To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Phyllis Salisbury Casavant entitled "Participation in and Satisfaction with Decision Making in Selected East Tennessee Negotiating and Non-Negotiating School Districts." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Robert K. Roney, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

The Graduate School

PARTICIPATION IN AND SATISFACTION WITH DECISION MAKING IN SELECTED EAST TENNESSEE NEGOTIATING AND NON NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Phyllis Salisbury Casavant

March 1985

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my father, James Orin Salisbury, and in honor of my mother, Helen Audrey Salisbury.
Their unfailing belief in the power of education has been a constant inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge and thank the members of her committee for their support in the completion of this degree: Dr. Robert K. Roney, Chairman, Dr. Peter M. Husen, Dr. K. Owen McCullough, and Dr. Frederick P. Venditti. Also, other members of the faculty and staff at UTK whom the author wishes to thank include Dr. Dewey Stollar, Dr. Charles M. Achilles, Dr. Norma Mertz, Dr. Trudy Banta, and Ms. Melba Wilkins. All of these people, in addition to being friends, have been encouraging, supportive, and inspiring.

The writer also wishes to acknowledge and thank a very fine group of friends who have made this experience both interesting and fun. These include Dr. Edward M. Taylor, Mr. Martin McConnell, Ms. Margaret Massey-Cox, Ms. Nan Lintz, and Dr. Reginald High. Dr. Susan Newkirk-Moore provided endless hours of support, cajoling, and threatening and made the completion of this degree a reality. The author's sisters, Ms. Barbara Salisbury, Ms. Camille Jungman, and Ms. T. Irene Sanders, were also very important sources of support and encouragement. Special thanks go to Mr. Neil Thomas.

Finally, the greatest thanks have to go to the author's husband, Edward Casavant, for his tremendous support and encouragement and to her children, Jamie and Mary Ann, for their constant inspiration.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze data from 16 selected school districts in East Tennessee relative to perceived levels of participation in decision making and perceived levels of satisfaction with decisions that have been made. These data were compared with existing data collected prior to the onset of professional negotiations, and an analysis was made looking at negotiating status, position of respondent, and type of decision (or combinations of these factors) as possible sources of variance.

A questionnaire developed by Larry Peach in 1978 was used to collect data both in 1979 and, from the same systems, in 1982. Six decision areas were addressed in the study and included curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations. Statistical procedures used to analyze the data were mean participation and satisfaction scores for each of the projected decision participants (teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members), analyses of variance, multivariate analyses of variance, and Duncan's New Multiple Range Test.

Major findings of the study included the following:

1. The 1982 survey group had significantly higher mean participation scores for teachers, principals, and central office staff in several decision areas.

2. Non-negotiating systems had significantly higher participation rates than negotiating systems for teachers, principals,

and central office staff in several decision areas, while negotiating districts had significant higher participation scores for central office staff and school board members in two decisional areas.

3. Teachers reported significantly lower satisfaction levels in all six decisional areas than did principals or central office staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. INTRODUCTION

The way an organization handles the critical decison-making process is a very important variable in the overall functioning and effectiveness of that organization. There are many aspects that may be examined when considering decision making. In addition to the content of the decision and the organizational level of each decision, there is the question of who makes the decision. Employee participation in decision making has received attention over the last 20 years; and, generally, participative decision making has been positively related to employee satisfaction.

Because it is now universally recognized that organizations do not exist in vacuums and are somewhat sensitive and adaptive to the environment of which they are a part, any factor that changes in the environment may be of significance to the functioning of the organization. One such factor that has caused changes in school systems has been the advent of professional negotiations. One of the organizational dimensions that may have been affected by the negotiations process is decision making and, in turn, employee satisfaction.

As a result of the Tennessee Professional Negotiations Act (Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-5501 through 49-5516) enacted in 1978, the negotiations process had been in place in some of the state's school systems since 1979. Because a data base had been collected in 1978 relative to the decision-making process in selected East Tennessee school systems, it appeared to be a good time after three years to determine what impact, if any, the collective bargaining process has had on decision making and employee satisfaction with it. Also, the content of a decision and the position of a participant were seen as relevant to the collective bargaining process and, through the negotiations process, possibly relevant to school system decision-making participation involvement and, ultimately, job satisfaction.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The advent of the use of professional negotiations in some Tennessee school systems may have had far-ranging effects on the roles that many professionals have played in the decision-making processes of their school systems. Concomitant with these changes in the type of decisions participated in, there may also have been changes in the perceived levels with both level of participation and type of decision. Understanding whether these changes in decision-making participation levels have occurred in selected systems and whether changes in perceived satisfaction levels have resulted is important in analyzing the actual role professional negotiations have played in altering decision-making processes as well as the

subsequent repercussions both for the ways school systems are managed and for the satisfaction levels of professional employees.

Also, changes that may have occurred relative to perceived participation rates and resultant feelings of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction among decision content areas and employee classifications can be seen as part of the total picture of school governance. This understanding of the roles these factors have played in altering the governance mechanisms of a school system is critical in an analysis of decision-making processes and a resultant improvement of the quality of decisions made in a school system.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze data from 16 selected school districts in East Tennessee relative to perceived levels of participation in decision making and perceived levels of satisfaction with decisions that have been made. These data were compared with existing data collected prior to the onset of professional negotiations (1978), and an analysis was made looking at negotiating status, position of respondent, and type of decison (or combination of these factors) as possible sources of variance.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

With the passage of Public Chapter 570, the Professional Negotiations Act, on March 10, 1978, many changes have occured in the management of Tennessee's public school systems. One area that

may have been impacted is the decision-making process. In a 1980 National Education Association (NEA) study reported by Sweeney (1981) it was found that out of 1,738 teachers, 25 percent indicated that they were dissatisfied with their jobs, one in ten said they would leave teaching as soon as possible, and another two in ten were undecided as to how long they would stay in teaching. Because decision making has been linked to the perceived satisfaction levels of professional employees, it is crucial to know how the perceptions and process have changed subsequent to the advent of the negotiations process.

V. ASSUMPTIONS

The study was based on the following assumptions:

1. The questionnaire represented a reasonable and accurate assessment of perceived levels of participation in decision-making processes.

2. The questionnaire represented a reasonable and accurate assessment of perceived levels of satisfaction with decision-making processes.

3. The survey respondents answered the questionnaire in an accurate and honest way.

4. Survey respondents constituted a reasonable representation of the 16 selected school systems.

VI. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

The study was delimited to 16 selected school systems in East Tennessee. Eleven of these districts have engaged in professional negotiations, while five have not. All of the districts in the study have been members of Public Schools for Cooperative Research (PSCR), a school study council organized in 1957 with a 1982 membership composed of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 17 school districts in East Tennessee, and associate membership of the Tennessee State Department of Education.

VII. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Central office staff. A professional person employed by the Board of Education to monitor and guide the actions of all school system employees is considered a central office staff member.

Negotiating systems. Those school systems that have provessional negotiations or collective bargaining agreements with professional employees are negotiating systems.

Non-negotiating systems. Those systems that do not have professional negotiations or collective bargaining agreements with professional employees are non-negotiating systems.

Participation. The extent to which an individual, either through personal action or the action of representatives, has influence on a particular management process is the perceived participation level in the decision-making process of that individual.

Participatory decision making. The extent to which subordinates, or other groups affected by decisions, are consulted with and involved in the making of decisions is the participatory decision-making (PDM) level of those individuals.

Principal. The administrative head of an individual school is the principal.

Satisfaction. The level of achievement of an individual's expectations is the reported satisfaction level of that individual.

Teacher. A certificated individual who guides and directs the learning experience of children in schools and who has direct contact with and responsibility for children on a regular day-to-day basis. Guidance counselors and librarians are included in this category.

VIII. QUESTIONS

The study addressed the following questions:

1. Are there significant variations in the perceived participation scores in the six decisional areas? If there are differences, which of the following factors or which combination of the factors have been sources of variance: (1) position of respondent? (2) time of survey? (3) negotiating status of district?

2. Are there significant variations in the perceived satisfaction scores in the six decisional areas? If there are differences, which of the following factors or which combination

of the factors have been sources of variance: (1) position of respondent? (2) time of survey? (3) negotiating status of district?

IX. PROCEDURES

Data were gathered from 16 school districts in East Tennessee, all of which were members of the Public Schools for Cooperative Research consortium. There were 17 members in this group in 1982, but data from the 1978 study were not available for two systems. One system that had participated in the 1978 study and was no longer a PSCR member agreed to participate in the 1982 study. In the smaller systems all personnel were surveyed, while in larger systems a sufficiently large sample was randomly drawn to ensure a .05 level of confidence that the sample was representative.

A questionnaire developed by Larry Peach in 1978 (Appendix) was used in this study. The questionnaire was designed to gather information not only about respondents' perceptions about the decision-making processes within their systems but also about their levels of personal satisfaction with those decisions.

After each system agreed to participate in the study, the questionnaires were packaged in individual envelopes labelled for the person whose name had been randomly selected. These envelopes were then grouped by system and individual school and hand-delivered to each central office. School system internal mail delivery systems were used to distribute and return the questionnaires in each system. After the questionnaires were completed and returned to the central office in sealed envelopes they were collected and the data analyzed.

The multivariate analysis of variance was appropriate because the data were at the interval level from randomly selected respondents in a normally distributed population. Factors that were looked at as possible sources of variance included position of the respondent, negotiating status of the district, and time of the survey. When the F test of the one way analyses run subsequently to a significant MANOVA indicated significance, the post hoc Duncan test was used to pinpoint the difference. An alpha value of .05 was used for all statistical procedures.

X. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study was divided into four chapters as follows:

Chapter I contains an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, importance of the study, assumptions, limitations and delimitations, definition of terms, questions, procedures, and organization of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of related literature and research, while Chapter III contains the presentation and analysis of data.

Chapter IV contains the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

I. INTRODUCTION

The decision-making process has traditionally been the focus of a great deal of interest and research, both on the part of students of organizational theory and by practitioners. The development of this body of research has roughly paralleled the prevailing interests in organizational theory. In the early part of this century, most people were content to view decision making in light of Frederick Taylor's division of the world into leaders and followers and the resultant codification of decision making by these leaders.

With the rise of interest in the social sciences, there was a recognition of the relevance of the participation of employees in decision making. There was great emphasis on "democratic" leadership, and effort was made to involve employees in democratic decision making with the hope that participative employees would be in a better position to integrate their needs with the organization's needs and that the overall functioning of the organization would become much more effective.

> In our terms a worker begins to participate in the problem-solving process, and his time perspective and his awareness of the organization as a whole are enlarged while at the same time the

> organization becomes increasingly influenced through the interdependency of the parts rather than by the direction of a given part. All of these conditions are consonant with our conception of a healthy organization (Argyris, 1964, p. 207).

From this broad enthusiasm for participative decision making a refining process began, and all the many dimensions of decisions, decision makers, and decision making became in turn foci for research and theory development. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) listed some of these mediating factors as the manager's confidence in his subordinates, the nonmanager's readiness to assume responsibility, the level of group effectiveness, the impact of the behavior of the manager on his subordinates, the impact of nonmanagers' behavior on their manager, and the relationship of forces outside the organization on both the participants of an organization and the role of the organization itself. Other factors of the decision-making process, such as the content of a particular decision and the type of the organization, also were recognized. In short, it was realized that indeed organizations do not exist in a vacuum and that many subsystems are in fact existent within the organization itself.

With this recognition of the diversity and complexity of the decision-making process, there have been many separate areas of research. While traditional research focused on the vertical dimensions of decision-making involvement, who made the decision and how, recent investigators have begun to look at the horizontal dimension, what the decision is and when it should be made (Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978 , p. 13).

Taylor's advocated approach of routinizing and controlling all work, and therefore all decisions relevant to work, gave way to the participative approach which attempted to make all jobs challenging and fulfilling through satisfying the employee's higher order needs of belonging, esteem, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1970) and growth (Alderfer, 1974). The final approach has attempted to integrate both of these through using routinization of participation where appropriate to individual, group, organizational, and environmental needs (Leavitt, 1962).

When the decision-making process has been studied, there have been basically three major approaches. These include experiential studies, conceptual non-experimental studies, and experimental ones (Tannenbaum & Massarik, 1950, pp. 408-409). Of these three approaches, there has been a trend to have more of the first two types than the latter, primarily because of the complexity and difficulty of effectively carrying out experimental studies given the nature of the decision-making process itself. Because of this difficulty, data have often been inconclusive, and there has been a call to refine experimental approaches. Lowin (1968) stated:

> It is abundantly clear that any simplistic participatory decision making (PDM) hypothesis is too gross to be proven or disproven. The findings to date can best be interpreted as mapping mediating conditions which shape effects of PDM . . . . Future research would do well to focus on intermediate conditions in order to ascertain the parameters of PDM effectiveness (pp. 98-99).

For these reasons, there is a continued interest in participatory decision making and the factors involved in its

effectiveness. Participation itself has been redefined relevant to particular organizational situations, as has subordinate and superordinate satisfaction with the process. Dimensions that have been investigated include environmental factors, such as the collective bargaining process, and technical factors, such as the content of a particular decision. Personal factors have also been investigated and included the age, sex, and position of those involved in participatory decision making.

II. DECISION MAKING

Simply stated, decision making involves the "behavior that is exhibited in selecting and implementing an alternative course of action" (Hoy & Miskel, 1978, p. 267). Sergiovanni et al. (1980) listed the steps in this calculative decision-making process as including the following: the decison maker decides what should be done; he scans all possible alternatives; he weighs the consequences of these alternatives; and, then, he chooses the alternative with greatest benefit for the smallest cost (p. 355). While decision making can be viewed in this relatively simplistic way, any really helpful discussion of decision making has to recognize that it is only rarely this simple.

Sergiovanni et al. (1980) offered three major criticisms of the calculative decision-making model. In the first place, people are limited in their calculative powers; and, secondly, the organizational environment and the environmental forces surrounding

the decision-making process are often very uncertain. Finally, individuals and groups of individuals seldom decide in a calculative manner (pp. 356-361). Furthermore, it has been recognized that in educational administration, where most problems are ill-structured and continually changing, not all the information needed for a calculative decision is available at the time the decision is needed (Owens & Lewis, 1976, p. 57). These problems surround defining the decision-making process in addition to the often wide disparities among the needs and wants of the various groups involved (Alkin, 1973).

III. PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING

Participative Decision Making Defined

Melcher (1976) has defined participative decision making (PDM) as the "extent to which subordinates, or other groups who are affected by decisions, are consulted with and involved in the making of decisions" (p. 12). In an organization, this process includes almost any effort to involve more groups and more people in the development of policy. While the ultimate decision-making authority may not rest with each of the groups involved, PDM includes formally structured ways for organizational participants to contribute directly to the decision-making process (ERIC, 1977). Lammers (1967) has stated that this participation can either be direct (personal) or indirect (representative).

PDM is a very complex process and involves not only the type of participation but also the stage of the process where

participation takes place, the levels and kinds of decisions involved, the importance of the decisional areas to participants, and the desired and actual levels of involvement (Inkpen, Ponder, & Crocker, 1975). While there has been widespread interest in PDM in organizations in general, there has been a similar concern with PDM in educational institutions in particular. Factors unique to educational organizations have been recognized as pertinent to the use and study of PDM processes designed to encourage subordinate participation in decision making.

PDM in the Schools

The very nature of an educational organization encourages the use of PDM. Hanson (1973) listed factors in educational organizations that influence PDM as the nature of the teaching task, the looseness of system structures, the traditions of autonomy and professionalism, collegiality, the low level of visibility in the classroom, the claim of teaching expertise, and the need of the teacher to control the learning process. Because of the combination of all these factors, there has been widespread interest in the use of PDM in schools. PDM is seen as the decison-making process most consistent with democratic principles and the American ethos while at the same time it gives students the opportunity of seeing a functioning democratic institution. Also, PDM is viewed as promoting better decisions with an increased chance of successful implementation. Communication is improved, and human resources are more effectively

utilized. PDM, furthermore, is supposed to improve school morale, professional pride, and subordinate job satisfaction (ERIC, 1977).

While these benefits are usually given as reasons for supporting efforts to encourage the involvement of participants in decision making, there are several conditions that are usually mentioned as prerequisites. Owens and Lewis (1976) listed these prerequisites as including subordinate ability to understand, a belief that PDM is consistent with the purposes of the organization, subordinate belief that PDM is compatible with one's own interests, and ability to comply (p. 58). In addition, subordinates must be motivated to comply, differences in expertise should not be too great (Mulder, 1971), and subordinates must be able to express themselves (Tannenbaum & Massarik, 1950). Owens and Lewis (1976) stated that when the problem is complex with elements that are ambiguous and not readily quantifiable, when the elements of the problem are interrelated and not easily separated, when the solution needs coordination and the interaction of a number of people, and when the problem is emergent, PDM is a likely method of decison making. The administrator must be an effective communicator; there must be consensus and knowledge of school goals; and there must be a perception that what is being asked for is actually possible (Owens & Lewis, 1976).

There are, of course, cautions that have been mentioned when considering the use of PDM in schools. Negative past experiences can play a large part in current attitudes toward PDM attempts, as well as ideological beliefs countervailing its efficacy. Management

reluctance can quickly dampen enthusiasm, and the stress of any change can be a hindering factor. Also, structural hierarchies and traditional practices can make subordinates hesistant to participate fully in PDM (Lowin, 1968).

Research on PDM

Over the past 25 years there have been many research studies on the decision-making process in education. Many of these studies have supported one or more of three general theoretical formulations. Bartunek and Keys (1979) listed these three generalized conclusions as including the following: (1) the characteristics of certain decisions are related to whether participation is appropriate; (2) the reasons a manager chooses to use PDM affect the effectiveness of its use; (3) the reasons a subordinate desires and chooses to participate in PDM vary and are also related to the effectiveness and use of the model.

The investigation of these formulations has led to several generalizations. Robinson (1979) listed some of these as follows: teachers desire more participation in school decision making than they are generally allowed to have; the desire for participation is very much related to the content of the decision under consideration; increased subordinate participation is positively related to teacher job satisfaction and school effectiveness; and the desire for increased decision-making involvement is related to several personal characteristics of individual teachers, such as age, sex, teaching position, and experience. Also decisional participation has been

noted as being a factor not only in job satisfaction but also in the enthusiasm a teacher has for a particular school and for a particular principal (Owens, 1970, pp. 92-95).

The discrepancy between the actual level of participation in decision making and the desired level has been the focus of many studies. Of these, Alutto and Belasco's investigations have been among those most often cited. They (1972A) have identified this discrepancy between current and desired rates of participation as crucial for several reasons. There is a range of participation, from the presentation of an opinion to membership in a group with final decisional authority and responsibility, as well as varying forms of organizational outcomes resulting from participation. Also, the desire for participation is by no means evenly distributed among organizational participants or among decisional areas. Because of these factors, Alutto and Belasco (1972A) developed a continuum of participation, from decisional deprivation through decisional equilibrium to decisional saturation. On the decisional deprivation end of this continuum, the subordinate feels he is participating in fewer decisions than he desires, while decisional equilibrium status represents participation in as many as desired. The participation in more decisions than is desired results in decisional saturation. Furthermore, since the content of a particular decision is a critical variable in the way a subordinate feels about his participation, any particular employee may at the same point in time find himself on various points on the continuum.

Using their continuum as a base, Alutto and Belasco (1972A) surveyed teachers in two school districts in New York and found that those who considered themselves decisionally deprived desired greater participation, that decisionally saturated participants were well distributed throughout the range of decisional situations, and that decisionally saturated individuals clearly desired to have lower rates of participation. In addition, this study revealed that when teachers felt that they were allowed participation in far fewer decisional areas than they desired, there were a greater perceived role conflict, a greater probability that those feeling this way were males employed in secondary schools, greater attitudinal militancy, and the perception that the superintendent had greater influence. On the other hand, those teachers who felt they were decisionally saturated were more often older female elementary teachers experiencing only minimal role conflict and who were moderately unfavorable to collective bargaining. Further studies by Inkpen, Ponder, and Crocker (1975), Robinson (1979), and Conway (1976) confirmed these findings that significant differences existed between desired and actual levels of participation among teachers and that the desire for participation was relative to the decisional area under consideration.

The process of group decision making is pertinent to the consideration of the role teachers play in school decision making. Knoop and O'Reilly (1975) found when surveying secondary teachers in Ontario that teachers desired less personal decisional power and greater participation in group decision making on a collaborative

basis, while Piper (1974) found higher quality decisions from groups than from individuals.

Because of the discrepancy between actual and desired levels of participation and because of the desire that this participation take the form of a collaborative role, the role of the building level manager, or principal, is very important when considering PDM in schools. Anderson (1975) found that an increase in administrative control through the increased use of bureaucratic rules resulted in an impersonalization in teachers' relations with students and greater resistance to change. Bridges (1967) found that teachers preferred principals who encouraged staff involvement in decision making, while Gorton (1971) found that the principal's willingness to allow this involvement was influenced by his own personal role orientation, by the expectations of his immediate superior, and by the expectations of his faculty. In addition, Blumberg, Wayson, and Weber (1969) documented that when a principal involved his faculty in school decision making, he did not necessarily lose authority. In fact, with increased staff participation, the principal gained more influence and control over school policy.

When considering participation by teachers in school decision making, there are costs as well as benefits. Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) listed five such potential costs as including increased time demands, loss of individual teacher autonomy, the risk of collegial disfavor, the subversion of the collective bargaining process, and

threats to individual career advancement if the individual is seen as too vocal. When teachers were asked to compare these costs with the potential benefits of feelings of self-efficacy, ownership of the collective enterprise, and the ethos of the workplace democracy (Duke et al., 1980), respondents generally gave higher ratings to the benefits than the costs. The only reluctance to participate was evidenced in a lack of generalized belief that participation opportunities were genuine. Sixty percent of the respondents felt that even when given a chance to participate that they had no real influence.

From these research results it can be asserted that teachers desire greater opportunities for involvement in school decision making than they have generally been allowed to have. This desire may not be for individual autonomy as much as for a collaborative participation in a representative group. The nature of the decisional content, as well as the role of the principal, is critical. Most importantly, opportunities for participation must offer avenues for real influence and shared responsibility.

IV. SATISFACTION

Job Satisfaction and PDM

The issue of job satisfaction is a complicated one. Researchers in the early stages of investigating this issue were chiefly concerned with the contention that more satisfied workers would be more productive, while later research looked at the reverse of this--namely,

that more productive workers tended to have higher levels of overall satisfaction (Holdaway, 1978). While these two avenues of research at first appear to look at the same thing, the approaches were very different. While the former focused on the product, the latter highlighted the process and the individuals involved in that process. In both cases, however, "any simplistic relationship between PDM on the one hand, and productivity or satisfaction on the other, is likely illusory" (Inkpen et al., 1975, p. 1). There are many, many factors involved in job satisfaction, from individual variables to organizational variables to environmental ones.

One of these variables, however, has been shown to be the extent to which an employee is allowed to participate in decisions affecting his work. And it may be said that this is particularly true for members in educational institutions.

Job Satisfaction and Teachers

In a 1980 National Education Association (NEA) study reported by Sweeney (1981, p. 1) it was found that 25 percent of 1,738 teachers surveyed expressed dissatisfaction with their current jobs. One in ten said they would leave teaching as soon as possible, while another two in ten were undecided as to how long they would stay in teaching. Also, secondary teachers appeared to be more unhappy than elementary teachers. These figures are alarming, and the reasons for such high levels of unrest are definitely worthy of investigation.

The decade of the 1960's has been identified as a period of unrest and increasing alienation for teachers who were seeking new roles with increased professional autonomy and more say in educational policy making (Cox & Wood, 1980). While this process may have begun in the 60's, it is by no means resolved. Various reasons for this generalized unrest have been given, such as a lack of follow through for innovations and the fact that school boards have not educated their publics about their responsibilities (Shanker, 1975); but paternalism is possibly the most frequently cited cause. Used in this context, "paternalism" refers to the fact that teachers have earned the right to negotiate for salary, benefits, and working conditions, but they still have gained little input in educational policy decisions. "No group of professionals in American society--other than teachers--has so little to say about how its members discharge their responsibilities" (Shanker, 1975, p. 23).

It is clearly evident that the opportunity to participate in school decision making through PDM mechanisms is relevant to teacher job satisfaction. While PDM is only one of the factors involved, many studies have highlighted its importance.

> Many school boards and administrators today are talking about "allowing" teachers to participate more in the decision process. However, teachers appear to want authority to make certain types of decisions, not merely the opportunity to become involved with some stages of decision making at the discretion of the administration (Corwin, 1965, p. 16).

Research on PDM and Job Satisfaction

Many studies have confirmed that there is a relationship between the level of involvement of teachers in decision making and

self-reported job satisfaction. Hermann (1971) found a slight correlation between faculty morale and the involvement in school policy, while greater correlations were found by Tjosvold (1977) and in a Montana study cited by Keef (1979).

Belasco and Alutto (1972) examined the relationship between the levels of teacher satisfaction and their state of decisional participation (deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation) and found systematic relationships between individual satisfaction and decisional state. Best (1973) also used the Alutto Belasco Decisional Participation Scale and had similar results: those decisionally deprived had the lowest morale.

Holdaway (1978) made a distinction between facet satisfaction (a person's affective reactions to particular aspects of his job) and overall satisfaction (reactions to total work role) and found that, while facet satisfaction scores differentially contributed to feelings of overall job satisfaction, lack of participation in decision making negatively contributed to the overall satisfaction score. When they looked at the increasing levels of teacher alienation, Cox and Wood (1980) found that decision-making participation was negatively associated with teacher alienation. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) investigated self-reported teacher stress and the response correlates of this stress, including job satisfaction, and found that job satisfaction was negatively related to teacher stress.

In a project conducted at the Wisconsin Center for Education Research it was found that a high level of teacher PDM activities

was characteristic of instructionally innovative schools and that, concomitantly, there was a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceived level of involvement and their overall job satisfaction (Lipham, 1983). In a similar study, Devlin (1978) found that the level of teacher participation in 20 decision-making areas was shown to be significantly related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job tension.

Several other investigators have found results confirming the relationship between level of PDM activity and job satisfaction. Snyder (1971), Sweeney (1981), and Hornstein et al. (1968) all found that when teachers were allowed some decision-making control, self-reported job satisfaction scores were higher. "The greater the extent to which the school faculty felt they were able to exercise control over professional matters, the greater their overall satisfaction in their positions" (Sweeney, 1981, p. 5).

The relationship between participation in school decision making and job satisfaction has clearly been documented. Since job satisfaction is related to effectiveness, this relationship cannot be ignored.

V. COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

Over the last 15 years the influence of the collective negotiation process on American education has steadily grown, both in terms of the number of people involved and in terms of the scope of issues addressed through this means. In 1962 the first significant

collective bargaining contract covering teachers was negotiated in New York City (Lieberman, 1979), and by 1982 over 60 percent of the country's teachers were covered by some type of bargaining agreement (Schachter, 1983). In view of this rapid growth, study of this influence has also increased.

When the Tennessee legislature passed the Tennessee Professional Negotiations Act (Tennessee Code Annotated, Section 49-5501 through 49-5516) in 1978, it became only the second southern state to allow teachers to negotiate (Freeman, Martin, & Roney, 1980). This legislation prohibited strikes and included within the scope of negotiations salaries or wages, grievance procedures, insurance, fringe benefits (excluding pensions and retirement programs), working conditions, leave, student discipline procedures, and payroll deductions. The scope of bargaining issues varies from state to state, and there has been much discussion and disagreement about what issues legitimately belong in the negotiations process. Also, the issues of alienation, professionalism, the control structure of public schools, differences in employee bargaining between the private and public sectors, and the relationship of the collective bargaining process to school decision making are all important aspects when considering the rapid growth and subsequent effects of collective bargaining for employees in the nation's public school system.

Alienation, Professionalism, and Control

The issues of alienation, professionalism, and the control structure of the public schools are all closely connected. A sense

of alienation from any real influence on the nature of their work has led teachers to seek a more professional identity as a means of gaining more control over their work lives. This professional identity has taken the form of professional associations with the power to participate in the collective bargaining process. Corwin (1965) stated:

> Professional associations were, of course, originally formed in order to free vocations from lay control . . . . The process of professionalizing publicly-supported vocations, then, is likely to be militant. It represents a challenge to the traditional ideologies of control by laymen and their administrative representatives. The professionalization of any vocation (including school administration) will involve boundary disputes among laymen, the professionals, and public administrators (p. 4).

