

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
RURAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS'
PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS
AND THEIR LEVEL OF SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT

by

Faleese M. Jenkins

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

~~_____~~
Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune
Co-Chairman

~~_____~~
Dr. Robert R. Richards
Co-Chairman

~~_____~~
Dr. Ronald L. McKeen

~~_____~~
Dr. Edward A. Ianni

~~_____~~
Dr. Kenneth E. Underwood

June 1987

Blacksburg, Virginia

7-25-61
H G 8

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
RURAL HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS'
PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS
AND THEIR LEVEL OF SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT

by

Faleese M. Jenkins
(ABSTRACT)

Co-Chairmen: Dr. Jimmie C. Fortune
Dr. Robert R. Richards

The nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement through a rebuilding of our educational system has not come without controversy; however, one element that is consistent throughout the research (Carnegie, Holmes, NEA, and the National Governors Association) is that teachers should participate in setting school goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance. This, of course, means a major shift in the current organizational and managerial structure of the school. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' involvement in decision-making and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic programs in their schools. Also, an investigation was made between the relationship of the teachers' demographic characteristics and desired levels of involvement with the levels they reported.

The hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their subject area and the number of students assigned to their school, towards their

involvement in planning school goals and policies.

2. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their years of employment, gender, race, or age, towards their involvement in planning school goals and policies.

3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making.

4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual level of involvement in school decision-making.

This correlational study employed the High__School Teacher_Involvement_Questionnaire survey, which was designed to identify relationships between selected school and teacher variables and the involvement of teachers in decision-making. The population consisted of 576 Northeastern North Carolina high school teachers (grades 9 through 12). Of the total population, 551 questionnaires were returned and analyzed via frequency distribution, oneway analysis of variance and Pearson Product Moment Correlation procedures.

Findings

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' involvement in decision-making and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic programs in their schools. Also, an investigation was made between the relationship of the teachers' demographic characteristics and desired levels of involvement with the levels they reported. In this research study, oneway analysis of variance statistical procedures were used to test Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 and Pearson Product Moment Correlational statistical procedures were used to test Hypothesis 3 and Hypothesis 4. Statistically significant differences were observed for Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 while statistically significant differences were only observed for half of the analyses presented for Hypothesis 2. Therefore, Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 were rejected and Hypothesis 2 was only rejected in part.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses her sincere appreciation to the many persons who made this study possible.

To Dr. Robert Richards and Dr. Jimmie Fortune for their guidance throughout the doctoral program and this study. Their confidence in my ability has sustained me over many potentially impossible situations.

To Dr. Ronald McKeen, Dr. Kenneth Underwood, and Dr. Ianni for their guidance throughout my study and for their cooperation as members of my doctoral committee.

To my parents, Thelma and Elijah Boston; and to my sister, Peola Forster, and her husband, Charles, who sacrificed in the early years to make this opportunity available to me.

To my mother-in-law, Alma Jenkins, who inspired me with her unrelentless quest for knowledge.

To Valerie Villines for being a true friend throughout this endeavor.

To Queenie Turner, Sarah White, and Corene Williams for their moral support and encouragement.

To God for answering my prayers and who gave me the strength and wisdom to persevere.

F.M.J.

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to the writer's family. To my husband, Jimmy, for his inspiration and support; and to my children, Lisa, Ginger and Jimmy Jr., for their understanding and encouragement.

F.M.J.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	x
 Chapter 1	
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF STUDY	3
Hypotheses	3
SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY.	4
Limitations of Study	6
Assumptions of Study	6
DEFINITION OF TERMS	7
ORGANIZATION OF STUDY	8
 Chapter 2	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
TEACHING AS A PROFESSION	10
ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS	11
Goals of Education	11
Subject Requirements	12
Extending the School Day or Year	16
Governance of American Schools	16
EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS	17
THE EFFECTIVE TEACHER	23
SUMMARY	37

	Page
Chapter 3	
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	39
METHOD AND PROCEDURE	39
RESEARCH DESIGN	43
Population	43
DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENT	44
Chapter 4	
ANALYSIS OF DATA	45
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	45
SUBJECT AREA AND SCHOOL POPULATION	54
Hypothesis 1	54
YEARS EMPLOYED, GENDER, RACE AND AGE	60
Hypothesis 2	60
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXPECTED AND REPORTED TEACHER INVOLVEMENT	72
Hypothesis 3	72
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND TEACHER INVOLVEMENT	74
ANALYSIS OF OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	76
CHAPTER SUMMARY	77
Chapter 5	
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	79
SUMMARY	79
Purpose of Study	79
Hypotheses	80
Significance of Study	80

	Page
Methodology	81
Research Design	82
Population	82
Description of Instrument	82
FINDINGS	83
DISCUSSION	84
CONCLUSIONS	87
RECOMMENDATIONS	87
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	89
APPENDICES	
A -- GALLOP POLL	97
B -- HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE (HSTIQ)	112
C -- LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL	118
D -- LETTER TO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR APPROVAL	120
E -- FIRST LETTER TO RESEARCH SUBJECTS	122
F -- SECOND LETTER TO RESEARCH SUBJECTS	124
VITA	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE Correlation Coefficients (Test-Retest Method)	42
2. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY TEACHING AREA	46
3. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY SCHOOL'S STUDENT POPULATION	47
4. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY GENDER	49
5. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY RACE	50
6. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY AGE	51
7. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY YEARS EMPLOYED AS A TEACHER	52
8. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES BY RATING OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS	53
9. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR SUBJECT AREA	55
10. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR SUBJECT AREA	56

	Page
11. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR SCHOOL'S STUDENT POPULATION	58
12. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR SCHOOL'S STUDENT POPULATION	59
13. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT	61
14. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT	62
15. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR GENDER	64
16. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR GENDER	65
17. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR RACE	67
18. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR RACE	68

	Page
19. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR AGE	70
20. ONEWAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS, BASED UPON THEIR AGE	71
21. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN THE IDEAL AND ACTUAL LEVELS OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS.	73
22. PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN RATINGS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND REPORTED (ACTUAL) LEVELS OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING, AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS	75
23. THE GOALS OF EDUCATION The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	98
24. SUBJECT REQUIREMENTS The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	100
25. SUBJECT REQUIREMENTS The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	101
26. SHOULD SEX EDUCATION BE REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	102

	Page
27. WHICH SEX EDUCATION TOPICS SHOULD BE REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	103
28. SHOULD SEX EDUCATION BE REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	104
29. IF SEX EDUCATION IS REQUIRED IN THE THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, WHAT INSTRUCTIONAL TOPICS SHOULD BE COVERED? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	105
30. WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE IN DECIDING WHAT IS TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	106
31. WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE IN SELECTING BOOKS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOMS AND LIBRARIES? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	107
32. WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE IN DECIDING WHAT IS TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	108

	Page
33. WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE IN SELECTING BOOKS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL CLASSROOMS AND LIBRARIES? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	109
34. DO YOU BELIEVE THE SCHOOL DAY SHOULD BE EXTENDED BY ONE HOUR? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	110
35. DO YOU BELIEVE THE SCHOOL YEAR SHOULD BE EXTENDED BY 31 DAYS, MAKING THE SCHOOL YEAR ABOUT 210 DAYS OF 10 MONTHS LONG? The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools April 30 - May 9, 1984	111

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The 1980s will be remembered for two developments: the beginning of a sweeping reassessment of the basis of the nation's economic strength and an outpouring of concern for the quality of American education (Carnegie, 1986). The nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement, in a characteristically American way, was initiated and seized by state political leaders, volunteer business groups, local officials, higher education leaders, professional educators, citizens, and parents. Each sought the causes for a widely perceived decline in the quality of American education while making, each in their own domain, determined efforts to redress the balance (Carnegie, 1986).

The nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement through a rebuilding of our educational system has not come without controversy. Course requirements for students have been stiffened, teachers' salaries raised, and new standards put in place in most states. Teacher educators have taken the initiative in re-examining the quality of teacher education and are attempting to improve it, etc.

Major elements of the Carnegie plan include the following:

- Teachers should participate in setting goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance.
- Decision-making of a collegial nature in which "lead teachers" play a central role. "Lead teacher" elected by teachers to be the

instructional manager; contract for services from central office. Hold "lead teachers" accountable; if not successful, remove.

The Holmes report, Tomorrow's Teachers, includes the following points:

- Increase practitioner's role in school management.
- The teaching profession should be restructured to reflect differentiated staffing patterns with rewards linked to various career stages for teachers.
 - . Instructor
 - . Professional Teacher
 - . Career Professional

The National Education Association's publication, The Learning Workplace: The Conditions and Resources of Teaching, contained the following:

- Create an autonomous, state level agency, governed by a majority of teachers, to approve certification, would also approve teacher preparation programs and initially license practitioners.
- Teachers do not have the opportunity to bring their professional expertise to bear in decision-making (decisional-deprivation).
- Communication between teachers and building level administrators is less frequent than desired.

Major elements of the National Governors' Association's Time for Results are as follows:

- A new compact between teachers and the public.
- Professional work environment.
- Teachers acknowledge responsibility to highest standards of professional competence.
- Schools must devise new ways of doing business.
- Supports creation of National Board of Professional Standards.
- New school structures required.
- Strong leaders
- Shared decision-making

- Greater opportunity for collegial relationships between teachers and administrators.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

As previously stated, this nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement through a rebuilding of our educational system has not come without controversy; however, one element that is consistent throughout the research (Carnegie, Holmes, NEA, and the National Governors Association) is that teachers should participate in setting school goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance. This, of course, means a major shift in the current organizational and managerial structure of the school. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' involvement in decision-making and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic programs in their schools. Also, an investigation was made between the relationship of the teachers' demographic characteristics and desired levels of involvement with the levels they reported.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their subject area and the number of students assigned to their school, towards their involvement in planning school goals and policies.
2. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their years of employment,

gender, race, or age, towards their involvement in planning school goals and policies.

3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making.

4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual level of involvement in school decision-making.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to measure the level of high school teachers' opinion regarding their involvement and interest in teacher-cited items of academic concern.

One element that is consistent throughout the research (Carnegie, Holmes, NEA, and the National Governors Association) is that teachers should participate in setting school goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance. This study is significant in that teachers were interviewed directly to obtain the items for the questionnaire. This procedure is a major shift from previous methods where items were composed by individuals other than teachers; even though teachers, along with their students, are the most important factor in the classroom and are in the best position to give expert input in the decision-making process. In addition, the survey was conducted

in rural northeast North Carolina where high school students lag behind other students in the state in performance on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and other standardized examinations (Fact Book, 1983: 12). As a result of the students' test performance, teachers are likely to become concerned about school effectiveness (because the teacher is the most important factor in the classroom learning environment). School effectiveness may be based on the teachers' attitudes and the teachers' attitudes are formed on the basis of their desired involvement verses their actual involvement in decision-making in the schools.

Consequently, this study may assist school in gaining insight as it relates to the teachers' desired involvement verses actual involvement. Through item analysis, administrators may gleam some guidance in the assignment of teachers on school committees and other related school activities designed to achieve the educational goals and objectives of the school. Thus, this study provides educators with baseline data on high school teacher involvement in planning school goals and policies. Furthermore, this study provides research information about the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward their school's effectiveness and their involvement, and their level of interest in planning school goals and policies.

Limitations of Study

This study was limited to the following framework of research:

1. It was confined to the Northeastern North Carolina Education District counties.
2. It was further confined to high schools (grades 9 through 12) within the fifteen counties.
3. The respondents were the full-time classroom teachers of each high school.
4. The findings and conclusions generated in this study were only generalizable to similar situations.

Assumptions of Study

The basic assumptions underlying this study were as follows:

1. The opinions of the 20 teachers interviewed accurately reflect academic and instructional school programs in which teachers wish to be involved in school decision-making.
2. The responses of the teachers to the questionnaire reflect their true opinions.
3. Teachers know their level (actual) of involvement in school decision-making.
4. Teachers know their desired (ideal) level of involvement in school decision-making.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this questionnaire, the following definitions apply to describe the academic or instructional program presented in this study.

