University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2008

Teachers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making committee.

Jennefer Pollio Woods 1948-
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Woods, Jennefer Pollio 1948-, "Teachers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making committee." (2008). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1589.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1589>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE
COSTS AND BENEFITS OF SITTING ON A
SCHOOL-BASED DECISION-MAKING COMMITTEE

By

Jennefer Pollio Woods
B.S. University of Louisville, 1982
M.Ed., University of Louisville, 1987

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

College of Education and Human Development
Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Human Resources
University of Louisville
Louisville, Ky.

May 2008

Copyright 2008 by Jennefer Pollio Woods

All Rights Reserved

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE
COSTS AND BENEFITS OF SITTING ON A
SCHOOL-BASED DECISION-MAKING COMMITTEE

By

Jennefer Pollio Woods
B.S. University of Louisville, 1982
M.Ed. University of Louisville, 1987

A Dissertation Approved on

April 23, 2008

By the following Dissertation Committee

Dr. Joseph M. Petrosko, Dissertation Director

Dr. Thaddeus Dumas

Dr. Marco A. Munoz

Dr. William Penrod

Dr. Mary Angela Shaughnessy, SCN

DEDICATION

First, I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Thomas D. Woods, Sr., and my son, Thomas D. Woods, Jr. Both were instrumental in the completion of this endeavor through their support and encouragement for me to complete my education. They provided understanding and patience throughout my education. Secondly, I dedicate this to my father, Michael Pollio, Sr. My father dedicated his life to caring for me after my mother's death, and provided a role model for a strong work ethic by continuing his career through major illness and pain. From him, I learned that anything is possible. Finally, I dedicate this to my mother-in-law, Mary Woods, who has always provided me with moral support and assistance when needed. I will always be grateful for everything that she has done to help me complete my education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation chairperson, Dr. Joseph Petrosko. It is with his patience and his knowledge that I have come to this point. Dr. Petrosko has been diligent in assisting me in editing and guiding me in the right direction for this study. He has spent countless hours working with me to meet my maximum potential in this endeavor. Also, would like to thank Dr. William Penrod for his time, knowledge, and patience in working with me on this project.

ABSTRACT

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF SITTING ON A SCHOOL-BASED DECISION-MAKING COUNCIL

Jennefer Pollio Woods

April 23, 2008

The purpose of this study was to identify teachers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of participating in a school-based decision-making process. These costs to teachers are increased time demands, loss of autonomy, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of collective bargaining, and threats to career advancement. The benefits include: feeling of self-efficacy, workplace democracy, and ownership. The study also determined the relationship between selected variables that were developed through a review of the literature, and teacher members' perceptions of the costs and benefits of participating on a decision-making council. Approximately 400 teacher members of SBDM councils Jefferson County Public Schools were surveyed via Survey Monkey website. The response rate was approximately 40%. The results indicated that one of the main factors that affect teachers' perception of SBDM is the principal's leadership style.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Costs of Participating in SBDM	4
Benefits of Participating in SBDM	7
Factors Influencing Perceptions of Costs and Benefits	8
Current Study of SBDM	11
Statement of the Problem	14
Purpose of the Study	15
Significance of the Study	15
Summary	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Introduction	17
General Theories of Motivation and Management	19
Early Motivation Studies	19
Theories X, Y and Z	23
Total Quality Management	25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Shared Decision Making in Schools	30
School Based Decision Making in Kentucky	37
Cost of Involvement in Site-Based Management	42
Increased Time	42
Loss of Autonomy	46
Collegial Disfavor	48
Subversion of Collective Bargaining	50
Threats to Career Advancement	52
Benefits of Participation in Shared Decision Making	54
Feelings of Self-Efficacy	54
A Feeling of Ownership	57
Workplace Democracy	59
Factors That May Affect Teachers' Perceptions of Costs and Benefits	60
Principal Involvement	60
Participants' Desire for Promotion	62
Length of Teaching Experience	64
Permanency of SBDM	65
Level of Participation within the Teacher's Professional Organization . . .	66
Duration of Implementation	67
Summary	70
Research Questions	70

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. METHODOLOGY	73
Research Questions and Hypotheses.	73
Population.	77
Survey Procedures.	77
Instrumentation	79
Dependent and Independent Variables	89
Analysis of Data	89
Techniques to Insure Validity	90
Techniques to Insure Reliability	91
IV. RESULTS	96
Research Questions and Hypotheses	98
Results of the Pilot Study	102
Descriptive Statistics on Teachers and Schools	103
Statistical Analysis For Research Questions	111
Qualitative Data	118
V. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS	121
Overview	121
Implications	132
Limitations and Recommendations	134
Conclusions.	135
REFERENCES.	136

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	143
Appendix B	150
Appendix C	152
Appendix D	163
CURRICULUM VITAE	164

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. SBDM Draft Questionnaire Items Rated for Content Appropriateness	82
2. Summary of Research Questions and Statistical Tests Used in the Study	92
3. Frequency distribution for Number of Years Teaching, Possession of Administrative Certification, and School Setting	105
4. Frequency Distribution for Number of Years SBDM was Implemented at the School and Number of Hours of SBDM Training	107
5. Frequency Distribution for Number of Teachers in Schools Categorized by Kentucky Accountability, Number of Teachers in Schools Categorized by No Child Left Behind Criteria, and Number of Teachers in Three Tiers in Category AYP-No.	109
6. Means, Standard Deviation, and Intercorrelations of Time Demands on Teachers and Six Predictor Variables	114
7. Summary Statistics or Regression Predictors for Dependent Variable Time	115
8. Means, Standard Deviation, and Intercorrelations of Self-Efficacy and Six Prediction Variables.	117
9. Summary Statistics or Regression Predictors for Dependent Variable Self-Efficacy	118

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This research study examines the perceptions of teachers who have served on school-based decision-making (SBDM) councils. This research examines factors that affect the perceived costs and benefits of serving on an SBDM council. The topic is of interest because although SBDM has been advocated as a way of reforming schools, the extent to which SBDM has been widely implemented and the many hours being spent by participants in the work of governing schools is an important factor in the success of the implementation of SBDM. However, without the active participation of teachers, SBDM cannot be successful. A number of factors may encourage or inhibit teacher participation, and these are important to consider if SBDM is to remain viable.

On January 8, 2002, President George Bush signed PL 107-110: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This law was part of a wave of education reform in the United States that has been developing since the late 1980s. Hanson (2005) stated that this wave of education reform revitalized an interest in school-based decision making. She contended that school decentralized decision making (DDM) is increasing. Hanson (2005) believed that because of the increased pressure from the reform movement relating to improved student achievement, there is a focus on assisting the principals do their jobs. DDM is perceived as assisting the principal in managing the school so that students can achieve at the highest levels.

The terms decentralized decision making, school-site management, school-based management, site-based management, and participatory management are frequently used interchangeably. They will be used herein to denote involvement of nonsupervisory personnel in the decision making process. The nonsupervisory personnel that will be discussed in this research study are teachers.

The initial movement toward school-based decision making did not always allow teachers the rights that they had anticipated when the movement first began. Hanson (2005) stated that this is the reason that she prefers the term decentralized decision making (DDM). The author stated that the term decentralized decision making was often referred to as school-based decision making or site-based decision making (both abbreviated SBDM) or site-based management (SBM). Hanson (2005) used the term DDM because SBDM and SBM had been used in the reform movements initiated in the last 20 years, and she contended that they were not successful in removing decision making from the administrators. For this reason Hanson (2005) believed that the process has had a negative connotation for teachers.

Movement toward decentralization of power in the 1960s and 1970s provided examples of site-based management that granted teachers little or no participatory management opportunities. New York City initiated a decentralization program in 1967, and Detroit followed in 1970 with a similar program. These early implementations delegated the decision-making power away from central office administrators and into the hands of the principal and community representatives. There was no provision for the teachers to be involved in the daily recommendations for the schools in these districts. Many considered these programs to be unsuccessful. Advocates of SBM argued that

these efforts served merely to reorganize administrative responsibilities by replacing one form of bureaucracy with another. Seigel and Fruchter (2000) stated that school-based management enacted in the 1970s and 1980s did not provide much autonomy to teachers. These management plans allowed the schools very little input into instructional improvement decisions, and they were not allowed to make decisions concerning budgeting.

As site-based decision making has been introduced into the public school systems, researchers have found implementation problems. Wall (1997) cited several studies that that described the problems. One study by Malen, Ogawa, and Kranz (1990) found that teachers' valuable time was being used to make committee decisions that had little to do with improving academic achievement. He cited literature (Lindquist & Muriel, 1989) that stated that the decision-making process did not flow smoothly. Many teachers believed that it was a slow, tedious process that took away from instructional time, a commodity that that is in high demand. A number of sources cited by Wall (1997; Wohlsetter, 1995; Wholstetter & Buffett, 1992) suggested that much of the rhetoric involved with SBDM has been greatly inflated. The actual process did not correlate with the rhetoric that was being used to promote the practice.

Newton and Winter (1999) described research concerning the role of the principal in the SBDM process. The studies reviewed by these authors indicated that some leadership behavior causes distrust and frustration in teachers. The reports provided instances of administrators who are unwilling to share their leadership roles which in turn discourages teacher participation in the decision making process. These authors cited literature by Malen & Ogawa (1988) that stated that the teachers' attraction to

participation on the school council was frequently affected by the principal's attitudes and behavior. Also, David (1994) reported that the principal was the most influential member of the council, determining how the council operated. In their own research, Newton and Winter (1999) found that principals decided how the council would operate. The teacher members of many of the councils that were chaired by the principal felt that it was ruled in an authoritarian manner, with the teachers having little power. Wall (1997) found that this perception was more likely to be seen in middle schools and high schools than in the elementary schools.

Cost of Participating in SBDM

Resistance by administration is not the only obstacle to the development of SBDM councils. Teacher participants of school-based decision making have been confronted with a number of costs while participating on the school council. Members of school-based councils have been given the opportunity to make their own decisions in many instances, but it has not been without some perceived loss of time and classroom autonomy. Research conducted by Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) identified a number of benefits received and costs incurred by teachers who are involved in participatory management groups within their schools. The authors listed five costs to teachers: increased time demands, loss of autonomy, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of collective bargaining, and threats to career advancement. Duke et al. (1981) also listed several benefits: feeling of self-efficacy, workplace democracy, and ownership. These costs and benefits are vital in the study of school-based decision making. As the authors stated:

To understand school decision making, it is crucial to determine who is involved in the process and the extent of their involvement. In addition, it is important to

know who is not involved and the reasons why. We propose that involvement is dependent on the presence of both organizational opportunities for involvement and the willingness of organization member to become involved. (Duke et al., 1981, p. 342)

Traditionally, the teaching profession has required a high level of time commitment. Teachers are required to prepare lessons, complete paperwork, and attend meetings outside of the direct instruction periods. Frequently, education reform results in many changes and new programs that require additional time commitments. Examples of these changes include elimination of textbooks in the classroom, and a teacher-developed curriculum. Some council participants believe that SBDM activities increase the burden on teachers' limited time. Jane L. David conducted a five-year study of Kentucky schools as they began to implement the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). In the third year of a five-year study, David (1994) found that many teachers were hesitant to participate in SBDM committee activities. Her study found that teachers indicated that the demands were too time consuming and some teachers did not believe that the trade-off was worth the effort.

Autonomy within the classroom has frequently been perceived as an inherent part of the teaching profession. One component of shared decision making that some believe is in opposition to this autonomy is the process of making committee decisions that affect the classroom. Teachers who previously made decisions concerning classroom instruction and curriculum implementation alone must make these decisions in conjunction with parents, other teachers, and community members. Curricular decisions that were once created and enacted by teachers must be developed with input from school-based decision-making committees. In the second year of her five-year report on the implementation of KERA in Kentucky schools, David (1992) found that frequently

the councils would make changes and teachers would refuse to implement them in the classroom. One council member was quoted: “We set up committees and the committees make plans and move to implementation and other teachers refuse—they want to do it their way” (p. 38).

Further, teacher participants on SBDM councils may perceive themselves incurring the disfavor of their peers. Faculty members who are not sitting on the council may second-guess participants’ decisions or resent the outcome of council votes. As schools begin to decentralize power and teachers become active in decision making, some teachers believe that this will undermine the power of collective bargaining. In the past, many decisions affecting teachers were made through collective bargaining between the teachers’ professional organization that is responsible for contract negotiations and administrators at central office. These decisions that benefited the teachers provided these professional organizations with a positive image at the school level. As SBDM decisions are made at the school, a struggle between the state mandates and collective bargaining has arisen. David (1994) reported that the percentages of schools adopting SBDM in the various Kentucky school districts ranged from 55 percent to 77 percent. She noted that the exception to this range was Jefferson County, which had a 14 percent acceptance rate. David surmised that this was due to the struggle to develop a relationship between SBDM decisions and collective bargaining.

Finally, teachers who strive to be promoted, i.e., to become administrators, may shy away from school-based councils. Some members of this group of potential administrators believe that promotions are not always based on sound educational practices, but are sometimes doled out as political favors. *Sitting on a council may be*

perceived as placing the aspiring administrators in opposition to the wishes of the individuals who control promotions, and therefore place them in disfavor.

Benefits of Participating in SBDM

Although involvement in school decision making incurs a number of costs, it also provides members with rewards. Along with the list of costs, Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) suggested a series of benefits that teachers may receive. The authors believed that participatory management will provide a feeling of self-efficacy, ownership, and workplace democracy.

The first benefit is a feeling of self-efficacy, referring to an individual's perception of his or her ability to successfully complete tasks. This feeling is increased as the individual develops a sense of satisfaction through professional accomplishments. Teachers receive this feeling of pride through successful education practices. It is believed that the opportunity to serve on the site-based council and, for example, to sit on committees for curriculum and school climate, will produce a positive feeling. This feeling of self-efficacy is generated by enhancement of the work environment through site-based management activities. Participation in school-based decision making as a means of job satisfaction has long been considered a rationale for SBDM. In an early opinion paper, Wood (1981) provided an eight-point definition of the quality of work life. These eight points were ways in which the quality of a teacher's work life could be improved. Among these indicators, Wood listed teacher participation in school-based decision making.

Duke et al. (1981) closely relate self-efficacy to a sense of ownership. When staff members believe that they have a stake in the future, there is an increased desire to

provide input for implementation of important policy decisions. The opportunity to be involved in the development of curricula and other school policies provides teachers sitting on a school-based council with a feeling of pride and commitment. A feeling of proprietorship for a reform component decreases the individual's feeling of apathy or hostility to a changing environment. These authors believe that sense of ownership will, in turn promote actions that will increase the possibility of success in school reform efforts. Southard, Muldoon, and Porter (1997) conducted a survey of 678 randomly selected members of school-based councils in Leon County, Florida. Southard et al. (1997) found in their conclusions that 78 percent of the respondents mentioned that all stakeholders should have input and be involved the decision making process. The respondents further stated that there should be a greater sense of ownership of school decisions.

Closely related to the idea of ownership is workplace democracy. This term refers to the tenet in organizational behavior of employees being involved in the decision-making process that affects their job efforts. Providing workers with the right to make decisions concerning their professional activities provides a more harmonious environment and increased productivity. Once teachers are given this opportunity, it is believed that they will receive satisfaction in the knowledge that they have affected the direction of their profession.

Factors Influencing Perceptions of Costs and Benefits

Duke et al. (1981) did not address the possibility that teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits could be influenced by various factors. Some factors that could affect these perceptions are: (a) the number of years that site-based decision making has been

implemented in the school, (b) the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the shared decision-making process, (c) the years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform, (e) participants' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) participants' level of involvement in the teachers' professional organization that negotiates contracts.

These six areas have the potential of influencing perceptions of teacher participants of SBDM councils. For instance, the duration of time that a school has implemented SBDM allows the council members to become more familiar with the process (Kemlper, 1999). Following this structuring period, councils have an opportunity to develop programs and make decisions concerning educational practices, and there is an opportunity to observe the accomplishments of the committees. This progression will increase the feeling of self-efficacy (Clark, & Astuto, 1994).

One variable that may potentially influence the teachers' perceptions of cost and benefits is the principal's involvement in the decision making process. The teacher participants of SBDM are more likely to perceive the decision-making process as a benefit when the teachers believe that the principal supports their actions, but will view the activity as a cost when they perceive the principal as using manipulation to influence votes (Adleman & Pringle, 1997; David, 1996; Southard; 1997).

The administrative influence on council members' votes is closely related to the third variable: the participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position. There is little research to determine teachers' perception of participating in school-based councils as an opportunity to exhibit leadership ability through expertise. Conversely,

some teachers who seek administrative positions may be more likely to view participation in SBDM as a cost due to the potential for conflict with superiors and loss of possible promotions.

The next factor involves the years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants. Teachers may perceive that the council make-up does not allow for equal decision-making power. Administrators who sit on councils have the ability to hire and fire personnel. This potential for conflict may cause nontenured teachers to perceive the SBDM council activities as a cost. As teachers acquire tenure, there is more job security and less threat from conflict with superiors. Teachers could then perceive SBDM council activities as less of a cost.

The level of participation in the teachers' professional organization that negotiates the teachers' contract may also affect the teacher participants' perceptions of sitting on an SBDM council. Duke et al. (1981) showed that teachers believe that SBDM may be subversive to collective bargaining rights. Sitting on the SBDM council may place teachers in conflict with their professional organization's ideology. Teachers who are highly involved in a teachers' organization are more likely to view participation in SBDM council activities as a conflict with teachers' collective bargaining rights. Finally, the teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of reform is an important factor in the level of teacher involvement in SBDM activities. Some believe that teachers will tend to gravitate towards the status quo unless they perceive a change as permanent.

Current Study of SBDM

This study investigated the relationship among a number of variables related to the participation of teachers in SBDM. The study also investigated variables that could predict the costs and benefits of SBDM participation by teachers. These questions were addressed.

Research Question One

What is the relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and time demands involved in participating in an SBDM council?

Research Hypothesis One

There is a positive relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and the time demands involved in participating in an SBDM council.

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and teachers' perceptions of workplace democracy in schools that implement SBDM?

Research Hypothesis Two

There is a positive relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and teachers' perceptions of workplace democracy in schools that implement SBDM.

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between the teachers' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and the number of years of teaching experience held by teachers that

participate on an SBDM council?

Research Hypothesis Three

There is a positive relationship between the teachers' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and the number of years of teaching experience held by teachers that participate on an SBDM council.

Research Question Four

What is the relationship between teacher perception of subversion of collective bargaining by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in teacher professional organizations that are responsible for contract negotiation activities?

Research Hypothesis Four

There is a positive relationship between teacher perception of subversion of collective bargaining by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in teacher professional organizations that are responsible for contract negotiation activities.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position?

Research Hypothesis Five

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position.

Research Question Six

What is the relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership change within the school?

Research Hypothesis Six

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership of change within the school.

Research Question Seven

What is the relationship between the dependent variable *time demands placed on teachers in SBDM* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in the professional organization that are responsible for contract negotiation activities?

Research Hypothesis Seven

There is a significant relationship between the dependent variable *time demands placed on teachers in SBDM* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in professional organizations that are responsible

for contract negotiation activities?

Research Question Eight

What is the relationship between the dependent variable *feeling of self-efficacy provided by decision making* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in professional organizations that are responsible for contract negotiation activities?

The population of this research study will consist of teacher participants of school-based councils in schools located in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Teachers were surveyed at the high school, middle school, and elementary school levels. Surveys were administered to teacher members of councils who are presently involved in the program.

Statement of the Problem

Many school reform movements have included school-based management as a component of change in education practices. Teachers are being included in the decision-making processes that affect school policy. In a few states such as Kentucky, school-based decision-making councils have been mandated as a component of the education reform movement.

Frequently, reforms are enacted without fully understanding the effects that they have on the participants. These effects will consequently influence the success of the reform movements and their ability to improve education in the schools. Teacher participants are a vital component of SBDM. To ensure its success it is necessary for

implementers of the school reform to understand the needs of these participants in school-based decision making. There are a limited number of studies available concerning teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits concerning participation in school-based management programs, and the factors that affect those perceptions. Few reports have included empirical research that provides an in-depth study of the attitudes towards the decision-making process as held by teachers who are serving on the councils. A lack of understanding of these perceptions could lead to teachers opting not to serve on school-based decision-making councils. Teacher membership of an SBDM council is necessary for its success. Loss of teacher participants will affect the continuance of SBDM councils and in turn will have a negative impact on school reform.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold. The first purpose was to identify teachers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of participating in a school-based decision-making process. These costs to teachers are increased time demands, loss of autonomy, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of collective bargaining, and threats to career advancement. The benefits include: feeling of self-efficacy, workplace democracy, and ownership. The second purpose was to determine the relationship between selected variables that were developed through a review of the literature, and teacher members' perceptions of the costs and benefits of participating on a decision-making council.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of education reform movements across the country is to improve the quality of education. Many states such as Kentucky include school-based decision

making as a component of their education reform. Decision-making privileges are being removed from the state and central office level and being placed in the hands of the SBDM governing bodies.

SBDM can contribute to the success of education reform. Teachers are an essential component of the SBDM process. If they decline the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, SBDM will fall by the wayside. It is essential not only to know what teachers perceive to be costs and benefits of sitting on a school based decision making council, but what influences teachers perceptions of these costs and benefits. This is important information that can be used by policy-makers. Understanding participants' perceptions of serving on the school-based decision-making bodies will provide information to determine whether changes should be made to the governing structure or it should remain the same.

Summary

This chapter has provided background information that outlines the costs and benefits incurred by teacher members of school-based councils. A search of the literature has indicated that there is a lack of research concerning teachers' perceptions of these costs and benefits. In addition, there is little research as to why teachers view SBDM activities as a cost or benefit.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This study addresses the topic of school-based decision making in a large urban school district. The author surveyed teachers that served on the school councils in this district. The researcher examined research questions that related to the teachers' perceived costs and benefits of participating in school-based decision-making council activities.

The enactment of PL 107-110: No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has brought education reform to the forefront of research, once again. School-based decision making, also known as site-based decision making, school-based management, or participatory management is an integral component of school reform. In this process, teachers become part of the decision making process for the purpose of improving the students' education.

This chapter will provide a review of the research literature on the inclusion of non-supervisory personnel in school decision making. This chapter will also provide a historical perspective on this topic, including its emergence as part of recent efforts at school reform. The policy implications of including nonsupervisory personnel in decision making will be briefly discussed.

