CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Elementary school teachers in today's schools have varying levels of involvement in school decision making. Much of the research on teachers' opinions about their involvement in decision making has been gathered through studies on school-based management, shared decision making, participatory management, school reform, and teacher empowerment. With increased use of school-based management and related practices, teachers have increased involvement in school decision making. The purpose of this study was to design and test an instrument to measure teachers' satisfaction with their involvement in school decision making. The population surveyed consisted of a sample of teachers that were currently working in schools participating in a site-based management program, and a sample of teachers in schools that were not. This review of the literature examined opportunities for teacher involvement in school decision making through practices implemented in school-based management, shared decision making, participatory management, and teacher empowerment.

School-Based Management

School-based management is a process that involves individuals who are responsible for actually making decisions and implementing those decisions (English, 1988). Under school-based management, decisions are made at the level closest to the issue being addressed.   When school-based management is working well, more decisions

flow up through the system rather than down from the top. In a study conducted by the

American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Elementary

School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, it was

concluded that educational reform efforts will be effective and long lasting when school-

based management is based on the two fundamental beliefs that decisions should be made

by individuals most closely affected by them, and when carried out by people who feel a

sense of ownership and responsibility for the process (English, 1988).

Deming's model of leadership calls for a decreased level of organizational

bureaucracy. His method provides the opportunity for all employees to participate in the

decision making process.   He developed 14 principles based on the belief that people

want to do their best and it is the responsibility of the management to see to it that they

do.   In addition, he believes that managers must constantly improve the system in which

they work, and that everyone is intrinsically motivated to learn because nobody really

wants to fail (Deming, 1988).

Lindelow defines SBM as a system in which the school is the primary unit of

educational decision-making (Lindelow, 1989). Wiesner (1987) emphasizes a local

ownership definition in a handout based on SBM in the St. Louis schools stating that the

concept of school-based management is to underscore and attain an operating method in

which school districts at all levels have a high degree of management authority. He states

that only when people are involved in their own professional destiny can real concern,

creativity, and initiative be stimulated for the benefit of students (Wiesner, 1987).

School-based management has grown out of business and industry management practices. Many management experts in the private sector as well as in the public schools have cited the advantages to systems that shift decisions to the levels most directly affected. Naisbitt (1990) described the trends toward decentralized decision-making throughout the private sector. He believes that people whose lives are affected by a decision must be part of the process of arriving at that decision (Naisbitt, 1990). Drucker (1988) on the other hand does not advocate decentralization as extensively. However, he does emphasize the importance of managers paying attention to the needs of employees. He believes that individuals at work know what makes them more productive, and what is helpful or unhelpful (Drucker, 1988).

There are a number of management experts who advocate the effectiveness of smaller business units. Peters and Waterman note the advantages of this approach in their book, *In Search of Excellence*. They believe that the point of smallness, is beautiful, it induces manageability , commitment, and it works. They conclude that managers can understand something that is small when one central discipline prevails (Peters & Waterman, 1984).

In his book *The Renewal Factor*, Waterman states that the goal is to have "people down the line implementing imaginative programs for renewal" (Waterman, 1987). He further states that people know what their boundaries are; they know where they should act on their own and where not. In addition, the boss knows that his or her job is to establish those boundaries, and then get out of the way (Waterman, 1987).

9

The earliest multi classroom schools were "managed" by teachers and a principal teacher. These were generally unmarried women able to administer the school and discuss its educational program (Levine & Taylor, 1991). When the proliferation of school administrators and the growth of teacher unions placed the two groups in conflict with one another, after World War II, school-site decision making became cursory and was often done "in the halls" or through quick meetings between the principal and staff. The principal "handed down" district policies and procedures to the teachers, who were then expected to carry them out. Authority in the schools became more and more centralized and bureaucratized (Levine & Taylor, 1991).

According to Levine and Taylor educators began to implement forms of school-based management in the early 1970's in an effort to respond to the changing characteristics of the neighborhood and communities they served. Neighborhood schools were becoming desegregated schools to which students were bused. The one time solid, middle-class, non-minority neighborhoods had become racially mixed. The problem of "white flight" focused attention on the need to improve schools that enrolled large numbers of black and Hispanic children and children of the "underclass." School-based management either didn't take hold as soon or had already been employed as a tried-and-true management practice for running good schools in the suburban and rural communities (Levine & Taylor, 1991).

In 1972, Florida mandated an annual plan drawn up by school-based management teams. However, the plan was not implemented until 1974. This mandate did little to

decentralize decision making or encourage programs of school improvement, due to the fact that they only had to write an annual report and specify their yearly goals and objectives (Levine & Taylor, 1991).

Smith and Purkey define school-based management (SBM) as a system designed to improve education by increasing the authority of actors at the school site (Smith & Purkey, 1985). They state that the idea becomes popular for two reasons: the importance ascribed to school site-management by research on school effectiveness and the "second wave" of education reform concerned with deregulation and decentralization (Smith & Purkey, 1985).

Some districts have had a long tradition of decentralization management, but for many districts, SBM is relatively new. As of 1988, Chesterfield, Missouri, had a 34-year tradition of school autonomy which was a theory based on the belief that the school staff, rather than central administrators, have a better understanding of the needs of the school (Clune & White, 1988).

Clune & White found that many districts have not taken advantage of the experience of other districts with SBM that could enhance the success or avoid problems that could occur during implementation. This failure to learn from the experience of others may have been due partly to the fact that individual school needs and planning vary (Clune & White, 1988).

Clune & White also found that in most districts, SBM developed as a result of interest and commitment on the part of the superintendent. These districts include

11

Boston, Massachusetts; Charleston County, South Carolina; Duval County, Florida; San Diego, California; Sarasota, Florida; St. Louis, Missouri; and Tulsa, Oklahoma. The superintendent has frequently served in conjunction with other influential actors, such as, the school board, principals, teachers, and parents (Clune & White, 1988).

Many SBM programs have been initiated in some districts on a pilot basis. Schools volunteer to participate in the program. According to Clune & White, the goal of the pilot program is to learn what works and then be able to develop a working model for implementation in other schools. In some cases, the principal has a veto over participating in a pilot program. For example, in the Independent School District #196, Rosemount, Minnesota, the principal was allowed to decide not to participate even if the teachers were in full support of the program (Clune &White, 1988).

Smith and Purkey stated that in the eighties, school-based management and effective schools' research began to coalesce in the pragmatic plans of many educators interested in improving schools for all children. They reported that many advocates of effective schools were unwilling to wait for a few unusually successful schools to emerge haphazardly from the unplanned efforts of a few exceptional principals. Therefore, they faced the challenge of finding other approaches to enhance the effectiveness of a group of "normal"schools. Effective principals were successful in soliciting faculty input regarding instructional decision making (Smith & Purkey, 1983). Some research on change in schools and in other organizations focused on participation in decision making as a key variable in developing motivation and commitment among staff members (Smith

12

& Purkey, 1983). Advocates of effective schools have emphasized the involvement of faculty members in the preparation and implementation of site-level improvement plans as an important way to help large numbers of schools move toward effectiveness (Smith & Purkey, 1983).

