation and satisfaction with the job and the organization. Most of this research has used a discrepancy approach to the measurement of the level of participation. This approach takes the form of the amount of participation desired versus

the actual participation perceived as occurring. Discrepancies on a given number of decision areas provide a measure of the extent to which the individual is satisfied with his/her level of decision involvement. Alutto and Belasco (1972) used this technique to place persons in one of three conditions: deprivation (participation less than desired), equilibrium (participating as much as desired), and saturation (participating more than desired). Their study of teachers in a single school system supported the hypothesis of the association of participation and satisfaction. The teachers in the deprived condition were most militant and were lowest in satisfaction. They also found that high trust and low conflict were not significantly associated with satisfaction in their population of teachers (Belasco & Alutto, 1972). Lipham (1983) reported that studies out of the Project on the Administration and Organization for Instruction in the Wisconsin Center for Education and Research supported the conclusion that a positive relationship existed between perceived teacher involvement and job satisfaction. In contrast, Burke (1981) reported on 17 school districts and found no significant relationships for elementary and secondary school teachers between satisfaction and either formal or informal participation. Buckley (1981) studied participation and teacher attitudes toward their leaders and

found that high participating teachers had significantly more positive feelings toward their leaders and toward leader-teacher interactions than those teachers who had little involvement in the decision-making process.

Jefferson (1981) documented a positive relationship between teacher morale and both actual and preferred participation in educational decision making. Although this series of studies tends to favor the hypothesized relationship, the ratio still shows about one of three investigations not confirming the relationship.

Conway (1976) and Best (1973) sought to clarify the relationship between participation and satisfaction. Conway considered the possibility of too much participation (saturation) as well as too little participation (deprivation) as being a dissatisfier. Correlating the level of participation from a deprived level through equilibrium to the saturation level with an organizational satisfaction measure, he found a curvilinear relationship. Best found a similar relationship with respect to morale. These studies suggest that there are conditions that moderate the effects of participation.

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) concluded from their study that "teacher satisfaction is not simply related to the degree to which they participate but also to the types of decisions in which they participate" (p.26). They factor

analyzed data about the 12 decision areas used by Belasco and Alutto and found them clustering in three domains: (1) Managerial, which included decisions about hiring, budgets, assignments of faculty, buildings, and community; (2) Technical, which centered on those decisions about texts, learning, methods, discipline, and instructional policy; and (3) a Negotiations Domain, which was concerned with grievances and salaries.

Researchers have related involvement in decision making to job satisfaction and job performance. Most early job satisfaction studies were carried out in industrial settings. Morse and Reimer (1956) studied the relationship between the means by which organizational decisions were made and individual job satisfaction and productivity. They found that for employees who were greatly involved in making decisions concerning their work satisfaction increased significantly.

Vroom (1964) found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Lawler and Porter (1967) found that satisfaction of employees was important because it influenced absenteeism and turnover. They agreed that performance caused satisfaction rather than satisfaction being the cause of performance.

Katzell, et al., (1975) reported on a number of studies (Morse & Reimer, 1956; Vroom, 1959; Seashore & Bowers, 1963;

Fowell & Schlacter, 1971) which showed an important relationship between decision involvement and job satisfaction. The studies indicated that (1) workers who have more input into their goals and working conditions have a higher average job satisfaction, (2) members of participative groups have stronger work motivation, and (3) that productivity was many times higher in groups having more control. Two conditions that seemed effective in improving productivity were when groups were given a greater say in goal setting and when groups were involved in determining modes of pay performance.

Teacher Work Attitudes and Career Satisfaction

Some studies suggest that relationships between attitudes and work behaviors are moderated by career stage (e.g. Blackburn & Fox, 1983; Gould & Hawkins, 1978; Slocum & Cron, 1985; Stumpf & Rabinowitz, 1981).

The concept of career staging has been addressed in the literature from two viewpoints. One approach, called organizational career staging, deals with one's adaptation, adjustment, and growth as an organizational member. This approach to career staging is evident in the research of Hall and Nougaim (1968), Schein (1971), and others. Career stages in this sense are usually measured in terms of how long the person has been a member of the organization.

While organizational career stage has been shown to impact career and job related variables (e.g., Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Buchanan, 1974; Gould & Hawkins, 1978), there is also evidence that career stages based upon appropriately chosen life stages may impact the type of needs that a person desires to satisfy through work. This second approach is based largely upon the work of Super, et al. (1957), who have suggested that individuals pass through five vocational life sequences: (1) growth, (2) exploration, (3) establishment, (4) maintenance, and (5) decline. According to Super and his colleagues, the exploration, establishment, and maintenance stages occur during the working years of 20 to 65. Finer distinctions of interest within the broader categories suggested by these authors are:

1. Trial Stage - ages 22 to 30. During the early 20's an appropriate occupation is found and a beginning job is tried. In the later 20's one or more changes in jobs may occur before one settles on a life work.
2. Stabilization Stage - ages 31 to 44. The career pattern now becomes clearer and effort is put forth to secure a firm foothold in the career.
3. Maintenance Stage - ages 45 to 65. The emphasis now shifts to maintaining what one has achieved. The

authors suggest that little new ground is broken and there is a continuation along established lines.

This view is consistent with Havighurst (1950) who viewed the 20's as a period of exploration, the 30's as a time of digging-in -- characterized by a high dedication to work, -- and the 40's as a time of reevaluation of past commitments and the setting of new directions.

Hall and Mansfield (1975) found empirical support for three career stages (during the working years) as follows, (1) early-ages 20-34, (2) mid-ages 35-49, and (3) late-ages over 50. During these periods, higher-order need strengths declined and job involvement rose. Assigning ages to career stages is not a trivial matter. The age grouping may be influenced by occupational, institutional, and cultural differences. For example, the careers of military officers are institutionalized with clear patterns of advancement and specific minimum time periods which must elapse between increases in rank. Advanced professional training may serve to delay entry into a career and therefore make the career stages occur later in life than would be the case for the typical business or administrative career. This could explain the differences between Hall and Mansfield's age groupings and those proposed by Super, et al. (1957).

Rush, Peacock, and Milkovich (1980) suggested that career stage would be more appropriately related to a career

clock than to age. This would allow the time contingent aspect of career stages to begin at different points for individuals of the same age as a function of their entry into the career. Therefore, career stage might be defined in terms of years in the teaching profession rather than age or tenure in the organization. These stages would include establishment, advancement, and maintenance. Establishment represents the period just after entry into the profession - the socialization period (up to 2 years); advancement represents the period of promotion and tenure decisions (from 2 years up to 10 years); and maintenance represents the post-tenure years (over 10 years).

Huberman and Prick (1989) proposed that there were "seasons" in the professional life of a teacher, ie. appropriate or favorable moments for carrying out specific tasks, qualitatively different ways of orienting toward one's career at different points. Three important phases made up this theory: stabilization - the granting of tenure and, thereby, a formal member of the teaching profession; stock-taking - consideration of leaving the profession especially by those who have not achieved their ambitions; and disengagement - loss of commitment for school-wide or district-wide reforms.

Huberman (1989) pointed out that age was an empty variable. Willett and Singer (1989) indicated that measures

of time could be either predictor variables or outcome variables. Therefore, theoretical explanations linking age or time to specific changes were difficult to construct unless the underlying variables were identified. With so much variability, there was little confidence in the acquired data.

Much life-cycle research relies on teachers' self-reports to provide the longitudinal dimension. These self-reports are not always accurate. When people recall past events, they amend their perceptions from the reported time to fit better into the total recollection of past and present (Floden & Huberman, 1989).

Measures of career satisfaction are difficult and varied. Some theorists have argued that reducing routine and increasing the opportunity for creativeness and independent decision making in jobs will result in higher work satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Oldham, et al., 1976). However, Scott (1966) proposed that the relationship between satisfaction and job complexity may be curvilinear. At very low levels of complexity the job may be done almost at a subconscious level. As complexity increases, satisfaction may decrease since the added consciousness required may infringe upon one's free time and socializing. However, the job may still be dull and routine, so, satisfaction declines. At some point

satisfaction should again rise as complexity increases since the added complexity will result in challenge or a level of arousal which may become intrinsically satisfying to the individual.

Another exception to the suggested job complexity - work satisfaction relationship may occur if (1) the job complexity reaches a level that threatens the person's competency and (2) competency is important to the person's self-esteem. This exception may have important implications to this study. For example, high job challenge perceived during early career has been reported to result in higher job satisfaction, lower turnover, and greater involvement (Hall, 1976). Rabinowitz and Hall (1981) stated that job characteristics and facets of job satisfaction were more strongly and consistently related to involvement in early career than in any other career stage. This view supports the idea of using challenging job assignments as a primary means of developing new employees. However, the relationship between job complexity and work satisfaction may be different in later years.

Comparisons of the early and midcareer groups suggest two different causes of involvement, as discussed by Rabinowitz and Hall (1977): (1) situational variables, such as a challenging and satisfying job, and (2) personal characteristics, such as the Protestant work ethic, which

give some people a predisposition toward high involvement in whatever job they do.

Then, there is a relative shift from involvement based on ability to perform (expectancy) in midcareer to performance-based rewards in late career. In fact, the strongest correlates (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1981, p. 143) of involvement in late career are two types of rewards, performance-based rewards and membership in the organization (i.e., organizational identification). In late career, unmeasured variables, such as family or leisure role activities, may become more strongly related to involvement.

Super, et al. (1957) and Hall (1976) characterized the maintenance stage as years when one attempted to hold on to the gains made in previous years rather than searching out new challenges. Aldag and Brief (1977) reported evidence that poor job performance was more likely to lead to feelings of guilt or self-doubt in older rather than younger workers. Hence, performance to older employees may be more indicative of their self-worth. Job complexity which threatens the older workers' performance is likely to decrease their work satisfaction. Butt and Raymond (1989) proposed that satisfaction had to do with aligning strong personal needs with work settings that allowed for their expression. Guskey (1989) tended to equate career

satisfaction with indications of greatly improved student achievement.

These findings suggest that the relationship between perceived job complexity and job satisfaction will vary with career stage.

A Synopsis of PDM Reforms in North Carolina

In North Carolina, between 1984 and 1988, the National Education Association (NEA) designed and implemented a number of experimental projects and initiated a number of research projects designed to supplement its knowledge base and strengthen Association expertise in initiating school restructuring. Each of these projects attempted to define and amplify the essential elements of how a school could be restructured to enable growth and development of practitioners. Examples are as follows:

1. Mastery in Learning (MIL) was a research based school improvement project broadly representative of all grade levels. These sites were geographically diverse and included students from all social, economic, and racial elements of society. The faculty at each school identified improvement priorities, explored relevant research, and prepared a specific plan for implementing change. As a

result, these faculties have moved into comprehensive school renewal programs.

2. Team Approach to Better Schools (TABS) was a cooperative decision making project which was operating during the 1987-88 school year. TABS was a process which empowered teachers in each local building site to work together using their own professional expertise to develop their own unique programs related to their own unique circumstances.

The Public School Forum sponsored a series of six conferences in the fall of 1987 to focus on steps that could improve education in North Carolina. One predominant recommendation emerged from all conferences:

Policymakers should determine exactly what they want from schools, provide the basic resources needed to do the job, and then give professional educators the freedom to do what they need to do to meet those goals. Educators would willingly be accountable if they were given the freedom to do their jobs (The Forum Study Group, 1988, p. 2).

The Forum Study Group, a collection of business, education and political leaders from across North Carolina, met in 1988 and reached a set of recommendations. These recommendations centered around three central themes: student success and non-compliance with rules and procedures is the only yardstick that should be used to assess the effectiveness of public schools; deregulation that will return more flexibility and control to local boards of

education and to local educators in exchange for demanding student performance accountability standards; and a commitment from policymakers that educators will have a resource base sufficient to establish schools of excellence.

In 1987 the General Assembly of North Carolina launched a school reform initiative when they enacted the Lead Teacher/Restructured School pilot project legislation. This concept concentrated on restructuring the way schools were organized and the way decisions about schools were made.

During its 1989 session, the General Assembly of North Carolina ratified Senate Bill 2. The intent of this bill was to provide local boards of education and school personnel with the authority to determine how their schools should be improved while at the same time holding them accountable for the academic achievement of students. People in local school districts could, with a minimum of regulation, set their strategies for meeting their goals and decide how best to use some of the available resources.

All local education units in North Carolina choosing to participate in the Performance-based Accountability Program of The School Improvement and Accountability Act (Senate Bill 2) proceeded to compile a school improvement plan. Each local unit school improvement plan had to delineate a set of student performance goals aimed at increasing student achievement. These locally developed student performance

goals were stated in terms of three to five year increments, including annual milestones to measure progress in meeting these goals.

Another intent of Senate Bill 2 was to facilitate school improvement through decentralizing decision making. The Act requires that a large number of teachers, school administrators, and other school staff be actively involved in developing school improvement plans.

Senate Bill 2 also stated that as long as the participating local units achieved at least 75% of the annual milestones delineated by the local unit in its approved local plan, it would continue to participate in the Performance-based Accountability Program. Units that did not achieve their goals after two years could continue in the program for a third year provided they received technical assistance from the Department of Public Instruction. If after one additional year a unit does not achieve its goals, the State Board of Education would allow the Department of Public Instruction to take over that unit to accomplish the necessary improvements.

Summary

After considering numerous reviews and studies of participation in decision making focusing on the last 20 years, a few important findings come to the forefront.

These studies generally agree that participation does increase feelings of self-worth and benefits the individual with heightened self-confidence. As a change strategy, participation may enhance results, but it is not a necessary condition for change. Having clear, specific, and concrete goals is beneficial whether they are set participatively or by management alone. Most studies tend to support the proposition that participation in organizational decisions increases satisfaction with the organization and the job. However, there are still a few empirical studies that do not confirm this proposition. Satisfaction is a function of the type of decision that participants are involved in as well as their degree of involvement. Too much participation detracts rather than contributes to this satisfaction. The amount of desired participation by teachers is influenced by their career stage and experience.

In the present study, the researcher investigated the involvement of teachers' decision making at different career stages to identify any relationship between teacher involvement and their career satisfaction.

CHAPTER III

OUTLINE OF PROCEDURES

This ex post facto, nonexperimental, descriptive study was conducted using standardized instruments during the 1990 - 1991 academic school year. The study analyzed the relationships between teachers' involvement in decision making and job satisfaction at three career stages: establishment - from 0 to 4 years in teaching, advancement - from 4 years up to 10 years, and maintenance - over 10 years in teaching (Stumpf & Rabinowitz, 1981). Personnel selected for study were working in North Carolina schools undergoing a school restructuring program.

