

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to design an instrument to measure elementary teachers' satisfaction with their involvement in school decision making. The outcome of this study has provided an instrument for principals to use as a needs assessment to determine how much, and in what areas, teachers want to be involved in school decision making. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research procedures and methodology that were implemented in the research study. A description of the methods and procedures used for the development of the instrument is included.

#### Population and Sample

The population selected to participate in this study consisted of all teachers from five elementary schools in two different school districts in the Hampton Roads Area. Prior approval was granted by the Research and Testing Department of both school districts before selecting the schools. One selected school district implemented site-based management programs, and the other school district did not.

The schools were selected by interviewing principals of various elementary schools in the two school districts. The purpose for these interviews was to identify those schools that were currently implementing site-based management, and schools that were

implementing little or no site-based management. Each principal was called to set up an appointment for an interview prior to the delivery of the survey instruments. During the interviews, the researcher asked a variety of questions in order to learn of the various cultures of the schools. The principals were asked to peruse the instrument to see if they agreed that the items included were appropriate. Also, they were asked if they believed this instrument would serve as a tool for principals to use as a needs assessment to find out how much, and in what areas, teachers wanted to be involved in school decision making. Finally, the researcher asked each principal for their permission to have their teachers participate in this study.

All five principals granted the researcher permission to include their teachers in this study. The principals volunteered to distribute the survey instruments themselves. The researcher delivered and collected the instruments at the designated times requested by the principals. The principal at the first school (a non site-based management school) gave the surveys to the teachers during a faculty meeting. All teachers in attendance (38) completed the surveys. The principal at the second school (a site-based management school) also gave the surveys during a faculty meeting. All teachers in attendance (44) completed the surveys. The principal at the third school (a non site-based management school) placed the surveys in the teacher's mailboxes. Thirty of the 36 surveys were completed after two different collection dates. The principal at the fourth school (a site-based management school) distributed the surveys during a meeting. All teachers in attendance (37) completed the surveys. The principal at the fifth school (a non site-based

management school) placed the surveys in the teacher's mailboxes. Nineteen out of 36 surveys were completed after two different collection dates. The number of responding teachers in the five schools, and the percentage of teachers responding by school ranged from 53% to 91%. There was no significant difference in the response rate for teachers in the site-based management schools as compared to the non site-based management schools. All instruments returned were used in the study. These data are shown in Table 1.

One hundred sixty-eight teachers participated in the study. Eighty-one teachers were in site-based management schools and 87 were in non site-based management schools. The sample included 150 females (89.3%) and 10 males (6.0%). Eight teachers (4.8%) did not respond to the question related to sex. One hundred-eleven (66.1%) of the teachers were White. Forty-three (25.6%) of the teachers were African American. Four (2.4%) were other minorities. Ten (6.0%) of the teachers did not respond to the question related to race. The average age of the teachers was 39.26 years, and the average number of years of experience was 13.76. These data are shown in Table 2. Correlations were computed to determine this data using the SPSS statistical program.

Cross tabulations were computed to show the educational levels of teachers across the five schools in relationship with their job assignment. The results indicated that of the 168 respondents, 46.4% of the teachers held the bachelor's degree while 41.7% of the teachers held the master's degree. Table 3 shows the break down of each teacher's

TABLE 1  
INSTRUMENT RETURN DATA

Respondents by School Type

School	Number of Respondents	Number of Teachers on Staff	Percent of Teacher Respondents
School 1 (NSBM)*	38	42	91%
School 2 (SBM)*	44	49	90%
School 3 (NSBM)	30	36	83%
School 4 (SBM)	37	50	74%
School 5 (NSBM)	19	36	53%

\*Note: NSBM denotes non site-based management schools and SBM denotes site-based management schools.

TABLE 2

AGE AND EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS

	Mean	STDDEV	N
AGE	39.26	9.96	144
EXPERIENCE	13.76	9.62	147

TABLE 3

## EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

	No Response	BA/BS Degree	MA/MS Degree	CAGS Degree	Doctoral Degree	Total
1st. grade	0 0%	14 8.3%	11 6.5%	1 .6%	0 0%	26 15.5%
2nd. grade	0 0%	9 5.4%	10 6.0%	0 0%	0 0%	19 11.3%
3rd.grade	0 0%	9 5.4%	2 1.2%	0 0%	0 0%	11 6.5%
4th. grade	2 1.2%	7 4.2%	3 1.8%	0 0%	0 0%	12 7.1%
5th. grade	0 0%	8 4.8%	5 3.0%	1 .6%	0 0%	14 8.3%
Resource teachers	0 0%	7 4.2%	28 16.7%	4 2.4%	1 .6%	40 23.8%
Kinder- garten	0 0%	12 7.1%	6 3.6%	1 .6%	0 0%	19 11.3%
Pre- school	0 0%	5 3.0%	2 1.2%	1 .6%	0 0%	8 4.8%
No grade indicated	7 4.2%	7 4.2%	3 1.8%	1 .6%	0 0%	19 11.3%
Total	9 5.4%	78 46.4%	70 41.7%	9 5.4%	2 1.2%	168 100%

educational level by their job assignment.