This sense of alienation among teachers has been defined by Clark (1959) as "the degree to which man feels powerless to achieve the role that he has determined to be rightfully his in specific situations" (p. 849). Because the growth of the size of the controlling bureaucracy in most schools has reduced communication lines (Bailey & Booth, 1978) and because this growth has reduced the opportunities for teachers to participate in decisions directly affecting their work (Adams, 1970), this alienation has led to a desire for power "grounded not in patterns of dominance and submission but in the enlargement and diversity of participation in human association" (Clayton, 1965, p. 73).

Freers (1982) identified four patterns that labor/management relations can take in American schools: paternalism, collective bargaining, collegial problem solving, and community problem solving.

While paternalism is an old pattern that is becoming less and less acceptable to today's teachers because of this increasing feeling of alienation, collegial problem solving and community problem solving can be successful only if individual participants, systems, and/or communities are willing to invest the time needed. In her study, Freers found that the size of the system was a significant factor, with collegial and/or community problem solving more effective in smaller systems and communities where communications lines were shorter and attitudes more homogeneous. In any case, it is evident that teachers have become less and less willing to be paternalistically controlled; and, for many systems where collegial and community problem solving are unwieldy or unworkable, collective negotiations have come to be viewed by many professionals as both a viable alternative and an antidote to alienation producing paternalism.

In a study involving Washington state teachers and principals and Swedish teachers and principals, however, Peterson (1972) found that while there was no incongruency perceived between collective negotiations and professionalism, there was little positive effect seen by survey respondents of the negotiations process on professionalism and job satisfaction. In other words, respondents felt that while negotiations may have contributed to higher salaries, they had as yet (1972) seen little effect on the quality of education and increased job satisfaction through greater control of work and increased professionalism.

In a 1982 study by Eberts and Pierce, however, it was found that collective bargaining was related to school decision making

and resource allocation for instruction by providing a stronger voice for mainstream teachers. In any event, the collective bargaining process is perceived by many to be related to the issues of professionalism, control, and alienation (Corwin, 1965).

Another trend in public education, accountability, has had an effect on the professionalization process. With taxpayers angry over more and more demands for money by school systems there has come a cry for proof of results (Bailey & Booth, 1978). This demand has resulted in a subsequent demand by teachers that they be regarded as "responsible professionals capable not only of directing their own activities, but also of assuming responsibility for the success of the school as a whole" (Hills, 1977, p. 127). There has not been perceived by teachers to be a corresponding growth in decision-making autonomy for them.

There are several characteristics that distinguish a professional. Clayton (1965) listed these as including: performing a distinctive service which utilizes intellectual abilities and techniques acquired through extended study; using activities subject to theoretical analysis, criticism, and resultant modification; making autonomous decisions and acceptance of responsibility for decisions; taking an intrinsic interest in work above a narrow economic self-interest; belonging to a comprehensive professional network; and maintaining standards of ethical conduct regulated by collegial organizations (p. 69).

It is easy to see that a professional who finds himself in a bureaucratic organization is immediately in a compromised situation.

> The professional in the bureaucratic organizations finds his work subject to evaluation and control by individuals deriving their authority from principles of bureaucratic administration, not members of his professional peer group (Cox & Wood, 1980, p. 2).

In addition to this increasing alienation, the conflict experienced by a professional in a bureaucratic organization, and the demand for accountability, there are other aspects of the field of education that helped set the stage for the rise of the collective bargaining process. The wide dispersion of the authority of the principal from system to system, and even from school to school within a system, led teachers to seek more clarification of their role (Redfern, 1968). Also, a claim to a unique expertise in a professional forced a "claim to expertness in the application of this study to a field of action" (Clayton, 1965, p. 70). A job shortage making job changing difficult for dissatisfied teachers, more primary wage earners in the profession, and a decline in respect for authority with a resultant loss of status and increase in the difficulty of teaching (Bailey & Booth, 1978) were also factors in the increased demand for collective bargaining capability.

Collective Bargaining and School Decision Making

There is a relationship between educational decision making and collective bargaining. While the credentials of teachers have improved and the sense of a professional identity has increased over

the last 20 years, there has not been a concomitant increase in responsibility and the distribution of authority for these same teachers (Hills, 1977). School systems have become larger and more complex, resulting in an increased administrative control at the same time teachers have been demanding more professional autonomy. Also, the idea of more and better lay control of schooling has been a decided factor in decreasing the potential for increased individual participation in school decision making.

Because of the colliding effects of teacher demands for professionalism and autonomy with the growth of larger and more complex school systems with increased administrative and bureaucratic control and the cry for a larger lay voice in schooling issues, collective bargaining has come to be seen by many teachers as a "means whereby teachers may have increased input into the decision-making authority of the organization and, consequently, provided a rule structure that has more meaning for them" (Adams, 1970, p. 4). Alutto and Belasco (1972B) found that teacher demands for increased participation in decision making were related to role ambiguity and conflict and that those who considered themselves most deprived in making decisions tended to be those who were most in conflict with the administrative control structure of their systems.

While there were many factors involved in the increase in collective bargaining opportunities for teachers, the demand for increased participation in the decisions that affect their work

definitely appears to be a significant factor. This demand is related to a growth in a sense of professionalism among teachers as well as the feeling of powerlessness and alienation.

From the beginning of the growth of collective bargaining in education, there has been a conflict between administrators and teachers' organizations as to what constituted legitimate bargaining issues. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) argued for limiting negotiable issues to salaries, welfare benefits, and class size, while the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) felt that the procedures for making educational policy decisions were appropriate issues for negotiation (Schachter, 1983). The Tennessee legislation, while including salaries, grievance procedures, and payroll deductions, also included working conditions. This last category can be expanded to include the very crux of educational policy making since almost any school decision has an effect on the working conditions of teachers. Indeed, over the past 15 years the scope of bargained contracts has become not only larger but also more comprehensive (Schachter, 1983). It is easy to see that the AFT position has prevailed over the AASA stance.

While the scope of bargained issues has grown to include class size, teaching assignments, auxiliary duties, lunch activities, playground supervision, pupil discipline, staff meetings, allocation of teaching supplies and materials, and other issues in the day-to-day operation of the schools, there has also been a power shift in the control structure of the schools. Teachers have insisted on bargaining

directly with top school officials through their own representatives. The ability and sanction to do this have resulted in vesting formal authority on teachers as a group (Hanson, 1973). This authority is in contrast to the traditional bureaucratic control structure of public education as well as the notion of lay control over schools.

In the 1982 Eberts and Pierce study, based on school districts in Michigan and New York, the results of more teacher input into the decision-making process through collective bargaining were clearly seen. These results supported a theory of the role that unions play in educational decision making.

> It states that collective bargaining in public education will make a difference when the preferences of the average teacher and the preferences of the school administration differ on such matters as salaries, fringe benefits, working conditions, and educational policy. . . . It has given teachers an alternative to expressing their preferences solely through the decision to stay or leave. Our theory states that resource allocation decisions that affect student achievement will be different to the extent that unions represent a different set of teacher preferences in collective bargaining than were previously considered by management (pp. 97-98).

The ways that this power is used by teachers have the potential for affecting decision making in individual schools as well as in entire systems in addition to the variety of issues that are actually bargained.

Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector

When examining the effects of the collective bargaining process on educational decision making, it is interesting to examine the salient features of bargaining in the public sector. There are several factors involved in collective bargaining in education that distinguish the process from traditional collective bargaining between labor and management in the private sector.

In the first place, there is a three-way interaction among teachers, the superintendent, and the board. This allows for more factions to develop and participate in the process (Cresswell & Simpson, 1977). Also, teachers help determine, in many cases, who is management through superintendent and school board elections (Lieberman, 1979). Funds are not always controlled exclusively by those who are directly participating in negotiations, so many processes are going on at the same time. Berg (1969) listed these as including local and state bargaining, local bargaining and state lobbying, local and state political power playing, and the centralization of policy and funding at the state level.

Eiken (1977) cited the major weaknesses of the labor-management negotiations model in education as the linkage of teachers' personal needs with pupils' instructional needs, the lack of connection between financial priorities with the traditional educational process which is supposed to involve the community, and the inhibition of curriculum change until a bargained contract runs out. While the differences between public and private sector negotiations distinguish one from the other, they also help explain some of the critical issues involved when examining the effects of the collective-bargaining process on educational decision making.

Conclusion

Collective bargaining and the school decision-making process are connected in two ways. Dissatisfaction with a lack of participation

in educational decision making was a factor in the feelings of alienation and powerlessness that contributed to the demand by teacher organizations for collective bargaining. Once collective negotiation mechanisms were set into place, factors of the process, in turn, had effects on school decision making through changes in the control structure of the schools. "The way management makes decisions and builds consensus effects its position at the table; the conduct of bargaining affects the way decisions are made" (Cresswell & Simpson, 1977, p. 50).

While it is often difficult to isolate the variable of the decision-making process when studying an organization, it can be seen as a factor in both the personal satisfaction of employees and in organizational functioning. At a time when the public is increasingly questioning the effectiveness of both teachers and schools the relationships of decision making to school structure and collective bargaining are of importance.

VI. DECISION CONTENT

Decision Content and Decision-Making Method

When considering the decision-making process in schools, the content of a particular decision is an important variable. While investigators have studied collective negotiations and the effects of that process on school decision making in the last 20 years, the content of decisions has also figured prominently.

Owens and Lewis (1976) listed three patterns for decision making within a particular school: participatory decision making with each individual taking part, representative participation through chosen members, and decisions made by the principal alone. Lipham (1983) suggested that the appropriateness of one of these patterns in a given situation is relative to decision content. He suggested that mandatory widespread staff participation is appropriate when determining objectives, establishing policies, and evaluating instruction, while staff participation may or may not be called for when selecting equipment or textbooks. Lipham (1983) called this type of PDM permissive. Prohibited participation (no widespread participation) was appropriate with decisions such as staff assignment and evaluation (p. 2).

Bedley (1980) listed the subjects of most decisions in school systems as including the following: communication with the public, within the school, and with parents; staffing; budget; curriculum; discipline and attendance; homework; pupil evaluation; parent conferences; teacher/advisee relationships; support services; and staff development and evaluation (p. 1). In a 1978 study, Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman separated the school decision areas into two domains, the managerial and the technical. The managerial domain included hiring new personnel, planning school budgets, determining specific professional assignments, resolving employee grievances, planning new facilities, working with community groups, and determining professional salaries. The technical domain included selecting specific

texts, working with individual learning problems of specific students, choosing the best instructional methods and techniques, establishing general instructional policies, and choosing classroom discipline methods. A third (and weaker) domain, the negotiations domain, was identified from two factors from the managerial domain: resolving employee grievances and determining professional salaries. When teachers were asked to describe their participation rates in the separate domains, it was found that teachers did discriminate among the domains and felt that they participated more in the technical domain than in the other two. Furthermore, dissatisfaction with chances for real participation and feelings of role ambiguity were associated most strongly with decisions from the technical domain where decisions are related to classroom matters. In other words, for teachers:

> . . . The degree of participation individuals perceive themselves to have in the relevant decisional domains is hypothesized to be systematically related to their reported satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role overload (Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978, p. 16).

Simpkins and Firesen (1969) in a study in Canada looked at 12 task activities in the five task areas of curriculum and planning and adaptation, classroom management, arrangement of the school instructional program, and general school organization using three decision-making modes: teacher, formal staff groups, and higher official authority. In results similar to Mohrman's, they also found that teachers wanted the extent and type of participation to vary with the nature of the decision. Once again, teachers were most concerned with instructional decisions (Simpkins & Friesen, 1969).

Decision Content and Desire for Participation

Bridges (1967) identified three general tests to determine decisions over which teachers were most interested in having influence. The test of relevance asked whether teachers felt the decision related to the nature of their work, while the test of expertise concerned whether teachers had the requisite knowledge necessary to make the decision. The test of jurisdiction concerned the ability to implement the decision and related to whether teacher acceptance was necessary to decisional implementation. Owens and Lewis (1976) related these three questions to desires for participation and, depending on expertise, relevance, and jurisdiction, identified a zone of sensitivity with a highly desired degree of participation, a zone of ambivalence with a varying desire for participation, and a zone of indifference when no participation is generally desired.

Hoy and Miskel (1978) discussed the fit between these zones of desired participation with the tests of relevance, expertise, and jurisdiction (pp. 228-235). Clearly, high personal interest should be related to high expertise, while those decisions falling within the zone of indifference may be related to lower relevance and expertise. The ways these factors fit together, of course, vary from school to school and from situation to situation within a school (Owens & Lewis, 1976) and are critical in determining the technique of decision making to be used.

Owens (1970) listed five techniques administrators may use when involving teachers in the decision-making process: discussion,

information seeking, democratic-centralist, parliamentarian, and participant determining (p.110). Methods centered on discussion and information-seeking would be more appropriate with decisions falling within the zone of indifference, while the zone of sensitivity might call for one of the other three listed methods. Both Lipham (1983) and Pitkoff (1981) highlighted the importance of the behavior of the leader in PDM and the notification at the outset of all the participants of what decision-making method will be used.

Stage of Participation

In addition to the relevance of the content of a particular decision, both to teachers' desire for participation and the resulting satisfaction with that participation, the stage at which any participation occurred appears significant. Wood (1972) identified three phases of the decision-making process: the generation, evaluation, and choice of alternative resolutions. He found that the point at which group members participated in the decision-making process, as well as the nature of the decisional issues, affected individual perceptions of influence.

Conclusion

The relationships among the factors of decisional content and teacher desire for both participation and influence have been shown to be critical. Any simple matching of desire for participation with opportunity for influence is inappropriate. Many other factors are involved, from the personalities of all participants to time,

cost, and legal factors. The issue is complicated and requires meshing all these factors in the most appropriate way in order to avoid the situation described by Mulder (1971).

> . . . People may be engaged to participate in matters which are either completely unimportant or above their level of expertness. Such participation can be regarded as a learning process for which people are not rewarded: when they realize that they are not, in fact, contributing anything, they will have learned not to engage themselves in any other, possibly productive and useful, participation activities (p. 36).