The Population and Sample

The population defined for this study consisted of personnel in ten schools which were listed as North Carolina schools participating in pilot restructuring programs established between 1987 and 1989 by the North Carolina Association of Educators (NCAE). These ten schools included a variety of grade levels and locations: three high schools, two middle schools, two elementary schools, one K-2 school and two K-8 schools. The intention of selecting this wide range of schools was to provide a representation from the different grade levels. One school declined to participate as a result of an administrative time scheduling

problem. There were 290 teachers in the nine schools; 207 of the 290 agreed to participate in the study. The final population (nine schools) consisted of 193 teachers (see Table 3.1).

TABLE 3.1
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE SCHOOLS

School	Grades Enrolled	Number of Teachers	Number of Respondents
01	7-8	15	12
02	6-8	26	04
03	K-2	20	09
04	K-6	35	31
05	K-8	17	13
06	9-12	49	40
07	K-6	28	13
08	10-12	50	38
09	9-12	50	33
Total		290	193
Percent Participation			66.6%

All teachers in the nine participating schools who did not occupy formal administrative positions and who had been teaching at their present schools for more than one year were invited to participate. Exclusion of teachers who had formal administrative responsibilities ($n = 14$) was an attempt to reduce the number of extraneous variables which might distort the focus of the study, which was teacher involvement in the decision-making process and how this

related to satisfaction with their professional responsibilities at different career stages. The omission of teachers with less than one year of experience in their present school increased the likelihood that all responding teachers understood and had established relationships in the decision-making process.

Attention was paid to the total number of faculty within each school. This procedure was used to ensure that the number of participating schools would provide a sufficiently large enough sample of teachers to yield an acceptable amount of data from which reliable and valid conclusions could be drawn.

The Instrument

The Decision Involvement Analysis questionnaire (Thierbach, 1980) that was used to define operationally the constructs of decision condition and job satisfaction consisted of two parts: Part I: Decision Involvement Analysis; and, Part II: Job Satisfaction Survey. Part I provided measures of the independent variable of decision condition. To measure this variable there were four substantive questions regarding 20 decision issues:

1. What is your ACTUAL EXTENT of involvement in making this decision?
2. What is your DESIRED EXTENT of involvement in making this decision?

3. To what degree are you INTERESTED in this decision?

4. To what degree do you possess EXPERTISE regarding this decision?

Questions 1 and 2 were suggested by the studies of Alutto and Belasco (1972), Conway (1976), Mohrman, et al., (1978), and Speed (1979) regarding the use of a discrepancy measure of extent of involvement in decision making to determine decision conditions. The response format used for questions 1 and 2 was a four-point scale ranging from 1 = no involvement to 4 = great involvement.

Questions 3 and 4 extended decision involvement to include the zone of acceptance concept recognized by Barnard (1938) and Bridges (1969) as being an important determinant in decision involvement. Question 3 assessed each respondent's interest regarding 20 decision issues, and used a four-point response scale ranging from 1 = no interest to 4 = great interest. Question 4 assessed each respondent's perceived knowledge regarding these 20 issues using a four-point response scale ranging from 1 = no expertise to 4 = great expertise.

The response format for the four decision involvement questions was a forced-choice type which required teachers to make either a positive or a negative response. The scales, however, allowed respondents to indicate varying

degrees of involvement within their positive or negative choices.

The selected decision issues were as follows
(Thierbach, 1980):

Instructional/Technical Domain Issues

1. Specifying the learning objectives for each unit of instruction
2. Developing procedures for assessing student achievement in your classes, subjects, or courses
3. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents
4. Assigning students to instructional groups within your class, team, or department
5. Preparing the budget for your grade level, subject department, or instructional team
6. Planning student record-keeping procedures and practices
7. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials
8. Determining grading procedures for evaluating the progress of your students
9. Evaluating how well your grade level, subject department or team is operating

Schoolwide/Managerial Domain Issues

10. Determining the administrative and organizational structure of your school
11. Establishing disciplinary policies in your school
12. Developing inservice programs for teachers in your school
13. Planning the student advisory program in your school
14. Resolving problems or issues in school-community relations
15. Setting and revising the goals of your school
16. Determining the procedures to be used for the evaluation of teachers
17. Allocating materials and equipment to grade levels, subject departments, or teams
18. Selecting department chairpersons or team leader
19. Developing procedures for involving parents in planning each student's learning program
20. Hiring a new faculty member to teach in your grade level, subject department, or instructional team

The decision issues generally covered those used by Alutto and Belasco (1972) in "A Typology for Participation in Organizational Decision Making" and "Patterns of Teacher

Participation in School System Decision Making", Conway (1976) in "Test of Linearity Between Teachers' Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Their Schools as Organizations", and Mohrman, et al., (1978) in "Participation in Decision Making: A Multidimensional Perspective" while adding greater specificity.

Part II, the Job Satisfaction Survey, was based on Mendenhall's (1977) adaptations of the "Index of Organizational Reactions" or IOR (Dunham, Smith, & Blackburn, 1977) which was designed for white-collar professional workers. To modify the IOR for teacher respondents, Mendenhall made several changes by using different items, changing the response set, and substituting two of the scales (kind of work, amount of work) with scales to measure teacher satisfaction in regard to community and pupil relations. Mendenhall's survey consisted of eight scales, 50 items, and used a five-point scale.

Speed (1979) developed a revised measure of teacher job satisfaction based on Mendenhall's (1977) Job Satisfaction Survey. Speed, using Mendenhall's data, computed a varimax orthogonal rotation factor analysis to determine the number and nature of underlying variables. The results of the factor analysis indicated that nine scales existed instead of eight. Speed's revised survey consisted of 27 items which assessed nine scales and used a four-point response

format ranging from 1 = very dissatisfied to 4 = very satisfied.

The nine scales and appropriate questions of the Job Satisfaction Survey include the following:

Scale I. Administrative/Supervision
How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 85 the opportunities provided to discuss problems with building administrators?
- Ques. 86 the trust you have in your building administrators?
- Ques. 96 the professional competence and leadership of your building administrators?

Scale II. Co-workers
How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 81 the amount of work done by other teachers in your school?
- Ques. 88 the quality of work of other teachers in your school?
- Ques. 105 the personal and social relationships you have with other teachers?

Scale III. Career Future
How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 83 your opportunities for growth in your profession?
- Ques. 90 your future in your school district?
- Ques. 94 the opportunities that you have to develop your areas of special interest?

Scale IV. School Identification
How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 87 the general reputation of your school?
- Ques. 98 your awareness of what is "going on" in your school?
- Ques. 107 the goals and objectives emphasized by your school?

Scale V. Financial Aspects

How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 84 the amount of money you make?
- Ques. 99 the salary schedule in your school district?
- Ques. 104 the fringe benefits in your school district?

Scale VI. Work Conditions

How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 95 the physical facilities at your school?
- Ques. 100 the arrangement of space and equipment in your school?
- Ques. 107 the availability of appropriate instructional material and equipment?

Scale VII. Amount of Work

How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 82 the number of students for whom you are responsible?
- Ques. 97 the number of courses for which you must prepare?
- Ques. 103 the amount of work you are expected to do?

Scale VIII. Pupil-Teacher Relations

How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 91 the extent to which you are able to meet your students' affective needs?
- Ques. 93 the quality of your interactions with your students?
- Ques. 101 the extent to which you are able to meet your students' academic needs?

Scale IX. Community Relations

How satisfied are you with:

- Ques. 89 the understanding of your school's program by parents and the community?
- Ques. 92 the extent to which the community recognizes and appreciates its educators?
- Ques. 106 the community's involvement in your school's program?

In addition to Parts I and II, Thierbach (1980) included a Personal Data questionnaire to elicit about each teacher information that would be relevant in determining teacher involvement in decision making. These data provided information concerning the establishment of career stages for each respondent. The information gathered from each respondent included age, sex, years as a teacher, years teaching in present school, grades taught, subjects taught, and education qualification. Additional questions addressed variables believed to have an impact on the relationship between teacher involvement in decision making and job satisfaction: respondents' perceived levels of influence in schoolwide and grade level, team, or department issues; length of grade level, team, or department meetings; organizational structure of the school, teacher certification, and teacher leadership responsibilities.

Validity and Reliability

Content validity of the Decision Involvement Analysis questionnaire was established (Thierbach, 1980) by using the judgement of experts in the field. Researchers, graduate students in the field of educational administration, professors of educational administration, and teachers were consulted to determine whether or not the instrument adequately represented the domain of decision involvement.

A pilot test was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the instrument using Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients. The Alpha coefficients of the four decision involvement questions ranged from .83 to .91.

Thierbach reaffirmed the content validity of the Job Satisfaction Survey by consulting researchers, graduate students in the field of educational administration, professors in educational administration, and teachers. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was reestablished during a pilot test of the questionnaire by computing a Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the overall scale. The internal consistency measure was Cronbach Alpha = .91.

I also conducted my own pilot test to assess the internal consistency of the instrument. Principals of one elementary school and one senior high school were contacted concerning participation in this pilot study. An explanation of the study and a copy of the questionnaires were given to each principal. Upon their agreement to participate packets containing a letter of explanation, directions, the questionnaires, and an answer sheet were delivered to the faculty of each school. Although encouraged to participate by the principal, participation was strictly voluntary (n = 112). After collecting and analyzing the results, the pilot study showed that the Alpha coefficient for the Decision Involvement Analysis was .95

and .82 for the Job Satisfaction Survey. The instrument, therefore, was deemed suitable for the purposes of this study.

Data Collection

Principals of the selected schools were contacted by telephone to inform them about this research study and their school's selection for participation (see Appendix A). Following the telephone interview, interested principals were mailed a packet of information regarding details of the study. The packet included a cover letter with instructions for participation, an abstract of the study, and a sample questionnaire (see Appendix B). During a follow-up telephone call, participation was confirmed and a date was set for the researcher to visit the school and administer the questionnaire.

Within a four-week period, I visited the participating schools where I met with the teachers on staff and distributed, administered, and collected the questionnaires. In cases of teacher absence, an explanatory letter, consent form, questionnaire and return mailer were left for the missing teacher. Follow-up telephone calls were made to these teachers if packets were not returned within a week of the visit to that school.

Participation was strictly voluntary. Individual teachers were informed of their ability to withdraw at any

time on the instructions for completing the surveys. An informed consent form was signed by each principal of the participating schools which guaranteed the participants, schools, and school systems anonymity in any reports of the research (see Appendix C).

Completed questionnaires were coded with school and respondent identification numbers and other information, such as school enrollment, grades in the school, and type of school. The data were then scanned into an IBM Personal System 2, Model 70 and a Sentry 7004 scanner. The software package, "Scan Tools", read the data which were stored in an ASCII or American Standard Code for Information Interchange file.

Analysis of Data

The third primary objective of this study was to ascertain the relationship among teachers' career stages of development, participative decision making, and career satisfaction.

To analyze the data, the ASCII file generated in the data collection process was then transferred into the software package, "Statistical Package for Social Sciences" or SPSS, for analysis. Prior to studying the specific research questions, a correlational matrix was computed to determine whether significant correlations existed between the independent variables.

Next, a career stage was established for each respondent. Career stage was defined in terms of years in the teaching profession rather than age or retention in the organization. The career stages were defined as follows: "establishment" represents the period just after entry into the profession - the socialization period (up to 2 years); "advancement" represents the period of promotion and tenure decisions (from 2 years up to 10 years); and "maintenance" represents the post-tenure years (over 10 years). For the purposes of this study the time period for the socialization period was changed to "up to four years" and for the advancement period to "four years up to ten years". In North Carolina an initially certified teacher is entering the profession for the first three years and on the fourth year may receive career status.

The general decision condition of all respondents was determined in regard to their actual and desired levels of involvement. The scoring procedure was similar to the modified scoring procedure used by Conway (1976) and Mohrman, et al., (1978). In the modified process, for each respondent, a discrepancy score (DS) was computed for each decision issue within each sample by subtracting the desired level of involvement (D) from respondents' perceived actual level (A). A final decision condition score (DC) was computed for each respondent by summing the 20 decision issue scores. The possible range for decision condition

scores for each individual was -60 to +60 and scores for each population and stage (establishment stage, advancement stage, and maintenance stage) were determined.

Respondents' interest scores were summated across all 20 decision issues used in the study. The possible range of scores was from 0 to 80. A correlation was calculated to assess the relationship between decision condition scores and interest.

The job satisfaction of all respondents was determined by summing the 27 satisfaction issue scores. The possible range was from 27 to 108.

The mean scores from the decision involvement questions were converted to ranks ranging from 1 to 20. The highest mean scores designated those areas in which respondents wanted more involvement.

With three career stages involved, a oneway analysis of variance was used to test the main effect of career stage on involvement in participative decision making. The following formula was used to determine if significant differences existed among the groups:

$$F = \frac{SSW}{SSB} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k (N_i - 1) s_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^k N_i (\bar{X}_i - \bar{X})^2}$$

Then, a non-parametric test and Scheffé post hoc procedures were used to determine the significance of these comparisons.

Finally, a correlation between decision condition scores and job satisfaction scores for each career stage was determined. Using Fisher Z, the procedure of choice to determine differences among two or more relationships, it was then determined if there was a significant difference among these correlations for each of the career stages. The following formula was applied:

$$\chi^2 = \sum w_j Z_j^2 - w \overline{Z_w}^2$$

where

$$\overline{Z_w} = \frac{\sum w_j Z_j}{w}$$

and

$$w = \sum w_j$$

After the data was compiled, it was important to validate my results with authorities in the counties participating. After studying these data results I interviewed the Instructional Supervisor of two of the participating school systems in order to assure that restructuring had actually taken place. A copy of that particular school system's results was given to the

supervisor and I asked a series of open-ended questions to confirm the validity of the information received from the questionnaires (see Appendix D).

CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate the involvement of teachers in decision making at different career stages to identify any relationships between their involvement and career satisfaction. Teachers from ten North Carolina schools that participated in restructuring programs between 1987 and 1989 were chosen to make up the population used in the study. Nine of these schools and 193 of the possible 290 teachers agreed to participate. The data were collected through the Decision Involvement Analysis questionnaire (Thierbach, 1980).

In this chapter these data are presented in two sections. The first presents the data in a descriptive manner and the second presents the statistical analysis of the data.

Description and Analysis of the Data

This section contains a descriptive overview of the data used to answer the research questions posed for the study. The data were analyzed using the "Statistical Package for Social Sciences" or SPSS. A synthesis of the relevant results is presented in Tables 4.1 through 4.34. These tables include the basic descriptive characteristics

of the independent and dependent variables of the study, and of personal demographic characteristics.

Independent Variables

The theoretical constructs of decision condition, interest, and expertise were contained within four basic decision involvement questions regarding 20 decision issues (see Chapter III). The difference score derived from the first two questions, actual and desired extent of involvement, formulated the fifth area of attention, discrepancy of involvement. The reliability (internal consistency) of these five areas was estimated using the Cronbach Alpha formula. As in the pilot study, the coefficients (Table 4.1) were moderate ($\geq .84$), but the items within each area were internally consistent and appropriate for this research.