The chapter will include the research questions and hypotheses that drive this study. The components of the study will be discussed. These will include the population

of the research, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, and a summary of the chapter.

Information concerning the costs and benefits discussed in this section has been developed from results provided by Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981). The costs listed by Duke et al. include loss of autonomy, increased time demands, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of collective bargaining, and threats to career advancement. The rewards listed by Duke et al. for participating in school-based councils include feeling of self-efficacy, ownership, and workplace democracy.

Duke et al. did not address the possibility that teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits could be influenced by various factors. Some factors to be reviewed that could possibly affect teachers' perceptions are: (a) the number of years that site-based decision making has been implemented in the school, (b) the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the shared decision making process, (c) the years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform, (e) participants' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) participants' level of involvement in the teachers' professional organization that negotiates contracts.

These variables were selected because of their impact on teachers' attitudes towards a wide variety of school-based activities. The relationship of these variables on teachers' attitudes toward school governance was determined through a review of the literature.

General Theories of Motivation and Management

The concept of including non-supervisory personnel in the decision making process within the workplace is one of the major tenets of organizational behavior. This practice, known as shared decision making or participatory management, originated in the business sector and has moved into the education arena. One only needs to look at the leading authors in organizational behavior literature to understand the impact that shared-decision making has had on the business and school culture.

Early Motivation Studies

The teamwork concept encouraged in businesses and schools is based on the belief that employees who have some control of their environment will be more content and produce higher quality work. Information concerning characteristics of a workplace that produces employee satisfaction has its foundation with organizational behavior pioneers such as A. H. Maslow (1943) and Fredrick Herzberg (1959). These researchers constructed a hierarchy of work motivators.

Abraham Maslow (1943) described a theory of human motivation. He believed actualization was the driving force of individuals and that humans strive to reach the highest levels of their abilities. Maslow developed a hierarchy that depicts a general sense of the employees' needs in the workplace. The hierarchy theory is often depicted as a pyramid with the base consisting of basic human needs and each level dependant on the previous level. Moving from the base of the pyramid upwards, the five levels of needs are: (a) physiological (hunger, thirst, shelter, sex, etc.); (b) safety (protection from physical and emotional harm); (c) social (friendship, love, acceptance); (d) esteem (autonomy, self-respect, recognition, and attention); and (e) self-actualization (a desire to

successfully complete activities outside of their own physical needs such as a devotion to work or a vocation).

Rowan (1998) supported Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs, but believed that there was a necessity for several changes in the structure. He stated that three changes are needed to improve the theory. First, Rowan believed that esteem from others and self-esteem should not be combined into one level. Next, he stated that the need for competence or effectiveness should be included between safety needs and the need for love and belonging. Finally, Rowan contended that the hierarchy should not be depicted as a pyramid. He believed that the pyramid suggests that there is an end point to personal growth.

Rowan (1998) supported his belief that self-esteem and esteem from others should be separated on the basis that Maslow (1965) argued for this separation as a revision of his 1943 theory. In his 1965 revision of the pyramid, Maslow stated that self-esteem and the need for esteem from others should be sharply, clearly, and unmistakably differentiated. He further stated in this later revision that reputation, prestige, and applause were important for children and adolescents, even necessary for building self-esteem. Maslow contended that true self-esteem may initially have a base in those things, but true self-esteem came from a feeling of dignity, controlling one's life, and being one's own boss.

While Maslow (1943) studied the physical, social, and emotional needs of individuals, Fredrick Herzberg (1959) developed a management theory that focused on employees' needs and the necessity of a positive work environment. Herzberg developed a theory of work motivation. He divided organization development into two theories: the

hygiene and motivation theories. The hygiene theory included company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions and interpersonal relations, salary status, professional status that appears as rank within the company, and security. Within the motivation theory, the motivators consisted of achievement, recognition for achievement, interest in the task, responsibility for enlarged tasks, and growth and advancement to higher-level tasks. These two approaches to management are to be executed concurrently if Herzberg's theory is to meet its maximum potential for usefulness in developing an organization.

Utley, Westbrook, and Turner (1997) conducted a study of nine organizations to determine the relationship between the use of Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction and several other organizational management techniques such as Total Quality Management (TQM). The study was conducted among employees of large high-technology government testing facilities. Surveys were distributed to employees that worked in engineering and technical positions. The intent of the researchers was to limit the study population to knowledge workers; therefore, clerical and manufacturing workers were not included.

The authors hypothesized that organizations that emphasize motivators are likely to have a higher level of implementation of total quality management than those that stress hygiene factors. A two-part questionnaire was used to gather information and the data were statistically analyzed. The study supported the hypothesis. The two highest ranked companies for quality management implementation had a strong emphasis on motivators, and the two lowest ranked companies relied most heavily on hygiene factors.

The researchers concluded that indicators of companies that excelled in their businesses focused on the employee's ability, a sense of self-esteem produced through accomplishments in the workplace, and a feeling of self-fulfillment. These indicators relate closely to the benefit of self-efficacy for teachers who participate in SBDM as cited by Duke et al. (1981).

Maslow (1943) and Herzberg, (1959) believed that intrinsic motivators would encourage employees to produce higher quality work, which in turn would promote a more positive workplace attitude. Both authors have provided important groundwork in understanding the higher-level needs of employees.

Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1959) developed theories concerning the physical, social, and emotional needs of employees. Once these needs were identified it has become necessary to understand how they affect leadership styles and supervisors' attitudes toward employee productivity. As one example, Halepota (2005) studied the motivational theories of Maslow, Herzberg, and McGregor in relationship to improving productivity in the construction industry.

Halepota (2005) stated that the motivation level of workers is highly dependant on management style. The manager is responsible for identifying the most effective management style for the organization. Halepota further stated that morale building is an important component in motivating workers and creating productivity, and that building morale begins through developing a shared vision. These leadership styles addressed by Halepota have also been researched and defined by individuals such as McGregor and Ouchi.

Theories X, Y and Z

Closely related to the research concerning work motivators is the study of leadership styles. Pioneers in this area have studied how leaders' perceptions of their employees will affect work production and the workplace environment.

Douglas McGregor (1960) developed what is commonly referred to as Theory X and Theory Y. McGregor postulated in his Theory X that employers frequently attempt to supervise employees with guidelines that are grounded in the belief that workers are unhappy with their assignments and must be coerced into completing tasks. McGregor stated that supervisors using Theory X perceive these same workers as not wanting to work, not wanting the responsibility of making decisions in the workplace, and preferring to be directed. Under Theory X, supervisors closely monitor employees and define jobs and systems that determine how workers utilize their time. The organization relies on rewards, promises, incentives, rules, regulations, and threats to encourage employees to complete assignments.

In contrast to Theory X, McGregor stated that employees depicted in Theory Y enjoy their work and have a self-commitment to completing tasks correctly. These employees do not need coercion to be effective members of the workplace. Theory Y managers encourage work through trust and cooperation. Employees in Theory Y develop a feeling of commitment and will therefore be self-directed. McGregor encouraged sensitivity training and other methods of teaching managers interpersonal skills that would help them function under Theory Y.

Halepota (2005) summarized McGregor's leadership theory in reference to workers managed through Theory Y. The author stated that workers can be motivated to

achieve the goals of their organization through Theory Y. They must be given the freedom to achieve the goals through their own means. Management must allow employees to implement plans that they develop and show confidence in the potential for success of the innovations that the employees design.

McGregor's (1960) theories have recently been expanded to encompass a greater number of participatory management tenets. Ouchi (1981) introduced the concept of Theory Z style of management. Theory Z not only describes the attitudes of managers and workers as did Theory X and Y, but also analyses how workers perceive management. Organizations implementing Theory Z encourage long-term employment, slow promotions, individual responsibility, and participatory decision making.

Theory Z is very similar to the organizational structure found in Japan, where employees are allowed to participate in decision-making and are trained to handle a number of varied tasks. Ouchi (1981) believed that employees desire a cooperative working environment and have a need to be supported by the company. In Theory Z, a corporation's management has confidence in its workers and empowers them with participatory decision-making. For this reason, workers are expected to learn various tasks through job rotation, broaden skills through training, and they are expected to be generalized in ability rather than specialized. Promotions in a Theory Z corporation are granted more slowly so that the employee will receive more training. The purpose of this structure is to encourage employees that have been promoted to develop loyalty towards the company, understand how it operates, and use Theory Z management techniques when working with new employees.

Ouchi's (1981) Theory Z provided leadership through trust. Managers trust their employees to make sound decisions. Management style is to act as a couch in decision making rather than through authoritarian means. Ouchi postulated that the lack of productivity in the United States will not be remedied by merely changing the monetary policies or by investing more money in research and development. Ouchi believed that the answer lies in managing employees through a plan that has people working together more effectively. He presented Theory Z as a way to achieve this goal.

McGregor's (1960) Theories X and Y delineated a progression from strong managerial supervision of employees to the use of a motivational environment that provides the workers with more decision making. Ouchi's (1981) Theory Z management style provides a much higher level of participatory management. This addresses the employees' needs at the higher level of Maslow's (1943) and Herzberg's (1959) hierarchy. Theory Z addressed organizational behavior that relates to McGregor's motivators of achievement and recognition of achievement, and to Maslow's concept of self-actualization. Ouchi's *Theory Z* was embraced by W. Edwards Deming, one of the founders of Total Quality Management.

Total Quality Management

William Edward Deming (1982) advocated a Japanese style of management that was later adopted in the U.S. business sector. His program, Total Quality Management (TQM), addressed the need to improve work production and performance. In the early 1950s, Deming's concept of TQM became an inspiration to a Japanese nation that was in the process of economic redevelopment after World War II. Deming's philosophy has become popular in the United States and has recently been adopted by many

organizations, including school systems.

Deming (1982) outlined Fourteen Points of Total Quality Management. These provided guidelines for organizations to improve productivity through, among other things, better employee relations. Several of his recommendations included adopting a new philosophy of management that encourages employees to take on leadership roles, organizations to improve job training, and managers to eliminate fear as a method of motivation. Deming also promoted eliminating departmental barriers as well as barriers that prevented employees from having pride in their workmanship. The author believed that employees should be provided ample opportunity to self-improvement activities, and to provide input into organizational changes.

Zeitz, Johannesson, and Ritchie (1997) developed a survey instrument designed to measure dimensions of TQM and of organizational culture. In the developmental stage of constructing this instrument the authors reviewed the literature that was available concerning TQM. They found that the common difficulty with implementation of the program is that policies are established at the upper management level, but have little effect on supervisors and nonsupervisory personnel. They found that for TQM to be successful, the organizational culture must be appropriate to adopt the plan. The authors believed that there must be good communication between top management and employees, the employee must have a feeling of empowerment, and there must be a feeling of trust that permeates the organization. Zeitz et al. cited Detert and Mauriel (1997) in support of the theory that TQM is a sound practice. Detert and Mauriel evaluated the soundness of utilizing TQM as part of the education reform movement. They stated a belief that the introduction of TQM into the school setting has come with a

number of difficulties. TQM is strongly aligned with the structure of most education reform, but faces political, cultural, and resource constraints.

Holt and Ford (1996) conducted a longitudinal case study of Overland High School in the Cherry Creek Colorado School District, where the staff had adopted the TQM program. The Colorado high school enlisted US West Telecommunications to train approximately 30 faculty members in TQM methods. The authors believed that the process helped empower staff to tackle unfocused, nonproductive committee meetings. The authors further believed that success hinged on the principals' commitment to the program, enlisting a TQM coordinator, and implementing outside trainers' advice.

Holt and Ford (1996) found that one of the most vital components of the transition to TQM is that of participative management, or the empowerment of teachers in the decision-making process. During the interviews conducted in this study, one of the Overland school administrators expressed support for TQM. He stated that he believed that shared decision making provided employees with a common vision that in turn provided a sense of unity. He further stated that this was a “cultural shift” from the traditional top down command structure.

TQM has been adopted into school districts across the country. Rist (1996) cited a Tupelo, Mississippi superintendent that credited TQM with improving his performance. The administrator stated that he found that most of the people in the district were smarter than he was. He believed that when he gave them decision-making powers that they made good decisions, and when he listened to them, he appeared smarter.

Blankstein and Swain (1996) reported that at Kate Sullivan Elementary School in Tallahassee, Florida the staff embraced the guidelines of Deming and TQM. The

principal found that sharing leadership responsibilities was an important factor in the attempt to improve the quality of education at the school. These authors stated that the principal believed that her leadership style shift required everyone within the school to work cooperatively. This change from a few individuals monopolizing the power to sharing the decisions provided a more universal feeling of contributing to the overall success of the school.

Deming's theory of TQM has made an impact on the organizational structure of many schools, but leadership roles are changing in other schools without the inclusion of all of Deming's (1982) Fourteen Points of Management. Reform movements have also encouraged education systems to develop school-based management councils within their schools. The leadership transition has been successfully made many times, but has often required school staff to overcome major obstacles.

The participatory management component of Deming's (1982) Fourteen Points of TQM has helped launch a method of organizational governance that provides nonsupervisory personnel with decision-making powers. As early as 1982, Peters and Waterman described participative leadership in their book *In Search of Excellence*. While partners at McKinsey and Co., a management consulting firm, Peters and Waterman (1982) conducted a case study of 43 companies from six industries that were listed in the Fortune 500. They began with a list of 62 of the best performing McKinsey clients. The 62 companies were selected from six industry categories: technology, consumer goods, general industry, service, project management, and resource based. They applied a set of performance measures: compound asset growth for the previous twenty years, compound equity growth for the past twenty years, the average ratio of

market value to book value, average return on total capital for the previous twenty years, average return on equity for the previous twenty years, and average return on sales for the previous twenty years. For a company to qualify as a top performer, it must have been in the top half of its industry in at least four out of six of these measures. Following these lines of measurement, the authors eliminated what they perceived as the weakest companies.

Peters and Waterman (1982) compiled eight attributes shared by most of the organizations that they determined to be in their words “the best-run companies.” Among the characteristics that each company exhibited were: (a) encouraging autonomy and entrepreneurship, which encouraged innovation by providing employees with more independence, and (b) treating people with dignity. The companies allowed the employees to develop changes, and management was encouraged to listen to ideas and attempt to implement useful changes.

Much of the emphasis on the companies’ attributes related to decision-making powers, and allowing employees to develop a sense of ownership in their work. The authors portrayed the “excellent” corporations as those that embraced the theory of shared-decision making.

Cavanaugh Leahy & Company, a consulting firm specializing in organizational development, strategic planning, and leadership development, initiated a review of over 400 articles and books related to participatory management that were published between 1987 and 1997 (Elliott, 1999). The research uncovered conflicting information in the definition and implementation of this organizational practice. Elliott found that there was conflict in the definition of the term. Definitions of participatory management in the

literature review ranged from total inclusion of employees in the decision-making process to walking through the workplace to talk to the employees.

Elliott (1999) also found that there was little information concerning how to implement the procedure. The study found that most “how to” articles offered very superficial guidelines or only discussed one dimension of participatory management. Finally, the study determined that there was little information concerning circumstances that are best suited for participatory management.

Elliot (1999) recommended that companies research the idea of participatory management carefully before implementing it in their organizations. He also advised companies to make distinctions between situations where participatory management has been implemented and their own workplace environment, to determine what they will need prior to launching the program.

The most significant general finding discovered by the above studies was that increased productivity was associated with allowing non-supervisory personnel the right to make decisions. Repeatedly, it was found that when shared decision making was brought into the workplace, employee satisfaction improved and productivity increased. Because of this success, school districts across the country have been including shared decision making in their reform movements.

Shared Decision Making in the Schools

Throughout the history of the United States public school system, critics have called for reform of the education program. Early calls for reform, such as the Carnegie publication, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, developed guidelines to improve education. The authors of this 1986 report maintained that teachers were not

treated as professionals because they were provided few opportunities to make decisions. “Teachers work in an environment suffused with bureaucracy. Rules made by others govern their behavior at every turn. Perceptive researchers have told us for years that teachers are treated as if they have no expertise worth having” (The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, p. 38).

The report included a component that would allow teachers to make decisions concerning their schools. One major element of the plan was to restructure the schools to provide teachers with an environment that allowed them to make decisions concerning state and local goals for students. This more professional environment would continue to hold teachers accountable for student progress, but would provide for a greater degree of teacher judgment.

In the book, *A Place Called School*, Goodlad (1984) argued that the public school system was desperately in need of change, but he made few recommendations concerning the input of educators. Goodlad’s recommendations differed from most other reforms in that they did not call for teacher decision making or any input from for changes from teachers.

Newton and Winter (1999) discussed the impact of the early reports on school reform. The authors contended that since *A Nation at Risk* was published in 1983, leaders in all geographic areas have struggled with attempts at school reform. The authors listed reports, such as the 1986 publication of *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* produced by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, to explain the four strategies that have been used in many reform movements. These four strategies include implementing a site-based management program in the schools.

Many of these reform movements differed from various past reforms, because of the inclusion of provisions for teachers to be part of the school decision-making process. Early reform movements were initiated at the central office level and mandated in the schools. Changes that began in the 1980's have encouraged improvements through input from classroom educators. It is believed that teacher input can provide the first-hand knowledge necessary for educational improvement. Midgley and Wood (1993) argued that SBDM is a sensible way of implementing reform. The authors believed that teachers want their expertise and experience used. Teachers have the knowledge to make informed decisions concerning the teaching/learning process.

Robertson and Brigg (1995) examined how schools introduce changes in curriculum and instruction, and how school-based decision making affects these changes. The authors collected data on the extent to which power, knowledge and skills, information, and rewards, along with an instructional guidance system, leadership, and resources assisted in the implementation of curriculum and instruction innovations in four areas.

Robertson and Brigg (1995) collected data in 17 schools in eight locations. Information was gathered through interviews conducted by two person teams at each school. These interviews focused on school-based management, curriculum, and instruction innovations. The teams interviewed decision-making councils, department heads, union representatives, teacher participant and non-participants of the innovations.

Information and leadership scored high in six of the schools with two or more categories of reform. The authors concluded that these two variables along with instructional guidance were an important component of implementing reform. They further theorized that these are interrelated because there must be a high level of information passed through leadership for reform to be successful. This study reinforced

the belief that participants in the decision-making process must be provided with information to develop an environment that will encourage teacher participation.

Developing an environment that encourages teacher participation in the decision-making process involves a change in attitudes and school structure. If school-based management is to be successful, these changes must be addressed. This is not always the case; therefore, frequently schools enter into the process unprepared. Wohlstetter (1995) found that most individuals did not realize how extensive the system-wide change is when SBDM is implemented. The author found that frequently SBDM councils were formed, and then given substantial responsibility in areas of budget, personnel, and curriculum.

To avoid failure in the school-based management process, the literature indicates that schools and local school district administrators must provide necessary training and support to allow teachers and parents to effectively make decisions concerning the educational process. Without this support researchers believe that school-based councils' decisions will carry little weight and make little change.

Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) conducted a three-year study involving 44 schools in 13 districts in the United States, Canada, and Australia, to ascertain indicators of successful SBDM bodies. They interviewed 500 people including school board members, superintendents, associate superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and students. All schools involved in the study had participated in school-based decision making for at least four years; some had been involved for much longer. The results of the study produced variables that separated effective from ineffective school-based decision-making schools. The authors described what they determined to be necessary for schools to be successful in SBDM implementation.

Included in their list of essential resources is training for the members of the participative decision making process. Professional development was deemed important in preparing teachers for the role of decision makers. The authors found that schools that they determined to be successful SBM schools implemented school-wide professional development as an on-going process. These activities were directed toward building change, creating a professional community, and developing a shared knowledge base.

The authors further state that the successful schools had pledged more than one year of professional development activities and funding to implement these activities. Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) did not provide information concerning the frequency of professional development activities, but provided insight into the district support provided in the restructuring schools. They cited four districts where teachers' contracts established the number of professional development days implemented at each school. Two of the districts developed new support systems for the schools. Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) was determined to have extensive staff development opportunities through the Gheens Academy. This is the staff development office for the district. At the time of the study, it had a budget in excess of one million dollars. As each JCPS school voted to implement SBDM, the district provided extra funding for professional development. Just as a competent teacher would not leave students to educate themselves, Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) argued that school districts should not expect participatory management members to develop the program structure without instruction and support.

Bondy (1994) conducted a study to determine factors that influence a successful shared-decision making school. The author completed a three-year longitudinal study in an unidentified county in Florida. One or two researchers were assigned to the pilot schools. The researchers conducted ethnographic interviews, collected archival material, analyzed data, and wrote twice-yearly status reports. Interviews were conducted with the

faculty, staff, and administrators.

In a report of their early findings, Bondy (1994) determined that SBDM school restructuring was affected by 15 factors that fall into four categories. The categories involved process, vision, and communication. The author found that the principal at a successful SBDM school was instrumental in sharing leadership power and continuously kept the process moving. The participants had a common vision, supported change, and were risk takers. Participation, open communication, and mutual respect were visible at these schools. Lastly, the participants were involved in effective training.

This inclusion in the decision-making process provides teachers with increased responsibilities, which in turn provides increased benefits and costs. Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) furnished readers with a list of the costs and benefits for teachers that have been defined through their study.

The research of Duke et al. (1981) involved case studies of the decision-making procedures for five urban public secondary schools located in northern California. The authors selected these schools for their decision-making opportunities. The purpose of the study was to answer two general questions: "What opportunities for shared decision making are available to teachers? To what extent do teachers take advantage of these opportunities?" (p. 314). The structure of the decision-making process in these schools ranged from formal committees to principals asking for input from key members of the faculty involved in making decision.

The results of the initial case study of the five schools produced five components involved in the decision making process in the schools:

1. Deciding to decide: setting an agenda,
2. Determining guidelines on which decisions will be made.
3. Gathering information necessary to enable participants to make an informed decision,

4. Designing choices or alternatives: a choice may denote a proposed strategy, or a solution to a problem,
5. Expressing a preference: a decision is made on a solution to the problem,

In an attempt to understand the decision-making process and teachers' opportunities to be involved in the proceedings, Duke et al. (1981) determined that some teachers chose not to be involved in SBDM. Interview data from random samples of teachers at each school showed that 36 percent of teachers chose not to be involved in some or all of the opportunities when given the option. Twenty-seven percent of the teachers reported not being involved because they believed that no opportunities were provided, even though the results of the study contradicted this belief. The remaining 42 percent of the teachers interviewed stated that their involvement had produced little satisfaction. The authors analyzed the data to determine the rationale for these teachers' perceptions. They looked at potential costs and rewards for teacher participation in SBDM.

