

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-5-2011

The Perception of School Personnel Relative to the Effectiveness of Shared Decision- Making Practices on the Professional Climate of Secondary Schools

Myron V. Johnson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Johnson, Myron V., "The Perception of School Personnel Relative to the Effectiveness of Shared Decision-Making Practices on the Professional Climate of Secondary Schools" (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 240.

<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/240>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khggerty@memphis.edu.

To the University Council:

The Dissertation Committee for Myron V. Johnson certifies that this is the final approved version of the following electronic dissertation: The Perception of School Personnel Relative to the Effectiveness of Shared Decision-Making Practices on the Professional Climate of Secondary Schools.

Reginald L. Green, Ed.D.
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Lisa Horton, Ph.D.

Ronnie Priest, Ph.D.

Larry McNeal, Ph.D.

Accepted for the Graduate Council:

Karen D. Weddle-West, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate Programs

THE PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL RELATIVE TO THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
SHARED DECISION-MAKING PRACTICES ON THE PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE OF
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

Myron V. Johnson

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Major: Leadership and Policy Studies

The University of Memphis

May 2011

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my family, my mother, Charlotte, who supported me in every way one could have ever imagined. To Jerry and Everlena Maclin, the most loving, supportive, and honest grandparents a grandchild could have ever hoped for. To my nephews Tyler and Cortez and my niece, Ta`niya, always remember that through prayer, hard work, dedication, and integrity, your life can be however you imagine it.

Finally, to the memory of my loving dog, Prinston, a five-pound Yorkshire Terrier whom we all loved dearly.

And now I know:

Whose woods these are I think I know,
His house is in the village though.
He will not see me stopping here,
To watch his woods fill up with snow.

My little horse must think it queer,
To stop without a farm house near
Between the woods and frozen lake,
The darkest evening of the year.

He gives his harness bells a shake,
To ask if there is some mistake.
The only other sounds the sweep,
Of easy wind and downy flake.

The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep
And miles to go before I sleep.

Robert Frost

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I shall forever be reminded of a time in my life in which I was totally dependent upon people who had an insatiable desire to see me succeed.

To Dr. Reginald Leon Green – you have been an excellent example of scholarly pursuit and what it means to be resilient. I am appreciative that you took on this project and assisted me in seeing it through to maturity. From one African American male to another, thank you. To my committee members – your educational guidance and tutelage has been priceless; Dr. Lisa Horton, Dr. Ronnie Priest and finally Dr. Larry McNeal my ram in the bush. You all shall never know how much your expertise and cooperation meant.

To my mother who has stood in the gap and in her own way supported me in every endeavor and undertaking. I Love You! To my loving grandparents – your un-severed love for me and your relentless support and barrage of prayers are what have kept me going in the ninth hour. I cannot say enough about you both. How encouraging you have been to me (all) of my life. You both have been the engine by which I have been fueled over and over again. No matter how low I would become throughout life, it is always revitalizing to know that I can stop by or call you for a fill up!

Granddaddy – I have been your professor since the day I completed my undergraduate studies. You believed in me and as a result, your belief system helped me believe in myself. How smart you are, how handsome you are and look at that smile. Man, who do you belong to? Your words evoked a self-esteem so far reaching you shall never know its end. Your talks about education and how it will pay dividends if you stick with it is my purposefulness. Thanks!

To “the 4 a.m. buddies” – Your prayers have been a life line for me. Thanks so much for your encouragement and support you are appreciated. To Betty Moore, without you I don’t know how this dissertation would have been organized and completed. You are a jewel thanks for not giving me anything less than your best. Robert Moore, thank you for praying me through I decree that your latter shall be greater.

Lastly, to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ who has given me the will and appetite to trudge forward when it was so easy to give up. I am reminded of my favorite passage of scripture that foretells Jesus’ love for us: For I know the plans I have for you, “declares the Lord”, plans to prosper you and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future and an expected end (Jeremiah 29:11).

ABSTRACT

Johnson, Myron V. Ed. D. The University of Memphis. May 2011. The Perception of School Personnel Relative to the Effectiveness of Shared Decision-Making Practices on the Professional Climate of Secondary Schools. Major Professor: Reginald Leon Green, Ed. D.

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent, if any, does shared decision-making exist within the confines of a school's culture. The study looks at three school districts in the Mid-South. Two rural school districts and one suburban school district were incorporated in the study. The research of this study was concerned with determining the amount of input teachers prefer in secondary schools as compared to the amount of input teachers are allowed by administration. To make this comparison, a survey was designed with 38 questions from each of the six categories requesting a response on how much input a teacher currently has versus how much input a teacher would like to have in five particular areas: a) Instructional Time; b) Committee Formation; c) Meetings; d) School Procedures; and e) Instruction; teachers were also asked about organizational culture and job satisfaction. The findings showed significant differences in the amount of input teachers preferred in secondary schools as compared to the actual amount of input allowed by school administration in the various categories. Teachers have relatively less input over when they meet and about the content of the meeting when compared to some other areas. Four areas in which teachers would like to have more input were teaching duties, disciplinary and student referral procedures, and all matters related to the quality of instruction. A relationship existed between school culture and job satisfaction. The correlation observed between culture and job satisfaction suggests that the relationship between them is indirect with job satisfaction working through culture. Overall, shared decision-making does exist within the confines of the school culture, but the amount of teacher input varies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	4
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Statement of the Problem	8
	Conceptual Framework	8
	Research Questions	11
	Statement of the Problem	12
	Delimitations of the Study	12
	Limitations of the Study	13
	Definition of Operational Terms	13
	Organization of the Study	15
2	Review of the Literature	16
	Introduction	16
	The Call for School Reform	16
	Teacher Empowerment and Organizational Culture Research	18
	The Relationship between Teachers' Empowerment and Their Organizational and Personal Commitment	28
	The Relationship between Teacher Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	30
	SDM	37
	SDM in Schools	39
	Summary	45
3	Methodology	47
	Subjects	47
	The Instrument	48
	Data Collection	50
	Data Analysis	51
	Demographics of Participants	53
	Summary	53
4	Results	54
	Introduction	54
	Research Question 1	55
	Research Question 2	55
	Research Question 3	55
	Research Question 4	55
	Research Question 5	55
	Research Question 6	55
	Participants	56
	Data Analysis	57
	Results	58

Reliability of the Instruments	74
Summary	74
5 Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	76
Purpose of the Study	78
Subjects	79
Instruments	80
Summary of the Findings	82
Research Question 1	82
Research Question 2	86
Research Question 3	87
Research Question 4	88
Research Question 5	88
Research Question 6	89
Discussion	90
Conclusions	95
Future Recommendations for Practice	96
Final Thoughts	97
References	91
Appendices	
A. Teacher Survey Instrument	99
B. Letters to the Principals	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Item Frequencies and Percentages for All Surveyed Respondents (TEAS)	60
2. Coefficient Alpha Statistics by Scale for Current and Desired Levels of Input into Shared Decision-Making	64
3. Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Current and Desired Levels of Input into Shared Decision-Making and the Extent Of Discrepancy between Current and Desired Levels	66
4. Item Frequencies and Percentages for All Surveyed Respondents: Job Satisfaction	70
5. Item Frequencies and Percentages for All Surveyed Respondents: Human Relations/Clan Culture	72
6. Correlations between Current Levels of SDM Input and the Discrepancies between Current and Desired Levels of SDM Input and Measures of Teacher Satisfaction and Human Relation Organizational Culture (N = 261)	73

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Since the early 1970s, American education has been at the forefront of public policy analysis (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997). In response to the second wave of reform calling for school management decentralization, increased participation and collaboration in decision-making, there has been substantial increase in interest regarding the role teacher's play in decisions made in the operation of schools (Hess, 1994; Husband & Short, 1994; Keedy & Finch, 1994; Morrison, Wakefield, Walker, & Solberg, 1994).

Numerous journal articles provide evidence of positive outcomes of shared decision making (Chase, 1991; Reyes, 1992; Sebring & Camburn, 1992; Weiss, 1993). This study renders an in-depth analysis of teacher perceptions of empowerment as a result of shared decision-making (SDM). One of the first studies of shared decision-making was performed by George Murray in Georgia in 1993. Murray found that teachers regarded the following conditions as being conducive to positive school climate in which SDM existed: school culture, staff development, competency requirements, program content and implementation patterns.

Levin (1991) further supports the enhancement of teacher efficacy with the use of SDM. His findings indicate that many crucial decisions regarding curriculum teaching strategies and personnel should be made by school staff at the site level. Not all research supports this decision-making model; however, several studies cite the negative effect and attitude of teachers following implementation of participatory decision-making (Conley, 1989; Elenbugen & Hiestand, 1989; Huddleston, 1991; Sturskinski, 1990; Weiss, 1992; Welsh, 1987).

In examining the relationship between teacher decision-making and sense of efficacy, Taylor (1994) found that SDM accounted for very little of the variance in teachers' self efficacy

(Taylor, 1994). A study conducted to assess effects of leadership style on teacher motivation (Gallmeier, 1992) showed that teachers who work under dictatorial administrators do not have significantly higher motivation than those working for democratic managers (Gallmeier, 1992). This lack of clear direction in the literature may be accounted for by the great difficulty of analyzing the level and extent of actual SDM that occurs in schools.

Slotnik (1993) asserts that SDM is not a reform; rather, it is a methodology for management. However, most of the literature indicates that teacher participation in decision-making is viewed as a school reform change initiative centered on a SDM alternative strategy for school management (Conley & Bacharach, 1990; Goldman, 1992; Grant, 1992). This is an essential point in the discussion of SDM. The literature suggests that there is a great deal of confusion regarding what type of decisions can/should be made by teachers, administrators, parents or board members. A lack of congruence in expectations regarding decision-making has resulted in frustration and failure of teachers to take an active role in participatory management (Goldman, 1992; Grant, 1992; Zukeman, 1993). The literature suggests that teachers who had opportunities to participate regularly and actively in school making policies (i.e. instructional time, forming committees, meetings, school procedures, and instructional decision) were far more likely to exhibit enthusiasm and support for their system than teachers who recorded limited opportunities to participate (Keith & Girling, 1991).

Extrinsic motivation research conducted by Ashton and Webb (1986) indicates that the motivation of teachers can be greatly increased by increasing emotional rewards, which teachers indicate are satisfying yet so infrequent in the current system. At the center of these rewards is SDM and the opportunity for a real voice in schooling (Andrews, 1994; Chase, 1991). The

literature also strongly supports the concept that environmental issues greatly affect the teacher in the classroom.

Denham and Michel (1981) describe teacher efficacy as an ecologically determined state, which results from the co-mingling of a variety of sources including: past training, administration, peers, and the community characteristics. Their research indicates that teachers frequently believe that they are not competent enough to have an integral part in shared governance.

Ruscoe and Whitford (1991) also reported research findings regarding teacher attitudes toward efficacy and empowerment and the learning environment in their schools. Their work indicated that teachers want to be involved in the restructuring of education and, although they desire a role in SDM, they attribute an increased sense of efficacy, more positive attitudes and work environment to the following: supportive administration, collegial faculty, and a major focus on students. These two researchers say that in order to bring about a collaborative work environment supportive of SDM, the leader must embrace and promote the concept of empowerment and teacher efficacy by providing the opportunity for teachers to mutually determine the direction of the organization and also by allowing them to have a voice in five areas: instructional time, forming committees, meetings, instruction and school procedures. In doing so, teacher job satisfaction and the school's organizational culture is positioned to improve.

Purpose of the Study

Education, specifically the performance of public schools charged with educating America's youth, has been a topic of discussion in our society for many years. Today, this particular discussion takes place all over America. It is a widely discussed topic, but only a

select few have learned how to get our schools and the students they instruct to advance. This is partially because we have looked in a myriad of directions, when, in fact, one of the most important keys to success is the development of our teachers/educators.

Recent discussions about educational restructuring emphasize involvement of teachers and parents in determining the approach schools used to educate all children (e.g., Comer, 1993; Conley & Bachan, 1992; Lange, 1993). It also delineates strategies for implementation of SDM (Bergman, 1992; Lampe, 1993). Support for SDM as an approach to school reform derives from theory concerning facilitative power and participative decision-making (e.g., Dunlap, Conley, & Goldman, 1993; Hart, 1995; Hoy & Tarter, 1993; Mohrman, 1978; Smyth, 1992; Strike, 1993). SDM places emphasis on facilitative power and shared leadership.

There are numerous journal articles that provide evidence of positive outcomes (Chase, 1991; Reyes, 1992; Sebring & Camburn, 1992; Weiss, 1994). A comparative analysis of teacher perceptions of empowerment as a result of SDM was among the first to be conducted in Georgia schools by George Murray (1993). He found that teachers regarded the following conditions as being conducive to SDM: school climate, staff development, competency requirements, program content, and implementation patterns.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to examine the correlation between the differences in the perception of secondary school teachers and their desired roles in site-based SDM versus their actual roles. The research examined the degree to which teachers desired to be involved in certain aspects of the decision-making process within the school environment.

Conceptual Framework

Research on teacher empowerment began to appear in the literature in late 1980's (Edwards et al., 1996). Empowerment, as perceived by Short, Greer and Melvin (1994) is defined as "a process whereby school participants developed the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems" (p. 106). It is an individual's belief that they have the skills and knowledge to improve a situation in which they operate.

Advocacy for SDM has become a major focus of school restructuring proposals across the nation (Brickly & Westerberg, 1990; Combs, 1989; Kessler, 1992; Lieberman, 1989; National Governors Association, 1989). This focus is both fashionable and controversial (Barth, 1988). Decision-making encompasses the steps taken in selecting among alternatives or choosing alternative courses of an action. It requires assigning priorities and making choices (Keith & Girling, 1991). Typically in schools, SDM involves administrators and teachers and, in some cases, parents, other community members and students; it is also tied to teacher empowerment efforts (Sergiovanni, 1992).

The thought behind SDM is that those closest to students know best how to improve their schools and are in the best position to make and carry out decisions. The involvement of teachers in the decision-making process is not new; in fact, Keith and Girling (1991) and Chase (1952) reported the same positioning.

Also, in examining job satisfaction in 22 Wisconsin high schools, Flannery (1994) found that the teachers who had the highest levels of expertise were particularly interested in working in schools where they could participate in school-level decision-making. It is also clear that teachers do not want to participate in issues that they regard as either trivial or outside their areas of expertise (Flannery, 1980). Most of the recent restructuring literature favors SDM (Keith &

Girling, 1991). Some of the benefits touted are that SDM: facilitates making better decisions; encourages teachers to assume greater responsibility for what happens in a school (Keith & Girling, 1991); teacher job satisfaction (Flannery, 1980); minimizes selection of selected decisions (Keith & Girling, 1991); increases efficacy of those involved (March & Simon, 1985); and contributes to improved student achievement (Dismulse, 1993).

SDM seems destined to be one of the major reforms of the 1990s. With organizations, such as American Association of School Administrators and the National Education Association, pushing for adoption of SDM and the mandating of shared decision-making by some states or school districts, educators need to learn as much as possible about the complexities of SDM. One of the first steps to success in SDM is understanding what it truly is. SDM is an elusive concept (Allen & Hickman, 1992). It involves fundamental changes in the way schools are managed and alterations in the roles and relationships of everyone in the school community (Allen & Hickman, 1992).

SDM is a process of making educational decisions in a collaborative manner at the school level. This process is said to be ongoing; SDM cannot be done once and then forgotten (Meadows, 1992). While SDM takes many forms, it emphasizes several common beliefs or premises. First, those closest to the children will make the best decisions about children's education. Second, teachers, parents and school staff should have more say about policies and programs affecting their schools and children. Third, those responsible for carrying out decisions would have a voice in determining those decisions. Change is most likely to be effective and lasting when those who implement it feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process (Bauer, 1992).

The purpose of SDM is to improve school effectiveness and student learning by increasing staff commitment and ensuring that schools are more responsive to the needs of their students and community (Bauer & Lang, 1993). Student success and achievement must be kept in the forefront of our thinking as the reason to implement site-based, SDM (Lang, 1993). SDM has the potential to improve the quality of decisions; increase a decision's acceptance and implementation; strengthen staff morale, commitment and teamwork; build trust; help staff and administrators acquire new skills; and increase school effectiveness (Liotos, 1993).