TABLE 4.1
RELIABILITY (INTERNAL CONSISTENCY) COEFFICIENTS REGARDING
DECISION INVOLVEMENT SCALES

Scales (20 items per scale)	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient
1. Actual Extent	0.87
2. Desired Extent	0.84
3. Interest	0.85
4. Expertise	0.91
5. Discrepancy (Actual-Desired)	0.86
Number of Respondents = 174	

The following scoring procedure was used for extent of involvement: 1 = no involvement, 2 = little involvement, 3 = some involvement, and 4 = great involvement. This scoring procedure was used to compute the frequencies and mean scores for actual and desired levels of involvement regarding each decision issue (see Appendix E, Tables 4.15 through 4.18). The mean scores of the discrepancy measure (actual - desired), found in Appendix E, Tables 4.17 and 4.18, indicate a general state of deprivation across all decision issues. This is reflected in Table 4.2 which indicates, in regard to extent of involvement, that the mean scores for actual involvement in the technical/instructional and managerial domains were 3.02 and 2.35, respectively; whereas, the corresponding mean scores for desired involvement in the technical and managerial domains were 3.40 and 3.03. Consequently, the mean scores for the discrepancy measure over the two domains were -0.38 and -0.68. The overall grand mean which included both domains regarding actual, desired, and discrepancy measures were 2.69, 3.22, and -0.53, respectively. A negative mean score indicates that the desired extent of involvement was greater than the actual extent of involvement creating a state of deprivation.

The following scoring procedure was used to analyze the independent variable, interest: 1 = no interest, 2 = little interest, 3 = some interest, and 4 = great interest.

Table 4.2
OVERALL MEAN DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ACTUAL, DESIRED, AND DISCREPANCY SCALES

Decision Issues	Actual Extent of Involvement	Desired Extent of Involvement	Discrepancy Measure (Actual-Desired)
Technical/Instructional	3.02	3.40	-0.38
Managerial/Schoolwide	2.35	3.03	-0.68
Overall/Grand Mean	2.69	3.22	-0.53

Involvement Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great
 N = 193

As with the extent of involvement areas, the scoring procedure was used to compute the frequencies and mean scores regarding respondents' interest in each decision issue (see Appendix E, Tables 4.19 and 4.20). Table 4.3 indicates that the mean scores regarding interest in the technical/instructional issues and the managerial issues were 3.52 and 3.22, respectively. This indicates a large amount of interest in the technical/instructional domain. The overall mean score, including technical and managerial scores, was 3.37.

Similarly, the data pertaining to respondents' perceived expertise in the decision issues were analyzed using the following scoring procedure: 1 = no expertise, 2 = little expertise, 3 = some expertise, and 4 = great expertise. Tables 4.21 and 4.22 in Appendix E contain the frequency distribution and mean scores regarding respondents' perceived expertise in each decision issue. Summary data presented in Table 4.4 indicate that the technical/instructional and managerial domains were 3.26 and 2.86, respectively. This, again, reflects a higher score in the technical/instructional domain. The overall technical and managerial mean score was 3.06.

Table 4.3

OVERALL FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR INTEREST SCALE

Decision Issue	Absolute Frequency				Miss. Cases	Mean	
	1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great		Mean Score	S.D.
Technical/Instructional Domain	37	79	392	832	11	3.52	0.41
Managerial/Schoolwide Domain	112	221	1135	1017	24	3.22	0.42
Overall = Technical + Managerial	149	300	1527	1849	35	3.37	0.38
Percent Total	3.9	7.8	39.6	47.9	1.0		
Interest Response Set: N = 193	1 = No	2 = Little	3 = Some	4 = Great			

Table 4.4
 OVERALL FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR EXPERTISE SCALE

Decision Issue	Absolute Frequency				Mean		
	1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
Technical/Instructional Domain	45	125	622	550	9	3.26	0.48
Managerial/Schoolwide Domain	189	453	1326	519	22	2.86	0.51
Overall = Technical + Managerial	234	578	1948	1069	31	3.06	0.50
Percent Total	6.1	15.0	50.1	27.7	0.8		
Expertise Response Set:	1 = No	2 = Little	3 = Some	4 = Great			
N = 193							

Dependent Variable

The reliability (internal consistency) of the job satisfaction questionnaire (see Chapter III) was estimated at .91 using the Cronbach Alpha coefficient indicating that the instrument was internally consistent.

The following scoring procedure was used to analyze the data regarding the dependent variable of job satisfaction: 1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = satisfied, and 4 = very satisfied. Tables 4.23 and 4.24 in Appendix E present the frequencies and mean scores for respondents' levels of job satisfaction for each of the 27 questions and for the nine scales of the questionnaire. Overall, respondents were moderately satisfied with their professional circumstances as illustrated by the overall mean score of 2.78.

Personal and Situational Variables

The situational variables noted in this study included the size of school and grade levels constituting each school. The details of the variables were presented in Table 3.1.

The personal variables considered were age, gender, years of teaching experience, years of teaching experience in present school, organizational structure of teaching assignment, position in school (teacher, team/unit leader, department chairperson), main teaching level, highest educational qualification, grade range of teaching

certification, monthly meetings (number held and length of time), method of participation in decision-making process, and perceived levels of influence in schoolwide and team/unit/department decisions. Tables 4.28 through 4.34 in Appendix F present the data for each of these variables.

The hypothetical "average" respondent was 41 years of age with 15 years of teaching experience, 10 of which had been in his/her present school. The majority of respondents were female, taught in departmentalized structures, taught on a secondary level. Most respondents had a Bachelor's degree, attended meetings more than three times a month for less than one hour, participated in decision making by choice, and perceived that they had some influence in both schoolwide and team/unit/department decisions.

Career Stages

A career stage was established for each respondent by using data from the introductory segment of the questionnaire. This statement asked each respondent to provide the total number of years he/she had been in the teaching profession. Career stage one (establishment) had the fewest number of teachers (22), followed by career stage two (advancement) with 29 teachers. The majority of teachers (119) were in the third career stage (maintenance). There were 23 cases with missing data that could not be classified. The mean number of years in teaching for all

respondents (15.1 years) falls within the maintenance career stage.

Next, the extent of involvement data were computed by career stage. The mean scores for actual and desired levels of involvement, as well as discrepancy scores, are reflected in Table 4.5. The mean scores for actual and desired involvement in the establishment stage were 2.64 and 3.14.

TABLE 4.5
MEANS FOR VARIABLES BY CAREER STAGE

Variable	Career Stages		
	Establishment 1	Advancement 2	Maintenance 3
Actual Involvement			
Mean	2.64	2.52	2.61
SD	0.62	0.50	0.53
Desired Involvement			
Mean	3.14	3.11	3.18
SD	0.41	0.37	0.41
Decision Condition Discrepancy			
Mean	-0.49	-0.60	-0.58
SD	0.38	0.45	0.48
Interest			
Mean	3.32	3.25	3.36
SD	0.39	0.37	0.38
Expertise			
Mean	2.64	2.95	3.09
SD	0.64	0.40	0.44
Valid N	18	29	110
Missing Cases = 36			

The advancement stage reflects lower mean scores with 2.52 for actual involvement and 3.11 for desired involvement. Maintenance stage had a mean desired involvement score higher than the other two stages (3.18) and a mean actual involvement score which fell between the other two stages at

2.61. The discrepancy scores show a general deprivation in each career stage.

Data concerning interest and expertise were computed by career stage for the mean scores (Table 4.5). The mean scores regarding interest in the establishment, advancement, and maintenance stages were 3.32, 3.25, and 3.36, respectively. There were no statistically significant differences among the scores (see Appendix E, Table 4.25). The mean scores for expertise in the establishment, advancement, and maintenance stages reflected a progression from low to high (2.64, 2.95, and 3.09), respectively. There was a statistically significant difference between the establishment stage and the maintenance stage (see Appendix E, Tables 4.26 and 4.27).

To analyze the data regarding job satisfaction, mean scores were computed by career stage for each of the nine scales (Table 4.6). Overall, the respondents in each career stage were moderately satisfied with their professional circumstances. The grand means for the establishment stage, advancement stage, and maintenance stage were 2.77, 2.64, and 2.82, respectively.

The mean of each personal variable was computed by each career stage. Table 4.7 presents the data for these variables. The average establishment-stage respondent was 29 years of age, female, and had 4 years of teaching experience at her present school.

Table 4.6
 Job Satisfaction Scales by Career Stages

Job Satisfaction Scale	Career Stage								
	Establishment			Advancement			Maintenance		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
1 Admin/Supervision	3.23	0.55	20	2.86	0.59	29	3.10	0.63	118
2 Co-Workers	3.33	0.50	22	3.04	0.53	27	3.13	0.52	116
3 Career Future	2.60	0.62	21	2.58	0.59	29	2.88	0.56	117
4 School Id.	3.09	0.56	22	2.83	0.53	28	3.06	0.51	117
5 Financial Aspects	2.06	0.72	22	2.12	0.61	28	2.12	0.70	116
6 Work Conditions	2.42	0.63	22	2.25	0.61	28	2.59	0.61	115
7 Amount of Work	2.86	0.52	22	2.87	0.41	28	2.89	0.59	116
8 Pupil-Teacher Rel.	3.03	0.42	22	2.93	0.42	28	3.05	0.48	117
9 Community Rel.	2.49	0.56	22	2.36	0.63	28	2.54	0.56	117
Grand Mean	2.77	0.38	19	2.64	0.35	27	2.82	0.41	112
Total N = 193									

TABLE 4.7
PERSONAL VARIABLE FREQUENCIES BY CAREER STAGE

Personal Variable	Career Stage		
	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance
Mean Age	28.9	34.6	44.5
Gender			
Female	16	22	75
Male	3	7	37
Ave. Years At Present School	3.8	3.9	13.3
Dept. Chair			
Yes	6	5	29
No	16	22	81
Team Unit Leader			
Yes			
No	3	4	24
	19	22	85
Level of Teaching			
K-3	5	7	19
4-6	0	0	10
6-9 Middle School	2	2	4
7-12	4	14	62
Highest Degree			
Teacher Cert.	5	5	14
Bachelor's	12	13	36
Master's	3	8	56
Specialist	2	1	8
Doctoral	0	1	0
Participation Reason			
Choice	15	24	72
Elected	3	3	18
Selected	1	1	13
Other	3	0	14
Perceived Influence-Schoolwide			
No	2	2	6
Little	6	11	28
Some	13	14	69
Great	1	0	8
Perceived Influence-Team/Department			
No	0	1	3
Little	4	5	12
Some	14	17	66
Great	4	4	29

The majority of respondents in career stage one were not department chairpersons or team/unit leaders, taught on a K-3 level, and had a Bachelor's degree. They participated in decision making by choice and perceived that they had some influence in both schoolwide and team/unit/department decisions. The average advancement-stage respondent was 35 years of age, female, and had four years of teaching experience at her present school. The majority of respondents in career stage two were not department chairpersons or team/unit leaders, taught on a secondary level, and had a Bachelor's degree. They participated in decision making by choice and perceived that they had some influence in both schoolwide and team/unit/department decisions.

The average maintenance-stage respondent was 45 years of age, female, and had 13 years of teaching experience at her present school. Most respondents in career stage three were not department chairpersons or team/unit leaders, taught on a secondary level, and had a Master's degree. They participated in decision making by choice and perceived they had some influence in both schoolwide and team/unit/department decisions.

Statistical Analysis of the Data

This section presents the statistical analysis of the data collected in relation to each of the research questions used in the study.

Study of the Research Questions

Prior to studying the research questions of the study, a correlational matrix was computed to determine whether significant correlations existed between the independent variables. Table 4.8 presents the correlational matrix for the decision involvement and job satisfaction scales. As in the Thierbach study, the moderately high correlation (0.64) found between the interest and expertise scales indicated that the scales were not independent but rather assessing to some degree the same variable. Therefore, the use of both variables would not provide much additional information. Consequently, on the basis of this correlation, the original factorial design was modified to include only the interest scale. This decision to retain interest and exclude expertise was based on Thierbach's assumption that respondents were more capable of assessing their interest than their expertise in the given decision issue. This shows an expected relationship that people who were interested in something generally desired to be involved in that phenomenon.

Table 4.8
Correlation Matrix For Survey Scales

Variable	Actual Involvement	Desired Involvement	Interest Scale	Expertise Scale	Decision Condition	Job Satisfaction
Actual Involvement	1.0000**					
Desired Involvement	0.5184**	1.0000**				
Interest	0.3803**	0.8394**	1.0000**			
Expertise	0.4072**	0.6654**	0.6368**	1.0000**		
Decision Condition	0.7023**	-0.2447**	-0.2677**	-0.0922	1.0000**	
Job Satisfaction	0.3722**	0.0541	0.0849	0.0768	0.3771**	1.0000**

** = 1-tailed Significance $\alpha = .001$
N = 164

The high correlation (0.85) between the interest scale and the desired involvement scale indicated that the scales were not independent.

Second, it was necessary to determine the general decision condition (DC) of all respondents in regard to their actual (A) and desired (D) levels of involvement. SPSS computer programs were used to calculate these conditions (using the formula $DC = A - D$) for each respondent across all 20 decision issues.

Table 4.9 provides the frequency distribution for modified decision scores. The modified decision scores ranged from -41 to +4 (possible range -60 to +60) and had a mean of -11.49. The range of scores indicated that a general state of deprivation existed for the respondents in this study. The decision conditions of equilibrium and saturation as defined by Alutto and Belasco (1972) were not the "norm". In fact, only six of 193 respondents indicated a positive score (toward saturation). These data were divided into three decision conditions -- low (-41 to -15), medium (-14 to -6), and high (-5 to +4) involvement. These intervals represented approximately 33% of the range. Finally, respondents' interest scores were summed across all 20 decision issues used in the study. Table 4.10 presents the frequency distribution for the interest scale. The summed interest scores ranged from 40 to 80 (possible range was 0 to 80) and had a mean of 66.51. This mean was used to

divide the range in order to form two levels of interest --
low (40 to 67) and high (68 to 80).