The authors identified five costs and three benefits that could potentially affect teachers' interest in participating in school based decision. The costs were increased time demands, loss of autonomy, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of collective bargaining, and threats to career advancement. The benefits included feelings of self-efficacy, a sense of ownership, and improved feeling of workplace democracy. The authors then designed an interview form and asked teachers at the schools involved in the earlier study to rate each cost and benefit on a scale of 1 (insignificant) to 7 (major) on a Likert Scale with a range from one to seven.

The results indicated that teachers found time demands to be the most significant cost with a mean score of 4.92. The benefits had a mean score of 5.77 for self-efficacy, 5.97 for ownership, and 5.82 for workplace democracy.

Duke et al. (1981) interpreted the mean scores to indicate that most teachers perceive there to be a slight cost for participating in school-based decision making, and the benefits to be highly important factors for participating in the process. One variable that is not present in this study is the right of the faculty to determine if the school will participate in school-based decision making. Kentucky law required that all school districts adopt a policy for school-based decision making by January 1, 1991, and all Kentucky public schools, with few limited exceptions, had a school-based decision making council by 1996. This research will allow a comparison of Kentucky, with its mandatory inclusion in SBDM, with the mean scores of the costs and benefits measured by Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981).

This review of the literature concerning school-based decision making documented that shared decision making can be successful in the schools, but it comes with certain costs and benefits. The literature also indicated that it is necessary to provide training in SBDM and to encourage open communication. If school-based decision making is to be successful in Kentucky, these factors must be considered.

School-Based Decision Making in Kentucky

School-based management has been included in Kentucky's schools as a result of the implementation of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). This reform law was produced as a result of litigation that arose in response to perceived inequities in the state funding for education. The court decision in *Rose v. Council for Better Education*, (790 S.W.2d 186 [Ky. 1989]) mandated that the Kentucky legislature equalize education throughout Kentucky. One of the major components of KERA was the requirement that all school districts adopt a policy for school-based decision making by January 1, 1991, and all Kentucky public schools, with a few limited exceptions, have a school-based decision making council by 1996.

Kentucky law provides decision-making prerogatives to the school-based councils in a multitude of areas. KRS 160.345 (2005) (Appendix A) defines the responsibilities of the SBDM Council. Among the responsibilities is the right to select the principal, when there is an opening, and make personnel decisions when there is a teaching vacancy. The council is not permitted to transfer or fire employees. The council may make decisions concerning expenditures for instructional materials, informational technology, and equipment.

Teacher members of the council are elected by the faculty for either a two-year term or two one-year terms. A teacher that is sitting on the SBDM council is protected from being involuntarily transferred to another school.

The school-based decision-making process mandated by KERA has been the focus of several studies and has been discussed in educational publications. For instance, Van Meter (1994) described the school-based decision-making process as it developed in Kentucky. He listed the 16 areas that were within the authority of the council at the time, and the progression of implementation of the participatory management process. In a discussion of lessons to be learned from the Kentucky mandated process, Van Meter identified four lessons to be learned in the initial years of SBDM in Kentucky.

Van Meter (1994) stated that frequently early implementation of a reform policy lacks specific guidelines. This is not a factor that will strongly impact the reform because someone will step up and fill the void. Van Meter further stated that the mandated SBDM policy has created a problem at the state level. State agencies had difficulties with guidelines and controls over the operations of the committees.

Van Meter (1994) pointed out that there was a difference in acceptance of SBDM at different education levels. He found that elementary schools voted approval for SBDM more quickly than high schools. He also found that the statewide reform became more formally organized. He gave the development of

the Kentucky Association of School Councils (KASC) as an example. This organization serves as an information clearinghouse and networking system for the membership, and in early 1993 held its first annual KASC state conference.

As educators began participating in Kentucky's mandated participatory management program, more studies followed. Lindle (1996) described the components of the decision-making process and elaborated on the lessons that can be learned from the Kentucky implementation. Lindle recognized the importance of lessons that other states can learn from Kentucky when initiating school-based decision making. The author stated that she believed that the Kentucky SBDM process that includes the principal, three teachers, and two parents is a model that other states should replicate.

Tyra (1997) conducted a survey of 175 elementary school principals in Kentucky. Only schools that had implemented SBDM since 1994 were surveyed. The purpose of confining the study to this group of schools was to involve only schools that had already encountered issues concerning first year transition. The completed responses were elicited from 121 elementary school principals.

Tyra (1997) studied the essential components thought to be necessary for an SBDM program to positively affect student learning. The author attempted to determine whether these factors were included in Kentucky's model for school-based decision making and whether they were being practiced by SBDM members. School improvement plans are to focus on improve student achievement through teacher and community input. SBDM cannot succeed if there is not a high level of teacher/parent participation.

Tyra's (1997) study revealed that principals had expressed some concerns over the level of participation in SBDM activities. Results of the study indicated that the principals perceived that SBDM developed a "strong feeling of belonging and community." When asked if "SBDM generated a feeling of belonging and community"

and increased parent and teacher/staff participation,” 12 percent strongly agreed, 49 percent agreed, and 20 percent were undecided (p. 90). Respondents expressed a concern about lack of participation in SBDM by school staff and parents. When principals were asked if SBDM had increased the level of parent and teacher participation, only 3.3 percent strongly agreed, 28.9 percent agreed, 11.6 percent undecided, 46.3 percent disagreed, and 9.1 percent strongly disagreed that teacher and staff participation increased (p. 91). Tyra concluded that teacher participation is an area of concern for successful implementation of SBDM.

Another study involving Kentucky’s implementation of its SBDM program included the state’s largest district. Wohlstetter, Smyer, and Mohrman, (1994) studied four school districts in the United States and Canada. Jefferson County, Kentucky was included in this study as well as Prince William County, Virginia and San Diego, California. In this study, the authors attempted to determine the conditions necessary for teachers to introduce curricular and instructional changes into the schools through SBM. They also conducted research to determine the impact of the high involvement model on the changes. Schools that were studied were looked at to determine if they implemented this high involvement model used in business.

Specifically, the authors examined the process for decentralizing power, knowledge, information, and rewards in the school. The authors also investigated how SBM reform worked in conjunction with curriculum and instruction reform to improve school performance, and what factors were important to the success of SBM.

Three researchers visited each district for one week. Interviews were conducted with the superintendent, and with the four assistant superintendents that were involved with school-based decision making, curriculum and instruction, personnel, and finance. Site visits were made at schools where interviews were conducted with the principal, vice principal, members of the site council, union chair, resource specialists, selected

department chairs, and several other teachers. The interview questions concerned the implementation and timetable of SBDM, format and context, impact on teaching and learning and school organizational structure.

The study categorized school districts as “struggling schools” and “actively restructuring schools.” An actively restructuring school was determined to have the potential to be successful in implementing school-based management. Some of the factors that were determined to positively affect SBDM in the districts that were studied were: extensive professional development opportunities for training related to school-based decision making, allowing schools to set their own parameters concerning the structure of the council and choice of the council chair, and dispersing decision making power to subcommittees to alleviate teacher burn out and frustration.

The purpose of the Wohlstetter et al. (1994) study was to focus on districts that the researchers referred to as “exemplary SBM districts.” The results of this study found that the Jefferson County Public Schools exhibited the qualities of an actively restructuring school district in all components. The authors indicated that JCPS is progressing in the right direction for successful school-based decision making. The authors stated that successful implementation of school-based decision making will increase the teachers’ belief in the permanency of SBDM.

A review of the literature concerning SBDM in Kentucky indicated that districts in the state are working in the right direction for successful implementation. This review of the literature also indicated that teachers may be hesitant to participate in council activities. For this reason it is necessary to understand the costs that are incurred by teachers when they agree to participate in the decision making process.

Costs of Involvement in Site-Based Management

Increased Time

A review of the literature indicated that the time spent in site-based management activities is a factor in the acceptance of SBDM within the schools and possibly in teachers' perception of the cost of participation on the SBDM governing body. Studies have indicated that teachers often feel burdened by the increased responsibilities of SBDM activities. Din (1997) conducted a random survey of 252 rural schools in Kentucky. Participants included current school council members. These members consisted of the principal, one teacher member, and one parent member. The purpose of the survey was to investigate what duties the school councils undertook, what benefits were gained by the SBDM activities, and what obstacles the councils faced. The survey questions were developed based on the provisions of KERA that determine the duties of the council. One hundred and thirty-two council members completed the surveys. Following the quantitative results, the author provided insight into the problems addressed in open-ended responses. One of the main obstacles to successful SBDM activities identified by the respondents was the problem of time constraints. Members stated that there was not enough time to perform council duties as well as to carry out teaching assignments.

Southard, Muldoon, and Porter (1997) conducted a study to assess the effects that site-based decision making had in Leon County, Florida. They conducted a series of interviews and surveys with principals, members, and former members of SBDM councils. The results indicated that time was a major barrier for the implementation of SBDM. Data showed that one-third of the participants that listed barriers to the success of SBDM believed that the process was too time consuming and took too much time from teaching duties. Data indicated that 23 percent of the individuals interviewed believed that the process was too time consuming and 15 percent of the respondents that no longer

serve on the SBDM Council said that the reason that they no longer served on the council was because of the amount of work that was expected of them and the amount of time that activities took.

Often teachers are permitted very little time outside of the instructional day to complete the paperwork and professional development activities that are necessary to be successful educators. Watts and Castle (1993) conducted a study in which they surveyed 13 schools and 14 school districts that were actively involved in programs run by the National Center for Innovations. Each site was surveyed for options and strategies to address the problem of time constraints. The responses were grouped into categories and then regrouped until broad categories surfaced. The sites were capable of responding to researchers through an electronic network that permitted them to communicate with researchers about restructuring. The survey results were also extended through an electronic search of databases that contained information concerning additional strategies.

Watts and Castle (1993) determined that the "traditional view of a teacher's work is governed by the idea that time with students is of singular value" (p. 306). Preparation for committee meetings, time spent at school-based committees, and professional development necessary to make the participatory management activities successful are time-consuming. These authors concluded that: "Our experience with more than a hundred experimental restructuring efforts has demonstrated to us that the frustration associated with the lack of time is a matter of fundamental importance if restructuring efforts are to succeed" (p. 306).

Reviewing the literature concerning the time element necessary for the implementation of site-base management revealed that school based management may drain teachers of valuable time that is already considered a precious commodity. Adelman and Pringle (1997) completed case studies of several schools implementing school-based decision making. The key hypothesis of this study was "Increasing the

quantity of time that children spend in school will not, by itself, lead to improved outcomes—unless what happens within that time also changes in some way” (p. 28). The authors conducted two case studies of public schools that had added significant time to either the school day or the school year. The first case study was conducted in two elementary schools in New Orleans that had temporarily adopted a 220-day school year. They found that teachers spread over 44 weeks the same curriculum that they had previously taught in 36 weeks. The scores on standardized test minimally increased. The authors determined that the scheduling changes were developed quickly, with no teacher or principal input on classroom level, to the extended time was to decrease the pace of instruction.

In contrast, the second case study was conducted at a magnet school in Boston that had added 90 minutes to the instructional day. A magnet school is a public school that has a strong focus in an academic area. Students choose to attend this school rather than their assigned neighborhood school for the purpose of receiving more intense instruction in the selected academic area. Teachers were organized into teams, and this allowed some teachers to be involved in noninstructional activities such as parent contact. The additional instructional time focused on math, reading, study skills, homework assistance, and test preparation. The standardized scores at this school rose from last place in the district to first place. Teacher input provided support for the change and productive alternatives for use of time. The authors determined that several factors contributed to participants’ willingness to invest their unpaid time in long-term voluntary reform activities. Among these factors was the inclusion of true school-based decision making that involved the autonomy to select faculty members who believe in the schools reform efforts, and leadership that encouraged and assisted the reform efforts in the early years.

Adelman and Pringle (1997) recommended a reallocation of time. Their study supported “reassessment of learning time.” They stated that this reassessment should influence the way teachers view their roles as instructors. The authors believed that teachers view as valuable only the time students spend in the classroom, and that this perception must be changed to realize that activities outside of the classroom can be valuable instructional times.

The studies involving the cost of time necessary for implementation of SBDM activities have not addressed whether there is a correlation between time expenditure and the duration of implementation within the school. An early SBDM participant survey of Kentucky schools that had implemented SBDM for at least three years was reported. The Kentucky department of Education reported in their monthly publication, *Kentucky Teacher* (1993) that the time spent in SBDM activities decreased as the years of implementation increased (March, p. 1). There is no research to indicate whether teachers’ perceptions and attitudes towards the cost of time changed during the implementation period.

Winter, Keedy, and Newton (1999) conducted a study concerning factors that influence teachers participating on a school council. Randomly selected teachers that were enrolled in graduate level courses were asked to role play individuals considering a council job and react to content-validated descriptions for a vacancy on the local school council.

The results indicated that the number of children of the respondent negatively affected the individual’s desire to participate in council activities. The greater the number of dependents of the respondent, the less he or she was interested in a council position. When discussing these findings the authors stated that it cannot be ignored that women currently represent 74 percent of the teaching profession (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). *The role of making school policies adds to an already heavy*

workload of teachers that are juggling career and family responsibilities.

The research involving time costs for teachers has indicated that this is a major factor in deciding to participate on an SBDM council. Adding this activity to the full teaching day deters educators from participation. Teachers may be unwilling to take the extra time to be involved in council meetings that may limit their classroom autonomy.

Loss of Autonomy

Studies indicated that some teachers believe that SBDM has increased their decision-making parameters and therefore provided them increased autonomy. Other teachers have stated that they believe that SBDM has resulted in a loss of classroom autonomy.

A number of faculty members employed at a successful SBDM school believe that they have more control over curriculum than in a school that is run in an autocratic fashion. Odden and Wohlstetter (1995) studied 13 school districts that had been operating under SBDM for at least four years and studied the variable of autonomy. In the conclusions of their study, they included a discussion of the characteristics of a successful participatory management school. The authors stated that teachers believed that they had considerable decision-making flexibility concerning curriculum specifics, instructional approaches, and materials used in their classrooms. For instance, the teachers were involved in development of curriculum framework, school vision, and mission statements.

Many researchers believe school-based decision making has increased teacher autonomy rather than reducing the control that educators have in the classroom. Decisions are made at the school level rather than through central office. Teachers often believe that these autonomous decisions are an improvement. Lange (1993) conducted a 15-month study of six schools and principals involved in an administrative change from centralized governance to a decentralized approach to school management. In

summarizing his findings, the author stated the quality of the decisions improved as teacher autonomy increased. This was achieved by removing many of the decisions from the centralized school system, and placing them at the building level.

Other teachers have expressed concern over the parental involvement included in some versions of school-based management. A number of teachers believe that parents will infringe on their classroom autonomy and control the direction of their curricula. White (1989) examined the literature concerning the elements of school-based decision making and concluded that parent control will interfere with the teachers' power, goals, and objectives. This inclusion of parents into the school-based management body has caused not only objections from members of the teaching profession, but also unrest among parent committee members. Guskey and Peterson (1996) stated that parents believed that some teachers feel that the classroom is their exclusive domain. For this reason, many of them are uncomfortable pushing for change, even when they believe that such change is necessary.

Nir (2002) conducted a three-year study in 28 elementary schools in Jerusalem, Israel. The purpose was to study the impact of SBM on teacher commitment. Nine hundred and thirty teachers were studied over the three-year period. One measure of the study was teacher autonomy. The results indicated that SBM had no effect on the teachers' perception of autonomy. The data revealed no significant statistical difference in teachers' perception of autonomy prior to SBM and after implementation of SBM.

A review of the literature concerning teacher autonomy in the school-based decision-making process is ambiguous. The literature has shown that loss of autonomy may be considered a cost of SBDM. As parents become involved in classroom decisions, teachers believe that they are losing control of their curriculum. Conversely, other literature has indicated that inclusion of decision making within the schools has increased the teachers' perceptions of autonomy. As curriculum and instruction decisions are

moved from the central office administrators to the SBDM councils, the teachers are given more classroom autonomy.

Newark and Klotz (2002) conducted a study of self-efficacy in relation to school-based decision making. The authors surveyed approximately 100 teachers in secondary schools that implement school-based decision making and approximately 100 teachers in secondary schools that are not school-based decision making. Incorporated in the study were survey questions that related to curriculum decisions for the school and in turn the classroom. The results showed that teachers in the school-based decision managed schools had more influence on the curriculum than those teaching in the schools that did not implement school-based decision making.

As teachers are provided more decision making power, the increase in collegial discord may increase. The decisions made by school-based decision-making councils may cause conflict with their colleagues.

Collegial Disfavor

Literature supports the perception that members of the school-based decision-making body may place themselves in conflict with their peers over the decision-making process. As teachers become participants in SBDM, it is believed that other members of the faculty will regard them as an extension of the school administration. Lange (1993) conducted a 15-month study involving six schools and principals that were transforming school governance from centralized to decentralized format. He found in his study that the teachers that did not participate in council activities were suspicious of the teacher members of the council. The author believed that the nonparticipants felt that the autocratic principal was replaced with an autocratic council.

Elsewhere participants in the school-based councils viewed the situation in much the same way as the nonparticipants mentioned in Lange's study. A study of SBDM councils in Kentucky schools showed that the decision-making teams feel the pressure

and disfavor of unpopular decisions. David (1992) conducted a five-year study of the Kentucky Education Reform Act. During the first year of the study, the author investigated school-based decision making. She interviewed Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) officials that were associated with the implementation of SBDM and individuals in the Office of Accountability, collected documents from KDE, and visited seven Kentucky SBDM schools to interview teachers, principals, parents, and selected central office staff. The interview staff also visited schools that were not participating in SBDM, conducted a literature review of hundreds of articles that appeared in Kentucky newspapers and spoke with other individuals involved in studies relating to SBDM in Kentucky. In her findings, she determined that teachers were hesitant to participate in SBDM activities, especially after having done so. Data indicated that causes were time pressures and the dislike for making unpopular decisions—especially those that involved personnel.

A more recent study conducted by Dee, Henkin, and Pell (2002) indicated that potential conflicts can be addressed through open communication. The authors recommended establishment of a strong channel of communication between the individuals that sit on a site-based council and the rest of the staff and faculty. The authors contended that teachers that do not sit on the council typically receive little information concerning proposed and approved school changes. Therefore, these members of the faculty will not understand the potential benefits and the rationale of the proposed changes. Dee et al. suggested planning forums, which are small groups of teachers that gather to discuss issues that are to be addressed by the council. This will provide school-wide feedback and ownership of the decisions made by the school-based council.

The review of the literature found that non-participants of SBDM are frequently distrustful of SBDM participants. The nonmembers are resistant to the changes

implemented by the council. The literature review further indicates that this feeling of distrust can be offset by open communication. This open communication must not only be between participant and non-participants of the council, but between the policy setters and the teacher unions that participate in collective bargaining for these educators.

Subversion of Collective Bargaining

The research literature indicates that collective bargaining rights have had an impact on the adoption of SBDM. Collective bargaining rights for teachers have steadily increased in the United States' education system. Robson and Davis (1983) reported that between 1963 and 1973 approximately two million teachers employed in the United States obtained some form of collective bargaining rights with their employers. In 2006, The National Education Association claims to have 2.8 million members (www.NEA.org), and the American Federation of Teachers claims 1.5 million educators as members of their union (www.AFT.org). These two groups, which collectively negotiate for over four million educators are the dominant teacher professional organizations in the United States.

David's (1994) five-year study of Kentucky schools indicated that the protection of teachers' rights under these collective bargaining contracts has had an impact on the adoption of school-based decision making. In the third year of her study, David researched the connections between school-based decision making and changes in curriculum and instruction. She visited 13 schools in nine districts across Kentucky. The sample consisted of schools that had reported to have made significant changes in classroom practices and represented various geographic areas and sizes of schools. The author interviewed teachers, administrators, parents, some school board members, and central office administrators. David reported on the percentages of Kentucky schools with councils for each of the state's eight education service regions. She found the percentages of school councils in the regions varied. The totals ranged from 55 percent

to 77 percent. The major exception was education region three. This region had only 14 percent of the schools that had established school councils. The author contended that this low number was due to an ongoing struggle concerning state mandates and collective bargaining.

The local collective bargaining agreement that David (1994) referred to is a voluntary binding negotiation agreement between Jefferson County Public Schools and Jefferson County Teachers Association (JCTA). All items in the negotiated contract must be upheld unless the SBDM school votes on a contract deviation. The process involves obtaining approval from the faculty through a vote. This vote for a contract deviation is only binding for a specific issue. Once that issue is resolved, the SBDM council must then comply with the terms of the contract on all other rules governing employment.

Kentucky procedure varies from the traditional practices of collective bargaining and the way that SBDM is usually implemented. Many decisions are made at the school level by SBDM body rather than at the central office level. Since SBDM is mandated through state law, decisions made by this governing body must be implemented. This provides state support for the school council's decisions, and state law supersedes local contracts.

Very little literature exists concerning the effects of collective bargaining on SBDM. Hess (2005) reviewed the literature on the impact of collective bargaining on school reform. He cited an analysis of 10 Rhode Island districts that was conducted by the Education Partnership which found that "bargaining agreements focused on 'adult entitlement' severely limited 'school autonomy' and increased the cost of schooling" (Hess, 2005, p. 32). On the other hand, he cited union defenders that stated that collective bargaining can improve teacher quality and that it promotes teacher professionalism.

Threats to Career Advancement

The research literature indicates that teachers may perceive themselves as being placed in conflict with the building and/or system administrators. This conflict may in turn threaten their possibilities for career advancement. Research has not established that participation in school-based decision making places the teacher in a professionally precarious position. However, studies have indicated that the development of school-based management bodies can produce antagonism between administrators and the teachers participating in the process. This conflict is due to power struggles and administrators' resistance to relinquishing their decision making power. Wohlstetter and Briggs (1994) conducted a three-year study of schools in the United States, Canada, and Australia to learn what makes SBM work. They found some schools that exhibited difficulty with the implementation of SBDM. Their results found that frequently in struggling schools there was a power struggle between the principal and the staff. Similarly, David (1994) found in her third study of SBDM that teachers had experienced or feared administrative resistance either at the school or district level. The power struggles and resistance from administrators could place a potential candidate for career advancement in conflict with individuals that make the final determinations on promotions.