Public education entered a period of change and experimentation in which there was a widespread and growing endorsement of increased teacher participation in site-level planning and in the implementation of fundamental reforms. According to Clune and White, proposals for experimentation with such reforms varied widely, from relatively modest arrangements that involved teachers in planning somewhat marginal changes to radical efforts that gave teachers sole responsibility for redesigning almost everything in their schools (Clune & White, 1988).

Clune and White also believe that SBM programs focus on teaching students greater social responsibility, and promote involvement of school staff, parents and the community, with the aim of creating a sense of school ownership. Many of these SBM programs have given schools the authority to focus on the curriculum, shift funds across personnel categories, select the number of teachers, teacher assistants, and full-time and part-time positions (Clune & White, 1988). Some school staffs make decisions regarding the selection of textbooks, supplemental instructional materials to be used, selection of learning activities, as well as, determine the nature of alternative programs implemented. Some SBM programs allow the school site authority to decide when the school day or school year begins or ends.   In some SBM programs, the principal has the autonomy to

hire certified and classified staff. In other cases, teachers and SBM councils make recommendations and are involved in the screening, interviewing, and final selection (Clune & White, 1988).

Boyer (1988) believes that schools must work harder at sharing the authority for making important decisions. In order to rebuild excellence in education, reaffirming the importance of the local school and freeing leadership to lead is important. (Boyer, 1988). Furthermore, he theorizes that when teachers are provided the increased involvement in decision making, they will strive to improve the status and quality of the teaching force in the 1990s and beyond (Boyer, 1988).

Ferrera (1992) declares that a school reform must rest on shared beliefs, with trust being the key ingredient.   He believes that the participants must have a shared vision. There must be trust in leadership, as well as trust of all the participants (Ferrera, 1992).

Lieberman (1988) suggests that it is important to expand the roles of teachers in order to change the teaching profession in profound ways. She recommends that teachers should be provided greater recognition and status, and have a reward structure to allow for choices, renewal, and opportunity to grow and learn.   She also believes that as working conditions improve, so does teacher satisfaction (Lieberman, 1988).

Sergiovanni (1996) states in his book, *Leadership for the Schoolhouse*, that the schoolhouse should make the decisions about school organization, curriculum, and classroom life that reflects constructivist teaching and learning principles (Sergiovanni, 1996). He also states that a theory for the schoolhouse should encourage principals,

14

teachers, parents, and students to be self-managing, and accept responsibility for what they do, and they should feel a sense of commitment and obligation to do the right thing (Sergiovanni, 1996).

Raelin (1989) believes that a fundamental problem of school management is the ability of the administrator to establish a balance between controlling the building while granting teachers their professional right of autonomy.   Results of his study revealed that virtually all work takes place for teachers within a bureaucracy, where they serve as both professionals and employees (Raelin, 1989).

The quality and character of a school and the accomplishments of its students have a lot to do with the nature of the adult relationships in a school (Barth, 1990). Barth found that frequently, personal relationships are adversarial: teacher against student, teacher against teacher, principal against teacher, school people against parents (Barth, 1990).

 Elam, Rose, and Gallup (1992) reported that parents are sometimes critical of the information they received from the public schools in regard to their children's academic progress. While identifying some of the biggest problems in which the public schools had to address, there were many questions raised concerning the placement of handicapped children in the same classroom with other students. Frequently, regular classroom teachers have not been trained adequately to teach handicapped students. There was support for a national public school curriculum, for national goals and standards, and for a national testing program toward these goals and standards. This was evident in the 24th

Gallup Poll (Elam, Rose, Gallup, 1992).

Rossi and Stringfield report that there are several attributes of interpersonal relations that occur in schools that have effective site-based management programs. Teachers share a vision and a sense of purpose. Students feel cared about and maintain open communication. They all share a sincere sense of trust (Rossi & Springfield, 1995).

According to McClure, the structure of schools causes a degree of isolation. He views school faculties as a collection of individuals working independently (McClure, 1988). Based on a project by the NEA in response to the national outcry for school improvement, the Mastery in Teaching Project was implemented to explore the benefits of collegiality. The outcome of the five year school-based improvement effort found that faculties began viewing leadership as a shared responsibility that was based on competence as much as on role (McClure, 1988). They became more collegial and better able to share ideas for problem solving purposes, and they considered themselves as powerful forces that could affect the quality of their schools (McClure, 1988).

According to Guthrie, when school-based management strategies are tailored to the curriculum of each state and local school district, there is the potential for solving the tensions that exist between state-level policy makers and local school personnel (Guthrie, 1986).

Many educators believe that the best decisions about education are those made by the people closest to the students. However, few realize the extent of system wide change that school-based management entails. Frequently, school-based management systems

have been implemented simply by establishing a council at the school site and assigning various responsibilities in the areas of budget, personnel, and curriculum. Wohlstetter (1995) identified the conditions in schools that promote high performance through SBM. She defines "high-performance SBM" as occurring in schools that are actively restructuring in the areas of curriculum and instruction; these were schools where SBM worked well. She also compares this group of successful schools to schools using SBM but with less success in making changes that affect teaching and learning (Wohlstetter, 1995). Her study reveals that successful SBM requires a redesign of the whole school organization, and that people at the school site must have "real" authority over budget, personnel, and curriculum, in order for SBM to work. Authority must be used to introduce changes in the functioning of the school that actually affect teaching and learning, in order to improve school performance (Wohlstetter, 1995). Furthermore, her study reveals that school's techniques for using its new power must include strategies for decentralizing three other essential resources: 1) professional development and training for teachers and other stake holders in management, in solving problems, and in curriculum and instruction; 2) information about student performance, about parent and community satisfaction, and about school resources to help school people make informed decisions; and 3) rewards to acknowledge the increased effort SBM requires and to recognize improvements in school performance (Wohlstetter, 1995). Her research focuses on the importance of leadership on the part of the principal by having instructional guidance mechanism, such as, a curriculum framework at the school site to direct reform efforts

17

(Wohlstetter, 1995).

Bacharach and Conley (1986) hypothesize that effectively managed organizations allow employees to have a say in strategic organizational decisions and in decisions that directly affect their work. However, teachers rarely have the opportunity to participate in decision making outside their own classrooms. Collective bargaining allows teachers a means of exercising their power and influence, however, managers do not always view collective bargaining positively (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). Therefore, the potential value of teacher participation in work-related and strategic policy decisions is often ignored (Bacharach & Conley, 1986).

The value of workers' participation in collective decision making became increasingly recognized as critical in the private sector during the 1980's. As a result, teachers believe that they are professionally trained and have the most direct contact with students, and they should be involved in identifying school needs and establishing priorities among them. A structure that allows teachers to develop and present ideas, which create formal channels for these ideas, and mechanisms for implementing new ideas can foster such participation (Bacharach & Conley, 1986).

Geisert (1988) believes that replacing administrators by teacher committees will not solve management problems; moreover, it will give teacher unions too much power in the management of schools. He states that increasing the number of decision makers in schools can create a need for additional procedures and policies which may increase bureaucratic obstacles to school improvement (Geisert, 1988).