TABLE 4.9
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR MODIFIED DECISION SCORES

				Decision Condition			
				Score	Frequency	Percent (%)	
L O W	-41	1	0.5	M E D I U M	-14	7	3.6
	-38	1	0.5		-13	5	2.6
	-33	1	0.5		-12	5	2.6
	-32	1	0.5		-11	4	2.1
	-31	2	1.0		-10	12	6.2
	-30	3	1.6		-9	4	2.1
	-29	1	0.5		-8	5	2.6
	-28	2	1.0		-7	9	4.7
	-27	1	0.5		-6	13	6.7
	-26	2	1.0		H I G H	-5	10
	-25	4	2.1	-4		10	5.2
	-23	3	1.6	-3		5	2.6
	-22	6	3.1	-2		8	4.1
	-21	5	2.6	-1		11	5.7
	-20	2	1.0	0		4	2.1
	-19	7	3.6	1		1	.5
	-18	2	1.0	2		1	.5
	-17	5	2.6	3		2	1.0
	-16	4	2.1	4		2	1.0
	-15	6	3.1				

Missing Cases: 16

Mean Discrepancy Score: -11.486

Standard Deviation: 9.144

Low (N=59) Medium (N=64) High (N=54)

TABLE 4.10
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR INTEREST SCORES

	Interest Score	Frequency	Percent (%)		Interest Score	Frequency	Percent (%)
	40	1	0.5		65	12	6.2
	49	1	0.5		66	8	4.1
	50	1	0.5		67	6	3.1
	51	4	2.1		68	8	4.1
	52	1	0.5		69	7	3.6
	53	1	0.5		70	6	3.1
	54	2	1.0		71	10	5.2
L	55	5	2.6	H	72	8	4.1
O	56	7	3.6	I	73	11	5.7
W	57	4	2.1	G	74	5	2.6
	58	3	1.6	H	75	10	5.2
	59	4	2.1		76	9	4.7
	60	3	1.6		77	3	1.6
	61	5	2.6		78	5	2.6
	62	6	3.1		79	2	1.0
	63	6	3.1		80	1	0.5
	64	12	6.2				

Missing Cases: 16
 Mean Interest Score: 66.514
 Standard Deviation: 7.579
 Low (N=92) High (N=85)

Research Question 1:

In what areas of the decision-making process, if any, do teachers want to be involved?

To study the question, the mean scores from the decision involvement questions were converted to ranks. A rank of 1 was assigned the highest mean score and 20 to the lowest mean score. The highest scores reflect those areas in which the respondents wanted more involvement than they actually attained; in other words they were in a state of

deprivation. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.11.

TABLE 4.11
DECISION CONDITION RANKING

Decision Condition	Rank
XII. Determining the procedures to be used for the evaluation of teachers	1.0
XX. Hiring a new faculty member to teach in your subject/department/instructional team	2.0
IX. Preparing the budget for your subject/department/instructional team	3.0
XV. Allocating materials or equipment to subject/department/instructional team	4.0
XIX. Evaluating how well your subject/department or instructional team is operating	5.0
VII. Assigning students to instructional groups within your team or department	6.5
VIII. Planning the student advisory program in your school	6.5
II. Determining the administrative and organizational structure of your school	8.0
XVII. Selecting department chairpersons or team leaders	9.0
XVIII. Developing procedures for involving parents in planning the student's learning program	10.0
V. Establishing disciplinary policies in your school	11.0
X. Resolving problems or issues in school-community relations	12.0
VI. Developing inservice programs for teachers in your school	13.0
XIV. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials	14.0
III. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents	15.0
XIII. Planning student record-keeping procedures and practices	16.0
XI. Setting and revising the goals of your school	17.0
I. Specifying the learning objectives for each unit of instruction	18.0
IV. Developing procedures for assessing student achievement in your subject or courses	19.0
XVI. Determining grading procedures for evaluating the progress of your students	20.0

According to the analysis of this effect, with the exception of the sixth rank, all of the managerial decision issues were the highest ranked scores. These are the major areas of deprivation. Respondents had "some" actual involvement (3.02) in technical/instructional decisions and desired more involvement (3.40) in these decisions (see Table 4.2). These same respondents had "little" actual involvement (2.35) in managerial schoolwide decisions and desired more actual involvement (3.03) in these decisions (see Table 4.2). A t-test for matched pairs (comparing actual involvement in technical/instructional decisions and actual involvement in managerial decisions) shows a significant difference. The t value was 17.71 with 176 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed probability of .000. Another t-test for matched pairs (comparing desired involvement in technical/instructional decisions and desired involvement in managerial decisions) also shows a significant difference. The t value was 13.35 with 178 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed probability of .000. Since, the desired extent of involvement in managerial decisions (3.03) is significantly less than the desired involvement in instructional decisions (3.40), this shows that respondents much prefer to be involved in the technical/instructional decision issues rather than managerial issues. The top choices of the respondents included specifying learning objectives and evaluation of students.

The mean distribution for interest scale (Table 4.3), shows that a similar situation exists here. Overall, respondents showed "some" interest (3.37) in making any of these decisions. A t-test for matched pairs (comparing interest in technical/instructional decisions and interest in managerial decisions) shows a significant difference. The t value was 10.95 with 176 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed probability of .000. As before, respondents were significantly more interested (3.52) in making instructional decisions than in making managerial decisions (3.22).

Research Question 2:

Is the teacher's stage of career development a factor in his/her actual involvement in participative decision making?

The oneway analysis of variance tested the main effect of a teacher's stage of career development on his/her actual involvement in participative decision making. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.12. According to the analysis, no two groups are significantly different.

TABLE 4.12
ONEWAY ANOVA FOR ACTUAL INVOLVEMENT AMONG THREE GROUPS:
ESTABLISHMENT, ADVANCEMENT, MAINTENANCE

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	91.4307	45.7154	0.403	0.669
Within Groups	154	17479.2699	113.5018		
Total	156	17570.7006			

There is no significant difference in the means of actual involvement scores among the teacher's stage of career development.

Research Question 3:

What relationship exists between the teachers' zone of acceptance, as measured by interest and expertise, and decision condition?

A correlational matrix was run to assess the relationship between decision condition scores and interest (see Table 4.8). This revealed a significant negative relationship at the .001 level ($r = -0.27$) between these two variables. The results of this correlational matrix encouraged further investigation. A Pearson Product Moment correlation was run to assess the relationship between decision condition and interest ($n = 175$). The outcome revealed a significant negative relationship at the .001 level ($r = -0.28$) between these two variables. As interest increases the decision condition scores decrease. The higher the level of interest in the issue, the more teachers desire involvement in the decision-making process and consequently the perception of deprivation increases.

Research Question 4:

What relationships exist between decision condition and job satisfaction at the different career stages of teaching?

To analyze the data regarding this question, correlations between job satisfaction scores and decision condition scores were computed for each career stage (Table 4.13).

TABLE 4.13
CORRELATIONS OF DECISION CONDITION SCORE WITH JOB SATISFACTION SCORE BY CAREER STAGE

Career Stage	Correlation (r)	Degrees of Freedom	Significance p ≤
1 - Establishment	0.32		
2 - Advancement	0.41		
3 - Maintenance	0.39	104	0.001

The correlation coefficients were then tested to determine if significant differences existed among the relationships for the career stages using the following Fisher Z formula:

$$X^2 = \sum w_j Z_j^2 - W \bar{Z}^2$$

Table 4.14 reflects the process used for analysis. The results point to the fact that there are no significant differences among the relationships for the stages ($p \leq .075$), so career stage is not a factor in this situation.

TABLE 4.14
TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE CAREER STAGES

Career Stage	N	w= N-3	r	Z	$W_j Z_j$	$W_j Z_j^2$
1	17	14	0.32	0.332	4.648	1.543
2	27	24	0.41	0.436	10.464	4.562
3	105	102	0.39	0.412	42.024	17.314
Totals		140			57.136	23.419

The data presented in this chapter were analyzed using the "Statistical Package for Social Sciences", or SPSS. The analytic procedures included: (1) descriptive analysis, (2) the Cronbach Alpha estimate for reliability, (3) ranking, (4) oneway analysis of variance, (5) Pearson product-moment correlation, (6) t-test for matched pairs, (7) Scheffé method of multiple comparisons, and (8) Fisher Z. The probability level of all tests of statistical significance was established at the .05 level.

CHAPTER V
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FURTHER STUDY

This chapter consists of five sections: an overview of the study, a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications for practice, and implications for further research.

Overview of the Study

This study examined the decision theory assumption that appropriate teacher involvement in the decision-making process is related to job satisfaction and this relationship is influenced by career stages. The purposes of the study were to: (1) investigate the involvement of teachers in the building-level participative decision-making process; and (2) to determine if the different stages of teacher career development affect involvement in the decision-making process and/or job satisfaction.

The conceptual and theoretical foundations of the study were based on the literature dealing with social systems theory, decision theory, job satisfaction, and career stages. Four research questions guided the study: (1) In what areas of the decision-making process, if any, do teachers want to be involved? (2) Is the teacher's stage of career development a factor in his/her actual involvement in

participative decision making? (3) What relationships exist between the teacher's zone of acceptance, as measured by interest and expertise, and decision condition? (4) What relationships exist between decision condition and job satisfaction at the different career stages of teaching?

A survey methodology was used to gather data by means of a questionnaire that measured teachers' decision condition, zone of acceptance, and level of job satisfaction. The instrument also included personal data reflecting nine teachers' stage of career development. A pilot test was used to estimate the reliability of the questionnaire and check for clarity and ease of response. The results of the pilot test indicated that the instrument was suitable for the purposes of the study (reliability estimate of .87 using Cronbach Alpha). The questionnaire was administered to 276 teachers in nine schools that participated in pilot restructuring programs established between 1987 and 1989 by the North Carolina Association of Educators (NCAE). I visited each school to distribute, administer, and collect the questionnaires; I conducted a follow-up visit to two schools to assure that restructuring had actually taken place and to confirm the validity of the information received from the questionnaires.

To analyze the data, the "Statistical Package for Social Sciences", or SPSS, was used. The analytic

procedures used were: (1) descriptive analysis, (2) the Cronbach Alpha estimate for reliability, (3) ranking, (4) oneway analysis of variance, (5) Pearson product-moment correlation, (6) t-test for matched pairs, (7) Scheffé method of multiple comparisons, and (8) Fisher Z.

Summary of the Findings

In this section the findings from the analysis of the data are presented. The probability level of all tests of statistical significance was established at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

The major findings of the study are as follows:

1. A significant positive relationship exists between teachers' decision condition and their level of overall job satisfaction.
2. There is no significant relationship between the teacher's stage of career development and his/her actual or desired involvement in decision making.
3. Teachers are not as actively involved in decision making as they would like to be ($p \leq .05$).
4. Teachers have somewhat greater interest in and expertise toward instructional matters than toward managerial matters.
5. Teachers are generally satisfied with their professional circumstances.
6. A significant relationship does not exist between level of interest in decision issues and overall job satisfaction.

7. There is a significant negative relationship between decision condition and interest.
8. A majority of respondents perceived that they had some influence in school-based decision making on all levels.
9. There is a greater deprivation level of involvement in decision making among teachers in the advancement stage than in other stages; however, the differences are not significant at the .05 level.

Conclusions Related to the Research Questions

The following conclusions regarding decision involvement, job satisfaction, and career stages were derived from the findings of the study.

Conclusion One: Building-level administrators interested in positive change and teacher morale should concentrate on involving teachers in technical decisions and should generally guide teachers into greater involvement in managerial decisions. This conclusion is based on several points in the literature and a finding in this study that teachers desire to be involved in the decision-making process, but more in the technical or instructional areas rather than the managerial areas of decision making.

Discussion: The first research question in this study was primarily concerned with what areas of the decision-making process teachers want to be involved in. As indicated in Chapter II, Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) examined

involvement in decision making in relation to Parson's (1951) technical and managerial domains. They concluded that teachers desired greater involvement in technical issues than in managerial issues. The findings of Thierbach (1980) only partially supported Mohrman, et al.'s conclusions. She found that teachers' responses indicated that although they desired greater involvement in technical/instructional issues than in managerial/schoolwide issues, the discrepancy between their actual and desired level of involvement was greater regarding managerial/technical issues. Thierbach concluded that this finding indicated that less agreement existed between teachers' actual and desired levels of involvement for managerial issues than for technical issues.

The present study showed a general deprivation level for all respondents in all areas of decision making (-.53). Regardless of whether these teachers were not involved at all or were greatly involved in the decision-making process, generally they appeared to want to increase their present level of involvement.

This study found basically the same situation as Thierbach did. Teachers indicated that they desired greater involvement in the instructional areas (3.40) than in the managerial areas (3.03). However, just as before, there was a greater discrepancy in the managerial issues (-.68) than in the technical issues (-.38), and this is taken as a

positive sign. This data therefore, offers support to Thierbach's previous study.

Attention should be given to the discrepancy between teachers' actual and desired levels of involvement in managerial issues. Guided training in decision making in managerial issues would provide the experience necessary for teachers to decide if they still preferred involvement in instructional issues and opposed to managerial issues.

Conclusion Two: Principals should involve teachers at all levels of career development in technical decisions, for in this study, a teacher's stage of career development is not a factor in his/her actual involvement in participative decision making.

Discussion: The second research question in this study was concerned with whether there was any relationship between the teacher's stage of career development and his/her actual involvement in participative decision making.

Chapter II provides evidence which gives us reason to believe that there are stages in one's career and that they can help us understand worker behavior and attitudes. Havighurst (1950) viewed the 30's age bracket as a time of increased involvement and dedication to one's work. Hall and Mansfield (1975) supported the theory that as one advanced through the various career stages (denoted by age), job involvement rose. Hall (1976), however, stated that higher job challenge, not age, could result in greater

involvement in one's early career. Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) discussed the theory that other variables, ie. situational variables, personal characteristics, and rewards, also played a role in causing involvement in midcareer and late career periods.

In this study there was a greater deprivation level of involvement in decision making among teachers in the advancement stage than in other stages. This was most likely due to the theory that at this time period teachers are striving for promotion and are trying to prove their capabilities.

In this study there was no statistically significant difference between/among the career stages (Table 4.37). This is not to say that these career stages do not exist nor does it disagree that certain variables have influence on involvement at the different stages. However, the question of whether these variables have a greater importance across all stages than do the stages themselves seems to surface in this study.

Conclusion Three: Principals need to have a keen awareness of their teachers' professional knowledge and interests so as to direct them into involvement in areas where they will be most committed. In this study there was a statistically significant negative relationship between interest and decision condition.

Discussion: The third research question of the study was primarily concerned with determining the relationship between the teachers' zones of acceptance concept and their decision conditions. As indicated in Chapter II, Barnard (1938) and Bridges (1969) provided the conceptual framework for the zone of acceptance (also referred to as the zone of indifference) and Hoy and Miskel (1978) clarified and expanded the concept to apply to the decision-making process. The zone of acceptance, as defined in past educational literature, is derived from a combination of respondents' levels of interest and expertise regarding decision issues. Thierbach (1980) made an attempt to measure the zone of acceptance. The variables of interest and expertise were not viewed as independent by the respondents of that study. On that basis, Thierbach deleted the expertise variable from the research design and retained the interest variable.

