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Abstract

This study examines teachers' perceptions of the relationship between transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in decision making in site-based managed schools. Site-based management was defined as the shift of decision making responsibility from the central office to the local school. Transformational leadership behavior was defined as the behavior of principals that helps build new relationships between teachers and principals. Teacher participation in decision making was defined as the participation of teachers in deciding issues related to school improvement and student achievement.

Five main results emerged in the study. First, this school district does not contain components of site-based management. This district had intentions of restructuring but after years of planning, the school board voted against pursuing the initiative further.

Second, results substantiate findings that the constructs of transformational leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making are multidimensional. Transformational leadership behavior consists of three dimensions and teacher participation in decision making contains four dimensions.

Third, one canonical correlation was found to be significant between transformational leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making.
Results of the canonical correlation indicate that the “instructional behavior” dimension (e.g., staff development) contributed more to the leadership behavior variate than the other two dimensions.

Fourth, a significant difference was found in teacher participation between schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior. Principals in schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior encourage teachers to participate in decisions related to the “managerial procedures” dimension (e.g., student assignments, budget development) more than teachers in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior.

Fifth, case study results indicate that teacher participation in decision making is low in this district. It also indicates that teachers in schools where the principal was rated high in transformational leadership behavior participate more in the decision making process than teachers in schools where the principal was rated low in transformational leadership behavior.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Since the publication of *A Nation At Risk* in 1983, various educational researchers and policymakers have pointed out the need for education reform in public schools (Murphy, 1991; Guthrie, 1986). This study, which painted a bleak picture of U.S. school effectiveness, was a driving force in a flurry of school reform activities at the national, state, and local levels (Rungeling & Glover, 1991; Guthrie, 1986; Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989).

One type of school reform put forth by researchers and policymakers is school restructuring. Restructuring refers to changes in rules, roles, and relationships in schools (David, 1989). In many states, a major form of restructuring utilized by school districts, is site-based management.

Although site-based management is a widely accepted strategy of restructuring today, it is not a new idea. It was proposed in the 1970s as a means of overturning state-mandated educational standards and the centralized funding initially called forth by the push for equity (Hanson, 1991; Guthrie, 1986), usually under the titles of decentralization and school-site budgeting (David, 1989).

Proponents of site-based management believe that local schools should be given more decision making authority (Guthrie, 1986) which would enable teachers, principals, and local communities to participate in decisions concerning programs that affect the school's educational goals.
At the beginning of the 1990s, site-based management emerged as a restructuring strategy to improve education in the United States (Hanson, 1990). Dade County, Florida, Chicago, New York and Los Angeles, to name a few school districts, employed the concept of site-based management to increase student learning by establishing conditions in schools that would promote improvement, create new and innovative methods of teaching, and provide professional staff development (David, 1989).

In discussions of site-based management, particular attention is given to teacher participation in the decision making process. However, participants in these discussions often fail to mention the importance of the leadership role of principals.

Current research on school restructuring indicates that new roles and relationships between principals and teachers are needed to improve the quality of schooling for the 21st century (Leithwood, 1992; Popin, 1992; Hoover, 1991; David, 1989). A key to developing these roles and relationships is the leadership of the school principal (Beck & Murphy, 1993; Lipham, 1981; Edmonds, 1979). School principals, key figures in the restructuring movement (Murphy, 1991; Brown, 1990; Guthrie, 1986), are called upon to empower others in the school community, especially teachers, to work collaboratively to promote teacher professionalization, shared decision making, and group participation.

As schools move forward in an effort to meet the needs of students in a changing society, the principal's current role as instructional leader "no longer
appears to capture the heart of what school administration will have to become" (Leithwood, 1992, p. 8). Although the concept of instructional leadership has served a purpose throughout the 1970s and 1980s (Leithwood, 1992), it failed to produce the kind of leadership needed in an age of reform. What is needed is leadership that will alter current power relationships among teachers and principals, and teachers and students (Sarason, 1990).

In recent studies, researchers (Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986) have begun exploring the concept of transformational leadership in schools. According to these researchers, transformational leadership is facilitative leadership that builds a shared vision, improves communication, and develops collaborative decision making processes. Principals of schools who exemplify transformational leadership behaviors may empower teachers to rise above their own expectations, to create and accept group goals, and to participate in the decision making process (Leithwood, 1992).

Transformational leadership was initially proposed by Burns (1978) and later expanded upon in non-educational settings by Bass and associates (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1989; Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987). According to Hallinger (1992), Leithwood (1992), and Hoover (1991), transformational leadership subsumes instructional leadership as a means of building new and better relationships within the schools, which in turn enhances the teaching and learning process.
Leithwood and associates (Leithwood, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, Sillns, & Dart, 1993; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990), in their research on the transformational leadership of school principals, indicate that principals who exhibit transformational leadership pursue three fundamental goals: (1) they provide assistance to teachers in developing and maintaining collaborative, professional school cultures; (2) they provide motivation for teacher development and professional growth; and (3) they provide assistance to teachers in using effective problem solving techniques.

In the present study I investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making in site-based managed schools.

**Statement of the Problem**

In this study I address the gap in research on the relationship between teachers' perception of principal leadership behavior and teachers' participation in decision making at site-based managed schools. Although the literature is rich with theoretical conceptions, empirical evidence linking principal leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making is sparse. This study is an effort to look beyond the rhetoric about shared decision making at school sites by providing research on the ways in which principals' leadership behavior can affect teachers' involvement in the decision making process in schools.

For decades reform efforts have been the center of discussion concerning public school organizations (Cuban, 1990). More recently, debate has centered on
school restructuring which includes such notions as the decentralization of authority from the central office to the local school site (Brown, 1990, 1992), the leadership role of the school principal (Murphy, 1991; Guthrie, 1986), and the professionalization of the teacher workgroup through teacher participation in decision making (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Sykes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). Ongoing objectives of school restructuring are the improvement of schools and student achievement (Hill & Bonan, 1991; Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992; Brown, 1990, 1992; Hanson, 1990) by implementing such strategies as site-based management (Guthrie, 1986; Blase & Kirby, 1992; David, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989) and shared decision making (Strusinki, 1991; AASA/NAESP/NASSP, 1988).

According to Guthrie (1986), site-based management has been proposed in almost every corner of the United States. Although many states have experimented with site-based management, no state has implemented all components of site-based management. For example, some individual schools maintain decision making authority over budgetary matters, while others focus on the hiring of school personnel or curriculum issues. However, according to Guthrie (1986), "enough components have been tried in enough states to give policy makers and practitioners some idea of how the total system might work" (p. 309).

The concept of site-based management takes on many meanings (see Brown, 1990; Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989; Garms, Guthrie & Pierce, 1978).
The most salient of these is a shift of authority from the district level to the local school site. This shift of authority places more responsibility on the school principal for school level decisions concerning personnel, budget, curriculum and instruction (Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989), and on teachers, to be involved in the decision making process. Thus, decentralization of authority puts new emphasis on principals as leaders and on teachers as partners in the school decision making process with both playing an important role in the improvement of schools (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Maeroff, 1988; Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989).

Connecting teachers with principals and with one another in a collegial atmosphere, sharing in the decision making process, is essential if schools are to improve (Maeroff, 1988). Involving teachers in the decision making process allows them to "...exercise [their] craft with quiet confidence and to help shape the way the job is done" (Maeroff, 1988, p. 475). This does not mean that teachers are in charge. Rather, it means that teachers engage in consultation and collaboration with the principal and with other teachers in deciding issues that relate to the improvement of schools and student achievement. They participate in a shared power relationship.

A basic threat to enhancing the role of principals and teachers is the traditional bureaucratic control of schools. Rules and regulations are the basis for control in a hierarchical, centralized organization. This bureaucratic approach to school management legislates policies that school administrators must translate
into rules and procedures for teachers who in turn must incorporate them into their

Restructuring schools along a site-based management model alters the
roles of principals and of teachers, providing an opportunity for both to work
collaboratively in improving the quality of schooling and student achievement.
Instead of receiving and implementing orders from the central office or mandating
a vision of the school, principals lead by creating a sense of ownership and
common purpose and by creating a collegial atmosphere in partnership with
teachers in the decision making process (Seeley, Niemeyer & Greenspan, 1990).

The importance of teacher involvement as a means of promoting school
effectiveness is gaining recognition in part because it allows the expertise of
teachers to be utilized more fully (Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley, & Bauer,
1990; Rosenholtz, 1989) and gives them a sense of ownership in the school.
Teachers who participate in the decisions that affect them and the students they
teach will show greater commitment to the overall goals of the school and will
take responsibility for the decisions they make (Sarason, 1990).

Concomitantly, the importance of a new leadership role for principals is
also coming to the fore. As Hoy and Miskel (1991) note, leadership is a key
concept in understanding and improving schools. According to Beck & Murphy
(1993), the challenge for principals as leaders in restructured schools is to lead the
transition from the bureaucratic model of schooling, ...to a post-industrial model,
with the goal of educating all youngsters well - while at the same time completely changing the way principals themselves operate. (p. 190)

These changes do not mean that principals will involve teachers in all decisions. Rather, it means that principals will seek teacher involvement primarily when decisions are directed toward enhancing work with students and improving student performance; that is, when teachers' primary role - teaching - is affected.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal leadership behavior and their participation in decision making at site-based managed schools. This study broadens the knowledge base on site-based management by providing a better understanding of the way principal leadership behavior affects the way teachers participate in this popular reform strategy.

**Significance of the Study**

Many states have passed laws either encouraging or mandating site-based management in schools. Legislation alone, however, will not transform school environments. The principal's role is crucial in determining whether site-based management achieves reformers' goals.

The significance of this study lies in its exploration of the way that principal's leadership behavior, as perceived by teachers, affects teachers' participation in decision making at site-based managed school. It is hoped that this study will provide useful data to legislators, policymakers, and practitioners.
that will help make legislated site-based management schemes more effective in improving individual schools. For example, insights gained in the study may suggest ways in which principal training programs can be improved to provide more effective building-level leadership in the site-based managed schools now being established all over the United States. In addition, the study may help to explain why site-based management has not improved school performance in many instances, as several research studies have shown.

**Conceptual Framework**

Site-based managed schools is the context in which the present study took place. The district chosen for this study is located in South Central Louisiana. In 1993, this district implemented a major reform effort intended to improve student achievement in that school parish. One of the components provided for the decentralization of the decision making process to local school sites. This decentralization process proposes to utilize teacher’s expertise in concert with principals in planning and implementing curriculum and instructional needs of students in each school.

Included in this reform strategy was the implementation of site-based decision making committees composed of teachers, who would make decisions concerning issues relating to school-wide and district-wide initiatives. Site-based decision making committees would concentrate on decisions concerning curriculum standards for each grade level in their school, needs assessment in areas of school needs, criteria for staff development workshops, problems or
difficulties which arise throughout the school year, and the overall need of the
school district. Committees meet at the end of the school year to evaluate
decisions made at the school level and at the district level.

Although site-based management encompasses components such as school
budget, personnel, supplies and resources, parental involvement and shared
decision making, in the present study I examine the relationship between
principals' leadership behavior and teacher participation in the decision making
process as perceived by teachers.

Research Questions

In this study I examine teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership
behavior and teachers' participation in decision making in site-based managed
schools. Both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies were used. The
quantitative component was designed to answer the major questions listed below.

Questions

1. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the
   concept of leadership behavior?

2. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the
   concept of teacher participation in decision making?

3. To what degree does a relationship exist between teachers’
   perceptions of transformational leadership behavior of
   principals and teacher participation in decision making in site-
   based managed schools?
4. Is there a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of participation in decision making when schools are classified into two groups composed of schools where teachers perceive a high degree of transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal and schools where teachers perceive a low degree of transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal?

The qualitative component was designed to seek additional information concerning teacher participation in decision making and principal leadership behavior. Teachers were asked to respond to interview questions describing the types of decisions they are involved in making in their school, types of decisions in which they would like to participate, and ways in which their principal fosters their participation in the decision making process. However discussions were not limited to these questions only.

**Organization of the Study**

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter one includes the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, conceptual framework, and the research questions. Chapter two contains the literature review of site-based management, transformational leadership, and teacher participation in decision making. Chapter three contains the methodology used in the study. Chapter four contains both quantitative and qualitative results.
of the study. Chapter five contains the conclusions of the study and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The present study explores if a significant relationship exists between transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in the decision making process as perceived by teachers. The context of the study is site-based managed schools. I review relevant research on site-based management, transformational leadership, and teacher participation in decision making in this chapter.

Site-based Management

The concept of site-based management takes on different meanings. Some researchers emphasize that school-based management is (1) a shift of power from school districts to the local school site (Garms, Guthrie, & Pierce, 1978; Brown, 1990; Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989; David, 1989) and (2) a strategy of decentralizing budget and personnel decisions joined with content reforms, such as curriculum and instruction (Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992; Streshly, 1992). A consensus reached by most researchers on site-based management is that participation in the decision making process takes place at the local school site.

The shift of decision making responsibilities mentioned above has received more attention than any other issue of restructuring (Murphy, 1991). At the core of this type of restructuring effort is the belief that the "individual school community
must become the focus of attention, that the resources and authority to change must reside with those—teachers, parents, administrators—who are closest to the learners” (Murphy, 1991, p 36).

According to site-based management proponents, the implementation of site-based management can bring about major changes in education by empowering schools to create conditions that will improve student achievement and the quality of schools (Goodlad, 1984). The overriding issue in the research on site-based management is decisional participation by those closest to the individual school.

Although researchers describe site-based management in terms of participation in decision making, a number of other components need to be taken into consideration. For the purpose of this study the different forms of site-based management, authority and responsibility, changes in roles, rules, and relationships, and shared decision making are discussed in detail below.

Forms of Site-based Management

Brown (1992) has identified two forms of site-based management: organizational and political. Organizational decentralization "is a structure in which professionals in schools make important decisions concerning the educational welfare of their students" (p. 3). This results when vertical authority is given to schools rather than district staff (horizontal) (Brown, 1990). This form of
decentralization allows for and encourages shared decision making within the local school.

Political decentralization, on the other hand, "is a structure in which public school parents make policy decisions involving the education of their children" (Brown, 1990, p. 4). This form of site-based management grants school policy authority to boards, made up at least partly of parents. These boards direct school policy and may even have authority over the employment of key school personnel, such as the hiring or firing of the school principal (Brown, 1992). Typically, these boards include teachers as well as parents, to insure that individuals directly affected by decisions participate in the decision making process. An example of political decentralization can be found in the Chicago Public Schools (Hess, 1991).

Wohlstetter and Odden (1992), have identified three forms of site-based management: community control, administrative decentralization, and principal control. Community control is defined as "shifts of power from professional educators and the board of education to parents and community groups not previously involved in school governance" (p. 533). This form of site-based management follows Brown's (1992) description of political decentralization. Administrative decentralization allows for teacher control by delegating the responsibility for the decision making process to the school site. This form of site-based management replaces the decisions previously made by central administrators with school site councils where teachers are empowered to make
decisions concerning the welfare of their students and their school (Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992). Principal control, unlike the other two forms of decentralization mentioned above, may or may not include a school site council. An example of principal control is found in the Edmonton Schools in Canada, where principals are responsible for budgetary matters with staff and parents, but are not required to establish school site councils (Wohlstetter & Buffett, 1992). Administrative decentralization is similar to Brown's (1992) description of political decentralization.

In the context of what has been described above, roles, routines, and relationships of actors in site-based managed schools require change (David, 1989). This change involves shifts of power by principals, teachers, parents, and central office staff.

**Shifts of Power**

The shift in management responsibility from the district to the school site requires that everyone change roles, routines, and relationships (David, 1989). For example, principals, teachers, parents, and in some cases students provide input on the needs of the school (Fernandez, 1990). In essence, site-based management is a form of organization in which decisions are made by those closest to the source of education.