VII. PDM AND PARTICIPANT POSITION

When examining PDM and the decision-making process in schools, it is obvious that both participation and satisfaction rates vary according to the position each participant holds. Traditionally, school decision making has been hierarchical, with the majority of decisions made at the central office or school board levels. Principals were next in participation rates; teachers were the least consulted. In the past 15 years, however, the negotiations process between school boards and teacher associations has apparently had an effect on patterns of participation in the school decision-making process.

It is perhaps ironic that while teachers have expressed a desire to increase their participation "in matters concerning one's own job and immediate work surroundings" (Holter, 1965, p. 298), the scope of negotiated contracts has grown larger with its concomitant diminished community control (through the principal) and a hiatus on innovation (for the length of the contract) (Schachter, 1983). Principals have felt left out of the negotiations process and out

of the decision-making hierarchy, unable to influence board policy on one hand and the teacher contract on the other (Cronin & Crocker, 1969).

The effects of several individual and organizational characteristics on the job satisfaction of principals were tested by Bacharach and Mitchell (1983). They found that those principals in the middle of the decision-making continuum, i.e., those neither deprived nor saturated, were more satisfied. In other words, power that was perceived as appropriate made their jobs easier. Caldwell et al. (1981) also found that principals, when they were included in the decision-making process through meaningful input with the central office and the board prior to the bargaining process, experienced more role satisfaction.

> Many respondents indicated that they are not satisfied with the way in which their own salaries and benefits are determined and that they do not have adequate participation in the teacher-district negotiations. The implications seem to be obvious, either get the principals more involved or expect them to be increasingly dissatisfied (Caldwell et al., 1981, p. 11).

While principals have had questions about their responsibilities, teachers have still felt "quite deprived from making managerial decisions" (Lipham, 1983, p. 2), particularly in the areas of school organization, teacher evaluation procedures, hiring new professional staff, setting school-wide policies, and determining school goals. In 1976, Yarborough reviewed 42 studies to determine how teachers felt about PDM and found out that participation in decision making was highly regarded.

While teachers have felt left out of the decision-making hierarchy, there has been a public call for accountability of teaching methods and practices. In other words, many teachers have felt they have more responsibility for their work without a concomitant rise in their authority (Corwin, 1965). At the same time the board of education, those most removed from the operating level of the school, are those held most responsible (Corwin, 1965).

> The reallocation of power in educational decision making more properly means a more effective division of responsibility and authority among teachers, principals, other administrators, and supervisors. It is the application of the best expertise available to a given problem. . . . The allocation of more power to teachers does not necessarily mean a surrender of a like amount to the other components in the decision-making process (Redfern, 1968, p. 25).

It is easy to see that while the collective bargaining process has had an effect on the ways decisions are being made in school systems, it has had an effect on ways various participants (teachers, principals, central office staff) view their roles in the decision-making process as well. While Fisher (1969) found no significant difference in the attitude toward collective bargaining based on the position of the participant, Eberts and Pierce (1982) asserted that:

> Contract provisions place constraints on the decisions of administrators. They sometimes place limits on the way resources are employed. . . . The larger the number of provisions in a contract, the less able are administrators to avoid the impact of the contract provision by substituting another (pp. 99-100).

It is evident that, if participation in decision making is a factor in job satisfaction (Caldwell et al., 1981; Bacharach & Mitchell, 1983) and if the decision-making process is being affected by collective

bargaining (Eberts & Pierce, 1982), then the relationship between the position of a school system professional and the decision-making process is very much affected as well. When, either through altered, constrained or increased participation, the PDM process is modified by the collective-bargaining process, then job satisfaction will probably be altered (increased or decreased). Because of this complex relationship, the position of a participant is a relevant variable when considering participatory decision making and job satisfaction.

VIII. SUMMARY

With the increased focus over the last 20 years on the participation of organizational members in the decision-making process and the relationship between participation and job satisfaction, there has been an increasingly complex and detailed look at the variables involved. From a pyramidal organizational structure with decisions made by those in the top level of management there has been a shift to more subordinate participation. Environmental factors (the collective-bargaining process), technical factors (decision content), and personal factors (participant position) have been among those aspects of decision making that have been investigated relative to their relationship both to participatory decision making and job satisfaction.

Research studies have generally shown that members in educational organizations desire greater meaningful involvement in school decisions, and this participation has also been related to

perceived job satisfaction. The collective-bargaining process has been seen by many to be an attempt to gain greater control over professional performance. Also, it has been shown that the content of a decision is relevant to the desire for participation, as is the organizational position of the individual.

The relationships among these variables are as complex as the relationship between participatory decision making and job satisfaction. They are, by no means, the only variables involved. Still, the collective-bargaining process, decision content, and the organizational position of those involved are three critical variables that can be used to study both decision making and job satisfaction.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

Because the decision-making process has been shown to be an important variable in the overall effectiveness of an organization and because employee satisfaction with that process has also been shown to be a factor in employee functioning, an understanding of key factors in decision making in Tennessee school systems would be useful to educational professionals. This study looked at differences among organizational members and their perceptions about key participants in the decision-making process as well as their feelings of satisfaction with the process. Also, because baseline data were collected from the same systems in 1978, comparisons were made between 1978 (before the actual implementation of collective negotiations) and 1982 (when the collective-negotiations process had been in place three years) in order to see if perceptions had changed over time and if these changes were relative to the position of the respondent, whether the system was one that had chosen to utilize the negotiations process, or a combination of factors. The 1978 data were collected after the decision whether to negotiate had been made and prior to actual implementation. Because of this, comparison could be made between systems that had chosen to negotiate and those that had not for both survey years.

II. RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

School systems participating in this study were members of the Public Schools for Cooperative Research consortium (PSCR). PSCR was organized in 1957 and in 1982 included as members 17 school districts in East Tennessee, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and the Tennessee State Department of Education. The study included 16 school districts. Data from 1978 were unavailable for Knox County and Hamblen County. Bristol, while no longer a PSCR member in 1982, agreed to participate in the study.

Figure 1 lists the systems that participated in the study. Surveys were sent to a random sample of central office staff and principals. All teachers in the smaller systems (Clinton, Harriman, Lenoir City, and Oneida) were surveyed, while a random-sampling technique was used for teachers from the remaining systems in order to assure a sample size sufficiently large to assure a confidence level of .05 in all statistical procedures. Eleven out of the 16 systems chose to participate in the negotiations process.

Table I contains the sample size and number of respondents for each position level for each year data were collected, as well as for the two groups: negotiating districts and non-negotiating districts. For the 1978 data, the total return rate was 68.6 percent for negotiating districts and 59.0 percent for non-negotiating systems. For negotiating districts, 68.7 percent of the sample of teachers, 67.8 percent of the sample of principals, and 68.8 percent of the sample

Anderson County

*Bristol

Chattanooga

Claiborne County

*Clinton

Cocke County

Greene County

*Greeneville

Harriman

Knoxville

Lenoir

*Morristown

*Oak Ridge

Oneida

Rhea County

Roane County

*Systems choosing not to participate in the negotiations process

Figure 1

School Systems Participating in the Study

TABLE I

SAMPLE SIZE AND SURVEY RESPONSE OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF FROM SELECTED EAST TENNESSEE NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1978 AND 1982

	1978						1982					
	Negotiating Districts			Non-Negotiating Districts			Negotiating Districts			Non-Negotiating Districts		
Position	Sample Size	Return	%	Sample Size	Return	%	Sample Size	Return	%	Sample Size	Return	%
Teacher	1860	1277	68.7	699	411	58.8	900	501	55.7	200	82	41.0
Principal	283	192	67.8	55	35	63.6	43	37	86.0	13	5	38.4
Central Office Staff	144	99	68.8	42	24	57.1	45	40	88.9	13	6	46.1
Total	2287	1568	68.6	796	470	59.0	988	578	58.5	226	93	41.2

of central office staff included in the survey population returned questionnaires. For 1978 non-negotiating districts, 58.8 percent of the teachers, 63.6 percent of the principals, and 57.1 percent of the central office staff included in the survey sample returned questionnaires.

A total of 58.5 percent of the survey population in negotiating districts and 41.2 percent in non-negotiating districts completed and returned the 1982 survey. In negotiating districts, 55.7 percent of the survey sample of teachers, 86.0 percent of the survey sample of principals, and 88.9 percent of the survey sample of central office staff returned questionnaires, while in non-negotiating districts 41.0 percent of the teacher sample, 38.4 percent of the principal sample, and 46.1 percent of the central office staff sample returned questionnaires.

III. QUESTIONNAIRE AND DATA GATHERING

This survey used the Peach Critical Decision Inventory Questionnaire developed by Larry Peach in 1978. The survey instrument was designed to gather information both on respondents' perceptions about the way decisions are made in their respective districts and on the respondents' personal levels of satisfaction with these decision-making processes. Six critical decision areas were identified: curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations.

Each decision area contained five decision situations. Respondents were asked to use a Likert-type scale to record the perceived level of participation for each decision for teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members. The Likert-type scale ranged from "No Participation" to "Makes Decision" and was as follows:

None	Provides Information		Recommends Decision		Influences Decision		Makes Decision
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

In addition, the following Likert-type scale was used to record the respondents' perceived levels of satisfaction with the decisional areas of curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations:

Highly Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

After each system agreed to participate in the study, the questionnaires were packaged in individual envelopes labeled with the name of the projected participant. These envelopes were then grouped by system and hand-delivered to each central office. School system internal mail delivery systems were used for distribution to the participant and for return to the central office. After the questionnaires were returned to the central office in sealed, unidentifiable envelopes, they were collected and the data analyzed.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for the analysis of the data. The data were at an interval level, and a .05 level of significance was used for all statistical treatments. Participation and satisfaction mean scores for the six decision areas (curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, community relations) and the relative perceived participation of teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members were calculated and used as dependent variables. The position of the respondent (teacher, principal, central office staff), the time of data collection (1978 and 1982), and the negotiating status of the school system (negotiating and non-negotiating) were looked at individually and in combination as possible sources of significant variation.

When the MANOVA had an F value with an alpha of less than .05 for one of the possible sources of variance, a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated for each of the dependent variables. When one (or more) of these variables had, in turn, a significant F value in the ANOVA model, a Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was used as a post hoc procedure to determine exactly where and in what direction the differences occurred. If a MANOVA failed to produce a significant F value, then it was determined that no significant difference existed for that particular possible source or combination

of possible sources of variance. Also, when a significant MANOVA was found and the ANOVA for a particular dependent variable failed to indicate significance, then analysis for that dependent variable as related to that particular possible source or combination of sources of variation was terminated; and no significant difference was determined to exist.

The MANOVA procedure was used because it was determined to be the best way to eliminate the greatest degree of chance producing a significant difference among the multiply-compared dependent variables.

> Almost any situation in which multivariate techniques are applied could be analyzed through a series of univariate significance tests, one such univariate test for each possible combination of one of the predictor variables with one of the outcome variables. However, since each of the univariate tests is designed to produce a significant result α x 100% of the time (where α is the "significance level" of the test) when the null hypothesis is correct, the probability of having at least one of the tests produce a significant result when in fact nothing but chance variation is going on, increases rapidly as the number of tests increases. It is thus highly desirable to have a means of explicitly controlling the experimentwise error rate. Multivariate statistical techniques provide this control (Harris, 1975, p. 6).

V. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION IN AND SATISFACTION WITH DECISION MAKING

Participation

The survey population was divided into two groups according to the time the survey was conducted (1978 and 1982), and mean scores were calculated for perceived participation levels of teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members in each of the six decision areas. These are the combined scores for responding

teachers, principals, and central office staff from both negotiating and non-negotiating systems and are included in Table II.

Teachers received the lowest participation scores in all six decision areas. These scores were as follows: curriculum and instruction (1978, 4.81; 1982, 4.96), finance and business management (1978, 3.40; 1982, 3.52), certificated personnel (1978, 2.49; 1982, 2.65), pupil personnel (1978, 4.85; 1982, 5.12), school plant and facilities (1978, 3.11; 1982, 3.19), and community relations (1978, 3.83; 1982, 4.03).

All decision areas received the same ranking of mean scores from both the 1978 and 1982 survey groups. In the area of curriculum and instruction, the highest perceived participation mean score was assigned to central office staff (1978, 6.78; 1982, 7.04). Both groups assigned the next highest score to school board members (1978, 5.86; 1982, 5.67) and the next to principals (1978, 5.50; 1982, 5.57).

Perceived participation mean scores in finance and business management decisions were as follows: principal participation (1978, 4.39; 1982, 4.31), central office staff (1978, 6.49; 1982, 6.70), and school board members (1978, 7.98; 1982, 8.00). The 1978 and 1982 survey groups assigned the highest participation mean score in decisions about certificated personnel to school board members (1978, 7.45; 1982, 7.48), the next highest to central office staff (1978, 6.76; 1982, 7.17), and the next to principals (1978, 6.53; 1982, 6.63).

TABLE II

MEAN SCORES FOR PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION LEVELS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FOR DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE 1978 AND 1982

Decision Area	Teacher Participation	Principal Participation	Central Office Participation	School Board Participation
Curriculum and Instruction				
1978	4.81	5.50	6.78	5.86
1982	4.96	5.57	7.04	5.67
Finance and Business Management				
1978	3.40	4.39	6.49	7.98
1982	3.52	4.31	6.70	8.00
Certificated Personnel				
1978	2.49	6.53	6.76	7.45
1982	2.65	6.63	7.17	7.48
Pupil Personnel				
1978	4.85	6.69	6.30	5.89
1982	5.12	6.82	6.68	5.86
School Plant and Facilities				
1978	3.11	6.02	6.19	6.86
1982	3.19	6.15	6.39	6.96
Community Relations				
1978	3.83	6.48	6.73	7.20
1982	4.03	6.72	7.01	7.34

In the area of pupil personnel decisions, the mean scores for both 1978 and 1982 were in the following order: principals (1978, 6.69; 1982, 6.82), central office staff (1978, 6.30; 1982, 6.68), and school board members (1978, 5.89; 1982, 5.86). The order of the mean scores of perceived participation in both the decisional areas of school plant and facilities and community relations was the same. These results were as follows: school board members (school plant and facilities -- 1978, 6.86; 1982, 6.96/community relations -- 1978, 7.20; 1982, 7.34),central office staff (school plant and facilities-- 1978, 6.19; 1982, 6.39/community relations -- 1978, 6.73; 1982, 7.01), and principals (school plant and facilities -- 1978, 6.02; 1982, 6.15/ community relations -- 1978, 6.48; 1982, 6.72). The perceived teacher participation scores in these areas were the lowest and are listed above.