There are several factors that are important for SDM implementation to be successful. First, start small and go slowly. Gulluzzo suggests that SDM will be most successful if carried out in small steps, rather than wholesale changes, agree upon specifics at the outset there is no single right way to do SDM; it depends on what you want from it; be clear about procedures, roles and expectations; lack of clarity leads to lack of progress with SDM; next, give everyone a chance to get involved, in decisions made by administrative appointees as opposed to elected or volunteer representatives which may be perceived as top-down decisions. Lastly, building trust and support is necessary; if mistrust and apprehension exist between administrators and teachers, SDM is not easily accepted (Hall & Galluzzo, 1991).

Considering the research that will be conducted on the topic of SDM within secondary schools and based on the data to be collected, six questions were identified as the basis for this study.

Research Questions

What are the actual and desired levels of shared decision making as perceived by teachers in the areas of: a) Instructional leadership; b) Forming of committees; c) Meetings; d) School Procedures; e) Instruction?

What discrepancies exist between the actual and desired levels of shared decision making as perceived by teachers in the areas of: a) Instructional Time; b) Forming of Committees; c) Meetings; d) School Procedures; e) Instruction?

What is the relationship between the actual levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction?

What is the relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction?

What is the relationship between the actual levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and the degree to which they perceive their schools to foster a culture of human relations?

What is the relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the areas previously mentioned and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations?

Statement of the Problem

Based upon the reading and research that has been promoted in reference to SDM within the school; culture documented literature has labeled it as a goal that is definitely achievable, but, to the contrary, teachers may be standing on opposing sides. The study is significant as it offers school educational leaders a detailed look at how teachers wish to be involved in school-based

decisions. Additionally, the study will further engender those decisions teachers have a desire to be involved in. As a result, school educational leaders will be able to incorporate the results of the study into future planning of the school year; it will also help leaders maintain a positive and productive school culture in which teachers desire to work, learn and grow.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited to secondary school teachers in Tennessee who are currently employed as teachers. Information will be gathered through a satisfaction survey that was administered on site at each school. Participants in this study were selected from a pool of secondary teachers in Tennessee public school districts using a range of sampling techniques.

The time allotted to respond to 38 questions per survey may have been problematic for some respondents. Teachers will be provided with ample time to complete the survey. Although the survey can be completed in 15 – 30 minutes, it can still be subject to quick, inaccurate answers. To avoid non-responses, all surveys were collected at the end of the allotted time period.

This study focused only on the perceptions of secondary school teachers in the State of Tennessee; the teachers were from various school districts, which included two rural districts and one suburban district. The literature that was used for the compilation and writing of this study was directly related research that stemmed from the topic of SDM and the proposed possible solutions to the identified problems that exist.

Limitations of the Study

Many of the teachers were asked to answer each survey issued to them honestly and candidly. Since some teachers may have been absent, it was expected that some restrictions

would be placed upon the survey process and would restrict only the opportunity to survey an entire teaching staff.

Definitions of Operational Terms

Autonomy – Refers to the teachers’ feelings that they have control over various aspects of their working life, including scheduling, curriculum development, selections of text books and planning instruction (Husband & Short, 1994).

Distributed Leadership – Gronn (2002) defines distributed leadership as comprising concertive action. Gronn suggests that distributed leadership is imbued with the additional dynamic which is the product of collective activity focused on well-articulated shared goals.

Empowerment – A process whereby school participants develop competence and take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems (Melvin, 1994).

Impact – Refers to the teachers’ perceptions that they can affect and influence school life (Husband & Short, 1994).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior – Behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal rewards team and that in the aggregate promote the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988).

Professional Growth – Refers to the teachers’ perceptions that the school provides opportunities to grow and develop professionally, opportunities to continue to learn, and opportunities to expand their skills during school.

Self-Efficacy – Refers to the teachers’ perceptions that they are equipped with the skills and abilities to help students learn and are competent enough to develop curricula for students (Husband & Short, 1994).

Self-Efficacy Theory (SET) – An individual’s expectations for success determines the behavioral response, including an individual’s determination to initiate a specific behavior (Bandura, 1999).

Shared Leadership - Lambert (2002) defines shared leadership as being responsible for the learning of colleagues.

Site-based Management (SBM) – Short and Greer (1997) define site-based management as an approach to move decision-making control from the central office of a school to the local school level.

Teacher Leaders – Patterson and Patterson (2004) define a teacher leader as a teacher who works with colleagues for the purpose of mentoring and improving teaching and learning.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 of this study presents the problem and addresses the need for the study. Chapter 2 consists of an extensive review of the literature. Chapter 3 gives detailed information on the research methodology used for the design of the study and the procedures used to complete the study. Chapter 4 reports the procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data. The final chapter, Chapter 5, is used to conclude this study and to report conclusions from the findings of the study. This chapter also includes the recommendation for further study and an overall summary. Following Chapter 5 are the references and appendices used in the development of this study as a whole.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to present literature related to the main topics of this study. The literature focuses on the role of teachers in establishing committees and school meetings and in the development of instruction, school procedures, and institutional decisions. The literature suggests possible increases in job satisfaction and positive organizational culture. Teachers feel good about their jobs and the culture of the schools, and this also heightens student achievement. In the 1980s, a startling vision of education's future began appearing in reform proposals; schools must be run by interested people such as teachers, administrators, principals, students, parents, and the community in order to provide students with the learning/teaching environment which makes them use their potentials to maximum levels. Since then, SDM has become a significant part of school reforms (Lashway, 1996).

The Call for School Reform

There is a widespread public concern regarding the status of American schooling. Media reports daily chronicle these various concerns: violence in schools; lack of parental input; failing SAT/ACT scores; failure to adequately compete with foreign countries; lack of professionalism and educational ability of teachers; and decreasing graduation rates, especially in the urban centers of the country. If these reports are true, it would seem that everyone and everything is at the heart of the demise of public education (Lampe, 1997).

Although there is little disagreement that the above conditions prevail in today's schools, no reform movement, thus far, has had any significant lasting effect. Perhaps we are not making progress because we have not truly identified the goal of education in the 21st century. We have continued trying flavor of the month innovations in a desperate search for a solution. Wagner

(1993) discussed this lack of systemic reflection, which he deemed fundamental to long term improvement. This lack of systemic reflection is a result of not having any real incentive to change from the status quo. He asserts that there are five essential areas that must be examined regarding school improvement: initiatives vision and core values, the school's strengths and weaknesses, priorities and strategies for change, goals and needed skills, and resources.

Wagner (1997) suggests before undertaking another reform that “we need to know what we want from schooling and systemically reflect on the process for change” (p. 323). In an effort to respond to the reports detailing the failure of schooling in America, educational reform was initiated with great energy and determination. The first move of restructuring efforts to increase the quality and effectiveness of the educational enterprise was comprised by public policy mandates and inducements. This wave was characterized by adherence to the industrial age classical mode of management (Taylor, 1911). This turn of the century scientific management model became the widely used standard for the development of the now obsolete “factory” school.

Wave one was authoritarian and teacher-centered. It was competitive, and it stressed uniform minimum standards and accountability and was single-pathed and linear (Sergiovanni, 1993). During this period, the objective was to develop a measured, standardized, narrow curriculum that monitored both teacher and student output. Little attention was paid to critical thinking or reasoning, and the focus was, instead, on measurable minimum standards. These coercive initiatives did little to change either the functioning or the public perception of the status of American schools (Sergiovanni, 1993).

Following this successful attempt at school reform, came the second wave of reform in the early 1990s. This current wave has emphasized capacity-building and system-changing

activities that address fundamental transformation of the infrastructure of public schools. It espouses learner-centered teaching participation operation and collaboration and is multi-faceted (Sergiovanni, 1993). This era is characterized by attempts to increase the use of democratic principles and approaches consonant with the current SDM and site-based Management (SBM) focus.

Although the intent of this wave appears praise-worthy, there was little, if any, preparation of school personnel to meet this lofty call for change. This lack of preparation for innovation is evidenced throughout the attempted reforms of the educational system and this failing has had a substantive effect on the attributed teacher efficacy (Sergiovanni, 1993).

Teacher Empowerment and Organizational Culture Research

The academic achievement of students is a major concern of educators in the United States because there are a large number of students who are underachieving and a large number of schools that are equally underachieving. The notion of academic achievement has come into play. Several studies have occurred over the last three to four decades that speak to school reform. However, none of these reforms have put forth processes and procedures to help students and teachers maximize their fullest potential.

These national concerns about the poor performance of U.S. school children were amplified considerably on October 4, 1957, when the Soviet Union Launched Sputnik I into outer space. Congress responded to Sputnik in 1958 by passing the National Defense Education Act, which authorized \$887 million over four years for college loans, scholarships, equipment and research in the areas of math, science, and foreign languages (Brucoli & Lyman, 1994). To move forward to 1958, as part of President Johnson's war on poverty in the socially-conscious 1960s, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, which became

the largest single act for K-12 education by the federal government ever instituted in the United States.

In the late 1970s, the “back-to-basics” movement was initially established to counter the “negative” effects (i.e., failing test scores) of the open education movement of the 1960s and early 1970s. It moved the national education agenda even closer to engagement with academic skills and higher academic standards (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The 1990s saw the enactment into law of many of the recommendations for academic excellence that had been gaining ground during the previous two decades.

Through the mid-1980s, research on school leadership focused on the activities of a single member of the school community – the school principal (Bridges, 1982). A well-known conclusion from this research was that strong principal leadership – and especially strong instructional leadership – is central to successful programmatic change and instructional improvement (see, for example, Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Lipham, 1981). From the mid-1980s onward, the focus of school leadership research changed. Since then, SDM has become a significant part of school reform (Lashway, 1996).

In 1989, President Bush convened the nation’s governors for the first National Education Summit. The governors established six initiatives for educational improvement that were to be reached by the year 2000. This included improving high school graduation rates to 90 percent and ensuring students in grades 4, 8, and 12 demonstrated competency in English, Mathematics, Science, History, and Geography (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

In 1994, President Clinton signed into law a version of America 2000 called the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which established a commission to draw up national standards for

academic achievement legislation in the 1990s (Paris, 1994). This created the national framework that ultimately led to the crowning achievement of academic achievement discourse, the No Child Left Behind Act. President George W. Bush would sign this bill into law in January 2002. This act reauthorizes and amends federal education programs established under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (Manna, 2009). The focus of the No Child Left Behind Act is for historic school reform based on accountability, flexibility, researched-based education, and parent options.

To segue into that of decision-making, Kamlesh and Solow (1994) describes decision-making as a systematic process of choosing from several alternatives to achieve a desired result. Within this definition, three elements are presented: (a) choice (choosing from options); (b) process (electing to make the decision independently or involving others); and (c) purpose (the results or desired outcome (Kamlesh & Solow, 1994). Vroom and Yetton (1973) offered a normative model that distinguishes between individual and group decision-making. The model addresses how the behavior of the leader affects decision quality and acceptance (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The originators of the model also suggest how leaders should involve followers in the decision-making process and to what extent.

“Throughout this model, Vroom and Yetton address two basic assumptions: (a) the more influence followers have, the more they will be motivated to implement a decision; (b) when decision acceptance is not already high, follower participation will increase decision acceptance” (Green, 2005, p. 14). In such instances, the stakeholders may not have an interest in the issue or the expertise necessary to provide meaningful input. Consequently, the school leader should not conclude that an autocratic style or participatory style will always be either inferior or superior. “Rather, the goal should be to involve faculty members or stakeholders in the decision-making

process when their involvement will improve the quality and/or acceptances of the decision” (Green, 2005, p. 142).

In recent years, with the widespread acceptance of the reform movement, participatory decision-making has increased in importance. Involving faculty member and other stakeholders in the decision-making process is an approach that has been informed by many researchers and writers (Gorton, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 2004; Maier, 1963; Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 1989). Based on the work of these individuals, evidence suggests that under certain conditions, groups outperform individuals.

The challenge for school leaders is to determine when and under what conditions faculty members and other stakeholders should be involved. As explained, these are some instances when school leaders should make decisions autocratically; however, in some instances, they should invite the participation of stakeholders. Some writers have reported that the question of whether a group will do a better job of making a decision than the leader acting independently depends, to a large extent, on the complexity of the issue, the expertise of the participants selected, and whether or not the issue is in the participant’s zone of concern (Blanchard, Hershey, & Johnson, 1996; Yukl, 1994).

In relation to the literature, teachers/educators are most satisfied when they are able to have input in the following areas: forming committees, school procedures, school meetings, and making suggestions on instructional decisions. They are more likely to have an increased positive approach in relation to job satisfaction; thus, producing a more positive school culture where teachers/educators feel good about their work atmosphere; thus, producing a more positive work climate and increased student achievement” (Blasé & Blasé, 1999).

As emphasized throughout the literature, the primary purpose of SDM is to improve teaching and learning. “SDM through a well-defined decision-making model, will provide an opportunity for all participants to share their perspectives and expertise through effective communication and a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities, through which SDM will foster a collaborative effort and a greater sense of ownership and commitment” (Constance, Perry, Brown, & McIntire, 1994). The process of SDM will affect participants from different perspectives.

Since students learn in classrooms, teachers should be deeply involved in the decision-making process. Since teachers have a practical understanding of classroom complexities, they will presumably focus on programs that improve achievement. Teachers are pleased when their views influence school decisions, leading them to feel both respected and empowered (Lashway, 1996). As Griffin states, collaborative efforts are often taken seriously, and decisions are more likely to be supported. This also leads to the teachers’ positive job satisfaction.

Involvement in decision-making will have created ownership commitment and a sense of empowerment, as collaboration leads to new roles and relationships. At its best, SDM promotes equality and makes the school a more democratic work place (Blasé et al., 1995). On the other hand, when students are assisted with the preparation of activities, such as designing a learning center within their classroom or establishing discipline standards for themselves, they will follow rules more strictly and voluntarily (Reynolds, Murrill, & Whitt, 2006).

Without question, in order for the process of SDM to flow more smoothly, without a doubt, teacher empowerment is necessary. These outcomes—teacher organizational commitment (OC), professional commitment (PC) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)—are key

factors in their performance in a school setting (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002; Howell & Dorfman, 1986).

Research on teacher empowerment began to appear also in the literature in the late 1980s (Edwards et al., 1996). Empowerment is defined as “a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems” (Melvin, 1994). Often, individuals believe that they have the skills and knowledge to improve a situation in which they operate. In a national study on empowerment of teacher leaders, it was cited that leaders in reading recovery teacher were more highly empowered than reading recovery teachers or classroom teachers (Rinehart & Short, 1991). This outcome was explained as having resulted from reading recovery teacher leaders having more opportunities to make decisions and grow professionally; these leaders had more control over their daily schedules and felt a high level of teaching competency.

According to Maeroff (1988), teacher empowerment consists of improved status, increased knowledge, and access to decision-making (Maeroff, 1988). Short and Rinehart identifies six dimensions of teacher empowerment: decision-making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact (Short & Rinehart, 1992). In a study devoted to the concept of teacher empowerment, Husband and Short (1994) describe six dimensions of teacher empowerment in detail:

1. Decision-making – “refers to teachers’ participation in critical decisions that directly affect their work involving issues related to budgets, teacher selection, scheduling and curriculum. To be effective, teachers’ participation in decision-making must be genuine, and the teachers needed to be confident that their decisions actually impact real outcomes” (Husband & Short, 1994, p.108).

2. Professional Growth – “refers to the teachers’ perceptions that the schools provide them opportunities to grow and develop professionally to continue to learn and expand their skills during their work in school. Status refers to the professional respect and admiration that the teachers perceive that they earn from colleagues. Respect is also granted for the knowledge and expertise that the teachers demonstrate, resulting in support of their actions from others” (Husband & Short, 1994, p.106).
3. Self-efficacy – “refers to the teachers’ perceptions that they are equipped with the skills and ability to help students learn and are competent to develop curricula for students. The feeling of mastery in both knowledge and practice that results in accomplishing desired outcomes is critical in the teachers’ sense of self-efficacy” (Husband & Short, 1994, p. 106). Lastly, the incorporation of autonomy within the school environment encircles a teacher’s perception of the SDM model.
4. Autonomy – “refers to the teachers’ feeling that they have control over various aspects of their working life, including scheduling, curriculum development, selection of textbooks and planning instruction. This type of control enables a teacher to feel free to make decisions related to their educational milieu. Impact refers to the teachers’ perception that they can affect and influence school life” (Husband & Short, 1994, p. 107).
5. Distributed Leadership – “is the sharing, the spreading, and the distributing of leadership work across individuals and roles across the school organization” (Louis, Mayrowetz, Murphy, Seashore, & Smylie, 2007, p. 86).