In three of the largest school districts in the United States - Dade County, Florida, Chicago, and Los Angeles - authority has been decentralized to school
councils composed of the principal, teachers, parents, and community members. Across the country, districts have given principals, teachers, students, and parents more decision making authority with some giving principals the power to veto site council decisions. Although there are many interpretations of site-based management, one concept seems quite clear: decision making responsibilities are shifted from the school district to the individual school site.

Of the different roles mentioned, the most dramatically changed is that of the school principal (Knight, 1992; Fernandez, 1990; Doggett, 1990; Guthrie, 1986). As chief executive officer (Guthrie, 1986), the principal, given responsibility and authority, is free to become the primary leader of the school (Lindelow, 1981). Principals at site-based managed schools state that they have more flexibility to allocate resources within their schools. They consider themselves more accountable to their supervisors or school council, depending upon whether the form of site-based management is organizational or political (Watkins, 1991). Although principals complain about the excessive workloads required under site-based management (Chapman & Boyd, 1986), many state that their schools are much better off than under centralized management (Brown, 1990).

Teachers are also affected by the change to site-based management. The provision of a "lump sum" budget of millions of dollars to many schools requires that principals involve teachers in making decisions on how money is to be spent.

Parents also participate in the changes brought about by site-based management strategies. Instead of just serving as volunteers in the school and helping with homework, under political decentralization, parents have a voice in directing school policy and allocating resources (Hess, 1991). While research does not explain exactly what the effects of these changes in public education are, they do indicate that new authority is given to parents, many of whom are willing to commit the time and energy required to direct school policies (Brown, 1992).

When greater authority is given to principals, teachers and parents, difficulties sometimes arise. Typical questions are: Who is actually in charge? Who is responsible when things go wrong? Under organizational decentralization, principals have the final word and answer to their superiors. Under political decentralization, principals are initially accountable to school councils composed of teachers, parents and other community members. However, principals are also accountable to the central office, which means they serve two masters (Chapman & Boyd, 1986).
The role of the central office is also changed by the implementation of site-based management (Duttweiler, 1989). "Because the site administrator will inherit power and authority primarily from the central office, the role of central office administrators will change nearly as much as the role of the principal" (Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989, p. 124). Central office administrators will shed some of their authority and become managers of the school system instead of bosses (Brown, 1991a). Ideally, they will facilitate instead of dictate.

Site-based Management and Shared Decision Making

Site-based management is distinguished from other forms of restructuring in that it represents a change in the operations of a school district, i.e., how authority and responsibility are shared (David, 1989; Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992). Site-based management strategies seek to delegate the decision making process into the hands of school staff and/or parents. It is a form of decentralization in which decision making authority is redistributed for the purpose of improving individual schools, resulting in increased authority at the local school site (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990a). The assumptions underlying this shift in decision making are (1) that school staff have the expertise to improve instruction and school climate (Guthrie & Reed, 1991), and (2) that if restructuring is to have a lasting effect, all participants should be involved in the education process (Guthrie, 1986). The first assumption argues that the involvement of teachers in school leadership and decision making directly engages their expertise and provides an
incentive for creativity. The second assumption suggests that site-based management increases parental and community involvement. Questions arising from these two assumptions are: What authority is delegated to school sites? and How is this authority distributed to school sites?

Answers to these questions remain nebulous and elusive because components of site-based management are unique to each school district and each school site. However, possible responses include the notion that site-based management is a decentralized strategy which redefines authority throughout the system; that is, authority is shifted to the individual school site making that school the fundamental decision making unit. In essence, the state and central office set up broad goals and standards, provide resources, but allow/empower school site participants, principals, teachers, parents, and/or community members to determine the means of achieving these goals. Allowing school site participants authority in decision making over matters such as personnel, budget, curricula and resources, enables the site to integrate goal-setting, policymaking, planning, budgeting, implementing and evaluating in a manner that contrasts with the often unsystematic, fragmented processes which have caused so much frustration and influence in the past. (Caldwell & Spinks, 1988, p. 3-4)
Summary of Site-based Management.

Site-based management is a restructuring strategy that shifts power from the central office to the local school sites. According to proponents, it has the capacity to increase parental involvement, foster shared decision making, and empower teachers. Researchers argue that all these lead to greater school productivity (Brown, 1990), improved student achievement and improved quality of schools (Hill & Bonan, 1991; Wohlstetter & Odden, 1992; Goodlad, 1984).

Although site-based management has been implemented in several districts, there is little systematic evidence about its impact and structure (Raywid, 1990). Problems mentioned are that (1) the concepts of site-based management are not clearly delineated to all participants before implementation (Harrison, Killion, & Mitchel, 1989); (2) site-based management is an elusive notion (Malen, et al., 1990a), therefore, determining the extent of shared decision making arrangements and the distribution of power are difficult (Purkey, 1990); and (3) most writings on site-based management are project and status reports or advocacy pieces and tend to rely on the impressions of single individuals and exceptional cases (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990b).

Despite these limitations, site-based management is proclaimed as a reform strategy that has the potential to decentralize, simplify, and localize decision making efforts (Doggett, 1990) that can lead to improved student achievement and increased teacher effectiveness in the classroom. If site-based management
strategies are appropriately defined and tailored to individual schools, teachers and principals may work collaboratively in making decisions which will enhance the teaching and learning process (Guthrie, 1986).

**Transformational Leadership**

Although numerous studies have been conducted on the transformational leader in non-educational organizations (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1989) few have been reported in educational settings (Leithwood, 1992). Results of these studies suggest that principals who display transformational leadership behavior make a positive difference in teacher collaboration and commitment to change (Leithwood, 1992; Hoover, 1991; Roberts, 1985). I review relevant literature on transformational leadership below.

**Research on Transformational Leadership in Non-educational Settings**

Transformational leadership, along with transactional leadership, was first proposed by Burns (1978) and investigated later in detail by Bass and others (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1989; Bass, Waldman, Avolio & Bebb, 1987). Burns (1978) defines transformational leadership as leadership which "[induces] followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectation—of both leaders and followers" (p. 19). This definition of leadership is consistent with ideas advanced in the school restructuring literature which calls for building new roles and relationships between teachers and principals and teachers and students (Schlechty, 1991;
Sarason, 1990). According to Leithwood (1992), transformational leadership in schools has a potential to enhance the teaching and learning process called for by reform advocates.

In his research on leadership, Burns (1978) proposed two fundamentally different forms of leadership. The first, referred to as transactional leadership, "occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things" (p. 19). According to Burns, the "relations of most leaders and followers are transactional --leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes" (p. 4).

The second form of leadership, transformational leadership, "occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Burns' theory of transformational leadership is more complex than that of transactional leadership. His premise is that

the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders. (Burns, 1978, p. 4)

Burns (1978) argued that these two forms of leadership - transactional and transformational - represent opposite ends of the leadership continuum, with transactional leadership being the least effective. Conversely, Bass and Avolio
(1989) proposed that transactional leadership is influential in the maintenance of the organization, while transformational leadership motivates and elevates the needs and wants of subordinates to new levels which results in achievement of organizational goals. Thus, both transformational and transactional leadership are necessary for the improvement of the organization and for individual growth, according to Bass and Avolio (1989).

In summarizing his conception of the transformational leader, Bass (1985) grants that much of his research is in conjunction with Burns' theory. However, he notes three distinct differences in interpretation. First, Bass (1985) included an expansion of the portfolio of needs and wants of subordinates. Second, he opposed Burn's claim that transformational leadership is only transforming if it furthers what is good rather than evil. According to Bass's (1985) theory, the transformational leader is one who elevates or transforms the individual, whether it is for good or for evil. What matters to Bass (1985) is that "followers' attitudes and behaviors were transformed by the leader's performance" (p. 21), not whether it was for the good of society. Thus, the transformational leader may or may not elevate or transform the individual for the good of the organization, according to Bass.

A third difference argued by Bass concerns Burns' (1978) theory of the transformational and transactional leader as opposites on a single continuum. According to Bass, leaders exhibit qualities of both transactional and
transformational leadership; "most leaders do both but in different ways" (Bass, 1985, p. 22). For example, the transactional leader clarifies what is to be done and how the subordinate's needs will be met while the transformational leader will increase the subordinate's confidence and elevate the "value of the outcomes" (p. 22). According to Bass (1985), this is done "by expanding the subordinate's needs, by focusing on transcendental interests, and/or by altering or widening the subordinate's level of needs on Maslow's hierarchy" (p. 22).

**Attributes/Dimensions of the Transformational/Transactional Leader**

In an attempt to define constructs of the transactional and transformational leader, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) was administered by Bass (1985) to 104 U.S. army colonels, foreign officers, and civilians of equal rank and 72 senior military officers. A factor analysis conducted on these data revealed that "five factors were required to understand transactional and transformational leadership" (Bass, 1985, p. 229). Of these five, charismatic leadership, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation were considered transformational; contingent reward and management-by-exception, transactional. Results of a comprehensive review of relevant research revealed eight dimensions of the transformational and transactional leader (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). These were later adapted to educational organizations (Leithwood, 1993) and are described below.
1. Identifies and articulates a vision: behavior on the part of the leader aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her school and developing (often collaboratively), articulating, and inspiring others with a vision of the future;

2. Fostering the acceptance of group goals: behavior on the part of the leader aimed at promoting cooperation among staff and assisting them to work together toward common goals;

3. Conveys high performance expectations: behavior that demonstrates the leader's expectations for excellence, quality, and/or high performance on the part of staff;

4. Provides appropriate models: behavior on the part of the leader that sets an example for staff to follow and which is consistent with the values espoused by the leader;

5. Provides intellectual stimulation: behavior on the part of the leader that challenges staff to re-examine some of the assumptions about their work and to rethink how it can be performed; and

6. Provides individualized support: behavior on the part of the leader that indicates respect for individual members of staff and concern about their personal feelings and needs. (Leithwood, 1993, p. 20-21)

Two transactional leadership dimensions also revealed by Podsakoff et al., (1990) and adapted for educational organizations include:
1. Contingent reward: the leader tells staff what to do in order to be rewarded for their efforts;


Studies of school principal leadership in British Columbia and Ontario schools engaged in the process of restructuring (see Leithwood, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, Sillns, & Dart, 1993; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991) revealed that "contingent reward" is more characteristic of transformational leadership and that "management-by-exception" has no significant effects on leadership practices in schools. According to Leithwood and colleagues, transactional leadership is not relevant to school principal leadership in restructured schools. The two transactional dimensions do not motivate teachers to do their best work, nor do they encourage teachers to assume leadership responsibilities. Transformational leadership practices encourage teachers to work for transcendental goals, to become self-motivated, and to seek self-actualization in the classroom.

Transformational leadership, discussed above (Leithwood, 1993), serves as a framework for the present study.

Research on Transformational Leadership in Educational Organizations

Transformational leadership is a new concept in the research on principal leadership in schools (see for example, Leithwood, 1993). What little is known,
however, suggests that further study is warranted on educational leadership in restructured schools.

Building upon studies in non-educational organizations (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1989), Leithwood and colleagues (Leithwood, 1993; Leithwood, Jantzi, Sillns, & Dart, 1993; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990) found that transformational leaders are in pursuit of three fundamental goals: (1) developing and maintaining teacher collaboration and professional school culture, (2) fostering teacher development, and (3) facilitating group problem solving processes. I discuss a summary of these studies along with characteristics associated with transformational leadership below.

Transformational Leadership and Cultural Reform

Goals for cultural change in restructured schools include the building of collegiality and individual values and the development of problem solving through shared decision making among school staff. The school principal can help bring about cultural change using qualities associated with transformational leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990).

In a study of 12 principals in the process of school restructuring, Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) found that principals who exhibit transformational leadership characteristics use six strategies to reform or build a professional school culture. These strategies include:
• strengthening the culture by clarifying and prioritizing shared goals for school improvement initiatives;
• using decision making by staff, including staff involvement in the hiring process;
• fostering staff development by enhancing teachers' skill and knowledge of instructional methods;
• frequent and direct communication to keep teachers informed through teacher-principal interactions and through the use of planning teams;
• establishing school decision making teams to share power and responsibility with teacher teams;
• using rituals and symbols to express cultural values by conducting various celebrations and award ceremonies in recognition of school improvement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990).

Although principals used all six strategies, variations were noticed in how they used them.

Transformational leadership characteristics of school principals, expressed in this study, included teacher participation in the decision making processes, communication of shared goals, supportive efforts of the principal to individual teacher needs, establishing the school's vision, planning with colleagues, sharing power and responsibility with teachers and staff through delegation of activities,
daily interaction with individual teachers, and selecting new staff members who were committed to the school's goals. According to Leithwood and Jantzi (1990):

This study provides support for the claim that principals have access to strategies which are "transformational" in effect and, hence, assist in the development of collaborative school cultures. This means two things in our view: significant changes in staff members' individual and shared understanding of their current purposes and practices; and an enhanced capacity to solve future professional problems, individually and collegially. (p. 276)

Transformational Leadership and Teacher Development

One challenge of school principals, in restructured schools, is to provide teachers with the motivation and the opportunity to participate in teacher development. The key to effectively accomplish this is to involve teachers in individual growth development. That is, to instill in teachers that school restructuring entails teacher participation in self-improvement as well as group discussions of individual beliefs and values and the importance of their teaching responsibilities.

In their study of 12 principals in restructured schools in Ontario and 12 principals in restructured schools in British Columbia, Leithwood, Jantzi, and Dart (1991) concluded that principals who exhibit transformational leadership qualities
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foster both school restructuring efforts and teacher development. Principals who
practice transformational leadership skills accomplish this by

helping teachers take more responsibility for their own
motivation for professional growth,... by creating a context in
which teachers can more readily learn from one another,...
and to ensure that the school site itself, the critical centre for
acquiring authentic, situated knowledge, will be used as a
primary resource for teacher development. (Leithwood, et
al.,1991, p. 10)

In an effort to motivate teachers to "life-long learning" through teacher
development, principals initiated total group meetings to develop a mission
statement for their school, thus providing teachers with a sense of ownership in the
school. Committees composed of teachers were then formed to refine the mission
statement and the growth development plan. According to teachers in the study,
principals were the key leaders in providing support throughout the process.
Principals encouraged teachers to develop their own interests and leadership
potential and to share learning experiences with their colleagues.

Teacher development was provided to teachers, on their school campus, by
principals and external personnel through workshops on different learning styles,
peer coaching, class management, and the use of computers. School board
consultants specializing in planning and teaching strategies were also utilized to
enhance teacher performance in the classroom. Materials needed to effectively
implement new teaching strategies were provided by the principal. To encourage
staff morale, recognition of teachers for their activities in the classrooms were communicated to the parents and the overall community.

Another component essential in promoting teacher development was teacher participation in decision making. Principals involved teachers in making decisions that directly affected them. Collaboration through team planning, usually by grade levels, was used for planning teaching strategies and preparing learning packages. Team work and teacher participation in decision making enabled teachers to become comfortable in sharing experiences, evaluating their work, and asking other teachers and/or the principal for help.

Results of this study indicate that transformational leadership qualities of principals are essential in providing teacher development in restructured schools. Principals exhibiting these qualities provide motivation and opportunity for professional growth through life-long learning experiences. Leithwood, et al. (1991), conclude that transformational leadership

is one in which necessary instrumental or managerial tasks are used for transforming purposes. This means school leaders helping teachers find personal, professional significance in learning from the everyday acts associated with school improvement processes that might otherwise be viewed as mundane or unremarkable. (p. 32)

Transformational Leadership and Group Problem Solving

In a qualitative study of expert and typical principals in nine elementary schools, evidence of transformational leadership behavior emerged through the
means these principals used to "(1) generate better solutions to school problems, (2) develop teachers' commitment to implementing such solutions, and (3) foster long-term staff development" (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991, p. 239). Expert and typical principals were determined from ratings by board administrators and ratings on The Principal Profile Survey (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986). Principals rated high by board administrators and high on the survey were considered expert principals. The remaining principals were considered typical.