Teachers were asked to indicate their involvement in the following school decision making responsibilities or committees: site-based management team, department chairperson, testing committee, school curriculum development team, school textbook adoption committee, and school child study team. They were also provided with space to write in any additional school committee involvement. Responses were weighted with two points each assigned to: involvement with site-based management team, department chairperson, curriculum development team, and child study team. One point each was assigned to: involvement in the school testing committee, textbook adoption committee, and write-in committees. One hundred six teachers, 63.1% of the total group scored one to five points on the ten-point weighted scale. Twenty teachers (12%) scored six to ten points on the ten-point weighted scale. Twenty-five percent of the teachers indicated no involvement with committees or responsibilities. These data are shown in Table 4.

### Instrument

The instrument developed in this study is the **Satisfaction with Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire (SPDMQ)**. This instrument has two parts. The first part (all **a** items) is a measure of teachers' desired level of participation in decision making. The second part (all **b** items) is a measure of teachers' perceived actual level of participation in decision making. The discrepancy between the two is a measure of the level of satisfaction with participation in decision making. The greater the discrepancy,

TABLE 4

## TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL COMMITTEES

Involvement Points	Number of Teachers	Percent of Teachers
1	20	11.9
2	29	17.3
3	17	10.1
4	20	11.9
5	20	11.9
6	8	4.8
7	5	3.0
8	2	1.2
9	4	2.4
10	1	.6
No Involvement	42	25

Distributed across SBM schools and NSBM schools



the less the satisfaction with participation in decision making.

The instrument was designed using a five-point Likert scale with the following values: (1) Never; (2) Rarely; (3) Sometimes; (4) Often; (5) Always.

### Development of the Instrument

The development of the instrument involved the following steps:

1. Reviewed the literature to identify the domains of teacher satisfaction with participation in decision making.
2. Created items in each domain.
3. Reviewed and revised items so that they clearly expressed an idea related to the domains. This step included asking other doctoral students, administrators, teachers, and the dissertation committee members to review the items created on the draft instrument.
4. Made revisions on the draft instrument based on feedback from fellow doctoral students, administrators, teachers, and dissertation committee members.
5. Administered the draft instrument to fellow doctoral students, administrators and teachers.
6. Made revisions to instrument based on feedback from the administration of the draft instrument.
7. Administered the new draft instrument to selected teachers and

administrators.

8. Made final revisions based on feedback from the selected teachers and administrators.
9. Presented final instrument for use.
10. Administered the final instrument to teachers in five elementary schools.

The first draft instrument was developed after a review and analysis of literature in the following areas: school/site-based management, teacher empowerment, participatory management, and shared decision making. This analysis resulted in the identification of domains consisting of issues that were formulated into items for inclusion in the draft instrument. Each item was phrased in terms of desired and actual levels of involvement. The four domains formulated were: (1) involvement in the operation of the school; (2) involvement in establishing curriculum and instructional techniques; (3) involvement in teacher development, evaluation, and work allocation; and (4) involvement in establishing student-teacher relationships. Each item on the instrument is connected to a particular domain of teacher involvement in school decision making. The domains and items identified thus are in Table 5:

TABLE 5

DOMAINS AND ITEMS ON THE SATISFACTION WITH PARTICIPATION IN  
DECISION MAKING QUESTIONNAIRE

Involvement in the Operation of the School

Desired Participation		Actual Participation	
1. a.	I want to be involved in the planning of the use of school facilities.	1. b.	I am involved in the planning of the use of school facilities.
2. a.	I want to be involved in establishing the budget for the operation of the school.	2. b.	I am involved in establishing the budget for the operation of the school.
3. a.	I want to be involved in the hiring of staff members new to the school.	3. b.	I am involved in the hiring of staff members new to the school.
4. a.	I want to be involved in decisions about how to spend my school's discretionary funds.	4. b.	I am involved in decisions about how to spend my school's discretionary funds.
5. a.	I want to be involved in developing the school's master schedule.	5. b.	I am involved in developing the school's master schedule.