This study also used a correlational matrix (Table 4.33) to determine the zone of acceptance. In the results there was found to be a significant positive relationship (.64) between interest and expertise. Analysis of the data revealed that there was a significant negative correlation between the respondents' levels of interest and their decision conditions as determined by the discrepancy measure ($r = -.27, p \leq .05$). However, there was not a significant correlation between the respondents' levels of expertise and

their decision condition also determined by the discrepancy measure ($r = -.09$, $p \leq .05$). On the basis of these statistical findings, the expertise variable was deleted from the research design.

The significant negative correlation between respondents' levels of interest and their decision conditions indicated that respondents with high levels of interest perceived that they were deprived in the decision-making process to a greater extent than those with low levels of interest. This relationship is supported by Hoy and Miskel's supposition that the zone of acceptance is related to the decision-making process.

Conclusion Four: Building level administrators need to involve all teachers in greater amounts of decision making. The findings of this study show that the decision condition of teachers has a direct influence on their level of job satisfaction. Career stages, however, are not a factor in this relationship.

Discussion: As noted in Chapter II, much of the research on participative decision making assumes that appropriate involvement of staff members in the decision-making process does benefit the personal needs of the individual, increases satisfaction with the organization and the job, and may enhance innovation. This level of satisfaction is a function of the type of decision that participants are involved in as well as the degree of involvement. The

amount of desired participation by teachers may be influenced by their career stage and experience. This study particularly addressed the assumed influence of career stages on the relationship between levels of decision involvement and job satisfaction because of the assumption that high levels of job satisfaction will lead to greater academic success for teachers and students.

The fourth research question of the study was concerned with the relationship between teachers' decision condition and levels of job satisfaction at the different career stages of teaching. The descriptive analysis in this study indicated that a general state of deprivation existed across all respondents (-.53) regarding the selected decision issues used in the study. The findings support the fact that few respondents perceived themselves as saturated (only 6 of 177 respondents indicated a positive score towards saturation). Alutto and Belasco (1972) had stated that decision conditions of equilibrium and saturation existed. Due to the low number of respondents who met the criterium of saturation, however, Alutto and Belasco concluded that these conditions were not crucial variables in determining the level of satisfaction. Thierbach (1980) confirmed these conclusions and, therefore, decision conditions were redefined as low, medium, and high levels of involvement. She found these conditions to be significantly related to teachers' levels of job satisfaction. Lipham (1983)

reported that his studies supported the conclusion that a positive relationship existed between perceived teacher involvement and job satisfaction. Buckley (1981) stated that teachers with high participation in decision making have more positive feelings toward leaders and teacher-leaders. The present study finds that there is a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and decision condition.

Theorists such as Hall and Nougaim (1968), Stumpf and Rabinowitz (1981), and Slocum and Cron (1985) have shown that career stage has an impact on career related attitudes and behaviors. Rabinowitz and Hall (1981) stated that job characteristics and facets of job satisfaction were more strongly related to involvement in early career than in later stages. Expectancy in midcareer stages and rewards in late career stages are causes of involvement. These findings and others suggest that the relationship between job complexity and job satisfaction will vary with career stage but that involvement in decision making seems to play only a small part.

The present study found that career stages were not a factor in the relationship between job satisfaction and decision condition.

The brief overview of other relevant research shows that collectively the studies cited do offer support for the findings of the present study and for the conclusion that

there is a distinct relationship between decision condition and job satisfaction but that career stages, in and of themselves, have little impact on this relationship.

Implications for Practice

The findings and conclusions of this study have provided several implications which may benefit practicing administrators.

The findings of this study indicate that teachers do want greater involvement in decision making. Administrators therefore, must communicate with their staffs in such a way as to know their needs, interests, and decision condition. Having assessed these characteristics for their teachers, administrators should look carefully at the decision-making process itself allowing for a large percentage of involvement but effectively used. Administrators and their staffs need to reach agreement on the teachers' roles regarding decision making in order that teachers feel influential and reach a greater level of job satisfaction. The following issues had the greatest discrepancy measurement between the actual and ideal levels of involvement: (1) determining the procedures to be used for the evaluation of teachers; (2) hiring a new faculty member to teach in that teacher's subject department or instructional team; (3) preparing the budget for that teacher's subject department or instructional team;

(4) allocating materials and equipment to subject departments or teams; and (5) evaluating how well that teacher's subject department or team is operating. Each of these issues should be given careful consideration by the administrators in an attempt to reduce teacher decision deprivation.

In summary, the findings and conclusions of this research study indicate that administrators should allow teachers who are affected by and interested in a decision issue the opportunity to participate in the decision making. In return teachers will perceive a greater level of satisfaction in their jobs. Even though knowledge of the teachers' career stage is valuable, career stage does not appear to play as important a role in job satisfaction and decision making as previously thought.

Implications for Further Research

Improvement means studying a situation over and over again and proposing alternative methods that will answer questions and change the situation for the better. However, with every change there are new situations to address, and so it is with the restructuring of schools.

Theorists and researchers have studied the involvement of teachers in decision making; yet, there is still much to be understood. Study of the following ideas or concepts may add to our understanding of site-based management.

As soon as we discuss stages in the teaching career there is room for legitimate criticism. There is no proven way to identify stages of career development correctly assuming, that is, that stages do exist. Many factors exist that affect individuals throughout their careers which can influence the shape of a current stage or the progression to the next stage. Researchers need to examine further the identification of stages of career development and consider the impact of variables on this identification. Further, these variables may play a more important role than we have been aware of previously. Could these variables make behavior and the need for participation different at the various stages of career development no matter how they are defined?

Teachers' involvement in decision making is an important current issue. It is apparent that teachers want this involvement -- but, what social and political variables might affect their participation and the outcomes of their participation in decision making?

An important need in the study of participative decision making is for longitudinal studies documenting effects of teacher participation. Attention should be given to varying the content of decisions, the types of participation, the degree of involvement, and both attitudes and outcomes.

Participative decision making is increasingly demanded by most Americans, including educators. As this demand for direct involvement in decisions that affect individuals' lives continues to increase, school administrators must take serious consideration of incorporating it into the education system. Continued study of this area will undoubtedly lead to a more effective and quality education system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldag, R. J. , & Brief, A. P. (1977). Effects of age and experience on productivity. Industrial Gerontology, 4, 192-197.
- Alioto, R. F. , & Jungherr, J. A. (1971). Operational PPBS for education: A practical approach to effective decision making. New York: Harper & Row.
- Alutto, J. A. , & Belasco, J. A. (1972). A typology for participation in organizational decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 117-125.
- Appleyby, P. H. (1949). Policy and administration. University of Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bartlem, C., & Locke, A. (1981). The Coch and French study: A critique and reinterpretation. Human Relations, 34, 555-556.
- Bello, C. A. , & Cleverley, G. (1980). Capital growth sharing schemes and the value of the firm. Journal of Business, Finance, and Accounting, 7, 19-38.
- Best, J. K. (1973). Decision status and teacher morale: A study of the relationship between decisional condition/decisional deviation and teacher morale. Buffalo, New York: State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Blackburn, R. T. , & Fox, T. G. (1983). Physicians' values and their career stage. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22, 159-173.
- Blau, P. M. (1954). Co-operation and competition in a bureaucracy. The American Journal of Sociology, 59, 530-535.
- Blau, P. M. , & Scott, W. R. (1962). Formal organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

- Bowers, D. G. (1976). Systems of organization: Management of the human resource. University of Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1988). Foreword. The condition of teaching. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyer, E. L. (1988). School control: Striking the balance. Teacher involvement in decision making: A state-by-state profile. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brandt, R. (May 1989). On teacher empowerment: A conversation with Ann Lieberman. Educational Leadership, 46, 23-29.
- Bridges, E. M. (Winter 1967). A model for shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 49-61.
- Bridges, E. M. (1969). Subjective and objective aspects of demands for involvement. Administrator's Notebook, 17, 6.
- Brown, M. E. (1969). Identification and some conditions of organizational involvement. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 346-355.
- Brubaker, D. L. (1982). Curriculum planning: The dynamics of theory and practice. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Brubaker, D. L. , & Nelson, R. H. Jr. (1974). Creative survival in educational bureaucracies. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company.
- Buchanan, B. I. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
- Buckley, M. F. (1981). The relationship of philosophical orientation, participation in decision making, and degree of fulfillment of expectations about participation in decision making to elementary school teacher attitudes toward leaders, leader-teacher interaction, and membership in the organization (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 1981).
- Burke, D. J. (1981). Teacher involvement in decision making and teacher satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1981).

- Butt, R. L., & Raymond, D. (1989). Studying the nature and development of teachers' knowledge using collaborative autobiography. International Journal of Education Research, 13, 403-437.
- Caldwell, B., & Spinks, J. M. (1988). The self-managing school. New York: The Farmer Press.
- Caldwell, S. D. , & Wood, F. H. (October 1988). School-based improvement - Are we ready? Educational Leadership, 46, 50-53.
- Carr, R. A. (August 1988). Second-wave reforms crest at local initiative. The School Administrator, 16, 16-18.
- Cawelti, G. (December 1989). Elements of site-based management. Paper presented at the National Curriculum Study Institutes, Miami.
- Chapey, G. (1983). Can we learn a lesson from Japan? The Clearinghouse, 56, 394.
- Chapman, D. W. , & Hutcheson, S. M. (1981). Attrition from teaching careers: A discriminant analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 93-105.
- Chapman, D. W. , & Lowther, M. A. (March/April 1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 241-247.
- Clear, D. K. , & Seager, R. C. (1971). Legitimacy of administrative influence as perceived by selected groups. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, 46-63.
- Coch, L., & French, J. R. P., Jr. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations, 1, 512-532.
- Conway, J. A. (Summer 1984). The myth, mystery, and mastery of participative decision making in education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 11-34.
- Conway, J. A. (March 1976). Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 130-139.
- Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught: Consistency and change in American classrooms 1890-1980 (p. 265). New York: Longman.

- Dachler, H. P. , & Wilpert, B. (1978). Conceptual dimensions and boundaries of participation in organizations: A critical evaluation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 1-39.
- Dickson, J. W. (1981). Participation as a means of organizational control. Journal of Management Studies, 18, 159-176.
- Dreyfuss, G. (August 1988). Dade County opens doors to site decisions. The School Administrator, 45, 12-15.
- Drucker, P. F. (1969). The age of discontinuity: Guidelines to our changing society. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dumont, V. I. with J. Nations]. (September/October 1989). Site-based decision making is an idea whose time has come. North Carolina Education, 20, 5-7.
- Dunham, R. B. , Smith, F. J. , & Blackburn, R. S. (September 1977). Validation of the index of organizational reactions with the JDI, the MSQ, and faces scales. Academy of Management Journal, 20, 420-432.
- Dunnette, M. D. , Arvey, R. D. , & Banas, P. A. (May-June 1973). Why do they leave? Personnel, 25-39.
- Elam, S. M. (June 1989). The second gallup/phi delta kappa poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa, 785-791.
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the Life cycle. New York: International Universities Press.
- Floden, R. E., & Huberman, A. M. (1989). Teachers' professional lives: The state of the art. International Journal of Education Research, 13, 460.
- The Forum Study Group. (December 1988). Summary report. Thinking for a living: A blueprint for educational growth.
- Gould, S., & Hawkins, B. L. (1978). Organizational career stage as a moderator of a satisfaction-performance relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 425-436.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1954). Patterns of industrial bureaucracy. New York: Free Press.

- Greenberg, E. S. (1975). The consequences of worker participation: A clarification of the theoretical literature. Social Science Quarterly, 56, 191-209.
- Greenblatt, R. B. , Cooper, B. S. , & Muth, R. (April 1983) School management and teacher effectiveness: Finding the best style. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Montreal.
- Grumet, M. (January 1989). Dinner at Abigail's: Nurturing collaboration. NEA Today, 7, 20-24.
- Guskey, T. R. (1989). Attitude and perceptual change in teachers. International Journal of Educational Research, 13, 439-451.
- Guthrie, J. W. (December 1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 305-309.
- Hackman, J. R. , & Lawler, E. E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 259-286.
- Hall, D. T. (1976). Careers in organizations. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Press.
- Hall, D. T. , & Mansfield, R. (1975). Relationship of age and seniority with career variables of engineers and scientists. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 201-210.
- Hall, D. T. , & Nougaim, K. (1968). An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organizational setting. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 12-35.
- Hall, G. E., & Rutherford, W. L. (1976). Concerns of teachers about implementing team teaching. Educational Leadership, 34, 227-233.
- Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C., & Dossett, W. A. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 568)
- Havighurst, R. J. (1950). Development tasks and education. New York: Longmans, Green.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: World Publishing Company.

- High, R. M. , & Achilles, C. M. (1988). Involvement in what? Teacher actual and preferred involvement in selected school activities. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hord, S. M. (February 1981). Understanding the change process: A primer for teacher educators. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 568)
- Hoy, W. K. , & Miskel, C. G. (1982). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Random House.
- Huberman, A. M. (1985). Educational change and career pursuits - Some findings from the field. Interchange, 16, 54-71.
- Huff, S., Lake, D., & Schalman, M. L. (1982). Principal differences: Excellence in school leadership and management. Boston: McBer and Co.
- Jefferson, B. (1981). A study of the relationship between teacher morale, elementary school principals' philosophies of human nature and teachers' involvement in educational decision making (Doctoral dissertation George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee).
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Katzell, R. A. , & Yankelovich, D. (1975). Work, productivity and job satisfaction. New York: Psychological Corporation, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Latham, G. P. , & Yukl, C. A. (1976). Effects of assigned and participative goal setting on performance and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 166-171.
- Lawler, E. E. , & Porter, L. W. (1967). The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial Relations, 7, 20-28.
- Levinson, D. J. , Darrow, C. N. , Klein, E. B. , Levinson, M. H. , & McKee, B. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Knopf.
- Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewis, J. Jr. (April 1989). School-based Management Forum, pp. 1-7.

- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lipham, J. M. (May 1983). Leadership and decision making for effective educational change. The Executive Review, 3.
- Lipham, J. M. (1974). Performance objectives for school principals. Berkeley, California: McCutchan.
- Lipham, J. M. , & Hoeh, J. A., Jr. (1974). The principalship: Foundations and functions. New York: Harper & Row.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4, 309-336.
- Locke, E. A. , & Schweiger, D. M. (1979). Participation in decision-making: One more look. Research in organizational behavior, 1, 265-340.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lortie, D. C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain? Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 568-575.
- March, J. G. , & Simon, H. A. (1970). Decision-making theory. In O. Grusky & G. A. Miller (Eds.). - The sociology of organizations: Basic studies. London: Macmillan, 1970, pp. 93-102.
- McConkey, D. D. (1980). Participative management: What it really means to practice. Business Horizons, 23, 66-73.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (November 1984). The limits of policies to promote teaching excellence. Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 571)
- McPike, L. I. & O'Rourke, P. (Spring 1987). Shared decision making at the school site: Moving toward a professional model. American Educator, 46, 10-17.
- Melcher, A. J. (Summer 1976). Participation: A critical review of research findings. Human Resource Management, 15, 12-21.
- Mendenhall, D. R. (1977). Relationship of organizational structure and leadership behavior to teacher job satisfaction in IGE schools (Technical report no., 412 ed.) Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning.