Teacher empowerment has been studied in relation to job satisfaction (Rinehart & Short, 1994). Previous research supports four assumptions regarding teacher empowerment. “First, teacher empowerment is most effective when it is orientated to increase teacher professionalism.

Second, empowerment has at least two dimensions – organizational and classroom. Third, empowering teachers has its greatest impact on student achievement when the emphasis is on the core technology of teaching and learning in schools. Fourth, to be effective, teacher empowerment needs to be authentic, therefore, teacher empowerment is perceived as a crucial factor that affects school effectiveness” (Ball & Rinehart, 1998, p.115).

The concept of teacher empowerment grew from literature on school effectiveness, school improvement and school reform. Empowerment has been defined as administrative power sharing (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000), a process for teacher growth (Husband & Short, 1994) and as an opportunity for autonomy (Lightfoot, 1991). Schools where teachers reported feeling empowered cited the importance of the leader. Gonzales and Short (1996) found that the more empowered teachers felt in their work, the less they believed that coercion and punishment were used by their principals to influence the work of teachers.

The lines of traditional leadership roles and followers are blurred. The complexity and size of school systems today are such that one leader cannot meet the demands of daily tasks and problems. Thus, a singular leader-centric school cannot operate as efficiently as one in which leadership roles are distributed. Those who study and those who practice the art of leadership are embracing a re-thinking of leadership practice as a collective effort (Green, 2005, p. 138).

Recently, the concept of distributed leadership has been at the forefront of the school leadership literature. Unlike the study of leadership, focusing on the individual, distributed leadership examines the construct as an emergent property of interacting individuals (Bennett, Wise, Woods, & Harvey, 2003). Distributed leaderships are “the sharing, the spreading, and the distributing of leadership work across individuals and roles across school organization” (Smylie, Mayrowetz, Murphy, Seashort, & Louis, 2007).

Discussion of community building, the complexity of leadership as a construct, the need to share leadership in times of accountability, and the connection of distributed leadership to school improvement (Doyle, 2004; Halverson, 2009; Harris, 2005; Hartley, 2007; Storey, 2004; Wright, 2008) all have increased interest about this concept. While there has been much discussion, there has been little empirical evidence in the literature of distributed leadership in practice.

Research studies have examined the practice of distributed leadership. Findings from various studies which form the basis of distributed leadership as it relates to teacher use does include (a) leadership practice as support for organizational structure; (b) trusts as strengthening organizational culture, and (c) relationships as the foundation for organizational affiliation. To understand the concept of distributed leadership, it is important to consider what it is not. Delegation of tasks or dividing responsibilities according to role is not distributed leadership (Timperley, 2005; Watson & Scribner, 2007). Watson and Scribner (2007) found that schools purport to practice distributed leadership actually delegate “responsibilities without passing on the accompanying authority traditionally invested in those who perform such duties” (pp. 21-23).

Harris (2005) referred to this as “misguided delegation.” Distributed leadership is more than just the single charismatic leader who transforms an organization; it is leadership that is “stretched over” many individuals in the organization, with the tasks of leadership performed through the interaction of multiple individual leaders (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). The interactions of the organization’s members are a key aspect of distributed leadership.

Equally important are the contexts in which these interactions occur (Harris, 2005; Spillane et al, 2001). Smylie and associates (2007) referred to this as “leadership sharing, spreading, and distributing involving multiple actors across multiple roles and multiple levels of

school organizations” (p. 142). Organizational constructs of organizational structure, organizational culture, and organizational affiliation, in turn, lead the organizational outcomes of (a) efficacy, (b) increased trust, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) teacher intent to stay (Bennett et al., 2003). The above-mentioned constructs tie hand-in-hand with that of teacher empowerment.

A linear hierarchical model of leadership gives way to a model of leadership built on task expertise and the context of the problem at hand. Thus, distributed leadership focuses on the goals of the group, rather than on the actions of one (Copeland, 2003; Gronn, 1996). Sharing goals and a purpose requires a shift in thinking where leadership is concerned. This new thinking embraces a redistribution of power, allocating tasks to those who hold the greatest expertise (Copeland, 2003). SDM has also been found to be a key component to teacher empowerment (Rice & Schneider, 1994; Rinehart & Short, 1994; Rinehart, Short, Short, & Eckley, 1998). However, teacher SDM, while critical, will only be embraced if teachers feel their opinions will have an impact on organizational outcomes (Greer, Michael, & Short, 1994).

The Relationship Between Teachers’ Empowerment and Their Organizational and Personal Commitment

Organizational commitment, as defined by Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), is the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization. This concept is based on three factors: the acceptance of the organization’s goals and values (identification), the willingness to invest effort on behalf of the organization (involvement), and the importance attached to keeping up the membership in the organization (loyalty).

These characteristics imply that the members of the organization wish to be active players in the organization have an impact on what is going on in it, feel that they have high

status within it, and are ready to contribute beyond what is expected of them. This is especially true when the leaders of the organization are perceived as adopting consultative or participative leadership behavior, where SDM is prevalent (Yousef, 2000). In this case, when leaders are perceived as participative, employees feel more committed to the organization, express higher levels of job satisfaction, and have higher performance levels (Firestone & Pennell, 1993).

Organizational conditions that showed a strong association with teacher commitment to the organization include teachers' autonomy in making classroom decisions, their participation in school-wide decision-making, and their opportunities to learn. A positive relationship was also found between organizational commitment and teachers' involvement in job-related duties (Blau & Sciarappa, 2009). Professional commitment is the degree to which a person's work performance affects his self-esteem (Lodahl, 2004).

For a person who is professionally committed, work is a vital part of life. This means that both the work itself and the co-workers are very meaningful to the employee. The importance he/she attaches to the organization as a whole is important, as well. Active participation in decision-making increases involvement, which results in a higher level of acceptance and satisfaction (Evers, 1990). Teachers' successful participation in decision-making could be explained by the feeling of ownership that comes from initiating ideas rather than responding to others' proposals (Evers, 1990).

Gaziel and Weiss (1990) claimed that teachers' participation based on establishing a strong voice in decisions and policies was a characteristic of professional orientation and fostered better working relations among staff members (Gaziel & Weiss, 1990). With regard to self-efficacy, studies have shown that teachers with a greater sense of efficacy are more enthusiastic about teaching (Guskey, 1984) report a higher level of commitment to teaching

(Coladarci, 1992; Evans & Tribble, 1986), and are more likely to remain in teaching (Glickman, 1996). Wu and Short (1996), who studied the relationship between teacher empowerment and teacher job commitment and job satisfaction, found that among the sub-scales that compose the teacher empowerment scale, professional growth, self-efficacy and status were significant predictors of job commitment (Wu & Short, 1996).

The Relationship Between Teacher Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The concept of OCB (Organizational Citizenship Behavior), derived from Katz's (1964) conception of extra-role behavior, was introduced by Organ (1977), who defined it as behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system whose aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). Researchers have recognized the significant impact of organizational citizenship behavior on the success of an organization (e.g., Chen, Hui, & Segó, 1988; Karambayya, 1989).

As noted by several scholars, organizational citizenship behaviors are important to the organization because organizations cannot anticipate the whole range of behaviors needed for the achievement of organizational goals solely through the use of formal job descriptions (Peren, Vandenberg, & Willering, 1999). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) provides the organization with additional resources and eliminates the need for expansive formal mechanisms otherwise crucial to successful restructuring processes.

Today, as schools move into a new era of organization (Blasé & Blasé, 1996; Clement & van den Berghe, 2000; Reitzug, 1994; Wall & Rinehart, 1998), performance prescribed by task roles is necessary but not sufficient for predicting school effectiveness. Therefore, schools will have to be more dependent on teachers who are willing to exert considerable effort beyond

normal job requirements, namely, to engage in OCB (Somech & Prach-Zahavy, 2000).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior refers to various dimensions such as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (Organ, 1988); obedience, loyalty, and various types of participation (Dienesch, Graham, & Van Dyne, 1994); and helping voice (Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001; Van Dyne & Lepine, 1998).

Organization citizenship behaviors operate indirectly; they influence the social and psychological environment of organizations which, in turn, influence the technical core (Diefendorff, 2002). However, in the case of teachers who exhibit OCB, they also help to achieve organizational goals. This is reflected through extra role behaviors toward the organization, expressed by teachers organizing social activities for the school, volunteering for roles and tasks that are not part of their jobs, providing innovative suggestions to improve the school, and by organizing joint activities with parents above the norm (Dipaola & Tschannen-Moron, 2001).

Based on Zimmerman and Rappaport (1998), who knew the concept of empowerment as a “sense of civic duty” involving democratic participation and affecting community life and social issues, one can expect to find a relationship between empowerment and organizational citizenship commitment (Rappaport & Zimmerman, 1988). Participation in decision-making, one of the characteristics of teacher empowerment, has been found to lead to engagement in organizational citizenship behavior in various contexts (Hackman, Lawter, Porter, & Hackman, 1996).

Teacher Efficacy

Researchers and policy analysts (Goodak, 1994; Husband & Short, 1994; Morrison, 1994; Ross, 1994) assert that teacher self-efficacy is a critical component in the restructuring of

schooling and that there is a lack of clarity regarding role expectations and aspirations of teachers indecision-making. This results in a lack of general and personal self-efficacy in the workplace. Recent reports in the literature support the focus on teacher attributes and self-efficacy as major elements in productive schooling (Hoy & Woolfork, 1993; Sachs, 1990).

The teacher's competency and self-efficacy, which greatly affects the teacher-student relationship, is at the heart of reform and is the sine-quantum of meaningful change in schools (Bandura, 1977). Albert Bandura introduced a theory of behavioral change known as self-efficacy theory (SET). Bandura hypothesized that an individual's expectation for success determines the behavioral response, including: (a) the individual's determination to initiate a specific behavior; (b) level of intensity of the response; and, (c) perseverance and coping behaviors when confronted with obstacles

Bandura's (1977) theory depicts an individual's belief in their abilities to successfully engage in behavior within their environment. Numerous studies support this theoretical model and indicate a strong relationship between perceived self-efficacy and actual performance. SET has been widely used and widely supported by experts in research studies examining teacher involvement in SDM (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Luzzo, 1994).

Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as a cognitive motivational construct that involves two components: outcome expectancy and self-efficacy. According to Bandura, outcome expectancy involves the beliefs that an individual holds regarding the specific results accruing from a particular action. Self-efficacy beliefs pertain to beliefs regarding personal competency to affect or execute a given task. Bandura described this cognitive phenomenon and provided methodologies that might prove to be most useful as we analyze teacher and system variables.

In order to enhance teacher efficacy, teachers must believe that their behaviors can affect the education of their students. Teachers must recognize that they have the capacity and power to make decisions, which will affect their role and students' production (Hall, 1992). The key focus must be on determining how to bring about and sustain wide-spread teacher sense of efficacy (Hall, 1992; Barros, 1989; Ashton & Web, 1986). Evidence shows that teachers need to feel competent to do the job and to be assured that the system is capable of supporting their roles (Morrison et al., 1994; Ross, 1994; Weber & Montani, 1994). There is support in the literature that is in keeping with the idea that teacher self-efficacy is a crucial component in the restructuring of schools.

Research conducted by Ashton and Webb indicates that the motivation of teachers can be greatly increased by emotional rewards. The research also explains that the involvement that satisfy teachers are infrequent in current systems of education (Ashton & Webb, 1986). At the center of these rewards is SDM and the opportunity for a real voice in schooling (Andrews, 1994; Chase, 1991). The literature also strongly supports the concept that environmental issues greatly affect the teacher in the classroom. Denham and Micael (1981) describe teacher efficacy as an ecologically determined state which results from the co-mingling of a variety of sources including: past training, administration, peers, and the community's characteristics (Denham & Micael, 1981).

Their research indicates that teachers frequently believe that they are not competent enough to have integral part in shared governance. Ruscoe and Whitford reported research findings regarding teacher attitudes toward efficacy and empowerment and the learning environment in their schools (Ruscoe & Whitford, 1991). Their work indicated that teachers want to be involved in the restructuring of education. They attributed an increased sense of

efficacy, more positive attitudes, and work environment to the following: supportive administration, collegial faculty, and a major focus on students.

In order create a more collaborative work environment supportive of SDM, the leader must embrace and promote the concept of empowerment and teacher efficacy by providing opportunities for teachers to mutually determine the direction of the organization (Ruscoe & Whitford, 1991). Good intentions alone will not bring this about. Bandura (1982) posited that even when individuals perceived that specific actions will likely bring out the desired behavior, they will not engage in the behavior or persist after initiating the behavior if they (teachers) feel they do not possess the requisite skills.

Phenomenon implies different relationships within the school where the distinctions between followers and leaders tend to blur. It also opens up the possibilities for teachers to become leaders at various times and suggests that leadership is a shared and collective endeavor that can engage the many rather than the few. The process of SDM, affects participants from different perspectives. For example, since students learn in classrooms, it has been lauded that teachers should be deeply involved in the decision-making process (Lashway, 1996).

Having a practical understanding of classroom complexities will presumably allow teachers to focus on programs that improve achievement. Teachers are pleased when their views influence school decisions, leading them to feel both respected and empowered; additionally, collaborative efforts in decision-making are often taken seriously are more likely to be supported (Lashway, 1996). This also leads to increased job satisfaction and a sense of empowerment, as collaboration leads to new roles and relationships; at its best, SDM promotes equality and makes the school more democratic (Blasé et al 1995).

On the other hand, when students are assisted in the preparation of activities, such as the design of a learning center in their classroom or the establishment of discipline standards for themselves, will follow necessities more strictly and voluntarily (Langa, 2002). Gibb (1954) first suggested the idea of two forms of team leadership: distributed and focused. Focused leadership occurs when leadership resides within a single individual, whereas distributed leadership occurs when two or more individuals share the roles, responsibilities, and functions of leadership (Gronn, 2000).

These two concepts of focused and distributed leadership can be considered endpoints on a continuum rather than rigid or categorical. To further develop the concept of how leadership is shared among members, Yukl's definition of leadership as "influence processes involving determination of the group's or organization's objectives, motivating task behavior in pursuit of these objectives and influencing group maintenance and culture" (Green, 2005, p. 73).

Building on the concept of leadership as influence and drawing on multilevel theory, they defined shared leadership as an emergent team property that results from the distribution of leadership influence across multiple team members (Kozwolski & Klein, 2000; Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999). In keeping with the notion of collective constructs Morgeson and Hoffman (1999) argued that shared leadership originated with individual members of a team engaging in activities that influence the team and other team members in areas related to direction, motivation, and support (Morgeson & Hoffman, 1999).

Leadership can be conceptualized in relation to either the strength of influence (i.e., its quality or effectiveness) or the source of influence (i.e., single versus multiple team members). Shared leadership is a relational phenomenon involving mutual influence between team members

as they work toward team objectives. Social network theory provides a natural theoretical and analytical approach to studying the relational influence instruction in teams (Mehra et al., 2006).

While teachers are consumed with many variables that exist within the confines of schools, teacher/leaders are primarily concerned with several factors. These factors include the attitudes and opinions concerning education and the school, such as providing a safe learning environment, creating schedules, forming committees, creating school procedures, and supporting student instruction. “The human relations variable of job satisfaction and organizational culture comes into play as well where the literature suggests whether or not teachers are satisfied with their job and the overall school culture” (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 143).

The above-mentioned factors speak to the conditions of teachers and how much input they currently have as opposed to how much input they would like to have, if they desire to have any level of involvement at all. The culture of trust in a school is perceived as the collective trust between all parties, which include administrators, teachers, parents, and students. “Trusting relationships, organizational culture, job satisfaction and instruction seem to be at the forefront of best practices in SDM to which teachers seem to agree generates the greatest job satisfaction” (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 145).

In sum, “shared leadership is distinct in that the former can take place in a team with or without a designated leader and can be either formal or informal, which addresses the distribution and sharing of leadership among all team members in contrast to only one or two leaders” (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 146).

SDM in Schools

What is SDM? SDM is also referred to as a philosophical belief that some decisions traditionally made by district level administrators are moved to the school level, and some decisions traditionally made by the school principal are shared with school staff, students, and members of the school community. SDM is not the same as administering the school, which is the principal's function. SDM is a process and not an end in itself. It provides an opportunity for members of a school community to collaborate in solving problems, defining a course of action, and shaping direction for the individual school (Rappaport & Zimmerman, 1988).

What is the purpose of SDM?