1. Special course offerings for students - policies governing "special" student courses or programs.

2. Establishment of honor courses - policies and goals of college preparation courses.

3. Professional time - determining the use of the teacher's instructional and noninstructional time.

4. Contracting courses - policies that govern contracts made by a school with consultants, colleges, universities, etc., to provide specialized courses for teachers.

5. School philosophy and goals - procedures that determine the school's general direction.

6. Professional growth - programs designed to increase the professional abilities of teachers.

7. School Effectiveness. An academically effective school is distinguished by its culture: a structure, process, and

climate of values and norms that channel staff and students in the direction of successful teaching and learning.

8. Principal Effectiveness. Effective schools studies show that the principal is a key person in establishing and maintaining good schools; the characteristics and techniques that effective principals display.

9. Teacher Effectiveness. Effective schools studies indicate that effective teachers display many of the following characteristics: well-organized, efficient, task oriented, knowledgeable, verbally fluent, aware of student developmental levels, clear, enthusiastic, self-confident, confident of student abilities, hold high expectations, are friendly and warm, encouraging and supportive, attentive, accepting, and tolerant.

10. Teacher Involvement. The level of active involvement teachers have in planning school goals and policies for certain aspect of the educational program.

ORGANIZATION OF STUDY

The introduction, purpose of study, hypotheses of study, significance, definition of terms, limitations, assumptions, and organization of the study are described in Chapter 1. A review of related research studies and select-

ed literature pertaining to school effectiveness and teacher involvement are presented in Chapter 2.

Chapter 3 contains a detailed description of the methodology utilized in collecting and analyzing the data while Chapter 4 includes the presentation and analysis of the data. Finally, Chapter 5 provides the summary, conclusions, discussions, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Educators have become increasingly convinced that the characteristics of schools are important determinants of academic achievement. The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature relevant to this study of school effectiveness and teacher involvement. The research literature will be presented in five major sections: teaching as a profession, attitudes toward education and schools, effective schools, effective teachers, and effective principals.

TEACHING AS A PROFESSION

The person who becomes a teacher assumes the deepest sense of responsibility a society can bestow upon a human being. Education is linked both to public policy and to individuals' hopes and dreams. It can involve people, money, ideas, goals, methods, knowledge and other factors. Teaching has been described as an art by some, and as a science by others. Teaching as an art calls for inspiration, intuition, talent and creativity -- very little of which actually can be taught. Teaching as a science requires knowledge and skills that can be learned. Most people agree that teaching has both artistic and scientific elements (Ellis, Cogan, and Howey, 1981).

In the United States, teachers are male, female, young, old, white, non-white, experienced, newly trained -- a wide variety of people with different personalities, different specializations, different opinions and different goals. Education serves several important functions. Five important functions are intellectual development, physical development, character development, moral training and citizenship training. The range and depth of the school's responsibility for these functions have become a great controversy.

People grow and change with acquired knowledge and experience. Trends in education are continuously evolving, recycling and passing in and out of favor (Elliss, Cogan and Howey, 1981: 5-20).

Teachers should believe in the dignity of teaching and in the value of professional knowledge and skills. A well-adjusted teacher must have well-formulated, attainable professional and educational goals (Smith, 1969: 449).

ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS

Goals of Education

U.S. teachers, responding to The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools (Phi Delta Kappan 1985), were asked to rate the importance of certain goals of education on a scale of zero to 10 (see Appendix A, Table

23). Fifty-six percent of teachers gave the highest rating (10) to two goals: developing good work habits, the ability to organize one's thoughts, and the ability to concentrate; and developing the ability to think -- creatively, objectively, and analytically. Fifty-five percent of teachers gave a top rating to developing the ability to speak and write correctly; 53 percent to developing the ability to use mathematics for everyday problems; 51 percent to encouraging the desire to continue learning as a lifelong process.

The highest percentage of the U.S. public (68 percent) gave a 10 to developing the ability to speak and write correctly. The second-highest percentage of the public (64 percent) gave the highest rating to developing standards of what is right and wrong.

Subject Requirements

One of the major recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education was that significantly more time in high school be devoted to the traditional basics, English and mathematics, as well as to certain "new" basics, including science, computer science, foreign languages for the college-bound, and vocational training. Virtually all teachers, responding to The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Public Schools (Phi Delta Kappan 1985), felt that English, math, and science should be required for all students, both those who intend to go to college and those who do not (see Appendix A, Table 24).

Teachers, however, would distinguish between the college-bound and the non-college-bound in the number of years they would require of a given subject. For example, the average number of years of English that teachers could require for college-bound students was 3.8; the figure for non-college-bound students was 3.6. The figures for math were 3.4 years for college-bound and 2.7 for the non-college-bound. For science, teachers would require 3.0 years for the college-bound and 2.2 years for the non-college-bound.

The U.S. public agreed with (see Appendix A, Table 25) teachers (Phi Delta Kappan 1985) about the importance of requiring high school students to take English and mathematics. More than 90 percent of teachers and of the U.S. public would require all students to take these subjects. Similar percentages of the public and of teachers would require high school students to take business, and a somewhat smaller percentage of the public than of teachers would require high school students to take history and science. For all other subjects, however, a much smaller percentage of the public than of teachers endorsed course requirements for either college-bound or non-college-bound students.

U.S. teachers overwhelmingly support sex education in both public high schools and public elementary schools (Appendix A, Table 26). Almost nine out of 10 teachers (86 percent) believed that sex education should be part of the instructional program in the high schools; only 8 percent

opposed the idea. Seventy-five percent of teachers favored including sex education in the elementary schools; only 18 percent opposed the idea. Teachers, however, believed that different sexual topics were appropriate for different levels of schooling (Appendix A, Table 27). For example, eight of ten teachers felt that the following topics should be covered in high school sex education courses: the biology of reproduction, venereal disease, and birth control. Smaller majorities felt that premarital sex, abortion, homosexuality, and the nature of sexual intercourse should be covered in high school classes. Other than biology of reproduction, much smaller percentages of teachers felt that specific sexual topics should be covered in elementary schools.

Almost as large a percentage of the U.S. public (70 percent) as U.S. teachers (86 percent) supported sex education as part of the high school instructional program (Table 28). For elementary schools, the public was about evenly divided; 45 percent favored and 48 percent opposed sex education in elementary schools. However, with regard to the specific topics to be included in sex education at both levels, the public was substantially less in favor of instruction in each of these areas (Appendix A, Table 29).

U.S. teachers felt that they should have the most influence in deciding what is taught in the public schools in their communities, according to the findings of the Gallop Poll (Appendix A, Table 30). They felt even more

strongly that they should have the most influence in the selection of books for classroom use and for school libraries (Appendix A, Table 31). For example, 33 percent of teachers stated that teachers should have the most influence in deciding what is taught; 19 percent said the school board, 17 percent said the state government, and 3 percent said the federal government. Only 2 percent said that parents should have the greatest influence in deciding what is taught. Almost 8 in 10 teachers (79 percent) stated that they should have the most influence in the selection of books for classrooms and school libraries. Only 4 percent said principals or school administrators, 3 percent said the school board, and 2 percent said the parents.

Whereas teachers believed strongly that they should have the most say in determining what is taught in the public schools, the public felt that parents and local school boards should have the most influence in this area. Only 11 percent of the public agreed that teachers should have the most influence; 27 percent said the school board, and 24 percent said parents (Appendix A, Table 32). In selection of books for classrooms and school libraries, only 42 percent of the public stated that teachers should have the most influence. About one in five members of the public (18 percent) believed that parents should have the most influence (Appendix A, Table 33).

Extending the School Day or Year

Some of the education reform reports have recommended extending the length of the school day, the length of the school year, or both, in order to provide more time for instruction. U.S. teachers (Appendix A, Tables 34 and 35) opposed both of these recommendations by roughly the same margins -- 72 percent to 24 percent in the case of lengthening the school day and 66 percent to 28 percent in the case of lengthening the school year. By contrast, the U.S. public was only marginally opposed to lengthening the school day or school year. The public opposed extending the school day by a margin of 42 percent to 52 percent, and the public opposed extending the school year by a margin of 44 percent to 50 percent.

Governance of American Schools

During the summer of 1984, Ron Brandt, executive editor of Educational Leadership, led a three-day workshop at the University of Montana to review the numerous national reports on the status of the educational system. After comparing the recommendations of the various panels, boards, and commissions with the observations of John Goodlad, Ernest Boyer, and Ted Sizer, the participants (teachers and principals) came up with a recommendation of their own: change the way American schools are governed (Brandt, 1984). They wanted more discretion for themselves, but the trend was to centralize decisions at the state level.

Richard J. Deasy (1984) believed that the fundamental purpose of educational policy is to create, nurture, and sustain those contexts in which students can best learn and teachers best teach. Thus, in order to produce dynamic rather than destructive tension in the schools, Deasy proposed the following guidelines:

1. Each policy must be justified in terms of a comprehensive view of the school.

2. The shaping of a policy and, without question, its implementation should be collaborative. Participation by those who will be affected is not just politically necessary; it also gives them ownership of the decision and mobilizes rather than frustrates their energy.

3. We must state what will count as success if the policy is implemented. We also need to know what we are losing in exchange for the gains.

4. We should say how much we are willing to commit to implementation of the policy. Changing behavior, and particularly behavior in social institutions, requires. To pretend that quick changes can be made is unfair to schools and deceives the public into setting unreal expectations.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

Purkey and Smith's review of the literature on school effectiveness concluded that differences among schools do affect students' academic achievement (1982). This literature challenges previous research that had found unequal academic achievement to be primarily a function of family

background and related variables (Coleman, et.al., 1966; Jencks, et. al., 1972). Easily measured differences among schools -- class size, teacher salaries, number of books in the library, the reading series, the age of the building, or whether or not the school had a compensatory education program -- were found to bear little relationship to achievement (Averch, et. al., 1972; Coleman, et. al., 1966; Jencks, et. al., 1972; Stephens, 1967; Hanushek, 1981; Mullin and Summers, 1981; Murnane, 1980).

According to the findings of Purkey and Smith, two elements in particular appear to be common to effective school: high expectations for student achievement on the part of school staff members, and strong instructional leadership on the part of the school principal or another staff member. Other elements that are common to a significant number of effective schools include the following:

1. Well-defined school goals and emphases
2. Staff training on a schoolwide basis
3. Control by staff over instructional and training decisions
4. A sense of order
5. A system for monitoring student progress
6. Good discipline (1982)

In addition, private schools with high student achievement have good attendance, assign more homework, offer a strong academic program, and emphasize high standards. Schools that are safe for students also stress academic

excellence and program improvement, and have strong leadership.

A review of the literature by Joseph D'Amico found that each effective school may be one of a kind (1972). Although the conclusions of the four school effectiveness studies reviewed (Brookover and Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1981; Phi Delta Kappan -- Duckett, et. al., 1980; and Rutter, et. al., 1979) seemed similar and appeared to support most school improvement efforts, the conclusions do not match. Not only is the number of characteristics different in each study, but also the characteristics that seem similar are expressed differently. In addition, some characteristics seen as "indispensable" by some authors -- e.g., strong administrative leadership -- are not included at all in others. A summary of D'Amico's content analysis review of the studies follows.

Brookover and Lezotte's characteristics of effective schools are

1. Improving schools accept and emphasize the importance of basic skills mastery as prime goals and objectives.
2. Staff of improving schools believe all students can master the basic skills objectives and they believe the principal shares this belief.
3. Staff of improving schools expect their students will go on with their education.

4. Staff of improving schools do not make excuses: they assume responsibility for teaching the basic skills and are committed to do so.

5. Staff of improving school spend more time on achieving basic skills objectives.

6. Principals at improving schools are assertive instructional leaders and disciplinarians, and they assume responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic skills objectives.

7. Staff at improving schools accept the concept of accountability and are involved in developing (or using) accountability models.

8. Teachers at improving schools are not very satisfied or complacent about the status quo.

9. There is more parent-initiated contact and involvement at improving schools (even though the overall amount of parent involvement is less).

10. The compensatory education programs in improving schools de-emphasize paraprofessional involvement and teacher involvement in the selection of compensatory education bound students.