- Mertens, S., & Yarger, S. J. (January-February 1988). Teaching as a profession: Leadership, empowerment, and involvement. Journal of Teacher Education, 39, 32-37.
- Mohrman, A. M., Jr. , Cooke, R. A. , & Mohrman, S. A. (Winter 1978). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 14, 13-19.
- Morse, N. C. , & Reimer, E. (1956). The experimental change of a major organizational variable. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52, 120-129.
- Mulder, M. (1971). Power equalization through participation? Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 31-39.
- Neider, L. L. (1980). An experimental field investigation utilizing an expectancy theory view of participation. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26, 425-442.
- Oja, S. N. (October 1980). Adult development is implicit in staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 1, 7-56.
- Oldham, G. R. , Hackman, J. R. , & Pearce, J. L. (1976). Conditions under which employees respond positively to enriched work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 395-403.
- O'Rourke, P. (Spring 1987). Shared decision making at the school site: Moving toward a professional model. American Educator, 46, 10-17.
- Parsons, T. (1951). The social system. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Pauly, E. W. (1978). The decision to innovate: Career pursuit as an incentive for educational change. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Perelman, L. J. (September 1988). Restructuring the system is the solution. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 20-24.
- Powell, R. M. , & Schlacter, I. (1971). Participative management: A panacea? Academy of Management Journal, 14, 165-173.
- Prick, L. G. M. (1989). Satisfaction and stress among teachers. International Journal of Education Research, 13, 363-377.

- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T. (1981). Changing correlates of job involvement in three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 138-144.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 265-288.
- Rush, J. C. , Peacock, A. C. , & Milkovich, G. T. (1980). Career stages: A partial test of Levinson's model of life/career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 347-359.
- Sarason, S. B. (1971). The culture of school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization and the career: A conceptual scheme. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7, 401-426.
- Scott, W. E. (1966). Activation theory and task design. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1, 3-30.
- Seashore, S. E. , & Bowers, D. (1963). Changing the structure and functioning of an organization. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Sheehy, G. (1977). Passages. New York: Bantam.
- Sheive, L. T. (November 1988). New roles for administrators in Rochester. Educational Leadership, 46, 53-55.
- Sirotnik, K. A. , & Clark, R. W. (May 1988). School-centered decision making and renewal. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 660-664.
- Slocum, J. W. , & Cron, W. L. (1985). Job attitudes and performance during three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 26, 126-145.
- Speed, N. E. (1979). Decision participation and staff satisfaction in middle and junior high schools that individualize instruction (Technical report no. 521 ed.) Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling.
- Stumpf, S. A. , & Rabinowitz, S. (1981). Career stage as a moderator of performance relationships with facets of job satisfaction and role perceptions. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 202-218.

- Super, D. E. , Crites, J., Hummel, R., Moser, H., Overstreet, P., & Warnath, C. (1957). Vocational development: A framework for research. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Super, D. E. , & Hall, D. T. (1978). Career development: Exploration and planning. Annual Review of Psychology, 29, 333-368.
- Talbot, A. P. (1987). Participative management: A critical analysis (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1987).
- Tannenbaum, A. S. (1968). Control in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thierbach, G. L. (1980). Decision involvement and job satisfaction in middle and junior high schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1980).
- Tucker, M. S. (February 1988). Peter Drucker, knowledge, work, and the structure of schools. Educational Leadership, 46, 44-46.
- Urbanski, A. (October 1987). Restructuring the teaching profession. Education Week, 32.
- Urbanski, A. (November 1988). The Rochester contract: A status report. Educational Leadership, 46, 48-52.
- Vanek, J. (1975). The participatory economy. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Vann, A. S. (January 1989). Shared decision making for principals and teachers. The Education Digest, 54, 17-20.
- Vroom, V. H. (1959). Some personality determinants of the effects of participation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 322-327.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Vroom, V. H. , & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Willett, J. B., & Singer, J. D. (1989). Two types of questions about time: Methodological issues in the analysis of teacher career path data. International Journal of Education Research, 13, 439-451.

- Wingis, C. (March 1981). New connections in Silicon Valley. Industrial Marketing, 66, 82-84.
- Wood, C. J. (1984). Participatory decision making: Why doesn't it seem to work? Educational Forum, 49, 42-64.
- Worthy, J. (1950). Organizational structure and employe morale. American Sociological Review, 15, 169-179.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Telephone Interview

Hello _____

Introduction

My name is _____ and I am conducting a research project under the direction of Dr. Charles Achilles through the Department of Educational Administration at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Purpose

The purpose of my call is to ask whether you would be willing to participate in a study of teacher involvement in decision making. Your school was selected as a result of being listed as a participant in pilot restructuring between 1987 and 1989. CAN YOU CONFIRM YOUR SCHOOL'S PARTICIPATION?

YES___ NO___

Your willingness to participate would mean that you would allow me to visit your school for one day in January or February. During this visit, if permitted, your teachers will be asked to complete a decision involvement and teacher job satisfaction questionnaire. The questionnaire takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. Teachers would be asked to complete the instrument during a faculty meeting.

APPENDIX A

Telephone Interview

Is it convenient for me to discuss the study with you now?
If "no", then I will mail you a copy of the decision involvement questionnaire and an abstract of the study. I will call again to discuss this further after you have had an opportunity to review the printed material.

Outline of the Research

The purpose of this study is to investigate the involvement of teachers in the building-level participative decision making process at different stages of teacher career development to identify possible relationships between teachers' involvement in the decision making process at different career stages and teacher career satisfaction. In other words, are teachers who are extensively involved in decision making more satisfied in their positions than teachers with limited decision making involvement and does their career status play an important role in this?

I will provide feedback to you in summary form. Summary data protects the anonymity of individuals and schools. Also, it may be useful to you to know which decision issues teachers actually have the most participation in and which decision issues they wish to have increased participation in.

APPENDIX A

Telephone Interview

DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

WILL YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY?

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

2158 Gaines Avenue
Gastonia, N. C. 28054

January 25, 1991

Name
School
Address

Dear _____:

Thank you for your interest in my study of teacher involvement in decision making. This study is being conducted through the Department of Educational Administration, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The purpose of the study is to determine the actual and desired extent of teacher involvement in decision making, as well as teacher interest and expertise in relevant decision issues. The study can provide a better understanding of decision involvement in North Carolina schools.

To assess levels of involvement in decision making, I plan to administer a questionnaire to teachers who have been in your school for more than one year and do not hold administrative, counseling, or other non-teaching positions. enclosed is a copy of the complete instrument for your review. The instrument can be completed in about 20 minutes.

As stated in our telephone conversation, I will contact you again by telephone during the first week in February. If you and your staff are willing to participate, I will arrange a time to visit your school and administer the questionnaire to the teachers.

Upon completion of the study, a summary of the major findings will be mailed to you. Teachers will remain anonymous, as will schools, in the summary data.

If you have any questions regarding this research or my visit, please call me at (704) 866-6600 prior to 4:00 P. M. or (704) 864-5636 after 4:00 P.M.

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

Again, I wish to thank you for your assistance with this study. I look forward to visiting your school.

Sincerely,

Gail D. Stowe

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

DECISION INVOLVEMENT ANALYSIS

Abstract

The renewal and improvement of education is a major focus all across the United States. To improve education, teachers must be involved appropriately in the decision making process.

The purposes of this study are to determine: (1) to which extent teachers are and wish to be involved in decision making;

(2) whether or not the teacher's stage of career development is a factor in a teacher's actual involvement in participative decision making; (3) what relationship exists between the teachers' zone of acceptance and decision condition; and (4) what relationships exist between a teacher's decision condition and job satisfaction at the different career stages. The population will consist of personnel in ten schools which were listed as North Carolina schools participating in pilot restructuring programs established between 1987 and 1989 by the North Carolina Association of Educators (NCAE). Teacher respondents will complete the Decision Involvement Analysis and Job Satisfaction questionnaires. The researcher will deliver, administer, and collect the questionnaires in each school participating in the study.

The study should produce a better understanding of faculty involvement in decision making as it relates to the job satisfaction of teachers at various career stages. Further, decisions on which teachers desire greater, the same, or less involvement will be identified. The findings should be useful to principals in involving teachers appropriately in the decision making process. Appropriate teacher involvement in decision making should result in increased teacher job satisfaction, motivation, and morale.

No individual or school will be identified in any report of the study. Instead, a summary of the total major findings will be provided to all schools.

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

Instruction For Completing The Surveys

Good research procedures require the following procedures to be adhered to:

- No identification of persons or schools will be made.
 - Your completion and return of the answer sheet constitutes voluntary consent.
 - Your participation is entirely voluntary.
-

Please use a #2 pencil to answer these questions.

Place the answer sheet with its title (General Purpose Answer Sheet) at the top of the page.

1. In the section marked LAST NAME, please complete the empty boxes with the name of your school beginning in the left-most box. Bubble the appropriate letters underneath each box.
2. In the box marked BIRTH DATE, please complete just the year portion of your birthday.
3. In the box marked IDENTIFICATION NUMBER, two questions will be asked. The first question will be in columns A & B, the second question will be in columns C & D.

In columns A & B, please answer and bubble the following question:
Number of years you have been teaching?

In columns C & D, please answer and bubble the following question:
Number of years you have been teaching at your present school?

4. In the box marked SEX, make the appropriate choice.
5. In the box marked GRADE OR EDUCATION, please indicate the grade level you teach. If you teach more than one grade level, use the grade level that you teach the most children (estimation will be fine). Use 13 for kindergarten, 14 for pre-kindergarten, 15 for Itinerants. **Please do not include counselors in this survey.**

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

Use this answer sheet to answer all parts of the surveys that follow. The questions on the surveys are numbered to match the answer sheets. Questions 1-100 will be answered on side 1 of the answer sheet. Questions 101-117 will be answered on side 2 of the answer sheet.

DECISION INVOLVEMENT ANALYSIS

I. SPECIFYING THE LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR EACH UNIT OF INSTRUCTION.

1. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
2. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
3. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
4. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

II. DETERMINING THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF YOUR SCHOOL.

5. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
6. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
7. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
8. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

III. DEVELOPING PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING STUDENT PROGRESS TO PARENTS.

9. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
10. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
11. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
12. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

IV. DEVELOPING PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN YOUR SUBJECTS OR COURSES.

13. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
14. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
15. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
16. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

V. ESTABLISHING DISCIPLINARY POLICIES IN YOUR SCHOOL.

17. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
18. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
19. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
20. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

VI. DEVELOPING INSERVICE PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS IN YOUR SCHOOL.

21. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
22. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
23. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
24. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

VII. ASSIGNING STUDENTS TO INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPS WITHIN YOUR TEAM OR DEPARTMENT.

25. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
26. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
27. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
28. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

VIII. PLANNING THE STUDENT ADVISORY PROGRAM IN YOUR SCHOOL.

29. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
30. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
31. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
32. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

IX. PREPARING THE BUDGET FOR YOUR SUBJECT DEPARTMENT OR INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM.

33. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
34. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
35. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
36. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

X. RESOLVING PROBLEMS OR ISSUES IN SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS.

37. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
38. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
39. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
40. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

- XI. SETTING AND REVISING THE GOALS OF YOUR SCHOOL.
41. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 42. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 43. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
 44. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise
- XII. DETERMINING THE PROCEDURES TO BE USED FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHERS.
45. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 46. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 47. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
 48. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise
- XIII. PLANNING STUDENT RECORD-KEEPING PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES.
49. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 50. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 51. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
 52. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise
- XIV. SELECTING TEXTBOOKS AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS.
53. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 54. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 55. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
 56. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise
- XV. ALLOCATING MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT TO SUBJECT DEPARTMENTS OR TEAMS.
57. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 58. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
(a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
 59. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
(a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
 60. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
(a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

XVI. DETERMINING GRADING PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING THE PROGRESS OF YOUR STUDENTS.

61. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
62. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
63. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
 (a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
64. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
 (a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

XVII. SELECTING DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS OR TEAM LEADERS.

65. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
66. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
67. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
 (a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
68. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
 (a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

XVIII. DEVELOPING PROCEDURES FOR INVOLVING PARENTS IN PLANNING THE STUDENT'S LEARNING PROGRAM.

69. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
70. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
71. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
 (a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some interest (d) Great Interest
72. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
 (a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

XIX. EVALUATING HOW WELL YOUR SUBJECT DEPARTMENT OR TEAM IS OPERATING.

73. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
74. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
75. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
 (a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
76. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
 (a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

XX. HIRING A NEW FACULTY MEMBER TO TEACH IN YOUR SUBJECT DEPARTMENT OR INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM.