Table III reports the 1978 perceived participation scores for teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members in the six decision areas when the survey population was divided into two groups: negotiating and non-negotiating districts. In the areas of curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, and school plant and facilities the mean scores were ranked differently between the two groups and, again, perceived teacher participation scores were the lowest in all six decision areas.

The perceived participation scores in the area of curriculum and instruction for negotiating systems in 1978 were 6.79 for central

TABLE III

MEAN SCORES FOR PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION LEVELS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FOR DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SYSTEMS

Decision Area	Teacher Participation	Principal Participation	Central Office Participation	School Board Participation
Curriculum and Instruction				
Negotiating	4.60	5.33	6.79	5.78
Non-Negotiating	5.44	5.90	6.40	5.72
Finance and Business Management				
Negotiating	3.21	4.19	6.39	7.94
Non-Negotiating	4.02	4.98	6.44	7.92
Certificated Personnel				
Negotiating	2.35	6.42	6.67	7.43
Non-Negotiating	2.94	6.81	6.53	7.08
Pupil Personnel				
Negotiating	4.78	6.56	6.14	5.84
Non-Negotiating	5.27	6.92	6.33	5.75
School Plant and Facilities				
Negotiating	3.02	5.93	6.08	6.84
Non-Negotiating	3.45	6.21	6.18	6.70
Community Relations				
Negotiating	3.75	6.45	6.58	7.19
Non-Negotiating	4.18	6.42	6.90	7.11

office staff, 5.78 for school board members, 5.33 for principals, and 4.60 for teachers and for non-negotiating systems were 6.40 for central office staff, 5.90 for principals, 5.72 for school board members, and 5.44 for teachers. The mean scores in finance and business management decisions were as follows: school board members (negotiating systems, 7.94; non-negotiating systems, 7.92), central office staff (negotiating systems, 6.39; non-negotiating systems, 6.44), principals (negotiating systems, 4.19; non-negotiating systems, 4.98), and teachers (negotiating systems, 3.21; non-negotiating systems, 4.02).

In 1978, both negotiating and non-negotiating systems assigned the highest mean score to perceived school board member participation (negotiating systems, 7.43; non-negotiating systems, 7.08) and the lowest mean scores to teacher participation (negotiating systems, 2.35; non-negotiating systems, 2.94) in the area of certificated personnel. Negotiating systems, however, assigned the next highest mean to central office staff participation (6.67) and the next to principals (6.42), while non-negotiating systems reversed this order with a 6.81 for principal participation and a 6.53 for central office staff participation. This same change in the rankings between negotiating and non-negotiating systems was also found in the area of school plant and facilities with the following scores: negotiating systems (6.84, school board member participation; 6.08, central office staff participation; 5.93, principal participation; 3.02, teacher participation) and non-negotiating systems (6.70, school board member participation; 6.21, principal participation; 6.18, central office staff participation; 3.45, teacher participation). Mean scores in

the remaining two decisional areas for negotiating systems were as follows: pupil personnel (principal participation, 6.56; central office staff participation, 6.14; school board member participation, 5.84; and teacher participation, 4.78) and community relations (school board members, 7.19; central office staff, 6.58; principals, 6.45; and teachers, 3.75). The mean scores for 1978 non-negotiating systems in these same two decision areas included pupil personnel (principals, 6.92; central office staff, 6.33; school board members, 5.75; and teachers, 5.27) and community relations (school board members, 7.11; central office staff, 6.90; principals, 6.42; and teachers, 4.18).

The 1982 mean scores for negotiating and non-negotiating systems are listed in Table IV. The rankings for each group were the same except in the area of curriculum and instruction. In this area both groups assigned the highest participation score to central office staff (negotiating, 7.10; non-negotiating, 6.80). The other rankings, however, varied as follows: negotiating (5.74, school board members; 5.54, principals; 4.94, teachers) and non-negotiating (5.85, principals; 5.68, teachers; 5.39, school board members). In finance and business management decisions, certificated personnel decisions, school plant and facilities decisions, and community relations decisions the rankings between negotiating and non-negotiating systems were the same. School board members received the highest perceived participation mean scores with central office staff, principals, and teachers following in descending order. While both negotiating and non-negotiating groups assigned the same rankings in the area of pupil personnel decisions, the order changed with principals receiving the

TABLE IV

MEAN SCORES FOR PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION LEVELS OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FOR DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1982 NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SYSTEMS

Decision Area	Teacher Participation	Principal Participation	Central Office Participation	School Board Participation
Curriculum and Instruction				
Negotiating	4.94	5.54	7.10	5.74
Non-Negotiating	5.68	5.85	6.80	5.31
Finance and Business Management				
Negotiating	3.58	4.35	6.70	7.99
Non-Negotiating	3.94	4.86	6.71	7.82
Certificated Personnel				
Negotiating	2.72	6.66	7.16	7.49
Non-Negotiating	2.82	6.62	6.99	7.54
Pupil Personnel				
Negotiating	5.27	6.81	6.69	5.97
Non-Negotiating	5.48	6.73	6.54	5.42
School Plant and Facilities				
Negotiating	3.25	6.23	6.40	6.89
Non-Negotiating	3.32	6.10	6.56	7.27
Community Relations				
Negotiating	4.06	6.74	6.96	7.17
Non-Negotiating	4.25	6.39	7.15	7.84

highest scores, then central office staff, school board members, and finally teachers.

Satisfaction

The mean scores for teachers, principals, and central office staff for satisfaction levels with the decision-making process in all six decision areas for each survey year are listed in Table V. These are the combined means for both negotiating and non-negotiating districts. The range was from 1 ("Highly Dissatisfied") to 9 ("Highly Satisfied") and included in ascending order "Dissatisfied," "Neutral," and "Satisfied." Teachers had the lowest mean satisfaction scores in all six decisional areas. These scores were as follows: curriculum and instruction (1978, 5.42; 1982, 5.74); finance and business management (1978, 4.40; 1982, 4.43); certificated personnel (1978, 4.59; 1982, 4.49); pupil personnel (1978, 5.60; 1982, 5.92); school plant and facilities (1978, 5.27; 1982, 5.44); community relations (1978, 5.63; 5.84).

In the areas of pupil personnel (1978, 6.72; 1982, 6.88) and community relations (1978, 6.79; 1982, 7.08), the combined group of principals from both negotiating and non-negotiating districts had the highest overall satisfaction scores for both survey years, while the combined central office staff group had the highest overall satisfaction scores in both 1978 and 1982 in the area of finance and business management (1978, 5.69; 1982, 5.57). The remaining 1978 principal satisfaction scores were as follows: curriculum and

TABLE V

MEAN SCORES FOR 1978 AND 1982 TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF FOR OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE

Decision Area	Teacher Satisfaction	Principal Satisfaction	Central Office Satisfaction
Curriculum and Instruction			
1978	5.42	6.29	6.36
1982	5.74	6.69	6.17
Finance and Business Management			
1978	4.40	5.13	5.69
1982	4.43	5.41	5.57
Certificated Personnel			
1978	4.59	5.89	6.20
1982	4.49	5.80	5.78
Pupil Personnel			
1978	5.60	6.72	6.55
1982	5.92	6.88	6.62
School Plant and Facilities			
1978	5.27	6.51	6.49
1982	5.44	6.27	6.43
Community Relations			
1978	5.63	6.79	6.61
1982	5.84	7.08	6.53

instruction, 6.29; finance and business management, 5.13; certificated personnel, 5.89; and school plant and facilities, 6.51. Principals in 1982 reported satisfaction mean scores of 6.69 in curriculum and instruction, 5.41 in finance and business management, 5.80 in certificated personnel, and 6.27 in school plant and facilities. Overall satisfaction mean scores for central office staff were curriculum and instruction (1978, 6.36; 1982, 6.17); certificated personnel (1978, 6.20; 1982, 5.78); pupil personnel (1978, 6.55; 1982, 6.62); school plant and facilities (1978, 6.49; 1982, 6.43); community relations (1978, 6.61; 1982, 6.53).

Table VI contains the combined negotiating and non-negotiating mean scores for overall satisfaction levels in the six decision areas for teachers, principals, and central office staff for each of the survey years, 1978 and 1982. The mean scores for the 1982 survey population were higher in the four areas of finance and business management (4.58), pupil personnel (5.98), school plant and facilities (5.53), and community relations (5.92) and higher for the 1978 group in curriculum and instruction (5.58) and certificated personnel (4.90). The overall mean satisfaction scores for the 1982 group in the areas of curriculum and instruction and certificated personnel were 5.76 and 4.65, while for the 1978 group the following mean scores were obtained: finance and business management, 4.58; pupil personnel, 5.79; school plant and facilities, 5.52; and community relations, 5.85.

When the survey population was divided into two groups according to whether the school system had elected to engage in the collective-negotiations process, the higher mean overall

TABLE VI

COMBINED MEAN RESPONSES FOR OVERALL SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF WITH DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE 1978, 1982

Decision Area	1978	1982
Curriculum and Instruction	5.58	5.76
Finance and Business Management	4.58	4.58
Certificated Personnel	4.90	4.65
Pupil Personnel	5.79	5.98
School Plant and Facilities	5.52	5.53
Community Relations	5.85	5.92

satisfaction scores for teachers, principals, and central office staff from both survey years were from non-negotiating systems. These mean scores are presented in Table VII and were as follows: curriculum and instruction, 6.15; finance and business management, 5.31; certificated personnel, 5.27; pupil personnel, 6.02; school plant and facilities, 5.74; community relations, 5.99. The mean satisfaction scores from negotiating districts were 5.49 (curriculum and instruction), 4.38 (finance and business management), 4.72 (certificated personnel), 5.79 (pupil personnel), 5.47 (school plant and facilities), and 5.83 (community relations).

Summary

The mean scores for the perceived participation rates of teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members in the six decision areas have been presented. The variables that were used as classifiers were survey year (1978 and 1982) and negotiating status of system (negotiating and non-negotiating). The overall satisfaction mean scores have also been presented using the same classifying variables.

Perceived teacher participation rates (never exceeding 5.7) were the lowest in all but two cases. On the rating scale this top score falls in the "Recommends Decision" range. It is also interesting to note that in the satisfaciton ratings no mean score exceeded 7.08 which falls in the "Satisfied" range.

TABLE VII

COMBINED MEAN RESPONSES FOR OVERALL SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF WITH DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING DISTRICTS

Decision Area	Negotiating	Non-Negotiating
Curriculum and Instruction	5.49	6.15
Finance and Business Management	4.38	5.31
Certificated Personnel	4.72	5.27
Pupil Personnel	5.79	6.02
School Plant and Facilities	5.47	5.74
Community Relations	5.83	5.99

VI. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PARTICIPATION IN AND SATISFACTION WITH DECISION MAKING

Introduction

The data will be presented and analyzed relative to the following two research questions:

1. Are there significant variations in the perceived participation scores in the six decisional areas? If there are differences, which of the following factors or which combination of the factors have been sources of variance: (1) position of respondent? (2) time of survey? (3) negotiating status of district?

2. Are there significant variations in the perceived satisfaction scores in the six decisional areas? If there are differences, which of the following factors or which combination of the factors have been sources of variance: (1) position of respondent? (2) time of survey? (3) negotiating status of district?

Combined Participation and Satisfaction Scores

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on all the survey data to determine where significant differences existed. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used for all statistical manipulations using a probability level of .05. The initial MANOVA included as possible sources of variance the following factors: position of respondent (teacher, principal, central office staff); time of survey (1978 and 1982); negotiating status of district (negotiating and non-negotiating); position of respondent and time of survey; position of respondent and negotiating status of district;

time of survey and negotiating status of district; and position of respondent, time of survey, and negotiating status of district. Because SAS was used, observations with missing independent values were excluded from the analysis. A total of 1,480 observations were included in the MANOVA. Scores were calculated for the perceived participation of teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members in each of the six decision areas of curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations. Scores were also calculated for each respondent's perceived satisfaction with the decision-making process in each of the same six decision categories.

Table VIII shows the results of the first MANOVA using all possible combinations of sources of variance. The F values for position of respondent (F=2.21, df=60, 2,876) and for negotiating status of district (F=1.96, df=30, 1,439) fell into the critical range indicating that significant differences existed among some or all of the dependent variables as related to these two possible sources of variance.

Because neither of the four possible interactions among the three main effect variables indicated significance in the first MANOVA, a second MANOVA was performed using only the three classifying variables of position of respondent, time of survey, and negotiating status of district as possible sources of variance. This procedure was used because when in the course of multivariate analysis none of the interactions indicates significance, a second MANOVA is performed with only the main effects to increase the overall power of the procedure by

TABLE VIII

MANOVA FOR WITHIN GROUPS FOR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION AND SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FOR DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 AND 1982

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	F Value[a]
Position of Respondent (P)	60, 2,876	2.21*
Time of Survey (T)	30, 1,439	.74
Negotiating Status of District (N)	30, 1,439	1.96*
P x T	60, 2,876	.55
P x N	60, 2,876	1.11
T x N	30, 1,439	.97
P x T x N	60, 2,876	.79

[a]F value calculated by Hotelling-Lawley trace.

*$p < .05$.

decreasing the mean square error term at the same time that the degrees of freedom are increased and the sum square error term remains the same. As seen in Table IX, all three of these F values fell into the critical range and were as follows: position of respondent (F=5.23, df=60, 2,890); time of survey (F=3.60, df=30, 1,446); and negotiating status of district (F=8.53, df=30, 1,446). Because of the possibility of the existence of significant variation, a series of analyses of variance (ANOVA) was calculated for all three of these independent variables in order to pinpoint the location of any significant variation.