Bacharach and Conley (1990) suggest that school-based management is not a school reform program in and of itself. They believe that school-based management is only one way to restructure decision making and planning at the school site so that day-to-day administration and teaching can be collaborative and collegial. They state that without a reason for switching to school-based management, this change in planning and reporting arrangements is likely to be only a cosmetic attempt to improve the school (Bacharach & Conley, 1990). In their study, they discover that without a comprehensive improvement process, school-site management can cause confusion and frustration on the part of those involved in setting priorities and could end up doing little to promote school improvement. Also, they state that the idea of placing authority to make day-to-day decisions at the school site is not new (Bacharach & Conley, 1990).

Wohlstetter hypothesizes that in school-based management there is a need for three commodities that private sector research has found to be essential for making good and productive decisions. Based on her findings, it is evident that school-based management requires fundamental change in people's understanding of the organization and their role in it. Furthermore, she suggests that successful schools should take time to educate themselves regarding different approaches necessary to achieve valued outcomes. She believes that educators should visit and expose themselves to different organizations, and focus on learning from both school and private sector organizations (Wohlstetter, 1994).

Researchers have identified leadership as a crucial factor in school effectiveness.

19

The principal is the only one who sees the whole school. Therefore, the principal plays a very important role in SBM. It is believed that the principal's role changes greatly as a result of SBM. Clune and White indicate that when SBM is being implemented, the authority and responsibility of the principal can cover three directions at once: more involvement in the school program; more involvement in shared governance; and a higher level of responsibility in district decision making (Clune & White, 1988). Principals are considered to be key figures in fostering a relationship of shared governance within the school. They are held accountable for achieving the school objectives outlined in the school-site plan. Frequently, the difference between a successful and unsuccessful SBM program is related to the leadership qualities of the principal. Although most decisions involve a group decision-making process rather than the principal making decisions unilaterally, the principal often encourages the teachers to accept more responsibility and commitment by exchanging information and ideas. A talented principal in a SBM system will find a balance between order and freedom (Clune & White, 1988).

It is believed by Romanish (1991) that the single most significant shift which will facilitate a new role for teachers is to dramatically change the role and function of the school principal. He believes that building principals must have their positions modified. He bases his belief on the fact that if teachers and learners constitute the very marrow of the school's existence, then all duties and positions which occur outside the classrooms are there for one reason: a way to support and advance the efforts of those who teach and learn. Therefore, he theorizes that if teaching and learning are actually the hub to which

all else is tied, then all else must come to be viewed as buttressing the affairs of the classroom (Romanish, 1991).

Teachers find themselves assigned to one of the most difficult tasks in a society, and yet they do not feel that they have the authority to do what is expected of them or the recognition that they think the job ought to carry (Maeroff, 1988). One of the most important advantages of school-based management is the ability to take full advantage of the expertise of all staff. Making schools more teacher-centered is one objective of SBM. There have not been major changes in the roles and responsibilities of teachers in SBM, however, SBM has provided teachers with greater flexibility and the opportunity to make changes. Teachers have more responsibility and authority to organize and coordinate school programs. They are more sensitive and better able to respond to the needs of the students when working together to develop a school-site plan which includes the school's goals and objectives. Teachers have more input into the educational decisions that are made, including decisions about school climate; student attendance; discipline policies; teaching methods and strategies; and staff development. Teachers receive training to better inform them about the objectives of SBM, and to enhance their skills in working effectively in groups, and to learn to listen more effectively and share ideas with students and parents (Maeroff, 1988). Communication links are generally strengthened between teachers and the principal. The teacher's reaction toward SBM varies. Many times there is hesitation due to fears of doing something that is new. On the other hand, many teachers are enthusiastic about the increased flexibility and opportunity they have gained in

order to set up programs and schedules differently from other schools. Research has indicated that SBM has revised interest in some teachers who had been suffering from teacher burnout. Some have said that SBM programs have made them feel good about themselves and what they are doing. There has been positive feedback from the community and this has also been a motivating factor to teachers and caused them to be eager to carry-on with the SBM program (Clune & White, 1988).

In the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA), councils were established that received decision making authority in 16 areas of school operations and policy.   These school-based decision making schools manage their instructional finances, and in some districts, schools are able to administer all aspects of the building budget.   The KERA councils are also responsible for eight policy areas: curriculum, staff assignment, student assignment, school schedule, instructional practices, discipline, extracurricular programs, and alignment with state standards. These areas are considered to be sources of contention within schools and SBDM Councils (Lindle, 1995).

According to David (1995), site-based management is an attempt to transform schools into communities where people participate constructively in major decisions that affect them. He states that the reasons for initiating site-based management varied, however, virtually all are linked to the language of increasing student achievement (David, 1995).

Research suggests that teacher involvement in decisions may damage the learning process. Conway and Calzi state that the results of any restructuring effort must maintain

that the focus is to enhance the teaching/learning process (Conway & Calzi, 1996).

School-based budgeting is a concern for both teachers and principals. According to Calvert (1989) in schools implementing school-based management, the principals dominate the process. He believes that principals often fail to share their power with the teachers or community members (Calvert, 1989).

Shared Decision Making

"Site-based management," also known as "teacher empowerment" and "shared decision-making," is one (Lifton, 1992). In the beginning the pressure for site-based management came from several different sources. Lifton stated that the two national teachers' unions viewed the idea in a very serious way. The general public's uneasiness with school systems caused them to move toward supporting shared decision-making as an ultimate solution to the educational quality control problem (Lifton, 1992).

One rational of having shared decision-making is the theory that teachers know and understand the needs of their students better than anyone else. It is believed that if teachers have the authority to make decisions right at the building level, without being subjected to any outside bureaucracy, much greater progress can be made. Another rational is that power to run the schools should be shared with the parents of the community, in order to acknowledge their vital stake in their children's education as well as to bring them back into the schools allowing a coordinated home-school effort (Lifton, 1992).

Along with these concepts is the idea that school-based decisions will eliminate the need to follow rigid rules imposed from above. The projected consequences include greater teacher responsibility to students, more teacher involvement in parent and community meetings, and some extension of the student/teacher day or student/teacher year. Also, the desire for expanded teacher involvement might justify higher compensation levels, comparable to those found in other professional and semi-professional occupations (Lifton, 1992).

Lifton (1992) notes that the future of the current site-based management concepts will depend on how well they accommodate or overcome present-day constraints that saturate the public school environment. The author believes that if shared decision-making is to succeed, then all of the parties must have a genuine commitment to it. State collective bargaining laws differ as to how much and what kind of authority can legally be transferred from the board of education and administrators as its agents. Without the clear concurrence of the union, in many states, the school board cannot seek to work matters out on an individual basis with teachers. This practice may deprive site-based management efforts of needed flexibility (Lifton, 1992).

According to Robinson and Barkey (1992) the restructuring process of a school begins by conducting a comprehensive needs assessment followed by developing a vision that outlines a more desirable future, and goals for the improvement of instruction outcomes. They believe if involvement is expanded at the school site, this could lead to ownership and higher quality decisions regarding school improvement (Robinson &

Barkley, 1992).