The power struggle is apparent in the teacher elections for SBDM Council members. The Kentucky General Assembly Office of Education Accountability states:

A high percentage of complaints related to the school-based decision-making initiative received by the Office of Education Accountability (OEA) allege principal interference, coercion, and intimidation in teacher elections. Between May 2001 and August 2002 EOC received 16 complaints related to the teacher election process. Eight of these complaints were received via EOC's hotline coming during the closing hours or just after the completion of the teacher elections. Nine written complaints alleging interference with the teacher election process were also filed. EOC is currently pursuing a resolution of a situation in which a principal has interfered in three separate council elections, two of which were teacher elections. (OEA, 2004, p. 5)

This report from the Office of Education Accountability (2004) has provided empirical evidence of influence of administrators over teachers. This influence could cause teachers to fear intimidation, and reprisals from administrators. In turn, this could discourage teachers from sitting on councils for fear of loss of career advancement.

Promotion practices involving possible political and/or personal influences have reached the Kentucky Supreme Court. In the case of *Young v. Hamilton* and *Back v. Robinson*, 2003 SC-0397-1, rendered April 22, 2004, the court reviewed two separate lower court decisions that challenged the right of the superintendent to limit the principal applicants sent to the school-based decision-making selection committee. Prior to the court decision, superintendents would limit the principal candidates recommended to the SBDM council on the basis that they would determine the “qualified” candidates. SBDM committees were not permitted to request more candidates than the superintendent recommended. The Kentucky Supreme Court decided that the superintendents were not allowed to limit the candidates if they had met state qualifications. They stated that if a school council does not approve of the of the superintendent’s choices, that they would be allowed to interview other candidates. It further stated that allowing the superintendent to make these selections would allow the position to be filled based on any qualifications even personal or political.

This Supreme Court decision has addressed the issue of superintendent control over the hiring of principals. However, the decision has not eliminated the fear of reprisals for decisions made as a member of an SBDM council.

The review of the literature verified that some teachers fear a loss of career advancement for sitting on a school-based decision-making council. The literature provided documentation of conflict and antagonism between principals and teacher members of the school-based decision-making councils. These conflicts can in turn cause administrators to resist promoting teachers to administrative positions. The

literature review further provided information concerning Kentucky court actions that would help prevent this retribution.

This review of the literature has provided background information concerning the teachers' perceptions of the costs of participating in a school-based decision-making council. Duke et al. (1981) have also provided data that indicates that there are benefits derived from this activity.

Benefits of Participation in Shared Decision Making

Feelings of Self-Efficacy

A review of the research literature substantiates the belief that an increased feeling of self-efficacy is a motivating factor for teacher participation in SBDM activities. The term self-efficacy refers to the teacher's self-image regarding professional judgment and the ability to competently complete tasks. This feeling of self-efficacy corresponds with Abraham Maslow's theory of motivation, which contends that people progress through a hierarchy of needs. The peak of this hierarchy is self-actualization. Self-efficacy falls within the upper level of Maslow's motivational needs. Employees who feel this sense of accomplishment continue to develop professionally. Tewel (1995) contended that recognition for accomplishments and having pride in one's work motivates employees much more than extrinsic promotion-based rewards.

Ruscoe and Whitford (1991) conducted a study of professional development schools in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Professional development schools are schools within the Jefferson County Public Schools that have entered into a collaboration with the University of Louisville as an internship site for student teachers. The authors surveyed 1,065 teachers and 85 administrators in 24 schools. The questionnaire contained 87 closed-ended questions and 7 open-ended questions. The response rate was 93.6 percent.

The survey addressed 17 efficacy questions involving teacher empowerment. Teachers reported the greatest influence over classroom issues such as instructional

methods, pupil behavior standards, progress reports to parents, and evaluating student teachers. The respondents believed that they had the least influence over evaluating teachers, and selecting student teachers. They also responded that they had a low level of agreement with statements that addressed decision making, especially concerning indicators for faculty performance. The teachers also did not believe that they had adequate time to promote shared decision making, or strong faculty participation in the decision-making process.

Administrators indicated that they believed teachers have more decision-making powers than the teachers themselves reported. This inconsistency in the perceptions of the extent of teachers' decision-making power can affect the success of SBDM. Administrators must have a clear understanding of teachers' beliefs in their empowerment. If there is not an agreement concerning the level of teachers' decision-making power, teacher members of the SBDM council will become disillusioned and choose not to participate in the process.

The study of Rusco and Whitford (1991) was conducted prior to the implementation of KERA and mandatory SBDM councils. Teachers had little opportunity to be involved in a decentralized form of the decision-making process. Studies indicate that the decentralization of the decision-making process has the potential of increasing job satisfaction and self-efficacy in teachers.

Robertson and Kwong (1994) found that there is an increase in job satisfaction and self-efficacy when schools engage in school-based decision making. These authors conducted a study of 57 schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Surveys were sent out to all members of school leadership councils at 156 Los Angeles Unified School District buildings. The schools selected for the final study were those that had returned at least 75 percent of their council members' surveys. The survey instrument consisted of 126 items. The survey was developed using a 4-point Likert-type scale. The

authors found that the employees at the SBDM schools were frequently more satisfied with their jobs and were more productive than employees of schools that did not have SBDM. The report did not indicate what type of job satisfaction scale was used, or how they defined “job satisfaction.” The data indicated that this was more likely when there was a decentralization of information, knowledge, and rewards as well as power.

The research of Wholsetter, Smyer, and Mohrmann (1994) supports the hypothesis that increased participation promotes increased satisfaction in school-based management council members. In a previously cited study of successful school-based management schools, Wohlstetter, Smyer, and Mohrman (1994) concluded that extrinsic rewards were not the sole motivators for teachers to continue to participate in the SBDM Council. The authors stated that survey participants also indicated that intrinsic satisfaction was important. The respondents stated that they found it rewarding to have the power to make decisions, have input into the innovations in curriculum and instruction, and better address the needs of the students.

Johnson and Logan (2000) conducted a study of self-efficacy and participation in SBDM councils in Kentucky. They surveyed 206 school councils in the state of Kentucky. The self-efficacy of school council members was measured through a pilot-tested School Council Efficacy Scale. They found that the teachers on the council had a higher level of self-efficacy concerning decisions made in their roles as council members than teachers that did not participate in school based decision-making councils.

Newkirk and Klotz (2002) also studied self-efficacy in school based management schools as compared to schools that did not participate in SBDM. Additional variables studied were: age, gender, years of teaching experience, years at the present school, grade-level assignment, and education degrees held by participants. One hundred teachers in SBDM schools and 100 teachers in schools that did not implement SBDM in

Mississippi were interviewed. The results indicated that there were significant differences in self-efficacy among teachers in SBDM schools as opposed to those that do not have SBDM when looking at years of teaching experience, years of teaching at present school, and grade level experience. The data also indicated that there were no significant differences in these variables within the SBDM schools. The conclusion was that these variables were not significant predictors of teacher self-efficacy.

Research has indicated that teachers participating on an SBDM Council may have a more positive feeling of accomplishment and productivity than those teachers who have not chosen to participate on an SBDM Council (Johnson & Logan, 2000; Halepota, 2005). The literature further indicated that these intrinsic rewards are more important to teachers than many extrinsic rewards that are offered (Newton & Hughey, 2000). In general, research indicates a feeling of ownership in the workplace may generate a feeling of self-efficacy.

A Feeling of Ownership

Consistent with this idea of need for involvement literature suggests that creating opportunities for involvement in the decision-making process is an important step toward developing a climate that promotes a feeling of ownership (Siegel & Fruchter, 2002; Southward, Muldoon, & Porter, 1997). Ownership refers to the belief that employees have a stake in the future of the organization. This attitude of proprietorship is derived from the ability to influence decisions through participatory management. Linquist and Mauriel's (1989) study indicated that teachers develop a sense of ownership in the school through school-based decision-making councils.

Lindquist and Mauriel (1989) conducted a four-year longitudinal study of two school districts. The first district was a suburban metropolitan school system and the other was located outside of a large metropolitan area. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, archival research, and site observations. *The findings were described*

in the form of qualitative case studies. In their conclusions, the authors found that participation in decision-making councils would lead to a feeling of ownership, which in turn is believed to lead to a higher level of acceptance of and cooperation with implementation of the decisions. In the long run, this would produce greater job satisfaction. The authors believed that the sense of ownership will also breed an environment of cooperation in the implementation of new policies.

Cross and Reitzug (1995) conducted a two year study of site-based management schools. They conducted the study in six Midwest urban districts: four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. Four of the schools were located in large urban districts, two were in smaller districts. The authors observed site-based council meetings and interviewed parents, teachers, and principals. These authors also studied the school documents related to school-based decision making.

Cross and Reitzug's (1995) findings were formed into six lessons for developing ownership within the school. The six lessons included building a climate of trust, creating meaningful staff involvement, and allowing enough time for school members to see the success of SBDM decisions. In conclusion, the authors posed the rhetorical question: "Who better to own city schools than those who have the greatest stake in the education of their students?" (p. 19). Research indicates that the optimum way to develop this sense of ownership in the school's stakeholders is to provide teachers with the right to make decisions involving professional matters.

Southard, Muldoon, and Porter (1997) studied existing and former members of school councils in the Leon County, Florida schools and found a positive relationship between participating in SBDM and a feeling of ownership. Among the conclusions in their study, the authors found that the majority of the respondents believed that SBDM provided a means to empower stakeholders, created a feeling of ownership, and gave an opportunity to participate in the decisions being made for their schools.

Most literature suggests a correlation between teachers' perceptions of a feeling of ownership and participation in SBDM councils (Siegel & Fruchter, 2002; Southard, Muldoon, & Porter, 1997). The data showed that teachers who sit on an SBDM council have a stronger feeling of ownership in their work environment than nonparticipants. The data further indicated that the belief in ownership in the work environment is directly related to the level of workplace democracy.

Workplace Democracy

Workplace democracy is a fundamental tenet of SBDM and is closely related to feelings of ownership. This term refers to the belief that employees have a right to make decisions concerning professional matters. The workplace democracy theory can be considered a rewording of Cross' and Reitzug's (1995) question to ask: "Who better to make decisions than those who have the greatest stake in the education of their students?"

The concept of workplace democracy is the core of the entire school-based management process. Educators are afforded the right to make decisions concerning the educational programs within the schools. The concept of providing nonsupervisory personnel decision-making rights has been successful in organizations for years. Peters and Waterman (1982) described companies they determined to be excellent in leadership and effectiveness through the measurements previously mentioned. These organizations have consistently exhibited a high level of autonomy and low-key supervision. The education system in the United States has begun to embrace this organizational practice, but it has been slow in developing, and has frequently faltered.

The slow development of autonomy and workplace democracy may be a direct result of the authoritarian role of the principal. Wall (1997) conducted a study of teachers' perceptions of empowerment in school-based decision-making schools and schools that did not incorporate school-based decision making. The data indicated that *there were no significant differences in the SBDM and non-SBDM schools in five of six*

subscales of empowerment, which were: decision making, status, professional growth, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact. The question becomes, why did teachers in SBDM schools fail to perceive more empowerment than those teachers in schools without councils? The author surmised that the principals may still exhibit authoritarian control over the decision making process. Under these circumstances, the teachers may not have challenged the position of the principal; therefore, they would not feel as empowered by the SBDM process.

Duke et al. (1981) found that teachers believe that participation comes with a cost of time and sometimes loss of classroom autonomy. The data has also supported the notion that teachers believe that there are intrinsic rewards of feelings of ownership and self-efficacy. There are certain factors that may affect these teacher perceptions of costs and benefits.

Factors That May Affect Teachers' Perceptions of Costs and Benefits

Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) indicated that teachers perceive that participating in activities relating to site-based council involve costs and benefits. Certain factors such as principal involvement, length of teaching experience, desire for promotion, permanency of SBDM, duration of implementation may influence these perceptions.

Principal Involvement

The principal's level of participation can influence the success of SBDM in a positive or negative manner (Southard, Muldoon, & Porter, 1997; David, 1994; Lindaur, Garth, & Richardson, 1997; Yantski, 1998). The above studies have shown that many school administrators see reform in their own best interest and will support the SBDM process.

Weiss (1995) conducted a five-year longitudinal study of 12 high schools in different parts of the country. Half of the high schools had implemented some form of

shared decision-making and half of the schools were being governed by traditional leadership programs. Data were collected by individual interviews of teachers, principals, assistant principals, and other staff members such as guidance counselors and librarians. The questionnaire used a structured, open-ended response format. The focus of the study was to determine how decisions were made, what types of decisions were discussed, and what topics were involved in decision making. The results were reported in a qualitative format. According to Weiss (1995), the data indicated that principals perceived reform was in their own best interest. They believed that embracing SBDM would make them appear as “champions of change.” Weiss (1995) also found that half of the administrators perceived the current school system to be failing and believed that SBDM was an alternative to the status quo, with teachers providing input for change.

In a study conducted by Newton and Winter (1999) the results indicated that teachers’ satisfaction was higher when principals acted as SBDM chair. Schoolteachers rated the job descriptions for the position of SBDM member. Content-validated descriptions were used. The study design was a 2x2x3 analysis of variance. The independent variables were school council job attributes (instructional leadership, management), the role of the principal as a council member (chair, member with a teacher as the chair), and the teacher’s school level (elementary school, middle school, or high school). The dependent variable was the teacher reaction to the school council job.

Data indicated an interaction effect over the two variables: instructional leadership and management. When a teacher chaired the council, there was no variance in the teacher’s rating of the position. When a principal chaired the committee, the teachers rated the job with instructional leadership attributes higher than with management attributes.

As previously stated, the Office of Education Accountability has recorded multiple cases of accusations of principals attempting to influence teachers concerning

the voting process involved with SBDM. Several studies also show that some teachers perceive principals as influencing the outcome of SBDM council decisions through manipulation.

Consistent with this idea, Spaulding (1994) conducted a case study of a principal in a south-central Texas school that had used school-based management for approximately five months. The principal of the school was recommended for the study because she was determined to be effective in facilitating school-based decision making. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, and observations of participants in the school-based decision making process. Spaulding (1994) was attempting to determine strategies used by the principal to influence teachers in SBDM. Spaulding's (1994) qualitative study included a description of the techniques used by the principal to influence votes. She found that teachers perceived the principal to influence the outcome of SBDM council decisions through manipulation of teacher suggestions, use of voting techniques, planting of information, the exchange of principal favors in support for desired teacher behaviors, and use of expert knowledge.

Research does not address how the principals' involvement affects teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits. There is also little information that correlates teachers' perceptions of the principal in the decision-making process, and teachers' desire for promotion.

Participants' Desire for Promotion

Some potential administrators believe that promotions are filled not only according to ability, but also through political favoritism. David (1992) alluded to this perception in the first year of her five-year study concerning SBDM in Kentucky: "I would not have been hired had it not been for site-based [decision-making]. They looked at my credentials and not my politics" (p. 5). Involvement in the SBDM process may cause others to see the individual as a leader. Conversely, conflict with administrators

may cause participants that desire a promotion to shy away from SBDM activities.

Prospective administrators may perceive sitting on an SBDM council as placing themselves in opposition to the desires of administrators and therefore in peril for promotions. Daniel and Shay (1995) surveyed teachers in 12 Kentucky schools. The study involved cluster sampling of Eastern Kentucky schools. The sample consisted of seven SBDM schools and five non-SBDM schools. Participants completed a survey instrument with a Likert scale. The purpose of the instrument was to solicit information that was specific to Kentucky SBDM procedures. A chi square analysis of the data was implemented to determine relationship among attitudes toward school-based decision making. These authors stated that many teachers believe that SBDM would increase the level of conflict between teachers and administrators. This conflict could result in teachers with potential to be administrators declining the opportunity to sit on an SBDM council.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory (1992) conducted a five-year study of the implementation of KERA. This study involved four rural Kentucky school districts. The researchers involved with this study produced results from their field notes. The respondents were asked: "How did you vote on SBDM, or how would you vote if a vote were taken today (or if you were permitted to vote)?" Fifty-two percent of the teachers were in favor of SBDM, 10 percent were against, and 26 percent were not sure. Of the 10 percent of the respondents that were opposed to SBDM, three subjects stated that the major reasons for voting against SBDM is that they believed that it would increase the politics in the school.

These data indicate that, for some teachers, there is a fear of increased political activity within the school through SBDM. Politics will frequently accompany promotion attempts, but there is no research that correlates the SBDM participants' desire for promotion to their perceptions of costs and benefits of sitting on the council.

The impact of the effect of SBDM on promotions may be limited. One study showed that the majority of teachers do not have a strong desire for promotion. Metlife, Inc. (2003) conducted research that surveyed 1,017 public school teachers in grades K-12. The interviews were conducted either by phone or through the internet. When asked, "How interested are you in becoming a principal?": eighty-one percent answered Not very/Not at all interested. This response was spread equally across elementary and secondary teachers.

Length of Teaching Experience

There is also no research available correlating the SBDM teacher participants' perceptions of costs and benefits and their length of teaching experience. Literature indicated that job security was an important variable with participation on the SBDM council. Sacken (1994) stated that, even though the formal authority is spread through the council, the fact that there is one person that controls the members of the council contradicts that theory. Sacken (1994) also contended that the fact that one member had the power to reward, punish, hire, and fire members of the council made that member "more equal than others."

Educators who have tenure have less fear of punishment through dismissal from their teaching position than non-tenured teachers. In Kentucky, tenure is acquired after four years of successful employment as a teacher. Also, Kentucky school regulations prohibit a member of the SBDM Council from being involuntarily transferred from the school where they are a member of the SBDM Council. An involuntary transfer is when a teacher is moved to another school because their teaching position is no longer available. An involuntary transfer would be more likely to affect a teacher with little seniority, since teachers with the least seniority in certification areas within the schools are individuals that often receive the involuntary transfers. According to Steve Neal, Executive Director of JCTA, the contractual agreement between JCTA and JCPS requires

that the teacher with the least senior teacher possible be overstaffed. The possible exception is that if the overstaff causes the building to fall out of compliance with the designated racial balance, then the least senior teacher within that minority would be skipped (2007).

There is no information to determine how these factors would affect the perception of cost and benefits of teacher participation on an SBDM council.

Permanency of SBDM

Although there is little literature that indicates that teachers must believe that the reform movement in which they are involved is a permanent change in education if they are to develop ownership of the program, it is believed that this is frequently the case. The administration must actively support the change to develop the belief that the reform is not a “passing fad.” One study that addresses the issue of the permanency of SBDM is Weiss’ (1995) longitudinal study of 12 high schools. In the study, the author reports teachers’ self-interests, beliefs, and knowledge “propelled more of them toward defending the status quo than championing school reform” (p. 585). Weiss (1995) stated that for teachers to be active participants in the change, they must see this as a permanent part of the school structure. Weiss further contended that this change must be supported from the district level to the classroom level with time, money, and training. The author also stated that unless the teachers perceive SBDM as permanent, authentic, and that they truly hold the power, teachers will not actively participate in the reform movement.

The above research by Weiss (1995) has provided information concerning the need for teachers’ acceptance of SBDM as a permanent component for them to participate in decision-making activities. The level of acceptance may also be affected by the extent to which the potential council members are involved in their teachers’ professional organization responsible for contract negotiations.

Level of Participation within the Teacher's

Professional Organization

Research indicates that SBDM can potentially develop conflicts with collective bargaining activities (Hess, 2005; Bascia, 1998; Nina, 1998). As the conflict with the teachers' organization increases, active participants of this professional organization may choose to avoid participation in SBDM activities. White (1989) stated that SBDM could cause conflict between the administration and the teachers' professional organization that collectively bargains teachers' contracts. The author stated that the allocation of administrative duties to the teachers will involve school staff in decisions normally developed by the teachers' contract. An individual that is an avid supporter of the contract may hesitate to support an activity that will weaken the organization's strength.

Research is unavailable that provides information concerning teachers' professional organization activities and the teacher participants of the SBDM council. A recent research of the literature by Bascia (1998) did indicate that union members have an impact on how the teachers' professional organizations address the issue of SBDM participation. The author stated the professional organizations are the representatives for the teachers. The organization's leadership is determined by the local teachers. The members are polled concerning their issues and priorities. This would indicate that members would have a direct impact on how professional organizations react to contractual issues involving SBDM, but the research does not indicate SBDM teacher participants' level of participation in the teachers' professional organization. Teachers may perceive the conflict between contractual agreements and SBDM as compromising their standing in their teacher associations. This level of conflict may change as the duration of implementation lengthens.

Duration of Implementation

Duration of implementation within the school has an effect on the direction of the school council, and possibly the perceptions that teachers hold of its effectiveness (Rodriques & Slate, 2001). Studies show that SBDM councils focus on more global issues after the first or second year of implementation. David (1994) cited teachers' belief in the improvement in the decision-making process over time. The author quoted a teacher that stated that in the beginning stages of SBDM the council was perceived as a grievance board, but over a three-year period became an umbrella organization for different committees.

In the first year of implementation, school-based decision making was directed towards development of the decision-making structure. David (1992) found that the first year of the SBDM council in Kentucky schools produced questions, concerns, and conflicts. David (1992) stated that this was a sign of progress because KERA entailed complex changes. The author also found that during the first year of implementation of SBDM, much of the time was spent developing a council structure which involved state mandated operational policies. When David conducted her study, the use of corporal punishment was being debated throughout the state. Therefore, many of the SBDM decisions involved discipline. Other areas involved extracurricular activities such as proms and cheerleading tryouts. The council also made facilities decisions from cafeteria use to lockers.

This level of decision making in the early years of an SBDM body may be significant in teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits of sitting on an SBDM council. Teachers will only be interested in participating in the decision-making process if they believe they are making important decisions. Issues that seem unimportant to teachers or councils that make few decisions may increase the teachers' belief that sitting on the council is a cost, and diminish the belief that there are benefits.