As the literature suggests, the purpose of SDM is to enhance student achievement through both improvement of the instructional program and delivery of support services. "SDM is based upon the premise that employees, students, and the community make better decisions when people functioning closest to implementation of the potential decision participate in making decisions" (Rappaport & Zimmerman, 1988 ,p.152). SDM provides opportunities for schools to explore ways to restructure the delivery of instruction and services to better meet the needs of students.

What are the guidelines for SDM?

Criteria that meet the guidelines for SDM include individuals, such as school staff and administrators, making decisions, using the schools SDM model. "Their efforts should reflect collaboration with other schools, the district office, the community and colleagues as necessary" (Reynolds et al, 2006, p. 126). Lastly, the development a communication plan to promote staff understanding and acceptance of the decision will assist in a more seamless shared decision-

making model. This plan must be coordinated with the approved curriculum, board policy, existing contracts or agreements, state statutes, and federal laws.

Does SDM guarantee the best decision?

While numerous authors have explored the topic of shared decision making “Many studies have produced results in identifying that if staff participating in a SDM process understand the skills necessary for reaching consensus, trust each other, have an adequate database for the issue or problem being discussed, and are committed to stretching their thinking to reach a decision collaboratively, then shared decision will lead to the best decision” (Reynolds et al., p.129). If it appears that the best decision was not made, the original group that made the decision will have the opportunity to research any new data available, consider the new data and, if necessary, make a different decision.

SDM in Schools

SDM is an effort to transform conventional school organizations into learning communities by giving the power to all related participants to improve teaching and learning. SDM supports and involves high levels of involvement through these learning communities. The focus is on a process that supports new approaches to teaching and learning (Reynolds et al., 2006).

In response to the second wave of reform calling for shared-decision making, school management decentralization and increased participation and collaboration in decision-making, there has been substantial interest evolving over the recent years concerning the role of the teacher in decisions made in operation of schools (Hess, 1994; Husband & Short, 1994; Keedy & Finch, 1994; Morrison et al., 1994).

Numerous journal articles provide evidence of positive outcomes (Chase, 1991; Reyes, 1992; Seloring & Camburn, 1992; Weiss, 1993). A comparative analysis of teacher perceptions of empowerment as a result of SDM was conducted in Georgia schools by Murray (1991) and found that teachers regarded the following conditions as being conducive to SDM: school climate, staff development, competency requirements, program content, and implementation patterns.

Research further supports the enhancement of teacher efficacy with the use of SDM. Research by Levin (1991) indicates that many crucial decisions regarding curriculum, teaching strategies and personnel should be made by school staff at the site level. Not all research supports this decision-making model; however, several studies cite the negative effect on and attitudes of teachers following implementation of participatory decision-making (Conley, 1989; Elenbogen & Hiestand, 1989; Huddleston, 1991; Sturinski, 1990; Welsh, 1987; West, 1992).

In an examination of the relationship between teacher decision-making and sense of efficacy, Taylor (1994) found that SDM accounted for very little of the variance in teachers' self-efficacies (Taylor, 1994). A study conducted to assess the effect of leadership style on teacher motivation showed that teachers who work under a dictatorial administration do not have significantly higher motivation than those working for democratic managers (Gallmeier, 1992). This lack of clear direction in the literature may be accounted for by the great difficulty of analyzing the level and extent of actual SDM that is occurring in schools. This chasm between wanting and having participatory management can be seen readily in many other organizations, as well.

The whole idea of the quality movement and wide stakeholder participation in decision-making is causing much concern in these organizations, and bringing about its implementation is

fraught with problems. The current struggles within these two competing policy ideologies of authoritarian versus democratic management has placed many burdens upon organizations with enigmatic questions such as how does the process truly take place to evoke change . Slotnik (1993) asserts that SDM is not a reform but rather a methodology for management. However, most of the literature indicates that teacher participation in decision-making is viewed as a school reform change initiative centering on an alternative strategy for school management (Conley & Bacharach, 1990; Goldman, 1992; Grant, 1992).

Organizational Culture and Its Meaning

There are important variables that must be considered in assessing organizational culture within an organization. Organizational culture is first defined as an important factor in accounting for organizational performance. It encompasses the taken-for-granted values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in an organization. It represents how things are in the culture. It reflects the prevailing ideology that people carry inside their heads. “It conveys a sense of identity to employees, provides unwritten and often unspoken guidelines for how to get along in the organization and it enhances the stability of the social system that they experience” (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 16).

“An organization’s culture is reflected by what is valued, the dominant leadership styles, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definition of success that make an organization unique” (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 17). “Organizational culture, however, has been an area in which conceptual work and scholarship have provided guidance for managers as they re-research ways to improve their organization’s effectiveness” (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 16).

Importance of Organizational Culture Assessment

The need to diagnose and manage organizational culture is growing in importance partly because of an increasing need to merge and mold different organizations' cultures as structural changes have occurred (for instance, when schools are consolidated or when downsizing and outsourcing eliminate parts of the organization or when entire organizations merge). "The escalating importance of culture is also partly a result of the increasing turbulence, complexity and unpredictability of the external environments in which organizations operate" (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 144).

Culture reinforces continuity and consistency in the organization through adherence to a clear set of consensual values. "Culture also fosters adaptability by providing a clear set of principles to follow when designing strategies to cope with new circumstances" (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 144). Organizational culture assessment is increasingly important; therefore, "because of the need to both change and maintain stability in the face of increasingly turbulent external environments, having a diagnostic instrument to identify core organizational culture values can be an especially useful tool in the effective management of organizational change" (Cameron & Quinn, 2006, p. 145).

Competing Values Framework and Human Relations Culture Frame

Principals' impact on school performance have resulted in several national and regionally –based statements about professional standards. The high levels of interest have resulted in number of reviews in research articles. Leadership Effectiveness Assessment Device (LEAD) expresses their contents as observable behaviors and maps such behaviors into a comprehensive model of organizational and leadership effectiveness called the Competing Values Framework (CVF). Within LEAD, the CVF is evoked as an "organizing mechanism, a sense-making device,

a source of new ideas, and a learning system” (Cameron et al., 2006) to help articulate best “practices” in educational leadership in a way that is more cognitively tractable and growth-enabling.

The Competing Values Framework of Quinn and Rohrbaugh is a theory that was developed initially from research done on the major indicators of effective organizations. Based on statistical analyses of a comprehensive list of effectiveness indicators, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) discovered two major dimensions underlying conceptions of effectiveness. The first dimension is related to organizational focus, from an internal emphasis on the well-being and development of people in the organization toward an external focus on the well-being and development of the organization itself. The second dimension differentiates the organizational preference for structure and represents the contrast between stability and control and flexibility and change. Together the two dimensions form four quadrants (Quinn & Rohbaugh, 1983).

The Competing Values Framework was named as such because the criteria within the four models at first seemed to carry conflicting messages. Organizations must be adaptable and flexible, but at the same time, they must be stable and controlled – a paradox. Each quadrant of the framework represents one of four major models of organizational and management theory (Quinn, 1988). The Human Relations Model places emphasis on flexibility and internal focus. It stresses cohesion, morale, and human resources development as criteria for effectiveness. The Open Systems Model emphasizes flexibility and external focus and stresses readiness, growth, resources acquisition and external support. The Rational Goal Model emphasizes control and an external focus. It regards planning, goal setting, productivity and efficiency as being effective. Finally, the internal Process Model emphasizes control and internal focus, and it stresses the role of information and management, communication, stability, and control.

Another variant of the Competing Values Framework deals with leadership. Quinn (1988) uses his competing values framework of organizational effectiveness to organize the literature on leadership. He also argued that more effective managers have the ability to play multiple, even competing, leadership roles. They should simultaneously consider and balance the competing demands that are represented by each set of expectations.

The Competing Values Culture Instrument presents a set of questions related to a school's culture (Quinn, 1988). The context of the instrument presents four sets of items containing descriptions of four hypothetical schools. The participant is asked to distribute 100 points among the four descriptions depending on how similar each description is to his or her school. The participant is also told that none of the descriptions is any better than the others; they are just different.

The four sets include school character, school leadership, school cohesion, and school emphases (Cameron, et al., 2006). In the first set, identified as School Character, the descriptions relate to the school being a very personal place, a very dynamic and entrepreneurial place, a very formalized and structural place, or a very production-oriented place. In the second set, identified as School Leadership, leaders are described as warm and caring, risk-takers, rule-enforcers, or coordinators and coaches. In the third set, identified as School Cohesion, the glue that holds the school is described as loyalty and tradition, commitment to innovation and development, formal rules and policies, or the emphasis on tasks and goal accomplishment. The fourth set, identified as School Emphasis, describes the emphasis as human resources, growth and acquiring new resources, performance and stability, or decisive action and achievement.

Summary

The quest for educational excellence led to many years of reform efforts in America, which ultimately led to new educational reforms being enacted today. This study took a closer look at the roles that teachers play within the confines of schools at the district level as well as teacher roles within the classroom. These roles can be ultimate influencers on decision-making, teacher efficacy, job satisfaction, and organizational culture.

The focus of this chapter was to examine the process of job satisfaction, an element that goes hand-in-hand with teacher efficacy and new approaches to teaching and learning within the school environment. This chapter also took a broader look at teaching and how teachers are pleased when their views help influence school decisions; this leads teachers to feel both respected and empowered, and this will ultimately lead to job satisfaction if the process of SDM is carried out properly and in its correct context.

Chapter 2 also delves into how the process of SDM, if executed properly, promotes equality and makes the school a more democratic workplace, which ultimately creates an atmosphere where teachers are empowered and where students create a culture central to learning. The notion of distributed leadership also surfaces in the fact that lines of traditional leadership roles and followers must take on a newer concept. True to its art, the role of distributed leadership must be embraced, rethought, and looked at as a collective effort.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was three-fold. First, the researcher wanted to determine the current and desired levels of shared decision-making, as perceived by teachers, in the areas of instructional time, committee formation, meetings, school procedures, and instruction. Second, if a discrepancy existed, the researcher wanted to determine the extent of the discrepancy between the current and desired levels of input. Third, the researcher sought to find the extent of the relationship between the current levels of shared decision-making, as perceived by teachers, in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction apropos to human relations culture. This chapter describes the methodology used to conduct the study. Details regarding the sample size and the sample's characteristics are also discussed. The instruments used to collect the data are identified and explained, and procedures for data analysis are outlined.

Subjects

Given the nature of the problem to be researched, the researcher chose to embark upon a quantitative approach because it shows a pattern of relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. Teachers in three selected school districts, two rural and one suburban, answered 38 questions in area school faculty meetings. The survey was distributed by the researcher as part of the statistical procedural methods. Teachers were urged to answer all questions presented in the survey so that the information could be aggregated and used for the school improvement process of shared decision making (SDM). It was stressed that teacher confidentiality would be maintained. The completed surveys were placed in envelopes and labeled by school. Each survey was individually coded by school. The researcher tallied results

from all the completed surveys independently. The seven survey variables included instructional time, forming committees, meetings, school procedures, instruction and lastly, job satisfaction and organizational culture. The demographics information were loaded onto a spreadsheet and placed into SPSS software. Following the analysis of the survey, each site will be conveniently selected. Teachers/educators in secondary schools, grades 9 – 12, were surveyed based upon the five questions below, which surfaced in the literature that speaks to the type of autonomy teachers currently have versus that which doesn't exist within the culture of the school.

The Instrument

The Teacher Effectiveness Assessment Survey (TEAS) was an adaptation or realignment of the original survey instrument launched in a New York City school district to capture the content of teacher perceptions as it relates to their attitudes and opinions about education and the culture of their school with respect to instructional time, forming committees, meetings, school procedures, instructional decisions, job satisfaction, as well as organizational culture. The survey was realigned to include the human relations aspect of teachers' opinions in relation to their school's culture. The surveyed responses allowed each teacher to respond to their job as well as to the organizational culture of the school.

The survey was distributed by the researcher as part of the statistical procedural methods. Teachers were urged to answer honestly so that information could be aggregated and used for the school improvement process of SDM. It was stressed that teacher confidentiality would be maintained. The 269 completed surveys were placed in envelopes and labeled by school. Each survey was individually coded by school. Two surveys were incomplete and not tallied for the research. The researcher tallied results from the 269 completed surveys independently. The five

survey variables and the demographic information were loaded onto a spread sheet and placed into SPSS software. Following the analysis of the survey, each site was conveniently selected.

Teachers in secondary schools, grades 9-12, were surveyed based upon the five scaled opinions, which surfaced in the literature. These opinions spoke to the type of autonomy teachers currently have versus that which doesn't exist within the culture of the school.

Likert Scale. The Likert Scale was used to stress the significance of each teacher's response. The survey instrument (Appendix B) – 1 – Almost no interest, 2 – Is Slight interest, 3 – some interest, 4 – great deal of interest, and 5 – very great deal of interest. The survey contained three pages of questions – Which equals to seven categories in which teacher responses were polled. The survey contained nine sections with overall questions totaling thirty-eight questions per teacher response.

Content Validity. To verify the content validity of the survey, the instrument was reviewed by the policy office of the New York City Superintendent's Office. Feedback from university professors were used to edit and revise the final survey instrument. The process for examining the content validity of the survey instrument used in this study was based on the original school district's use of the instrument to prepare teachers to render their personal and professional opinions as it relates to the culture of their particular school.

The survey results were checked to confirm that no major anomalies existed. Descriptive statistics and frequencies indicated that all means would be within the range of possible values (1 – 5) and that no value had been mistyped.

Data Collection

Given the nature of the problem researched, the researcher embarked upon the quantitative approach, Punch (2005) wrote that quantitative research involves measurements,

usually of a number of variables across a sample. Therefore, for each variable, there are scores for each member of the sample. This is called distribution, and there are various ways of summarizing it. The logic of quantitative sampling is that the research analyses data is collected from the sample, but wishes in the end to make statements about the whole target population from which the sample is drawn (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Quantitative research led the researcher “in the direction of gaining a deeper understanding” (Hopkins, 2000). In quantitative research, the aim is to determine the relationship between one thing (an independent variable) and another (a dependent or outcome variable) in a population. Quantitative research designs are either descriptive subjects that usually measured once or experimental subjects that are measured before and after a treatment (Hopkins, 2000). Quantitative research is all about quantifying relationships between variables; the researcher measures variables on a sample of subjects (Hopkins, 2000).

Quantitative research is mainly concerned with numbers and data easily quantified. The most popular quantitative technique is the survey, often based on a large number of cases in which a broad overview of a market is required. Consequently, the researcher chose to administer the survey face-to-face. Administering the survey in this manner usually takes less time and most often requires choosing between several responses rather than long verbal responses.

In research, surveys often aim to understand a target market, which, in this case, would be secondary educators. In survey research, the researcher selects a sample of respondents from a population and administers a standardized questionnaire to them. The questionnaire, or survey, can be a written document that is completed by the person being surveyed, an online questionnaire, a fact-to-face interview, or a telephone interview (Angus & Katona, 1953). Using

surveys, it is possible to collect data from large or small populations (sometimes referred to as one universe of a study).

Different types of surveys are actually composed of several research techniques developed by a variety of disciplines; for instance, interviews began as a tool primarily for psychologists and anthropologists, while sampling got its start in the field of agricultural economics (Angus & Katona, 1953). Survey research does not belong to any one field, and it can be employed by almost any discipline. According to Angus and Katona (1953), “it is this capacity for wide application and broad coverage which gives the survey technique its greatest usefulness” (p. 119).

Data Analysis

The answers to the 38 survey questions were loaded into SPSS 11.5 software. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the perception of the importance and existence of the 38 variables based on the nine categories of the teacher survey. Multiple linear regressions were used to answer research questions concerning job satisfaction and organizational culture based on specified variables.

Fink and Fowler (2005) have alluded to the fact that descriptive research methodology is appropriate to use in social science research to collect and analyze perceptions of significant organizational events. The primary methodology is a distributed survey instrument that captures a sample of Tennessee teachers. A comparative data study of the groups and matched pairs of teachers were collected and analyzed to describe teacher perceptions of the dependent variables: (a) actual decisions that teacher’s desire to be a part of and (b) those decisions that they prefer to have no interest. Results were analyzed according to independent variables of gender, experience, size of school, location, educational attainment and years of experience.

In referring to a methodology, Tuchman (1998) wrote that methodology is “the study of the epistemological assumptions implicit in specific methods” (p.210). Therefore, methodology includes a way of looking at a phenomenon that specifies how a method captures the object of study. Through the use of the surveying method, the participants were asked to give their opinions and supply insight and expectations of the SDM process within their school. The guidelines outlined by the University of Memphis subjects committee on the use of human subjects a research study were observed. Prior to conducting the study, permission was requested and granted from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Memphis. The approved forms ensure the proper treatment of human subjects were included (Appendix B).