When people have greater input in a process, they take greater pride and ownership in the outcome (Torres, 1992). Furthermore, it is important to develop a mechanism and accountability for decisions in areas governed by local school board policies, as well as state and federal regulations (Torres, 1992).

According to Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, there is a need for professional development of teachers in schools, because the result is a greater appreciation for what matters and what works, as well as what needs to be changed to promote student success (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). There is growing evidence that professional development not only makes teachers feel better about their practice, but because it reaps learning gains for students (Darling- Hammond, and McLaughlin, 1998).

Teachers have responded positively to shared decision making in many instances. Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1991) interviewed teachers about shared decision making. These teachers reported a greater sense of ownership, professional, and respect as a result of this approach. They also reported less conflict between teachers and administrators. This approach requires teachers to candidly confront their colleagues on issues critical for themselves and the school, negotiate, and resolve their differences. Although this may cause conflict among the participating teachers, overall teacher morale increases when shared decision making is used. However, there have been many roadblocks to the successful implementation of this strategy. This approach presents different demands for teachers. As a result, teachers must be trained to handle the new demands of decision

making about issues such as budgets and policies and other critical issues (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyeth, 1991).

An additional challenge of shared decision making arises when some teachers choose not to participate. The tensions among teachers must be addressed since the teachers who are involved frequently feel as though they are carrying more than their share of the load while teachers who are not involved may feel left out and resented by others (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyeth, 1991). Younger teachers may be more likely to voluntarily participate which creates another possible rift in the faculty as older teachers may feel as though their authority is being taken away (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyeth, 1991).

Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth, state that in order for shared decision making to work, teachers must feel as though they can change current policies and present new ideas to the principal. It is important for teachers to feel as though they are equal partners in the process and that their work on the issues is valued. They believe that everyone involved must have a clear understanding of their roles before work is started. The amount of time that teachers devote to this process should be monitored so that it does not interfere with the teachers' ability to teach effectively and meet the needs of the students. The final outcome of successful shared decision making is an improved school for teachers, students, administrators, and prospective teachers (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyeth, 1991).

Participatory Management

Fiedler (1987) defines directive leaders as those who tell people what to do; they let the group members know what is expected of them, they instruct them, they require them to meet certain standards and they make sure everyone knows who the boss is. He defines non directive leaders as those who consult their subordinates, request their opinions and ask them to participate in planning and decision making. In our democratic traditions, we tend to favor participatory management that encourages everyone to contribute to group decisions (Fiedler, 1987).

Covey (1990), defines dependent people as those who need others in order to get what they want, and independent people as those who can get what they want on their own. However, he defines interdependent people as those who combine their own efforts with the efforts of others to achieve their greatest success (Covey, 1990).

The education reform movement was predicated on the assumption that the problem with America's schools was that teachers lacked the motivation to teach. Reform efforts that were enacted by state legislatures focused on ways to motivate teachers to perform better. Efforts such as merit pay and career ladders were two prime examples that were often highly politically attractive, however, they failed to address the most critical obstacle to improving the educational system which was the characteristics of the learning workplace (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

Many of the education reform plans that have been adopted by state legislature are

27

practices that some of the most successful private sector organizations have rejected for

more than 25 years. Many of the proposed education reform plans are consistent with the

research on effective organizations and effective schools. Rather than these programs

creating the desired atmosphere of cooperation and productivity, they have created

atmospheres of conflict and completion (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

As more attention is placed on teacher motivation as a primary predictor of

excellence, more attention is also placed on the issue of job resources. Researchers stress

the importance of each position being provided with the resources necessary to fulfill the

assigned job responsibilities. The lack of resources result in serious personal

consequences such as dissatisfaction, lowered commitment to the job, and stress

(Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

The researchers believe that the resources necessary to perform the job of teacher

can be grouped into these categories: (1) authority, (2) time and (3)space, (4) human

support, equipment, supplies, and (5) materials, knowledge, skills, and information

(Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd, state that in effective organizations, decision

making is typically a decentralized process. More complete and accurate information

upon which to base decisions is yielded from highly participative decision-making

processes. They also believe that participation gives employees an opportunity to be

involved in problem solving, become more committed to the chosen solution, and they

frequently work harder to achieve desired results. An increase in participation enhances

the degree of consensus that exists in the organization and provides employers with a

higher level of information concerning the goals and objectives of the organization. The

researchers found that participation results in higher levels of satisfaction, cooperation,

lower turnover and absenteeism levels, and reduced stress (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd,

1986, p.19).

Education reformers have not dealt extensively with decision-making structure to

organization effectiveness. The researchers believe that teachers, as professionals, should

be highly involved in the decision-making process in their schools if the highest quality is

to be attained. Teachers should be highly involved in setting goals related to decisions

concerning the work process in schools, and in decisions that govern resource use and

allocation. With teachers being given the chance to contribute through their involvement

in decision-making, more effective change and growth toward excellence occurs

(Bacharach, Bauer, &Shedd, 1986).

Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd state that school management seems to react in one

of two ways when there are questions raised about teacher participation in decision

making. The "caring administrator" reaction is epitomized by the administrator who

contends that teachers already have so much to do that they do not want to bog them

down with decision-making responsibilities. The "paranoid administrator" reacts by

assuming that teacher involvement somehow denies management its decision-making

authority (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

According to the researchers, teachers can be involved in decision-making without

becoming *de facto* administrators, and administrators can seek advice, suggestions, and information from teachers without giving up their decision-making power or appearing weak. They believe that increased participation can improve the quality of teaching, the quality of administrating, and the overall quality of schools. In education, these initiatives have been few and far between. They suggest that it is important to educate administrators and teachers concerning the benefits of decision making, and encourage experimentation with programs designed to create participative decision-making systems. The researchers believe that it is also important that the appropriateness of private-sector participation programs be examined for use on schools (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

Communication is vital in organizational effectiveness. Through communication, organizational members can share information, set goals and priorities, provide advice and feedback, and evaluate their own and their organization's performance. Communication is vital to coordinating and controlling an organization's activities. An important phase of the overall communication process in schools is the communication that takes place between teachers and the building-level administrators. Based on effective schools literature, in effective schools, building-level administrators have frequent interaction with teachers, and offer advice and feedback. Teachers must be permitted to participate in decision making. Goals and objectives must be set and shared. Therefore, a strong interface between teachers and administrators must exist. The researchers state that effective administrators must clarify the goals, expectations and responsibilities of school

staff so that work is well coordinated and that teachers never have to guess what is expected of them or their students (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

In 1988, the National Education Association reported that public education's bureaucratic movement began in the 1940's with the attempts by administrators to involve faculty in the decision making process of individual schools. This was a part of the early human relations movement in American management. This movement emphasized the cooperative nature of organizations and the role of management in fostering cooperation among the firm's employees. The philosophical founders of this movement were Elton Mayo and Chester Barnard. Mayo emphasized the individual worker's desire for acceptance by his or her peers, the role of sentiment, and the instinct of human association. His model provided an environment in which workers could fulfill their natural desire. Barnard viewed organizations as cooperative, but not coercive systems. In his model, subordinates granted superiors the authority to make decisions. Both Mayo and Barnard viewed informal groups as critical to the functioning of formal organizations. Informal groups played an important role in encouraging organizational cohesiveness and communication. Prior to the human relations movement, public schools had experienced about thirty years of the scientific management concepts and practices. This movement implemented rigid, authoritarian structures and highly formalized control systems. A softening influence on these structures resulted from the human relations movement. The early human relations movement in education predominant emphasis was on consultation, not participation. During this movement management continued to have sole

31

responsibility for directing school operations but there was a raise in managerial

consciousness about the importance of the work culture and informal groups.   This

movement focused on the nonrational informal aspects of the organization while the

scientific management focused on the rational, or formal aspects of the organization. In

both movements, the emphasis was on the control of employee behavior and not the

transformation of school organization (NEA, 1988).