The results from the ANOVAs of perceived participation are listed in Table X. Significant differences were found to exist in all perceived participation scores in all decision areas in one or more of the three independent variables except in perceived central office staff participation in decisions about finance and business management, central office staff participation in decisions about school plant and facilities, school board member participation in decisions about curriculum and instruction, school board member participation in finance and business management decisions, and school board member participation in decisions revolving around community relations issues. These results indicated that significant differences existed among the respondents according to their position, the time of the survey, and/or negotiating status of their respective districts in all the remaining perceived participation scores in each of the six decisional areas.

TABLE IX

MANOVA FOR WITHIN GROUPS FOR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION AND SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FOR DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 AND 1982

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	F Value[a]
Position of Respondent	60, 2,890	5.23*
Time of Survey	30, 1,446	3.60*
Negotiating Status of District	30, 1,446	8.53*

[a]F value calculated by Hotelling-Lawley trace.

*p .05.

TABLE X

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS FOR DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 AND 1982

Decision Area	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
Perceived Teacher Participation				
Curriculum and Instruction	299.03	4, 1,475	74.75	28.58*
Finance and Business Management	286.57	4, 1,475	71.64	24.00*
Certificated Personnel	169.78	4, 1,475	42.44	16.58*
Pupil Personnel	157.93	4, 1,475	39.48	12.64*
School Plant and Facilities	124.87	4, 1,475	31.21	11.46*
Community Relations	147.47	4, 1,475	36.86	12.22*
Perceived Principal Participation				
Curriculum and Instruction	114.04	4, 1,475	28.51	10.66*
Finance and Business Management	216.58	4, 1,475	54.14	16.88*
Certificated Personnel	39.86	4, 1,475	9.96	3.32*
Pupil Personnel	49.35	4, 1,475	12.33	5.42*
School Plant and Facilities	42.53	4, 1,475	10.63	4.41*
Community Relations	45.53	4, 1,475	11.38	3.88*
Perceived Central Office Staff Participation				
Curriculum and Instruction	78.91	4, 1,475	19.72	7.40*
Finance and Business Management	35.16	4, 1,475	8.79	2.36
Certificated Personnel	80.30	4, 1,475	20.07	4.88*
Pupil Personnel	124.30	4, 1,475	31.07	8.70*
School Plant and Facilities	32.22	4, 1,475	8.05	2.22
Community Relations	66.13	4, 1,475	16.53	4.69*
Perceived School Board Member Participation				
Curriculum and Instruction	20.67	4, 1,475	5.16	1.03
Finance and Business Management	3.91	4, 1,475	.97	.61
Certificated Personnel	46.36	4, 1,475	11.59	3.70*
Pupil Personnel	49.92	4, 1,475	12.48	2.97*
School Plant and Facilities	34.61	4, 1,475	8.65	3.43*
Community Relations	25.15	4, 1,475	6.28	2.19

* $p < .05$.

Table XI contains the results of the ANOVAs of the reported satisfaction scores in the six decision areas. All six F values fell into the critical range and were as follows: curriculum and instruction (F=32.64), finance and business management (F=34.00), certificated personnel (F=38.76), pupil personnel (F=26.43), school plant and facilities (F=26.69), and community relations (F=27.44). The results of these ANOVAs indicated that significant differences existed somewhere in the responses of either teachers, principals, or central office staff from 1978 and 1982 survey groups from negotiating or non-negotiating districts.

In order to determine the exact location of significant variance, a series of post hoc Duncan's New Multiple Range Tests was calculated. These results are discussed below.

Position of Respondent and Perceived Participation in Decision Making

Significant differences were evident in all six perceived teacher participation scores due to the position of the survey respondents. In perceived teacher participation in curriculum and instruction decisions all three of the responding groups differed significantly. Teachers (mean of 4.79) perceived that teachers participated less, while principals differed and perceived that teachers participated more (mean of 5.25). Central office staff differed from each of the other two groups of respondents and had the highest mean score for teacher participation in curriculum and instruction decisions (mean

TABLE XI

ANALYSES OF VARIANCE FOR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF WITH DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 AND 1982

Decision Area	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Value
Curriculum and Instruction	269.32	4, 1,475	67.33	32.64*
Finance and Business Management	398.38	4, 1,475	99.59	34.00*
Certificated Personnel	443.33	4, 1,475	110.83	38.76*
Pupil Personnel	219.36	4, 1,475	54.84	26.43*
School Plant and Facilities	275.83	4, 1,475	68.95	26.69*
Community Relations	227.91	4, 1,475	56.97	27.44*

* $p < .05$.

of 5.66). When asked to rate teacher participation in finance and business management decisions, all three groups of respondents again differed significantly. The order of the teacher participation scores in this area was also the same with a mean of 3.38 for responding teachers, a mean of 3.82 for responding principals, and a mean of 4.41 for responding central office staff.

In the decison area of certificated personnel, teachers differed from each of the other two groups with a perceived teacher participation mean of 2.47, while principals (mean of 3.02) and central office staff (mean of 3.18) failed to differ significantly with each other. This same pattern was also exhibited in the assigned teacher participation rates in each of the remaining three decisional areas: pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations. In each of these decisional areas teachers assigned a significantly lower perceived teacher participation score (pupil personnel, mean of 4.92; school plant and facilities, mean of 3.08; community relations, mean of 3.82) than did each of the other two groups, and in each decisional area principals and central office staff failed to differ significantly with each other. These mean scores for responding principals were: pupil personnel, mean of 5.35; school plant and facilities, mean of 3.53; and community relations, mean of 4.40. The perceived teacher participation mean scores for central office staff survey respondents were: pupil personnel, mean of 5.58; school plant and facilities, mean of 3.87; and community relations, mean of 4.56.

When asked to ascribe perceived principal participation rates in the six decision areas, survey respondents differed significantly according to their respective position groups in four of the decisional areas. These four were: curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, pupil personnel, and school plant and facilities. In all four of these decision groupings central office staff respondents ascribed significantly higher perceived principal participation rates. In curriculum and instruction decisions, finance and business management decisions, and school plant and facilities decisions, central office staff mean scores were significantly higher than each of the other two groups. These central office mean scores were as follows: 6.03 for curriculum and instruction, 5.17 for finance and business management, and 6.46 for school plant and facilities. In the case of pupil personnel decisions, central office staff ascribed principal participation scores (mean of 7.04) differed only from the responses of teachers (mean of 6.65).

Responding principal mean scores of principal participation in these same four areas were 5.61 (curriculum and instruction), 4.48 (finance and business management), 6.84 (pupil personnel), and 5.90 (school plant and facilities). The mean scores for responding teachers were 5.46 (curriculum and instruction), 4.35 (finance and business management), 6.65 (pupil personnel), and 6.04 (school plant and facilities).

Only one decisional area evidenced any significant difference relative to position group membership in ascribed central office staff

participation. In the area of pupil personnel decisions, teachers differed from each of the other two groups with a significantly lower perceived central office staff participation mean score (6.23). The other two groups failed to differ from each other (principals, mean of 6.79; central office staff, mean of 6.67).

When assigning school board member participation in decisions about pupil personnel issues and in decisions about school plant and facilities issues, teachers ascribed significantly higher school board member perceived participation scores. In the case of pupil personnel decisions, teachers with a mean score of 5.89 differed significantly from central office staff (mean of 5.26), while in school plant and facilities decisions, teachers (mean of 6.89) differed from both principals (mean of 6.52) and central office staff (mean of 6.47).

Significant differences that were found to exist relative to whether respondents were teachers, principals, or central office staff included all six decision areas when survey respondents were asked to ascribe a perceived participation rate for teachers. In both curriculum and instruction decisions and in finance and business management decisions, all three groups differed with central office staff assigning the highest mean scores, principals the next, and teachers the lowest. In the areas of certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations, teacher respondents differed from each of the other two groups with significantly lower ascribed teacher participation results.

Teachers ascribed significantly higher principal participation scores than each of the other two groups in the areas of curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, and school plant and facilities and significantly higher than central office staff in pupil personnel decisions. Teachers assigned a significantly lower central office staff participation score than the other two groups in pupil personnel decisions and significantly higher mean scores for school board member participation in school plant and facilities decisions. Teachers also differed from central office staff with a higher mean score for school board member participation in pupil personnel decisions.

Time of Survey and Perceived Participation in Decision Making

When the time of the survey, either 1978 or 1982, was considered as a source of variance significant differences in perceived teacher participation were found in the decision areas of curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, and community relations. In each of these cases, the 1982 survey group had significantly higher perceived teacher participation scores. The means for the 1982 and 1978 survey groups were: curriculum and instruction (1982, 5.05; 1978, 4.83); certificated personnel (1982, 2.74; 1978; 2.52); pupil personnel (1982, 5.30; 1978, 4.92); and community relations (1982, 4.09; 1978, 3.87).

The 1982 survey group had significantly higher mean scores in perceived principal participation in school plant and facilities decisions (mean of 6.21) and in community relations decisions (mean of 6.69) than the 1978 group (school plant and facilities, mean of

6.07; community relations, mean of 6.44). Significance was also found in central office staff participation in decisons about curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, and community relations. Again, the 1982 survey group had significantly higher scores. The significant means for central office staff participation in these areas were: curriculum and instruction (1982, 7.06; 1978, 6.68); certificated personnel (1982, 7.13; 1978, 6.63); pupil personnel (1982, 6.67; 1978, 6.20); and community relations (1982, 6.99; 1978, 6.67). No significant differences were found between the 1978 and 1982 survey groups in ascribed school board member participation in any of the six decision areas.

In all instances where significant differences were found between the responses of the 1978 and 1982 survey groups, the participation mean scores ascribed by the 1982 group were higher. The specific cases of significant difference were teacher participation in decisions about curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, and community relations; principal participation in decisions about school plant and facilities and community relations; and central office staff participation in decisions about curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, and community relations.

Negotiating Status of System and Perceived Participation in Decision Making

Considering the negotiating status of a particular school system produced significant differences between the two groups

(negotiating and non-negotiating) in all six decision areas for perceived teacher participation, and in each area the scores assigned by non-negotiating systems were significantly higher than those assigned by negotiating systems. The means in each decision area for both negotiating and non-negotiating systems were as follows: curriculum and instruction (non-negotiating, 5.47; negotiating, 4.69); finance and business management (non-negotiating, 4.01; negotiating, 3.30); certificated personnel (non-negotiating, 2.92; negotiating, 2.45); pupil personnel (non-negotiating, 5.30; negotiating, 4.91); school plant and facilities (non-negotiating, 3.44; negotiating, 3.08); and community relations (non-negotiating, 4.19; negotiating, 3.83).

Only one decisional area, community relations, failed to produce a significant difference between negotiating and non-negotiating systems when respondents were asked to assess principal participation in decision making. In all of the other decisional areas the scores for perceived principal participation were higher for the non-negotiating systems. The significant mean scores were as follows: curriculum and instruction (non-negotiating, 5.89; negotiating, 5.38); finance and business management (non-negotiating, 4.96; negotiating, 4.23); certificated personnel (non-negotiating, 6.79; negotiating, 6.48); pupil personnel (non-negotiating, 6.90; negotiating, 6.62); and school plant and facilities (non-negotiating, 6.20; negotiating, 6.01).

Respondents from negotiating systems differed significantly from those from non-negotiating systems with a higher perceived mean participation rate for central office staff in decisions about

curriculum and instruction (negotiating, 6.87; non-negotiating, 6.45). Respondents from non-negotiating systems, however, had a significantly higher mean score (6.93) than negotiating systems (6.67) for central office staff participation in community relations decisions.

Only one decisional area produced a significant difference between negotiating and non-negotiating systems as related to school board member participation in decision making. This was in participation in certificated personnel decisions. Negotiating systems (mean of 7.45) had a significantly higher mean score than non-negotiating systems (mean of 7.14).

Significant differences between negotiating and non-negotiating districts were found in 14 ascribed participation rates. In 12 of these cases, the scores for non-negotiating systems were significantly higher. All six of the ascribed decision rates were higher for teacher participation in non-negotiating systems, while principal rates were also significantly higher in all decision areas except in community relations decisions where no significance was shown. Central office staff participation in community relations decisions was also significantly higher for non-negotiating systems. The two cases where negotiating systems had significantly higher perceived participation rates were central office staff participation in curriculum and instruction decisions and school board member participation in certificated personnel decisions.

Position of Respondent and Satisfaction with Decision Making

When overall satisfaction rates were calculated, significant differences were found in all six decision areas relative to the position group membership of the respondents. In the case of finance and business management decisions, all three position groups differed significantly. Central office staff had the highest mean satisfaction score (mean of 5.67), principals the next (mean of 5.17), and teachers the lowest (mean of 4.41).

In the other six decision areas, teachers differed from the other two groups with significantly lower mean satisfaction scores, while the other two groups failed to differ between each other. The mean scores for satisfaction in each decision area were as follows: curriculum and instruction (teachers, 5.50; principals, 6.34; central office staff, 6.32); certificated personnel (teachers, 4.57; principals, 5.88; central office staff, 6.12); pupil personnel (teachers, 5.67; principals, 6.74; central office staff, 6.56); school plant and facilities (teachers, 5.31; principals, 6.48; central office staff, 6.47); and community relations (teachers, 5.68; principals, 6.83; central office staff, 6.60).

Significant differences were found among the three position groups of respondents for satisfaction with the decision-making process in all six decisional areas. In each area, teachers had significantly lower satisfaction mean scores, and in finance and business management decisions principals and central office staff also differed between each other with a lower satisfaction score for principals.

Time of Survey and Satisfaction with Decision Making

When overall satisfaction scores were calculated for the 1978 survey group and the 1982 survey group, there were significant differences between the two groups in two of the decision areas. In both these cases the scores for the 1982 group were significantly higher.

The first decision area was curriculum and instruction. The mean for the 1982 group was 5.81 and the mean for the 1978 group was 5.57. Pupil personnel decisions was the other decision area where 1982 satisfaction scores were significantly higher (1982, 6.0; 1978, 5.77). The other four decision areas (finance and business management, certificated personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations) failed to produce significant differences in satisfaction scores relative to the time the survey was conducted.

Negotiating Status of District and Satisfaction with Decision Making

In the three decision areas where significantly different satisfaction scores were found, the responses from districts not engaging in the professional negotiations process were higher. In curriculum and instruction decisions, finance and business management decisions, and certificated personnel decisions the overall mean satisfaction scores were higher.