Demographics of Participants

There were three (3) public schools participating in the study. Information regarding average years in education and prior training before becoming a teacher were captured in this study. The sample of teachers included 269 individuals in the three school districts that participated. The average number of years in teaching and the average number of years in education were reported for the sample of teachers.

Teacher Demographic Sample

School Districts	# of Teacher	Teaching Exp
District A	70	1 – 32
District B	100	1 – 45
District C	100	1 – 38

Summary

This quantitative study will embark upon the sampling survey technique of respondents stratified from a population of secondary teachers/educators using a standardized questionnaire. This method allowed the researcher to survey the expectations that the participants had for the SDM process. The method also examined how the decisions were currently being made within the confines of the school. The researcher used open-ended questions to gather information and analyze data. The researcher also used surveying, which is the most common technique used in quantitative research so that each respondent's voice was able to be heard.

CHAPTER 4

Results

As stated in Chapter 1, this study focuses on the perceptions of secondary school teachers in regards to their current and desired levels of involvement in SDM across five general areas.

From these two levels of involvement, discrepancy indices were to be computed, and relationships were sought between current levels of involvement in SDM and the degree of discrepancy in current/desired levels of involvement in SDM and established measures of two other work-related constructs conducive to organizational health and effectiveness: specifically, job satisfaction and a “human relations” or “clan” cultural orientation.

To determine teacher perceptions of shared decision-making, the Teacher Effectiveness Assessment Survey (TEAS) was used, and three practices within each of five domains of shared decision-making were addressed. The five domains addressed were Instructional Time, Forming Committees, Meetings, School Procedures, and Instruction. To measure an individual’s feelings of job satisfaction and organizational culture, two additional items derived from a much longer instrument measuring the two domains aforementioned were employed. To measure respondent perceptions of the extent to which a “human relations” culture was evidenced at the school, the six items measuring attributes associated with that “clan” archetype were taken from a “Competing Values Framework” measure of four cultural orientations.

Results of this investigation are contained within this chapter and are presented with reference to the six research questions introduced in Chapter 1. These questions are as follows:

Research Question 1: What are the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the areas of: a) Instructional Time, b) Forming Committees, c) Meetings, d) School Procedures, and e) Instruction?

Research Question 2: What discrepancies exist between the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the areas of: a) Instructional Time, b) Forming Committees, c) Meetings, d) School Procedures, and e) Instruction?

Research Question 3: What is the extent of relationship between the current levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction?

Research Question 4: What is the extent of relationship between the discrepancies in the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction?

Research Question 5: What is the extent of relationship between the current levels of shared decision making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations?

Research Question 6: What is the extent of relationship between the discrepancies in the current and desired levels of shared decision making as perceived by teachers in the areas previously mentioned and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations?

Following a description of the sample, answers to the following questions are presented in the text and are accompanied by a series of tables. In Table 1, the item frequencies and percentages of responses to current and desired levels of participation in shared decision-making are presented with respect to 15 practices across the five areas. In Tables 2 and 3, the focus shifts from a concern with individual SDM practices to a comparison of the five areas that subsume these practices. To insure these various areas can be legitimately compared, reliability statistics were computed for each item grouping, and these statistics are presented in Table 2.

Given adequate levels of reliability, Table 3 presents means and standard deviations pertinent to the current and desired levels of shared decision-making with respect to each of the five areas, along with means and standard deviations apropos to the discrepancies between the two levels, job satisfaction, and cultural orientation. For the sake of completeness, item frequencies and percentages were presented with respect to the six-item measure of job satisfaction and the six-item measure of human relations culture in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. In the final table, the correlations that address the research questions concerning the extent of relationships among the constructs are provided in Table 6.

Participants

Responding to at least some part of the questionnaire were some 269 secondary school teachers at five high schools in three different Tennessee districts. Of these 269 individuals, 38 teachers responded to the survey in School I (14.1%), 72 teachers responded to the survey at School II (26.8%), 57 teachers responded to the survey at School III (21.2%), 83 teachers responded to the survey at School IV (30.9%), 19 teachers responded to the survey, and 38 teachers responded to the survey at School V (7.1%). According to the demographic information they provided, these 269 teachers had taught on average 7.4 years at their current school ($SD = 7.56$ years) and had taught on average about 3.8 years at some other school ($SD = 6.74$ years). When the respondents were asked how many years of experience they had in working with children prior to becoming a teacher, the average number of years cited was 3.5 ($SD = 6.26$ years), although the median number of years cited was only 1 year, and the modal number of years cited response was 0 years.

Teachers also responded to other items of interest, although the results were not used in these analyses. When asked if they had been a student in the district in which they now taught,

about one in four of the 247 teachers who responded to this question answered affirmatively ($n=67$, 25.4%). When asked if they had participated in any “training or developing programs for aspiring teachers,” slightly more than one in three of the 263 responding teachers answered in the affirmative ($n = 91$, 34.6%).

Data Analysis

The answers to the 38 survey questions were loaded into SPSS 11.5 software. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the perception of the importance and existence of the 38 variables based on the nine categories of the teacher survey. Multiple linear regressions were used to answer research questions concerning job satisfaction and organizational culture based on specified variables.

Fink and Fowler (2005) have alluded to the fact that descriptive research methodology is appropriate to use in social science research to collect and analyze perceptions of significant organizational events. The primary methodology is a distributed survey instrument that captures a sample of Tennessee teachers. A comparative data study of the groups and matched pairs of teachers were collected and analyzed describing teachers’ perceptions of the dependent variables: (a) actual decisions that teacher’s desire to be a part of and (b) those decisions that teachers prefer to have little or no interest. Results were analyzed according to independent variables which included: prior teacher training, years in school district, years in current school district, and years in other school districts.

In referring to a methodology, Tuchman (1998) wrote that methodology is “the study of the epistemological assumptions implicit in specific methods” (p.178). Thus, Tuchman concludes that methodology includes a way of looking at a phenomenon that specifies how a method captures the object of study. Through the use of the surveying method, the participants

were asked to give their opinions and supply insight and expectations of the SDM process within their schools.

The guidelines outlined by the University of Memphis subjects committee on the use of human subjects a research study were observed. Prior to conducting the study, permission was requested and granted from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Memphis. The approved forms ensuring the proper treatment of human subjects are included (Appendix B).

Results

In the following section, results pertinent to each of the research questions are presented, accompanied by tables of item frequencies and percentages, scale means and standard deviations, scale reliabilities, and correlations among the constructs under investigation. Other descriptive and inferential statistics that were computed to supplement the basic findings (for example, results of Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance to assess differences among scale means) are not tabled but are simply discussed with respect to the research question with which such statistics are most relevant.

Research Question 1: What are the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the areas of: : a) Instructional Time, b) Forming Committees, c) Meetings, d) School Procedures, and e) Instruction?

Descriptive Statistics: Item Frequencies and Percentages on the TEAS

As shown in Table 1, item frequencies and percentages regarding the desired and current levels of shared decision-making were obtained for each of three items across the five areas. After determining that participant responses to the items possessed internal consistency reliability, desired and current scale means were computed by area and subsequently were compared using repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

Table 1*Item Frequencies and Percentages for All Surveyed Respondents: TEAS*

Scale/Item	Slight		Some		Great	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
INSTRUCTIONAL TIME						
Curriculum night dates/times? (d)	69	30.8	64	28.6	91	40.7
Curriculum night dates/times? (c)	135	57.0	56	23.6	46	19.4
PTA meeting dates? (d)	126	48.7	58	22.4	75	29.0
PTA meeting dates? (c)	178	70.3	39	15.4	36	14.3
Field trip dates? (d)	91	35.4	47	18.3	119	46.3
Field trip dates? (c)	124	48.8	51	20.1	79	31.1
FORMING COMMITTEES						
Serve S.I.P. committee? (d)	103	39.7	68	26.3	88	34.0
Serve S.I.P. committee? (c)	155	60.8	42	16.5	58	22.8
Clubs for students? (d)	76	29.2	62	23.8	122	47.0
Clubs for students? (c)	134	51.2	56	21.4	72	27.5
Serve leadership committee? (d)	89	34.1	72	27.6	100	52.1
Serve leadership committee? (c)	153	58.4	67	25.6	42	16.0
MEETINGS						
Schedule faculty meetings? (d)	94	35.8	63	24	106	40.3
Schedule faculty meetings? (c)	174	65.9	56	21.2	34	12.9
Items on faculty agenda? (d)	78	29.8	73	27.9	111	42.4
Items on faculty agenda? (c)	153	58.7	64	24.5	44	16.8
Schedule com meetings? (d)	93	35.5	80	30.5	89	34.0
Schedule com meetings? (c)	174	66.6	40	15.3	47	18.0
SCHOOL PROCEDURES						
Discipline procedures? (d)	63	24.0	56	21.3	144	54.8
Discipline procedures? (c)	153	57.9	54	20.5	57	21.6
Student SPED referral? (d)	79	29.9	73	27.7	112	42.4
Student SPED referral? (c)	149	56.5	55	20.8	60	22.7
Student ESL referral? (d)	95	37.1	66	25.8	95	37.1
Student ESL referral? (c)	158	61.3	52	20.2	48	18.6
INSTRUCTION						
Interview new hires? (d)	128	48.6	45	17.1	90	34.2
Interview new hires? (c)	210	79.2	24	9.1	31	11.7
Staff development topics? (d)	67	25.5	55	20.9	141	53.6
Staff development topics? (c)	169	64.3	52	19.8	42	16.0
Textbook adoption? (d)	65	24.9	44	16.9	152	58.2
Textbook adoption? (c)	125	47.7	56	21.4	81	31.0

With respect to frequencies within the area of *Instructional Time*, teachers currently seem to have the highest level of input into the scheduling of field trips ($n = 79$, 31.1%), as opposed to either PTA meetings ($n = 36$, 14.3%) or curriculum dates and times ($n = 46$, 19.4%). While teachers would seem to prefer having more input into all three of these practices, a larger percentage of teachers would seem to prefer having relatively more input into setting curriculum dates and times ($n = 91$, 40.7%) than either determining PTA meetings dates ($n = 75$, 29.0%) or setting field trip dates ($n = 119$, 46.3%). In terms of absolute numbers, more teachers would seem to want input into field trip dates and times than curriculum night dates and times; however, inspection of the differences between desired and current frequencies shows that about 21.3% of respondents would prefer to have more influence on curriculum matters over current levels, while about 15.2% would prefer to have more input on field trips over current levels.

In relation to *Forming Committees*, teachers would seem again to want more input into all three practices compared to current levels, but relatively more influence would seem to be preferred with regard to who serves on the principal's advisory committee. Currently, nearly 60% of the teachers surveyed ($n = 153$, 58.4%) indicated that they had only slight influence on the composition of that committee, as compared with only 16% ($n = 42$) who indicated that their level of influence was considerable. In terms of preferred levels of influence, however, there is a significant shift in percentages. While only about one-third of the respondents seem to be satisfied with having only slight influence on who is selected to advise the school's leadership ($n = 89$, 34.1%), over half of the teachers surveyed want a great deal of influence in such matters ($n = 100$, 52.1%). Compared to one in six teachers who say they have a great deal of influence on who helps lead the schools, the proportion of teachers attesting to a great deal of influence on who serves on the SIP committee ($n = 58$, 22.8%) and what clubs are offered to students ($n = 72$,

27.5%) is roughly one in four. Whereas about 19% of the teacher respondents want a great deal more input into club offerings ($n = 122, 47.0\%$), only about 11% want much more input into who serves on the S.I.P. committee ($n = 88, 34\%$).

Appearing to be systematically slight is the level of influence exercised by faculty in regards to the form and content of *Meetings* involving faculty. Although faculty seem to have slightly more influence on agenda items than on when faculty and committee meetings are scheduled, the proportion of teacher respondents who indicated that their level of input was “only slight at best” approximated two-thirds apropos scheduling issues ($n = 174, 65.9\%$ for faculty meetings; $n = 174, 66.6\%$ for committee meetings) and nearly six in ten with respect to faculty meeting agenda items ($n = 153, 58.7\%$). While only about one in six faculty wanted a great deal more input into the scheduling of committees on which faculty serve ($n = 89, 34\%$), about one in four teachers wanted considerably more influence on issues involving the scheduling of faculty meetings ($n = 106, 40.3\%$) and the agenda at such meetings ($n = 111, 42.4\%$).

Although one might expect teacher influence over student referral *Procedures* to be widely exercised, only around one in five teacher respondents professed to having a great deal of input into disciplinary procedures ($n = 57, 21.6\%$), SPED referrals ($n = 60, 22.7\%$), or ESL referrals ($n = 48, 18.6\%$). Of these three areas, about one-third more teachers wanted a great deal more influence regarding disciplinary procedures ($n = 144, 54.8\%$), followed by about 26% more teachers who wanted much more input regarding SPED referrals ($n = 112, 42.4\%$) and 18.5% more teachers who wanted considerably more input into ELL referrals ($n = 95, 37.1\%$).

Finally, in regards to *Instruction*, nearly 80% of all teacher respondents indicated that their level of input in interviewing new hires was at best slight ($n = 210, 79.2\%$), compared with

the nearly two in three teachers who professed to similarly slight levels of input with respect to choosing staff development topics ($n = 169$, 64.3%) and the almost one in two teachers who indicated that they had little or no input into textbook adoption ($n = 125$, 47.7%). Although only about one in three respondents seemed to want more involvement in hiring ($n = 90$, 34.2), nearly 60% of respondent sought a great deal more influence into decisions about textbooks ($n = 152$, 58.2%), while well over half of all respondents indicated that they wanted a much larger voice in decisions pertaining to teacher training and staff development ($n = 141$, 53.6%).

Descriptive Statistics: Scale Means and Standard Deviations by Area of Decision-Making on the TEAS

While comparing results by item this provides insight into which practices teachers have or desire to have the most influence within SDM areas. They are less helpful in determining how the five areas compare in relation to the extent of input teachers currently have apropos SDM or that they would like to have apropos SDM. Enabling such comparisons across areas involves the computation of scale means and standard deviations for the five current and the five desired item groupings. However, prior to computing such statistics, there is the need to assess the extent to which teachers appeared to be responding to the practices targeted by each area in a coherent manner. The indicator that provides empirical evidence of this kind of homogeneity on this sort of rating scales is Cronbach's *Coefficient Alpha*.

Table 2

Coefficient Alpha Statistics by Scale for Current and Desired Levels of Input into Shared Decision-Making

Scale	<u>Current Level</u>		<u>Desired Level</u>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>a</i>
Instructional Time	223	0.67	215	0.63
Forming Committees	252	0.78	254	0.77
Meetings	258	0.80	260	0.80
School Procedures	258	0.79	255	0.83
Instruction	261	0.65	260	0.76

To determine the internal consistency reliabilities of the five scales measuring current levels of SDM and those of the five scales measuring desired levels of SDM, *Coefficient Alphas* were obtained based on the number of individuals who responded to all of that scale's constituent items (see Table 2). Despite the brevity of the scales, the reliabilities in all but three instances exceeded 0.70—generally considered as “adequate” to “good” scale reliability--and in all instances exceeded 0.60—generally considered as “minimally acceptable” to “adequate” scale reliability.

In light of these results, means and standard deviations were then computed for current and preferred sets of items for each of the five areas. To maximize the number of observations employed in comparing across areas and in finding discrepancies between current and desired levels of input, means were computed for a scale if the teacher respondent had responded to any

two of the scale's three constituent items. As indicated in Table 3, the result of this adjustment brought the number of observations used in analyses involving current and desired scale values to 263 and the number of observations used in analyses involving discrepancies between current and desired scales values to 261.