Qualities of the transformational leader exhibited by expert principals included the facilitation of group decision making and the stimulation of teachers to devote extra time and effort in collaborative problem solving processes. In contrast to typical principals who were concerned with satisfying the mandates of the central office or with meeting their own personal goals, expert principals preferred group problem-solving and actively encouraged teachers to participate in group discussions. For example, expert principals were open to new and innovative ideas articulated by teachers, while typical principals "changed topics or called on teachers who used the strategies the principal wanted to be accepted" (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991, p. 238).

Transformational leadership characteristics exemplified by expert principals were exercised with the vision of the individual as well as the larger school mission in mind. In addition to the qualities mentioned above, expert principals were
"open-minded, honest, careful, attentive to the group's needs, and attentive to their thinking" (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991, p. 241).

Results of the above study indicate that group participation in problem solving processes offer opportunities for expert principals to exercise transformational leadership characteristics. It also indicates that typical principals do not. Also suggested is that expert principals can encourage reflective thinking by individual teachers in solving their own everyday problems.

Summary of Transformational Leadership.

The school principal in a restructured school, such as a site-based managed school, who exhibits transformational leadership qualities, is one who is capable of leading others by facilitating collaboration through teacher participation in the decision making process. Roberts (1985), in her discussion of the transformational leader concludes that transformational leadership offers a vision of what could be and gives a sense of purpose and meaning to those who would share that vision. It builds commitment, enthusiasm, and excitement. It creates a hope in the future and a belief that the world is knowable, understandable, and manageable. The collective action that transforming leadership generates, empowers those who participate in the process. There is hope, there is optimism, there is energy. In essence, transforming leadership is a leadership that facilitates the redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of their commitment, and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment. (p. 1024)
Thus, the school principal, as transformational leader, may enhance and facilitate the accomplishment of school goals through teacher participation in the decision making process.

**Teacher Participation in Decision Making**

An essential aspect of site-based management is the shift of authority from the district level to the school level (Brown, 1991b). An important component of site-based management strategies is the inclusion of teachers in the decision making process (National Governors’ Association, 1986; AASA/NAESP/NASSP, 1988). Teacher participation in shared decision making is often associated with the professionalization of teachers. However, its main goals are the improvement of schools (Hallinger, 1988; Imber & Neidt, 1990) and increased teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Taylor & Bogotch, 1992).

Traditionally, school level decisions are the responsibility of the principal (Strusinski, 1991). Site-based management advocates, however, strongly suggest that a shift in responsibility for school decision making is needed for the improvement of schools (Guthrie, 1986). That is, teachers, in concert with the principal in the decision making process, may strongly impact upon students in the classroom.

Although teacher participation in shared decision making is encouraged by advocates and educational researchers, the construct itself, is elusive (Imber & Neidt, 1990). Many researchers in non-educational organizations as well as
educational organizations have attempted to define participation in decision making, yet no consensus has been reached. Because participation is an integral component of site-based management, defining participation in decision making and arriving at a consensus of participation is essential for the success of school restructuring efforts (Bacharach et al., 1990; Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1986).

Although the concept of participation in decision making remains unclear, researchers have provided some definitions. For example, Lowin (1968) defined participation as "a mode of organizational operations in which decisions as to activities are arrived at by the very persons who are to execute those decisions" (p. 69). Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) refer to participation in decision making as "teacher (or parent, student, or community) involvement in the process by which school decisions are made" (p. 93). In another attempt to define participation in decision making in educational organizations, Conway (1984) emphasized that two major conceptual perspectives intercept with participation in decision making: decision making, the process of making a choice, and participation, the shared activity of two or more individuals. Conway (1984) concludes that decisional participation is participation "by two or more actors in the process of reaching a choice" (p. 19). These definitions reinforce the concept that decisions made in site-based managed schools, involve individuals responsible for implementing those decisions (AASA/NAESP/NASSP, 1988).
In extensive studies of participation in decision making in educational contexts, Alutto and Belasco (1972) argued that participation in decision making forms a continuum, with decisional saturation at one end and deprivation at the other, depending upon the degree of participation experienced by individual teachers. These authors stress that due to the extent of involvement by individuals various results of participation in decision making will occur (i.e., individual participation in decision making may fall on the various points of the continuum).

Building upon the work of Alutto and Belasco (1972), Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) conducted a study of 797 teachers in 22 schools in the Midwest. A factor analysis of the data collected on 12 decisional areas revealed three dimensions of participation in decision making: managerial domain (e.g., bureaucracy), technical domain (e.g., instruction), and negotiation (e.g., teacher's union). In two more recent studies of participation in decision making (Taylor & Bogotch, 1992; Bacharach, et al., 1990), the multidimensionality of participation was also found. For example, Taylor and Bogotch (1992) found four dimensions: associated technology, (e.g., policies concerning discipline, grading, testing), managerial (e.g., budgeting personnel scheduling), core technology I (e.g., how and what to teach), and core technology II (e.g., textbooks, teaching assignments). Bacharach, et al. (1990) also found four dimensions: operational-organizational which includes issues of development and evaluation, operational-personal which entails teaching techniques and material usage, strategic-organizational which
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involves issues concerning resource allocation, and strategic-personal which deals with career issues. These studies contribute greatly to the multidimensionality of the construct of participation in decision making in educational organizations.

Although informative, results of these studies indicate that clarification of the construct, participation in decision making, is imperative if teacher participation in the decision making process is to be beneficial to teachers, students, and the school organization. Bacharach, et al. (1990) reiterate the concern of researchers by stating that "unless we begin to delineate strategically the specific decision domains in which teachers may become involved, few of our efforts to 'increase participation' will have the desired effect" (p. 164). Defining specific domains of decision making would enable researchers (and practitioners) to focus upon dimensions of participation in which teachers feel decisionally deprived or saturated (Bacharach, et al., 1990) offering a desired state of equilibrium to participants.

Important objectives of teacher participation in decision making are improved student achievement and increased teacher effectiveness in the classroom. It is argued that increased productivity in the classroom may be a result of teacher participation (Bacharach, et al., 1990) in that it leaves the teacher with a sense of ownership in the organization, eliminates isolation through communication with other teachers, and influences creativity and group autonomy (Maeroff, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1990; & Rosenholtz, 1989).
Conversely, Imber and Neidt (1990) argue that empirical evidence of increased student outcomes is nonexistent. However, these authors suggest theoretical perspectives on why teacher participation in decision making may increase student achievement. First, teachers experience a more democratic work environment, thus giving them the opportunity to voice their concerns and opinions about pedagogy. Second, because of teacher proximity to students and their expertise in curriculum and instruction, teachers are in a better position to make educational decisions. Finally, teachers care more about the implementation of decisions they help formulate. These reasons are consistent with studies of how effective principals can involve teachers in the decision making process (Blase & Kirby, 1992).

Essential to teacher participation in decision making is the behavior of the principal. According to Blase and Kirby (1992), principals who encourage, facilitate, and involve teachers in the decision making process not only build a sense of pride and commitment in teachers but also improve the quality of decisions. Principals, however, who resent or fear loss of power through shared decision making may not offer opportunities for teacher participation or may involve teachers only during the implementation stages (Imber & Neidt, 1990). Thus, leadership behavior may impact upon teacher participation in the decision making process.
Summary of Teacher Participation in Decision Making

The above studies reinforce the necessity of clarifying the construct of participation in decision making. These studies emphasize the fact that participation in decision making remains an elusive construct which demands further examination and empirical research. Especially needed is research on the multidimensionality of participation in decision making which would provide information regarding specific areas of teacher participation in educational organizations. Research is also needed on the relationship between principals' leadership behavior and teachers' participation in the decision making process.

Conclusion

The present chapter detailed relevant research on school restructuring, principal leadership behavior, and teacher participation in decision making. School restructuring, whether it is implemented throughout the district, or within each individual school, refers to some change in the structure of the organization. Site-based management, a shift from a centralized (hierarchical, top-down control) to a decentralized (bottom-up) form of organization, gives local schools the power to make decisions about curriculum and instruction, personnel, finances and/or discipline (Guthrie, 1986). In site-based managed schools, decisions are made locally as individuals in the schools know more about the needs of that particular school than do individuals at the district office (Lindelow & Heynederickx, 1989).
Reflected in the research is the importance of the role of the principal and of teachers as partners in the improvement of schooling and student achievement for the 21st century. According to researchers (Leithwood, 1992; Popin, 1992; David, 1989), if school restructuring is to be successful, new roles and relationships of principals and teachers are essential. These new roles and relationships include principal leadership behavior which will motivate and empower others in the school community, especially teachers, to work collaboratively in promoting teacher participation in decision making and group participation. The inclusion of teachers in the restructuring process is essential as teacher participation allows the expertise of teachers to be utilized more fully (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Maeroff, 1988) and gives them a sense of ownership.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of the present study was to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal's leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making in site-based managed schools. Site-based management is defined in the present study as the decentralization of the decision making process to the local school. According to Leithwood and colleagues (Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood, Jantzi, Sillns, & Dart, 1993; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990), principals who exemplify transformational leadership behavior encourage and promote teacher participation in decision making.

For the purpose of this study, the independent variable is teachers' perceptions of the leadership behavior of principals and the dependent variable is teachers' perceptions of teacher participation in decision making. Although the causal arrows may point in both directions, this direction seems the most logical. According to Leithwood (1992), principals who exemplify transformational leadership behavior affect teacher participation in decision making. In order to gain a clear understanding of the leadership behavior and the teacher participation in decision making constructs, both schools and teachers are used as the units of analysis.
This chapter includes the identification of the sample, instrumentation, data collection procedures, quantitative research, qualitative research, data analysis, and methodological limitations.

Sample

It is imperative that the sample used in a research project be purposeful so as to collect “information-rich” (Patton, 1990, p. 169) data which will provide appropriate responses to the proposed questions in the study. Data for the present study was collected in a school district located in South Central Louisiana.

The process for selecting this district was two-fold. First, the State Department of Education was contacted regarding the study. They were asked to submit names of restructured school districts that practiced site-based decision making at the local school, specifically, teacher participation in decision making. Second, in a meeting of Regional Service Center Managers, the proposed study was discussed and the conclusion was that the selected district was a good candidate for the study. According to Regional Service Center Managers, this school district was the best choice because of the emphasis on school restructuring and teacher participation in decision making, a major component of site-based management.

Restructuring efforts in this school district began in 1993. Incorporated into this plan was the establishment of site-based decision making committees, composed of teachers who would make decisions concerning school-wide and
district-wide initiatives. The site-based decision making committees participate in making decisions concerning curriculum standards for each grade level in their school, needs assessment in areas of school needs, criteria for staff development workshops, difficulties or problems which arise during the school year, and decisions concerning the overall needs of the school district. At the end of each school year, site-based decision making committees gather to evaluate the decisions made throughout the year.

The sample for this study consists of all regular education teachers teaching in elementary grades kindergarten through five. Elementary grade levels were selected because of the consistency of class schedules, age of students, and structure of the classrooms. All 22 elementary schools in the district were selected to participate in the study. Twenty of the 22 schools selected agreed to participate in the study. Eighteen of the 20 schools that agreed to participate returned completed questionnaires with a total of 212 (71%) teachers responding. Two schools were eliminated from the study. One school returned all questionnaires unanswered and one school returned only one completed questionnaire.

Of the 212 teacher responses, most are white (n=183, 86%) females (n=205, 97%), have been teaching for approximately four to nine years (n=62, 29%), and are between 41-50 years of age (n=89, 42%). The majority of teachers have bachelor’s degrees (n=158, 75%), while the remainder have master’s degrees (n=54, 25%). Teachers’ response rate per school ranged from 56% to 100%.
Table 3.1 delineates the total number of teachers in each school, the total number of teachers responding from each school, and the percentage rate of teacher responses per school.

Table 3.1

**Teachers Per School, Total of Teacher Responses From Each School, and The Percentage Rate of Responses Per School**

*Index (n=18 Schools)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Percentage Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table con’d*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Teacher Responses</th>
<th>Percentage Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Return Rate Percentage by School: 56% to 100%
Instrumentation

Instrumentation for the quantitative aspect of the study consisted of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) and the Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire (Bacharach, et al., 1990). Both questionnaires were administered to teachers teaching in grades Kindergarten through grade five. Teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions of the leadership behavior of their principal and their participation in the decision making process in the school. Psychometric properties of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) and the Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire (Bacharach, et al., 1990) are discussed below.

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire

The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) is a subscale of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass (1985) and later revised for use in restructured schools by Leithwood. In his initial research on transformational leadership behaviors, Bass (1985), administered the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to 104 participants. A factor analysis on the data revealed five factors: three were considered transformational while two were considered transactional. Building upon the research conducted by Bass (1985), Leithwood (1992), in extensive research conducted in restructured schools, concluded that six dimensions of transformational leadership behavior were
relevant in restructured schools and that transactional leadership behavior had no
significant effects on the leadership behavior of principals in restructured schools.

Leithwood began his research on transformational leadership behavior in
restructured schools using the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* developed by
Bass (1985). Through extensive research in restructured schools, on the effects
of transformational leadership on in-school variables, Leithwood concluded from
path analysis results that the construct transformational leadership behavior
consisted of six dimensions rather than the five dimensions developed by Bass
(1985).

The *Leadership Behavior Questionnaire* (Leithwood, 1992) consists of
24 items and measures teachers' perceptions of six dimensions of their principal's
leadership behaviors. Teachers were instructed to indicated on a Likert scale how
often their principal displays the leadership behavior described on the instrument.
Possible responses range from one, “seldom to never,” to four, “always or almost
always.” Examples of items on this scale include “how often does your principal
courage you to work toward the same school goals?” and “how often does your
principal treat you as an individual with unique needs and expertise?” A copy of
this instrument is in Appendix A.

The first dimension, which “identifies and articulates a vision,” is
described as the behavior of the principal when that principal identifies and
discusses with teachers the opportunities for school growth and inspires teachers
to strive toward that vision. This dimension is composed of five questions. The second dimension is composed of three questions and is principal behavior that "fosters the acceptance of group goals." In this instance, the behavior of the principal is to promote cooperation among teachers and to assist teachers in achieving common goals. The third dimension, which "conveys high performance expectations," is principal behavior that demonstrates the principal's expectations for excellence and quality in the performance of the teachers. This dimension is composed of five questions. The fourth dimension consists of five questions. This dimension is "provides appropriate models" and includes principal behavior that sets examples for teachers to follow and that are consistent with the values the principal presents. The fifth dimension, "provides intellectual stimulation," is behavior on the part of the principal that challenges teachers to re-examine assumptions about their work and encourages teachers to rethink their performance. This dimension contains three questions. The sixth dimension, "provides individualized support," consists of three questions. It refers to principal leadership behavior that portrays respect for teachers and concern about teachers' personal feelings and needs.

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients reported by Leithwood (1992) for each of the six leadership dimensions are identifies and articulates a vision, .95; fosters acceptance of group goals, .95; high performance expectations, .86;
sets appropriate models, .93; provides intellectual stimulation, .79; and provides individual support, .85.

A factor analysis was conducted on the data collected in the present study to determine empirical factors for both questionnaires. This study was based on research conducted by Leithwood (1992) on the transformational leadership of principals in restructured schools and Bacharach, et al., (1990) on teacher participation in decision making. However, it was imperative that a factor analysis be conducted on the data collected in this study to determine dimensions of transformational leadership and teacher participation in decision making in this particular school district.

*Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire*

The second instrument used in the study is the *Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire* (Bacharach, et al., 1990). It consists of 19 items and measures teachers’ perceptions of their participation in decision making.

Results of research on the *Teacher Participation In Decision Making Questionnaire* (e.g. Bacharach, et al., 1990; Taylor & Bogotch, 1992) revealed the existence of at least four dimensions. Each of the studies resulted in different factor patterns. For example, Bacharach, et al. (1990) found four dimensions: operational-organizational, operational-personal, strategic-organizational, strategic-personal. Taylor and Bogotch (1992) found four dimensions: associated technology, managerial, core technology, and core technology II. This evidence
indicates that teacher participation in decision making is a multidimensional construct. It also reveals that dimensions are not necessarily the same for the samples of teachers used in the different studies.

The current study examines the items and factor loadings associated with the four dimensions of teacher participation in decision making revealed by Bacharach, et al. (1990). It was anticipated that the same four dimensions would emerge: operational-organizational, operational-personal, strategic-organizational, and strategic-personal. The operational-organizational dimension consists of six questions and reflects decisions concerning organizational evaluations and relationships between teachers and their students. The operational-personal dimension reflects decisions concerning the skills, knowledge, and abilities of the teachers while performing basic day-to-day tasks. It consist of four questions. Strategic-organizational decisions refer to organizational budgets and goal development. This dimension consists of five questions. The strategic-personal dimension consists of four questions and reflects decisions concerning human resource issues such as the individual interests of teachers. Results of the factor analysis from the present study are discussed in Chapter 4. A copy of this instrument is in Appendix B.

Teachers were instructed to rate on a Likert scale from one, “seldom or never,” to four, “always or almost always,” both the extent to which teachers actually participate in decision making and the amount of desired participation.
Sample items include, "how often do teachers have the opportunity to participate in decisions made at the school level concerning how to teach?" and "how often do teachers have the opportunity to participate in decisions made at the school level concerning student discipline codes."

Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients reported by Bacharach et al. (1990) for factors derived from deprivation scores are strategic-organizational, .76; strategic-personal, .68; operational-organizational, .82; and operational-personal, .79.

Demographic Information

To gain a better understanding of the sample population, specific demographic information was collected from respondents. Teachers were instructed to indicated their age, degree received, years of teaching experience, ethnicity, gender, highest degree earned, and whether they were a member of the site-based decision making committee. A copy of the demographic questionnaire is in Appendix C.

Data Collection Procedures

Quantitative Research Component

The superintendent of the school district was contacted by letter requesting permission to conduct research in the 22 schools selected for the study. Included in the request was a brief description of the study and a copy of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) and the Teacher
Participation In Decision Making Questionnaire (Bacharach, et al., 1990). A copy of the letter is in Appendix D.

Principals of the selected schools were contacted by telephone and asked to distribute the instruments to all regular classroom teachers teaching kindergarten through fifth grade. Completed instruments were to be returned two weeks after the distribution date. A follow-up letter was sent to all principals at the end of the first week as a reminder that completed forms were due at the end of the second week. Eighteen schools participated in the study (n=212 teachers). A copy of the follow-up letter is in Appendix E.

Data collection was two-fold. First, teachers were asked to respond to questions concerning their perceptions of the leadership behavior of their principal and their perceptions of teacher participation in decision making. Second, teachers from six participating schools were selected to study using qualitative methods to gain a better understanding of quantitative results and to add depth and detail to the study. A total of 12 teachers participated in the qualitative study.

Data was collected in the fall of the 1995-1996 school year. Quantitative research methods were utilized to seek answers to the following questions.

Quantitative Research Questions

1. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the concept of leadership behavior?
2. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the concept of teacher participation in decision making?

3. To what degree does a relationship exist between teachers’ perceptions of the transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in decision making in site-based managed schools?

4. Is there a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of their participation in decision making when schools are classified into two groups composed of schools where teachers perceive a high degree of transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal and schools where teachers perceive a low degree of transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal?

Qualitative Research Component

The qualitative aspect of the study involved an interview protocol used to collect data from teachers in an effort to triangulate (Patton, 1990) quantitative results. Using data based on school means, the schools were divided into two groups: those with principals with high transformational leadership and those with principals with low transformational leadership. Schools with high, medium, and low school means from these two groups (high transformational leadership and
low transformational leadership), were selected to participate in the qualitative study. The principal of each selected school was asked to submit names of two teachers to be interviewed. Teachers participated on a volunteer basis. Two teachers from each of the three schools (high transformational leadership and low transformational leadership) were interviewed. A total of 12 teachers participated in the study. A copy of the interview protocol is in Appendix F.

The Developmental Research Sequence (Spradley, 1979) was used to collect and analysis data. Two interviews were conducted to elicit information from teachers. Teachers were initially interviewed in their perspective school after school hours. The second interview was conducted by telephone. Copious notes were taken and re-written immediately following each interview.

Initial interviews were conducted to collect descriptive information concerning the participation of teachers in the decision making process in their perspective school. A second interview was conducted by telephone, using structural questions pertaining to contextual information collected from teachers in the initial interviews. Domain and taxonomic analyses were performed on these two sets of data. Finally, a componential analysis was conducted to contrast differences in decision making between schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior. The following interview questions were utilized in this study.
Interview Questions

1. What types of decisions are you involved in making in your school?

2. In what types of decisions would you like to participate?

3. In what ways does your principal foster teacher participation in decision making?

These questions were utilized to gain greater understanding and to add depth to the study by allowing teachers to express personal perspectives and experiences concerning their principal’s leadership behavior and their participation in decision making.

Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted on the data collected. Three statistical procedures were utilized on the quantitative data. First, a factor analysis was conducted to determine which dimensions would emerge on both the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) and the Teacher Participation In Decision Making Questionnaire (Bacharach, et al., 1990). This study follows upon research conducted by Leithwood (1992) and Bacharach, et al. (1990); nevertheless, it was essential that a factor analysis be conducted on the data to confirm or reveal dimensions of transformational
leadership behavior and teachers participation in decision making in this particular school district.

Second, using these dimensions a canonical correlation was conducted to explore the relationship between principals’ leadership behavior and teachers’ participation in decision making. Because of the small number of schools (n=18), the teacher was the unit of analysis for this procedure. Third, multiple t-tests were conducted to determine if significant differences exist between teacher’s perceptions of participation in decision making (four components) when schools were grouped into high and low degrees of transformational leadership behavior. The school was the unit of analysis.

The qualitative component of this study involved analysis of the information collected through teacher interviews. Interviews were conducted to confirm and/or explain different aspects of participation in decision making according to the degrees of transformational leadership behavior of principals. The Developmental Research Sequence (Spradley, 1979) was used to analyze the data collected. This method began with a domain analysis using semantic relationships to structure domains of teacher participation in decision making. A componental analysis was then conducted to contrast differences in decision making between schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior.
Methodological Limitations of the Study

A major limitation to the present study is the measurement procedure. Both the *Leadership Behavior Questionnaire* (Leithwood, 1992) and the *Teacher Participation In Decision Making Questionnaire* (Bacharach, et al., 1990) are self-reported by teachers. Problems inherent in this method of measurement are related to the individual relationship between teacher and principal. If a good relationship exists between the teacher and the principal, the teacher may rate the principal as having high transformational leadership, even though the principal should have been rated low. However, if a poor relationship exists between the teacher and the principal, the teacher may rate the principal low even though the principal is indeed high in transformational leadership behavior.

Another limitation to the present study relates to external validity. Data were collected in one school district from which only elementary schools, kindergarten through fifth grade, were utilized. This limits the possibility of generalizing results to other school districts or other schools.

A third limitation involves the sample used in the qualitative study. The qualitative sample consisted of teachers who were selected by the principal and who participated on a voluntary basis. A problem with this type sample is that teachers may have been selected because of their loyalty to the principal. Thus, teacher responses may be skewed by the fact that teachers were selected by the principal.
A fourth limitation was that the school district selected to participate in the study was not restructured as indicated by Regional Service Center Managers. This was not known until all data were analyzed. Therefore, findings of the study may not present a clear picture of the relationship between principals’ transformational leadership behavior and teachers’ participation in decision making in restructured schools.
Chapter 4: Results

The present study examined the relationship between teacher participation in decision making and principal leadership behavior in site-based managed schools, as perceived by teachers. This chapter describes the results of both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data collected.

Quantitative data were collected using the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) and the Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire (Bacharach, et al., 1990). The qualitative aspect of the study was conducted through teacher interviews from six of the participating schools. Depending upon the question, the school or the teacher was the unit of analysis. Research questions presented in Chapter 3 will be discussed below.

Sample Characteristics

The research sample consisted of 18 elementary schools from a school district located in South Central Louisiana. In an effort to significantly improve the quality of education, this district implemented teacher participation in decision making, a component of site-based management. A total of 212 teachers in 18 schools responded to two survey questionnaires. Most of the teachers were white (86%) females (97%), had bachelors degrees (75%), and had been teaching for...
approximately 4-9 years (29%). Twenty-three percent were members of site-based management decision making committees (see Table 4.1).

School means were used to divide schools into two groups: those schools that rated high in transformational leadership behavior and those schools that rated low in transformational leadership behavior. Twelve teachers were interviewed, six from schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior and six from schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior. Teachers were interviewed to confirm quantitative results and to gain a deeper understanding of teacher participation in decision making.

**Descriptive Statistics**

**Scores For The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire**

The *Leadership Behavior Questionnaire* is a 24 item, 4 point, Likert scale (see Chapter 3). The lowest possible overall score is 24 while the highest possible overall score is 96. Mean scores for this study range from 91.96 ($s = 4.77$) to 77.38 ($s = 17.15$). The school means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4.2.

The highest possible individual item score is 4. Item scores range from 3.731 ($s = .532$) to 3.259 ($s = .905$). The means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 4.3.

According to these scores, teachers perceive their principal to be high in transformational leadership behavior in most areas. Teachers rated their principal
Table 4.1
Demographics of Teachers
Index (n=212 Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of SBM Committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>22.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>86.62</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>77.69</td>
<td>16.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>85.86</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>89.78</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 11</td>
<td>91.96</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 12</td>
<td>77.38</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 13</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 14</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 15</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 16</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 17</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 18</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Possible mean scores range from 96.00 to 24.00  
Lowest Mean Score is 77.38  
Highest Mean Score is 91.96
Table 4.3

Item Means and Standard Deviations For Each Dimension of The Leadership Behavior Questionnaire Index (n=212 Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behavior Dimension Two Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Models Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Leads by ‘doing’ rather than by ‘telling’</td>
<td>3.363</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Treats me as an individual with unique needs and expertise</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Excites us with visions of what we may be able to accomplish if we work together to school goals</td>
<td>3.292</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Symbolizes success and accomplishment within our profession</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Uses problem solving with staff to generate school goals</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Makes us feel and act like leaders</td>
<td>3.259</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Gives us a sense of overall purpose</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Provides good models for us to follow</td>
<td>3.472</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Works toward whole staff consensus in establishing priorities for school goals</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Behaves in a manner thoughtful of my personal needs</td>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d)
Leadership Behavior
Dimension Two Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Behavior</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Has both the capacity and judgment to overcome most obstacles</td>
<td>3.637</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Provides for extended training to develop my knowledge and skills</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Provides for our participation in the process of developing school goals</td>
<td>3.604</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Provides the necessary resources to support my implementation of school goals</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Challenges me to reexamine some basic assumptions I have about my work with students</td>
<td>3.278</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Stimulates me to think about what I am doing for my students</td>
<td>3.415</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Provides information that helps me think of ways to implement school goals</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behavior Dimension Three Items</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Insists on only the best performance from us</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Encourages teachers to work on the same school goals</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Commands respect from everyone in the school</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Shows us that there are high expectations for us as professionals</td>
<td>3.602</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Will not settle for second best in performance of our work</td>
<td>3.637</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Encourages us regularly to evaluate our progress toward achievement of school goals</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highest on item 6 (3.731, s=.532), “insists on only the best performance from us,” followed by item 9 (3.684, s=.615), “encourages teachers to work toward the same school goals.” Teachers rated their principal lowest on item 19 (3.259, s=.905), “makes us feel and act like leaders,” followed by item 5 (3.278, s=.816), “challenges me to reexamine some basic assumptions I have about my work with students.”

Scores For The Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire

The Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire is a 19 item, 4 point Likert scale (see Chapter 3 for details). The lowest possible score is 19 and the highest possible score is 76. Mean scores range from 52.56 (s=6.91) to 37.00 (s=9.68). The school means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4.4.

The highest possible individual item score is 4. Items scores range from 3.165 (s=.869) to 1.212 (s=.574). The means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 4.5.

Teachers rated their participation in decision making highest on item 16 (3.165, s=.869), “how to teach,” followed by items 9 (2.825, s=.970), “evaluations of your performance” and 13 (2.825, s=1.068), “procedures for reporting student achievement/progress to parents.” Teachers rated their participation in decision making lowest on item 8 (1.212, s=.574), “staff hiring,” followed by item 6 (1.425, s=.715), “designing or planning the use of facilities.”
Table 4.4
School Means and Standard Deviations for The *Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire* Index (n=18 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>14.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>42.14</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10</td>
<td>45.73</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 11</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 12</td>
<td>39.54</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 13</td>
<td>38.73</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 14</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 15</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 16</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 17</td>
<td>52.56</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 18</td>
<td>47.91</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Possible mean scores range from 76.00 to 19.00. Lowest mean score is 37.00. Highest mean score is 52.56.*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 4.5
Item Means and Standard Deviation For Each Dimension on the *Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire* Index (n=212)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Participation in Decision Making Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension One</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Evaluations of your performance</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Student discipline codes</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Standardized testing policy</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Grading policy</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Student rights</td>
<td>2.198</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) The textbooks and workbooks that will be available for use</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) The specific textbooks and workbooks that you will use in the classroom</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Staff development opportunities by your school/school district</td>
<td>2.528</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table con'd)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Participation in Decision Making Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Dimension Two**

Managerial Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Assignment of students to your class</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Removing students from your classroom</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Designing or planning the use of facilities</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Budget development</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Participation in Decision Making Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension Three</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)  The school to which you are assigned</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)  The subject(s) or grade level(s) you are assigned to teach</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension Four</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Procedures II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Procedures for reporting student achievement/progress to parents</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) What to teach</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) How to teach</td>
<td>3.165</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These scores indicate that teachers’ perceptions of their participation in decision making is not as high as their perceptions of their principal’s leadership behavior.

Teachers were also asked to rank the areas of participation in decision making which were most important to them. The first most important area of decision making selected by teachers was item 16, “how to teach” (89 teachers). Item 16 is part of dimension four, “instructional procedures II.” Item two, “subject or grade level” (51 teachers) was ranked as the second most important area. Item two is part of dimension three, “instructional procedures I.” Ranked third was item one, “the schools to which teachers are assigned” (70 teachers). Item one is part of dimension three, “instructional procedures I.” Ranked fourth was item ten, “student discipline code” (65 teachers). Item ten is part of dimension one “organizational policies.” Ranked fifth was item 15, “what to teach.” It is part of dimension four, “instructional procedures II.” Results of the areas of most importance are presented in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6

Teacher’s Perceptions of the Five Most Important Items on the *Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire* Index (n=212 Teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>First Most Important</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Second Most Important</th>
<th>Third Most Important</th>
<th>Total Times Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** First Most Important Item: Item 16  
Second Most Important Item: Item 2  
Third Most Important Item: Item 1  
Fourth Most Important Item: Item 10  
Fifth Most Important Item: Item 15
Tests of Research Questions

The following is a description of the data analysis results relating to each research question. Questions will be restated and results discussed.

Questions 1 & 2. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the concept of leadership behavior? Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the concept of teacher participation in decision making?