77. What is your **actual extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
78. What is your **desired extent** of participation in making this decision?
 (a) No Involvement (b) Little Involvement (c) Some Involvement (d) Great Involvement
79. To what degree are you interested in this decision?
 (a) No Interest (b) Little Interest (c) Some Interest (d) Great Interest
80. To what degree do you possess expertise regarding this decision?
 (a) No Expertise (b) Little Expertise (c) Some Expertise (d) Great Expertise

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

PART II. JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

81. How satisfied are you with the amount of work done by other teachers in your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
82. How satisfied are you with the number of students for whom you are responsible?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
83. How satisfied are you with your opportunities for growth in your profession?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
84. How satisfied are you with the amount of money you make?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
85. How satisfied are you with the opportunities provided to discuss problems with building administrators?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
86. How satisfied are you with the trust you have with your building administrators?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
87. How satisfied are you with the general reputation of your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
88. How satisfied are you with the quality of work of other teachers in your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
89. How satisfied are you with the understanding of your school's programs by parents and the community?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
90. How satisfied are you with your future in your school district?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
91. How satisfied are you with the extent to which you are able to meet your students' affective needs?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
92. How satisfied are you with the extent to which the community recognizes and appreciates its educators?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
93. How satisfied are you with the quality of your interaction with your students?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
94. How satisfied are you with the opportunities you have to develop your areas of special interest?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
95. How satisfied are you with the physical facilities of your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
96. How satisfied are you with the professional competence and leadership of your building administrators?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
97. How satisfied are you with the number of courses that you must prepare?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
98. How satisfied are you with your awareness of what is "going on" in your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
99. How satisfied are you with the salary schedule in your school district?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

100. How satisfied are you with the arrangement of space and equipment in your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
101. How satisfied are you with the extent to which you are able to meet your students' academic needs?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
102. How satisfied are you with the availability of appropriate instructional materials and equipment?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
103. How satisfied are you with the amount of work you are expected to do?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
104. How satisfied are you with the fringe benefits in your school district?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
105. How satisfied are you with the personal and social relationships you have with other teachers?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
106. How satisfied are you with the community's involvement in your school's program?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied
107. How satisfied are you with the goals and objectives emphasized by your school?
(a) Very Dissatisfied (b) Dissatisfied (c) Satisfied (d) Very Satisfied

Personal Data

108. What is your highest educational qualification?
(a) Teachers' Certificate (b) Bachelor's Degree
(c) Master's Degree (d) Specialist Degree
(e) Doctoral Degree
109. Which grade range best describes your certification?
(a) K-3 (b) 4-6
(c) 6-9 Middle School (d) 7-12
(e) other
110. Which best describes your teaching assignments?
(a) Self-contained
(b) Interdisciplinary team or unit
(c) Departmentalized by subject matter
(d) other
111. Monthly, how often do you attend team, grade level, or department meetings?
(a) once (b) twice
(c) three times (d) more than 3 times
(e) rarely attend
112. Departmental, grade level or team meetings usually last approximately
(a) one hour (b) less than one hour
(c) more than one hour
113. When you participate in making decisions that affect the entire school you participate, most often, because:
(a) You choose to be involved
(b) You were elected by colleagues
(c) You were selected by the principal
(d) Other

APPENDIX B

Principal's Packet

114. When you participate in making decisions that affects the entire school, to what extent do you feel your participation is influential?
- (a) No influence
 - (b) Little influence
 - (c) Some influence
 - (d) Great influence
115. When you participate in making decisions that affect your team, grade level, or department, to what extent do you feel your participation is influential?
- (a) No influence
 - (b) Little influence
 - (c) Some influence
 - (d) Great influence
116. Are you a departmental chairperson?
- (a) Yes
 - (b) No
117. Are you a team, grade level, or unit leader?
- (a) Yes
 - (b) No

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent FormResearch StudyThe Relationship of Teachers' Involvement in Participative
Decision Making at Different Career Stages and
Teacher Career Satisfaction

Consent Form

The research study in which you are participating is designed to ascertain the nature of teacher involvement in decision making in schools. The purpose of the study is to utilize organizational theory to refine and improve the structure of the school. In conducting the study, the researcher will administer questionnaires designed to gather information which is relevant to the development of administrative and organizational arrangements in schools.

The anonymity of all participants is guaranteed and no individual, school, or school district will be identified in any reports of the research. It is expected that the results of this research will have both theoretical and practical value to the field of education and to the public at large.

There is no known discomfort or risk associated with any of the procedure used in this study. any questions you may have concerning this procedure will be answered. You

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Form

are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time.

Please sign below to indicate your consent to participate in this study.

Principal

Date

APPENDIX D

Follow-up InterviewINTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. In your professional opinion, has restructuring taken place in this school?
2. This is a copy of a summary of this school's responses.
Do you agree or disagree that these responses are an accurate representation of the situation at this school?
3. Are there any responses that you disagree with? If so, why?

RESPONSES:School One:

1. Yes, it has.
2. Yes, I agree.
3. No. In looking over the summary of responses, I believe that they accurately reflect the feelings of the teachers at this school.

School Two:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, to a great degree.
3. There is one. In the section on determining grading procedures for evaluating students, teachers seemed to feel that they were not involved as much as they would like to be. However, teachers have all the input - 100%.

Table 4.15
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT

Decision Issues		Involvement Responses								Missing Cases
		1=No		2=Little		3=Some		4=Great		
Technical/Instructional Domain		A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	
I.	Specifying the learning objectives for each unit of instruction.	16	6	18	8	58	54	101	125	0/0
III.	Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents.	19	4	49	21	57	76	68	91	0/1
IV.	Developing procedures for assessing student achievement in your subject or course.	10	3	10	3	61	53	111	133	1/1
VII.	Assigning students to instructional groups within your team or department.	40	11	48	19	49	75	55	87	1/1
XIII.	Planning student record-keeping procedures and practices.	52	24	43	37	64	78	34	54	0/0
XIV.	Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials.	22	6	25	11	77	60	68	114	1/2
XVI.	Determining grading procedures for evaluating the progress of your students.	8	2	17	9	47	40	117	138	4/4

A = Actual Involvement D = Desired Involvement
 N = 193

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.16
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT

Decision Issues		Involvement Responses								Missing Cases
		1=No		2=Little		3=Some		4=Great		
		A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	
II.	Determining school administrative and organizational structure.	31	6	64	21	82	126	16	39	0/1
V.	Establishing school disciplinary policies.	18	2	44	9	103	111	28	71	0/0
VI.	Developing inservice programs for teachers in your school.	36	9	57	29	80	115	20	40	0/0
VIII.	Planning school student advisory program.	74	31	59	39	44	97	5	14	11/12
IX.	Preparing the budget for your subject department or instructional team.	44	9	43	23	72	87	33	74	1/0
X.	Resolving problems or issues in school-community relations.	34	8	70	37	77	116	11	31	1/1
XI.	Setting and revising school goals.	16	1	43	14	84	113	49	64	1/1
XII.	Determining evaluation procedures of teachers.	95	15	58	29	34	91	6	58	0/0
XV.	Allocating materials and equipment to subject departments or teams.	52	13	49	31	64	88	28	58	0/3
XVII.	Selecting department chairpersons or unit leaders.	46	11	22	12	36	49	87	120	2/1
XVIII.	Developing procedures for involving parents in planning the student's learning program.	57	18	49	35	64	101	21	38	2/1
XIX.	Evaluation of department or team.	31	7	46	10	72	90	42	85	2/1
XX.	Hiring a new faculty member to teach in your department or instructional team.	116	31	23	21	39	89	14	51	1/1

A = Actual Involvement D = Desired Involvement
 N = 193

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.17
 DISTRIBUTION OF MEANS FOR ACTUAL, DESIRED, AND DISCREPANCY SCALES

Technical Decision Issues	Actual Extent of Involvement	S.D.	Desired Extent of Involvement	S.D.	Discrepancy Measure*
I. Specifying the learning objectives for each unit of instruction.	3.26	0.94	3.54	0.72	-0.28
III. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents.	2.90	1.00	3.33	0.76	-0.43
IV. Developing procedures for assessing student achievement in your subject or course.	3.43	0.82	3.65	0.60	-0.22
VII. Assigning students to instructional groups within team or department.	2.63	1.12	3.25	0.86	-0.62
XIII. Planning student record-keeping procedures and practices.	2.42	1.07	2.84	0.97	-0.42
XIV. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials.	3.00	0.97	3.49	0.76	-0.50
XVI. Determining grading procedures for students.	3.46	0.84	3.68	0.63	-0.21
Number of respondents	193		193		193
Mean Score - Technical	3.02	0.56	3.40	0.45	-0.38

Involvement Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great

* Discrepancy Measure = (Actual-Desired)

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.18
 DISTRIBUTION OF MEANS FOR ACTUAL, DESIRED, AND DISCREPANCY SCALES

Managerial Decision Issues	Actual Extent of Involvement	S.D.	Desired Extent of Involvement	S.D.	Discrepancy Measure*
II. Determining the school's administrative and organizational structure.	2.43	0.86	3.04	0.68	-0.61
V. Establishing disciplinary policies in your school.	2.73	0.82	3.30	0.61	-0.57
VI. Developing inservice program for teachers in your school.	2.44	0.91	2.96	0.74	-0.53
VIII. Planning the student advisory program for your school.	1.89	0.87	2.52	0.87	-0.62
IX. Preparing the budget for your subject department or instructional team.	2.49	1.03	3.17	0.81	-0.68
X. Resolving problems or issues in school-community relations.	2.35	0.85	2.90	0.73	-0.54
XI. Setting and revising the goals of your school.	2.88	0.90	3.26	0.62	-0.38
XII. Determining the procedures to be used for the evaluation of teachers.	1.75	0.86	3.00	0.88	-1.25

Involvement Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great

* Discrepancy Measure = (Actual - Desired)

(table continues)

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.18 (CONTINUED)
 DISTRIBUTION OF MEANS FOR ACTUAL, DESIRED, AND DISCREPANCY SCALES

Managerial Decision Issues		Actual Extent of Involvement	S.D.	Desired Extent of Involvement	S.D.	Discrepancy Measure*
XV.	Allocating materials and equipment to subject departments or teams.	2.35	1.03	3.03	0.88	-0.67
XVII.	Selecting department chairpersons or unit leaders.	2.86	1.23	3.45	0.85	-0.60
XVIII.	Developing procedures for involving parents in planning the student's learning program.	2.26	1.01	2.83	0.85	-0.58
XIX.	Evaluating how well your subject department or team is operating.	2.67	1.01	3.32	0.74	-0.65
XX.	Hiring a new faculty member to teach in your subject department or instructional team.	1.75	1.02	2.83	1.00	-1.09
	Number of Respondents	193		193		193
	Mean Score - Managerial	2.35	0.57	3.03	0.42	-0.68

Involvement Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great
 * Discrepancy Measure = (Actual - Desired)

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.19
 FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INTEREST SCALE

Decision Issues	Absolute Frequency - Interest					Mean	
	1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
I. Specifying the learning objectives for each unit of instruction.	2	5	40	146	0	3.71	0.57
III. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents.	2	11	62	117	1	3.54	0.66
IV. Developing procedures for assessing student achievement in your subject or course.	1	4	43	144	1	3.73	0.53
VII. Assigning students to instructional groups within your team or department.	9	16	61	105	2	3.39	0.84
XIII. Planning student record-keeping procedures and practices.	17	30	90	56	0	2.96	0.90
XIV. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials.	4	3	59	124	3	3.61	0.65
XVI. Determining grading procedures for evaluating the progress of your students.	2	10	37	140	4	3.68	0.64
Total - Technical/Instructional	37	79	392	832	11	3.52	0.41
Percent Total - Technical/Instructional	2.7	5.8	29.0	61.6	0.8		

Interest Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great
 N = 193

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.20
 FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR INTEREST SCALE

Decision Issue	Absolute Frequency - Interest					Mean	
	1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
II. Determining the school's administrative and organizational structure.	3	15	92	82	1	3.33	0.69
V. Establishing disciplinary policies in your school.	1	5	79	108	0	3.52	0.58
VI. Developing inservice program for teachers in your school.	5	19	105	64	0	3.18	0.71
VIII. Planning the student advisory program for your school.	23	35	101	22	12	2.67	0.85
IX. Preparing the budget for your subject department or instructional team.	9	13	77	94	0	3.33	0.80
X. Resolving problems or issues in school-community relations.	5	21	117	49	1	3.10	0.69
XI. Setting and revising the goals of your school.	1	14	93	84	1	3.36	0.65
XII. Determining the procedures to be used for the evaluation of teachers.	10	13	81	87	2	3.28	0.81
Interest Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great							
N = 193							

(table continues)

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.20 (CONTINUED)
 FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR INTEREST SCALE

Decision Issue	Absolute Frequency - Interest					Mean	
	1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
XV. Allocating materials and equipment to subject departments or teams.	11	25	77	78	2	3.17	0.87
XVII. Selecting department chairpersons or unit leaders.	6	10	54	122	1	3.52	0.74
XVIII. Developing procedures for involving parents in planning the student's learning program.	13	24	104	50	2	3.00	0.81
XIX. Evaluating how well your subject department or team is operating.	5	10	79	98	1	3.41	0.71
XX. Hiring a new faculty member to teach in your subject department or instructional team.	20	17	76	79	1	3.12	0.95
Total - Managerial/Schoolwide	112	221	1135	1017	24	3.22	0.42
Percent Total - Managerial/Schoolwide	4.5	8.8	45.2	40.5	1.0		
Interest Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great							
N = 193							

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.21
FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTIONS FOR EXPERTISE SCALE

Decision Issues		Absolute Frequency - Expertise					Mean	
		1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
I.	Specifying the learning objectives for each unit of instruction.	4	8	97	84	0	3.35	0.66
III.	Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents.	1	23	104	64	1	3.21	0.67
IV.	Developing procedures for assessing student achievement in your subject or course.	2	8	75	107	1	3.50	0.64
VII.	Assigning students to instructional groups within your team or department.	10	19	100	63	1	3.14	0.80
XIII.	Planning student record-keeping procedures and practices.	17	40	99	37	0	2.81	0.85
XIV.	Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials.	7	13	94	77	2	3.28	0.76
XVI.	Determining grading procedures for evaluating the progress of your students.	4	14	53	118	4	3.52	0.74
Total - Technical/Instructional		45	125	622	550	9	3.26	0.48
Percent Total - Technical/Instructional		3.3	9.3	46.0	40.7	0.7		
Expertise Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great								
N = 193								

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.22
 FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR EXPERTISE SCALE

Decision Issue	Absolute Frequency - Expertise					Mean	
	1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
II. Determining the school's administrative and organizational structure.	9	47	111	25	1	2.80	0.74
V. Establishing disciplinary policies in your school.	3	20	116	53	1	3.14	0.65
VI. Developing inservice program for teachers in your school.	11	44	115	23	0	2.78	0.73
VIII. Planning the student advisory program for your school.	30	53	87	11	12	2.44	0.84
IX. Preparing the budget for your subject department or instructional team.	14	33	99	47	0	2.93	0.84
X. Resolving problems or issues in school-community relations.	14	43	115	20	1	2.75	0.76
XI. Setting and revising the goals of your school.	4	28	122	38	1	3.02	0.67
XII. Determining the procedures to be used for the evaluation of teachers.	20	39	103	31	0	2.75	0.85

Expertise Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great
 N = 193

(table continues)

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.22 (CONTINUED)
 FREQUENCY AND MEAN DISTRIBUTION FOR EXPERTISE SCALE

Decision Issue		Absolute Frequency - Expertise				Mean		
		1=No	2=Little	3=Some	4=Great	Miss. Cases	Mean Score	S.D.
XV.	Allocating materials and equipment to subject departments or teams.	18	36	95	43	1	2.86	0.89
XVII.	Selecting department chairpersons or unit leaders.	7	19	72	94	1	3.32	0.80
XVIII.	Developing procedures for involving parents in planning the student's learning program.	16	42	104	30	1	2.77	0.81
XIX.	Evaluating how well your subject department or team is operating.	11	22	95	63	2	3.11	0.83
XX.	Hiring a new faculty member to teach in your subject department or instructional team.	32	27	92	41	1	2.74	0.98
Total - Managerial/Schoolwide		189	453	1326	519	22	2.86	0.51
Percent Total - Managerial/Schoolwide		7.5	18.1	52.8	20.7	0.9		
Expertise Response Set: 1 = No 2 = Little 3 = Some 4 = Great								
N = 193								