Table 3

Scale Means and Standard Deviations for Current and Desired Levels of Input into Shared Decision-Making and the Extent of Discrepancy between Current and Desired Levels

Scale	Current (<i>N</i> = 263)		Desired (<i>N</i> = 263)		Discrepancy (<i>N</i> = 261)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Instructional Time	2.28	1.03	2.82	1.09	0.55	1.09
Forming Committees	2.31	1.09	2.96	1.10	0.66	1.26
Meetings	2.10	1.02	2.98	1.13	0.89	1.46
School Procedures	2.30	1.08	3.14	1.17	0.83	1.40
Instruction	2.14	0.97	3.12	1.16	0.98	1.28
Satisfaction	4.04	0.73	4.04	0.73	4.04	0.73
Culture	3.64	0.97	3.64	0.97	3.64	0.97

Inferential Statistics: Repeated Measures Analyses of Current and Desired Levels of Teacher Input across Five Areas of Shared Decision-Making

Regarding the *current* levels of input into the five SDM areas, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to test for differences among five means shown in the leftmost part of Table 3. Given an apparent violation of the assumption of homogeneity of covariance by these data, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied to adjust the degrees of freedom used in computing the overall F statistic ($F(3.704, 970.58) = 5.04, p < .001$). Indicative of at least one difference between pairs of means, this highly significant result was followed by a series of Bonferroni-adjusted paired comparisons, which indicated significant differences at $p < .05$ between the lower mean obtained for desired input into *Meetings* ($M = 2.10, SD = 1.02$) and the higher means obtained for desired input into three other areas: *Instructional Time* ($M = 2.28, SD = 1.03, r = 0.551, d = 0.25$), *Forming Committees* ($M = 2.31, SD = 1.09, r = 0.62, d = 0.32$), and “School Procedures” ($M = 2.31, SD = 1.08, r = 0.67, d = 0.35$).

A Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also employed to test for differences among five means shown in the middle part of Table 3 regarding the *desired* levels of input into the same five SDM areas. Given an apparent violation of the assumption of homogeneity of covariance by these data, the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was again applied to adjust the error degrees of freedom used in computing the overall F statistic ($F(4.67, 960.58) = 7.16, p < .001$). Indicative of at least one difference between pairs of means, this highly significant result was followed up by a series of Bonferroni-adjusted paired comparisons, which indicated significant differences at $p < .05$ between the mean obtained for the desired input into *Instructional Time* ($M = 2.82, SD = 1.09$) and the means obtained for two other areas: *School*

Procedures ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.17$, $r = 0.43$, $d = 0.36$) and *Instruction* ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.16$, $r = 0.35$, $d = 0.33$).

Research Question 2: What discrepancies exist between the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the areas of: a) Instructional Time, b) Forming Committees, c) Meetings, d) School Procedures, and e) Instruction?

With figures provided in the rightmost part of Table 3, mean discrepancies for each area of the five areas were computed by subtracting the current level of input into the SDM area from the desired level of input into that same SDM area. Simple inspection of these discrepancies reveals smaller and similar values for the two areas of *Instructional Time* ($M = 0.55$, $SD = 1.09$) and *Forming Committees* ($M = 0.66$, $SD = 1.26$) and larger and similar values among the SDM areas of *Meetings* ($M = 0.89$, $SD = 1.46$) *School Procedures* ($M = 0.83$, $SD = 1.40$) and *Instruction* ($M = 0.98$, $SD = 1.28$). To test for differences among these five means shown, a Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also conducted—with the Greenhouse-Geisser correction applied for violation of the assumption of homogeneity of covariance—and, as with the two previous analyses involving the current and desired means levels, a result that was highly statistically significant was obtained ($F(3.736, 971.296) = 10.61$, $p < .001$).

Following the results with a series of Bonferroni-adjusted paired comparisons indicated there were differences in the magnitude of means within the first group of two means and within the second group of three means that were established by way of simple inspection. Across the two groups, the discrepancy mean for *School Procedures* differed significantly from the discrepancy mean for *Instructional Time* ($r = 0.419$, $d = 0.30$), while the discrepancy mean for *Meetings* and the discrepancy mean for *Instruction* differed significantly from the discrepancy means for both *Instructional Time*. Of these comparisons, comparatively smaller effects were

observed for the differences between the *Meetings* and *Instructional Time* discrepancies ($r = 0.504, d = 0.38$) and the *Meetings* and *Forming Committees* discrepancies ($r = 0.640, d = 0.28$) than for the differences between the *Instruction* and *Instructional Time* discrepancies ($r = 0.356, d = 0.45$) and *Instruction* and *Forming Committees* discrepancies ($r = 0.528, d = 0.36$).

Research Question 3: What is the extent of relationship between the current levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction?

Research Question 4: What is the extent of relationship between the discrepancies in the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and their feelings of job satisfaction?

As presented in Table 4, item frequencies and percentages were computed for each of the six items constituting a brief measure of job satisfaction. To render the results more manageable, the results premised on a five interval scale were summed across to make three intervals: Strongly Disagree/ Disagree, Undecided, and Agree/Strongly Agree. With the exception of the first, negatively-worded item, inspection of the column indicating at least some level of agreement with the items suggests a high degree of satisfaction with teaching among the responding individuals. With nearly 85% of the teachers saying that they “find real enjoyment in their work,” irrespective of the institution in which they work, it would seem from the outset that the SDM practices unique to different schools would not have much direct influence on individual job satisfaction.

Table 4*Item Frequencies and Percentages for All Surveyed Respondents: Job Satisfaction*

Item	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Undecided		Strongly Agree/ Agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	(1) I am often bored with my job. (reverse scored)	190	71.2	17	6.4	60
(2) I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.	31	11.7	26	9.8	208	78.4
(3) I am satisfied with my job for the time being.	24	9.1	27	10.2	214	80.8
(4) Most days, I am enthusiastic about my work.	23	8.6	23	8.6	220	82.7
(5) I like my job better than my average co-worker.	20	7.6	50	18.9	194	73.5
(6) I find real enjoyment in my work.	24	9.1	18	5.8	223	84.1

After reverse-scoring the first item in the 6 item scale, a mean across the items was computed for each teacher in the sample. To investigate the extent of the relationship described in Research Question 3, Pearson correlations were obtained between the job satisfaction scale and the five scale means regarding current levels of input into SDM practices. Likewise, to investigate the extent of the relationship described in Research Question 4, discrepancy scores denoting the difference between the respondent's desired and current levels of input apropos the five SDM areas were correlated with the respondent's scores on the job satisfaction scale. As shown in Table 6, no statistically significant relationships were observed between scores on the job satisfaction scale and teachers' current levels of input into any of the five SDM areas, nor

were any statistically significant relationships observed between scores on the job satisfaction scale and the discrepancies between desired and current levels of input that were computed for the five SDM areas.

Research Question 5: What is the extent of relationship between the current levels of shared decision making as perceived by teachers in the five areas previously mentioned and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations?

Research Question 6: What is the extent of relationship between the discrepancies in the current and desired levels of shared decision making as perceived by teachers in the areas previously mentioned and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations?

As presented in Table 5, item frequencies and percentages were computed for each of the six items addressing aspects of the “clan” culture discussed in the literature on the “Competing Values Framework.” To render results more manageable, the results premised on a five interval scale summed up to make three intervals: Strongly Disagree/Disagree, Undecided, and Agree/Strongly Agree. Inspection of the column indicating at least some level of agreement with the items suggests that 60% or more of the responding teachers see some evidence of a human relations culture at their schools. That the extent to which a clan culture is perceived to exist is linked to one’s feelings of job satisfaction is suggested by the somewhat robust relationship that is obtained when scores on the culture and job satisfaction scales are correlated ($r = 0.489, p < .000$).

Table 5

Item Frequencies and Percentages for All Surveyed Respondents: Human Relations/Clan Culture

Item	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree		Undecided		Strongly Agree/ Agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	The organizational is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.	39	14.6	63	23.7	164
The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, facilitating, or nurturing..	44	16.6	41	15.5	180	68
The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus and participation.	44	16.7	47	17.8	173	65.6
The glue that holds the organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high.	43	16.1	57	21.4	166	62.4
The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation persist.	46	17.2	58	21.7	163	61
The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment and concern for people.	41	15.4	53	19.9	172	64.6

With respect to Research Question 5, teachers' current levels of input into the five sets of SDM practices seemed to be linked systematically to their perceptions concerning the presence of a clan culture at their respective schools. As shown in Table 6, correlations that were both positive and statistically significant were observed between the culture score and scores denoting

teacher's current level of input into "Instructional Time" ($r = 0.194, p < .01$), *Forming Committees* $r = 0.143, p < .05$), *Meetings* ($r = 0.231, p < .001$), "School Procedures" ($r = 0.128, p < .05$), and "Instruction" ($r = 0.191, p < .01$).

Table 6

Correlations between Current Levels of SDM Input and the Discrepancies between Current and Desired Levels of SDM Input and Measures of Teacher Satisfaction and Human Relation Organizational Culture (N = 261)

Scale	<u>Satisfaction</u>		<u>Culture</u>	
	Current <i>r</i>	Discrepancy <i>r</i>	Current <i>r</i>	Discrepancy <i>r</i>
Instructional Time	0.015	-0.005	0.194**	-0.092
Forming Committees	0.018	0.023	0.143*	-0.054
Meetings	0.015	0.022	0.231***	-0.186**
School Procedures	-0.023	-0.008	0.128*	-0.205**
Instruction	0.022	-0.001	0.191**	-0.171**

*** $p < .001$. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

In regards to Research Question 6, fewer statistically significant relationships were observed between the five discrepancy scores and the culture score, although all relationships were observed to trend in the hypothesized negative direction. In other words, as the discrepancy between the current and desired levels of input into SDM practices decreased, the extent to which a clan culture was perceived to exist increased. As shown in Table 6, correlations that

were both negative and statistically significant were observed between the culture score and score denoting the discrepancy between desired and current levels of input into “Meetings” ($r = -0.186, p < .01$), *School Procedures* ($r = -0.205, p < .01$), and “Instruction” ($r = -0.171, p < .01$).

Reliability of the Instruments

Information regarding the reliability and validity of the TEAS is warranted in this section because the TEAS was used as an adaptation instrument at the time of the study. Following the receipt of 269 teacher surveys, a reliability analysis was conducted among the items of each scale to determine their internal consistency. Reliability statistics were conducted on the 269 completed surveys. Means and standard deviations were pertinent to the current and desired levels of shared decision-making as reference to each of the live inputs, along with means and standard deviations reference to the discrepancies between both job satisfaction and culture. For structural validity, item frequencies and percentages were presented with respect to the six job satisfaction items and six organizational culture items.

Summary

Investigation of teachers’ input into SDM practices revealed significant variation in regards to the different areas in which teachers currently exercise and wish to exercise influence. At present, teachers appear to have relatively less influence over when they meet and what they are meeting about compared to some other areas. Two areas in which teachers would like to have more influence appear to be closely linked to their teaching duties, namely, disciplinary and student referral procedures and all matters related to the quality of instruction. Discrepancies between current and desired levels of influence were comparatively more pronounced for the three aforementioned areas.

Although no correlations were observed between influence over SDM practices and instruction, many links were found between school culture and SDM input. The correlation observed between culture and satisfaction suggests that the relationship between satisfaction and SDM input may be indirect, working through culture, rather than direct.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This research focused on the discrepancy of teachers in Secondary Schools to determine to what extent, if any, shared decision-making exists within the confines of the schools' cultures. The study looks at three school districts in the Mid-South. The school districts that were used within the study are two rural districts and one suburban district. The research of this study was concerned with determining the amount of input teachers prefer in Secondary schools as compared to the amount of input teachers were allowed by the administration. To make the comparison, this survey was designed with 38 questions from each of the five categories requesting a response as to how much input a teacher currently has versus how much input a teacher would like to have in five particular areas: a) instructional time; b) committee formation; c) meetings; d) school procedures; and e) instruction coupled with job satisfaction and organization.

The results of the specific outcome of the study are produced along with a set of recommendations to Tennessee policymakers on specific ways to improve the school's professional culture and the decision-making process. In other words, the amount of congruence between the individual shared decision-making dimensions and the job satisfaction and organizational culture dimensions may determine the level of satisfaction of the job. Building on the concept of leadership as influence and drawing on the multilevel theory, Kozwalski and Klein defined shared leadership as an emergent team property that results from the distribution of leadership influence across multiple team members (Kozwalski & Klein, 2000; Morgeson & Hoffman, 1999).

In keeping with the notion of collective constructs, Mogeson and Hoffman (1999) argued that shared leadership originated with individual members of a team engaging in the activities that influence the team and other team members in areas related to direction, motivation, and support. Leadership can be conceptualized in relation to either the strength of influence (i.e., its quality or effectiveness) or the source of influence (i.e., single versus multiple team members).

“Shared leadership is a relational phenomenon involving mutual influence between team members as they work toward team objectives” (Rappaport & Zimmerman, 1988, p. 68). What is SDM? Shared decision making (SDM) is also referred to as a philosophical belief that some decisions traditionally made by district level administrators are moved to the school level, and some decisions traditionally made by the school principal are shared with school staff, students and members of the school community. SDM is not the same as administering the school, which is the principal’s function. SDM is a process and not an end in itself. It provides an opportunity for members of a school community to collaborate in solving problems, defining a course of action, and shaping direction for the individual school (Rappaport & Zimmerman, 1988, p.72).

As literature suggests, the purpose of SDM is to enhance student achievement through both improvement of the instructional program and delivery of support services. “SDM is based upon the premise that employees, students, and the community make better decisions when people functioning closest to implementation of the potential decision participate in making decisions” (Constance et al, 1994). SDM provides opportunities for schools to explore ways to restructure delivery of instruction and services to better meet the needs of students.

While teachers are consumed with many variables that exist within the confines of schools, teacher/leaders are primarily concerned with several factors. These factors include the attitudes and opinions concerning education and the school, such as providing a safe learning

environment, creating schedules, forming committees, creating school procedures, and supporting student instruction. The human relations of job satisfaction and organizational culture comes into play, as well, where the literature suggests whether or not teachers are satisfied with their jobs and the overall school cultures.

This research adds to the body of literature that has been created and is concurrently being created regarding the topic of shared decision-making and its effectiveness on the professional climate of schools. This study also serves as a leadership development tool in the field of education. This chapter restates the purpose of the study, reviews the methods used in the study, summarizes the findings, and presents conclusions and recommendations. Final thoughts are presented at the conclusion of this chapter.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent, if any, does shared decision-making exist within the confines of the school culture. The study looked at three school districts in the mid-south. The school districts used within the study were two rural districts and one suburban district. The research of this study was concerned with determining the amount of input teachers prefer in secondary schools as compared to the amount of input teachers are allowed by administration. To make this comparison, a survey was designed with 38 questions from each of the five categories requesting a response to how much input a teacher currently has versus how much input a teacher would like to have in five particular areas: a) Instructional Time; b) forming committees; c) Meetings; d) School Procedures; e) Instruction; and, lastly, the human relations aspect of the survey, which includes job satisfaction and organizational culture to which teacher responses were polled. The results of the specific outcome of the study were produced

along with a set of recommendations to Tennessee policy-makers on specific ways to improve the school's professional culture and the decision-making process.

Subjects

Given the nature of the problem to be researched, the researcher chose to embark upon a quantitative approach. Teachers in three selected school districts, two rural and one suburban district, answered 38 questions in area school faculty meetings. The survey was distributed by the researcher as part of the statistical procedural methods. Teachers were urged to answer all questions presented on the survey so that the information could be aggregated and used for the school improvement process of SDM. It was stressed that teacher confidentiality was maintained.

The completed surveys were placed in envelopes and labeled according to school. Each survey was individually coded by school. The researcher tallied results from all the completed surveys independently. The seven survey variables and the demographic information was entered into a spreadsheet and placed into SPSS software. Following the analysis of the surveys, each site was conveniently selected. Teachers in secondary schools, grades 9 – 12, were surveyed based upon the five research questions that surfaced in the literature that spoke to the type of autonomy teachers currently have versus that which does not exist within the culture of the school.

The focus of the study in relation to shared decision-making compared each of the teachers' perceptions of shared decision-making. This allowed the researcher to investigate if differences existed in the perceptions of shared decision-making within the school culture, and if so, to what degree did they exist? And did they have a differing effect on teachers' job satisfaction and organizational culture? A total of 212 teachers responded to all of the current

items, 204 responded to all the preferred input items. Therefore, there were a total of 192 discrepancies.

Of the three school districts where teachers were surveyed, all 269 respondents were high school teachers who taught various disciplines from grades 9 – 12. The schools were geographically located across the state of Tennessee, representing both rural and suburban settings. Of the 269 teachers in five different schools and three different school districts polled, 72 teachers responded to the survey in school 1 which equates to 14%; in school 2, 57 teachers which equates to 26.8%; school 3 83 teachers responded which equates to 21.2%; school 4 19 teachers responded which equates to 30.9 % and finally school 5 14 teachers responded which equates to 7.1%.