A factor analysis was used to determine the dimensions for each of the two questionnaires used in the study. Using the items on each questionnaire, a correlation matrix was constructed. Once the factors were extracted, eigenvalues were used to determine the amount of variance the items accounted for in each factor. Only eigenvalues greater than one were considered acceptable (Nunnally, 1978). A principal components factor analysis, with a varimax rotation, was conducted to produce more interpretable common factors or to establish the "best fit" for the final analyses (Teddlie, Virgilio, & Oescher, 1990). The total variance accounted for on the leadership behavior dimensions was 64%. The total variance for the dimensions of teacher participation in decision making was 66%.

To examine the internal consistency of reliability of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) and the Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire (Bacharach, et al., 1990), Cronbach’s alpha was
computed on all dimensions. Coefficient scores of .70 or higher are considered acceptable (Nunnally, 1978). Reliability coefficients for both questionnaires were in the acceptable range. Cronbach's alphas for each dimension are presented in Table 4.7.

Results of the factor analyses conducted on the two questionnaires are explained below.

Factor Analysis Results on the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire

Leithwood (1992), in his research on the transformational leadership behavior of principals in restructured schools, indicates that six dimensions describe the transformational leadership behavior of principals. These dimensions include "identifies and articulates a vision," "fosters the acceptance of group goals," "conveys high performance expectations," "provides appropriate models," "provides intellectual stimulation," and "provides individualized support." A factor analysis conducted on the data collected in the present study revealed three dimensions with all 24 items loading on one of the three dimensions. These dimensions are referred to in the present study as "models behavior," "instructional behavior," and "high expectations behavior" (see discussion below). The present study focuses on the three leadership behavior dimensions revealed in the factor analysis conducted on the data collected.
Table 4.7

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Scores For The Three Leadership Behavior Dimensions And The Four Teacher Participation In Decision Making Dimensions Index (n=22 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models Behavior</td>
<td>.9486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Behavior</td>
<td>.8698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations Behavior</td>
<td>.8761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Participation in Decision Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Policies</td>
<td>.8577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Procedures</td>
<td>.8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Procedures</td>
<td>.7239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Procedures II</td>
<td>.7418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor loadings for the three leadership behavior dimensions ranged from .46 to .80. Only items loading at .46 or grader were selected as loading highly on a factor. Each item and factor loading are reported in Table 4.8.

Dimension one consists of items 7, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 24. These items relate to the ways principals model behavior expected from teachers. Each of these items describes the principal as one who models appropriate behavior for teachers to follow and as one who is caring and concerned about teachers’ feelings.

Factor loadings for dimension one range from .53 to .77. The percentage of variance explained is 55%. As noted in Table 4.7, the Cronbach’s alpha for this factor is .95. This dimension will be referred to as “models behavior.”

The second dimension includes behaviors of the principal toward instructional matters. Items loading on dimension two are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, and 17. These items relate to the staff development of teachers and to teacher support. The behavior of the principal in this dimension is one who encourages teachers to challenge themselves and to reflect on their teaching methodologies.

Factor loadings for dimension two range from .46 to .80. The percentage of variance explained is 5%. As noted in Table 4.7, the Cronbach’s alpha for this factor is .87. This dimension will be referred to as “instructional behavior.”

The third dimensions includes items 6, 8, 9, 12, 18, and 23. Items in this dimension relate to the behavior of principals toward teacher performance. The
Table 4.8

Factor Analysis for the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire
Index (n=18 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. For an item to be included on a factor, a loading of .45 or greater was required. If an item did not load at that level, a "-" is included in its place.
principal conveys to teachers that they must provide the best education possible to
students and that they should work as a group to achieve group goals.

Factor loadings for dimension three range from .49 to .79. The percentage
of variance explained by this factor is 4.4%. As noted in Table 4.7, the
Cronbach’s alpha is .88. This dimension will be referred to as “high expectations
behavior.”

In conclusion, results of the factor analysis on the data collected on the
Leadership Behavior Questionnaire provided three distinguishable dimensions
with all 24 items on the questionnaire loading on one of the three dimensions.
This study was based on Leithwood’s (1992) research which resulted in six
dimensions of leadership behavior: “identifies and articulates a vision,” “fosters
the acceptance of group goals,” “conveys high performance expectations,”
provides appropriate models,” “provides intellectual stimulation,” and “provides
individualized support.”

Because results of the present study provided three dimensions instead of
six, they were re-named as “models behavior,” “instructional behavior,” and “high
expectations behavior.” Factor loadings were considered acceptable. Cronbach’s
alphas were also in the acceptable range and provided estimates of the internal
consistency of the questionnaire.
Factor Analysis Results on the Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire

The construct, teacher participation in decision making, defined by Bacharach, et al. (1990) was used as the dependent variable in the present study. Bacharach, et al. (1990) found four dimensions of teacher participation in decision making. These dimensions are referred to as “strategic-organizational,” “strategic-personal,” “operational-organizational,” and “operational-personal” (see Chapter 2). A factor analysis conducted on the data collected in the present study also revealed four dimensions of teacher participation in decision making. These dimensions are referred to as “organizational policies,” “managerial procedures,” “instructional procedures I,” and “instructional procedures II.”

A factor analysis was conducted on responses to the Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire. Results of the factor analysis revealed four dimensions from these responses to the questionnaire. All items, except item eight, staff hiring, loaded highly on only one of the four dimensions. Item eight failed to load highly on any factor and results from it are not included in this study. Each item and corresponding factor loadings are presented in Table 4.9. Each of the four actual participation in decision making dimensions are discussed below.
Table 4.9

Factor Analysis for the *Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire*  
(Actual Participation)  
Index (*n*=18 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** For an item to be included on a factor, a loading of .45 or greater was required. If the item did not load at that level a "-" is included in its place.
The first dimension consists of teacher participation in decisions concerning the organizational policies of the school. Eight items loaded highly on this factor: 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, and 19. Items in dimension one include teacher evaluations, student discipline codes, standardized testing, grading policies, student rights, staff development opportunities, the textbooks and workbooks that are available for use, the specific textbooks and workbooks they will use in the classroom, and student rights.

Only items loading in at .45 or greater were selected as loading highly on a factor. Factor loadings for dimension one range from .45 to .80. The percentage of variance explained by this factor is 37%. As noted in Table 4.7, the Cronbach's alpha for this factor is .86. This dimension is referred to as "Organizational Policies."

The second dimension refers to school management processes. Five items loaded on factor two: 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Items include decisions concerning the assignment of students to their classes, removal of students from the classroom, use of school facilities, budget development, and expenditure priorities. The factor loadings range from .47 to .82. The percentage of variance explained for this factor is 9%. As noted in Table 4.7, the Cronbach's alpha is .80. This dimension is referred to as "Managerial Procedures."

Dimension three relates to the instructional process in the school. Two items loaded on this factor: 1 and 2. Items in this dimension relate to teacher
participation in decisions concerning the school to which they are assigned and the subjects or grade levels they teach. Factor loadings are .80 for item one and .83 for item two. The percentage of explained variance for this factor is 8%. The Cronbach’s alpha is .72. (See Table 4.7). This dimension is referred to as “Instructional Procedures I.”

The fourth dimension involves decisions concerning the procedures for reporting student achievement to parents, what to teach, and how to teach. Three items loaded on factor four: 13, 15, and 16. Factor loadings range from .60 to .83. The percentage of explained variance for this factor is 7%. The Cronbach’s alpha is .74. Items in dimension four are closely related to items loading on dimension three, “Instructional Procedures I.” Therefore, dimension four is referred to as “Instructional Procedures II.”

In conclusion, results from the factor analysis produced four dimensions of teacher participation in decision making. These dimensions are referred to as “organizational policies,” “managerial procedures,” “instructional procedures I,” and “instructional procedures II.”

Question 3: To what degree does a relationship exist between teachers’ perceptions of transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in decision making in site-based managed schools?

A canonical correlation was conducted on the data to determine the maximum amount of relationship between the constructs transformational
leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making. This statistical procedure is used to explore the relationship between two sets of constructs composed of two or more dimensions. In the present study transformational leadership behavior has three dimensions while teacher participation in decision making has four dimensions.

The main purpose of the canonical correlation, in the present study, was to explain as much as possible the relationship between the transformational leadership behavior dimensions and the teacher participation in decision making dimensions. In order to determine the best possible relationship between the two constructs a large sample size was needed (Thompson, 1991). Therefore, the teacher, instead of the school, was used as the unit of analysis. The sample size included 212 teachers from 18 schools. Results of the canonical correlation are presented in Table 4.10.

Only one canonical correlation was significant (0.476502), with transformational leadership behavior explaining 23% of the variance of teacher participation in decision making.

Analysis of the standardized canonical coefficients for the transformational leadership behavior variate indicates that items related to the “instructional behavior” dimension contributed more to the leadership behavior variable than the other two dimensions. “Instructional behavior” contributed .80, while “models
Table 4.10

Canonical Correlations Between Transformational Leadership Behavior Dimensions and Teacher Participation in Decision Making Dimensions Index (n=212 teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Correlations</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Approximate F</th>
<th>P&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.476502</td>
<td>0.2938</td>
<td>0.22705</td>
<td>5.1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.149727</td>
<td>0.0229</td>
<td>0.02241</td>
<td>0.9625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.072716</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
<td>0.00528</td>
<td>0.5475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
behavior” contributed .16 and “high expectations behavior” only .06. (See Table 4.11).

According to these results, items contained in the “instructional behavior” dimension are the types of principal leadership behavior that encourage teacher participation in decision making. Items highly regarded by teachers are:
provides for staff development, provides for participation in the process of developing school goals, and provides resources and information to support implementation of school goals.

Analysis of the standardized canonical coefficients for the teacher participation in decision making variate indicates that dimension two, “managerial procedures,” contributed slightly more (.38) than dimension one, “organizational policies” (.33), dimension three, “instructional procedures I” (.30), and dimension four, “instructional procedures II” (.23). (See Table 4.11). According to these results, teachers perceive items related to the “managerial procedures” dimension to be the types of decisions they value most in decision making. Items related to “managerial procedures” focus on decisions concerning budget development, student assignments, students removed from the classroom, and expenditures.
Table 4.11

**Standardized Canonical Coefficients For The Transformational Leadership Behavior Variate and The Teacher Participation in Decision Making Variate Index (n=212 teachers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership Behavior Variate</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Models Behavior</td>
<td>0.1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Behavior</td>
<td>0.8098*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations Behavior</td>
<td>0.0677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Participation in Decision Making Variate</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Policies</td>
<td>0.3309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Procedures</td>
<td>0.3812*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Procedures</td>
<td>0.3061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Procedures II</td>
<td>0.2282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** * Dimensions are weighted more than others
Question 4: Is there a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of participation in decision making when schools are classified into two groups composed of schools where teachers perceive a high degree of transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal and schools where teachers perceive a low degree of transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal?

A median split was conducted on the mean scores of the Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (Leithwood, 1992) to establish two groups of principals. Group one consists of principals rated high in transformational leadership behavior; group two consists of principals rated low in transformational leadership behavior. (See Table 4.12).

Independent group t-tests were performed comparing the differences between the high and low transformational leadership groups, on the four dimensions of teacher participation in decision making. The transformational leadership variable had a significant effect on teacher participation dimension two, "managerial procedures" ($t(16) = 2.63, p < .01$). This indicates that there is a significant perceived difference in teacher participation in decision making between schools with high transformational leadership behavior and schools with low transformational leadership behavior. Principals in schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior encourage their teachers to participate in decisions related to the "managerial procedures" dimension more than principals...
Table 4.12

Means and Standard Deviations for Schools Rated High in Transformational Leadership Behavior and Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior Index (n=18 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools Rated High in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 11</td>
<td>91.96</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 5 *</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 9</td>
<td>89.78</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 8</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3 *</td>
<td>86.62</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 7</td>
<td>85.86</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 17</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 10 *</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 15</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Rated Low in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 14 *</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 13</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1 *</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 18</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 16</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>22.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 6</td>
<td>77.69</td>
<td>16.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 12 *</td>
<td>77.38</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
* High scores range from 91.96 to 84.60  
* Low scores range from 83.50 to 77.38  
* Schools participating in the interview process  
Possible scores range from 96.00 to 24.00
rated low in transformational behavior. Items contained in this dimension are student assignments, the removal of students from the classroom, designing or planning the use of facilities, budget development, and expenditures.

The following section of Chapter Four contains the qualitative results from the study. The qualitative component was used to confirm results from the quantitative analyses.

**Qualitative Component**

The use of mixed methodologies, or triangulation, is valuable in strengthening a study (Patton, 1990). The present study utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in decision making in restructured schools.

In the first part of Chapter 4, results of the quantitative research questions were discussed. This section presents results of the qualitative component which involves six case studies of 12 teachers who were interviewed from six of the participating schools. Case studies add depth, detail, and meaning to a study and can be used to confirm or explain quantitative results (Yin, 1989). The use of qualitative research in this study provides greater detail and meaning to the degree of teacher participation in decision making in this particular school district.

The school district selected to participate in this study is located in South Central Louisiana. This district is referred to in the present study as the George
Washington School District. This district was recommended by Regional Service Center Managers employed by the State Department of Education because it contained the components of restructuring researched in this study, namely site-based management with specific emphasis on teacher participation in decision making.

Sample For the Qualitative Study

The sample for the quantitative section of the present study consisted of all regular education teachers (n=212) teaching in grades kindergarten through grade five. Eighteen schools participated in the study. (See Chapter 3). The sample used in the qualitative section consisted of 12 teachers from six of the schools selected to participate in the study.

Using school mean scores, a median split was conducted to determine those schools with high transformational leadership behavior and those schools with low transformational leadership behavior. (See Table 4.12). A total of 12 teachers were interviewed, six from schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior (school 5, school 3, and school 10) and six from schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior (school 14, school 1, and school 12).

Teachers who participated in the interview process were volunteers recommended by their principal. Initial interviews were conducted after school hours in each of the perspective schools. Teachers were contacted a second time by telephone to expand upon contextual information (Spradley, 1979) collected in
the initial interviews. Teachers were assured that all responses would be kept confidential. Pseudonyms were assigned to each school. Because of the time schedule (after school) of the interviews, teacher/student and teacher/principal interactions were not observed.

The focus of the qualitative component of the study was to capture a realistic picture of the areas of participation in decision making by teachers in their perspective schools. Interview questions were descriptive in nature (Spradley, 1979) and elicited information describing the types of decisions in which teachers participated, the types of decisions in which they would like to participate, and the ways in which their principal informed them that he/she wanted their input in making decisions related to the school or to teaching. Although questions were pre-determined, teachers were encouraged to express themselves concerning various aspects of the leadership behavior of their principal and the decisions made in their school.

A second interview was conducted to expand upon contextual information provided by teachers in the initial interview process. These questions were more structural and focused on “filling the gaps” to insure a better understanding of teacher participation in decision making in this school district. Domain and taxonomic analyses were conducted on both sets of data. Finally, a componential analysis was conducted to contrast differences in teacher participation in decision
making between schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior and schools rated low transformational leadership behavior.

Interview questions teachers responded to were: (1) What types of decisions are you involved in making in your school?; (2) In what types of decisions would you like to participate?; and (3) In what ways does your principal foster teacher participation in decision making?

This section of Chapter 4 begins with a demographic description of the school district. This is followed by six case studies which delineate the setting for each school, teacher responses to the interview protocol, and a summary of teacher responses from each of the three schools (first high, then low). This section ends with a discussion of the differences found between schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior and those rated low in transformational leadership behavior as stated by teachers who participated in the interview process.