Characteristics of effective schools developed by Edmonds (1981) are as follows:

1. Clarity that pupil acquisition of the basic skills takes precedence over all other school activities.

2. There is a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement.

3. Administrative leadership is strong and without it the disparate elements of good schooling can be neither brought together nor kept together.

4. A means is present by which pupil progress can be frequently measured.

5. There is an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand.

The findings of Duckett, et. al., 1979 (Phi Delta Kappan), into the characteristics of effective schools are summarized below.

1. Successful schools characterized by clearly stated curricular goals and objectives.

2. The leaders' attitudes toward urban education and expectations for school or program success determine the impact of the leader on exceptional schools.

3. The behavior of the designated school or program leader is crucial in determining school success.

4. Successful urban schools frequently employ techniques of individualized instruction.

5. Structured learning environments are particularly successful in urban classrooms.

6. Reductions in adult/child ratios are associated with positive school performance.

7. Successful schools are often supported with special project funds from federal, state, and local sources.

8. Successful urban schools are characterized by high levels of parental contact with the school and parental involvement with school activities.

9. Successful schools frequently use staff development or in-service training programs to realize their objectives.

10. The greater the specificity or focus of the training program in terms of goals or processes, the greater the likelihood of its success.

11. Resource and facility manipulations alone are insufficient to affect school outcomes.

Characteristics of effective schools developed by Rutter, et. al., 1979, are presented as follows:

1. Outcomes were better in schools where teachers expected the children to achieve well.

2. Outcomes were better in schools that provided pleasant working conditions for the pupils.

3. Outcomes were better in schools where immediate, direct praise and approval were the prevalent means of classroom feedback.

4. Outcomes were better in schools where teachers presented themselves as positive role models demonstrating punctuality, concern for the physical well-being of the

school building, concern for the emotional well-being of the pupils, and restraint in the use of physical punishment.

5. Children's behavior was better in schools where teachers were readily available to be consulted by children about problems and where many children consulted with teachers.

6. Outcomes were better in schools where a high proportion of children held some kind of position of responsibility in the school system.

7. A school's atmosphere is influenced positively by the degree to which it functions as a coherent whole, with agreed ways of doing things that are consistent throughout the school and that have the general support of all staff.

THE EFFECTIVE TEACHER

Teachers have acquired attitudes toward teaching through their training in teacher education program in various colleges and universities. This training was in isolation for the most part -- other than student teaching or other requirements, which emphasized actual classroom participation. This method of acquiring attitudes is referred to as learning and reinforcement approaches to attitudes. It is basically concerned with the way in which a person acquires an attitude. The cognitive consistency approaches to acquiring attitudes starts with an existing attitude and tries to explain how the attitudinal components fit together with each other.

Teachers, like all other human beings are viewed as active information processors, trying to make sense out of what they think, feel and do. They are actively constructing and interpreting the world to bring congruence to inconsistencies that may occur between and within attitudes. Inconsistencies occur between cognitions about and affect toward an attitudinal object, between affect toward a person and his or her position on an issue, or between a person's attitude toward an object (Himmelfarh & Eagly, 1974).

Whatever the source of the inconsistency, the person is motivated to reduce it. Fritz Heider's balance theory (1958) is basically concerned with how one makes an attitude regarding people and an attitudinal object consistent. The principal element in the theory is the person or perceiver notated as "P" by Heider. The two other elements are another person, "O," and another entity (which may be an object or a person, called "X"). There can exist a unit relationship (the degree to which the elements are perceived to belong together due to similarity, ownership or similar membership in a class and affective relationship (the nature of liking between the elements)). Heider's theory states that the nature of relations between elements is either positive (+) or negative (-).

The balance model speaks of "relations" that can link "elements." Positive relations (symbolized by "+") and so includes positive affect (liking) and any sort of similarity

or connection. Negative relations (symbolized by "N") are equivalent to (dislikes) and any sort of detachment or estrangement (Brown, 1969).

It is a stable cognitive state which is comfortable to the perceiver. Imbalance is unstable and it motivates perceiver to change the nature of one of the relationships to attain a balanced state. Imbalance may be reduced in many ways (Leventhal, 1974). First and foremost would be to affect a change in attitude. The balance theory has had a marked influence on many studies as they relate to attitudes and perception (Jordan, 1953; Rodrigues, 1967; Steiner and Spaulding, 1966; Lusko and Adewole, 1979).

The most common approach among psychologists to defining attitudes stresses their evaluative aspects. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) call an attitude "a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner." In this view, attitudes are basically evaluations of a particular person, group, action or thing.

Other theorists have suggested that attitudes should be considered in terms of their component parts. Specifically, attitudes are assumed to have three major components, known as a cognitive (thought) component, an affective (feeling) component, and a behavioral (action) component (Katz and Stotland, 1959; Rajecki, 1982). The three components of attitudes (affective, cognitive and behavioral) are generally assumed to be interrelated and consistent with one another. Whether or not teachers plan it or not teachers'

attitudes have a great influence on their effectiveness as a teacher (Rosser and Nicholson, 1984).

In order to make objective recommendations to school boards about hiring, tenure and reward, or dismissal, states Cruickshank (1985), principals, supervisory personnel and school superintendents need to know which teachers are good teachers. In addition, teacher educators need information about teacher effectiveness to give direction to the development of more objective admission and exit criteria and to help determine curriculum. Cruickshank, after an exhaustive review of the literature on teacher effectiveness, offered the following standards of teacher effectiveness.

Findings for "classroom organization" seem to support the teacher playing a central, dominant classroom role, but involving students in planning and organizing, having a structured curriculum, setting high goals and communicating them to students, working mostly with the whole class and less often with supervised small groups, providing independent work that is interesting and worthwhile, and minimizing "busy work."

Findings for "didactic teaching" support the teacher's persistence in seeking high goals, putting the daily schedule on the chalkboard, providing extensive content coverage, providing extensive content coverage, providing learning activities at an appropriate level of difficulty, differentiating instruction between high and low socioeconomic students, teaching systematically step by step, providing adequate opportunity to learn criterion material, providing structure and structuring comments, maintaining a brisk lesson pace, using questions suitable to the lesson's cognitive level, requiring public and overt student participation, providing adequate "wait time," accepting and using student ideas, providing immediate individual feedback, shaping student responses so they are correct, monitoring individual progress, using distributed and successful practice, praising judiciously, using little criticism, individualizing, reviewing, summarizing, providing teaching variety, and maintaining a

classroom absent of negative emotional climate. Further, effective teachers involve all students, limit student choices, hold students responsible for their work, attend to students equitably and capitalize on unexpected student wants.

Findings for "classroom management" suggest that the teacher set and maintain clear rules and consistently apply them using positive reinforcement, limit student behavior, hold students responsible for their behavior, direct students upon completion of their work, minimize transition time, deal with misbehavior quickly, negotiate student compliance and demonstrate "withitness," smoothness, momentum, ability to overlap, challenge, variety, and grouping alerting.

Findings for teachers would seem to indicate that they need to be well-organized, efficient, task oriented, knowledgeable, verbally fluent, aware of student developmental levels, clear, enthusiastic, self-confident, confident of student abilities, hold high expectations, be friendly and warm, encouraging and supportive, attentive, accepting, and tolerant.

Brophy and Good's (1986 and Cruickshank 1987) review of teacher effectiveness process-product (also called process-outcome) research dealt with the links between teacher behavior and student achievement. Within in topic the researchers stress teacher behavior over other classroom process variables (students' interactions with peers, curriculum materials, computers, etc.) and stress student achievement gain over other product variables (e.g., personal, social, or moral development). Their review presents the following studies and findings.

1. The Canterbury Studies of elementary science teaching
 - . Content coverage is more important than particular teacher behaviors.
 - . Younger students need to participate overtly.
 - . Questions should be asked one at a time, be clear and at an appropriate cognitive level.
 - . Enthusiastic reactions from teachers are motivating.

2. Flanders
 - . Teacher talk is positively associated with pupil achievement and attitude.
 - . Indirectness, praise, acceptance of pupil are positively associated with pupil attitudes and achievement.
 - . Restrictiveness and negative authority tend to be negatively related to pupil attitudes.
 - . Flexibility is correlated positively with pupil attitude and achievement.
3. Soar and Soar's studies of elementary teaching
 - . Regarding classroom emotional climate, neutral climates are at least as supportive of achievement as are warm climates. Negative climates appear dysfunctional.
 - . Regarding teacher management or control, students learn more in classrooms where teachers establish limits on pupil freedom and choice, physical movement and disruption, and where teachers talk more and control pupils' task behavior.
4. Stalling's Follow-Through Evaluation Study
 - . Student opportunity to learn the required content.
 - . A recitation pattern of teacher questioning.
 - . Pupils spending most of their time being instructed by teachers or working independently under close teacher supervision.
5. Stalling's California Early Childhood Education Study
 - . Spending more time on academic tasks.
 - . Teachers actively instructing in small groups.
 - . Giving more instruction, asking more academic questions.
 - . Providing more feedback.
6. Stalling's Teaching Basic Skills (reading) in Secondary Schools
 - . Quantity of instruction.
 - . Reviewing or discussing assignments.
 - . Having students read aloud.
 - . Praising success.
 - . Providing support and corrective feedback.
 - . Negative correlates
 - . Teachers not interacting with students.
 - . Too much teacher time spent organizing rather than instructing.
 - . Providing students choices of activities.
 - . Students working independently.
 - . Outside intrusions and social

interaction.

7. Brophy and Evertson in the Texas Teacher Effectiveness Study (elementary)
 - . Task oriented.
 - . Businesslike.
 - . Interact with students mostly within a teacher-student relationship.
 - . Spend most time on academic activities.
 - . Are persistent.
 - . Confident.
 - . Spend minimal time in transitions.
 - . Insure that students participate about equally.
 - . teachers producing the least achievement were more concerned with the affect than cognition or disliked their students and concentrated on authority and discipline.
8. Evertson, Brophy and others studied seventh and eighth grade English and Mathematics. For English the results seem to support greater achievement where teacher praise was relatively frequent during class discussion and where serious misbehavior was uncommon. Pupil attitudes were most favorable when the teacher perceived as nice and the class enjoyable but undemanding. In mathematics classes, the more successful teachers taught more "actively," spending more time lecturing, demonstrating, or leading recitation or discussion. When they gave seatwork, it was more likely to be assisted and monitored. Instruction was whole class, for the most part, and movement was a brisk pace. Teachers explained thoroughly and were "withit."
9. Brophy and Evertson's First Grade Reading Group Study
 - . More time was spent in reading groups and less time with misbehavior
 - . Transitions were shorter
 - . The teacher sat so as to be able to monitor the class while teaching a reading group
 - . Lessons had overviews
 - . Phonetics were used to introduce new words
 - . Pupils frequently had opportunities to read and answer questions
 - . Questions were addressed to individual learners in order
 - . Incorrect answers were followed by reteaching
 - . Praise was specific
10. Good and Grouws' Fourth-Grade Arithmetic Study
 - . Had better managed classes
 - . Spent less time in transitions
 - . Moved at a brisker pace
 - . Covered more content

- . Instructed more clearly
 - . Asked fewer questions that yielded incorrect answers
 - . Retaught
 - . Monitored seatwork and provided feedback
 - . Their students called out more answers, asked more questions, and initiated more academic contracts
11. The Beginning Teacher Study (BTES), a series of second- and fifth-grade studies
- . Are well-organized
 - . Maximize time devoted to instruction
 - . Minimize time spent on preparation, procedures, or discipline
 - . Spend most time actively instructing and monitoring seatwork

Achievement also was associated with the amount of time pupils were exposed to academic content, the percentage of time they actually spent engaged in academic activities, and the degree to which they were able to respond successfully. Combining these concepts, BTES coined the term "academic learning time" or the time pupils actually spend engaged in academic tasks that can be performed with high success. Further, pupil achievement was associated with accurate diagnosis and prescription of learning needs and learning tasks, frequent provision of immediate feedback, an emphasis on academic rather than affective goals, and pupil academic responsibility and cooperation.