Instruments

The survey for this study was an adaptation or realignment of the original survey instrument used to capture the content of teacher perceptions as it relates to their attitudes and opinions about education and the culture of their school. The survey addresses issues relating to instructional time, forming committees, meetings, school procedures, instructional decisions, job satisfaction, and organizational culture. The survey responses will allow each teacher to respond to their job as well as to the organizational culture of the school.

Given the nature of the problem to be researched, the researcher chose to embark upon a quantitative approach. Teachers in five selected school districts answered 38 questions during the spring of 2009 in area schools' faculty meetings. The survey was distributed by the researcher as part of the statistical procedural methods.

Teachers were urged to answer honestly so that information could be aggregated and used for the school improvement process of SDM. It was stressed that teacher confidentiality

would be maintained. The 269 completed surveys were placed in envelopes and labeled by school. Each survey was individually coded by school. Two surveys were incomplete and were not tallied for the research. The researcher tallied results from the 267 completed surveys independently. The five survey variables and the demographic information were loaded into a spreadsheet and placed into SPSS software. Following the analysis of the survey, each site was conveniently selected.

Teachers in secondary schools, grades 9-12, were surveyed based upon the five constructs mentioned. These constructs surfaced in the literature that speaks to the type of autonomy teachers currently have versus that which does not exist within the culture of the school.

The Likert Scale was used to stress the significance of each teacher's response and was labeled survey instrument (Appendix B) – 1 – Almost no interest, 2 – Is Slight interest, 3 – some interest, 4 – great deal of interest, and 5 – very deal of interest. The survey contained three pages of questions – in which teacher responses were polled. The survey contains nine sections with overall questions totaling 38 questions per teacher response.

Summary of the Findings

A summary of the results are presented below. The six questions and their findings are addressed. The research questions are in bold, and the findings are underlined for easy distinction.

Research Question 1

Out of 269 teachers surveyed, 63 teachers responded, and 30.8% of respondents had almost no involvement in decision-making as it related to developing curriculum night dates and times. In contrast, of 91 teachers who responded, 40.7% indicated they had a great deal of

involvement in shared decision-making as it relates to developing curriculum night dates. Notwithstanding, of 135 teachers who responded, 57% would desire a level of involvement in the (SDM) in relation to establishing curriculum night dates and times; however, of 46 teachers who responded 19.4% would desire a greater level of involvement in (SDM) in relation to curriculum date nights and times.

With respect to perceptions regarding PTA meetings, of 126 teachers who responded, 48.7% had almost no involvement in decision-making as it related to PTA meeting dates. In contrast, of 75 leaders who responded, 20% indicated they had a great level of involvement in SDM in relation to PTA meeting dates. Of 178 teachers who responded, 70.3% had no interest or level of involvement in SDM in relation to PTA meeting dates; however, of 36 teachers who responded, 14.3% would desire to have a great level of involvement in SDM in relation to PTA meetings.

Teachers' interest in field trips showed that out of 91 teachers who responded, 35.4% had almost zero or slight interest in planning field trip dates. In contrast, of the 119 teachers who responded, 46.3% indicated they had a great level of involvement in SDM in relation to field trip dates. Of the 124 teachers who responded, 48.8% had no interest or slight interest in field trip dates; however, of the 79 teachers who responded, 31.1% would desire to have a very great level of involvement in SDM in relation to planning field trip dates.

When asked about forming committees, of the 103 teachers who responded, 39.7% had almost zero or a slight level of involvement in who serves on the SIP Committee. In contrast, of the 88 teachers who responded, 34% indicated that they had a great deal of involvement in shared decision-making as it related to who serves on the SIP Committee. Of the 155 teachers who responded, 60.8% had a slight level of involvement in who serves on the SIP committees;

however, of the 58 teachers who responded, 22.8% would desire to have a greater level of involvement in who serves on the SIP committee.

In relation to school clubs offered to students, of the 76 teachers who responded, 29.2% had almost zero or a slight level of involvement. In contrast, of the 122 teachers who responded, 47% indicated they had a great deal of involvement in SDM as it relates to school clubs offered to students. Of the 124 teachers who responded, 51.2% had almost no or slight interest in SDM as it relates to school clubs offered to students; however, of the 72 teachers who responded, 27.5% would desire to have a greater level of involvement in school clubs offered to students. Out of 89 teachers who responded, 34.1% had almost no or slight involvement in who serves on the Principal Advisory Committee. In contrast, of 100 teachers who responded, 52.1% indicated they had a great deal of involvement in who serves on the Principal Advisory Committee. Of 153 leaders who responded, 58.4% had almost no interest in who serves on the Principal Advisory Committee; however, of the 42 teachers who responded, 16% would desire to have a greater level of interest in relation to who serves on the Principal Advisory Committee.

Teachers' interest in meeting times showed that out of 94 teachers who responded, 35.8% had almost no involvement in decision-making as it relates to where faculty meetings were held. In contrast, of the 106 teachers who responded, 40.3% indicated they had a great deal of interest in relation to when faculty meetings are held. Of the 174 teachers who responded, 65.9% had no interest in when faculty meetings are held; however, of the 34 teachers who responded, 12.9% would desire a greater level of interest in relation to when faculty meetings are held.

Out of 78 teachers who responded, 29.8% had almost no involvement in the items on the faculty meeting agenda. In contrast, of the 111 teachers who responded, 42.4%, indicated they had a great deal of interest in the items on the faculty meeting agenda. Of the 153 teachers who

responded, 58.7% had no interest in the items on the faculty meeting agenda; however, of the 44 teachers who responded, 16.8% would desire to have a greater level of interest in the items on the faculty meeting agenda.

Out of 93 teachers who responded, 35.5% had almost no involvement in the dates/times committee meetings are held. In contrast, of the 89 teachers who responded, 34%, indicated they had a great deal of interest in the dates/times when committee meetings are held; however, of the 174 teachers who responded, 66.6%, had no interest in the dates/times committee meetings are held. Of the 47 teachers who responded, 18%, had a greater level of interest in the dates/times of committee meetings

Teachers' perceptions of school procedures showed that out of 63 teachers who responded, 24% had almost no involvement in discipline procedures. In contrast, of 144 teachers, 54.8% indicated they had a great deal of interest in SDM regarding discipline procedures. Of the 153 teachers who responded, 57.9% had no interest in discipline procedures; however, of the 57 teachers who responded, 21.6% had a greater interest in the discipline procedures of the school.

Out of 79 teachers who responded, 29.9% had almost no involvement in the student referral for SPED. In contrast, of the 112 teachers who responded, 42.4% indicated they had a great deal of interest in student referral for SPED. Of the 149 teachers who responded, 56.5% had no interest in student referral for SPED; however, of the 60 teachers who responded, 22.7% had a greater level of interest in relation to student referral for SPED.

Out of 95 teachers who responded, 37.1% had almost no involvement for student referral for ESL. Of the 158 teachers who responded, 61.3% had no interest in student referral for ESL; however, of the 48 teachers who responded, 18.6%, had a greater level of interest in student referral for ESL.

Teachers' interests in instruction showed that out of 128 teachers who responded, 48.6% had no involvement in who sits on interviews for new hires. In contrast, out of 90 teachers who responded, 34.6% had a great level of interest in who sits in on interviews for new hires. Out of 210 teachers who responded, 79.2% had no interest in who sits in on the interviews for new hires; however, of the 31 teachers who responded, 11.7%, had a greater level of interest in who sits in on interviews for new hires.

Out of 67 teachers who responded, 25.5% had no involvement in staff development topics. In contrast, of the 141 teachers who responded, 53.6%, had a great level of interest in staff development topics. Of the 169 teachers who responded, 64.3% had no interest in staff development topics; however, of the 42 teachers who responded, 16% had a greater level in staff development topics.

Out of 65 teachers who responded, 24.9% had no involvement in textbook adoption. In contrast, of the 152 teachers who responded, 58.2% had a great level of interest in textbook adoption. Of the 125 teachers who responded, 47.5%, had no interest in textbook adoption; however, of the 81 teachers who responded, 31% had a greater level of interest in textbook adoption.

Research Question 2

As it relates to instructional time, the mean of 2.28 indicated teachers had slight involvement in decision making in the area of decision-making; however, a mean of 2.90 represented the preferred level of SDM related to instructional time.

In relation to forming committees, the mean of 2.35 indicates teachers had a slight involvement in decision-making; however, a mean of 2.96 represented the preferred level of SDM in forming committees.

In relation to meetings, the mean of 2.14 indicated teachers had a slight involvement in decision-making; however, a mean of 3.0 represents the preferred level of SDM in meetings.

In relation to school procedures, the mean of 2.34 indicated that teachers had a slight involvement in SDM; however, a mean of 3.10 represents the preferred level of involvement in SDM in school procedures.

In relation to instruction, the mean of 2.14 indicated that teachers had a slight involvement in the SDM; however, a mean of 3.07 represents the preferred level of involvement in SDM in instruction.

In an environment in which there is a great deal of satisfaction, the teachers preferred a great deal of involvement in the decision-making process. Likewise, an environment where there is a positive organizational culture, teachers prefer a great deal of involvement in the decision-making process.

Research Question 3

The extent of the relationship between the actual level of (SDM) as perceived by teachers in instructional time was 2.2%; this indicates a very low correlation between instructional time and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

The extent of the relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in forming committees was 2.3%; this also indicates a very low correlation between forming committees and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

The extent of the relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in relation to meetings was 2.7%; this indicates a moderately low correlation between school procedures and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

The extent of the relationship between the actual levels of shared decision-making, as perceived by teachers in relation to instruction, was 1.2%; this indicates an extremely low correlation between instruction and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

Research Question 4

The relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of (SDM) as perceived by teachers in instructional time and their feelings of job satisfaction was 3.7%; this indicates a very low correlation.

The relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in forming committees and their feelings of job satisfaction was 6.1%; this indicated the highest and most consistent correlation.

The relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of meetings and their feelings of job satisfaction was 2.1%; this indicates a low correlation.

The relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of school procedures and their feelings of job satisfaction, was 1.6%; this indicates an extremely low correlation.

The relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of instruction and their feelings of job satisfaction, was 11.5%; this indicates a very low correlation.

Research Question 5

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of (SDM), as perceived by teachers in instructional time and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.171 or 17.1%; this indicates a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in instructional time and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.171 or 17.1%; this indicates a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in forming committees and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.007 or 7%; this indicates an extremely low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in meetings and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.270 or 2.7%; this indicates a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in school procedures and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.130 or 1.3%; this indicates a very low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in instruction and the degree, to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.190 or 1.9%; this indicates a very low correlation.

Research Question 6

The extent of relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of (SDM), as perceived by teachers in instructional time and the degree to which they perceived their school to foster a culture of human relations was 0.051 or 5.1%, which represents a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in forming committees and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.007 or 7%; this represents a very low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of meetings and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.234 or 2.3%; this represents a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of school procedures and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.175 or 1.7%; this represents a very low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of instruction and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations. was 0.128 or 1.3%; this represents an extremely low correlation.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent, if any, SDM existed within the confines of the school's culture. The study examined three school districts in the Mid-South. The school districts used within the study represented two rural districts and one suburban district. The research of this study was concerned with determining the amount of input teachers were allowed by administration. To make this comparison, a survey was designed with 38 questions from each of the seven categories requesting a response on how much input a teacher currently has versus how much input a teacher would like to have in five particular areas: a) Instructional Time; b) Forming Committees; c) Meetings; d) School Procedures; e) Instruction. The last two categories were the human relations aspects of the school culture which included job satisfaction and organizational culture.

The results of the specific outcomes of the study were produced along with a set of recommendations to Tennessee policymakers on specific ways to improve the school's professional culture and the decision-making process. The proposed study is descriptive in

nature, as it uses a self-reporting survey sampling Tennessee teachers/educators. It makes a comparative study to compare the responses between the perceptions of teachers in relation to a specific desired SDM model.

Fink and Fowler (2005) have alluded to the fact that descriptive research methodology is appropriate to use in social science to collect and analyze perceptions of significant organizational events. The primary methodology is the distribution of a survey instrument. A comparative data study of the groups and matched pairs of educators was collected and analyzed describing teacher perceptions of the dependent variables: (a) actual decisions and (b) preferred level of involvement in relation to those decisions.

Results were analyzed according to independent variables of experience, prior teacher training, years in the school district, years in the current school district, and years in other school districts. The study presents literature related to the main topics of this study and literature relating to the role of the teacher/educator. These areas include forming committee, meetings, instructional time, school procedures and instruction, which the literature suggests will possibly produce increased job satisfaction and a positive organizational culture where teachers feel good about their jobs and the culture of their school. This in turn will produce teacher empowerment and will heighten student achievement.

In the first finding, individual means test revealed that out of 269 teachers surveyed, 63 teachers (30.8%) had almost no involvement in decision-making as it related to developing curriculum night dates and times. In contrast, 91 teachers (40.7%) indicated they had a great deal of involvement in shared decision-making as it related to developing curriculum night dates. In addition, 135 teachers (57%) would desire a level of involvement in the (SDM) in relation to

establishing curriculum night dates and times; however, 46 teachers (19.4%) would desire a greater level of involvement in (SDM) in relation to curriculum date nights and times.

In the second finding, individual frequencies revealed overall an environment in which there is a great deal of satisfaction. The teachers in those environments preferred a great deal of involvement in the decision-making process. Likewise, in an environment in which there is a positive organizational culture, teachers prefer a great deal of involvement in the decision-making process.

In the third finding, individual correlations revealed the extent of the relationship between the actual level of SDM0, as perceived by teachers in instructional time, was 2.2%; this indicates a very low correlation between instructional time and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

The extent of the relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in forming committees was 2.3%; this also indicates a very low correlation between forming committees and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

The extent of the relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in relation to meetings was 2.7%; this indicates a moderately low correlation between school procedures and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction.

The extent of the relationship between the actual levels of shared decision-making, as perceived by teachers in relation to instruction, was 1.2%; this indicates an extremely low correlation between instruction and teachers' feelings of job satisfaction. Overall, there was a significant positive correlation between levels of job satisfaction and school culture in the areas of meetings, instruction and instruction time.

In the fourth finding, individual discrepancies revealed that the largest discrepancies overall were found in the areas of meetings and instruction. Significant differences were found in current levels and preferred discrepancy levels. This demonstrated that there was really no increased level of job satisfaction and organizational culture in relation to the five areas of shared decision-making.

In the fifth finding, individual correlations revealed the extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in instructional time and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.171 or 17.1%; this indicates a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM as perceived by teachers in instructional time and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations was 0.171 or 17.1%; this indicates a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM as perceived by teachers in forming committees and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations was 0.007 or 7%; this indicates an extremely low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM as perceived by teachers in meetings and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations was 0.270 or 2.7%; this indicates a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in school procedures and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.130 or 1.3%; this indicates a very low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in instruction and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human

relations, was 0.190 or 1.9%; this indicates a very low correlation. Overall there was an increased positive relationship in levels of job satisfaction and culture in the areas of meetings, instruction, and instruction time.

In the sixth and final finding, individual correlation revealed the extent of relationship between the discrepancies in the actual and desired levels of (SDM), as perceived by teachers in instructional time and the degree to which they perceived their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.051 or 5.1%; this represents a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in forming committees and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.007 or 7%; this represents a very low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of meetings and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.234 or 2.3%; this represents a low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of school procedures and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.175 or 1.7%; this represents a very low correlation.

The extent of relationship between the actual and desired levels of SDM, as perceived by teachers in the area of instruction and the degree to which they perceive their school to foster a culture of human relations, was 0.128 or 1.3%; this represents an extremely low correlation.

Overall, there was, in fact, an increased relationship in meetings and school procedures.

Conclusions

Although findings reveal that there is no direct correlation in job satisfaction and organizational culture in relation to the shared decision-making (SDM) levels. The researcher can say conclusively that there was a small level of significance that existed between the teachers' perceptions of shared decision-making and the effect it had on teachers overall, especially in relation to the direct correlation in job satisfaction and the organization's culture.

Correlations revealed the strongest significance of positive relationships between levels of job satisfaction and organizational culture in the areas of meetings, instruction, and instructional time; meetings showed a relationship of 171. The analysis further showed that out of the three SDM items, meetings have the most consistent relationship. These analyses were also employed to investigate the perceived levels of shared decision-making. Correlation on job satisfaction and the culture of organization and, lastly, a means table was used to test the actual and desired or preferred levels of the five shared decision-making areas.