In a study of the literature concerning school-based management council implemented in Kentucky, Van Meter (1994) described the development of SBDM councils as progressing through three separate stages. He stated that the first stage of implementation is an orientation and start-up period. During this time, members participate in formal training and professional development activities that are centered around SBDM issues. Van Meter (1994) supported David's (1992) study in his hierarchy. The process referred to in David's study correlated to Van Meter's second stage of development. During this period, Van Meter contended that council issues involve discipline and extra curricular activities. He believed that most councils then move to the third phase in which he contended that discussion and decisions begin to center on the improvement of student academics, which in turn will improve the school's KERA accountability statistics. The purpose of implementing KERA was to improve student academic success; therefore, the length of time that a council has been formed will be significant in affecting teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits. As teachers move to Van Meter's (1994) third level of SBDM implementation feelings of self-efficacy and ownership will likely increase.

Rodrigues and Slate (2001) conducted a study that supported the theory that self-efficacy and ownership must increase through the time of implementation. The purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which the principals and teachers agreed on the degree of SBDM implementation, and their degree of agreement concerning support for SBDM. A total of 2,128 respondents consisting of teachers and principals in site-based management schools in Texas were surveyed. The 73-question survey addressed SBDM implementation, training for committee members, stakeholder involvement, support, and planning.

Rodrigues and Slate (2001) concluded that districts and schools should understand that SBDM takes time to implement. Because of this, improvements will be slow and

incremental, but SBDM should include all stakeholders for the outcomes to be most effective for the educational system.

Research suggests that participants of SBDM must see the progression to full decision making if they are to continue to feel a sense of ownership and self-efficacy. Lindquist and Mauriel (1989) concluded that SBDM must actively produce changes for ownership and support to continue. These authors stated that limiting the role of council members to an advisory status or a voice for the administration may cause the participants to lose their motivation. This, in turn, will diminish the sense of support and ownership.

Research has further indicated that teachers must see that SBDM is actively producing improvements in education for them to develop ownership and support of the movement. Newton and Hugby (2000) conducted a study in a mid-sized Kentucky school district. The schools were involved in mandated school-based decision making. Teachers were asked to read and evaluate a message directed toward the recruitment of SBDM council members. The message detailed the informal rewards that were being offered at several schools. The rewards included financial awards for the school and improved student achievement.

The results of the survey indicated that the benefits did not attract teachers to participate in school council activities. Inexperienced teachers rated the job descriptions more positively than the experienced teachers. The authors found that the disgruntled teachers initially supported the reform movement, but later became dissatisfied because of the limited outcomes that were achieved.

This perception of SBDM as a component of change develops through time. However, there is little information that correlates the duration of time that SBDM has been implemented to teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits of sitting on an SBDM council.

Summary

A review of the literature has provided information concerning the teachers' perceptions of the cost and benefits of sitting on school-based councils. The review of the literature has also provided background information concerning possible variables that may affect the teachers' perceptions the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based council. The latter variables were: (a) the number of years that school-based decision making has been implemented in the school, (b) the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process, (c) the years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform, (e) participants' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) participants' level of involvement in the teachers' professional organization that is responsible for contract negotiations. Information is currently unavailable that reveals how these factors will affect the teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits. The following questions will be instrumental in guiding this study concerning perceptions of the costs and benefits teachers sitting on a school-based decision making council.

Research Questions

Research Question One

What is the relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and time demands involved in participating in an SBDM council?

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and teachers' perceptions of workplace democracy in schools that implement SBDM?

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between the teachers' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and the number of years of teaching experience held by teachers that participate on an SBDM council?

Research Question Four

What is the relationship between teacher perception of limitations of collective bargaining in SBDM schools and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of threats to career advancement and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position?

Research Question Six

What is the relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership change within the school?

Research Question Seven

What is the relationship between the SBDM council participant's perception of threats to career advancement and the SBDM council participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position?

Research Question Eight

What is the relationship between the teacher members of the SBDM council's belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and the teacher council member's feeling of ownership within the school?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes procedures for identifying significant correlations among teacher beliefs about service on school-based decision-making councils. The discussion will also involve procedures for determining whether certain independent variables affect teacher beliefs that sitting on a school-based decision-making council: (a) incurs costs, and (b) provides benefits.

This chapter includes the sections: research questions and research hypotheses, population, survey procedures, instrumentation, dependent and independent variables, description of the statistical analysis of data, techniques to ensure validity, techniques to ensure reliability, and limitations of the research.

Research Questions and Research Hypotheses

Research Question One

What is the relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and time demands upon teacher participants sitting on SBDM councils?

Research Hypothesis One

There is a positive relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and the time demands upon teacher participants sitting on SBDM councils.

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and their perceptions of workplace democracy?

Research Hypothesis Two

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and their perceptions of workplace democracy.

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and their number of years of teaching experience?

Research Hypothesis Three

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and their number of years of teaching.

Research Question Four

What is the relationship between SBDM teacher participants' perception of limitations of collective bargaining procedures by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Hypothesis Four

There is a positive relationship between SBDM teacher participants' perception of limitations of collective bargaining procedures by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher

participants' involvement in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position?

Research Hypothesis Five

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position.

Research Question Six

What is the relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership change within the school?

Research Hypothesis Six

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership of change within the school.

Research Question Seven

What is the relationship between the dependent variable time demands placed on teachers in SBDM and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency

of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Hypothesis Seven

There is a significant relationship between the dependent variable time demands placed on teachers in SBDM and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Question Eight

What is the relationship between the dependent variable feeling of self-efficacy provided by decision making and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' position belief in the permanency of SBDM (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative, and (f) teachers' level or participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Hypothesis Eight

There is a positive relationship between the dependent variable feeling of self-efficacy provided by decision making and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the

principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' position belief in the permanency of SBDM (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative, and (f) teachers' level or participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Population

The population for this self-administered survey included teachers who were presently elected members of a school-based decision-making council. This group consisted of the entire population of educators sitting on councils during the school year of 2007-2008 in Jefferson County Public Schools, located in Jefferson County, Kentucky. The total number of subjects is approximately 400 council members. Respondents included teachers from all levels of education including: elementary school, middle school, high school, and schools designed to assist students with special needs.

Survey Procedures

A review of the literature concerning variables that affect teachers' willingness to sit on a school-based decision-making council was used to identify components of this survey. Questions were specifically developed to elicit teachers' beliefs concerning the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision making council. Questions were structured around the costs and benefits that were identified in *Studying Shared Decision Making in Schools* (Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1981), and independent variables that may effect costs and benefits.

The self-administered survey used in this research was reviewed by the Human Subject Review Committee at the University of Louisville. Next, the Director of Research for the Jefferson County Public School System reviewed the proposed survey.

This review is mandatory for all instruments being disseminated through this school system. The questionnaire was also be reviewed by a member of the Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) school system who has provided procedural advice and guidance to members of school councils.

The questionnaire was placed on the Survey Monkey website. A letter of informed consent was sent to participants via e-mail to their JCPS e-mail accounts. The letter also included instructions for accessing the survey. The letter provided the web link for the survey and a link to opt out of the survey.

Administering the survey by placing the questionnaire on the JCPS website provided an expedient format for returning the instrument. While online surveys have many benefits, they also have a potential for limitations. Pearson (2006) stated on their website that online surveys are often easily and quickly assembled and produce a high response rate because of the direct link to the survey through the e-mail announcement. These authors warned that data may be skewed because the respondent must have internet service available. This limitation has been addressed. Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) provides all faculty and staff internet access.

Schonlau, Fricker, and Elliott (2002) reviewed the literature concerning conducting research surveys through e-mail and websites. They stated that internet surveys should be considered when the target population has a membership in an affiliation with an organization that has a list of e-mail addresses. They also stated that it should be a moderately large group for this type of survey to be cost-effective. The target population for this survey meets both criteria.

The early field-tested survey required the participants to be responsible for addressing and returning the instrument. This format provided the participant with immediate access to the instrument. In addition, the participants were required to mail the previously completed survey. This format provided immediate return. The convenience of the internet survey provided an opportunity for a higher rate of return for the survey.

Instrumentation

Data for this study was collected through the questionnaire format of survey research. The questionnaire elicited a combination of questions answered through a Likert scale and through narrative responses. The Likert scale provided numerical responses of 1-5, with one indicating strongly disagree, five indicating strongly agree, and three representing the midpoint. Qualitative information was compiled through open-ended responses.

McMillan and Schumacher (1989) have stated that it is important to match the design of the instrument with the research questions. The authors contended that this is necessary to provide the most accurate responses possible. The survey pertaining to school-based decision making was developed to identify teachers' attitudes concerning sitting on a school council. Specifically, the survey was developed to elicit teachers' beliefs concerning the costs and benefits of participation in the decision-making process that were identified through a research of the literature. The survey instrument was designed to relate specifically to the research questions.

Opportunities for open-ended responses were provided after the quantitative section of the survey. These questions provide subjects with the opportunity to express

their feeling on the subject matter and should be the questions that the respondents have a strong desire to complete. Initially, the open-ended questions were at the beginning of the survey. A pilot study of the survey was conducted and respondents indicated that they were more comfortable with this section being placed at the end of the survey.

The qualitative responses immediately followed the section containing quantitative answers. Through the “comment” section, the respondent was provided with the opportunity to expand on answers that had been completed with a check mark. This approach assisted in providing further details to questions that may be difficult to answer in agree and disagree responses. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1985) believed that the narrative responses provide the respondents with more freedom to express their opinions and the researcher a wider range of responses. The narrative section of this survey also allowed the respondent to provide input that is significant to the results of this study, but may not be elicited in other questions.

A variation of this questionnaire was field tested in 1992, revised, and field tested again in 1998. Also, in 1999 the survey was reviewed by a focus group. In 1992, the survey was administered to teachers employed in an urban school in Jefferson County, Kentucky. The questionnaire elicited responses from teachers involved in participatory management activities. The participatory management style of decision making was a voluntary program similar to SBDM. However, participatory management provided JCPS teachers less decision-making power. Following the administration of this survey, questions were added and deleted.

Certain demographic questions were deleted. Respondents indicated a belief that they could be identified through the gender question. It was determined that this

information was not vital to the study; therefore, it was eliminated. Questions were also revised to be more explicit to the components of school-based decision making.

These adjustments were made to provide an instrument that would elicit clearer and more comprehensive answers. In 1998, the revised survey was then field tested with teacher participants of an SBDM council in a suburban school within the Jefferson County Public School District. Responses on the survey and comments concerning clarity of the instrument were reviewed. The instrument was then revised to attain a more accurate picture of the respondents' perceptions.

In 1999, the original instrument designed for this study was revised after it was reviewed by a focus group. The group consisted of individuals that had been trained in survey research methods. Changes were made in the instrument on the basis of suggestions of the focus group.

In 2006, the revised survey was field tested with eight teachers that were past participants of a school-based council in the Jefferson County Public School District. Past council participants were recruited to prevent present members of the school-based councils being introduced to the survey prior to the actual research data collection.

The respondents were given a content validity survey that included Likert scale ratings of items, as well as the opportunity for narrative responses. The instructions for the questionnaire asked the respondents to circle one number for each item to indicate their opinion of its content appropriateness. Each item was rated using a scale where the number one indicated Very Poor and the number five indicated Very Good. The instructions also explained that some questions had a negative slant and that such items *would be reverse weighted for scoring purposes.*

The survey was divided into sections, each corresponding to an attitude variable. For example, the first section corresponded to the variable Permanency of School Councils. It contained three items the author designed to measure the variable. The instrument contained a definition of each variable before the questions designed to measure it.

Mean scores for the eight teachers in the content validity study were tabulated for each item. The mean appropriateness ratings are shown in. As shown in the table, all ratings were 3.25 or above, with a large number of items rated 3.75 to 4.50.

Table 1

SBDM Draft Questionnaire Items Rated for Content Appropriateness

Questionnaire Items	Mean Rating
1. Permanency of School Councils	
School councils are a permanent component of reform that will remain as part of school governance.	4.62
Eventually, SBDM will be removed as a component of the Kentucky Education Reform Act.	3.75
In the next five years, SBDM will be replaced with another form of decision making.	4.37
2. Involvement in the Teacher Union	
I attend meetings for the Jefferson County Teachers' Union.	4.50

Table 1 (Continued)

Questionnaire Items	Mean Rating
I have never attended a JCTA meeting.	4.00
At one time, I have held an office for the Jefferson County Teachers' Association.	4.13
I believe that the actions of JCTA interfere with my role as an educator.	4.13
Jefferson County Teachers' Association is effective in protecting my rights as a teacher.	4.75
Many conflicts have had to be resolved between the SBDM procedures and JCTA.	4.75
3. Time Costs	
The time that I have spent with school council activities is balanced with my sense of accomplishment.	3.50
The time that I have spent with the school council has interfered with my teaching duties.	4.62
The time that I have spent with school council activities is not balanced with my sense of accomplishment.	3.50
The time that I spend working on activities for the council is what I anticipated when I became a member of the SBDM Council.	4.00

Table 1 (Continued)

Questionnaire Items	Mean Rating
I have spent more time on council activities than I had anticipated when running for the position.	4.25
4. Collegial Disfavor	
The majority of the faculty support decisions that they do not agree because of their belief that the decision was arrived at in a fair manner.	3.62
Members of the faculty have expressed resentment for decisions that I have made as a member of the SBDM Council.	3.87
My colleagues enact the decisions that I make as a member of the SBDM Council.	3.75
5. Desire for Promotion	
In the future, I anticipate working in an administrative position.	4.50
I have no desire to work in an administrative position within the system.	4.37
My desire is to eventually become a principal within the district.	4.50
I have no desire to become a principal within the district.	4.37
6. Subversion of Collective Bargaining by SBDM	
Decisions made through SBDM have had no effect on the rights provided in my contract.	3.37

Table 1 (Continued)

Questionnaire Items Rating	Mean
I believe that decisions made through SBDM have threatened my contractual rights	4.62
7. Principal Involvement	
The principal at my school allows the SBDM Council to make decisions.	4.75
The principal at my school sets the agenda for the SBDM meetings with little or no input from the council.	4.75
The principal at my school does not implement changed developed by the SBDM Council.	4.62
8. Teacher Autonomy	
Since the implementation of SBDM in my school, I believe that I have had more of an opportunity to make curricula decisions for my classroom.	3.57
SBDM has provided me with the opportunity to make curricula decisions that I was unable to make in the past.	4.42
I believe that SBDM has eliminated my decision making in the classroom.	4.43

Table 1 (Continued)

Questionnaire Items	Mean Rating
Since the implementation of SBDM in my school, more decisions concerning my classroom have been made by others.	4.57
9. Workplace Democracy	
SBDM Council decisions represent the consensus of the faculty in my school.	4.62
SBDM Council decisions are not representative of the opinions of the faculty in my school.	4.62
Faculty members at my school are given an opportunity to provide input prior to the SBDM Council implementing changes.	4.62
The faculty at my school has stated that they don't believe that they are given an ample opportunity to provide input prior to SBDM Council making decisions.	4.75
SBDM decisions are made only by the council members.	4.75
10. Self-efficacy	
I believe that my work with SBDM Council had provided valuable changes for the school.	4.62
The input that I provide on the school council has little impact on the decisions that are made by SBDM.	4.62

Table 1 (Continued)

Questionnaire Items	Mean Rating
11. Ownership	
I am involved in SBDM because I believe that it provides me with a stake in changes that are made at my school.	4.62
Decisions made by the school council are made without commitment from the staff and faculty.	4.50
Sitting on the school council has provided me with an opportunity to make real changes that will improve the school environment.	4.25
I am not interested in the decisions made on the school council, I don't believe that they will have much of an impact on the climate of the school.	4.12
12. Career Advancement in SBDM Participation	
I believe that sitting on the school council provides an opportunity for me to demonstrate my leadership skills.	4.37
Sitting on the SBDM Council places me at risk of conflict with administrators that are in a position to make decisions concerning my promotions.	4.62
I believe that sitting on the school council is a stepping stone to an administrative position.	4.12

Several items were revised based on comments and discussions with pilot study participants. Item one under *Subversion of Collective Bargaining* by SBDM and item one under *Teacher Autonomy* received lower mean scores due to typographical errors. These errors were corrected.

Also, wording of several questions was changed to provide more clarity and to better communicate the meaning of the questions. Participants did not understand the meaning of the term *accomplishment* in several questions. It was decided to replace that word with clearer language.

Several items concerning the Jefferson County Teachers Association (JCTA) elicited comments from respondents. Respondents believed that item six under *Involvement in the Teachers Union* implied that the phrase “interfered with my ability to make decisions” meant that JCTA would illegally interfere with the decision making process. This term was changed to “limited my ability to make changes.” Also, it was recommended that the term JCTA be used consistently, rather than interchanging it with the term *union*.

In summary, the pilot study revealed that the majority of items were judged by the respondents to have content validity. In response to the comments of the participants, changes were made for several items that had ambiguous language or were not communicating the intentions of the researcher.

Dependant and Independent Variables

The dependent variables utilized in this study were developed from results provided in the study conducted by Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981). These variables are: (a) time demands placed on teachers through participation in SBDM; (b) loss of autonomy; (c) risks of collegial disfavor during the decision-making process; (d) subversion of collective bargaining; (e) threats to career advancement through participation on SBDM councils; (f) feelings of self-efficacy provided by school decision making; (g) feeling of ownership in the important policy decisions; and (h) belief that there is workplace democracy.

Independent variables were developed through a study of the literature. They were: (a) the length of time that school-based decision making has been implemented in the school; (b) the teachers' attitude concerning the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process; (c) years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants; (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of school reform; (e) the SBDM participants' desire for promotion to an administrative position and; (f) the SBDM participants' level of involvement in the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations.

Analysis of Data

Descriptive statistics was used to summarize data in the questionnaire. This included frequency distributions on categorical variables and means and standard deviations for continuous variables. Research hypotheses were

addressed by computing Pearson correlation coefficients between variables named in research questions one through six. Multiple regression analysis was used for research questions seven and eight. Following the reduction and computation of statistical data, qualitative and quantitative results were reported.

Techniques to Insure Validity

Babbie (1985) stated that research based on surveys is weak in validity, but has strong reliability. The author contended that people have a difficult time narrowing their opinions into categories of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. For this reason, he believed that the responses should be considered approximations of the opinions of the subject.

Several steps were taken to strengthen measurement validity. To address the issue of the constraining effects of Likert scale choices, a comment section was included following the quantitative answer section. Also, an open-ended response section was included in the instrument. These open-ended responses provided the respondents the opportunity to provide further information concerning their opinions involving the content of the question.

Content validity refers to the extent that the participants believe that the survey items are representative of all potential areas of the study. Content validity was partly addressed through a thorough review of the literature concerning the components of school-based decision making. Once the review of the literature was completed, the survey questions were developed from the information. These questions were reviewed by a focus group that

was conversant with SBDM and survey methodology. The 20 members of the group were doctoral level students that had been trained in survey methodology and school-based decision making. Each member of the group was provided with a copy of the survey. They were asked to respond to the instrument format, clarity, and content.

The survey was field tested with a group of SBDM participants, and individuals that had previously sat on an SBDM committee. They were asked to respond to the survey and supply comments concerning the instrument format, clarity, and content. Once the pilot survey was completed, the survey was revised to address concerns.

Techniques to Insure Reliability

Prior to addressing research questions one through eight Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients was calculated for each scale in the instrument. The goal was to obtain alpha coefficients of .70 or higher. Table 2 shows the research questions, statistical analysis, and variables in the study.

Table 2

Summary of Research Questions and Statistical Tests Used in the Study

Research Question	Statistical Test	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
1	Correlation Coefficient	Number of years of implementation of SBDM at school	Cost: Time demands of SBDM
2	Correlation Coefficient	Perception of principal's support for SBDM	Benefit: Workplace Democracy
3	Correlation Coefficient	Years of teacher experience	Cost: Loss of autonomy
4	Correlation Coefficient	Involvement with union	Cost: Subversion of collective bargaining
5	Correlation Coefficient	Desire for Promotion	Cost: Threat to career advancement
6	Correlation Coefficient	Belief in permanency of SBDM	Benefit: Sense of ownership of change in the school
7	Multiple Regression	1. Length of time SBDM has been Implemented in the	Cost: Time demands of SBCM

Table 2 (Continued)

Research Question	Statistical Test	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
	Regression	SBDM has been Implemented in the Schools	demands of SBDM
		2. Teacher's perception of principal's support for SBDM	
		3. Teacher's years of teaching experience	
		4. Teacher's belief in the permanency of SBDM	
		5. Teacher's desire for a promotion to an administrative position	
		6. Teacher's level of participation in the union	

Table 2 (Continued)

Research Question	Statistical Test	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
8	Multiple Regression	1. Length of time SBDM has been Implemented in the Schools 2. Teacher's perception of principal's support for SBDM 3. Teacher's years of teaching experience 4. Teacher's belief in the permanency of SBDM 5. Teacher's desire for a promotion to an administrative position 6. Teacher's level of participation in the union activity	Benefit: Self-efficacy

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research questions and hypotheses, population, survey procedures, instrumentation, dependent and independent variables, a description of the statistical analysis of data, and limitations for the research pertaining to teachers' attitudes towards the belief that a number costs and benefits are involved in sitting on a school-based decision-making council. Results will be discussed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The current study examined teacher participants' perceptions of costs and benefits of sitting on a school based decision-making (SBDM) council. The focal population consisted of teachers presently sitting on a school-based decision-making council in Jefferson County Public School System, in Jefferson County, Kentucky. Participants in the study were teachers employed in schools at the K-12 level and special schools.

The total population was 425 participants. Due to internet server conflicts, 340 participants received the invitations. Seventy-five emails were returned undeliverable. An attempt was made to determine the correct e-mail addresses through the assistance of the Jefferson County Public Schools Research Department. This attempt ~~increased~~ the population to 350. Thirty e-mails were returned after a week due to respondents not accessing the message. This brought the total to 320 respondents. Twenty-two recipients opted out of the survey. Data were collected from 112 respondents, which is 40 percent of the total population.

Following the data collection procedures as described in Chapter III, the researcher collected data through a survey website. Participants were sent an invitation to complete an on-line survey via their school e-mail accounts. The invitation contained a letter of informed consent and two links to the *Survey Monkey* website. One link directed them to the survey and one link provided an opportunity to "opt out" of the survey.

The participants were sent a reminder in one week. Another e-mail was sent the following week as a reminder. A third e-mail was sent a week later to thank the participants that had answered the survey and to remind the individuals that had not, that they still had an opportunity respond. The researcher also had an article placed in the *Action*, which is the weekly newsletter for Jefferson County Teachers Association (JCTA). JCTA is the professional organization responsible for contract negotiations with the school district. The article in the organization newsletter *Action* encouraged teachers to complete the survey. Finally, the researcher attended a personnel representatives' meeting for JCTA to ask teachers to complete the survey.