Demographics of the District

The George Washington School District is located in South Central Louisiana. This school district was settled by the Spanish and later by the French in the Eighteenth Century. This school district consists of one large city and several small towns and rural areas. Families in the district are interested in the education of their children, but efforts to provide money to enhance education
through new school taxes have been overwhelmingly rejected. No new school 
taxes have been passed since 1980 (Pol, 1996).

Schools in the district are considered either suburban or rural. The school 
district enrolls 31,000 students in grades pre-kindergarten through 12 and employs 
2,000 teachers. Demographics of the schools participating in the study are 
presented in Table 5.1. Resident population in this district is composed of 76.1% 
white, 22.4% African-Americans, and 2.5% Asian (LDE, 1996).

In an effort to improve schooling, the district school board supposedly 
incorporated school-based management, specifically teacher participation in 
decision making, into its newly designed restructuring plan. Teachers in the 
school district would be given the opportunity to participate on decision making 
committees at the school level and at the district level. Committees composed of 
teachers were supposed to participate in decisions concerning curriculum 
standards, staff development opportunities, needs assessments in the area of 
school needs, difficulties or problems arising during the school year, and decisions 
concerning the overall needs of the school district. Committees were supposed to 
gather at the end of the school year to evaluate the decisions made by the various 
committees.

However, according to current research on restructured schools in 
Louisiana (Pol, 1996) and results of this study, this district had intentions of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Number of Teachers and Staff</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Urbanicity</th>
<th>Mean Scores on the LBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>86.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>84.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>90.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>PK-4</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>83.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>77.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>81.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
restructuring but after years of planning, the school board voted against pursuing the initiative further.

**Schools Rated High in Transformational Leadership Behavior**

*Jefferson Elementary*

**Setting**

Jefferson Elementary is located in a middle class neighborhood on the outskirts of a large city. The school building is made of tan brick and is surrounded by short shrubs. The classrooms, administrative offices, and yards are well kept. Floors remain shiny throughout the year.

Jefferson Elementary is recognized as a school of choice. Both teachers and parents are given choices concerning education. Teachers decide what type of programs they will use to teach. For example, some teachers teach reading using the Spalding method while others use phonetics. Some teachers use the basal reader while others use literature based texts. Parents may also choose the type of learning style they prefer for their child. For example, parents may want their child placed in a classroom where the Spalding method of reading is taught or they may choose the phonetics method instead. Parents choose the type of learning method they prefer for their child and present their request to the principal at the beginning of each school year.

There are approximately 776 students in kindergarten through grade four at Jefferson Elementary. Class sizes range from medium to large. Thirty-three
percent of classrooms contain 21-26 students. Faculty members, which includes all teachers and staff, total 50. Sixteen (32%) teachers have a master's degree or higher. Student scores on the LEAP test for grade three are considered high with 144 (98%) passing English and math (LDE, 1996).

Jefferson Elementary specializes in the teaching of English as a Second Language (ESL) students. These 40 ESL students are bused to this school from different areas in the parish. ESL teachers prepare these students for inclusion in the regular education classroom.

Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Teachers at Jefferson Elementary participate in three main areas: grade level decisions, staff development opportunities, and the spending of funds provided by the Parent-Teacher Association (PTO). The main area of participation takes place at each grade level. One teacher from each grade level is appointed or volunteers to be the chairperson for that grade level. Teachers from each of the grade levels meet once a month to discuss problems arising during the month and to determine possible solutions. The chairpersons then meet as a group with the principal, and share problems and possible solutions. The principal and teachers usually make decisions together unless the principal is not fully satisfied that teachers have looked at the entire picture. One teacher stated, “If she is not fully convinced that our solutions are made in the best interest of the student
body, as a whole, she will instruct us to discuss the problem in more detail or she will make the decision she feels is best.”

An example of grade level decision making taking place this year involved the inclusion of English as a Second Language (ELS) students into regular education classrooms. Teachers responsible for ELS students were not working with the students prior to putting them into the regular education classrooms. Ideally, teachers of ELS students would spend one to two months teaching students the rules of the school, various locations of importance, and some English before putting them into the regular classroom. Instead, these students were sent directly to regular education classes and expected to participate in the learning process even though they could not communicate with the teacher or with the students. Teachers teaching regular education classes felt that the ESL students were at a disadvantage because they did not know how to function in the classroom and did not know how to get around the school. Teachers throughout the day had to stop teaching to correct or re-state what was expected from these students. This brought much chaos into the classroom and stopped the learning process. A committee was formed by the principal to review the situation. After three months of deliberation, the principal announced the decision of the committee at a faculty meeting. Teachers of ESL students would spend approximately two months preparing these students for placement in the regular education classroom. In this particular case, teachers worked with the principal in
making a decision that would facilitate more appropriate ways of working with ESL students.

Teachers are also given the opportunity at the beginning of the year to decide on the type of staff development opportunities in which they would like to participate. The principal polls the teachers to find out what they feel they need most in the area of teaching and learning. Teachers voice their needs and the principal decides what types of workshops they will attend. For example, this year teachers expressed a need to develop their math and science teaching skills. The principal sent teachers to workshops on math and science activities and invited a guest speaker into the school.

Another area of decision making at Jefferson Elementary involves the funds given to the teachers by the PTO. This year teachers were given $425.00 each. The principal informed them that they could spend this money on anything they felt would enhance student learning in the classroom. Teachers were extremely pleased with this opportunity as they feel they know best the needs of their students.

It is important to stress that although teachers feel that their opinions are accepted by the principal and that they do participate in making some school level decisions, they realize that their principal makes the final decision. As one teacher stated, “she [the principal] is the one accountable, therefore we realize she should make the final decision.”
Teachers at Jefferson Elementary are content with the amount of participation in decision making in which they are involved. Teachers stated that their opinions are always welcomed by the principal. Even though the principal has already made her decision on certain matters, teachers feel they can voice their opinion without being ridiculed. One teacher stated, “I do have a voice in what I would like to make decisions on. I can not think of anything I am not able to voice my opinion about. That doesn’t mean I will get what I want, but I am able to ask.”

Some teachers do not wish to participate in decision making. One teacher stated that “Personally, I do not want to make decisions about anything in the school. I have enough to worry about with my students in the classroom. I am not an administrator and I have no desire to become one.”

According to teachers at Jefferson Elementary, their principal communicates both formal and informally. Weekly memos, bulletins, and personal notes are put into teacher’s mailboxes to inform them of upcoming events or to solicit volunteers to participate on various committees. Faculty meeting are held four times a year and are a means of communication as well.

Teachers view their principal as dynamic and energetic. She visits classrooms approximately three times a week and engages in activities with the students. She arrives at school early in the morning and departs late. She schedules meetings with teachers, parents, and students.
Teachers feel they can approach their principal at any time during the day. If the need arises, they can walk into her office and speak to her about problems arising in the classroom or on the playground. One teacher explained this by saying, "Last week I had to speak to her about a student. I went into her office and the bell rang. I asked her to come by my classroom and speak to me in the hall. She was there in five minutes."

The principal at Jefferson Elementary is also recognized as a workaholic. To some teachers this is a form of motivation. Her regular classroom visits are welcomed and her energy seems to inspire teachers to work longer hours and to participate in extracurricular activities. For others however, there is resentment. Some teachers resent that the principal visits their classroom often. They feel that she interrupts the learning process by visiting too often and that she is monitoring or "checking up" on them. Also, some teachers feel that the principal's expectations are too high. These teachers are unable to participate on the various committees because of the demands of their own children. For example, meeting before and after school are troublesome because of the responsibilities some teachers have for the education of their own children and because of other activities in which their children are involved.
Zachary Elementary

Setting

Zachary Taylor Elementary is constructed of creme colored cinder blocks and brick. It is located in a rural community and draws students from miles around. Butler buildings are situated next to the main building and used as classrooms for second, fourth, and fifth grade students. Classrooms in the main building are large and painted different colors. Large bookcases cover one wall and cabinets used for storage cover another wall. The school grounds and classrooms are well kept.

Approximately 819 students in kindergarten through grade eight attend this school. The majority of students attend classes with 27 students or more (52%). The faculty consists of 48 teachers and staff. Of the faculty, 16 (33%) teachers have obtained a master’s degree or higher. Ninety-six (100%) of the third grade students passed the LEAP test in English and 96 (97%) passed the math section (LDE, 1996).

Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Teachers at Taylor Elementary participate on several decision making committees. They are involved in making decisions about staff development, technology in the classroom, curriculum, extracurricular activities, and discipline.

At the beginning of each school year teachers are asked to express the types of staff development workshops in which they would like to participate. The
principal invites suggestions from each teacher at the initial faculty meeting in
August and plans workshops or conferences accordingly. One teacher stated that
"We are teachers and we know what educational improvements and knowledge
we need to acquire better than anyone in the school. Our principal believes this
and welcomes our suggestions."

Technology is also of great interest to most teachers at Taylor Elementary.
A technology committee composed of teachers on the various grade levels meets
once a month to discuss the educational software used in the classroom and to
discuss the possibility of purchasing new software. Teachers on each grade level
share with other teachers activities they have had success with and those that did
not work. Chairpersons on each committee report suggestions to the principal,
who then decides which particular software to purchase. Depending on funds, the
principal usually purchases what teachers desire.

Teachers also make some decisions on curriculum issues. According to
teachers at Taylor elementary, when problems arise concerning a subject area, they
are welcome to meet with the principal and discuss their problems. The principal
usually listens to their concerns and then makes the final decision. According to
one teacher, their principal "listens to our problems and takes our suggestions into
consideration. He doesn't necessarily do what we suggest. He usually considers
the whole student body and bases his decision on that. He makes the final
decision and we accept his decision. After all, we need a leader."
Teachers also have a choice in the extracurricular activities in which they participate. For example, they may choose to work with sports, cheerleaders, social studies fair, science fair, etc. In the past, teachers were appointed to various activities. Today extracurricular participation is on a voluntary basis only. Parents are also given the opportunity to choose the activity in which their child will participate. They may even decide that they do not want them to participate in any activity. This, too, is accepted by the principal.

The final area of participation in decision making by teachers at Taylor Elementary is student discipline. Teachers, in concert with the principal, have devised a discipline policy for their school. Their discipline policy includes not only student behavior, but the student dress code as well. A committee of volunteer teachers meet at the beginning of each school year to review and revise the discipline policy. They then meet with the principal and vice-principal to finalize the policy. As one teacher stated, "We know best what our students need. We bring our suggestions to the principal who takes our suggestions into consideration before making the final decision. Some parts of the discipline policy for the school district do not necessarily fit the needs of our students."

When asked what types of decisions in which they would like to participate, teachers indicated that students assigned to their classes, students removed from the classroom, textbooks used in the classroom and technology were issues of importance. Each year students are assigned to particular
classrooms, depending on their grade level. However, according to one teacher, the teacher should be the one to decide which students are allowed in her classroom. She stated that, “We as teachers have our own specialty areas and personality. Sometimes certain students would do better work with another teacher. For example, if a student is very hyper, that student should not be placed with a teacher who has no patience. We should be the ones to decide if a student will fit in with the teacher.”

Teachers also indicated that they should decide who will be removed from their classroom. During some school years, the school has an overload of students. Because of this situation, students are removed from classrooms and placed in newly opened classrooms. Teachers agree they should decide which students are taken out of a particular classroom. As one teacher explained: “If a student has a problem or a special need, and the teacher knows these needs, the teacher should be the one to decide if that student should be taken out of her classroom. Especially if that student feels comfortable with that teacher. It depends on the personality and on the needs of the student.”

Both formal and informal communication is used by the principal. He usually sends memos or bulletins, calls a faculty meeting, or visits with teachers individually. Through written notices he informs them of activities taking place and of certain committees he wants to form. He asks for volunteer participants or will approach a teacher he feels qualified to chair a particular committee. One
teachers stated that "The best thing our principal has done is send a memo out every Monday. The memo explains everything going on at school during that week. He also asks for volunteers to serve on various committees. The memo keeps every teacher informed. No one can say they did not know. They should have read the memo. Our principal opens the door to communication."

Faculty meetings are also used to inform teachers of upcoming events and to provide an opportunity for the principal to ask for teacher input on certain issues. He also uses faculty meetings to inform teachers that participation on a certain committee is needed at the central office. The principal also visits with teachers individually. He follows them to class or meets them at their door.

Lincoln Elementary

Setting

Lincoln Elementary is located in the center of a small rural community. The school building is constructed of beige bricks. It has a circular drive for student drop-off and pick-up by parents and buses. The classrooms are of medium size with 44% of class sizes in the 21-26 range. The school is neat and attractive and is kept clean.

Student enrollment consists of 287 students in kindergarten through grade five. The faculty and staff total 24 with 10 (42%) teachers holding a master's degree or higher. Forty-seven (91%) students passed the third grade LEAP test in
both English and math. Fifth grade scores, however, are lower with 40 (85%) students passing math and 40 (83%) students passing English (LPP, 1994-95).

Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Teachers at Lincoln Elementary have several decision making opportunities. Areas of participation in decision making include grade level decisions, staff development opportunities, student discipline, and program implementation. The main area of teacher participation involves grade level decision making. Teachers meet once a month and discuss curriculum issues or problems which arise during the month. One decision making activity includes the selection of textbooks for the next school year. The selection of textbooks is usually left up to the teachers by grade level. At the end of each school year teachers meet to discuss which textbooks each grade level will use for the upcoming year. The chairperson for each committee meets with the principal, who usually agrees with the committee’s decision as long as the books are on the state’s adopted list.

Grade level committees also discuss problems which take place in the classroom or on the playground. Most often discussed are discipline problems in the classroom. Teachers at Lincoln Elementary make decisions concerning how to handle student misbehavior. Most decisions concern the detention schedule for students and the schedule teachers will follow to monitor detention. Student detention takes place during school hours. Although teachers do make some
decisions concerning student detention, they are unhappy with the discipline policy set forth by the school board. This policy, according to one teacher, "is one which does not work with our students and cannot be changed by teachers at the school level."

Another area of participation in decision making involves staff development opportunities. At the beginning of the school year teachers are asked to indicate the types of workshops they feel are needed by the faculty. The principal then makes his decision usually in accordance with the majority's wishes. Two or three teachers are sent to staff development workshops throughout the year. They then report to other teachers in the school.

The final area of participation involves new program implementation. When a new program is introduced at the school, teachers are asked to decide on how it should be implemented. They then report to the principal, and he makes the final decision. One teacher stated, "If he [the principal] feels it is a good idea, he will do as we planned. If not, he makes his own suggestions and uses them in the final decision."

Teachers at Lincoln Elementary do participate in some areas of decision making. However, it is important to note that in each decision making area the principal makes the final decision. Teachers are aware of this and agree that he should make the final decisions because he is accountable for everything in the school. They are content to voice their opinions in the areas mentioned above.
Areas of decision making in which Lincoln teachers would like to participate include the discipline policy and the grading policy. Both policies are mandated by the school board, yet teachers believe they should have input on how students are disciplined and how to communicate student progress (grades) to parents. Because of the school board's decision, teachers must rely on recess detention instead of out of school suspension. They believe that the discipline policy should be changed so that it reflects the needs of each particular school. This policy would provide a more positive school climate.

The grading policy is also of concern to teachers at Lincoln Elementary. Teachers are told how many grades are to be given weekly and when to administer student achievement tests. According to one teacher, "The grading policy is designed by the school board, but we know more what our students need and what our parents expect. If we were allowed to decide on the grading policy at our school, we would have better evaluations of student progress and better teacher/parent communication." Another teacher stated, "Achievement tests are administered when the board instructs us to. We should be able to decide when our students are ready to take the test. Sometimes I think we test too early, which provides us with a poor indication of student progress."

The principal at Lincoln Elementary is approachable and friendly to the faculty. Communication at the school is usually formal through memos, bulletins, and faculty meetings. This means of communication informs teachers of
opportunities to participate on various committees or workshops. Teachers are encouraged to participate on a committee. However, if teachers do not volunteer, the principal assigns someone.