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

Involvement in Establishing Curriculum  
and  
Instructional Techniques

Desired Participation		Actual Participation	
6. a.	I want to teach topics of my choice that correlate with the curriculum.	6. b.	I am allowed to teach topics of my choice that correlate with the curriculum.
7. a.	I want to use the teaching methods of my choice to meet my students' educational needs.	7. b.	I am allowed to use the teaching methods of my choice to meet my students' educational needs.
8. a.	I want to have input in establishing the school curriculum.	8. b.	I am involved in establishing the school curriculum.
9. a.	I want to be involved in selecting the textbooks used in my classroom.	9. b.	I am involved in selecting the textbooks used in my classroom.
10. a.	I want to design my own evaluation tools to report my students' progress.	10. b.	I am allowed to design my own evaluation tool to report my students' progress.

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

Involvement in Teacher Development, Evaluation,  
and  
Work Allocation

Desired Participation

Actual Participation

11. a.	I want to be involved in deciding the school in which I teach.	11. b.	I am involved in deciding the school in which I teach.
12. a.	I want to be involved in selecting the students assigned to my class.	12. b.	I am involved in selecting the students assigned to my class.
13. a.	I want to decide the staff development I receive.	13. b.	I am allowed to select the staff development I receive.
14. a.	I want to be involved in selecting the evaluation instrument used to measure my job performance.	14. b.	I am involved in selecting the evaluation instrument used to measure my job performance.
15. a.	I want to select the subject(s) or grade level(s) that I teach.	15. b.	I am allowed to select the subject(s) or grade levels that I teach.

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

Involvement in Establishing Student-Teacher Relationships

Desired Participation		Actual Participation	
16. a.	I want to be involved in establishing grading policies.	16. b.	I am involved in establishing grading policies for my school.
17. a.	I want to be involved in establishing student discipline codes.	17. b.	I am involved in establishing students discipline codes.
18. a.	I want to be informed of any specific problems of students assigned to my class.	18. b.	I am informed of any specific problems of students assigned to my class.
19. a.	I want to be involved in the selection of my students who need to receive special instruction or assistance.	19. b.	I am involved in selecting my students who need to receive special instruction or assistance.
20. a.	I want to be allowed to temporarily remove problem students from my classroom.	20. b.	I am allowed to temporarily remove problem students from my classroom.

## Validity

Several steps were taken to establish the content and construct validity of the instrument, as described below.

Content and Construct Validity. The degree to which a measure relates to other variables as expected within a system of theoretical relationships is content validity (Babbie, 1992). The degree to which an instrument measures an intended hypothetical construct which explains behavior is construct validity (Gay, 1987). A review of the draft instrument by fellow doctoral students, administrators, teachers, and other educators, was the first attempt to address content and construct validity (See Table 6). The first step was to discuss the four domains selected to see if they were representative of areas of interest in education where teachers wanted to have involvement in school decision making. The questions under each domain were discussed to see if they were clearly related. These steps provided adequate expert judgement on how well the items represented the domains associated with teachers' satisfaction in decision making. Doctoral students, administrators, teachers, and other educators, were given an opportunity to write comments about the instrument including their opinions on questions that were unclear or had double meanings, questions that were unnecessary, and questions that should be added. Based on this phase of the instrument development, revisions were made and the revised version of the instrument was compiled for the second draft test.

The second draft test was useful in identifying problems that teachers may have in interpreting and answering questions. The instrument was administered to 15 randomly

TABLE 6  
CONTENT MATRIX

Survey Item	Literature Review	Doctoral Students Responses	Administrators Responses	Teachers Responses
1. I want to be involved in the planning of the use of school facilities.	Clune & White, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986	supportive of this question	supportive of this question	supportive of this question
2. I want to be involved in establishing the budget for the operation of the school.	Clune & White, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
3. I want to be involved in the hiring of staff members new to my school.	Clune & White, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988 Lindle, 1996 Casner-Lotto, 1988 Turner, 1987 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question



4. I want to be involved in decisions about how to spend my school's discretionary funds.	Clune & White, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
5. I want to be involved in developing my school's master schedule.	Clune & White, 1988 Lindle, 1996 Casner-Lotto, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
6. I want to teach topics of my choice that correlate with the curriculum	Wohlstetter, 1995 Clune & White, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Turner, 1987 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
7. I want to use the teaching methods of my choice to meet my student's educational needs.	Wohlstetter, 1995 Clune & White, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988 Lindle, 1996 Casner-Lotto, 1988 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question