The independent variables were: (a) the length of time that school-based decision making has been implemented in the school; (b) the teachers' attitude concerning the principal's involvement in and support for the decision making process; (c) years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants; (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of school reform; (e) the SBDM participants' desire for promotion to an administrative position and; (f) the SBDM participants' level of involvement in the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations. The dependent variables utilized in this study were developed from results provided in the study conducted by Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981). These variables were: (a) time demands placed on teachers through participation in SBDM; (b) loss of autonomy; (c) risks of collegial disfavor during the decision making process; (d) subversion of collective bargaining (renamed limitations of collective bargaining); (e) threats to career advancement through participation on SBDM councils; (f) feelings of self-efficacy provided by school decision making; (g) feeling of ownership in the

important policy decisions; and (h) belief that there is workplace democracy.

Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated for 10 scales used in the study. Appendix D contains a table showing values of alpha. All values were above .70, with the exception of the scale for Permanency of SBDM, which had a value of .62. The variable Career Advancement was measured with one item, since the items intended to form the scale were below an acceptable value of reliability (i.e., alpha was less than .50).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following eight research questions and hypotheses guided this research.

Research Question One

What is the relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and time demands upon teacher participants sitting on SBDM councils?

Research Hypothesis One

There is a positive relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and the time demands upon teacher participants sitting on SBDM councils.

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and their perceptions of workplace democracy?

Research Hypothesis Two

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and their perceptions of workplace democracy.

Research Question Three

What is the relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and their number of years of teaching experience?

Research Hypothesis Three

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and their number of years of teaching.

Research Question Four

What is the relationship between SBDM teacher participants' perception of limitations of collective bargaining procedures by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Hypothesis Four

There is a positive relationship between SBDM teacher participants' perception of limitations of collective bargaining procedures by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position?

Research Hypothesis Five

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position.

Research Question Six

What is the relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership change within the school?

Research Hypothesis Six

There is a positive relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership of change within the school.

Research Question Seven

What is the relationship between the dependent variable *time demands placed on teachers in SBDM* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and

(f) teachers' level of participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Hypothesis Seven

There is a significant relationship between the dependent variable *time demands placed on teachers in SBDM* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Question Eight

What is the relationship between the dependent variable *feeling of self-efficacy provided by decision making* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' position belief in the permanency of SBDM (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative, and (f) teachers' level or participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Research Hypothesis Eight

There is a positive relationship between the dependent variable *feeling of self-efficacy provided by decision making* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers'

position belief in the permanency of SBDM (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative, and (f) teachers' level or participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

Results of this chapter pertain to (a) results of the pilot study and (b) results of the main study. The results of the study were obtained through quantitative and qualitative analysis of the survey data. Descriptive statistics for the study participants were collected in the areas of: (a) years of teaching experience, (b) administrative certification, (c) educational setting where the teacher participates on the school-based decision-making council, (d) years that the respondent's school has participated in SBDM, (e) the school's yearly annual progress for Kentucky assessment, (f) school's rating in the No School Left Behind assessment, (g) respondent's hours of attendance in professional development in the area of school-based decision-making training.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize data in the questionnaire. This included frequency distributions on categorical variables and means and standard deviations for continuous variables. Research hypotheses were addressed by computing Pearson correlation coefficients between variables named in research questions one through six. Multiple regression analysis was used for research questions seven and eight. Following the reduction and computation of statistical data, qualitative and quantitative results were reported. Data analysis was performed by using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

Qualitative responses were elicited through an open-response question section of the survey. Respondents were asked to describe their greatest professional accomplishments in SBDM, the most important factors in their level of participation in

SBDM, largest burden in participating in SBDM, largest disappointment in SBDM, and an opportunity to expand on any qualitative questions that they would like. This information will be reported through summaries of themes that emerged from the data.

Results of the Pilot Study

The researcher administered the research instrument to a group of pilot participants (N = 8). The purpose of the study was to determine content validity. The participants in the pilot study consisted of teachers that had previously participated in a school-based decision-making council in the Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). This provided the respondents with the background knowledge to respond to the survey, but did not include individuals that would be involved in the major study.

The respondents were given a content validity survey that included Likert scale ratings of items, as well as the opportunity for narrative responses. The instructions for the questionnaire asked the respondents to circle one number for each item to indicate their opinion of its content appropriateness. Each item was rated using a scale where the number one indicated *Very Poor* and the number five indicated *Very Good*. The instructions also explained that some questions had a negative slant and that such items would be reverse weighted for scoring purposes.

The survey was divided into sections, each corresponding to an attitude variable. For example, the first section corresponded to the variable *Permanency of School Councils*. It contained three items the author designed to measure the variable. The instrument contained a definition of each variable before the questions designed to measure it.

Mean scores for the eight teachers in the content validity study were tabulated for

each item. The mean appropriateness ratings were 3.25 or above, with a large number of items rated 3.75 to 4.50.

Descriptive Statistics on Teachers and Schools

Table 3 shows frequency distributions on three variables related to the background of the respondents. As can be seen in the table, more than half of the respondents who answered the question stated they had 10 or more years teaching experience. The great majority of respondents (79 percent) did not have administrative certification. A majority of respondents (more than 50 percent) were employed in the elementary schools, with decreasingly smaller percentage in middle schools and high schools.

Table 4 shows two variables related to SBDM. For the schools where data were available, the majority of the respondents reported that SBDM had been implemented for 10 or more years. Respondents were asked how many hours they had been trained in SBDM. Of those answering this question, most stated they had nine or less hours training.

Three variables pertained to the school's accountability status. As shown in Table 5, a majority of teachers were working in schools that were either in the Meeting Goal or Progressing categories of the Kentucky school accountability system. In terms of categories of the No Child Left Behind Law, the majority of teachers were working in schools that were making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). However, about 32 percent of the teachers reported being in schools that were not making AYP. Those teachers were evenly spread among Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 schools.

Table 3

Frequency distribution for *Number of Years Teaching, Possession of Administrative Certification, and School Setting* (n = 113)

Number of Years Teaching

	n	%
15 or more years	38	33.6
10 to 14 years	23	20.4
5 to 9 years	28	24.8
2 to 4 years	15	13.3
1 year or less	2	1.8
Missing	7	6.2
Total	113	100.0

Administrative Certification

	n	%
Yes	10	8.8
No	89	78.8
Presently in Program	8	7.1
Missing	6	5.3
Total	113	100.0

Table 3 (Continued)

<i>School Setting</i>		
	n	%
Special Education or		
Alternative Placement School	5	4.4
High School	14	12.4
Middle School	22	19.5
Elementary School	66	58.4
Missing	6	5.3
Total	113	100.0

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for *Number of Years SBDM was Implemented at the School* and *Number of Hours of SBDM Training* (n = 113)

<i>Years SBDM Has Been Implemented in the School</i>		
	n	%
10 or more years	31	27.4
8 to 10 years	13	11.5
5 to 7 years	10	8.8
2 to 4 years	11	9.7
Missing	48	42.5
Total	113	100.0

Table 4 (Continued)

<i>Number of Hours of SBDM Training</i>		
	n	%
30 or more hours	5	4.4
25 to 29 hours	2	1.7
20 to 24 hours	2	1.7
15 to 19 hours	5	4.4
10 to 14 hours	17	15.0
5 to 9 hours	22	19.5
0 to 4 hours	31	27.4
Missing	29	25.4
Total	113	100.0

Table 5

Frequency Distribution for Number of Teachers in Schools Categorized by Kentucky Accountability, Number of Teachers in Schools Categorized by No Child Left Behind Criteria, and Number of Teachers in Three Tiers in Category AYP-No.

<i>Kentucky Accountability</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Meeting Goal	53	46.9
Progressing	41	36.3
Needs Assistance	11	9.7
Missing	8	7.1
Total	113	100.0

Table 5 (Continued)

<i>No Child Left Behind Categories</i>		
	n	%
AYP Yes	68	60.2
AYP No	36	31.9
Missing	9	8.0
Total	113	100.0
<i>No Child Left Behind Categories in AYP-No</i>		
	n	%
AYP No Tier 1	11	9.7
AYP No-Tier 2	13	11.5
AYP No-Tier 3	10	8.8
Missing	79	69.9
Total	113	100.0

Statistical Analysis for Research Questions

Research Question One

Research Question One stated: What is the relationship between the number of years of implementation of SBDM in the school and time demands upon teacher participants sitting on SBDM councils? The correlation between the variables, *years of implementation* and *time demands* was .049, $p = .699$. The correlation between these two variables was not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two stated: What is the relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the decision-making process and their perceptions of workplace democracy? The correlation between the variables *principal support* and *workplace democracy* was .648, $p = .000$. The correlation between these two variables was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question Three

Research Question Three stated: What is the relationship between the SBDM teacher participants' perception of loss of autonomy in an SBDM school and their number of years of teaching experience? The correlation between the two variables, *perception of loss of autonomy* and *number of years of teaching experience* was -.026, $p = .789$. The correlation between these two variables was not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question Four

Research Question Four stated: What is the relationship between SBDM teacher participants' perception of limitations of collective bargaining procedures by SBDM and the level of SBDM teacher participants' involvement in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations? The correlation between the two variables, *limitations of collective bargaining* and *involvement in the professional teachers' organization* was .177, $p = .061$. The correlation between these variables was not statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question Five

Research Question Five stated: What is the relationship between the SBDM council teacher participant's perception of career advancement by SBDM participation and the SBDM council teacher participant's desire for promotion to an administrative position? The correlation between the variables, *career advancement* and *desire for promotion* was .340, $p = .000$. The correlation between these variables was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. The variable *Desire for Promotion* was measured by one questionnaire item. In its original format, a multi-item scale for the variable had low internal consistency reliability, as estimated by Cronbach's alpha.

Research Question Six

Research Question Six stated: What is the relationship between the SBDM Council teacher participants' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform and their feeling of ownership change within the school? The correlation between the variables, *permanency of SBDM* and *feeling of ownership* was

.272, $p = .004$. The correlation between the variables was statistically significant at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question 7

Research Question Seven stated: What is the relationship between the dependent variable *time demands placed on teachers in SBDM* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) teachers' level of participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

A regression analysis was performed with time demands placed on teachers in SBDM as the dependent variable, and six predictors. The six predictors used in the regression analysis for this question were years of SBDM, principal support, years of teaching experience, permanency of SBDM, desire for promotion, and involvement in the teachers' professional organization.

Table 6 shows means, standard deviations and intercorrelations among study variables. As can be seen in the table, three predictor variables had a significant bivariate relationship with the dependent variable. The regression equation was statistically significant, $F(6, 57) = 10.66$, $P < .001$. The R square value was .529 (adjusted R squared was .479). Thus, approximately 48 percent of the variance in Time Demands was accounted for by the predictor variables.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviation, and Intercorrelations of Time Demands on Teachers and Six Predictor Variables. (n = 64).

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Time	3.70	.57	.05	.62**	.13	.48**	.13	.28*
1. Years of SBDM	2.97	1.15	-	-.06	.38**	-.01	-.29*	.21
2. Principal Support	3.64	0.89	-	-	.13	.39**	-.04	.05
3. Years of Teaching	3.81	1.11	-	-	-	-.04	-.38**	.16
4. Permanency	3.79	.70	-	-	-	-	.05	.19
5. Promotions	2.54	1.08	-	-	-	-	-	-.05
6. Involvement	3.77	0.59	-	-	-	-	-	-

* $P < .05$ ** $P < .01$

Table 7 shows regression coefficients for the regression equations. As can be seen in the table, there were four significant predictors of Time Demands: Principal Support, Permanency of SBDM, Desire for Promotion, and Involvement in The Teacher Organization. The greater the rating on these scales, the higher the rating for time demands.

Table 7

Summary Statistics or Regression Predictors for Dependent Variable Time

<u>Predictor Variable</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>β</u>
Years of SBDM	.039	.059	.067
Principal Support	.387	.075	.519**
Years of Teaching	.055	.063	.091
Permanency of SBDM	.223	.097	.232**
Desire for Promotion	.129	.067	.209*
Involvement in Teacher Organization	.220	.108	.195*

* $p < .05$,** $p < .01$

Note: For regression equation, $R^2 = .529$, adjusted $R^2 = .479$

Research Question Eight

Research Question Eight stated: What is the relationship between the dependent variable *feeling of self-efficacy provided by decision making* and the set of independent variables: (a) length of time SBDM has been implemented in the school, (b) teachers' perception of the principal's support for SBDM, (c) teachers' years of teaching experience, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM, (e) teachers' desire for

promotion to an administrative, and (f) teachers' level or participation in activities with the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations?

A regression analysis was performed with self-efficacy as the dependent variable and six predictors. The six predictors used in the regression analysis for this question were years of SBDM, principal support, years of teaching experience, permanency of SBDM, desire for promotion, and involvement in the teachers' professional organization.

Table 8 shows means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among variables used for question eight. Two predictor variables had significant Pearson correlations with self-efficacy: principal support and permanency of SBDM. The regression equation was statistically significant, $F(6, 57) = 15.33, p < .01$. The R squared value was .617 (adjusted R squared was .577). Thus, approximately 58 percent of the variance in self-efficacy was accounted for by the predictor variables.

Table 9 shows regression coefficients for the regression equation. There were two significant predictors: principal support and permanency of SBDM. The higher the ratings on these, the higher the rated self-efficacy of teachers.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviation, and Intercorrelations of Self-Efficacy and Six Prediction Variables. (n = 64)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Self Efficacy	3.70	.77	-.18	.74**	-.01	.50**	.12	.06
1. Years of SBDM	2.97	1.15	-	-.06	.34*	-.01	-.29 *	.21.*
2. Principal Support	3.64	0.89	-	-	.13	.40**	-.04	.05
3. Years of Teaching	3.81	1.11	-	-	-	-.04	-.38**	.16
4. Permanency	3.79	.70	-	-	-	-	.05	.19
5. Promotions	2.54	1.08	-	-	-	-	-	-.05
6. Involvement	3.77	0.59	-	-	-	-	-	-

** $p \leq .05$ * $p \leq .01$

Table 9

Summary Statistics or Regression Predictors for Dependent Variable Self-Efficacy

<u>Predictor Variable</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>SEB</u>	<u>β</u>
Years of SBDM	-.023	.594	-.034
Principal Support	.559	.079	.647**
Years of Teaching	-.014	.066	-.020
Permanency of SBDM	.272	.101	.245**
Desire for Promotion	.085	.065	.118
Involvement in Teacher Organization	-.008	.113	-.006

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ Note: Fn regression, $R^2 = .617$, adjusted $R^2 = .577$ **Qualitative Data**

Following the section of the quantitative section of the survey, respondents were asked to complete a section that involved narrative responses. The respondents were asked to respond to five questions concerning the greatest burdens, greatest accomplishments, most important factors, professional disappointment in SBDM, and respondents were given an opportunity to expand on quantitative questions.

Question One

Question one of the qualitative section of the survey asked: "My most important professional accomplishment as a member of the school council is." Eighty-two of the respondents answered this question.

Many of the responses focused on the ability to implement change within the school. Thirty responses addressed change as an important accomplishment. The areas of change that reoccurred were concerning discipline, curricula change, and scheduling. The respondents also viewed selection of principals and teachers as an important accomplishment. Approximately ten responses focused on the hiring process of teachers and principals. The last reoccurring responses were that of providing voice to the faculty, as one person stated, "Talking with my peers and using their opinions to help guide our decisions on SBDM."

Question two of the qualitative section of the survey asked: "The most important factors determining my amount of participation in school council activities is (are)." Seventy-seven of the respondents answered this question.

A number of respondents indicated that time and family commitment was an important factor. Several answers echoed the response of one individual: "The time commitment involved, pulling me away from the family and outside activities away from work." Others stated that the time was a factor in relationship to the effectiveness of the meetings.

Other factors that had an impact on the respondents were the feeling of commitment, and they believe that they have a voice in implementing change. Several stated that the commitment of the principal had a strong impact on the success or failure

of the decisions: Having a principal who supports SBDM and the democratic process.

“I’ve had principals before who used SBDM as straw men.”

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Overview

This research study examined the perceptions of teachers who have served on school-based decision-making (SBDM) councils in Jefferson County Public Schools in Kentucky. This research examined factors that affect teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits of serving on an SBDM council. The topic is of interest because although SBDM has been advocated as a way of reforming schools, and in Kentucky it is mandated in almost every school, the teachers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of participating in SBDM are important in the success of the implementation of SBDM. However, without the active participation of teachers, SBDM cannot be successful. A number of factors may encourage or inhibit teacher participation, and these are important to consider if SBDM is to remain viable. This research studied the factors that may encourage or inhibit teachers from participating in SBDM.

In order to understand teachers' attitudes towards SBDM this research studied teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making council. The variables for several analyses in the study concerned the costs of sitting on a council. These were loss of autonomy, increased time demands, risk of collegial disfavor, subversion of collective bargaining and threats to career advancement. Also

studied were the benefits of self-efficacy, ownership, and workplace democracy. Costs and benefits were derived from a study conducted by Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981).

Independent variables in the study were: (a) the number of years that site-based decision making has been implemented in the school, (b) the teachers' perceptions of the principal's involvement in and support for the shared decision making process, (c) the years of teaching experience held by SBDM participants, (d) teachers' belief in the permanency of SBDM as a component of education reform, (e) participants' desire for promotion to an administrative position, and (f) participants' level of involvement in the teachers' professional organization that negotiates contracts were developed from a research of the literature. Eight research questions were developed. This discussion of the results will address these eight research questions.

Research Question One

The results of Research Question One were that the correlation between the years of implementation of SBDM in the schools and time demands on teachers was not statistically significant ($r = .049$, $p = .699$). These results can be compared and contrasted with previous research.

The participants of the study were members of an SBDM council in Jefferson County Public School. The majority of the schools surveyed had implemented SBDM for more than five years (84.4 percent). Only 17.2 percent of the respondents were in schools that had implemented SBDM between 2-4 years, and 15.6 percent were in schools that had implemented SBDM for between 5-7 years. The rest of the respondents indicated that they were in schools that had implemented SBDM for 8-10 years (20.3 percent) and 10 years or more (46.9 percent).

According to previous research, time demands on teachers are a significant cost for participating in SBDM. Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) studied the costs and benefits of SBDM participation and found time demands to be a significant factor in how SBDM was perceived. Duke et al. used a survey with a rating scale of 1 (insignificant) to 7 (significant). Time demands were the most significant factor in SBDM service with a mean score of 4.92. Other research indicates that the longer that SBDM is implemented in a school the less teachers feel the stress of time demands. The Kentucky Department of Education reported in their monthly publication, *Kentucky Teacher* (1993), that the time spent in SBDM activities decreased as the years of implementation increased (March, p. 1).

One other factor to consider with the results of this question is teachers' familiarity with expectations with SBDM council. When SBDM is implemented in the schools for a number of years, teachers have a clearer understanding of the expectations prior to running for a seat on the committee. Several of the qualitative responses indicated that the teachers understood the time demands. When asked: "The largest burden of sitting on an SBDM Council is." Twenty-eight out of 85 respondents referred to time. Although the participants find time a burden to SBDM, other qualitative responses indicate that it was an anticipated burden. Several respondents stated that the time demands were what was expected and one respondent stated, "I don't consider it a burden. I think that our work is valuable, necessary, and supports our school and children. My time is well spent."

Research Question Two

The results of Research Question Two show a positive correlation between the principal's involvement in and support for SBDM and ratings of workplace democracy ($r = .648, p < .001$). These results closely correspond with previous research and qualitative responses of the participants of this study. Wall (1997) conducted a study of teachers' perceptions of empowerment in school-based decision-making schools and schools that did not incorporate school-based decision making. His study found no difference in five of six subscales of empowerment. The author surmised that the reason for the lack of feeling of empowerment was that the principals may have still exhibited a level of control over the SBDM councils and the decisions made within the schools.

The administrative control referenced in the Wall (1997) study is apparent in the qualitative responses of this study. When asked about the greatest burden incurred from participating on an SBDM council, eight respondents indicated the role of the principal. One response noted harassment by administration, and one respondent stated: "Realizing that protocol isn't being followed and having to determine which is more important—following protocol—or having a working relationship with administration."

The final qualitative question gave the respondents the opportunity to expand on quantitative questions. Individuals provided 29 responses. Twelve of these comments involved the central office/principal's involvement in the decision making process. One response stated that the principal allowed the committee to make decisions. The others stated that they believed that the outcome of the vote was determined by central office or by the principal. Respondents drew a connection between principal behavior and feelings of democratic empowerment. One respondent stated: "This is my 3rd year on SBDM, two

different principals. I honestly don't feel there was any purpose for SBDM, at least not in my school. We do NOT set policy, we sign off on what JCPS and/or principal wants. I hoped to have a say, people elected me because they feel that I am fair and equal to all, but that doesn't matter because I have no say at all."

Research Question Three

The results of this question showed no statistical significance in the relationship between perception of loss of autonomy and years of teaching experience ($r = .026$, $p = .789$). The term loss of autonomy refers to classroom autonomy. Broadly speaking, these results support the findings of Nir (2002). The author conducted a survey of 28 elementary schools and found that presence of SBDM had no effect on teacher autonomy. However, other research found that teachers believed that parental involvement on SBDM would lead to a loss of classroom autonomy (White, 1989).

There was no literature to indicate the relationship between teachers' years of experience and the loss of autonomy. The purpose of the question was to determine if tenure would influence the teacher participants' perception of the cost of loss of autonomy. The results did not support this hypothesized correlation.

Research Question Four

The correlation between the variables limitations of collective bargaining and involvement in the professional teacher' organization was found to be not statistically significant ($r = .177$, $p = .061$). The term limitations of collective bargaining was initially labeled subversion of collective bargaining in the Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) study. The author and her advisors determined that the term subversion was a loaded term so the variable was renamed limitations of collective bargaining.

One influencing factor in the lack of correlation between the variables may be the length of time that SBDM has been implemented in the schools. Jefferson County Teachers' Association (JCTA) is the professional organization responsible for contract negotiations. During the first five years of the implementation of SBDM in the schools, JCTA was active in balancing the components of SBDM with the negotiated contract between Jefferson County Public Schools and the teachers employed in the system. Thus, the attitudes of JCTA members may have been positively influenced toward SBDM.