12. The Stanford Studies
- . Using an overview or analogy to introduce materials
 - . Reviewing, repeating
 - . Praising or repeating pupil answers
 - . Being patient in waiting for responses
 - . Integrating the responses into the lesson
 - . Making clear presentations
 - . Providing feedback to student responses and improving responses that are incomplete or incorrect
13. The Vagueness Studies (often inappropriately referred to as "clarity" studies) report that teacher use of vague terms, mazes and discontinuity, or adding more content, impedes pupil achievement.
14. Brophy and Good also report additional variables gleaned from the work of individual investigators that relate to achievement
- . Opportunity to learn the content of test
 - . Time on task that is teacher supervised
 - . Selection of appropriate goals of instruction
 - . Involving students in organizing

- and planning
- . Giving clear direction
- . Listening to students
- . Good monitoring
- . Active instruction
- . Teacher clarity
- . Order and control
- . Use of structuring and "organizers" to help students learn
- . Appropriate "wait time"

THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Effective schools studies show that the principal is a key person in establishing and maintaining good schools. Among the findings, the role of the principal as building leader is almost universal. Heffner's review of effective school literature (1984) identified ten recurrent characteristics and techniques that effective principals display.

1. Develop goals, policies and directions for their building in advance of the school year.

2. Organize the school and design programs to accomplish building goals. This may be accomplished by involving the faculty in consensus-type planning or by utilizing knowledge about effective schooling techniques.

3. Monitor teacher and student progress toward achievement of stated academic objectives. Make frequent visits to classrooms, keep informed of policies and teachers' problems, and maintain a positive attitude that students and teachers can succeed.

4. Anticipate problems and solve them before they become significant. Effective principals problem-solve by consulting with their faculty, assume responsibility for

leading their school's instructional program, and make effective use of their time.

5. Maintain an orderly, yet non-repressive school climate that emphasizes discipline and purposeful learning.

6. Procure, manage and allocate resources to facilitate classroom instruction.

7. Create a climate for faculty personal and professional growth. In effective schools, principals have high expectations for faculty performance, provide frequent in-service training, identify and use good people to conduct school business, and maintain a distant, yet friendly relationship with the staff.

8. Stress achievement, especially in the basic skills, in their role as instructional leaders. Time engaged in academic tasks and focus on instruction and its improvement are stressed by effective the principal.

9. Are forceful, aggressive, and dynamic leaders who proactively seek to realize their conceptions of schooling. Effective principals possess superior interpersonal skills, especially in oral communication.

10. Understand the power structure in their district and community and operate within their constraints to get things done.

Sweeney and Pinckney (1983) found that the extent to which a school is instructionally effective depends on the ability of the principal to marshal faculty support and commitment to the task of teaching young people what their

parents want them to learn. In their study of 533 teachers and 39 building administrators , 39 schools -- 25 elementary and 14 secondary -- in five states, from urban, suburban, and rural schools, six categorical functions were found to consume the principal's day.

. Human Resource Management -- Assists teachers to motivate, challenge, and excite students to learn at the optimal level, and assists staff in obtaining maximum use of their human potential for reaching personal and organizational goals.

. Instructional Leadership -- Enhances student learning through updating curricular and instructional materials, evaluating staff for the purposes of improvement, and evaluating educational program and student progress.

. Learning Environment Management -- Develops and maintains discipline standards which provide students with a clear understanding of expectations for behavior inside and outside the classroom, and provides an educational atmosphere conducive to learning.

. Pupil Personnel -- Meets with students individually and in groups to address their problems and concerns, promotes student involvement in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.

. School-Community Relations -- Communicates with parents and promotes the school through advisory committees, parent-teacher organizations, needs assessments, and the media.

Furthermore, Sweeney and Pinckney's findings (1983) indicate that principals who got higher ratings in helping and supporting teachers tended to have faculties who were more committed to high performance goals, more likely to have good working relationships, and more inclined to feel accomplishment in their jobs.

There is universal support for cooperative decision-making in education. Decisions made in cooperation are more likely to be implemented at various levels within the educational organizational. In order to promote the concept of democratic leadership, Koopman (1973) suggested five principles to govern democratic act as follows:

- Provide all persons the opportunity to participate actively in all enterprises that concern them.

- Recognize that leadership is a function of every individual, and to encourage the exercise of leadership by each person in accordance with his interests, needs and abilities.

- Provide means by which persons can plan together, share their experiences, and cooperatively evaluate their achievements.

- Place the responsibility for making decisions that affect the total enterprise with the group rather than with one or a few individuals.

- Achieve flexibility of organization to the end that necessary adjustments can readily be made.

To implement the cooperative, decision-making plan, open discussion, standing and ad hoc committees, task forces, and the like should come into use in education on all levels.

Administrators should take steps to satisfy the psychological, as well as the economic needs of teachers. The relative happiness of the teacher will be transmitted to the pupils. The individual needs should be met and the welfare of individuals would be enhanced. The administrator should provide opportunities for decision-making, treat each person in a manner that is perceived as fair, create conditions where teachers can have a sense of achievements, provide recognition for deserving teachers, provide opportunities for individuals to accept responsibility, and make an effort to develop a sense of belonging and psychological security in each teacher. Teachers will work best under conditions which they recognize as fostering their maximum growth and satisfaction (Shane and Yauch, 1974: 104).

McGregor's (Theory "X") states that human being dislike work and will avoid it if they can. The theory further states that human beings prefer to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility. However, scholars feel that the theory gives inadequate attention to people and assumes that they function for purely economic motives.

Maslow's hierarchy-of-needs which states that a person's needs are hierarchical and that higher-order needs become motivators to the extent that power needs become

satisfied. One's lower-order needs relate to physiological needs, e.g., love, affection, status, self-fulfillment (Maslow, 1943: 370-396). Maslow's hierarchy of needs influenced the advancement of McGregor's Theory "Y," which states that human beings have the capability of self-control, that a person does not inherently dislike work, has the capacity for creativity and under certain circumstances seeks responsibility (McGregor, 1960: 33-34).

Lippitt and White (1958) conducted a study which further supported the effect of the kind of leadership on group behavior. Three styles were studied: laissez-faire, democratic, and authoritarian. The authoritarian type of leadership fosters decisions and policies made by the leader. This style gives step by step instructions with no overall plan made known.

The democratic leadership style lends itself to discussion and input in setting goals. This style gives advice in terms of possible alternatives. The laissez-faire leadership style gives little guidance and does not regulate or evaluate. Some desired positive group-process behavior include the facilitator of the goals of the group, observing and providing feedback for the group (Cartledge and Milburn, 1978).

Maier (1973) states that when leaders consult workers before making decisions the process is much more likely to result in increased commitment by workers. They are more likely to make favorable decision if given facts and then

left to discuss and decide for themselves than if persuasion is attempted. Administrators can use this principal effectively by allowing students to participate in decision about their school.

In decision-making the decision maker must be equipped to select among alternatives; consider the consequences of selecting a particular alternative and estimate the probability that a particular congruence will occur. Decision-making is learned and becomes an aspect of personal style. The decision-making process has three major components: an input sequence, in which information is assimilated. The operational sequence, in which the plan is carried into action. The test sequence in which feedback is received, evaluated and used as part of the new input for the next cycle of action (McDonald, 1969).

Decision-making and influences are two important facets of leadership. Who makes the decisions is important in connection with instructional programs for children. Decision-making has been moving away from the individual teacher.

SUMMARY

The nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement through a rebuilding of our educational system has not come without controversy; however, one element that is consistent throughout the research is that teachers should participate in setting school goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of

performance. This, of course, means a major shift in the current organizational and managerial structure of the school; and a new understanding of the balance in interpersonal relations for school administrators and teachers (Heider, 1958; and Berlinic and Gage, 1975). Thus, this current research will provide baseline data on the actual and ideal levels of involvement of teachers.

This will also provide research information about the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward their school's effectiveness and their involvement. It will also provide research information relating to teachers level of interest in planning school goals and policies.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' involvement in decision-making and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic programs in their schools. Also, an investigation was made between the relationship of the teachers' demographic characteristics and desired levels of involvement with the levels they reported. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research procedures and methodology employed in the research study. A description of the design, the methodology employed to select the sample and the population are included, as well as a description of the instrument utilized and the statistical procedures that were employed.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

This correlational study employed the High_School Teacher_Involvement_Questionnaire (HSTIQ) survey, which was designed by the researcher to identify relationships between selected school and teacher variables and the involvement of teachers in decision-making. The population consisted of 576 northeast North Carolina high school teachers (grades 9 through 12). Of the total population, 551 questionnaires were returned and analyzed via frequency distribution, oneway analysis of variance and Pearson Product Moment Correlation procedures. The study was to determine if

significant differences ($p < .05$) among the perceptions of teachers.

The procedure for the study included the following:

1. Twenty high school teachers, two each from ten different high schools, were interviewed to ascertain areas in which they wished to be involved in planning goals and policies for academic and instructional programs of their school (This group was not allowed to serve on the "Jury of Experts or to complete the questionnaire.).

2. Next, a review and analysis of the literature helped to further delineate the involvement of teachers. This research culminated in over 100 academic and instructional items being identified, which may involve teachers.

3. A "Jury of Experts," consisting of six high school teachers from six different high schools, was convened to establish the content validity of the HSTIQ. The Jury revised, deleted and added items until the final content consisted of 23 academic and instructional program items for the final instrument. Furthermore, the 23 items were recategorized into 23 "actual" involvement items and 23 "ideal" involvement items. Three open-ended teacher involvement questions were also included to provide respondents the opportunity to express their opinions in an unstructured format. In addition to the 46 "actual and ideal" involvement items and three open-ended questions, the questionnaire requests demographic data and a rating of the school's effectiveness. The questionnaire also provided

definitions of the 23 academic and instructional programs. The instrument was titled, High_School_Teacher__Involvement Questionnaire (HSTIQ). (NOTE: The "Jury of Experts" was not allowed to serve as one of the original 20 teachers to be interviewed or to complete the questionnaire.)

4. The HSTIQ was administered to 28 high school teachers to test its reliability through the test-retest method in measuring the teachers' perceptions. Twenty-one school days elapsed between the first administration and second administration of the questionnaire to the high school teachers. The HSTIQ's directions requested that respondents circle the number to indicate their response to each item. The 9-point Likert scale ranged from 1 (low involvement) to 9 (high involvement). Table 1 presents the reliability coefficients for the questionnaire.

5. Administrative approval to conduct the study was obtained.

6. The full-time high school classroom teacher faculty was administered the instrument.

7. The computer services at Elizabeth City State University were utilized to analyze and compare the data of gathered by the instrument.

The questionnaire is divided into the following five parts (see Appendix B):

Part I DEMOGRAPHIC DATA - Information about your present employment as a high school teacher.

Table 1

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Correlation Coefficients
(Test-Retest Method)

Subtest	Correlation Coefficient	2-Tailed Significance
Actual Involvement	.90	.00
Ideal Involvement	.90	.00
School Effectiveness	.67	.00
Demographic Data	.99	.00

Total Questionnaire	.91	.00

Part II RATING OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS - Your rating of your school's effectiveness.

Part III "ACTUAL" AND "IDEAL" SCALES OF INVOLVEMENT
- Your "actual" rating of your observed involvement in planning the school program. Your "ideal" rating of what you would like your involvement in planning the school program to be.

Part IV OPEN-ENDED TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS -
Express your opinion about your involvement in planning school policies and goals.

Part V DEFINITIONS - Describes the academic or instructional program presented in Part III.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This correlational research study was conducted to determine the opinions of high school teachers, who had been serving in their current positions for at least one year prior to this study, toward their level of involvement in school decision-making. To test the hypotheses, statistical procedures included one-way analysis of variance, frequency distributions, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation comparisons.

Population

The population selected for this study consisted of the secondary school teachers in northeast North Carolina. Secondary schools are those which served grades nine through twelve. The specific population for this study consisted of

the 576 full-time, high school classroom teachers from fifteen counties, which make up the northeast North Carolina Education District. Findings were completed questionnaires returned by 551 high school teachers -- a response rate of 96 percent.

DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENT

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the level of high school teacher opinion regarding their involvement and interest in teacher-cited items of academic concern. The researcher, after reviewing existing questionnaire and survey instruments in use, none of which met the purpose of this research study, deemed it necessary to develop a questionnaire data collection instrument to measure the opinions of the high school teachers. The instrument, after numerous revisions and refinements, was titled High_School Teacher_Involvement_Questionnaire (HSTIQ).

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to describe and report the analysis of data for each of the four hypotheses. For this analysis, each hypothesis is restated and the statistical analyses are presented.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The population selected for this study consisted of the secondary school teachers in rural northeast North Carolina. Secondary schools are those which served grades nine through twelve. The specific population for this study consisted of the 576 full-time, high school classroom teachers from fifteen rural counties, which make up the northeast North Carolina Education District (see Appendix C). Findings were based upon the completed questionnaires returned by 551 high school teachers -- a response rate of 96 percent.

As shown in Table 2, 20.3 percent of the respondents taught English, 11.3 percent mathematics, 9.4 percent science, 17.1 percent social studies, 8.9 percent fine arts, 9.1 percent physical education or health, 13.4 percent vocational education, and 10.5 percent taught a combination of the above subjects. Over 16 percent (see Table 3) of the respondents were teaching in schools with student

Table 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY TEACHING AREA

Teaching Area	Frequency	Percentage
English	112	20.3
Mathematics	62	11.3
Science	52	9.4
Social Studies	94	17.1
Fine Arts	49	8.9
Phy Ed and Health	50	9.1
Vocational Ed	74	13.4
Other	58	10.5
	---	-----
TOTAL	551	100.0

Table 3

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY SCHOOL'S STUDENT POPULATION

Student Population	Frequency	Percentage
Fewer than 500	89	16.2
501 to 1000	297	53.9
1001 to 1500	165	29.9
	---	----
TOTAL	551	100.0

populations of less than 500 students, 53.9 percent were teaching in schools with a student population between 501 and 1000 students, and 29.9 percent were teaching in schools with a student population between 1001 and 1500 students.

Table 4 presents the respondents' gender selections. Male respondents represented 38.5 percent of the respondents and females represented 61.5 percent. The respondents' race selection indicated that 62.6 percent were white and 37.4 percent were non-white (Table 5). Less than 20 percent of the respondents listed their age as being younger than 30, 46.3 percent listed the 30 to 40 category, and the remaining 34.3 percent listed the older than 40 category (Table 6). The total years of teaching experience, as presented in Table 7, shows that 11.4 percent had been teaching for less than five years, approximately 23 percent had been teaching at least five years to ten years, 48.6 percent had 11 to 20 years of experience, and 17.1 percent had more than 20 years of teaching experience.

The teachers' ratings of their school's effectiveness is presented in Table 8. A rating of one indicates an ineffective school, nine indicates an effective school, and ratings of two through eight fall between ineffective and effective. For this study, none of the respondents rated their school a one; less than one percent rated their school a two; 3.1 percent, three; 1.8 percent, four; 25.8 percent, five; 17.6 percent, six; 31.9 percent, seven;

Table 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY GENDER

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	212	38.5
Female	339	61.5
	---	----
TOTAL	551	100.0

Table 5

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY RACE

Race	Frequency	Percentage
White	345	62.6
Non-White	206	37.4
	---	----
TOTAL	551	100.0

Table 6

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY AGE

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Younger than 30	107	19.4
30 to 40	255	46.3
Older than 40	189	34.3
	---	----
TOTAL	551	100.0

Table 7

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY YEARS EMPLOYED AS A TEACHER

Years Employed	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 5	63	11.4
5 to 10	126	22.9
11 to 20	268	48.6
More than 20	94	17.1
	---	----
TOTAL	551	100.0

Table 8

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES
BY RATING OF SCHOOL'S EFFECTIVENESS**

Rating	Frequency	Percentage
Ineffective = 1	0	0.0
2	4	0.7
3	17	3.1
4	10	1.8
5	142	25.8
6	97	17.6
7	176	31.9
8	78	14.2
Effective = 9	27	4.9
	---	-----
TOTAL	551	100.0

14.2 percent, eight; and only 4.9 percent rated their school a nine.

SUBJECT AREA AND SCHOOL POPULATION

Hypothesis_1. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their subject area and the number of students assigned to their school, toward their involvement in planning school goals and policies.

The data in Table 9 present the responses of the high school teachers, based upon their subject area, toward their "actual" level of involvement in school decision-making. Analysis employing the oneway analysis of variance statistical procedure indicated that statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "actual" level of involvement. For their "ideal" level of involvement, as shown by Table 10, teachers wanted more input in the decision-making process. Analysis of the data, via oneway analysis of variance, indicated that statistically significant differences existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "ideal" level of involvement.

Table 9

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR SUBJECT AREA

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	7	53710.48	7672.93	7.44	0.0
Within Groups	543	559953.17	1031.22		
Total	550	613663.64			
<u>Subject Area</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
English		105.54			
Mathematics		95.84			
Science		111.27			
Social Studies		117.73			
Fine Arts		122.76			
Phy. Ed. and Health		123.52			
Vocational Ed.		104.86			
Other		93.95			
TOTAL		108.92			

Table 10

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR SUBJECT AREA

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	7	17904.12	2557.73	3.83	.00
Within Groups	543	362771.42	668.09		
Total	550	380675.54			
<u>Subject Area</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
English		164.36			
Mathematics		151.11			
Science		159.35			
Social Studies		158.81			
Fine Arts		168.53			
Phy. Ed. and Health		167.84			
Vocational Ed.		153.59			
Other		155.69			
TOTAL		159.78			

Table 11 presents the responses of the high school teachers, based upon their school's student population, toward their "actual" level of involvement in school decision-making. Analysis employing the oneway analysis of variance statistical procedure indicated that statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "actual" level of involvement. For their "ideal" level of involvement, as shown by Table 12, teachers wanted more input in the decision-making process. Analysis of the data, via oneway analysis of variance, indicated that statistically significant differences existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "ideal" level of involvement.

Therefore, based upon these findings where the high school teachers indicated significantly different levels of decision-making involvement in their schools based upon their subject area and the student population of their school, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

Table 11

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR SCHOOL'S STUDENT POPULATION

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	14784.71	7392.35	6.76	.00
Within Groups	548	598878.94	1092.84		
Total	550	613663.64			
<u>Student Population</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Fewer than 500		104.97			
501-1000		113.66			
1001-1500		102.53			
TOTAL		108.92			

Table 12

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR SCHOOL'S STUDENT POPULATION

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	8385.43	4192.71	6.17	.00
Within Groups	548	372290.54	679.36		
Total	550	380675.54			
<u>Student Population</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Fewer than 500		150.90			
501-1000		161.64			
1001-1500		161.21			
TOTAL		159.78			

YEARS EMPLOYED, GENDER, RACE AND AGE

Hypothesis_2. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their years of employment, gender, race, or age, towards their involvement in planning school goals and policies.

Table 13 illustrates the responses of the high school teachers, based upon their years of employment as a teacher, toward their "actual" level of involvement in school decision-making. Analysis employing the oneway analysis of variance statistical procedure indicated that statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "actual" level of involvement. For their "ideal" level of involvement, as shown by Table 14, teachers wanted more input in the decision-making process. Analysis of the data, via oneway analysis of variance, indicated that statistically significant differences existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "ideal" level of involvement.

Table 13

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	33309.15	11103.05	10.46	.00
Within Groups	547	580354.50	1060.98		
Total	550	613663.64			
<u>Years Employed</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Less than 5		90.37			
5 to 10		104.37			
11 to 20		114.51			
More than 20		111.52			
TOTAL		108.92			

Table 14

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	3	12260.56	4086.85	6.07	.00
Within Groups	547	368414.98	673.52		
Total	550	380675.54			
<u>Years Employed</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Less than 5		148.37			
5 to 10		157.28			
11 to 20		162.08			
More than 20		164.21			
TOTAL		159.78			

In Table 15 the responses of the high school teachers, based upon their gender, toward their "actual" level of involvement in school decision-making are presented. Analysis employing the oneway analysis of variance statistical procedure indicated that no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "actual" level of involvement. For their "ideal" level of involvement, as shown by Table 16, teachers wanted more input in the decision-making process. Further analysis of the data, via oneway analysis of variance, indicated that statistically significant differences existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "ideal" level of involvement.

Table 15

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR GENDER

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	249.66	249.66	.22	.64
Within Groups	549	613413.98	1117.33		
Total	550	613663.64			
Gender	Mean				
Male	108.07				
Female	109.45				
TOTAL	108.92				

Table 16

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR GENDER

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	5692.50	5692.50	8.33	.00
Within Groups	549	374983.04	683.03		
Total	550	380675.54			
<u>Gender</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Male		155.71			
Female		162.32			
TOTAL		159.78			

In Table 17 the responses of the high school teachers, based upon their race, toward their "actual" level of involvement in school decision-making are presented. Analysis employing the oneway analysis of variance statistical procedure indicated that no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "actual" level of involvement. For their "ideal" level of involvement, as shown by Table 18, teachers wanted more input in the decision-making process. Further analysis of the data, via oneway analysis of variance, indicated that statistically significant differences existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "ideal" level of involvement.

Table 17

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR RACE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	3953.25	3953.25	3.56	.06
Within Groups	549	609710.39	1110.58		
Total	550	613663.64			

Race	Mean
White	106.85
Non-white	112.39
TOTAL	108.92

Table 18

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR RACE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	1	4188.16	4188.16	6.11	.01
Within Groups	549	376487.39	685.77		
Total	550	380675.54			

Race	Mean
White	157.65
Non-white	163.34
TOTAL	159.78

In Table 19 the responses of the high school teachers, based upon their age, toward their "actual" level of involvement in school decision-making are presented. Analysis employing the oneway analysis of variance statistical procedure indicated that no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "actual" level of involvement. For their "ideal" level of involvement, as shown by Table 20, teachers wanted more input in the decision-making process. Analysis of the data, via oneway analysis of variance, indicated that no statistically significant differences existed between the responses of the teachers toward their "ideal" level of involvement.

Therefore, based upon these findings where the high school teachers indicated significantly different levels of decision-making involvement in their schools based upon their age for both "actual" and "ideal" involvement, and for their gender and race for "actual" level of involvement, Hypothesis 2 was rejected. However, based upon the findings where the high school teachers did not indicate significantly different levels of decision-making involvement based upon their years of employment for both "actual" and "ideal" involvement, and for their gender and race for "ideal" involvement, Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

Table 19

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "ACTUAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR AGE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	2957.77	1478.88	1.33	.27
Within Groups	548	610705.88	1114.43		
Total	550	613663.64			
<u>Age</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Younger than 30		104.34			
30 to 40		110.55			
Older than 40		109.32			
TOTAL		108.92			

Table 20

ONEWAY ANALYSIS VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR
 "IDEAL" LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING
 AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS,
 BASED UPON THEIR AGE

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	1205.08	602.54	.87	.42
Within Groups	548	379470.46	692.46		
Total	550	380675.54			
<u>Age</u>		<u>Mean</u>			
Younger than 30		157.03			
30 to 40		161.02			
Older than 40		159.66			
TOTAL		159.78			

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
EXPECTED AND REPORTED TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistical procedure was used to determine the relationship between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making. As shown in Table 21, the observed correlation coefficient of .52 indicates a moderate positive relationship between the two variables. In addition, the correlation coefficient was also statistically significant ($p < .05$), which means that one may be reasonably confident that a true relationship exists between the two variables.

Therefore, based upon the findings, Hypothesis 3, was rejected because a statistically significant relationship was observed between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making; however, in a practical sense it was not rejected because the teachers reported a low level of involvement but they wanted a high level of involvement.

Table 21

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
BETWEEN THE IDEAL AND ACTUAL
LEVELS OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING,
AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Coefficient	Cases	Two-tailed Significance
.52	551	.00

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL
EFFECTIVENESS AND TEACHER INVOLVEMENT

Hypothesis_4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual level of involvement in school decision-making.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistical procedure was used to determine the relationship between teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making. As shown in Table 22, the observed correlation coefficient of .18 indicates a little, if any, positive relationship between the two variables. In addition, the correlation coefficient was also statistically significant ($p < .05$), which means that one may be reasonably confident that a true relationship exists between the two variables.