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

Table 4.23
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Scale	Question	Absolute Frequency				
		1=Very Dissatisfied	2= Dissatisfied	3= Satisfied	4=Very Satisfied	Missing Cases
Admin/Supervision	85	11	33	107	40	2
	86	6	21	111	50	5
	96	3	17	112	59	2
Co-workers	81	7	21	113	51	1
	88	4	20	119	46	4
	105	2	12	111	64	4
Career Future	83	15	54	95	27	2
	90	13	36	117	24	3
	94	4	44	116	28	1
School Identification	87	3	43	95	51	1
	98	3	35	124	29	2
	107	1	17	133	39	3
Financial Aspects	84	64	74	50	4	1
	99	48	85	56	1	3
	104	33	72	78	6	4
Work Conditions	95	21	66	91	13	2
	100	29	64	83	14	3
	102	12	59	107	12	3
Amount of Work	82	15	42	97	38	1
	97	7	14	127	42	3
	103	9	48	118	15	3
Pupil-Teacher Relations	91	4	44	126	18	1
	93	3	11	108	70	1
	101	5	25	135	24	4
Community Relations	89	6	66	109	9	3
	92	23	90	70	9	1
	106	10	77	93	10	3
Total Frequency		388	1190	2801	793	66
Percent Total		7.4	22.7	53.5	15.1	1.3

N = 193

APPENDIX E
 Data Descriptions

Table 4.24
DISTRIBUTION OF MEANS FOR LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION

Scale	Question	Mean	Standard Deviation	Scale Mean	Standard Deviation
Admin/Supervision	85	2.93	0.79	3.08	0.61
	86	3.10	0.72		
	96	3.19	0.65		
Co-workers	81	3.08	0.72	3.15	0.52
	88	3.12	0.68		
	105	3.25	0.62		
Career Future	83	2.70	0.81	2.80	0.58
	90	2.80	0.74		
	94	2.88	0.67		
School Identification	87	3.01	0.75	3.02	0.50
	98	2.94	0.63		
	107	3.11	0.55		
Financial Aspects	84	1.97	0.82	2.11	0.67
	99	2.05	0.75		
	104	2.30	0.79		
Work Conditions	95	2.50	0.78	2.52	0.62
	100	2.43	0.84		
	102	2.63	0.70		
Amount of Work	82	2.82	0.84	2.88	0.53
	97	3.07	0.66		
	103	2.73	0.67		
Pupil-Teacher Relations	91	2.82	0.61	3.02	0.46
	93	3.28	0.64		
	101	2.94	0.60		
Community Relations	89	2.65	0.65	2.51	0.55
	92	2.34	0.75		
	106	2.54	0.68		
Grand Mean				2.78	0.38
Response Set: 1 = Very Dissatisfied 2 = Dissatisfied 3 = Satisfied 4 = Very Satisfied					
N = 193					

Data Descriptions

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

Data Descriptions

Table 4.25
 Oneway Anova On Participant Interest In Decision Making Among Three Groups:
 Establishment, Advancement, and Maintenance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	111.05	55.52	0.976	0.379
Within Groups	154	8759.72	56.88		
Total	156	8870.77			

APPENDIX E
Data Descriptions

Table 4.26
 Oneway Anova On Participant Expertise In Decision Making Among Three
 Groups: Establishment, Advancement, and Maintenance

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2	1310.36	655.18	7.775	0.0006
Within Groups	155	13060.88	84.26		
Total	157	14371.24			

APPENDIX E
Data Descriptions

Table 4.27
Scheffé Test On Participant Expertise In Decision Making Among Three
Groups: Establishment, Advancement, and Maintenance

Mean	Participation Group	Estab.	Adv.	Maint.
52.78	Establishment			
58.93	Advancement			
61.77	Maintenance	X		

APPENDIX F
Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.28
AGES AND GENDER OF RESPONDENTS

AGES

Years of Age	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
22-30 yrs.	29	17.2
31-40 yrs.	59	34.9
41-50 yrs.	53	31.3
51-60 yrs.	24	14.2
Over 60 yrs.	4	2.4
Missing Cases: 24		
Respondents: 193		
Mean: 41.412		
Standard Deviation: 10.135		

GENDER

Gender	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Females	123	71.5
Males	49	28.5
Missing Cases: 21		
Respondents: 193		

APPENDIX F

Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.29
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT SCHOOL

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Years Teaching	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
1-3 yrs.	22	12.9
4-9 yrs.	29	17.1
10-15 yrs.	40	23.5
16-20 yrs.	33	14.1
21-25 yrs.	25	20.0
26-30 yrs.	15	8.9
Over 30 yrs.	6	3.5

Missing Cases: 23
 Respondents: 193
 Mean: 15.100
 Standard Deviation: 9.280
 Respondents: 168

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT SCHOOL

Years Teaching	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
1-5 yrs.	59	36.2
6-10 yrs.	31	18.8
11-15 yrs.	30	18.4
16-20 yrs.	26	16.0
21-25 yrs.	13	7.9
26-30 yrs.	4	2.5

Missing Cases: 30
 Respondents: 193
 Mean: 10.350
 Standard Deviation: 7.717
 Respondents: 168

APPENDIX F

Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.30
CONDITIONS OF TEACHING

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF TEACHING ASSIGNMENT

Structure	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Self-Contained	44	23.4
Interdisciplinary Team or Unit	14	7.5
Departmentalized by Subject Matter	110	58.5
Other	17	9.0
Missing Cases: 8		
Respondents: 193		

NUMBER OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

Chairperson	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Yes	44	24.4
No	136	75.6
Missing Cases: 13		
Respondents: 193		

NUMBER OF TEAM OR UNIT LEADERS

Team or Unit Leader	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Yes	36	20.2
No	142	79.8
Missing Cases: 15		
Respondents: 193		

APPENDIX F

Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.31
PREPARATION AND CERTIFICATION TO TEACH

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

Certification or Degree	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Teacher's Certification	27	14.6
Bachelor's Degree	74	40.0
Master's Degree	71	38.4
Specialist Degree	12	6.5
Doctoral Degree	1	0.5
Missing Cases: 8		
Respondents: 193		

GRADE RANGE OF TEACHING CERTIFICATION

Grade Range	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
K-3	34	18.3
4-6	14	7.5
6-9 Middle School	9	4.8
7-12	88	47.3
Other	41	22.0
Missing Cases: 7		
Respondents: 193		

APPENDIX F

Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.32
MONTHLY MEETINGS

NUMBER OF MONTHLY MEETINGS

Number of Monthly Meetings	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Less than 1	12	6.3
1	62	32.8
2	27	14.3
3	19	10.1
More than 3	69	36.5
Missing Cases: 4		
Respondents: 193		

LENGTH OF MONTHLY MEETINGS

Length of Monthly Meetings	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Less than 1 hr.	125	67.9
1 hr.	54	29.4
More than 1 hr.	5	2.7
Missing Cases: 9		
Respondents: 193		

APPENDIX F

Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.33
PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Participation	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
Choice	129	67.9
Elected	24	12.6
Selected	16	8.4
Other	21	11.1

Missing Cases: 3
Respondents: 193

APPENDIX F

Demographic Descriptions

Table 4.34
PERCEIVED INFLUENCE IN DECISION MAKING

SCHOOLWIDE DECISIONS

Influence	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
None	12	6.6
Little	54	29.7
Some	105	57.7
Great	11	6.0
Missing Cases: 11		
Mean: 2.632		
Standard Deviation: 0.699		
Respondents: 193		

TEAM/UNIT/DEPARTMENT DECISIONS

Influence	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (Percent)
None	5	2.8
Little	23	12.8
Some	111	61.7
Great	41	22.8
Missing Cases: 13		
Mean: 3.044		
Standard Deviation: 0.684		
Respondents: 193		

TABLE 4.35
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL ONE

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	11	4		6	1
Mean	2.46	2.49		2.53	1.9
Standard Deviation	0.64	0.72		0.67	0.00
Response Desired Involvement					
N	12	4		7	1
Mean	3.15	3.08		3.22	2.95
Standard Deviation	0.35	0.48		0.30	0.00
Response Interest					
N	12	4		7	1
Mean	3.24	3.13		3.36	2.90
Standard Deviation	0.34	0.44		0.27	0.00
Response Decison Condition					
N	11	4		6	1
Mean	-0.71	-0.59		-0.74	-1.05
Standard Deviation	0.41	0.45		0.41	0.00
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	11	4		7	
Mean	3.04	3.00		3.06	
Standard Deviation	0.27	0.36		0.23	

(table continues)

APPENDIX G

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL TWO

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	4	1	1	2	
Mean	2.59	2.50	2.50	2.68	
Standard Deviation	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.25	
Response Desired Involvement					
N	4	1	1	2	
Mean	3.50	3.60	3.60	3.40	
Standard Deviation	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.50	
Response Interest					
N	4	1	1	2	
Mean	3.58	3.65	3.65	3.50	
Standard Deviation	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.35	
Response Decison Condition					
N	4	1	1	2	
Mean	-0.91	-1.10	-1.10	-0.73	
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.74	
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	4	1	1	2	
Mean	2.52	2.33	2.33	2.70	
Standard Deviation	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.52	

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL THREE

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	8		3	5	
Mean	2.63		2.98	2.41	
Standard Deviation	0.53		0.35	0.53	
Response Desired Involvement					
N	8		3	5	
Mean	3.07		3.27	2.95	
Standard Deviation	0.43		0.20	0.51	
Response Interest					
N	8		3	5	
Mean	3.36		3.45	3.30	
Standard Deviation	0.31		0.18	0.37	
Response Decison Condition					
N	8		3	5	
Mean	-0.44		-0.28	-0.54	
Standard Deviation	0.32		0.19	0.36	
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	7		1	6	
Mean	2.84		2.56	2.88	
Standard Deviation	0.28		0.00	0.27	

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL FOUR

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	23	2	2	13	6
Mean	2.70	2.65	3.05	2.68	2.64
Standard Deviation	0.37	0.28	0.21	0.43	0.29
Response Desired Involvement					
N	23	2	2	13	6
Mean	3.20	3.08	3.28	3.15	3.33
Standard Deviation	0.39	0.11	0.46	0.39	0.47
Response Interest					
N	23	2	2	13	6
Mean	3.29	3.30	3.23	3.23	3.44
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.07	0.60	0.33	0.52
Response Decison Condition					
N	23	2	2	13	6
Mean	-0.50	-0.43	-0.23	-0.47	-0.68
Standard Deviation	0.32	0.39	0.25	0.28	0.36
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	26	2	2	15	7
Mean	2.92	2.94	3.13	2.93	2.85
Standard Deviation	0.23	0.24	0.03	0.26	0.16

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL FIVE

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	13	2	3	7	1
Mean	2.89	3.13	2.92	2.91	2.20
Standard Deviation	0.57	0.04	0.25	0.73	0.00
Response Desired Involvement					
N	13	2	3	7	1
Mean	3.34	3.48	3.17	3.41	3.10
Standard Deviation	0.32	0.04	0.53	0.27	0.00
Response Interest					
N	13	2	3	7	1
Mean	3.48	3.68	3.37	3.49	3.35
Standard Deviation	0.31	0.18	0.49	0.30	0.00
Response Decison Condition					
N	13	2	3	7	1
Mean	-0.45	-0.35	-0.25	-0.51	-0.90
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.00	0.33	0.73	0.00
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	12	2	3	6	1
Mean	2.91	2.85	2.94	2.91	2.93
Standard Deviation	0.25	0.10	0.04	0.36	0.00

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL SIX

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	38	3	7	22	6
Mean	2.47	2.18	2.40	2.58	2.32
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.36	0.50	0.51	0.49
Response Desired Involvement					
N	39	3	7	23	6
Mean	3.00	2.73	2.86	3.06	3.08
Standard Deviation	0.39	.26	0.28	0.45	0.22
Response Interest					
N	38	3	7	22	6
Mean	3.22	2.98	3.02	3.31	3.23
Standard Deviation	0.39	0.23	0.30	0.44	0.18
Response Decison Condition					
N	38	3	7	22	6
Mean	-0.52	-0.55	-0.46	-0.48	-0.76
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.38	0.29	0.46	0.47
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	38	3	7	22	6
Mean	2.54	2.51	2.51	2.54	2.61
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.18	0.29	0.46	0.21

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL SEVEN

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	13	2	1	10	
Mean	3.09	3.55	2.45	3.06	
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.28	0.00	0.36	
Response Desired Involvement					
N	13	2	1	10	
Mean	3.32	3.65	2.80	3.31	
Standard Deviation	0.42	0.07	0.00	0.42	
Response Interest					
N	12	2	1	9	
Mean	3.56	3.83	3.40	3.52	
Standard Deviation	0.35	0.11	0.00	0.38	
Response Decison Condition					
N	13	2	1	10	
Mean	-0.23	-0.10	-0.35	-0.25	
Standard Deviation	0.32	0.21	0.00	0.35	
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	13	2	1	10	
Mean	3.21	3.11	3.15	3.23	
Standard Deviation	0.35	0.37	0.00	0.38	

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL EIGHT

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	38		7	30	1
Mean	2.18		2.01	2.20	2.90
Standard Deviation	0.31		0.35	0.27	0.00
Response Desired Involvement					
N	38	7	30	1	
Mean	3.11	3.04	3.12	3.20	
Standard Deviation	0.41	0.40	0.43	0.00	
Response Interest					
N	38	7	30	1	
Mean	3.28	3.09	3.32	3.45	
Standard Deviation	0.41	0.40	0.41	0.00	
Response Decison Condition					
N	38	7	30	1	
Mean	-0.92	-1.03	-0.92	-0.30	
Standard Deviation	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.00	
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	36	7	28	1	
Mean	2.66	2.43	2.71	2.78	
Standard Deviation	0.35	0.15	0.37	0.00	

(table continues)

TABLE 4.35 (CONTINUED)
 MEAN RESPONSES OF MAJOR VARIABLES BY SCHOOL AND BY CAREER STAGE
 SCHOOL NINE

Variable	Total School	Establishment	Advancement	Maintenance	Missing
Response Actual Involvement					
N	29	4	5	15	5
Mean	2.84	2.48	2.68	3.04	2.70
Standard Deviation	0.44	0.73	0.38	0.36	0.21
Response Desired Involvement					
N	29	4	5	15	5
Mean	3.23	2.99	3.34	3.35	2.94
Standard Deviation	0.36	0.38	0.23	0.31	0.37
Response Interest					
N	29	4	5	15	5
Mean	3.38	3.25	3.53	3.49	3.02
Standard Deviation	0.37	0.41	0.20	0.31	0.44
Response Decision Condition					
N	29	4	5	15	5
Mean	-0.39	-0.51	-0.66	-0.31	-0.24
Standard Deviation	0.36	0.44	0.46	0.30	0.25
Response Job Satisfaction					
N	31	5	5	16	5
Mean	2.80	2.60	2.73	2.89	2.79
Standard Deviation	0.40	0.48	0.48	0.39	0.22

APPENDIX G