Initially, research indicated that JCTA's involvement affected schools' voluntary involvement in SBDM. David (1994) conducted a five-year study of school participation in SBDM. The author found that the totals ranged from 55 percent to 77 percent. The major exception was education region three of Kentucky. This region includes Jefferson County Public Schools. Region three had 14 percent of the schools that had established school councils. The author concluded that the low number was due to struggles between state mandates and collective bargaining.

Qualitative responses of this study have indicated a lack of knowledge of past conflicts between JCPS and JCTA. Several respondents indicated that there was a conflict between SBDM and the contract: ". . . the union tries its best to do its job with the number of staff and large membership that it represents, the principal and the teachers all try to do their job. . . . But there have been some decisions made by the councils in the district that do directly conflict with the union contracts and should not be allowed." Others believe that there is little to no conflict: "Our school is very JCTA focused, but I have never perceived any tension with SBDM decisions and JCTA action."

The results of this question showed no association between a respondent's participation in JCTA and perceptions that SBDM is limiting collective bargaining. As stated above, there was apparent conflict when SBDM was introduced into the Jefferson County Public Schools. The issues were negotiated, and as time has passed the conflicts seem to have been resolved.

Research Question Five

The results of Research Question Five showed a statistically significant correlation between the variable desire for promotion and the variable desire for career advancement ($r = .34, p < .001$). It should be pointed out that only a minority of teachers have an interest in advancement to the principal's office.

Metlife, Inc. (2002) conducted a phone and internet survey of 1,017 public school teachers in grades K-12. When asked about the respondents' interest in becoming a principal 81 percent answered: Not very/Not at all. These results coincide with the results of a demographic questions concerning principal certification. The respondents indicated that 9.4 percent have a principal certification and 7.5 percent responded that they are in a principal certification program. The majority of the respondents (83 percent) indicated that they did not have certification and were not in a program to attain certification.

The purpose of Research Question Five was to determine whether teacher participants on the SBDM council believed that there was a relationship between sitting on the council and acquiring an administrative position. The results of the question indicate that the participants believed that there was a correlation.

Research Question Six

The results of Research Question Six showed that there was a statistically significant correlation at the .05 level between the variables, belief in the permanency of SBDM, and feeling of ownership of change in the school ($r = .272, p < .01$). When asked questions concerning the permanency of SBDM, the majority of the respondents agreed that it was a permanent component of KERA. One respondent stated in the qualitative section: "SBDM will probably be around for 10-15 more years and then something else will replace it."

The results of this question coincide with results found in previous studies. A number of authors found that teachers must believe that change is permanent before they will become active participants in the change (Weiss, 1995). This study supports the hypothesis that before teachers can accept ownership of the change implemented through SBDM, they must believe that it is a permanent component of KERA.

Research Question Seven

For Research Question Seven a regression analysis was performed, with time demands placed on teachers in SBDM as the dependent variable and six predictors. The six predictors used in the regression analysis were years of SBDM, principal support, years of teaching experience, permanency of SBDM, desire for promotion, and involvement in the teachers' professional organization.

Significant predictors of time demands ($p < .05$) were: principal's support, permanency of SBDM, desire for promotion, and involvement in the teachers' professional organization. The positive association of these variables with the dependent variable is consistent with previous research and qualitative responses from this study.

The relationship between the variables of time demands and permanency of SBDM relates closely to the variable of ownership. Teachers must believe that SBDM is permanent to have a feeling of ownership, which in turn encourages them to accept the increased time demands. Weiss (1995) stated that teachers must believe that SBDM is permanent, and that they truly hold power before they will actively participate in change,

The relationship between the variables of increased time demands and desire for promotion is due to the desire to become an administrator and the willingness to perform extra duties. There has been little past research correlating the desire for promotion with the increased time demands of sitting on a school-based decision-making council.

According to the qualitative responses, the potential administrator's role as a committee member provides leadership and an opportunity to learn the procedures for hiring a new principal. Respondents were asked what their most important professional accomplishment was as a member of a school council. Eighty-two individuals responded to the question, and 11 of the respondents stated that selecting the principal for their school was one of their most important professional accomplishments. One person stated: "This past school year I was chosen as chairperson on the Principal Hiring Committee at my school. It was a real eye opening experience." Two individuals indicated that the leadership demonstrated during participation in SBDM was their most important professional accomplishment. One respondent stated: "Have an input into the hiring process and insight into administration." These responses indicate that the teacher participants believe that the increased time demands of participating on an SBDM committee was productive in giving them insight into what qualities a school looks for in hiring a leader.

The positive correlation between time demands and the participants' involvement in the professional teachers' organization that is responsible for contract negotiations has little past research with which to compare. It is possible that teachers who are high in energy will be both involved with JCTA and with in-school activities like SBDM.

There is little research that studied the teachers' perception of the cost of increased time demands and the principals' involvement in and participation in SBDM. The correlation between the two variables in this question involve the teachers' feeling of self-efficacy and ownership and a positive feeling for the expenditure of extra time. As previously mentioned, the feeling of ownership of decisions is directly correlated to the principal's involvement with SBDM. Teachers feel less time demands when they have a feeling of self-efficacy and ownership for their decision making. Teachers believe that it is not time efficient to participate on the SBDM council if the principal is not working in a democratic manner. One qualitative response indicated: "The principal makes or breaks SBDM. It's either a democratic process or a rubber stamp for the principal's wishes. I didn't join SBDM until we had a principal that didn't waste my time."

There was no positive association between time demands and years of teaching experience. Some teachers with low experience are young. These teachers have time demands with families and must spend more time familiarizing themselves with classroom curricula than more experienced teachers. The majority of the respondents in this research had five years or more of teaching experience (83.9 percent). Within the same group, the majority of these teachers had ten or more years of experience (57.5 percent). Teachers with a number of years of experience would be more likely to manage time well. When asked about the greatest burden of sitting on an SBDM council, one

respondent stated that the greatest burden was “Time—meetings are at odd hours and there are often ‘special called meetings’ with short notice that interfere with family obligations.”

Research Question Eight

For Research Question Eight, a regression analysis was performed with self-efficacy as the dependent variable and six predictors. The six predictors used for this question were years of SBDM, principal support, years of teaching experience, permanency of SBDM, desire for promotion, and involvement in the teachers’ professional organization.

Significant predictors of self-efficacy ($p < .05$) were: principal support and perceived permanency of SBDM. Both of these statistically significant results coincide with previous research.

The positive correlation between self-efficacy and the principal’s support for and involvement in SBDM is likely based on the teacher participants’ sense of accomplishment as projected by the principal. Tewel (1995) contended that the intrinsic rewards of recognition for accomplishments and having pride in one’s work is a stronger motivator than extrinsic rewards.

Teachers’ feelings of self-efficacy are influenced by the level of decision making that the principal allows. Feelings of accomplishment and self-efficacy are lower when the teacher participant believes that the principal is in control of the decisions. Qualitative responses to this research indicated that teachers have a feeling of helplessness when principals become authoritarian. When asked about the most important factor determining the amount of SBDM participation, the principal was a

determining factor. "Having a principal who supports SBDM and the democratic process. I've had principals before who used SBDM as straw men."

This research found a statistically significant correlation between self-efficacy in SBDM teacher participants and perceived permanency of SBDM. If teachers see that an educational change like SBDM is permanent this will give weight to their involvement in SBDM. As the teachers go to the stage of perceiving SBDM as affecting important decisions, self-efficacy increases (Van Meter, 1994). Teachers do not believe that they are addressing minor issues, but are making decisions that will improve student achievement.

This question showed no relationship between self-efficacy and years of teaching experience, desire for promotion to an administrative position, and length of time that SBDM has been implemented in the school. It might be that these predictor variables do not have salience for psychological variables like self-efficacy.

Implications of the previous section indicate several variables that affect the teachers' perception of the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making council. The next section will discuss the implications on the success of SBDM Councils.

Implications

Previous research has shown that SBDM frequently becomes more successful with time (David, 1994). SBDM was implemented in Kentucky through KERA in 1990 and mandated in most schools by 1996.

This study has supported the several research studies. At the inception of SBDM in JCPS there were conflicts with the district and with JCTA regarding SBDM. As time

passed, issues were resolved through negotiations. The study found that teachers do not currently perceive a conflict between the two institutions. At this time teachers perceive SBDM to work well in coordination with the teachers' contract. Very little data were collected that indicated that teachers believed that SBDM violates contract procedures.

This study further found that teachers do not perceive increased time demands to be a major cost of participating in SBDM. Duke, Showers, and Imber (1981) determined increased time demands to be the largest cost as perceived by teachers. In this study the quantitative results did not show teachers to consider time as a major issue. However, the qualitative results indicated that teachers do see time as an issue. SBDM has been implemented in Jefferson County for over 10 years. Most committees have moved away from time-consuming micromanaging and have moved to less time-consuming policy decision making. Teachers have had an opportunity to observe the SBDM process and understand the time commitment when they run for office. The final factor is the years of experience of the teachers. More than 50 percent of the teachers surveyed had more than five years of teaching experience. These teachers have had more opportunity to adjust to the time demands of teaching and those of balancing family.

The one variable that has repeatedly affected perceptions of SBDM in this study was the management style of the principal. The principal's support for, and involvement in, SBDM showed a positive correlation with several variables. The qualitative results showed that some principals continue to use SBDM as a way to implement their personal agenda. On the other hand, the principals that allow the SBDM process to be a truly democratic process provide the teachers with a true feeling of self-efficacy and

ownership, and the teachers are more willing to expend the extra time it takes to participate in SBDM.

Limitations and Recommendations

One limitation of this research study is the single population that was surveyed. The survey population was limited to teachers in Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). JCPS is the largest school system in Kentucky. Many of the school districts in Kentucky are small rural districts. Many of these school systems do not have a professional teachers association that negotiates contracts for the teachers. These factors are likely to affect teachers' perceptions of costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making council, thus limiting the generalization of the present study.

It is the recommendation of this author that this study be replicated in smaller school districts in Kentucky. It would be preferable that the rural districts be located in Kentucky rather than another state. These small rural districts have been involved in the KERA reform movement since its inception and, therefore, would have the experience in common with JCPS. Also they would be involved in the law that mandated development of an SBDM Council. This replication of the study in rural Kentucky districts would provide a comparison of teachers' attitudes toward the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making council without adding an additional variable concerning the mandated dates of implementation.

The response rate for this survey was 40 percent which falls short of the recommended 50 percent recommended for surveys (Babbie, 1985). It is unknown what biases may have occurred due to lower-than-ideal response rate.

Conclusions

This study has found that there are several factors that have an impact on the costs and benefits of sitting on a school-based decision-making council. For example, the school principal has a strong impact on the teachers' feelings of self-efficacy and workplace democracy.

The results of this study indicate that teachers have a feeling of self-efficacy and workplace democracy when given an opportunity to make meaningful decisions. The study further indicates that teachers are more willing to expend the increased time needed to participate in an SBDM committee when they believe that their work is meaningful. Teachers' perceptions of time demands, lack of self-efficacy, and workplace democracy are negatively affected when the principal does not provide the teachers with a real opportunity to make changes and show leadership in the school.

This research indicates that teachers perceive activities pertaining to SBDM as an opportunity to exercise leadership skills. The quantitative data found that teachers sitting on an SBDM council perceive themselves as performing leadership activities within the school. There was a correlation between desire for promotion to an administrative position and teachers' perception of career advancement, but the data were not conclusive. Although the data were inconclusive, survey results and qualitative responses indicated that teachers relate sitting on an SBDM council with leadership skills that will eventually be helpful in acquiring a promotion to an administrative position. Thus, one effect of SBDM might be to produce teachers who have gained experiences that could make them more effective educational leaders.

REFERENCES

- Adleman, N., & Pringle, B. (1997). Education reform and the uses of time. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, (1), 7-29.
- American Federation of Teachers (2006). <http://www.AFT.org>.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1985). *Introduction to research in education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1992). *Notes from the field: Education reform in rural Kentucky, 1991-1992*. Report produced for Office of Educational Research and improvement (ED). Washington, DC. (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED360120).
- Babbie, E. (1985). *The practice of social research*. ,(4th ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bascia, N. (1998). The next steps in teacher union and reform. *Contemporary Education*, 69, (4), 210-13.
- Blankstein, A., & Swain, H. (1996). Is TQM right for schools? *The Executive Educator*. 16, (2), 51-54.
- Bondy, E. (1994). *Building blocks and stumbling blocks: Three case studies of shared decision making and school restructuring*. Report developed for the National Center for Restructuring Schools, Education, and Teaching. (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED376578).
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century: The report of the task force on teaching as a profession*.

Carnegie Forum on Education, Rochester, New York.

Cavanaugh Leahy & Company (1999). *Participatory management remains an enigma.*

<http://www.cavanaugh/leahy.com>.

Clark, D.L., & Astuto, T.A. (1994). Redirecting reform, challenges to popular assumptions about teachers and students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 513-520.

Cross, B., & Reitzug, U. (1995/1996). How to build ownership in city schools. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 16-19.

Daniel, R., & Shay, P. (1995). *Teachers' attitudes toward school based decision making*. Report through Morehead State University and Kentucky Educational Development Corporation (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED391791).

David, J. (1994). School-based decision making: Kentucky's test of decentralization. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 706-712.

David, J. (1992). *Primary school, school-based decision making, family resource/youth centers*. Lexington, KY: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence.

David, J. (1994). *School based decision making: Linking decisions to learning*. Lexington, KY: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence.

David, J. (1996). The who, what, and why of site based management. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 4-9.

Dee, J., Henkin, A., & Pell, S. (2002). Support for innovation in site-based-managed schools: Developing a climate for change. *Education Research Quarterly*, 25, (4) 36-49.

Demming, E. (1982). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Detert, J. Mauriel, J. (1997). *Using lessons of organizational change and previous school reforms to predict innovation outcomes: Should we expect more from TQM?* Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED408700).
- Din, F. (1998). The operations of Kentucky rural school councils. *Rural Educator*, 20(12), 15-19.
- Duke, D., Showers, B., & Imber M. (1981). Studying shared decision making in schools, in S. Bacharach (Ed), *Organizational behavior in schools and school districts* (245-276).New York: Praeger..
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guskey, T., & Peterson, K. (1996). The road to classroom change. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 10-15.
- Hanson, J. (2005). Decentralized decision making for schools. Rand Education Occasional Paper. <http://www.rand.org>.
- Halepota, H. (2005). Motivational theories and their application in construction. *Civil Engineering*, 47(3), 14-20.
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *Motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley.
- Hess, F. (2005). Reform at the table. *American School Board Journal*, 11, 33-35.
- Holt, M. & Ford, Sharon, S. (1996). Sustaining quality. *Executive Educator*, 18(1), 22-24.
- Johnson, P., & Logan, J. (2000). Efficacy and productivity: The future of school-based decision-making councils in Kentucky. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10, 311-329.

- Keckler, B., Austin, J., & Burns, L. (1999). *An in-depth analysis of decisions made by Kentucky's school-Based decision making councils*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. EA029780).
- Kentucky Department of Education (2005). *Kentucky school laws*. <http://www.education.ky.gov/kde/ADMINISTRATIVE+Resources/legal+and+Legislative+Services/Kentucky+Schools+Laws.htm>.
- Kentucky Department of Education (1993, March). Time for councils. *Kentucky Teacher*, 1.
- Kentucky Department of Education (1995). *Plain facts about Kentucky's school based decision making*. Frankfort, KY: Kentucky Department of Education.
- Kentucky Department of Education Accountability (2002). *2002 annual report: Issues and options for further legislative action*. Frankfort, KY: Office of Education Accountability.
- Lange, J. (1993). Shared decision making: A resource for restructuring. *NAASP Bulletin*, 76, 98-107.
- Lindauer, P., Garthy, P., & Richardson, M. (1997). Teacher perception of Kentucky elementary principal leadership effectiveness and school-based council meeting effectiveness. *Research in Schools*, 4(2), 39-47.
- Lindle, J. (1996). Lessons from Kentucky about school-based decision making. *Education Leadership*, 53(4), 20-23.
- Lindquist K., & Mauriel, J. (1989). School based management doomed to failure. *Education and Urban Society*, 2, 403-413.

- Malen, B., & Ogawa R.T., (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. *Education Evaluation*, 10, 251-270.
- Malen, B., Ogawa R.T., & Krantz, J.(1990). Site-based management: Unfulfilled promises. *The School Administrator*, 47 (2), 30-59.
- Maslow, A.H. (1965). *Eupsychian management: A journal*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin Inc.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychology Review*, 50, 370-396.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Metlife, Inc. (2003). *The Metlife survey of the American teacher: An examination of school leadership*. Metlife, NY.
- McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (1989). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction*. (2nd ed). New York: Harper Collins.
- Midgley, C., & Wood, S. (1993). Beyond site-based management: Empowering teachers to reform schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 245-252.
- National Center for Education Statistics (1998). *Digest of education statistics*. U.S. Department of Education Publication No. NCES 1999-036. Washington, D.C.: NCES.
- National Education Association. (2006). <http://www.nea.org>.
- Neal, S. (2007). E-mail Correspondence. sbn@jcta.org.
- Newkirk, C., & Klotz, J. (2002). *Teacher self-efficacy and site-based management as*

- a decentralization strategy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Chattanooga, TN: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED479806).
- Newton, R.M. & Winter, P. (1999). *An experimental investigation of teacher attraction to school council service*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Canada: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED437356).
- Newton, R.M., & Hughey, A. (2000). *Do the benefits associated with school council membership function as incentives for teachers to seek the position?* Report developed through Western Kentucky University and University of Alabama. (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED448124).
- Nir, A. (2002). School based management and its effect on teacher commitment. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5, 323-3421.
- Odden, E. & Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Making school based management work. *Educational Leadership*, 57, (5), 27-32.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory z*. New York: Avon.
- Parents' Coalition for Education in New York City, NY. (1993). *The rule is still the rule: The failure of school based management/shared decision making (SBM/SDM) in the New York city public school system*. Report developed through the Community Service Society of New York City. (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED367732).
- Pearson NCS. (2006). *How to conduct effective online surveys*. <http://survey.pearsonnecs.com/implementation/effective.htm>.

- Peters, T., & Waterman Jr., R. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rist, M. (1996). TQM in Tupelo. *Executive Educator*, 15(6), 27- 29.
- Robertson, P., & Kwong, S. (1994). Decision making in school-based management leadership councils: The impact of council membership diversity. *The Urban Review*, 26 (1), 41-53.
- Robertson, P., & Briggs, K. (1995). *The impact of school based management on educators' role attitudes and behaviors*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED384952).
- Robson, D., & Davis, M. (1983). Administrative authority, leadership style, and the master contract. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 21, (1), 5-13.
- Rodriquez, T., & Slate, J. (2001). *Principals' and teachers' views of site-based management in Texas*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration. Cincinnati, OH: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED463582).
- Rose v. Council for Better Education. 790 S.W. 2d 186 Ky. 1989.
- Rowan, J. (1998). Maslow amended. *The Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 38 (1), 81-97.
- Ruscoe, G., & Whitford, B. (1991). *Quantitative and qualitative perspectives on teacher attitudes in professional development schools: The third year*. Louisville, KY.

- Jefferson County Public Schools. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED336351).
- Sacken, D. (1994). No more principals! *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 664-70.
- Schonlau, M., Fricker, R., & Elliott, M. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the web*. Los Angeles: Rand Corp.
- Seigel, D., & Fruchter, N. (2002). *Evaluation of the performance driven budgeting initiative of the New York City board of education (1997-2000)*. Report developed for the Pew Charitable Society of Philadelphia, PA. (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED465842).
- Southard, M. Muldoon, J., & Porter, P. (1997). *School councils' perceptions of site-based decision making: challenges and benefits*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED461149).
- Spaulding, A. (1994). The politics of the principal: Influencing teachers' school based decision making. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED374542).
- Tyra, A. (1997). *Essential components of school decentralization: A study of theory to practice in Kentucky's model of school-based decision making as viewed by elementary principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.
- Tewel, K. (1995). Despair in the central office. *Educational Leadership*, 52(7), 62-68.

- Thompson, B. (1995). *Editorial policies concerning statistical significance: Three suggested reforms*. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Biloxi, MS: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED392819).
- Utley, D., Westbrooke J., & Turner, S. (1997). The relationship between Herzberg's two factor theory and quality improvement implementation. *Engineering Management Journal*, 9 (3), 5-9.
- Van Meter, E. (1994). Implementing school based decision making in Kentucky. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78,61-70.
- Wall, R. (1997). *School-based decision making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED407733).
- Watts, G., & Castle, S. (1993). The time dilemma in school restructuring. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 307-309.
- Weiss, C. (1995). The four "I's of school reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(4), 571-592.
- Winter, P., Keedy, J., & Newton, R.M. (1999). *Teacher service on school councils: Are teachers attracted to the accountability of school-based decision making?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administrators. Minneapolis, MN: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED436484).
- White, P. (1989). An overview of school-based management: What does

- the research say? *National Association of Secondary Principals Bulletin*, 73, 1-8.
- Whitford, B., Schlechty, P. & Schelor, L. (1987). Sustaining action research through collaboration: Inquiries for invention. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 64, 170-175.
- Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Getting school-based management right: What works And what doesn't work. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 22-26.
- Wohlstetter, P., & Buffett, T. (1992). Decentralizing dollars under school-based management: Have policies changed? *Educational Policy* 6(1) 35-54.
- Wohlstetter, P. & Briggs, K. (1994). The principal's role in school-based management. *Principal*, 74(2), 14, 16-17.
- Wohlstetter, P., R., & Mohrman, A. (1994). New boundaries for school-based management: The high involvement model. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16, 268-286.
- Wood, J.M. (1981). *Toward improving the quality of work life in education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference for Educational Administration. Melbourne, Australia: (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED208566).
- Yanitski, N. (1998). *Site based decision making in schools*. San Diego, CA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Reproduction Document No. ED432028).
- Young v. Hamilton & Back v. Robinson. (2003). Kentucky Supreme Court

SC-0397-I.

Zeitz, G, Johannesson, R., & Ritchie, E. (1997). An employee survey measuring total quality management practices and culture. *Group and Organization Management*, 22, 414-444.