Non-negotiating systems had a mean of 6.04 and negotiating systems had a mean of 5.48 in curriculum and instruction decisions, while finance and business management decisions had an overall

satisfaction mean score of 5.16 for non-negotiating systems and a mean of 4.35 for negotiating ones. The mean satisfaction scores with certificated personnel decisions were 5.09 for non-negotiating systems and 4.68 for systems engaging in the negotiating process.

Summary

The data have been presented and analyzed in order to answer the following two research questions.

1. Are there significant variations in the perceived participation scores in the six decisional areas? If there are differences, which of the following factors or which combination of the factors have been sources of variance:(1) position of respondent? (2) time of survey? (3) negotiating status of district?

2. Are there significant variations in the perceived satisfaction scores in the six decisional areas? If there are differences, which of the following factors or which combination of the factors have been sources of variance: (1) position of respondent? (2) time of survey? (3) negotiating status of district?

A MANOVA was calculated for all three single factors and all four combinations of factors. Significance was indicated for two factors: position of respondent and negotiating status of district. When another MANOVA was calculated with only the three single factors, significance was found for all three.

A series of ANOVAs using perceived participation scores for each of the dependent variables (four scores for each of the six

decision areas) indicated significance for the following variables with the possibility of significant variance for one or more of the three possible sources of significant variance: perceived teacher participation (curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, community relations); perceived principal participation (curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, community relations); perceived central office staff participation (curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, community relations); perceived school board member participation (certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities). Another series of ANOVAs was calculated for each of the dependent variables with each overall satisfaction score in each decision area and significance was found for each decision category.

Duncan's New Multiple Range Tests were calculated with both perceived participation scores and perceived satisfaction scores in each area where an ANOVA had indicated significance. Table XII lists the tests that indicated significant difference for perceived participation, and Table XIII the results of significant variation in perceived satisfaction scores. Each individual source of significant variance has been listed and analyzed.

TABLE XII

SOURCES OF SIGNIFICANT VARIATION FOR PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION SCORES OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 AND 1982

Participation	Curriculum and Instruction	Finance and Business Management	Certificated Personnel	Pupil Personnel	School Plant and Facilities	Community Relations
Teacher Participation						
P	*	*	*	*	*	*
T	*		*	*		*
N	*	*	*	*	*	*
Principal Participation						
P	*	*		*	*	
T					*	*
N	*	*	*	*	*	
Central Office Staff Participation						
P				*		
T	*			*		*
N	*		*			*
School Board Member Participation						
P			*	*		
T						
N			*			

* = significance.

P = position of respondent.

T = time of survey.

N = negotiating status of district.

TABLE XIII

SOURCES OF SIGNIFICANT VARIATION FOR PERCEIVED SATISFACTION SCORES OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF WITH DECISIONS MADE IN SELECTED NEGOTIATING AND NON-NEGOTIATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN EAST TENNESSEE, 1978 AND 1982

Satisfaction	Curriculum and Instruction	Finance and Business Management	Certificated Personnel	Pupil Personnel	School Plant and Facilities	Community Relations
Position of Respondent	*	*	*	*	*	*
Time of Survey	*			*		
Negotiating Status of District	*	*	*			

* indicates significant variation.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

This study was conducted in order to collect and analyze data from 16 selected school districts in East Tennessee relative to the perceived levels of the participation of teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members in decisions in the six decisional areas of curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations and relative to perceived levels of satisfaction with the decisions made in each of these same areas. These data were compared with existing data collected prior to the onset of the professional negotiations process in 1978. The decision to engage in collective bargaining had been made by 11 of the 16 systems prior to the collection of the 1978 baseline data, so the number of systems that had opted for negotiating remained constant throughout the study. An analysis was made looking at position group of respondent (teacher, principal, central office staff), time of survey (1978 and 1982), and negotiating status of district (negotiating and non-negotiating) as possible sources or combination of sources of possible variance.

Participants selected for the study were all employees of school systems holding membership in the Public Schools for Cooperative Research

consortium (PSCR). A random sample of teachers, principals, and central office staff was drawn from 12 of the districts, and all employees were selected as research participants from the four smallest school districts. Individually packaged labelled questionnaires were distributed to and collected from those individuals who had been selected to participate in the study.

The survey that was used was the Peach Critical Decision Questionnaire developed by Larry Peach in 1978. This survey instrument was designed to gather both information on respondents' perceptions about the participation levels of teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members in the decision-making process in their respective school districts and information on the respondents' personal levels of satisfaction with these processes. Six decision areas, each containing five relevant decisions, were identified and included curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations.

Various statistical procedures were used for data analysis. Mean participation scores for each of the projected participants (teachers, principals, central office staff, and school board members) were calculated in each decisional area, as well as mean satisfaction scores with the decision process in each area. Analysis of variance, multivariate analysis of variance, and Duncan's New Multiple Range Test were used to test for significant differences among responses. Factors used as possible sources or combinations of sources of variance were position of respondent, time of survey, and negotiating status of system.

II. FINDINGS

The following is a list of findings relative to the two research questions that are based on the data analysis.

1. The perceived participation rates of teachers in all six decision categories were the lowest among the four groups of key participants except in 1982 non-negotiating systems in curriculum and instruction decisions and in pupil personnel decisions. In both these cases school board member participation was perceived as being lower than teachers.

2. In curriculum and instruction decisions central office staff had the highest and teachers had the lowest perceived participation rates (except in 1982 non-negotiating systems where school board participation was perceived as lower than teacher participation).

3. In the areas of finance and business management decisions and school plant and facilities decisions, the ranking of the key participants was the same with school board members having the highest rates, followed by central office staff, principals, and finally teachers (except in 1978 non-negotiating systems.

4. The ranking for perceived participation in certificated personnel decisions was the same (school board members, central office staff, principals, and teachers) except in 1978 non-negotiating systems where principals had a higher perceived ranking than central office staff.

5. First principals, then central office staff, then school board members, and teachers were perceived to have influence in pupil personnel and community relations decisions except in combined 1978

non-negotiating and negotiating systems where both school board members and central office staff were perceived to have more influence than principals in decisions about community relations, in 1982 non-negotiating systems where teachers were perceived to have more influence than school board members in pupil personnel decisions, and in both 1982 negotiating and non-negotiating systems where school board members, then central office staff, then principals and finally teachers were perceived to have influence in community relations decisions.

6. Overall satisfaction scores for teachers were the lowest in each decisional area. Principals in 1982 were the most satisfied with decisions in curriculum and instruction, pupil personnel, certificated personnel, and community relations, while 1982 central office staff were the most satisfied with finance and business management and school plant and facilities decisions. The 1978 principals were the most satisfied with pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, and community relations decisions. Central office staff in 1978 were the most satisfied with curriculum and instruction decisions, finance and business management decisions, and certificated personnel decisions.

7. Non-negotiating districts had higher satisfaction scores than did negotiating districts in all six decision areas.

8. The interactions of position of respondent and time of survey; position of respondent and negotiating status of district; time of survey and negotiating stuatus of district; and position of

respondent, time of survey, and negotiating status of district failed to account for any significant difference among survey responses.

9. All three position groupings differed significantly when ascribing the perceived participation rate of teachers both in curriculum and instruction decisions and in finance and business management decisions. Central office staff had a significantly higher perceived teacher participation rate than did both principals and teachers, and principals had a significantly higher rate for teachers than teachers did for themselves. In the other four decision areas (certificated personnel, pupil personnel, school plant and facilities, community relations) teachers had significantly lower perceived teacher participation rates than both of the other two groups of respondents.

10. When assessing principal participation in decisions about curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, school plant and facilities, teachers rated principal participation significantly higher than did either principals or central office staff. In pupil personnel decisions, teacher perceptions of principal participation were significantly higher than central office staff perceptions of principal participation.

11. Teachers had significantly lower mean scores for the participation of central office staff in pupil personnel decisions than either principals or central office staff had.

12. In regard to school board member participation in school plant and facilities decisions, teachers had a significantly higher

perceived participation rate for school board members than each of the other two groups. In pupil personnel decisions, teachers perceived that school board members participated significantly more than central office staff thought they did.

13. The 1982 survey group had significantly higher perceived participation mean scores for teachers in curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, and community relations decisions; for principals in school plant and facilities and community relations decisions; and for central office staff in curriculum and instruction, certificated personnel, pupil personnel, and community relations decisions. No significant differences were found between the 1978 and 1982 survey groups in school board member participation in any of the decision areas.

14. Non-negotiating systems had significantly higher participation rates than negotiating systems for teachers in all six decision areas; for principals in all decision areas except community relations; and for central office staff participation in community relations decisions.

15. Perceived central office staff participation in curriculum and instruction decisions and perceived school board member participation in certificated personnel decisions were both significantly higher for negotiating systems than they were for non-negotiating systems.

16. Teachers had significantly lower perceived participation scores than either of the other two groups when rating their own

participation in the decision-making process in all six decisional categories.

17. Teachers perceived that the participation of principals in four decision areas was significantly more influential than either principals or central office staff perceived that it was.

18. There was little variation among the three position groups as to the participation of both central office staff and school board members in school system decision making. Only in central office staff participation in pupil personnel decisions (teachers perceived it as significantly lower), school board member participation in pupil personnel decisions (teachers were significantly higher than central office staff), and in school board member participation in school plant and facilities decisions (teachers had significantly higher perceived participation scores than each of the other two groups) was there any significant variation.

19. Non-negotiating systems had significantly higher perceived participation rates than did negotiating systems for both teachers (in all six areas) and principals (in all six areas except community relations) in decision making.

20. Teachers reported significantly lower satisfaction levels in all six decisional areas than did principals or central office staff. In finance and business management decisions teachers were significantly lower than each of the other two groups and in the other decision areas from the other two positions as a group.

21. The 1982 survey group had significantly higher satisfaction levels than did the 1978 group with curriculum and instruction and pupil personnel decisions.

22. Satisfaction with decisions in curriculum and instruction, finance and business management, and certificated personnel was reported at a significantly higher level for non-negotiating systems than for negotiating systems.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were drawn from the analysis of the data:

1. Since teachers in East Tennessee considered their own participation in and satisfaction with the decision-making process to be much less than other school system professional groups, they may be expected to have lower morale, be less satisfied with their jobs, and to be less effective in their positions than other professional groups since decision-making participation is considered an integral aspect of professional life.

2. Teachers perceived principals to have more influence in decision making than principals perceived themselves to have. When teachers perceive principals as more powerful than principals in fact may be, then teachers may become even more frustrated if they feel principals are not sharing this power.

3. School board member participation levels were viewed fairly constantly by all constituencies, indicating that despite attempts to include other school professionals in the decision-making process school boards are still making many administrative decisions.

4. The 1982 survey group perceived teacher participation to be higher in most decision areas (excluding finance and business management and school plant and facilities) and central office staff participation to be somewhat higher (excluding the same two decisional areas). Because of this, a movement toward increased participation for teachers and central office staff was evidenced between 1978 and 1982. Since principal and board member participation remained fairly constant, it appeared that for one or more constituencies to gain influence other constituent groups did not necessarily have to lose power.

5. The most variation occurred in the perception of the role of the teacher in the decision-making process. This role ambiguity could result in feelings of frustration and powerlessness and could result in decreased effectiveness and high teacher turnover.

6. Members of non-negotiating systems felt that teachers and principals had more input in decision making. The negotiating process appears to have had little impact on the influence levels of teachers and principals.

7. Central office staff influence in curriculum and instruction decisions and school board member influence in certificated personnel decisions were both thought to be greater in negotiating systems. Because teacher interest in these two areas is high, in terms of professional identity it appears that teachers in non-negotiating systems were in a better position.

8. If the negotiations process continues at the same level and in the same way, it will be to the detriment of perceived teacher participation and satisfaction with the decision-making process.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School systems need to consider the ways that decisions are made in order to develop strategies to increase the participation of teachers and principals. Not only would the increased participation of these two groups provide critical expertise but employee morale would be heightened.

2. Reasons for the increased perceived participation levels of central office staff in decision making should be analyzed.

3. Systems where the negotiations process is already in place should investigate the lack of perceived teacher and principal participation in decision making.

4. Negotiating systems should determine whether central office staff influence in curriculum and instruction decisions is appropriate at the degree it currently stands.

5. Systems and professional associations trying to decide whether to engage in professional negotiations should carefully consider if increased teacher and principal input in the decison-making process would result from such a move.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adams, Charles F. Alienation and the negotiations process. 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 117 846)

Alderfer, Clayton P. Existence, relatedness, and growth. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Alkin, Marvin C. Evaluation and decision making. Planning and Changing, 1973, 3, 3-14.

Alutto, Joseph A., & Belasco, James A. Patterns of teacher participation in school system decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1972A, 9, 27-41.

Alutto, Joseph A., & Belasco, James A. A typology for participation in organizational decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972B, 17, 117-125.

Anderson, James G. Bureaucratic rules: Bearers of organizational authority. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1966, 2, 7-34.

Anderson, James G. Strategies of control and their effects on instruction. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1975, 9, 115-121.

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Bacharach, Samuel B., & Mitchell, Stephen M. The sources of dissatisfaction in educational administration: A role-specific analysis. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1983, 19, 101-128.

Bailey, Max A., & Booth, Ronald K. Collective bargaining and the school board member. Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978.

Bartunek, Jean M., & Keys, Christopher B. Participation in school decision making. Urban Education, 1979, 14, 52-75.

Bedley, Gene. Decision making and decision review. Principal's Operational Briefing, April, 1980.

Belasco, James A., & Alutto, Joseph A. Decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1972, 8, 44-58.

Berg, Ivar. Unionized educators: Some comparisons with the private sector. The Urban Review, 1969, 3, pp. 24; 26-31.

Best, John Kevin. Decisional status and teacher morale: A study of the relationship between decisional condition/decisional deviation and teacher morale (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5425-A.

Blumberg, Arthur, Wayson, William, & Weber, Wilford. The elementary school cabinet: Report of an experience in participative decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1969, 5, 39-52.

Bridges, Edwin M. A model for shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1967, 3, 49-61.

Caldwell, William E., Hertzog, C. Jay, Riddle, Richard A., & Steinhart, Dean R. Perceived job satisfaction of secondary school principals as related to the collective bargaining process. American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 494)

Clark, John P. Measuring alienation within a social system. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 849-852.