Teacher Empowerment

According to Romanish (1991), active participation can be viewed differently,

depending on the size and philosophy of the school but at bottom, in the participatory

theory of democracy, it means participating in decisions that affect classroom and school

wide practice (Romanish, 1991). He believes that this practice requires a wide range of

participation by a great number of people. Therefore, teachers cannot be empowered

individually, but only collectively. The setting aside for special status (master teachers)

carries with it a loud voice in decision making for members of the special group, but it

does very little to empower teachers as a whole. Frequently, this method serves as a

means to further disenfranchise an already silenced body because teachers are often seen

as a collective by the system (Romanish, 1991).

Maeroff (1988) states that "reform proposals that ignore the central role of

teachers are doomed to failure." In his book, ***The Empowerment of Teachers:***

Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence, he stresses that giving teachers greater power is a

major way to make them more professional and improve their performance. Professionals

usually have a sense of authority about what they do and are recognized as expects in their

fields.   They feel good about themselves and are respected by others. According to

Maeroff, the empowerment of teachers has to do with their individual deportment, not

their ability to boss others. He defines empowerment as working in an environment in

which a teacher acts as a professional and is treated as a professional. He believes the

three guiding principles of empowerment are boosting status, making teachers more

knowledgeable, and allowing teachers access to the lofty towers of power means

(Maeroff, 1988).

Maeroff believes that enhancing teachers' status is the first step toward

empowerment because as long as teachers are undervalued by themselves and others, they

are not likely to feel that they have much power. Any effort to upgrade teaching must

begin with improving the circumstances of teachers so that they feel better about

themselves and what they do for a living. Maeroff further states that money can be a

significant factor in boosting teacher morale. The working conditions that lead teachers to

the depths of despair are also important. Many educators view teaching to be an

occupation with few amenities (Maeroff, 1988).

According to Maeroff, teachers normally have little time to share and compare

ideas because they are separated from others by classrooms. Professional growth is

impaired in settings where practitioners do not see their colleagues practice their

profession. Many teachers are not aware of their colleagues teaching techniques. Often

they work an entire day without contact with a colleague except over lunch, which often

turns out to be the only setting in which pent-up frustrations can be vented (Maeroff,

1988).

Glasser (1990), in his book *The Quality School* states that boss-management is

wrong because it limits both the quality of the work and the productivity of the worker. He believes that in education, boss-management is used almost exclusively, and has effectively limited the number of students who do acceptable work to about 50 percent in the best neighborhoods to about 90 percent in schools where parent support for learning is not good. Glasser believes that given the hardest of management jobs, teachers as well as administrators are burdened with a management style that limits their ability to succeed regardless to how competent they are (Glasser, 1990).

Glasser states that all managers have to deal with absenteeism and low productivity, however, teachers are among the few managers who must deal with workers who are disruptive. He views disruption as being extremely difficult to handle, but not common. However, it is difficult to prevent. Through his experience he found prevention of disruption to be a valuable lesson whereby he established an almost totally nonadversarial relationship with his students. He believes in an atmosphere in which the idea of being courteous prevails. He views courtesy as a core to how a lead-manager deals with workers (Glasser, 1990).

Glasser further states that empowering workers is not easy because workers, especially workers who have been boss-managed, are leery of power. They believe that with power comes increased responsibility. Therefore, as long as they accept that the manager has all the power, then the workers can blame the manager when things go wrong. When workers have power, they have to work harder or more carefully because they along with the manager, are responsible for what is produced (Glasser, 1990).

Glasser believes that when the quality of the work increases, it will be because the workers and the managers are working together much better than before. He believes that they should be compensated for their effort by being rewarded with a financial bonus given

to the whole school for any obvious increase in quality (Glasser, 1990).

Hart believes that teacher leadership requires a major rethinking of the role of the administrator. When teachers lead, they gain power and influence which threaten traditional lines of control (Hart, 1993). She states that when teachers move from isolation to participation, they become part of the power structure, working with administrators rather than under them (Hart, 1993).

Romanish believes that the most important shift that facilitates a new posture for teachers is to dramatically change the role and function of the teacher, as well as, dramatically change the role and function of the school principal. In order for teachers to have the power they need professionally, building principals most have their positions modified. The main principle guiding this proposal is that teachers and learners constitute the very marrow of the school's existence (Romanish, 1991).

According to Romanish, teacher empowerment relates to control of the profession itself. He believes that when teachers view themselves as being empowered, they want to decide who their colleagues are. Teachers are seen as empowered in some sense if they are allowed to hold the reigns which set the standards for admission to the profession (Romanish, 1990). Therefore, Romanish believes that if teachers are allowed to truly govern their profession's enrollment, they will be able to hire teachers. He states that many desire to hire through committees of elected colleagues (Romanish, 1990).

Learning remains a very personal matter despite all the legislated approaches to the contrary. Romanish believes that it is insufficient to expect teachers to support programs

35

and policies created by individuals who do not know the teachers nor the young people (Romanish, 1990).

Romanish states that an empowered status for teachers can allow them to move away from the control of standardized testing. He believes that under a decentralized system that teachers govern, teachers will still be accountable (Romanish, 1990).

Maeroff fines that getting teachers and principals to see each other as collaborators in making schools work effectively for students, rather than being competitors for power, can be enhanced if teachers have access to decision making. He believes this to be essential, because principals can impede the ambitions of even the best teachers, just as teachers, acting in concert, can undo the good work of an administrator if they do not act as members of a team. Many times administrators and teachers are distrustful toward each other. This results as a reflection of the limited dialog between them (Maeroff, 1988).

Maeroff implies that knowledge should be the basic currency in which a teacher deals. However, frequently it is permitted to grow old and devalued. Strengthening the intellectual and methodological foundation of teachers is viewed as one of the most important challenges facing those who want to improve the quality of instruction, according to Maeroff. During the reform movement, it became evident that schools could get better when teachers knew more about their subjects and how to teach them. Empowerment was dependent on giving teachers this opportunity (Maeroff, 1988).

Two major foundations that offered teachers assistance in becoming more knowledgeable and confident were: The Rockefeller Foundation's Collaborative for

36

Humanities and Arts Teaching (CHART) and The Ford Foundation's Urban Mathematics Collaborative. These programs allowed teachers to gain prestige and knowledge. They became prime candidates to participate in the decision-making process (Maeroff, 1988).