Appendix A

- (b) 1. The teacher representatives shall be elected for (1) one year terms by a majority of the teachers. A teacher elected to a school council shall not be involuntarily transferred during his or her term of office. The parent representative shall be elected for one (1) year terms. The parent members shall be elected by the parents of students preregistered to attend the school during the term of office in an election conducted by the parent and teacher organization of the school or, if none exists, the largest organization of parents formed for this purpose. A school council, once elected may adopt a policy setting different terms of office for parent and teacher members subsequently elected. The principal or head teacher shall be the chair of the school council.
- (f) After receiving notification of the funds available for the school from the local board, the school council shall determine, within the parameters of the total available funds, the number of persons to be employed in each job classification at the school. The council may make personnel decisions on vacancies occurring after the school council is formed but shall not have the authority to recommend transfers or dismissals.
- (g) The school council shall determine which textbooks, instructional materials, and student support services shall be provided in the school. Subject to available resources, the local board shall allocate an appropriation to each school that is adequate to meet the school's needs related to instructional materials and school-based student support services, as determined by the school council. The school council shall consult with the school media librarian on the maintenance of the school library media center, including the purchase of instructional materials, information technology, and equipment;
- (h) *From a list of applicants submitted by the local superintendent, the*

principal at the participating school shall select personnel to fill vacancies, after consultation with the school council, consistent with subsection (2)(i)10. of this section. The superintendent may forward to the school council the names of qualified applicants who have pending certifications from Education Professional Standards Board based on recent completion of preparation requirements, out-of-state preparation, or alternative routes to certification pursuant to KRS 151.028 and 161.048. Requests for transfer shall conform to any employer-employee bargained contract which is in effect. If the vacancy to be filled is the position of principal, the school council shall select the new principal from among those persons recommended by the local superintendent. When a vacancy in the school Principalship occurs, the school council shall receive training in recruitment and interviewing techniques prior to carrying out of the process of selecting a principal. The council shall select the trainer to deliver the training. Personnel decisions made at the school level under the authority of this subsection shall be binding on the superintendent who completes the hiring process. Applicants subsequently employed shall provide evidence that they are certified prior to assuming the duties of a position in accordance with KRS 161.020. The superintendent shall provide additional applicants upon request when qualified applicants are available.

(i) The school council shall adopt a policy to be implemented by the principal in the following additional areas:

1. Determination of curriculum, including needs assessment and curriculum development;
2. Assignment of all instructional and noninstructional staff time;
3. Assignment of students to classes and programs within the school;

4. Determination of the schedule of the school day and week, subject to the beginning and ending times of the school day and school calendar year as established by the local board;
 5. Determination of use of school space during the school day;
 6. Planning and resolution of issues regarding instructional practice;
 7. Selection and implementation of discipline and classroom management techniques as a part of a comprehensive school safety plan, including responsibilities of the student, parent, teacher, counselor, and principal;
 8. Selection of extracurricular programs and determination of policies relating to student participation based on academic qualifications and attendance requirements, program evaluation, and supervision;
 9. Procedures, consistent with local school board policy for determining alignment with state standards, technology utilization, and program appraisal; and
 10. Procedures to assist the council with consultation in the selection of personnel by the principal, including, but not limited to, meetings, timelines, interviews, review of written applications, and review of references. Procedures shall address situations in which members of the council are not available for consultation; and
- (j) Each school council shall annually review data on its students' performance as shown by the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System. The data shall include but not be limited to information on performance levels of all students tested, and information on the performance of students disaggregated by race, gender, disability, and participation in the federal free and reduced price lunch program. After completing the review of data, each school council, with the involvement of parents, faculty, and staff, shall develop and adopt a plan to ensure that

each student makes progress toward meeting the goals set forth in KRS 158.645 and 158.6451(1)(b) by April 1 of each year and submit the plan to the superintendent and local board of education for review as described in KRS 10.340. The Kentucky Department of Education shall provide each school council the data needed to complete the review required by this paragraph no later than November 1 of each year. If a school does not have a council, the review shall be completed by the principal with the involvement of parents, faculty, and staff.

3. The policy adopted by the local board to implement school-based decision making shall also address the following:
 - (a) School budget and administration, including: discretionary funds; activity and other school funds; funds for maintenance, supplies, and equipment; and procedures for authorizing reimbursement for training and other expenses;
 - (b) Assessment of individual student progress, including testing and reporting of student progress to students, parents, the school district, the community, and the state;
 - (c) School improvement plans, including the form and function of strategic planning and its relationship to district planning, as well as the school safety plan and requests for funding from the Center for School Safety under KRS 158.446;
 - (d) Professional development plans developed pursuant to KRS 156.095;
 - (e) Parent, citizen, and community participation including the relationship of the council with other groups;
 - (f) Cooperation and collaboration within the district, with other districts, and with other public and private agencies;
 - (g) Requirements for waiver of district policies;

- (h) Requirements for record keeping by the school council; and
 - (i) A process for appealing a decision made by a school council.
- (4) In addition to the authority granted to the school council in this section, the local board may grant to the school council any other authority permitted by law. The board shall make available liability insurance coverage for the protection of all members of the school council from liability arising in the course of pursuing their duties as members of the council.
- (5) After July 13, 1990, any school in which two-thirds (2/3) of the faculty vote to implement school-based decision making shall do so. All schools shall implement school-based decision making by July , 1996, in accordance with this section and with the policy adopted by the local board pursuant to this section. Upon favorable vote of a majority of the faculty at the school and a majority of at least twenty-five (25) voting parents of students enrolled in the school, a school meeting its goal as determined by the Department of Education pursuant to KRS 158.6455 may apply to the Kentucky Board of Education for exemption from the requirement to implement school-based decision making, and the state board shall grant the exemption. The voting by the parents on the matter of exemption from implementing school-based decision making shall be in an election conducted by the parent and teacher organization of the school or, if none exists, the largest organization of parents formed for this purpose. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, a local school district shall not be required to implement school-based decision making if the local school district contains only one (1) school.
- (6) The Department of Education shall provide professional development *activities to assist schools in implementing school-based decision*

making. School council members elected for the first time shall complete a minimum of six (6) clock hours of training in the process of school-based decision making, no later than thirty (30) days after the beginning of the service year for which they are elected to serve.

School council members who have served on a school council at least one (1) year shall complete a minimum of three (3) clock hours of training in the process of school-based decision making no later than one hundred twenty (120) days after the beginning of the service year for which they are elected to serve. Experienced members may participate in the training for new members to fulfill their training requirement.

School council training required under this subsection shall be conducted by trainers endorsed by the Department of Education. By November 1 of each year, the principal through the local superintendent shall forward to the Department of Education the names and addresses of each council member and verify that the required training has been completed. School council members elected to fill a vacancy shall complete the applicable training within thirty (30) days of their election.

(7) A school that chooses to have school-based decision making but would like to be exempt from the administrative structure set forth by this section may develop a model for implementing school-based decision making, including but not limited to a description of the membership, organization, duties, and responsibilities of a school council. The school shall submit the model through the local board of education to the commissioner of education and the Kentucky Board of Education, which shall have final authority for approval. The application for approval of the model shall show evidence that it has been developed by representatives of the parents, student, certified personnel, and the administrators of the school and that two-thirds (2/3) of the faculty have agreed to the model.

Appendix B

November 7, 2007

You are invited to participate in a research study sponsored by the Department of Leadership, Foundations and Human Resource Education, College of Education, and the University of Louisville. This study is being conducted by Joseph Petrosko, PhD, and Jennefer Pollio Woods, Ph.D. candidate. Your participation in the research study involves answering an online survey questionnaire concerning teachers' perceptions of the costs and benefits of participating in a School Based Decision Making Council. There are no risks for your participation in this research study. The information collected may not benefit you directly. The information received from this study may be helpful to others. The information from this study will be stored in an on-line survey website. The e-mail addresses and school locations will not be part of any information provided to the researchers. I am unable to identify individuals with their schools.

Individuals from the College of Education and Human Development, University of Louisville, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Human Subjects Protection Program Office (HSPPO) at the University of Louisville, and Research Department of Jefferson County Public Schools, and other regulatory agencies may inspect these records. In all respects, however, the data will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Should the data be published your identity will not be disclosed.

Taking part in this study is voluntary. By entering this website and responding to this survey you are indicating your voluntary consent to take part in this research study. You do not have to answer any questions that cause you discomfort. You may chose to not to participate in this study at all. If you chose to participate in the study, you may stop at any time, or chose not to answer individual questions.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints concerning the research study, please contact: Joseph Petrosko (502) 852-4563 or Jennefer Woods (502) 819-5827, edgehanger@insightbb.com.

If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Human Subjects Protection Program Office at (502) 852-5188. You can discuss question about your rights as a research subject, in private with a member of the Institutional review Board (IRB). You may also call this number if you have other questions about the research, and you cannot reach the research staff, or want to talk to someone else. The IRB is an independent committee comprised of individuals from the University community, staff of the institutions, and people from within the community that are not affiliated with these institutions. The IRB has reviewed this research study.

If you have concerns or complaints about the research or research staff and you do not wish to give your name, you may call 1-877-852-1167. This is a 24 hour hot line answered by individuals that do not work at the University of Louisville.

Thank you for your time in this matter,

Joseph Petrosko, PhD
Principal Investigator

Jennefer Pollio Woods
Co-Investigator

Appendix C

School Based Management Survey

Section I: For each item below, circle one number to indicate your opinion. The rating of 1 means the item is a *strongly disagree*. A rating of 5 means *strongly agrees*

Item

(1-Strongly Disagree; 5-Strongly Agree)

School Councils are a permanent component of reform that will remain as part of school governance	1	2	3	4	5
Eventually, SBDM will be removed as a component of the Kentucky Education Reform Act.	1	2	3	4	5
In the next five years, SBDM will be replaced with another form of decision- making.	1	2	3	4	5
I attend meetings for the Jefferson County Teachers' Association.	1	2	3	4	5
I am not involved in JCTA activities.	1	2	3	4	5
At one time I have held an office for the Jefferson County Teachers' Association.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that the actions of JCTA hindered me in my role as an educator.	1	2	3	4	5
Jefferson County Teachers Association is effective in protecting my rights as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
Jefferson County Teachers Association has limited my decision making on an SBDM Council.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that the actions of JCTA assisted me in my role as an educator.	1	2	3	4	5
The time that I have spent with school council activities is balanced with my sense of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5
The time that I have spent with the school council has interfered					

with my teaching duties. 1 2 3 4 5

The time that I have spent with school council activities is not balanced with my sense of accomplishment. 1 2 3 4 5

The time that I spend working on activities for the council is what I anticipated when I became a member of the SBDM Council. 1 2 3 4 5

I have spent more time on council activities than I had anticipated when running for the position. 1 2 3 4 5

The majority of the faculty support decisions that they do not agree with, because of their belief that the decision was arrived at in a fair manner. 1 2 3 4 5

Members of the faculty have expressed resentment for decisions that I have made as a member of the SBDM Council. 1 2 3 4 5

My colleagues enact the decisions that I make as a member of the SBDM Council. 1 2 3 4 5

The council makes decisions, but the faculty fails to follow through on implementation. 1 2 3 4 5

In the future, I anticipate working in an administrative position. 1 2 3 4 5

I have no desire to work in an administrative position within the system. 1 2 3 4 5

My desire is to eventually become a principal within the district. 1 2 3 4 5

I have no desire to become a principal within the district. 1 2 3 4 5

Decisions made through SBDM have had no effect on the rights provided in my contract. 1 2 3 4 5

I believe that decisions made through SBDM have threatened my contractual rights. 1 2 3 4 5

SBDM works well in coordination with my teachers contract 1 2 3 4 5

Many conflicts have had to be resolved between SBDM procedures and my teacher's contract. 1 2 3 4 5

The principal at my school allows the SBDM Council to make decisions, 1 2 3 4 5

The principal at my school sets the agenda for the SBDM meetings with little or no input from the council.	1	2	3	4	5
The principal at my school actively works to have SBDM decisions enacted in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
Since the implementation of SBDM in my school, I believe that I have had more of an opportunity to make curricula decisions for my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
SBDM has provided me with the opportunity to make curricula decisions that I was unable to make in the past.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that SBDM has eliminated my decision making in my Classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
Since the implementation of SBDM in my school more decisions concerning my classroom have been made by others.	1	2	3	4	5
SBDM Council decisions represent the consensus of the faculty in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
SBDM Council decisions are not representative of the opinions of the faculty in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
Faculty members at my school are given an opportunity to provide input prior the SBDM Council implementing changes.	1	2	3	4	5
The faculty at my school has stated that they don't believe that they are given an ample opportunity for input prior to the SBDM Council making decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
SBDM decisions are made only by the council members.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that my work with the SBDM Council has provided valuable changes for the school.	1	2	3	4	5
The time that I have spent with the school council is balanced with my sense of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5
My participation on the school council has provided me with little to no sense of accomplishment.	1	2	3	4	5

The input that I provide on the school council has little impact on the decisions that are made by SBDM. 1 2 3 4 5

I am involved in SBDM because I believe that it provides me With a stake in changes that are made at my school. 1 2 3 4 5

Decisions made by the school council are made without commitment from the staff and faculty. 1 2 3 4 5

Sitting on the school council has provided me with an opportunity to make real changes that will improve the school environment. 1 2 3 4 5

I am not interested in the decisions made on the school council, I don't believe that they will have much of an impact on the climate of the school. 1 2 3 4 5

I believe that sitting on the school council provides an opportunity for me to demonstrate my leadership skills. 1 2 3 4 5

Sitting on the SBDM Council places me at risk of conflict with administrators that are in a position to make decisions concerning my promotions. 1 2 3 4 5

I believe that sitting on the school council is a stepping stone to an administrative position. 1 2 3 4 5

Section II: Please answer these questions in narrative form.

1. My most important professional accomplishment as a member of a school council is:

2. The most important factor(s) determining my amount of participation in school council activities is (are):

3. The largest burden of sitting on an SBDM Council is:

4. My largest professional disappointment in SBDM is:

Comments: Please use this section to expand on any questions in Section Two that you believe that you did not have an ample opportunity to express yourself.

Section III: Demographic Information

Please respond to each of the following questions by placing the appropriate number on the line located on the right side of the page.

1. Years of teaching experience:

- One year or less 1
- 2 to 4 years..... 2
- 5 to 9 years 3
- 10 to 14 years4
- 15 or more years5

1. Administrative Certification:

- Yes.....1
- No2
- Presently in a program3

2. Present educational setting (indicate setting where you are

Participating in the school council:

- Elementary School 1
- Middle School 2
- High School3
- Special Education or alternative placement school....4

3. Years that SBDM has been implemented in my current school counting this year. If you do not know you may use the three digit district identification number for your school. This will only identify the school and not the respondent:

- 2 to 4 years 1
- 5 to 7 years 2
- 8 to 10 years3
- 10 years or more 4

4. Please indicate the classification of your school, using the State of Kentucky categories for school performance.

- Meeting Goal..... 1
- Progressing 2
- Needs Assistance3

5. Please indicate the classification of your school, using the categories for school performance that are derived from the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) YES..... 1
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) NO 2

6. Please report the number of hours training you have had in the School-Based Decision Making (SBDM) process. Insert the number of hours on the line.

Appendix D

Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients for Scales

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Number of Items</u>	<u>Alpha</u>
Permanency	3	.84
Involvement	6	.72
Time Demands	5	.74
Workplace Democracy	9	.79
Desire for Promotion	4	.92
Limit to Contract Procedures	4	.79
Principal Support	3	.78
Loss of Autonomy	4	.77
Self-Efficacy	4	.91
Ownership	4	.62

Note. The variable Career Advancement was measured with one item, since the items intended to form the scale were below an acceptable value of reliability (i.e., alpha was less than .50).

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME: Jennefer Pollio Woods

ADDRESS: 2123 Edgehill Road
Louisville, KY 40205

DOB: Louisville, Kentucky- June 8, 1948

EDUCATION:

- University of Louisville
Ph.D. Educational Administration
- University of Louisville
M.E.D.: August 1987
- University of Louisville
B.S.: May 1982. (With High Honors)

CERTIFICATIONS:

- Elementary: 1-8
- Trainable: K-12
- L.B.D.: K-12
- Supervision
- Director of Special Education
- Principal Internship Eligibility K-4
- K.T.I.P. Observer

EMPLOYMENT:

- Bellarmine University
Adjunct Professor
- Teacher Educator for K.T.I.P.
Observe and evaluate teachers
- Spalding University
Adjunct Professor
Assistant Professor 7-2005-7-2006
Teach classes in the LBD Program:
Traditional and Alternative Certification
Supervise Student teachers
Advise LBD graduate students
07-2005-Present
- Jefferson Community College
Adjunct Instructor
Teach classes to pre-education major and educational assistants for the *No Child Left Behind* Certification
01-2004- Present
- Wheeler Elementary
L.B.D. Resource

- E.B.D. Self-Contained
- L.B.D. Resource Teacher: Collaborative Model
- Taught in an LBD Resource Room, Self-contained EBD Classroom, E.C.E Team Leader, School Technology Coordinator, and Extended School Support Coordinator
- 1994-to October 2005
- K.T.I.P. Resource Teacher
- Assist and Observe intern teachers
- 08-1988- 10-2005
- Portland Elementary
- 3/4 Split and 4th grade
- B.D. Variation Self Contained Class
- L.B.D. Resource Teacher: Collaborative Model
- 1987 to 1994
- Waggener High School
- S.P.H.: Began 1st H.S. S.P.H. Satellite Unit in Jefferson County.
- 1982-1987
- 1979-1982
- Substitute Teacher

HONORS:

- WHAS EXCEL Award
- February 19, 2003
- Earth Day 2000 Merit Award
- April 22, 2000
- Kentucky Association For Environmental Education President's Award 1996
- Environmental Quality Commission's 1994 Earth Day Award
- Graduated in 1982 with High Honors

PUBLICATIONS:

- Interview: "Kentuckiana Parenting and Family Magazine"
- May 2003
- Authored: "Let's Celebrate Arbor Day with...Operation Brightside"
- Authored: "A Living Legacy" An activity and resource book to be used in conjunction with the Famous and Historic Tree Project.
- Louisville Gas & Electric Company
- Authored "Manufacturing For Tomorrow" An activity and resource book to be used in conjunction with The Louisville Area Chamber of Commerce's case study of manufacturing
- Compiled and edited: "M.S.D. Science Activity Book" for Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District through the Education/Workforce Program.
- Co-authored: L.G.& E.: "You Make A Difference" Science Activity Book that is written in coordination with K.E.R.A. goals.

COMMUNITY SERVICE:

- Boys Scouts of America
Lifetime Learning Program
Teacher Advisor
- University of Louisville
K.T.I.P. Teacher Educator
Observe and evaluate intern teachers
01-05- Present
- Jobs With Justice
Workers Rights Board Leadership Committee
10-03-Present

ACTIVITIES:

- Spalding University Mentoring Program
2005-Present
- Coordinator of Extended School Services for Wheeler Elementary
2003-2004 School Year
- Jefferson County Teachers' Association Board of Directors
2003-2005
- Participant in NEA study Professional Development School in
coordination with JCPS and U of L
2001
- Project C.R.I.S.P. (Culturally Responsive Instruction for the Special
Population) 2000-2001
- Recycling coordinator for Wheeler Elementary 2000-2001
- E.C.E. Team Leader: 1998-Present
Wheeler Elementary
- Kentucky Association For Environmental Education
Conference Chair for 1995 Annual State Conference
- NAASP
"Principals for Tomorrow"
1995-1996
- Powerful Learning Institute
J.C.P.S.
1995
- Kentuckiana Education/Workforce Institute
Curriculum Writing Committee
1994
- Kentuckiana Education/Workforce Institute
Internship
1992, 1993, 1994
- Kentucky Teachers Intern Program
Resource Teacher
1985-2005
- J.C.T.A. Professional Representative

1987 to Present

- National Science Foundation Zoo Project
1989-1992

PRESENTATIONS: Functional Behavior Assessment

- Wheeler Elementary
March 1999
- Kentucky State Fair
- Kentucky Council for Environmental Education
August 16, 1997
- E.C.E. Satellite Link Telecast
Dr. Denzil Edge
University of Louisville
February 15, 1996
- K.A.E.E. Annual Conference
"Water, Water Everywhere..."
Mulhenberg County
- N.S.T.A. Regional Conference
MSD Workshop: "Water, Water, Everywhere..."
- CESI Hands-On Workshop: 2 Presentations
Louisville, Kentucky
November 1993
- MSD Environmental Seminar
University of Louisville
November 1993
- Animal Science Conference
Louisville Zoo
February 4, 1992
- K.S.T.A. and K.A.P.S. State Conference
1989, 1990, 1991
- H.A.S.T.I. Convention
Indianapolis, Indiana
February 1991
- N.S.T.A. Regional Conference
Washington, D.C.
December 1990
- U. of L. Graduate Course
Hands On Science Workshop
March 1990
- Thinking Like a Scientist Workshops
Learning Choice Schools
1989 and 1990
- "Learning In America With Roger Mudd"
National Television Presentation
1989
- Children's Environmental Festival (Earth Day at the Zoo)Louisville Zoo

1989, 1990, 1993

COMMITTEES:

- JCPS/ JCTA Diversity Committee
2001-2002 School Year
- Jefferson County Teachers' Association Discipline Committee
2002
- Kentucky Association for Environmental Education
Awards Committee Chair
1997, 1998
- Kentucky Environmental Education Council
Teacher Advisory Committee
1996-1998
- Kentucky Association for Environmental Education
Board of Directors 1993-1998
Secretary 1995-1997
- Wheeler Environment Committee
- Wheeler Elementary
Chairperson
Building and Grounds Committee
- Wheeler Elementary
SCAT Team
- Chamber of Commerce: Education Task Force for
Manufacturing Case Study Committee: 1994-1996
- Chamber of Commerce: Education to Workforce Committee
- Health Textbook Recommendation Committee: 1992
- Participatory Management Committees
Portland Elementary
Steering Committee: 1990-1992
Discipline Committee Chair: 1990-1991
Professional Development Chair: 1991-1992
- J.C.T.A. Teachers' Rights Committee 1991-1995
Co-chair: 1992 to 1995
- Science Textbook Recommendation Committee
1989
- Science Committee for Learning Choice Schools
1988-1990
- Writing Committee for Learning Choice Schools
1987-1988

1988-1990

- Writing Committee for Learning Choice Schools
1987-1988