Therefore, based upon the findings, Hypothesis_4, was rejected because a statistically significant relationship was observed between the teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual level of involvement in school decision-making. In a practical sense it was also rejected because the teachers rated their school's effectiveness low while at the same time indicating a low level of involvement.

Table 22

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT
BETWEEN RATINGS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS
AND ACTUAL LEVELS OF TEACHER
INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING,
AS REPORTED BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Coefficient	Cases	Two-tailed Significance
.18	551	.00

ANALYSIS OF OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

The investigator, realizing that some of the respondents may wish to express their perceptions to the questionnaire in an unstructured format, provided three questions that would allow respondents the opportunity to do so. The responses were analyzed and tabulated as follows:

1. What do you like about your level of involvement in your school?

Response	N
- Teachers are allowed to use their own professional judgment in certain situations.	5
- Teachers have some responsibility for school for selecting school activities.	3
- Teachers have the sense of being a true professional.	7

2. What do you dislike about your level of involvement in your school?

- The meetings take away from/cut into valuable instructional time.	5
- Involvement adds to the additional duties of the teacher.	4
- Involvement creates jealousy among co-workers, if not equally assigned.	2

3. How may your level of involvement in your school be improved?

- Teachers should be allowed to volunteer for placement on special committees, etc., instead of being assigned. 3
- Suggestion boxes should be placed in the schools and the suggestions should be given serious consideration by the administration. 1

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to describe and report the analysis of data for each of the four hypotheses. For this analysis, each hypothesis was restated and the statistical analyses are presented. Therefore, based upon the findings observed for this study, the following summary is presented:

1. High school teachers indicated significantly different levels of decision-making involvement in their schools based upon their subject area and the student population of their school, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

2. High school teachers indicated significantly different levels of decision-making involvement in their schools based upon their age for both "actual" and "ideal" involvement, and for their gender and race for "actual" level of involvement, Hypothesis 2 was rejected. However, the teachers also did not indicate significantly different

levels of decision-making involvement based upon their years of employment for both "actual" and "ideal" involvement, and for their gender and race for "ideal" involvement, Hypothesis 2 was accepted.

3. Hypothesis 3 was rejected because a statistically significant relationship was observed between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making; however, in a practical sense it was not rejected because the teachers reported a low level of involvement but they wanted a high level of involvement.

4. Hypothesis 4 was rejected because a statistically significant relationship was observed between the teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual level of involvement in school decision-making. In a practical sense it was also rejected because the teachers rated their school's effectiveness low while at the same time indicating a low level of involvement.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and conclusions in this chapter are the results of the data analyses. Discussion includes information relevant to the implications of these findings and conclusions. Recommendations are offered for practical applications of the findings and for future research.

SUMMARY

Purpose of Study

The nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement through a rebuilding of our educational system has not come without controversy; however, one element that is consistent with recent reports on the subject of this study (Carnegie, Holmes, NEA, and the National Governors Association) is that teachers should participate in setting school goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance. This, of course, means a major shift in the current organizational and managerial structure of the school. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' involvement in decision-making and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic programs in their schools. Also, an investigation was made between the relationship of the teachers' demographic characteristics and desired levels of involvement with the levels they reported.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their subject area and the number of students assigned to their school, towards their involvement in planning school goals and policies.
2. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of the teachers, based upon their years of employment, gender, race, or age, towards their involvement in planning school goals and policies.
3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making.
4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' ratings of school effectiveness and actual level of involvement in school decision-making.

Significance of Study

This study is significant in that teachers were interviewed directly to obtain the items for the questionnaire. This procedure is a major shift from previous methods where items were composed by individuals other than teachers. In addition the survey was conducted in rural northeast North Carolina where high school students lag behind other students in the rest of the state in performance on standardized examinations. As a result of the student test performance, teachers are likely to become concerned about

school effectiveness (because the teacher is the most important factor in the classroom learning environment). School effectiveness may be based on teachers' attitudes and the teachers' attitudes are formed on the basis of their desired involvement versus their actual involvement in the schools.

This study may assist school administrators in gaining insight as it relates to the teachers' desired involvement versus actual involvement. Through item analysis, administrators may glean some guidance in the assignment of teachers on school committees and other related school activities designed to achieve the educational goals and objectives of the school. Thus, this study provides educators with baseline data on high school teacher involvement in planning school goals and policies. Furthermore, this study provides research information about the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward their schools' effectiveness and their school involvement, and also their level of interest in planning school goals and policies.

Methodology

This correlational study employed the High__School Teacher_Involvement_Questionnaire (HSTIQ) survey, which was designed to identify relationships between selected school and teacher variables and the involvement of teachers in decision-making. The rural population consisted of 576 northeast North Carolina high school teachers (grades 9

through 12). Of the total population, 551 questionnaires were returned and analyzed via frequency distribution, oneway analysis of variance and Pearson Product Moment Correlation procedures.

Research_Design

This correlational research study was conducted to determine the opinions of high school teachers, who had been serving in their current positions for at least one year prior to this study, toward their level of involvement in school decision-making. To test the hypotheses, statistical procedures included one-way analysis of variance, frequency distributions, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation comparisons.

Population

The population selected for this study consisted of the secondary school teachers in rural northeast North Carolina. Secondary schools are those which served grades nine through twelve. The specific population for this study consisted of the 576 full-time, high school classroom teachers from fifteen counties, which make up the rural northeast North Carolina Education District. Findings were based upon the completed questionnaires returned by 551 high school teachers -- a response rate of 96 percent.

Description_of_Instrument

The problem of this study was to identify the relationship of high school teacher opinion regarding their involvement and interest in teacher-cited items of academic

concern. The researcher, after reviewing existing questionnaire and survey instruments in use, none of which met the purpose of this research study, deemed it necessary to develop a questionnaire data collection instrument to measure the opinions of the high school teachers. The instrument, after numerous revisions and refinements, was titled High School Teacher Involvement Questionnaire (HSTIQ).

FINDINGS

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' involvement in decision-making and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic programs in their schools. Also, an investigation was made between the relationship of the teachers' demographic characteristics and desired levels of involvement with the levels they reported. In this research study, oneway analysis of variance statistical procedures were used to test Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 and Pearson Product Moment Correlational statistical procedures were used to test Hypothesis 3 and Hypothesis 4. Statistically significant differences were observed for Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 while statistically significant differences were only observed for half of the analyses presented for Hypothesis 2. Therefore, Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 were rejected and Hypothesis 2 was only rejected in part.

DISCUSSION

Twenty high school teachers, two each from ten different high schools, were interviewed to ascertain areas in which they wished to be involved in planning goals and policies for academic and instructional programs of their school (This group was not allowed to serve on the "Jury of Experts or to complete the questionnaire.). Next, a review and analysis of the literature helped to further delineate the involvement of teachers. This research culminated in over 100 academic and instructional items being identified, which may involve teachers.

A "Jury of Experts," consisting of six high school teachers from six different high schools, was convened to establish the content validity of the HSTIQ. The Jury revised, deleted and added items until the final content consisted of 23 academic and instructional program items for the final instrument. Furthermore, the 23 items were recategorized into 23 "actual" involvement items and 23 "ideal" involvement items. Three open-ended teacher involvement questions were also included to provide respondents the opportunity to express their opinions in an unstructured format. In addition to the 46 "actual and ideal" involvement items and three open-ended questions, the questionnaire requests demographic data and a rating of the school's effectiveness. The questionnaire also provided definitions of the 23 academic and instructional programs.

The instrument was titled, High_School_Teacher__Involvement Questionnaire (HSTIQ). (NOTE: The "Jury of Experts" was not allowed to serve as one of the original 20 teachers to be interviewed or to complete the questionnaire.)

The HSTIQ was administered to 28 high school teachers to test its reliability through the test-retest method in measuring the teachers' perceptions. Twenty-one school days elapsed between the first administration and second administration of the questionnaire to the high school teachers. The HSTIQ's directions requested that respondents circle the number to indicate their response to each item. The 9-point Likert scale ranged from 1 (low involvement) to 9 (high involvement).

The most interesting aspect of working with these groups of teachers was that each teacher expressed their appreciation for employing their services, ideas, and participation in the study. Although it may seem inconceivable, it marked the first time that any of the teachers had participated in this type of research.

Participants were also advised that results of the study may be obtained by writing to

P.O.Box 891
Elizabeth City, NC 27909

High school teachers indicated significantly different levels of decision-making involvement in their schools based upon their subject area and the student population of their school. High school teachers also indicated significantly

different levels of decision-making involvement in their schools based upon their age for both "actual" and "ideal" involvement, and for their gender and race for "actual" level of involvement; however, the teachers did not indicate significantly different levels of decision-making involvement based upon their years of employment for both "actual" and "ideal" involvement, and for their gender and race for "ideal" involvement.

It is important to note that teachers felt a need to participate in management decisions, based upon their feelings of empowerment; however, it must also be noted that not all teachers felt this need equally. Teachers who are young, less experienced, female, and ethnic minorities felt the greatest need to participate and believed that they were not allowed to participate in policy decisions as much as they wished. These were obviously the teachers who were more likely to feel less close to authority figures and, therefore, less likely to have an informal influence on policy decisions. This researcher suspected that actual participation in management decisions was not nearly as important to the teachers as the feeling that they could be involved if they wanted to be. Thus, teachers may be more sensitive to the barriers to involvement than to the opportunity for involvement in policy decisions.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings indicate that teachers report limited involvement in school decision-making and that they desire a greater role in the decision-making process. In addition, investigators may be reasonably confident that a true relationship exists between the ideal and actual levels of teacher involvement in school decision-making. Finally, investigators may also be reasonably confident that a true relationship exists between the teachers' ratings of their school's effectiveness and their actual levels of involvement in school decision-making. The findings support the suggestions mandated by national forums (Carnegie, Holmes, NEA, National Governors Association, etc.) established to improve our schools and student achievement through a rebuilding of our educational system, i.e., teachers should participate in setting school goals and be accountable for achieving agreed upon standards of performance. This, of course, means a major shift in the current organizational and managerial structure of the school -- the school of the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There should be a replication of this study involving other educational organizations, so that results can be generalized to other areas of education.

2. The relationship between teachers' actual and ideal levels of involvement in school decision-making by

elementary school teachers should be conducted. Further research is needed to help develop a clearer understanding of the relationship between these variables for elementary school teachers.

3. This study should be expanded to measure the opinions of principals toward the involvement of teachers in the school's decision-making process.

4. This study should be replicated nationally and regionally to determine if high school teachers would respond similarly in terms of ideal and actual levels of involvement in school decision-making.

5. This study should be expanded to determine if teachers' ratings of their school's effectiveness is a direct result of their perceived level of involvement in the decision-making process of the school.

6. A study should be conducted to ascertain those policy and management decision items with which teachers do not wish to become involved.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1983.
- A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Carnegie Forum's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
- "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century: Excerpts," The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 21, 1986, pp.43-54.
- A National Agenda for the Eighties. President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Action for Excellence. Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado: June 1983.
- American Association of School Administrators. The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools: Problems & Solutions. Sacramento, California: Education News Service, 1983.
- American Association of School Administrators. Let's Discuss the Issues. Arlington, Virginia, 1987.
- Anderson, Beverly and Allan Odden. "State Initiatives Can Foster School Improvement," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 67, No. 8 (April 1986), pp. 578-581.
- Bailey, Adrienne Y. "The Educational Equality Project: Focus on Results," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 65, No. 1 (September 1983), pp. 22-25.
- Bakalis, Michael J. "Power and Purpose in American Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 65, No. 1 (September 1983), pp. 7-13.
- Berlinic, David and N.L. Gage. Psychology of Education. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1975, pp. 21-26.
- Borton, Terry, editor. The Weekly Reader National Survey on Education. Middletown, Connecticut: Weekly Reader, 1987.
- Boyer, Ernest L. High School: A Report on Secondary

Education in America. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1983.

Brandt, Ron. "On School Improvement: A Conversation with Ronald R. Edmonds," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 12-15.

Brown, B. Frank. Crisis in Secondary Education: Rebuilding America's High Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984.

Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Callahan, Joseph F. and Leonard H. Clark. Innovations and Issues in Education: Planning for Competence. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1977.

Carmine, Douglas, Russell Gersten, and Susan Green. "The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Second Look," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 47-50.

Carnegie Report, The. In American Association of School Administrators. Let's Discuss the Issues. Arlington, Virginia, 1987.

"Carnegie Report, The: A Bold Beginning," Instructor, August 1986, pp. 14-16.

Carroll, John B. "Educational Research: Reflections on the Past," Improving Education: Perspectives on Educational Research. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: The National Academy of Education, 1984, pp. 9-14.

Center for Research on Elementary & Middle Schools. "Principals Say Teacher Observation and Feedback Is Most Important," CREMS, The Johns Hopkins University, November 1986, pp. 1-2.

Clauset, William A., Jr. and Alan K. Gaynor. "A Systems Perspective on Effective Schools," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 54-59.

Cruickshank, Donald R. "Profile of an Effective Teacher," Educational Horizons, Winter 1985, pp. 90-92.

D'Amico, Joseph J. "Using Effective Schools Studies to Create Effective Schools: No Recipes Yet," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 60-62.

Davis, Alan and Allan Odden. "How State Instructional

Improvement Programs Affect Teachers and Principals," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 67, No. 8 (April 1986), pp. 590-593.

Deasy, Richard J. "Guidelines for Effective Education Policies," Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 2 (October 1984), pp. 4-6.

Deutsch, Morton and Robert M. Krauss. Theories in Social Psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Edmonds, Ronald R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 4-11.

Educating Americans for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, National Science Foundation, 1983.

Ellis, Arthur K., John J. Cogan, and Kenneth R. Howey. Introduction to the Foundations of Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Elms, Alan C. Social Psychology and Social Relevance. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.

Farrar, Eleanor and Patricia Flakus-Mosqueda. "State-Sponsored Schoolwide Improvement Programs: What's Going On in the Schools?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 67, No. 8 (April 1986), pp. 586-589.

Feldman, Robert S. Social Psychology: Theories, Research, and Applications. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1985.

Finn, Chester E. "Teacher Unions and School Quality: Potential Allies or Inevitable Foes?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, Number 5 (January 1985), pp. 339-340.

Firestone, William A. and Robert E. Herriott. "Prescriptions for Effective Elementary Schools Don't Fit Secondary Schools," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 51-53.

Freedman, Jonathan L., J. Merrill Carlsmith, and David O. Sears. Social Psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Frymier, Jack R. A School for Tomorrow. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.

Frymier, Jack R. Motivation to Learn. Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1985.

- Fuhrman, Susan, Eugene Huddle, and Jane Armstrong.
 "Improving Schools," Phi_Delta_Kappan, Vol. 67, No. 8
 (April 1986), pp. 594-596.
- Futrell, Mary Hartwood. "Chester Finn and Quality
 Education," Phi_Delta_Kappan, Vol. 66, No. 5 (January
 1985), pp. 339-340.
- Gallup, Alec. "The Gallup Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools, Part 2," Phi_Delta_Kappan,
 Vol. 66, Number 5 (January 1985), pp. 323-331.
- Gardner, David Pierpont, Chairman, The National Commission
 on Excellence in Education. "A Nation at Risk: The
 Imperative for Educational Reform," American_Education,
 June 1983, pp. 217.
- Glaser, Robert. "The Necessity for Research in Education:
 An Introduction," Improving_Education:--Perspectives
 on_Educational_Research. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:
 The National Academy of Education, 1984, pp. 4-8.
- Goldberg, Milton and James Harvey. "A Nation at Risk: The
 Report of the National Commission on Excellence in
 Education," Phi_Delta_Kappan, Vol. 65, No. 1 (Septem-
 ber 1983), pp. 14-18.
- Goodlad, John I. A_Place_Called_School. New York:
 McGraw-Hill, 1983.
- Graham, Patricia Albjerg. "The Twentieth Century Fund Task
 Force Report on Federal Elementary and Secondary
 Education Policy," Phi_Delta_Kappan, Vol. 65, No. 1
 (September 1983), pp. 19-21.
- Heffner, Stan. "Assessing Principal Performance," The
 School_Administrator, Vol. 41, No. 5 (May 1984), pp.
 22-24.
- Holmes. In American Association of School Administrators.
Let's_Discuss_the_Issues. Arlington, Virginia, 1987.
- Howe, Harold II. "The Value of Research and Disciplined
 Inquiry to the Improvement of Education: Impressions
 of a Nonresearcher," Improving_Education:--Perspectives
 on_Educational_Research. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:
 The National Academy of Education, 1984, pp. 21-25.
- Hoy, Wayne K. and Cecil G. Miskel. Educational
 Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New
 York: Random House, 1978.
- Keever, Glenn, editor. "A Nation Prepared--The Carnegie

Report," North Carolina Education, Vol. 16, No. 4 (May-June 1986), pp. 6-7.

- Kimbrough, Ralph B. and Michael Y. Nunnery. Educational Administration, 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1983.
- Klausmeir, Herbert. Learning and Human Abilities: Educational Psychology, 4th ed. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1971.
- Klausmeier, Herbert, James M. Lisham and John C. Daresh. The Renewal and Improvement of Secondary Education. Landam, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1983.
- Klausmeier, Herbert J. with the assistance of Thomas S. Sipple. Learning and Teaching Concepts: A Strategy for Testing Applications of Theory. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. "A Response to D'Amico: Not a Recipe But a Framework," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), p. 63.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Teacher Unions and Educational Quality," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, No. 5 (January 1985), pp. 341-343.
- Making the Grade. New York: Twentieth-Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, 1983.
- McCormack-Larkin, Maureen and William J. Kritek. "Milwaukee's Project RISE," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 12-15.
- McCurdy, Jack, editor. American Association of School Administrators. The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools: Problems & Solutions. Sacramento, California: Education News Service, 1983.
- McDonald, Frederick J. Educational Psychology, 2nd ed. California: Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.
- Murphy, Joseph, Richard P. Mesa, and Philip Hallinger. "A Stronger State Role in School Reform," Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 2 (October 1984), pp. 20-26.
- Myers, David G. Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 1983.
- National Governors Association. In American Association of School Administrators. Let's Discuss the Issues. Arlington, Virginia, 1987.

- NEA (National Education Association). In American Association of School Administrators. Let's Discuss the Issues. Arlington, Virginia, 1987.
- Odden, Allan and Beverly Anderson. "How Successful State Education Improvement Programs Work," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 67, No. 8 (April 1986), pp. 582-585.
- Odden, Allan and Eleanor Odden. "Education Reform, School Improvement, and State Policy," Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 2 (October 1984), pp. 13-19.
- Ohanian, Susan. "Huffing and Blowing Schools Excellent," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, Number 5 (January 1985), pp. 316-320.
- . "On Stir-and-Serve Recipes for Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1985, pp. 696-701.
- Purkey, Stewart C. and Marshall S. Smith. "Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools," Educational Leadership, Vol. 40, No. 3 (December 1982), pp. 12-15.
- Rosenberg, Morris. Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rosenholtz, Susan J. "Political Myths About Education Reform: Lessons from Research on Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, Number 5 (January 1985), pp. 349-355.
- Rosser, Rosemary A. and Glen I. Nicholson. Educational Psychology: Principles in Practice. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1984.
- Rubin, Louis. "Formulating Education Policy in the Aftermath of the Reports," Educational Leadership, Vol. 42, No. 2 (October 1984), pp. 7-12.
- Shane, Harold G. and M. Bernadine Tabler. Educating for a New Millennium: Views of 132 International Scholars. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1981.
- Shanker, Albert. "The Making of A Profession," American Educator, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Fall 1985), pp. 10-17, 46, 48.
- . "The Revolution That's Overdue," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, No. 5 (January 1985), pp. 311-315.
- Slavin, Robert E. Educational Psychology: Theory Into Practice. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1986.
- Smith, Henry P. Psychology in Teaching. New York:

Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

Smith, M. Daniel. Educational Psychology and It's Classroom Applications. New York: Allan and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Soltis, Jonas F. "Imaging a School," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 66, Number 5 (January 1985), pp. 321-323.

Stone, David R. and Elwin C. Nielson. Educational Psychology: The Development of Teaching Skills. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1982.

Sweeney, Jim and Robert Pinckney. "Faculty Management: The Principal's Most Important Role," Spectrum: Journal of School Research and Information, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Fall 1983), pp. 3-6.

Wiles, Jon and Joseph Bondi. Supervision: A Guide to Practice. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1980.

Woolfolk, Anita E. Educational Psychology, 3rd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1987.

APPENDIX A
GALLOP POLL

Table 23
THE GOALS OF EDUCATION
The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward the Public Schools
April 30 - May 9, 1984

The Goals of Education	Highest Rating %	
	All Teachers	U.S.Public
To help develop good work habits, the ability to organize one's thoughts, the ability to concentrate	56	48
To develop the ability to think -- creatively, objectively, analytically	56	51
To develop the ability to speak and write correctly	55	68
To develop the ability to use mathematics for everyday problems	53	54
To encourage the desire to continue learning throughout one's life	51	41
To encourage respect for law and order, for obeying the rules of society	46	52
To develop the ability to live in a complex and changing world	41	51
To prepare those who plan to attend college for college	36	46
To develop skills needed to get jobs for those not planning to attend college	34	54
To develop standards of what is "right and wrong"	33	64
To develop the desire to excel	32	51
To develop an understanding of democracy and to promote participation in the political process	31	33
To develop the ability to get along with different kinds of people	31	42
To develop respect for and understanding of other races, religions, nations, and cultures	30	39
To develop the ability to deal with adult responsibilities and problems, i.e., sex, marriage, parenting, personal finances, alcohol and drug abuse	28	46
To help students make realistic plans for what they will do after high school graduation	27	52

- continued

Table 23 (Continued)
 THE GOALS OF EDUCATION
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

The Goals of Education	Highest Rating_%	
	All Teachers	U.S.Public
To develop an understanding about different kinds of jobs and careers, including their requirements and rewards	20	56
To gain knowledge and understanding of science and scientific facts	17	45
To gain knowledge of the important facts of history, geography, etc.	15	42
To develop an appreciation for participation in the arts, music, literature, theater, etc.	14	35
To help students overcome personal problems	13	45
To develop the ability to understand and use computers	12	43
To promote physical development through sports programs	8	20
To help students get good/high-paying jobs	6	46
To develop an appreciation of the "good" things in life	6	32

Table 24
SUBJECT REQUIREMENTS
The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward the Public Schools
April 30 - May 9, 1984

Subjects	Should be required			
	College-Bound Students Percentage	Students Years	Non-College Bound Students Percentage	Students Years
Mathematics	96	3.4	94	2.7
English	95	3.8	93	3.6
History/U.S.Gov't	95	2.9	91	2.2
Science	95	2.8	90	2.4
Foreign language	77	2.1	28	1.4
Physical Education	74	2.6	73	2.6
Health Education	73	1.5	75	1.6
Business	63	1.5	80	2.1
Art	54	1.3	45	1.3
Music	49	1.3	42	1.3
Ind. Arts/Homemaking	46	1.4	78	2.4

Table 25
SUBJECT REQUIREMENTS
The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward the Public Schools
April 30 - May 9, 1984

Subjects	<u>Should be required</u>			
	<u>College-Bound Students</u>		<u>Non-College Bound Students</u>	
	All Teachers Percentage	U.S.Public Percentage	All Teachers Percentage	U.S.Public Percentage
Mathematics	96	96	94	92
English	95	94	93	90
History/U.S.Gov't	95	84	91	71
Science	95	84	90	61
Foreign language	77	57	28	19
Physical Education	74	43	73	44
Health Education	73	52	75	50
Business	63	68	80	76
Art	54	24	45	18
Music	49	22	42	18
Ind. Arts/Homemaking	46	37*	78	83*

* The U.S.Public was asked about "vocational training"

Table 26
SHOULD SEX EDUCATION BE REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage	
	High School	Elementary School
Should	86	75
Should not	8	18
No opinion	6	7