Administrators who think teachers have been given access to decision-making have frequently been surprised to learn that the teachers feel as if they are on the outside, trying to get a look at what is going on inside (Maeroff, 1988).

Maeroff found that teachers in Seattle who participated in CHART, were so unaccustomed to having any power that they could not believe that they were going to have some influence over curriculum revision. They were waiting for the program director to tell them what they wanted. Several weeks passed before they realized that they had power (Maeroff, 1988).

The Carnegie Forum Task Force recommended that schools create professional environment for teaching by giving teachers the discretion and autonomy that professionals enjoy in other fields. There was a similar philosophy by the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals that was evident when the organizations produced the report *Ventures in Good Schooling*. The two groups called this document "*a cooperative model for a successful secondary school*." This document contains 84 recommendations on how to encourage cooperation between teachers and principals. Many view teacher empowerment as a method to put teachers and principals on a collision course. However, giving teachers a larger role in decision making does not mean reducing principals to figureheads. Researchers believe

that someone still has to be in charge. Many teachers believe that there should be a principal in whom the ultimate authority for decisions rests (Maeroff, 1988).

Research on effective schools indicates that teacher empowerment is especially important because state reforms frequently go against research by reducing opportunities for teachers to exercise their professional judgement. However, decision-making teachers--empowered teachers--are crucial to creating the optimum conditions for learning (Instructor, 1986).

"Quality Circles," a method of group decision making that is geared toward considering issues as diverse as the structure of parent conferences, distribution of afternoon supervisory duties, student placement process, and textbook selection, has been used in elementary schools in Waterbury, Vermont, and Central School in Larchmont, New York (Instructor, 1986).

There are other strategies of group decision making, such as, an *ad hoc* committee at Larchmont"s Central that studied the problem of kindergarten enrollment and initiated an extended-day kindergarten as an alternative to the former half-day sessions, increasing enrollment by 24 percent and increasing learning readiness for first grade. These teachers met weekly at lunch to exchange ideas, confront problems, and pool resources. They described their school as "a place where both students and teachers want to be, and this feeling is sustained by being part of the democratic process that governs school life."(Instructor, 1986).

There are other schools known as America's good schools that have executive

38

committees that include teachers or a faculty senate. The agendas are frequently

established by teachers. Many of these teachers feel that they are participants in key

decisions, they feel responsible--for training colleagues, designing curriculum, monitoring

pupil progress, and keeping up with research. They have a direct voice in the textbook

selections, and they recognize and analyze their own in-service needs. These schools

work at perfecting methods to improve the instructional staff, and they have formal

evaluation processes for their teachers (Instructor, 1986).

At Laguna Elementary in Tucson, Arizona, they used both "summative" and

"formative" evaluations to ensure that positive reinforcement resulted. They also held

week-long Professional Growth and Renewal Programs. Teachers in many of these

schools are observed formally by both administrators and other teachers. Frequently, this

results in constructive discussion and formulation of new teaching ideas. Also, if

weaknesses exist, strategies are devised to acquire necessary skills (Instructor, 1986).

Teachers are encouraged to teach to their strengths. New teachers are nurtured

with the advice, experience, and expertise of the entire staff. Some schools assign

experienced mentor teachers to help first-year novices. Specialists and part-time teachers

are as much a part of the planning groups as are the veteran teachers (Instructor, 1986).

The majority of good schools used some system of peer observation. Many times

a team of teachers will videotape a teacher with special skills or a particular problem and

discuss it with the entire staff. This is considered a form of peer coaching. Teachers are

provided with visitation days to examine other programs and materials. At Harrison

Avenue School, New York, teachers exchanged places for two days with a school in Randolph, Massachusetts, as a means of sharing ideas and information. There are also schools like C.M. Russell Elementary School in Missoula, Montana, where teachers have an exchange day within their own school. These support mechanisms recognize professional expertise and combat teacher isolationism (Instructor, 1986).

Some school districts develop teacher institutes. These institutes are run by a board of teachers, to research and present new teaching data as well as offer in-service courses throughout the year. Staff development needs are determined by the outcome of observations, interest surveys, and faculty requests (Instructor, 1986).

Dr. W. J. Creel Elementary in Melbourne, Florida, established a program where by the teachers receive three types of training on a monthly basis. Observations are followed by feedback at weekly team meetings and during individual conferences. There are regular in-services of teaching techniques occurring in motivation theory, lesson design, modeling, and student understanding. These teachers also receive continuous training in specific curriculum areas (Instructor, 1986).

Good schools treasure their talented teachers and reward them in many ways. Some receive plaques, Happy Grams, teacher of the week awards, teacher of the month awards, fruit, breakfast, Teacher Appreciation Days, flowers, other small gifts, and even a monetary gift. The teachers are also recognized by their students. Effective schools let their teachers know that they are loved and appreciated. They do whatever it takes to help get their teachers to do what they do best--teach. They make their teachers full

partners in the educational planning and development process. They assist their teachers in reaching their potential in the classroom as well as within their profession (Instructor, 1986).

Many suggestions have been offered by respondents pertaining to how teachers can be put in charge. They believe that putting teachers in charge can extend from the individual teacher's level all the way to the national level (Turner, 1987).

ABC University School District in the suburban Los Angeles community of Cerritos, made significant changes in its management structure and methods of operation for nearly twenty years. The result has been substantial. Teachers in the ABC District are part of a highly participative structure, both in their individual schools and at the district level. The changes that made this possible were due to a combination of internal and external influences, including: 1) the commitment of district leadership, 2) creative initiatives for change on the part of the teachers' union, 3) the availability of state financial support targeted for the professionalization of teaching, and 4) a university intervention program (Sickler, 1988).

During the 1986-87 school year, the teachers in the ABC Unified District controlled the curriculum development and the textbook adoption. They had control of more than $1 million in curriculum and staff development funds. Teachers were involved in making decisions concerning teaching assignments, as well as, assigning students to classes. They assisted in establishing student routines and in determining disciplinary policies. They selected and evaluated their peers for positions as mentor teachers, and

they participated in developing an evaluation procedure for all certificated employees (Sickler, 1988).

Management in the ABC Unified District was significantly reduced through attrition, which allowed for more direct communication between individual schools and the district office. Therefore, do to the reduction in personnel costs, more funds became available for the classrooms. The district budget was decentralized, which allowed each school more control over expenditures, and the district worked with the union to raise teacher salaries substantially (Sickler, 1988).

The effects of empowering teachers have been visible in a number of ways. Data on individual schools have shown the most significant gains, but district-wide statistics also reflect improvements. In 1970 ABC students were scoring below the 15th percentile on standardized achievement tests. By 1975-76 district-wide scores on the California Assessment Program tests reached the 62nd percentile in mathematics, the 66th percentile in spelling, the 59th percentile in written expression, and the 60th percentile in reading. In 1985-86 there were still more gains reported in each subject. Scores in math were at the 72nd percentile, in spelling at the 71st percentile, in written expression at the 64th percentile, and in reading at the 62nd percentile. At the same time, excused absences among students had declined from 178,358 in 1983 to 170,969 in 1986, and teacher absenteeism in the district had declined for the past five years (Sickler, 1988).