8. I want to have input in establishing the school curriculum.	Wohlstetter, 1995 Clune & White, 1988 Maeroff, 1988 Casner-Lotto, 1988 Lindle, 1996 Smylie, 1994 Turner 1987 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
9. I want to be involved in selecting textbooks used in my classroom.	Clune & White, 1988 Turner, 1987 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
10. I want to design my own evaluation tools to report my student's progress.	Clune & White, 1988 Maeroff, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Romanish, 1990 Turner, 1987	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
11. I want to be involved in deciding the school in which I teach.	Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
12. I want to be involved in selecting students assigned to my class.	Maeroff, 1988 Lindle, 1996 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question

13. I want to decide the staff development I receive.	Maeroff, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988 Casner-Lotto, 1988 Turner, 1987 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
14. I want to be involved in selecting the evaluation instrument used to measure my job performance.	Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988 Turner, 1987	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
15. I want to select the subject (s) or grade level (s) that I teach.	Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
16. I want to be involved in establishing grading policies for my school.	Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Maeroff, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question

17. I want to be involved in establishing students discipline codes.	Maeroff, 1988 Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986 Lindle, 1996 Casner-Lotto, 1988 Turner, 1987 Sickler, 1988	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
18. I want to be informed of any specific problems of students assigned to my class.	Elliott, 1996 Lerner, 1993 Martin, 1998	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
19. I want to be involved in the selection of my students who need to special training or assistance.	Maeroff, 1988 Lerner, 1993 Elliott, 1996 Webber, 1998 Martin, 1998	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question
20. I want to be allowed to temporarily remove problem students from my classroom.	Lindle, 1996	supportive of the question	supportive of the question	supportive of the question

selected teachers from an elementary school that was not included in the selected population. These teachers were asked to complete the instrument and record the amount of time needed for its completion. They were also asked to offer suggestions that would strengthen the instrument. The results of the administration of the second draft instrument were useful in assuring that the domains were representative of areas of interest where teachers wanted involvement in school decision making. Furthermore, the results were useful in making the question's more teacher friendly. Also, the time for completion of the instrument was determined by establishing a mean score. Based on this phase of the instrument development, further revisions were made, and the third draft instrument was completed.

The third draft instrument was administered to fellow doctoral students. The results of this final draft test were useful in further identifying problems teachers may have in interpreting and answering questions. In addition, an estimate of the time needed for administration of the instrument was determined. The final instrument contained 20 questions which fell into four domains, with five questions in each domain. Each question measures a desired level of involvement and a perceived actual level of involvement in school decision making. (See Appendix A).

### Scoring Procedures

There were 20 two-part items and four domains included in the final draft of the

instrument. Each of the four domains contained 5 two-part items. Part “a” of each item asked teachers about their desired level of involvement and part “b” of each item asked teachers about their perceived actual level involvement in school decision making.

In order to determine teachers’ satisfaction with involvement in each of the four domains teachers’ responses to the five items in each domain were subjected to the discrepancy equation: *Difference (a-b) = Satisfaction*. For example, a response of “4” on item (1a) and a response of “2” on (1b) results in a discrepancy score of “-2.” Likewise, a response of “2” on item (1a) and a response by the same teacher of “5” on item (1b) would result in a discrepancy score of “+3.” A negative discrepancy score on an item suggests that the teacher wants to have more involvement. The closer to “0”, the higher the teacher’s satisfaction. Zero indicates the highest degree of satisfaction.

The domain discrepancy score for each teacher was computed by summing the five discrepancy scores for each domain. As a result, each teacher had four domain discrepancy scores. These scores, in turn, were summed to determine overall satisfaction.

In addition to determining discrepancy scores, total scores for desired and actual involvement scores were the sums of all “a” items. All “b” items were summed to produce totals for actual involvement.

### Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which test scores are free from errors of measurement (Drummond, 1996). The reliability of the **Satisfaction with Participation in Decision**

**Making Questionnaire (SPDMQ)** was computed using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha affords opportunity to assess the reliability of the instrument. The results indicate that for the various items in SPDMQ there is a moderately strong reliability.

t-tests were used to determine the discrepancy of teachers' satisfaction with their involvement in the operation of the school, in establishing curriculum and instructional techniques, in teacher development, evaluation, and work allocation, establishing student/teacher relationships, total desired involvement, and total actual involvement, based upon their participation in a site-based management program, or a non site-based management program. t-tests were also used to determine if satisfaction of teachers' total involvement was affected by their age, race, and years of experience. Data relative to these questions were subjected to ABstat subprogram TIND, the t-test for independent samples. Chi square was computed by cross tabulation for each school regarding teachers' satisfaction in decision making based on their sex, race, involvement on committees, their educational level, and their grade assignment. Descriptives were computed using the SPSS for frequencies, means, standard deviations, minimums, and maximums for all variables.