Table 27
 WHICH SEX EDUCATION TOPICS SHOULD
 BE REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Topics	Percentage					
	High School			Elementary School		
	Yes	No	No Opinion	Yes	No	No Opinion
The biology of reproduction	83	15	2	70	28	2
Venereal disease	83	15	2	40	50	10
Birth control	80	18	2	29	58	13
Premarital sex	68	24	8	21	65	14
The nature of sexual intercourse	62	28	10	24	63	13
Abortion	64	27	9	18	65	17
Homosexuality	55	31	14	15	68	17

Table 28
SHOULD SEX EDUCATION BE REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?
The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward the Public Schools
April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage			
	In High School Teachers U.S.Public		In Elementary School Teachers U.S.Public	
Should	86	70	75	45
Should not	8	22	18	48
No opinion	6	8	7	7

Table 29
 IF SEX EDUCATION IS REQUIRED IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
 WHAT INSTRUCTIONAL TOPICS SHOULD BE COVERED?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Topics	Percentage			
	<u>In_High_School</u> Teachers U.S.Public		<u>In_Elementary_School</u> Teachers U.S.Public	
Sex education (in general)	86	70	75	45
The biology of reproduction	83	54	70	37
Venereal disease	83	59	40	23
Birth control	80	55	29	20
Premarital sex	68	42	21	18
The nature of sexual intercourse	62	37	24	16
Abortion	64	38	18	12
Homosexuality	55	32	15	10

Table 30
 WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE
 IN DECIDING WHAT IS TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage		
	All Teachers	Elementary Teachers	High School Teachers
Teachers	33	31	35
Local school board	19	17	20
State government	17	19	16
Federal government	3	2	3
Parents	2	2	2
No opinion	26	29	24

Table 31
 WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE IN SELECTING
 BOOKS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS CLASSROOMS AND LIBRARIES?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage		
	All Teachers	Elementary Teachers	High School Teachers
Teachers	79	76	82
Principals and school administrators	4	5	2
Local school board	3	2	3
Parents	*	*	1
No opinion	14	17	12

* Less than one-half of 1 percent.

Table 32
 WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE
 IN DECIDING WHAT IS TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage	
	All Teachers	U.S. Public
Teachers	33	11
Local school board	19	27
State government	17	17
Federal government	3	9
Parents	2	24
No opinion	26	12

Table 33
 WHO SHOULD HAVE THE GREATEST INFLUENCE IN SELECTING
 BOOKS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS CLASSROOMS AND LIBRARIES?
 The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
 Toward the Public Schools
 April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage	
	All Teachers	U.S. Public
Teachers	79	42
Principals and school administrators	4	15
Local school board	3	13
Parents	*	18
No opinion	14	12

* Less than one-half of 1 percent.

Table 34
DO YOU BELIEVE THE SCHOOL DAY SHOULD BE EXTENDED BY ONE HOUR?
The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward the Public Schools
April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage	
	All Teachers	U.S. Public
Favor	24	42
Oppose	72	52
No opinion	4	6

Table 35
DO YOU BELIEVE THE SCHOOL YEAR SHOULD BE EXTENDED BY 31 DAYS,
MAKING THE SCHOOL YEAR ABOUT 210 DAYS OR 10 MONTHS LONG?
The Gallop Poll of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward the Public Schools
April 30 - May 9, 1984

Response	Percentage	
	All Teachers	U.S. Public
Favor	28	44
Oppose	66	50
No opinion	6	6

APPENDIX B
HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER INVOLVEMENT
QUESTIONNAIRE (HSTIQ)

HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

BY

Faleese M. Jenkins - 1987

Purpose of Questionnaire: The purpose of this questionnaire is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, your involvement in planning goals and policies for the academic and instructional programs of your school. The questionnaire is divided into the following five parts:

- Part I DEMOGRAPHIC DATA - Information about your present employment as a high school teacher.
- Part II RATING OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS - Your rating of your school's effectiveness.
- Part III "ACTUAL" AND "IDEAL" SCALES OF INVOLVEMENT - Your "ideal" rating of your observed involvement in planning the school programs. Your "ideal" rating of what you would like your involvement in planning the school program to be.
- Part IV OPEN-ENDED TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS - Express your opinion about your involvement in planning school policies and goals.
- Part V DEFINITIONS - Describe the academic or instructional program presented in Part III.

Part I DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Directions: Place a check () beside the response, which best describes you in your present employment.

1. Type of school system

- 1. Urban
- 2. Suburban
- 3. Rural

2. Number of students assigned to your school

- 1. Fewer than 500
- 2. 501 to 1000
- 3. 1001 to 1500
- 4. 1501 to 2000
- 5. More than 2000

3. Sex

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

4. Race

- 1. White
- 2. Non-White

5. Age

1. Younger than 30
 2. 30 to 40
 3. Older than 40

6. Total number of years employed as a teacher

1. Less than 5
 2. 5 to 10
 3. 11 to 20
 4. More than 20

7. Teaching area

1. English
 2. Mathematics
 3. Science
 4. Social studies
 5. Fine arts
 6. Physical education and health
 7. Vocational education
 8. Other (please specify: _____)

Part II RATING OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Considering my school's total educational program, I rate (evaluate) my school as being - (please circle the appropriate number to indicate your response):

INEFFECTIVE-----> EFFECTIVE
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Part III "ACTUAL" AND "IDEAL" SCALES OF INVOLVEMENT

Below is a list of items that may be used to describe your involvement in decision making regarding academic or instructional programs in your school. Each item describes a specific school program, but the statement does not ask you to judge whether the level of your involvement is desirable or undesirable. Although some statements may appear similar, each expresses a difference that is important in describing your involvement in planning goals and policies for your school; therefore, please consider each statement as a separate description.

Directions:

- a. READ each item carefully. If the item is not clear refer to definitions in Part V.
- b. THINK about your "actual" rating of your observed involvement in planning the program.
- c. DRAW A CIRCLE around the appropriate number in the "ACTUAL SCALE OF INVOLVEMENT" column to indicate your response to the item.

- d. THINK about your "ideal" rating of what you would like your involvement in planning the school program to be.
- e. DRAW A CIRCLE around the appropriate number in the "IDEAL SCALE OF INVOLVEMENT" column to indicate your response to the item.

1 - LOW INVOLVEMENT in planning the academic or instructional program.
 2 - YOUR
 3 - level
 4 - of
 5 - involvement
 6 - falls
 7 - within this
 8 - range
 9 - HIGH INVOLVEMENT in planning the academic or instructional program.

ITEMS	ACTUAL SCALE OF INVOLVEMENT									IDEAL SCALE OF INVOLVEMENT									
	LOW	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	HIGH	LOW	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Adoption of school textbooks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
2. Retention of students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
3. Teacher in-service programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
4. Special course offerings for students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
5. Master schedule	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
6. Student discipline	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
7. Remediation programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
8. Independent study courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
9. Establishment of honor courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
10. Teacher's class schedule	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
11. Length of time in a class (minutes, hours, days, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
12. Selection of library books	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
13. Assembly programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
14. Professional time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
15. Contracting of courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
16. School philosophy and goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	

17. Professional growth	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
18. Curriculum development		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. Student dress code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
20. Standards of conduct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
21. Improvement of instruction		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. Academic standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
23. Graduation requirements		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Part IV OPEN-ENDED TEACHER INVOLVEMENT QUESTIONS

1. What do you LIKE about your level of involvement in your school?

2. What do you DISLIKE about your level of involvement in your school?

3. How may your level of involvement in your school be improved?

Part V DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this questionnaire, the following definitions apply to describe the academic or instructional program presented in Part III.

1. Adoption of school textbooks - textbooks selected for classroom use.
2. Retention of students - policies governing nonpromotion of students.
3. Teacher in-service programs - selection of school in-service programs.
4. Special course offerings for students - policies governing "special" student courses or programs.
5. Master schedule - schedule of all school classes and activities.
6. Student discipline - regulations and policies which govern student discipline.
7. Remediation programs - course/program objectives designed to meet the needs of low achieving students.
8. Independent study course - course/program objectives designed to meet the needs of high achieving students.
9. Establishment of honor courses - policies and goals of college preparation courses.
10. Teacher's class schedule - your class schedule.
11. Length of time in a class - minutes, hours, days, etc.
12. Selection of library books - selection of library books for use by all students.
13. Assembly programs - policies which determine which programs and activities will be presented.
14. Professional time - determining the use of the teacher's instructional and non-instruction time.
15. Contracting courses - policies that govern contracts made by your school with consultants, colleges, universities, etc., to provide specialized courses for teachers in your school.
16. School philosophy and goals - procedures that determine the school's general direction.
17. Professional growth - programs designed to increase the professional abilities of teachers.
18. Curriculum development - the planning, revision, implementation of the curriculum.
19. Student dress codes - establishment of rules and policies that determine proper student dress.
20. Standards of conduct - rules and policies that govern proper student conduct.
21. Improvement of instruction - policies, objectives designed to improve classroom teaching.
22. Academic standards - policies, rules, etc., which determine grading scales, achievement awards, etc.
23. Graduation requirements - the minimum credits needed to graduate from high school.

APPENDIX C
LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

March 12, 1987

Dear Superintendent:

I am a doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to solicit the opinions of high school teachers relative to their involvement in planning goals and policies for academic and instructional programs of their school. The results of this study will help to provide greater insight relative to teacher involvement and perceptions as they relate to school effectiveness in general.

I seek your support in this study because I am confining my survey population to Northeastern North Carolina. I will seek to illicit the opinions of high school teachers in your county.

It should be noted that the respondents will remain completely anonymous and all information received will be treated with strict confidentiality. If you approve of this questionnaire and its distribution, please respond to me by March 16, 1987 by using the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Upon receipt of your approval, I will inform your high school principal in writing of your approval. At which time, I will solicit their support in encouraging their teachers to complete and return the questionnaire.

I will be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Faleese M. Jenkins

Enclosure

APPENDIX D
LETTER TO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
FOR APPROVAL



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

March 17, 1987

Dear Principal:

I am a doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to solicit the opinions of high school teachers relative to their involvement in planning goals and policies for the academic and instructional programs of their schools. The results of this study will help to provide greater insight relative to teacher involvement and perceptions as they relate to school effectiveness in general.

I have received permission from your superintendent of schools to distribute the questionnaire to the high school teachers. Permission was also given to solicit your support in facilitating the completion and return of the questionnaire. Therefore, I am seeking your support by asking you to please encourage each teacher in your school to participate. I will mail the questionnaire to the teachers on March 19, 1987. It is critical that all questionnaires be completed and returned to me by March 27, 1987. Please announce your support of this study and encourage each teacher to respond.

All respondents will remain completely anonymous and all information received will be treated strict confidentiality.

I will be pleased to send you a summary of the survey results if you desire. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Faleese M. Jenkins

Enclosure

APPENDIX E
FIRST LETTER TO RESEARCH SUBJECTS



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

March 19, 1987

Dear Fellow Educator:

I am a doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University. The enclosed questionnaire is designed to solicit the opinions of high school teachers relative to their involvement in planning goals and policies for academic and instructional programs of their school.

I have received permission and support from your superintendent of schools and your principal to solicit your participation in this study. I am particularly desirous of obtaining your responses because the whole focus of my study relative to effective schools centers around your involvement and perceptions.

It will be greatly appreciated if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope prior to, but not later than March 27, 1987. Other phases of this research cannot be completed until I have received your response.

Your response will remain completely anonymous and all information will be treated with strict confidentiality. Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Faleese M. Jenkins

Enclosure

APPENDIX F
SECOND LETTER TO RESEARCH SUBJECTS



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

April 17, 1987

Dear Fellow Educator:

On March 19, 1987, a questionnaire was mailed to you seeking your opinion of your involvement in planning goals and policies for academic and instructional programs at your school.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard the remainder of this letter. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope today. It is critical that I recover all of the questionnaires distributed if the results of the study are to accurately represent high school teachers' opinions toward their school involvement in school decision making.

Again, I understand the importance of your time and appreciate very much your willingness to donate a portion of that valuable time to my study.

Yours truly,

Faleese M. Jenkins

Enclosure

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**