The move to empower teachers with responsibility for decision making has made an evolutionary process than began in the 1970's. Eugene Tucker, who served as district

superintendent from 1976, to the spring of 1986, encouraged the process. Tucker was

firmly committed to involving staff members at all levels in the management of their work.

Three steps were taken during his superintendency that greatly influenced the process of

change across the district: (1) a new management organization was established, (2)

teachers gained control of the curriculum, and teachers were viewed as school leaders

(Sickler, 1988).

Former superintendent Tucker, estimated that nearly 30 percent of the almost

1,000 teachers in the district had been drawn into roles of responsibility, through the

mentor teachers, the IRTs, the Subject Area Committees, and the Curriculum Council

(Sickler, 1988).

A School Improvement Process (SIP), which draws on the collective energy and

expertise of teachers, administrators, students, parents, and the other community

members, fundamentally changed the way schools were operated and enhanced

opportunities for learning. Teachers in Hammond, Indiana, had a major say in decision

making and in shaping educational programs that they believed to be better suited for their

students. Decisions in a wide range of areas were traditionally under the sole jurisdiction

of the school principal and central administrators, were now being made by teachers and

administrators, working together with parents and students on school-based improvement

teams. These areas included: curriculum planning and development, instructional

strategies, staffing needs and hiring, professional development, disciplinary procedures,

scheduling, and so on (Casner-Lotto, 1988).

43

The key component of the SIP was believed to be the concept of "pyramiding."

When this is done properly, there should be an increase in the number of people who have input into decision making and thus increases the acceptance of new programs and policies. Pyramiding required that each member of the SIP team interact on regular basis with five to seven peers. This interaction consisted of communicating information about team's work or about a specific proposal and gathering feedback from other interested parties that were not members of the team. All members of the initial group of five to seven individuals were expected to reach a similar number of people, who, in turn, would contract others. This procedure caused a significant portion of the school population to be reached in a relatively short period of time. The success of pyramiding varied from school to school depending on how well the team was organized and on the school's level of commitment to the improvement process (Casner-Lotto, 1988).

Do teachers really want to make their own decisions? This question was addressed by Karen Foster in *Educational Leadership*, May 1990. She theorizes that principals believe that superstars do indeed want to have an impact on their own professional lives but the average teachers--perhaps 95 percent of the work force--just want someone to tell them what to do. According to Foster, principals and other school system leaders recognize the advantages of school-based decision making (Foster, 1990).

Clinton Grove Elementary was selected as a Project 2000 School. It was one of several schools to initiate a futures-planning, school-based management model within the Prince George's County, Maryland, Public Schools. The foundation was established to

move toward teacher empowerment. Clinton Grove's management team of representatives from all the teacher teams, the support staff, and the parents made major decisions about budget and spending, instituting curriculum and instructional changes at the primary level, developing a personnel plan, implementing a staff development program incorporating peer coaching, and much more, by the end of the project's first year. The district's school improvement program gave them a framework for understanding the concept of group responsibility and led to the development of a mission statement at Clinton Grove Elementary. Evaluating decisions using a mission statement guarded against the parochialism of individual teacher interests and the danger of making decisions based on the interests of adults rather than of students. The principal's role was to assist teachers in comparing any proposed action with the statement, as they identified how it supported or deviated from the stated philosophy. The participants listed all the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and qualities that they wanted their "ideal graduate" to possess. Although it took almost one year to write the mission statement, after getting parents' approval, the mission stated was printed, hung on the wall in every classroom, and the statement prefaced the Parent Handbook. The symbolism of its overriding presence served to bring people together (Foster, 1990).

It is believed that the biggest single step toward preparing teachers for empowerment comes through staff development. The establishment of TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) provides a structured program incorporating peer observation and coaching. This program focuses on the importance of effective training in

45

order to maximize teachers and students fullest potentials (Foster, 1990).

Today, many children experience difficulties in their educational setting. Often, teachers have not been trained to deal with children with disabilities. Lerner (1993) developed a list of 16 typical methods of modifying academic tasks designed for children with learning disabilities. She also offered tips for teachers of children with attention deficit disorders (Lerner, 1993). It is vital that team work occurs in order to meet these children's needs. Parents, teachers, and administrators must show teamwork so that these children will receive the best possible education. Teachers must be allowed to use their expertise in assisting in the establishment of an appropriate curriculum (Lerner, 1993).

Jo Webber believes that it is important to teach proper behavior the same way that we teach reading to someone who does not read. He believes that unequal educational opportunities occur in schools because of the many untrained teachers and the limited support resources (Webber, 1998).

According to Elliott, parents, community members, and policy makers, expect to know how well all students in America's schools are learning. There is an emphasis on achieving higher educational standards and greater accountability has begun to move educators beyond the traditional issues of access to services, due process, and compliance to issues related to how well students perform (Elliott, 1996).

Other Related Studies

Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd stated that in effective organizations, there are

46

constant evaluating and reevaluating of the working conditions. According to the researchers in education, we have been inclined to ignore work conditions, or to assume that problems with school work conditions have little to do with the quality of work. There have been few studies that have tried to empirically identify the characteristics of teachers' work conditions and their consequences on the work of teaching (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

The study on the conditions and resources of teaching (CART), represents the first national effort to empirically identify the specific problems teachers encounter related to the work conditions of schools (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

The (CART) sought to assess, through a series of survey questions that were administered to a national sample of teachers, the degree to which these four principles guided our nation's schools. To the extent that they did not, it was concluded that school work conditions did not fully promote effective teaching. The guiding question of the study was: To what degree does the organization of work in schools allow teachers to perform as well as they can? The researchers viewed this issue as not whether teachers are motivated to perform, but whether they are capable of performing; the issue was whether teachers can teach, given the conditions of work and the resources provided to them to accomplish their work (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

The CART survey asked teachers to describe how often they were given the opportunity to participate in decisions. There were five decision areas surveyed: (1) organizational policies; (2) student-teacher interface; (3) teacher development and

47

evaluation; (4) work allocation; and (5) teaching process (Bacharach, Bauer, 7 Shedd, 1986).

The researchers define decisional deprivation as the difference between the amount of involvement in school decision making teachers feel they should have as compared to the amount of involvement they feel they actually have. Decision deprivation measures allow the researchers to directly assess teachers' sense of powerlessness as well as the likely impact of decision-making practices on effectiveness (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

As a result of the CART study, decisional deprivation indicates that teachers feel they should have considerably more of a chance to be involved in decision making. Fewer teachers responded that their current opportunity to be involved in decision-making was appropriate, and there were a relatively insignificant percentage of teachers who felt saturated with opportunities to get involved (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

The researchers believe that education reformers have ignored the basic lesson of decades of research on organizational effectiveness in the rush to embrace motivation as the principal element through which schools might enhance the quality of classroom instruction. They state that the job must first be properly designed before it can be formed effectively and that the job design of the role of the teacher determines how effective an individual can be as a teacher. They also believe that no matter how well-motivated people may be, the lack of resources can prevent them from accomplishing their job responsibilities. The lack of resources can result in frustration and ultimately demotivated

48

job holders. Furthermore, a lack of resources can lead to teachers becoming scavengers, using makeshift techniques, and therefore, teaching can become de-professionalized (Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd, 1986).