Clayton, A. Stafford. Professionalism and problems of power. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1965, 16, 69-73.

Conway, James A. Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 130-139.

Corwin, Ronald G. Professional persons in public organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1965, 1, 1-22.

Cox, Harold, & Wood, James R. Organizational structure and professional alienation: The case of public school teachers. Peabody Journal of Education, 1980, 58, 1-6.

Cresswell, Anthony M., & Simpson, Daniel. Collective bargaining and conflict: Impacts on school governance. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1977, 13, 49-69.

Cronin, Joseph M., & Crocker, Julian D., Jr. Principals under pressure. The Urban Review, 1969, 3, pp. 24; 34-37.

Devlin, Barbara Seeley. Teacher participation in decision making and its relationship to the variables, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job tension and atittudinal militancy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 3257-A.

Duke, Daniel L., Showers, Beverly K., & Imber, Michael. Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1980, 16, 93-106.

Eberts, Randall W., & Pierce, Lawrence C. The effects of collective bargaining on public schools in Michigan and New York. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 928)

Eiken, Keith P. Teachers unions and the curriculum change process. Educational Leadership, 1977, 35, 174-177.

ERIC Clearinghouse of Educational Management. Research action brief: Participative decision making. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 136 356)

Fisher, James R. The relationship of sex, level, and position of Oregon educators to attitudinal statements that deal with collective negotiations and sanctions. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 081 071)

Freeman, Pamela, Martin, Oneida, & Roney, Robert. Perceived participation in decision making, satisfaction, and militancy of teachers, principals, and central office staff in Tennessee public school districts. Boston, Massachusetts: American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 189 682)

Freers, Ann M. Negotiations in small school districts. New Orleans, Louisiana: American Association of School Administrators Annual Meeting, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 223 399)

Gorton, Richard A. Factors which are associated with the principal's behavior in encouraging teacher participation in school decision making. Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 64, 325-327.

Hanson, Mark. The emerging control structure of schools. Administrator's Notebook, 1973, 21, 1-4.

Hermann, William M. Relationship of faculty morale to faculty involvement in school policy determination in selected communities of Mercer and Mahoning Counties (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Akron, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 2950-A.

Harris, Richard J. A primer of multivariate statistics. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Hills, Jean. The shifting balance of authority and responsibility in the public schools. Planning and Changing, 1977, 8, 116-127.

Holdaway, Edward A. Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 30-47.

Holter, Harriet. Attitudes towards employee participation in company decision-making process. Human Relations, 1965, 18, 297-321.

Hornstein, Harvey A., Callahan, D.M., Fisch, E., & Benedict, B.A. Influence and satisfaction in organizations: A replication. Sociology of Education, 1968, 41, 380-389.

Hoy, Wayne K., & Miskel, Cecil G. Educational administration: Theory, research and practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Inkpen, W.E., Ponder, A.A., & Crocker, R.K. Elementary teacher participation in educational decision making in Newfoundland. The Canadian Administrator, 1975, 14, 2-5.

Keef, James L. Teacher "restlessness" and decision making. The Clearing House, 1979, 52, 410-412.

Knoop, Robert, & O'Reilly, Robert. Participative decision making in curriculum. Ottawa, Canada: University of Ottawa, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 102 684)

Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. Teacher stress and satisfaction. Educational Research, 1979, 21, 89-96.

Lammers, C.J. Power and participation in decision making in formal organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 1967, 73, 201-216.

Leavitt, Harold J. Unhuman organizations. Harvard Business Review, 1962, 40, 90-98.

Lieberman, Myron. Eggs that I have laid: Teacher bargaining reconsidered. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 60, 415-419.

Lipham, James M. Leadership and decision making for effective educational change. The Executive Review, 1983, 3, 1-5.

Lowin, Aaron. Participative decision making: A model, literature critique, and prescriptions for research. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 68-106.

Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York, New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Melcher, Arlyn J. Participation: A critical review of research findings. Human Resource Management, 1976, 15, 12-21.

Mohrman, Allan M., Jr., Cooke, Robert A., & Mohrman, Susan Albers. Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 13-31.

Mulder, Mauk. Power equalization through participation? Administrative Science Quarterly, 1971, 16, 31-38.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational behavior in schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Owens, Robert G., & Lewis, Edward. Managing participation in organizational decisions. Group and Organization Studies, 1976, 1, 56-66.

Peterson, Richard B. Teacher attitudes toward professionalism, job satisfaction and collective negotiatings: A cross-cultural study. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (DHEW), 1972.

Piper, Donald L. Decision making: Decisions made by individuals vs. those made by group consensus or group participation. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1974, 10, 82-95.

Pitkoff, Evan. Teacher participation in school decision making. May, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 204 302)

Redfern, George B. Negotiation changes principal-teacher relationships. The National Elementary Principal, 1968, 47, 20-25.

Robinson, Norman. Patterns of participatory management in schools. Quebec City, Quebec: Annual Conference of Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 165 245)

Schachter, Hindy L. Reflections on broad-scope teacher bargaining. American Secondary Education, 1983, 12, 21-23.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., Burlingame, Martin, Coombs, Fred D., & Thurston, Paul W. Educational governance and administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Shanker, Albert. Why teachers are angry. The American School Board Journal, 1975, 162, 23-26.

Simpkins, W.S., & Friesen, D. Teacher participation in school decision making. The Canadian Administrator, 1969, 8, 13-16.

Snyder, William Carroll. Morale as an effect of teachers' perception of their role in educational decision making (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6071-A.

Sweeney, Jim. Professional discretion and teacher satisfaction. The High School Journal, 1981, 65, 1-6.

Tannenbaum, Robert, & Massarik, Fred. Participation by subrodinates in the managerial decision-making process. The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 1950, 16, 408-418.

Tannenbaum, Robert, & Schmidt, Warren H. How to choose a leadership pattern. Harvard Business Review, 1973, 51, 176-182.

Tjosvold, Dean. Control and collaborative relationships between administration and teachers. Planning and Changing, 1977, 8, 195-203.

Wood, Michael T. Effects of decision processes and task situations on influence perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1972, 7, 417-427.

Yarborough, Thelma B. Teacher attitudes toward participation in decision making. College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 142 521)

APPENDIX

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE 37916
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND SUPERVISION

April 21, 1982

Four years ago The University of Tennessee, in cooperation with the Public Schools for Cooperative Research consortium of East Tennessee school districts, undertook a study of decisions made in those districts -- who made them and how satisfying were they. We are now undertaking a follow-up study from these same districts to see how, if at all, the situation may have changed since 1978. You have been randomly selected to participate in this endeavor, and we hope you will take a few minutes from your busy schedule to react to all five scales on each of the thirty questions.

Obviously, your participation is voluntary and anonymous. No individuals, schools or even districts will be identified to others as we report the results. Each district will be furnished a profile of its own decisions as well as an overall profile of the total group but even a district's individual schools will not be identified.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it sealed in the enclosed envelope via your school mail to the superintendent's office by May 7 where our research staff will pick it up. No one in your system will see the individual responses.

Thank you for your cooperation

Robert K. Roney, Project Director
Pat Brown, Project Staff
Marjorie Carey, Project Staff
Phyllis Casavant, Project Staff

RKR:mcb
Enclosure

CRITICAL DECISIONS INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS

Questions 1-3 Self-explanatory.

Questions 4-33 **Under Column 2 Headed DECISIONS:** Read the Decision Statement. Consider each of these decisions as they have been made in your school system.

Under Column 1 Headed LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION: On each of the scales of 1 through 9 (1—no participation progressing through 9—makes decision totally), circle the number that you feel represents **the participation of each group listed** (Teachers, Principals, Central Office Personnel and Supt./Board) in the process of making the decision listed in Column 2. Be sure to respond on all four scales for each decision.

Under Column 3 Headed PERSONAL LEVEL OF SATISFACTION: On the scale of 1 through 9 (1—Highly Dissatisfied progressing through 9—Highly Satisfied), circle the number on the scale which represents your personal satisfaction with each decision as made in your school system.

REFER TO THE FOLLOWING EXAMPLE:

(Column 1)

LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION etc.

	None	Provides Information		Recommends Decision			Influence Decision	Make Decision	
Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	(8)	9
Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	(6)	7	8	9
Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	(7)	8	9
Supt./Board	1	(2)	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

(Column 2)

DECISIONS

5. The decision to adopt specific new textbooks for the school system.

(Column 3)

PERSONAL LEVEL OF SATISFACTION etc.

Highly Dissatisfied			Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	(8)	9	

NOTE: Please be sure to respond on all scales. If you are not sure, please give us your best guess. Your opinion is important.

QUESTIONNAIRE

CARD 1

Demographic Data: (2-3) 1. Number of years employed in public schools:_____

(4) 2. Sex: Male_____ (1) Female_____ (2)

(5) 3. Present Position:
1 Teacher, Gr. 1-5_____
2 Teacher, Gr. 6-8_____
3 Teacher, Gr. 9-12_____
4 Principal, Gr. 1-5_____
5 Principal, Gr. 6-8_____
6 Principal, Gr. 9-12_____
7 Central Office_____

(Column 1) LEVEL OF PARTICIPATION FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING IN MAKING THE DECISION										(Column 2) DECISIONS		(Column 3) PERSONAL LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE DECISION								
	None	Provides Information		Recommends Decision			Influences Decision		Makes Decision			Highly Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied
(6) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	4. A decision to make organizational changes in the instructional program at the building level.	(10)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(7) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(8) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(9) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(11) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	5. A decision to adopt specific new textbooks for the school system.	(15)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(12) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(13) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(14) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(16) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	6. A decision on the selection of tests to be used in a system-wide testing program.	(20)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(17) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(18) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(19) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											

	PARTICIPATION									DECISIONS	SATISFACTION								
	None											Highly Dissatisfied							Highly Satisfied
(21) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	7. A decision to change the social studies curriculum of the school system.	(25)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(22) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(23) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(24) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(26) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	8. A decision to establish procedures for obtaining instructional supplies.	(30)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(27) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(28) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(29) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(31) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	9. A decision on the formulation of the school system budget.	(35)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(32) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(33) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(34) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(36) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10. A decision to increase local contributions to salaries.	(40)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(37) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(38) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(39) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(41) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11. A decision on how instructional material funds will be expended.	(45)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(42) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(43) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(44) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(46) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	12. A decision on policy formulation regarding fringe benefits.	(50)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(47) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(48) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(49) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											

	PARTICIPATION										DECISIONS		SATISFACTION								
	None																				
(51) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	13.	A decision to request a bond referendum for identified school improvements.	(55)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(52) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(53) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(54) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(56) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	14.	A decision on the establishment of evaluation criteria to be included in the evaluation of teacher performance.	(60)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(57) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(58) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(59) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(61) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	15.	A decision in the selection of a replacement for a teacher taking an unexpected medical retirement.	(65)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(62) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(63) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(64) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(66) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	16.	A decision to dismiss a non-tenured teacher.	(70)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(67) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(68) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(69) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(71) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	17.	A decision to transfer a teacher from School A to School B.	(75)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(72) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(73) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(74) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(76) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	18.	A decision to assign teachers to non-instructional tasks.	(80)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(77) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(78) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												
(79) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9												

CARD 2	PARTICIPATION									DECISIONS	SATISFACTION									
	None	Provides Information		Recommends Decision			Influences Decision		Sole Decision			Highly Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied
(2) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	19. A decision on methods of reporting pupil progress, promotion, and retention.	(6)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(3) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(4) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(5) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(7) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	20. A decision to place a student in a learning disabilities class.	(11)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(8) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(9) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(10) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(12) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	21. A decision to suspend a student for repeated infractions of local school rules and regulations.	(16)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(13) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(14) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(15) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(17) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	22. A decision on the organization and appointment of teachers to a system committee dealing with improved pupil attendance.	(21)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(18) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(19) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(20) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(22) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	23. A decision on information to be included in student cumulative records.	(26)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(23) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(24) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(25) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(27) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	24. A decision to provide additional space at a local school building.	(31)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(28) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(29) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(30) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											

	PARTICIPATION									DECISIONS		SATISFACTION								
	None								Make Decision			Highly Dissatisfied								Highly Satisfied
(32) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	25. A decision to replace equipment, such as student desks, in a particular classroom.	(36)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(33) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(34) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(35) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(37) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	26. A decision to provide additional funds for routine maintenance of a local school building. (Example, repaint a classroom)	(41)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(38) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(39) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(40) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(42) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	27. A decision on acquisition of land for future school use.	(46)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(43) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(44) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(45) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(47) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	28. A decision to assign specific classrooms to specific teachers at the school building level.	(51)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(48) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(49) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(50) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(52) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	29. A decision to permit local community groups the use of the school building.	(56)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(53) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(54) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(55) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(57) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	30. A decision to have parent-teacher conferences in the individual schools.	(61)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(58) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(59) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(60) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											

PARTICIPATION										DECISIONS	SATISFACTION								
	None	Provides Information		Recommends Solution			Solution Decision	Sole Decision				Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied
(62) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	31. A decision on the information to be included in a news release to the media.	(66)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(63) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(64) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(65) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(67) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	32. A decision to meet with community groups to discuss changes in school programs.	(71)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(68) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(69) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(70) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(72) Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	33. A decision to identify specific objectives for the school system.	(76)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(73) Principal(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(74) Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											
(75) Supt./Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9											

VITA

Phyllis Salisbury Casavant was born on September 6, 1950 in Chattanooga, Tennessee. She graduated from Girls' Preparatory School in Chattanooga in 1968 and attended Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. She graduated from Duke with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Latin in 1972 and received a Master of Education degree in Special Education/Teaching Emotionally Disturbed Children, also from Duke, in 1974.

She was a resource teacher, Benton Heights Elementary School, Monroe, North Carolina from 1974 to 1977. In 1977 she moved back to Tennessee and in 1980 enrolled in the doctoral degree program in Educational Administration and Supervision at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, graduating in March of 1985 with the Doctor of Education degree. While in graduate school she was a departmental graduate assistant and also participated as a Student Associate in the Experimental Program for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research for Women in Educational Administration, a National Institute of Education project for pre-doctoral fellows.

Currently she is Assistant Director of the Tennessee Statewide Facilitator Project of the National Diffusion Network. She is married to W. Edward Casavant and has two lovely children, James Edward and Mary Anderson.