The analyses also revealed that the largest discrepancies existed in the areas of meetings and instruction. Significant differences were shown in these two areas. The data revealed that in an environment in which there is a great deal of satisfaction, the teachers preferred a great deal of involvement in the decision-making process. Likewise, in an environment where there is a positive organizational culture, teachers prefer a great deal of involvement in the decision-making process.

Future Recommendations for Practice

In this investigation, a discrepancy existed between the subjects of meetings and job satisfaction. There are few studies with this type of design; therefore, further research is suggested to learn more about shared decision-making and the human relations evaluation of job

satisfaction and organizational culture. The association between human relations and shared decision-making has been viewed throughout this investigation. Nonetheless, the association has at times been challenged by various researchers. While shared decision-making is considered a universal phenomenon of school effectiveness, it is important to investigate the influence of discrepancy between the teachers' perceptions of shared decision-making and its effects within the culture of the school.

Future recommendations for practice regarding the human relations aspect of shared decision-making within the school culture is also suggested, particularly, measuring this piece of the instrument based on other theoretical structures. Viewing SDM through the lens of other researchers may provide insight into a collection of human relations behaviors that yield the greatest levels of outcomes. Commonalities or differences in the results may provide educational practitioners with information regarding the leadership imperatives necessary for school leadership in today's arena.

The inconsistencies in evaluation models and evaluation participants' suggestions future research which includes gathering information from schools and districts regarding the types and uses of shared decision-making evaluation models. Building the leadership capacity of school principals has also received increased attention and serves as the catalyst for the next recommendation for future research. The evaluation method suggested in this research implies that the principal is ultimately responsible for how well teachers and staff foster a sense of community within the confines of the school. This type of approach, according to researchers, builds self-efficacy and commitment to the organization for all involved. Once a school has implemented this type of professional development, it would be important to analyzing school

outcomes, such as student achievement, school climate, or teacher satisfaction levels, could prove useful in evaluating the effectiveness of this type of study.

Final Thoughts

This investigation focused on perceived levels of SDM by teachers in the professional climate of schools. Their current level of involvement was contrasted with their preferred level of involvement to determine whether a relationship existed in the areas of instructional time, forming committees, meetings, school procedures, and instruction. Essentially once determined when a relationship existed between the perceptions, the logical assumption was that this could lead to an enhanced school climate and quite possibly enhance student achievement because the morale of teachers increased.

Shared decision-making is perceived as a relational phenomenon and, therefore, should be treated as such. Conclusively, if educational leaders would use this study to inform the planning and implementation in stages of professional development of their schools, this would make for a much more cohesive and positive school culture where teachers, educational leaders, staff and parents can learn and grow together.

This study found that 85% of teachers were overall satisfied with their jobs. High levels of job satisfaction help create positive classroom environments and enhance student performance. Ultimately, high levels of job satisfaction also assist schools in meeting and exceeding their annual progress goals.

REFERENCES

- Ashton, P., & Webb, K.B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York, NY: Longman Press.
- Liontos, L. B. (1993). Shared Decision-making. *Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council*.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychology Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Ball, D. L., & Rinehart, H. (1998). Implementation of shared governance for instructional improvement: principals' perspectives. *Emerald Insight*, 37(5), 476-500.
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Phillip, A., & Harvey, J.A. (2003). Distributed Leadership: A review of the literature. *Journal of School Leadership*, 24(3), 160-172.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1978). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Blanchard, K., Hershey, P., Johnson, D., & Johnson, L. (1982). *The Leadership Quarterly* 8(2), 153-170.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher Development Teachers' Perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 349-378.
- Blau, B., & Sciarappa, K. (2009). Involving Staff in Teacher Hiring. *Principal to Principal*, 16, 127.
- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, 34-64.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2006). Diagnosing and Changing Organizational

- Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework. In John Wiley, Ed.) *The Jossey-Bass Business & Management Series* (75-77).
- Cameron, K. S., Degraff, J., Quinn, R. E., & Thakor, A. (2006). A competing values framework. *North Hampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing*.
- Chen, X., Hui, C., & Seago, D. J. (1988). The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Turnover: Conceptualization and Preliminary Tests of Key Hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 922 – 931.
- Coladarci, T. (1988). The relevance of educational research for identifying master teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72, 90-98.
- Conley, S. (1991). Review of Research on Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making. *Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association*, 225–226.
- Constance, M. Perry, D.W., Brown, W., & McIntire, G. (1994). Teachers respond to the SDM opportunity. *Education*, 114(4), 117.
- Copeland, D. (2003). *Instructional Leadership Characteristics of Secondary Blue Ribbon School Principals*. Seton Hall University.
- Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., & Lord, R. G. (2002). Examining the roles of job involvement and work centrality in predicting organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 93-108.
- Dienesch, R. M. Graham, J. W., & Van Dyne, L. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802.

- Doyle, L. H. (2004). Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors. *Journal of School Leadership, 14*, 352-377.
- Goldman, P., Dunlap, D., & Conley, D. (1993). Facilitative power and non-standardized solutions to school site restructuring, *Educational Administration Quarterly 29*, 1, 69-92 (with D. Dunlap & D. Conley).
- Eckley, M., Rinehart, J., Short, P. M., & Short, R. J. (2004). Influence of Teacher Empowerment on Teachers' Organizational Commitment, Professional Commitment, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of School Leadership, 20*(3), 227-289.
- Edwards, J. L., Green, K. E., & Lyons, C. A. (1996). Factor and Rasch analysis of the school culture survey. *American Educational Research Association, 18*(3), 25. .
- Evans, E. D., & Tribble, M. (1986). Perceived teaching problems, self-efficacy, and commitment to teaching among pre-service teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 80*, 81-85.
- Evers, C. W. (1990). Participative Decision-Making in Schools: Influence of shared decision-making on school and classroom activity. *Sage Publications, 26*(3), 127-134.
- Firestone, W. A., & Pennell, J. R. (1993). Teacher Commitment, Working Conditions, and Differential Incentive Policies. *Review of Educational Research, 63*, 489-525.
- Gaziel, H., & Weiss, I. (1990). School bureaucratic structure, locus of control and alienation of primary school teachers. *Research in Education, 44*, 55-66.
- Gibb, C.A. (1954). Leadership. Handbook of Social Psychology. *Journal of Education Administration, 35*(2), 877-917.
- Glickman, C. D. (1993). Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Education Series.*
- Gonzales, E., & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of teacher empowerment and

- principal power bases. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 2, 210–216.
- Green, R. L. (2005). *Practicing the Art of Leadership: A Problem-Based Approach to Implementing the ISLLC Standards*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Greer, J., Michael, R., & Short, P. (1994). Creating Empowered Schools: Lessons in Change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48, 116-118.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed Leadership as a Unit of Analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 423-451.
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). Evaluating Professional Development. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.*, 129-138.
- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E. (1996). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55, 259-286.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Leadership Behavior of Principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-248.
- Halverson, R. (2009). School Formative Feedback System. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 85(1), 159-193.
- Harris, A., & Mujis, D. (2005). Improving Schools Through Teacher Leadership. In I. Goodson and A. Hargreaves (eds.) *Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill Education*, 28 – 42.
- Hartley, D. (2007). The Emergence of Distributed Leadership in Education: Why now? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(2), 202-206.
- Hopkins, W. G. (2000). Quantitative Research Design. *Sportscience*, 4, 15.
- Huddleston, J. (1991). Participative decision-making can capitalize on teacher expertise. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 75(534), 80–85.

- Katz, M. (1994). Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Feelings and Behavior. *The School Community Journal*, 4(2), 28-32.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Klein, K. J. (2000). A multilevel approach to theory and research in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 18(25), 17-24.
- Langa, M. A. (2002). Shared decision making and its effect on students. Retrieved from [http://www.parenthood web.com/articles/phw71.html](http://www.parenthoodweb.com/articles/phw71.html)
- Lashway, L. (1996). The limits of SDM. *Eric Digest*, 5(2), 26-34.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, 52 (3), 309-339.
- Lightfoot, S. (1991). Review of Research on Teacher Participation in School Decision Making. *Review of Research in Education*, 26(15), 35-42.
- Lipham, J. P. (1981). Effective Principal, Effective School. *National Association of Secondary Schools*.
- Lodahl, T. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(2), 26-32.
- Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., Louis, K. S., & Smylie, M. (2007). Distributed leadership as work redesign: Retrofitting the job characteristics model. *Educational Policy and Leadership*, 6, 69-103.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A source book for new methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lovely, S. D. (2005). Making the Leap to Shared Leadership. *National Staff Development Council*, 24(6), 65-72.

- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). Teacher Empowerment: A step toward professionalization. *NASSP Bulletin*, 35(19), 54-62.
- Manna, P. (2009). The No Child Left Behind Act and Educational Accountability in the United States.
http://pmanna.people.wm.edu/research/MannaEducationInUS_v01-27-10.pdf
- Mayrowetz, J., Murphy, M., Seashore, L., & Smylie, M. D. Distributed Leadership as work redesign: retrofitting the job characteristics model. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(4), 469-503.
- Mehra, A., Smith, B., Dixon, A., & Roberson, B. (2006). Distributed Leadership in Teams: the network of leadership perceptions and team performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 232-245.
- Melvin, W. (2010). Participative Decision-making in Schools: A Mediating-Moderating Analytical Framework for Understanding School and Teacher Outcomes. *Sage Publications*, 46(2), 174-209.
- Morgeson, F.P., & Hofmann, D. A. (1999). The structure and function of collective constructs: implications for multilevel research and theory development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 249-265.
- Morrison, G. M., Wakefield, P., Walker, D., & Solberg, S. (1994). Teacher preferences for collaborative relationships: Relationship to efficacy for teaching in prevention-related domains. *Psychology in the Schools*, 11, 221-230.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1982). *Employee-Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The good soldier syndrome*.

Lexington, KY: Lexington Books.

- Paris, K. (1994). A leadership model for planning and implementing change for school-to-work transition. *Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center on Education and Work, 22-25, 65-76.*
- Peren, N. W., Vandenberg, A., & Willering, M. (1999). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 19(3), 212-226.*
- Punch, K. F. (2005). Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. *Sage Publications, 19-28.*
- Rappaport, J., & Zimmerman, M. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 16(5), 725-750.*
- Reynolds, T., Murrill, L. D., & Whitt, G. L. (2006). Learning from Organizations: Mobilizing and Sustaining Teacher Change. *The Educational Forum, 101-127.*
- Rice, N. (2006). Opportunities Lost, Possibilities Found: shared Leadership and Inclusion in an Urban High School. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 45(26), 85-96.*
- Rinehart, J. S., & Short, P. M. (1991). Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers and regular classroom teachers. *The Journal of School Leadership, 1, 379-399.*
- Rinehart, S. J., Short, P. M., Short, R. J., & Eckley, M., (1998). Teacher Empowerment and principal leadership: understanding the Influence process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34.*

- Sergiovanni, T.J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F., & Thurston, P.W. (1992). *Educational Governance and Administration*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating School Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30, 23-28.
- Storey, J. (2004). Changing theories of leadership and leadership development. In Storey, J. (ed.) *Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends* (pp. 11-37). London, UK: Routledge,
- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics: Toward an organizational model of student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5, 703-729.
- Taylor, F. (1911). *The Principals of Scientific Management*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37, 395-420.
- Wagner, T. (1993). Systemic Change: Rethinking the purpose of school. *Educational Leadership*, 25(6), 54-65.
- Watson, S., & Scribner, J. (2007). How Leadership Influences Student Learning. *The Wallace Foundation*, 48-62.
- Wright, S. (2008). Teachers and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15(3), 25-32.
- Wu, V., & Short, P. (1996). Efficacy Beliefs of Special Educators: The Relationships Among Collective Efficacy, Teacher Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction. *Sage*

Publications, 33(4), 134-143.

Yousef, D. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(6), 74-82.

Yukl, G. A. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Appendix A

Teacher Survey Instrument (TEAS)

I. EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING – TEACHERS

This section asks about your work experience as a teacher, previous positions you have held, and training you have had in relation to your current position.

1. PRIOR to this school year, how many years were you employed as a teacher:

Current school? Other school?

2. PRIOR to becoming a teacher, how many years of experience did you have working with children

3. Were you a student in the school district in which you are now serving as a teacher?

Yes No

4. PRIOR to becoming a teacher, did you participate in any training or development programs for Aspiring teachers? Yes No

II. ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS ABOUT EDUCATION AND YOUR SCHOOL.

I am interested in the importance you place on various educational goals. From the following seven (7) goals, which do you consider the most important, the second most important, the third most important, fourth most important, etc.

- Providing a safe learning environment for students.
- Creating schedules that provide effective use of instructional time.
- Participating in productive school committees
- Participating in meetings that are focused on the schools' vision and goals
- Creating procedures within the school that will minimize confusion

Supporting outstanding student instruction

Providing economically appropriate prices for school activities and goods

III. Using the scale 1-5, where 1 is “almost no interest”, 2 is “slight interest”, 3 “some interest”, 4 “great deal of interest” and 5 is “greatest deal of interest”, in participating in the decision-making process of the following activities (Circle one):

(a) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

2) How much input would you like to have in setting PTA meeting dates?

1 2 3 4 5

(a) How much input do your currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

3) How much input would you like to have in selecting field trip dates?

1 2 3 4 5

(a) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

A. FORMING COMMITTEES

(1) How much input would you like to have in who serves on the S.I.P. committee?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do your currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(2) How much input would you like to have in which school clubs are offered to students?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(3) How much input would you like to have in who serves on the Principal Advisory Committee?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

B. MEETINGS

(1) How much input would you like to have on when faculty meetings are held?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(2) How much input would you like to have on items that will be addressed during faculty meetings?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(3) How much input would you like to have on dates and times of school committee meetings?

1 2 3 4 5

(c) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

C. SCHOOL PROCEDURES

(1) How much input would you like to have on the discipline procedures of your school? 1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(2) How much input would you like to have on the student referral for SPED?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(3) How much input would you like to have on the student referral for ESL?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

D. INSTRUCTION

(1) How much input would you like to have on sitting in on interviews of new hires?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(2) How much input would you like to have in Staff Development topics?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

(3) How much input would you like to have on textbook adoption?

1 2 3 4 5

(b) How much input do you currently have? 1 2 3 4 5

Using the scale 1-5, where 1 is “strongly disagree”, 2 is “disagree”, 3 “undecided”, 4 “agree” and 5 is “strongly agree”, (Circle one):

E. JOB SATISFACTION

(1) I am often bored with my job. 1 2 3 4 5

(2) I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job. 1 2 3 4 5

(3) I am satisfied with my job for the time being. 1 2 3 4 5

(4) Most days, I am enthusiastic about my work. 1 2 3 4 5

(5) I like my job better than my average co-worker. 1 2 3 4 5

(6) I find real enjoyment in my work. 1 2 3 4 5

F. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

(1) The organizational is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves. 1 2 3 4 5

(2) The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify mentoring, nurturing and a facilitating nature. 1 2 3 4 5

(3) The management style in the organization is characterized by teamwork, consensus and participation. 1 2 3 4 5

(4) The glue that holds the organization together is loyalty and mutual trust. Commitment to this organization runs high. 1 2 3 4 5

(5) The organization emphasizes human development. High trust, openness, and participation. 1 2 3 4 5

(6) The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment and concern for people. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

Appendix C

Letters to the Principals

January 7, 2009

Dear Principal,

I am at present the Educational Principal at Little Tyler Enrichment Academy in Millington and would desire that you assist me in completing a research project that is the culminating requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Memphis. This research concerns the effectiveness of school-based management and the perceptions of teachers in relation to shared decision-making. A large return of the survey instrument is vital in order to validate this research.

The project has been approved through the Research Department at the University of Memphis. Please take advantage of this opportunity regarding your perception of shared decision-making tasks at your particular school. Your responses will be held in strict confidence and all respondents/participants will remain anonymous and will not result in any type of risk to you and/or your faculty. **Be assured that no individual or individual school sites' data will be identified in the final analysis.**

Please respond to each portion of the questionnaire. If you or your designee could possibly distribute the questionnaire during the professional staff portion of your day in the next teacher/faculty meeting at your school this would be ideal. Each questionnaire should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete. The teacher responses should be placed in the enclosed envelope and I will personally retrieve them.

Please know that participation is voluntary and refusal to participate will involve no penalty. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to call me at (901) 678-2369. If an explanation for answers to questions regarding the research subjects' rights, the Chair of the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects should be contacted at (901) 678-2533 – Ms. Corrina Ethington.

Thankfully,

Mr. Myron V. Johnson

Enclosures: Questionnaires