According to teachers, the principal has high expectations from his faculty and often praises them for their work. His usual demeanor is to allow teacher input on decisions that concern the school. He does, however, have the final say in all matters pertaining to the school.

**Summary of Qualitative Results From Schools Rated High in Transformational Leadership**

Teachers from the three schools rated high in the principals' transformational leadership behavior do experience some decision making opportunities. Areas of decision making include decisions on grade level concerns, staff development opportunities, technology in the classroom, curriculum, extra-curricular activities, student discipline, teacher funds, and new program implementation.

Teachers, in these particular schools, are often asked by the principal to participate on various committees in the school and to express their concerns and opinions about school related issues. They are not, however, involved in making the final decision. The final decision is made by the principal and is accepted by the teachers.
Although teachers experience some degree of participation in decision making, there are other areas of decision making in which they would like to participate. These areas include student discipline, grading, students assigned to the classroom, students removed from the classroom, technology, and the selection of textbooks. While some teachers express their desire to participate more on decision making committees, some teachers would prefer not to participate in any decision making activity. These teachers find themselves overloaded with mundane routines in the classroom which take up most of their extra time. In addition, some teachers have children of their own who require parental supervision that must be taken care of after school hours.

Principals in these three schools have good communication with faculty. Communication is both formal and informal. Teachers are informed throughout the week by memos, bulletins, and personal contact. Faculty meetings are held approximately four times a year and are also considered a good means of communication. The principal visits with teachers in their classrooms and invites them to visit the office. Teachers are often asked to express their opinions or suggestions concerning school decisions. However, in all three schools, the principal makes the final decision, with or without teacher input.
Schools Rated Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior

Madison Elementary

Setting

Madison Elementary is located in a small rural community. This community is about ten miles from a large city where residents work and do most of their shopping. The main school building is made of brick and houses administrative offices and most of the classrooms. Small butler building are located next to the school and house students in third and fourth grades. A concrete circular drive is located in front of the school and is used by buses and parents to drop-off or pick-up students.

The schools grounds are well kept. The grass is cut short and sidewalks well trimmed. The inside of the school building is waxed and shiny. Classrooms are kept clean, but are small and have little storage space for teaching materials and textbooks.

The student body consists of 808 students in pre-kindergarten through grade four. Faculty and staff total 54. Thirteen (24%) teachers possess a master’s degree or higher. Thirty-one percent of the classrooms contain 21-26 students. Third grade LEAP test scores indicate that 146 (92%) students passed both English and math (LDE, 1996).
Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Teachers at Madison Elementary are at a disadvantage when it comes to making decisions concerning school or teacher related activities. According to teachers, the principal has never asked for their opinions in matters related to the school. Instead, they are told “what to do and how to do it.” When a situation arises, teachers meet with the principal, who tells them not to worry and that matters will be taken care of. Unfortunately, some matters are not taken care of by the principal. One teacher stated, “If we wanted to do something or needed something we went to his office. He was usually nice and listened to our problems. He would then tell us that he would take care of them, but it never got done. He just told people what they wanted to hear.” Another teacher stated that “our principal dictates to us what to do and when to do it. He has never asked my opinion about anything. He makes all the decisions.”

Teachers at Madison Elementary are unsure about the types of decisions in which they would like to participate. Because the principal in this school has always made all the decisions, teachers are unaccustomed to making decisions and are therefore at a loss as to the types of decisions in which they would like to participate. One area teachers did mention was teacher funds. For example, each year the PTO gives money to teachers to buy teaching materials. Teachers were told to meet with the principal to discuss their needs and that the principal would then purchase these items. Teachers have followed this procedure, but they never
received materials. Another example involves the school’s playground equipment. Teachers pooled their funds to repair or replace the broken and dangerous playground equipment. Once again they were told it would be taken care of. At the end of the school year the playground equipment was still broken and dangerous, and they were informed that funds were no longer available.

According to teachers, computers are the principal’s only interest. He spends most school funds on computers. Teachers feel that computers are important, but that more important things are needed for teaching and learning. One teacher indicated:

Computers are his big thing. He spends everything on computers. We don’t know why because when our students go on to fifth grade there are no computers in the middle grade schools for them to follow through on. Therefore, it is pointless to teach them computers when they are not going to use them in middle school.

Another teacher stressed her concern by stating that “we have no money left and we never spent it on anything for the classroom. The only reason we can think of for lack of funds is that the principal spent all the money on computers.”

Communication between the principal and the teachers at Madison Elementary is sparse. Teachers described their principal as being quiet and to himself. They indicated that he spends most of his time in the office. His only means of communication is through memos left next to the sign-in sheet and at short faculty meetings. His secretary makes all other announcements over the PA system.
Classroom visitations are done only during the evaluation process. When one teacher was asked how her principal informed teachers that he wanted their input in decision making she stated that “He doesn’t, really. He sends us memos occasionally and has short faculty meetings. But again, this is only to tell us what to do. He is quiet and to himself and has trouble communicating with everyone. He comes from a junior high level and doesn’t know how to communicate with teachers, students, or parents on an elementary grade level.” Another teacher reinforced the principal’s lack of communication by stating, “One day some of our students saw the principal and told him hello. Our principal did not respond. He just walked back into his office.”

Roosevelt Elementary

Setting

Roosevelt Elementary is located in a middle to high income neighborhood. It is situated on the outskirts of a large city. The school is beautifully constructed of brown brick and has large oak and magnolia trees located on the grounds. A four foot fence surrounds the school with several gates used for entrance. The playground is filled with swing sets, seesaws, and other equipment that students play on at recess. The main building contains the administrative offices and most of the classrooms. Classrooms can only be entered from inside the building. The floors are shiny and the cinder block walls are painted a soft yellow. Bulletin boards are seen in every hall. Two small butler buildings are adjacent to the
school and house fifth grade students. A small brick building is located next to the school and is also used as classrooms.

Incorporated into the curriculum are three interesting educational programs. One program includes education for the gifted and talented students from the parish. These students are bused to Roosevelt Elementary once a week. Students participate in advanced and creative educational experiences.

The second program is entitled the French Immersion program. This program is offered to students in kindergarten through third grade. Students in this program are taught in English and in French. In order for students to qualify, parents or grandparents of these students must speak French and students must be academically ready to participate in this special program. A test is administered to all students prior to entering the program.

A third program involves special education for physically handicapped students or students diagnosed with a behavior disorder. Students who qualify are bused in from other schools in the parish.

Roosevelt Elementary has 418 students in kindergarten through grade five. The class size range is somewhat small. Fifteen percent of classrooms contain 1-21 students while three percent contain 27 or more students. Forty-three (90%) students passed the math section of the LEAP test, while 42 (84%) students passed the English section. The faculty consists of 42 teachers and staff members. Fifteen teachers hold a master's degree or higher (LDE, 1996).
Student discipline problems are of concern to teachers at Roosevelt Elementary. During the 1994-1995 school year, 64 students were suspended for serious infractions.

Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Teachers at Roosevelt Elementary have little participation in decision making. An area mentioned by teachers concerned the selection of textbooks and weekly readers for each grade level. Once a month teachers meet on grade level committees. They discuss the learning process in general and the textbooks they would like to use in the classroom. Chairpersons then meet with the principal and inform him of their needs. If feasible, the principal allows teachers to purchase the material they choose. According to one teacher, “Our principal makes most of the decisions. Occasionally he asks for suggestions from teachers, but very seldom uses them.”

Student discipline and budgetary matters are areas of decision making in which teachers would like to participate. According to teachers, student discipline is a problem in the school. The present discipline policy is not helping alleviate problems in the classroom or on the playground. One teacher emphasized this by stating that “all we do is discipline students. We can’t teach. We need to develop a discipline policy that the whole school will follow. We need consistency.” Another teacher indicated, “I would like to share input in the area of discipline.
But every time I mention discipline the principal tells us it is a school board policy and cannot be changed.”

Deciding on how teacher funds are spent is another area of interest for teachers. Two budgetary matters mentioned were funds given to teachers to purchase supplies and extra funds for teacher aides or nurses. Teachers stated that they receive money for teaching materials and supplies, but, they must get the principal's approval prior to buying anything. Sometimes he rejects their proposal and tells them what he wants teachers to purchase. One teacher stated that she would like to make decisions on how funds are spent. “I know we have to follow school board regulations, but there are some things we need that the school board is not aware of. For example, we could use another aide and school nurse. But we are not allowed to make those types of decisions.”

Another issue mentioned by teachers was that some teachers do not want to participate in decision making. These teachers do not want to be responsible for decisions and would prefer to simply teach. One teacher serving on the faculty advisory committee and on the school wide planning committee said, “The school is moving towards more teacher participation in decision making. However, more teachers will be expected to participate and some teachers are not interested.”

Communication is both formal and informal at Roosevelt Elementary. The principal communicates through memos, bulletins, faculty meetings and personal contact. The principal, although a quiet individual, does speak to teachers and
keeps up with happenings in the classroom. He does not, however, elicit teacher input on issues pertaining to the school. Instead, he usually makes the decisions and informs teachers after the fact. One teacher described her principal this way: “Our principal does not want our input because he is the principal and he makes the decisions. He does ask us what we need in the classroom, but that doesn’t mean we will get what we want.”

Kennedy Elementary

Setting

Kennedy Elementary is located in a middle income neighborhood. It is constructed of brown brick on the outside and cinder blocks on the inside. The building is built Acadian style and has a beautiful Acadian decor located next to the main entrance. The arrangement consists of a large black pot, once used to boil sugar cane, surrounded by antique farming equipment. Classrooms are connected to the main building with an outside entrance for each. Eight butler building are situated next to the school and are used as fifth grade classrooms.

A six foot fence surrounds the school. Students and visitors enter the school grounds through a double gate that is locked each night. The playground is large and is equipped with swings and slides.

No special magnet programs are offered at Kennedy Elementary. However, a profound class for mentally impaired students has been implemented to provide special education to students living in the neighborhood.
Kennedy Elementary houses 973 students in grades four through eight. Sixty-two faculty members are employed. Twenty-nine (47%) teachers have a master’s degree or higher. One hundred seventy-six (90%) students passed the LEAP test in both English and math (LDE, 1996).

Student class sizes are rather large. Seventy-three percent of the classrooms contain 27 or more students. Student discipline is a concern to teachers in this school. During the 1994-1995 school year, 228 students were suspended for serious infractions.

Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Teachers at Kennedy Elementary are not involved in the decision making process. Teachers are asked for input in some areas but do not influence the final decision made by the principal. Some teachers are members of the effective schools committee, but, they have not attended a meeting in a while. When they do attend, subject matter pertaining to school improvement, either through curriculum or discipline, is discussed. Although discussions on how to improve the school are conducted by teachers, decision making is left up to the principal. One teacher observed, “Even if we had to make a decision we probably would not know how.”

Teachers would like to participate in decisions concerning student discipline and the number of students placed in the classroom. Discipline, according to teachers is a big problem in the school. One teacher said, “I would
like help decide on a better plan of action for those students who continuously give trouble. When we bring this up to the principal he tells us it [the discipline policy] comes from the school board. I believe we could think of a better plan.”

Another issue mentioned by teachers is that some teachers do not want to participate in decision making. One teacher in particular indicated that she has three children of her own and does not have the extra time needed to participate on a committee. She stated, “I don’t really have time to stay after school and attend a meeting. I would not mind participating during school hours. Also, if I could help make decisions about the number of students in the classroom or the subjects I would teach I would probably be more interested.”

Although little participation in decision making is experienced by teachers, principal/teacher communication is high. The principal communicates formally through bulletins and faculty meetings and informally through personal contact. At times the principal asks for teacher volunteers to chair committees, but often, he does not follow through with their input. Often the principal will approach a teacher he believes is knowledgeable in a particular area and asks her to participate on a committee. The principal has good rapport with faculty, students, and parents, but as one teacher stated, “He [the principal] still makes all the decisions.”
Summary of Qualitative Results From Schools Rated Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior

Interviews of teachers in the three schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior indicate that teachers very seldom or never participate in the decision making process. Teachers are usually not asked to participate and are in fact told what to do by the principal. Some teachers in one school mentioned that they were allowed to select the textbooks and weekly readers to be used in the classroom. However, this was not the consensus of the six teachers interviewed. Overall, teachers indicated that they were not allowed to voice their opinion or to suggest possible solutions to problems existing in the school. Problem-solving and decision making were viewed as the principal's responsibility only. Teachers' conceptions of participation in decision making are portrayed to them by the principal. Teachers accept this portrayal because they lack experience in expressing their concerns and wishes.

Areas of participation in decision making in which teachers would like to participate include teacher funds, student discipline, number of students in the classroom, and playground equipment. Lack of motivation to participate was also mentioned by teachers. Some teachers expressed that they do not want to make decisions other than what they will teach each day. One possible explanation for the apathy expressed by teachers is that they have never participated in decision making and are therefore unsure whether they know how to make decisions.
Although teacher participation in decision making is not evident in these three schools, communication between the principal and the teachers is rated high. Two of the schools have both formal and informal lines of communication. The principal is outgoing and friendly and communicates through memos, bulletins, faculty meetings, and personal contact. One school reported having only formal communication. The principal in this school held short faculty meetings approximately four times a year and never ventured out of the office during the day. The secretary, instead of the principal, makes daily announcements over the PA system.

Differences in Teacher Participation in Decision Making in Schools Rated High and Schools Rated Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior

Teachers from the six schools previously mentioned were selected to participate in the qualitative component of the study. Two teachers from three schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior and two teachers from three schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior were interviewed after school hours, in their respective schools.

In this section I contrast teachers' perceptions of their participation in decision making in the schools rated high in the principals' transformational leadership behavior and in schools rated low in the principals' transformational leadership behavior. Results are discussed below. According to teachers, a moderate to high degree of teacher participation is evidenced in schools rated high
in transformational leadership behavior while teacher participation in decision making in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior is sparse. Teachers in schools rated high participate in eight areas of decision making. These areas include grade level decisions, staff development, technology, curriculum issues, extracurricular activities, student discipline, program implementation, and teacher funds. Conversely, teachers in schools rated low participate in only one area of decision making: grade level decisions. (See Table 5.2).

When data are compared to areas of decision making in which teachers would like to participate, teachers from schools rated high mentioned seven areas of decision making while schools rated low in transformational leadership mentioned only four areas in which they would like to participate. (See Table 5.3). Areas of decision making in which teachers in schools rated high would like to participate include students assigned to their classrooms, student removal from classrooms, textbook selection, technology, grading policy, student discipline, and playground equipment. Teachers in schools rated low wish to participate in making decisions concerning students assigned to their classroom, student discipline, teacher funds, and playground equipment.

A lack of desire to participate in the decision making process was also mentioned by teachers from both schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior. Two teachers in one school rated high
Table 5.2

Areas of Teacher Participation in Decision Making in Both Schools Rated High in Transformational Leadership Behavior and Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior Index (n=6 schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + Indicates Areas of Participation in Decision Making By School.
Table 5.3

Areas of Teacher Participation in Decision Making in Which Teachers Would Like to Participate in Schools Rated High in Transformal Leadership Behavior and Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior Index (n=6 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Student Assign.</th>
<th>Student Removal</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Grading Policy</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Teacher Funds</th>
<th>Do Not Wish To Participate</th>
<th>Playground Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: + Indicates Areas of Participation in Decision Making In Which Teachers Would Like to Participate By School.*
indicated that they did not care to participate in decision making while four teachers in two schools rated low expressed their lack of desire to be part of the decision making process. Principals, in both schools rated high and in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior are viewed, by teachers, as having a high level of communication with teachers (see Table 5.4). This does not necessarily indicate that communication by principals is used to solicit teacher participation in decision making. According to teachers in schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior, the principal is instrumental in motivating and/or encouraging teachers to participate in the decision making process. On the other hand, teachers in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior, indicate that their principal very seldom and sometimes never invites them to participate in the decision making process. (See Table 5.5).