According to the researchers, the lack of resources limits teachers' creativity and ability to do their jobs in a manner that satisfies them. The prime motivating agent in any profession is believed to be a sense of self-satisfaction with one's own performance. It is viewed especially critical in a profession that is as low-paying as teaching. They state that the lack of resources can have a direct impact on teachers' ability to perform, and it indirectly affected teacher motivation and satisfaction. Frequently, the lack of resources has been linked to such work consequences as stress and burnout (Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

The reform movement promoted the concept of teacher empowerment. Some studies show that the more decisions a teacher makes concerning her students and the more involved she is in making school wide decisions, the better her performance and the higher her morale. ***Instructor's*** Poll provided a unique opportunity to look at the attitudes of decision makers. Most of the teachers who responded to the first four items in the table were called *empowered*. They represented 28 percent of all classroom teachers responding. Empowered teachers are significantly more likely to believe that career ladders, merit pay plans, master teacher programs, and recognition programs would improve teaching. Empowered teachers are less likely to believe that an increase in salary would lead to improved teaching (Instructor, 1986).

Results of the poll indicated few significant differences in age, location, current teaching position, class size, sex, and degrees held. Decision-making power produced a positive attitude toward some items on education's reform agenda. More importantly, it indicated a stronger commitment to the profession. The findings were logically understood, and consistent with what had been seen in good schools for years. It was believed that respect for professionalism breeds both respect and accountability. Teachers, who are involved in decisions about students, become more responsible for and committed to student outcomes (Instructor, 1986).

In the fall of 1986, *Instructor* surveyed the teachers in schools cited by the Department of Education's Elementary School Recognition Program and found that those schools may be good based on the fact that the teachers in those schools felt individually and collectively empowered. More than 1,000 teachers were surveyed. These are the results of the survey:

- 95 percent of the teachers made decisions related to the curriculum for their students
- 94 percent made decisions related to selection of texts and supplementary materials
- 96 percent made decisions about the instructional methods used
- 88 percent made decisions related to their in-service training
- 95 percent had opportunities to talk with other teachers
- 81 percent had an opportunity to observe fellow teachers
- 75 percent were involved in choosing the subject they taught
- 97 percent said their principal provided them with regular guidance

on instructional matters

- 43 percent said they were involved in the hiring of new teachers

- 33 percent said they had a voice in hiring administrators (Instructor, 1986).

In March 1987, *Learning 87* poll was given to more than 1,000 teachers who were asked to respond to, " *What are the Critical Problems in Teaching? And How Can They Be Solved*?" Teachers responded by saying that they know best what happens--and what is needed-- in the classroom. They wanted to be treated like professionals. They wanted to be in charge of what they do. They were tired of seeing decisions made by people whose last classroom experience was as a student (Turner, 1987).

The majority (93 percent) of the respondents to the March, *Learning 87* poll agreed that teachers should be responsible for setting and maintaining the standards of their profession. However, doing what's required to take control of the teaching profession takes time--something that teachers say is in drastically short supply. When the teachers were asked to rank and comment on the most serious problems they face as educators, the respondents put time at the top of the list. Many believed that overcrowded classrooms contributed to the time crunch and was a major or moderate problem for more than half of the respondents. They believed that overcrowded classrooms contributed to the majority of discipline problems (Turner, 1987).

Maeroff reported the results of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, a survey that was conducted in September 1988, of ten possible areas of decision making. The results indicated that teachers across the country felt that they were mainly involved in only two areas: choosing textbooks and materials, and shaping the curriculum. These are the results of the eight areas that teachers' considered themselves not involved in (Maeroff, 1988):

- Setting standards for student behavior (53 percent)

- Deciding whether students are tracked into special classes (55 percent)

- Designing staff development and in service programs (57 percent)

- Setting promotion and retention standards (66 percent)

- Deciding school budgets (80 percent)

- Evaluating teacher performance (90 percent)

- Selecting new teachers (93 percent)

- Choosing new administrators (93 percent)

The results of a survey by John Goodlad suggested that teachers prefer to work in a school where the principal is in charge. The schools that were judged by teachers to be "more satisfying" were places of employment where the principals were deemed to be significantly more in control of the jobs and of their time, and where the principals felt they had considerable influence. The study discovered that teachers were less satisfied working in schools where principals were less in control and less influential. Many teachers responded that they were not seeking to enter into a power struggle with principals, but merely wanted to have a greater role in decision making (Maeroff, 1988).

The National Study of School Evaluation conducted a study in 1988, using the Teacher Opinion Inventory . This instrument was developed to assess teachers' opinions concerning many facets of the school, to "compile teachers' recommendations for improvement," and to provide "data to assist school's professional staff in decision making relative to program development." The population surveyed were elementary and secondary teachers. There were seven subscales: Organization/Administration, Instruction, Student Support Climate, School/Community Relations, Job Satisfaction, Program, Student Activities. The instrument had two parts. All A items were measured using a Likert-scale, and all B items were measured using open-ended questions regarding recommendations. This instrument was first developed in 1975 and has revised several times. This instrument is still available today (Conoley & Impara, 1994).

Whitmore developed an opinion survey entitled, "A TEACHER ATTITUDE

INVENTORY (TAI): IDENTIFYING TEACHER POSITIONS IN RELATION TO EDUCATIONAL ISSUES AND DECISIONS." This survey was used by district administrators, principals, and teachers for determining attitudes toward educational practices. They responses help in planning in-service professional growth programs, faculty discussions, team teaching, and classroom setting for gifted students. This tool is also used for evaluation, research, and determining teaching styles. It has also been useful for school personnel to make decisions regarding program development, policy formulation, administrative organization, faculty development, as well as community relations. This tool can be used as part of a complete school evaluation process (Sweetland & Keyser, 1991).

In 1993, a total of 30,000 students, parents, and teachers were surveyed with the SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE (SEQ). This instrument measured 11 characteristics of school effectiveness. This instrument can be used to compare schools. However, the SEQ has not been found to have validity (Conoley, & Impara, 1996).

Ovando surveyed 25 teachers in the same school district that were in leadership responsibilities such as department chairperson, academic team leader, or lead teacher. The results of the survey indicated that teachers leadership roles demanded extra time, frequently taken from planning periods, conference times, professional days, and before and after school. The teachers indicated that they were more interested in protecting student contact time. Some teachers felt more stressed due to the additional responsibilities. Some reported that switching from two different frames of mind was difficult. However, many teachers believed that the new roles were satisfying and helped them grow professionally (Ovando, 1994).

Although, it was not the goal of the researcher to directly measure teaching practices, she concluded that teacher leadership might adversely affect some teaching practices. Ovando recommended that teacher leaders receive continuing support to help them address these concerns (Ovando, 1994).