In conclusion, teachers in schools with principals rated high in transformational leadership behavior participate in more decision making activities than do teachers in schools with principals rated low in transformational leadership behavior. However, teachers in both schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior, express a desire to participate in more areas of decision making while others do not share that desire. Although good communication by principals was evident in both school rated high and low, results indicate that good communication by principals does not necessarily produce a high level of teacher participation in decision making.
Table 5.4

Types of Communication Used by Principals in Schools Rated High in Transformational Leadership Behavior and Schools Rated Low in Transformational Leadership Behavior

Index (n=6 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Memos</th>
<th>Bulletins</th>
<th>Personal Contact</th>
<th>Faculty Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + Indicates the Ways in Which Principals Foster Teacher Participation in Decision Making By Schools.
Table 5.5

Types of Communication Used by Principals to Foster Teacher Participation in Decision Making in Schools Rated High in Transformational Leadership Behavior and School Rated Low in Transformational leadership Behavior Index (n=6 Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Memos</th>
<th>Bulletins</th>
<th>Personal Contact</th>
<th>Faculty Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Elem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Elem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: + Indicates the Ways in Which Principals Foster Teacher Participation in Decision Making by Schools.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Overview of the Study

In restructured schools, specifically site-based managed schools, principals and teachers make decisions together to enhance learning and improve schooling. The main purpose of the present study was to explore the gap in research concerning the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of the transformational leadership behavior of principals and their perceptions of teacher participation in decision making in those schools. Transformational leadership behavior was defined as the behavior of principals that helps build new relationships between teachers and principals. Principals who exemplify this type of behavior motivate teachers to work toward school goals, to meet personal goals, and to participate in the decision making process.

Teacher participation in decision making was referred to as the participation of teachers in deciding issues that relate to the improvement of schools and student achievement. In essence, teachers participate with the principal in a shared power relationship. The basic tenet of teacher participation in decision making is that teachers may exercise their expertise in making decisions that will shape the way their job is done, which gives them a sense of ownership in the school.
Site-based management was the context in which the study took place. It was defined as the shift of decision making responsibility from the central office to the local school. Proponents of site-based management argue that site-based management is a restructuring effort that can bring about changes in education by empowering principals and teachers to create conditions in schools that will enhance student learning and improve the quality of schools.

The George Washington School District was selected to participate in this study. According to Regional Service Center Managers employed by the State Department of Education, this school district contained the elements of restructuring defined in the study. Results of current research on school restructuring in Louisiana (Pol, 1996), however, indicate that the George Washington School District had intentions of restructuring but after years of planning, the school board voted against pursuing the initiative further. According to Pol (1992), some schools in the district did portray a moderate level of restructuring. However, most were defined as having little restructuring components. Results of the present study reflect some of the findings by Pol (1996), and also shed new light on the constructs of teacher participation in decision making and transformational leadership behavior of principals.
This chapter begins with a brief discussion of the investigation and conclusions based on the findings. The discussion continues with recommendations for further research.

**Research Questions**

Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies were utilized in the present study. The quantitative component consisted of an exploration of four research questions while the qualitative component consisted of six case studies of 12 teachers in six participating schools. In this section quantitative research questions are re-stated and results discussed followed by a discussion of the results of the six case studies conducted in the qualitative section. The discussion then continues with the conclusions and recommendations.

1. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the concept of leadership behavior?

The present study was based on Leithwood’s (1992) research on the transformational leadership behavior of principals in restructured schools. According to Leithwood, transformational leadership behavior is a multidimensional construct composed of six dimensions. The factor analysis conducted on the data collected in the present study also revealed the multidimensionality of transformational leadership behavior, but it contained only three dimensions. All 24 items contained in the *Leadership Behavior*
Questionnaire loaded on one of the three dimensions. Because of these results, the three dimensions were renamed as "models behavior," "instructional leadership behavior," and "high expectations behavior."

Results of the factor analysis are beneficial to researchers and school organizations in that they confirm the multidimensionality of transformational leadership behavior and define the types of principal leadership behavior needed in restructured schools. Researchers may consider these findings when studying restructured schools, including site-based managed schools. According to researchers (Knight, 1992; Fernandez, 1990; Doggett, 1990; Guthrie, 1986), the role of the principal in restructured schools is dramatically changed. That is, the principal in restructured schools should possess leadership behavior that will transform the way schools are managed. The principal who exemplifies transformational leadership behavior may do this by encouraging teachers to work for transcendental goals, seek self-actualization in the classroom, and become self-motivated (Leithwood, 1992).

School organizations may also profit from these results. An important aspect of school restructuring is the leadership of the principal (Blase & Kirby, 1992; Kirby, et. al, 1992; Imber & Neidt, 1990). School organizations may use these results as criteria to employ principals who possess transformational leadership behaviors. For example, principals in restructured schools, such as site-based managed schools, must have the ability to communicate goals, support
efforts of individual teacher needs, establish the school's vision, and share power
and responsibility with teachers and staff (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). School
organization administrators may use the types of behavior defined in the present
study when seeking suitable principals to administer to the needs of teachers and
staff in restructured schools.

These findings reinforce the theory that transformational leadership
behavior is a multidimensional construct. It also delineates specific dimensions
and areas of transformational leadership behavior most valued by teachers.

2. Which separate empirically determined dimensions underlie the
concept of teacher participation in decision making?

Teacher participation in decision making, defined by Bacharach et al.
(1990), was the basis of the present study. In their research, Bacharach et al.
concluded that teacher participation in decision making was a multidimensional
construct consisting of four dimensions. Results of the present study also
confirmed the multidimensionality of teacher participation in decision making.
Data factored into four dimensions, but items loading on each dimension did not
load on the same dimensions described by Bacharach, et al. (1990). For
example, items loading on dimension one in the present study were 9, 10, 11, 12,
14, 17, 18, and 19. Items contained in dimension one reported by Bacharach, et
al. include 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Because items loaded differently, dimensions
were assigned new names. These are "organizational policies," "managerial procedures," "instructional procedures I," and "instructional procedures II."

These findings provide pertinent information concerning the multidimensionality of the construct and delineates the types of decisions in which teachers may participate. According to Bacharach, et al. (1990), these findings are essential in providing strategic decision domains in which teachers may become involved. Delineating specific decision making domains is beneficial to researchers, principals and teachers. Knowing specific areas of decision making can help enable teachers to participate in decisions they desire to participate instead of decisions that are superficial or less important to the education of students.

3. To what degree does a relationship exist between teachers' perceptions of transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in decision making in site-based managed schools?

A canonical correlation was conducted to explain the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making. Results indicate that items related to dimension two, "instructional behavior" contributed more to the leadership variable than the other two dimensions and that teacher participation in decision making dimension two "managerial procedures" contains types of decisions most valued by teachers.
Only one canonical correlation was found to be statistically significant in the study. The “instructional behavior” of principals (dimension two), was perceived by teachers as the type of principal leadership behavior that encourages more teacher participation in decision making. Principals who exercise “instructional behaviors” empower teachers to participate in decisions concerning the development and implementation of school goals, provide support for implementing these goals, and provide for staff development opportunities (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991).

These results also substantiate findings by Leithwood et al. (1991). According to Leithwood et al., the principal is the key to teacher involvement in decision making. Principals who exemplify “instructional behaviors” mirror to teachers their concern for the well-being of teachers. They are caring, honest, and attentive to the needs of teachers. They listen to new and innovative ideas by teachers and provide opportunities for the implementation of these ideas.

Principals exemplifying “instructional behaviors” encourage teachers to develop their own interest and to reach their leadership potential. They stress teacher development and involvement in individual growth, self-improvement; and they include teachers in developing school goals. The principal, in this case, is also facilitator of group decision making in which teachers are given the opportunity for reflective thinking in the solving of every day problems, to share
experiences with colleagues, and to ask for help when needed (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991).

According to teachers, the "managerial procedures" dimension of teacher participation in decision making contains items of decision making they value most. This dimension contains items relating to decisions concerning student assignments, removal of students from the classroom, planning the use of facilities, budget development, and expenditures. These results are consistent with both the quantitative and qualitative components of the present study.

In the quantitative component of the study, teachers rated their participation in decisions pertaining to the "managerial procedures" dimension lowest of the four dimensions. Although these areas of decision making are most valued by teachers, these areas are offered the least often in the decision making process in their school.

In the qualitative component of the study, the majority of teachers stated that they do not participate in making decisions concerning areas contained in the "managerial procedures" dimension. In fact, teachers listed these types of decisions as areas in which they would like to participate. Teachers at Taylor Elementary were the only teachers to indicate that they participate on budgetary matters. However, teachers from Taylor Elementary, Kennedy Elementary, Madison Elementary, and Roosevelt Elementary indicated that decisions
concerning student assignment, student removal from the classroom, and teacher 

funds as areas in which they would like to participate.

Defining the construct teacher participation in decision making is essential 

if school administrators and policy makers are to increase teacher participation in 

the decision making process. Administrators who know specific areas of decision 

making may encourage greater participation by teachers. Policy makers who 

target those areas of decision making most valued by teachers may also encourage 

more teacher participation. According to Bacharach, et al. (1990), delineating 

strategic decision making areas in which teachers may participate, would increase 

teacher participation, producing a more desired effect.

4. Is there a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of 

participation in decision making when schools are classified into two 

groups composed of schools where teachers perceive a high degree of 

transformational leadership behavior displayed by the principal and 

schools where teachers perceive a low degree of transformational 

leadership behavior displayed by the principal?

To determine schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational 

leadership behavior, a median split was performed using school mean scores. 

Results of the independent group t-tests revealed that transformational leadership 

behavior dimension two, “instructional behavior” had a significant effect on
teacher participation in decision making in schools rated high in transformational leadership.

A significant difference in teacher participation exist between schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior. According to teachers' perceptions, principals in schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior encourage teachers to participate in decisions related to the "managerial procedures" dimension more than do principals in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior.

Case Study Results

Twelve teachers in six schools participated in the six case studies. A median split was conducted on the mean scores of each school to determine schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior. A total of 12 teachers, two from each school, were selected by the principal to participate in the interview process. Teachers participated on a volunteer basis only. Teachers were asked to describe the types of decisions they were involved in making, types of decisions in which they would like to participate, and ways in which their principal fostered teacher participation in decision making.

Results of the six case studies indicate that teachers in schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior participate more often and in more areas of decision making than do teachers in schools rated low in transformational
leadership behavior. However, teacher participation in schools rated high in transformational leadership behavior is considered low when schools are viewed individually instead of as a group. For example, when schools are grouped together, teachers in the three schools expressed that they participate in eight areas of decision making. When schools are examined individually, teachers at Taylor Elementary indicated that they participate in five of the eight areas while teachers at Lincoln Elementary participate in four areas and teachers at Jefferson Elementary participate in three areas.

Teachers in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior expressed having a low degree of participation in decision making. Teachers at Roosevelt Elementary mentioned one area of participation: grade level decisions. Teachers at both Madison Elementary and Kennedy Elementary expressed having no participation in decision making whatsoever.

In the areas of decision making in which teachers would like to participate, seven were mentioned by teachers in schools rated high and six were mentioned by teachers in schools rated low. These results are once again misleading when schools are viewed as a group instead of individually. When schools are viewed individually, teachers at Taylor Elementary expressed a desire to participate in four areas of decision making, while teachers at Lincoln Elementary and Jefferson Elementary each expressed a desire to participate in two areas of decision making.
Teachers in schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior expressed a desire to participate in six areas of decision making. Teachers at Roosevelt Elementary and Kennedy Elementary expressed a desire to participate in three areas of decision making while teachers at Madison Elementary expressed a desire to participate in two areas.

According to teachers, principals in both schools rated high and schools rated low in transformational leadership behavior display high levels of communication with teachers. Formal and informal channels of communication are utilized by principals from both types of schools. Principals communicate through memos, bulletins, personal contact, and faculty meetings.

Although there is a high level of communication by principals at both schools rated high and schools rated low, only principals in schools rated high use memos, bulletins, personal contact, and faculty meetings as means of communication to foster teacher participation in decision making. According to teachers, principals in schools rated low very seldom and sometimes never invites them to participate in making decisions in their school.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the present study, three major recommendations are discussed in this section. First, further study is needed on the constructs of transformational leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making in restructured schools, such as site-based managed schools.
Schools participating in the present study were initially selected because of the restructuring efforts reported by Regional Service Center Managers. However, as results in the present study and in the study by Pol (1996) indicate, this school district did not implement many components of site-based management. Although some restructuring was evidenced in some schools (Pol, 1996), the majority of schools did not contain restructuring components. One reason this school district decided not to restructure was because of objections from conservative religious groups who protested on the issues of morality (Pol, 1996).

In order to gain a true picture of the transformational leadership behavior of principals and teacher participation in decision making, these constructs must be studied in schools that have been restructured to a greater extent than George Washington.

Second, it is recommended that researchers delineate specific areas of decision making in which teachers may participate (Bacharach, et al., 1990). Defining specific areas of participation may enable teachers to participate in decisions in which they desire to participate instead of participating in decisions that are less important to them and to the education process. In doing so, teachers may be motivated to become more involved in decision making and thus have a sense of ownership in the school (Sarason, 1990).

Finally, it is recommended that school organizations and policy makers in restructured schools become more aware of the types of behavior associated with
the transformational leadership behavior of principals. According to Leithwood (1992), the principal who exhibits transformational leadership behaviors may motivate teachers to participate in decisions that effect students in the classroom and the overall quality of schooling. Employing these types of principals may be beneficial to students and teachers in restructured schools, such as site-based managed schools.
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Appendix A

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire
Leadership Behavior Questionnaire

Listed below are statements describing leadership behaviors. For each of the statements please indicate how often your principal displays the leadership behavior described.

Key: Use one of the following four responses.
(1) Seldom or never  (2) Occasionally  (3) Often  (4) Always or almost always

1. Has both the capacity and judgment to overcome most obstacles.............................................................................1 2 3 4

2. Provides for extended training to develop my knowledge and skills..............................................................................1 2 3 4

3. Provides for our participation in the process of developing school goals..............................................................................1 2 3 4

4. Provides the necessary resources to support my implementation of school goals.........................................................1 2 3 4

5. Challenges me to reexamine some basic assumptions I have about my work with students................................................1 2 3 4

6. Insists on only the best performance from us..............................................1 2 3 4

7. Leads by 'doing' rather than simply by 'telling'..............................................1 2 3 4

8. Commands respect from everyone in the school..............................................1 2 3 4

9. Encourages teachers to work toward the same school goals.................................1 2 3 4

10. Treats me as an individual with unique needs and expertise.........................................................1 2 3 4

11. Stimulates me to think about what I am doing for my students.........................................................1 2 3 4

12. Shows us that there are high expectations for us as professionals.........................................................1 2 3 4
Key: Use one of the following four responses.

(1) Seldom or never (2) Occasionally (3) Often (4) Always or almost always

13. Excites us with visions of what we may be able to accomplish if we work together to accomplish school goals.

14. Symbolizes success and accomplishment within our profession.

15. Uses problem solving with staff to generate school goals.

16. Takes my opinion into consideration when initiating actions that affect my work.

17. Provides information that helps me think of ways to implement school goals.

18. Will not settle for second best in performance of our work.

19. Makes us feel and act like leaders.

20. Gives us a sense of overall purpose.

21. Provides good models for us to follow.

22. Works toward whole staff consensus in establishing priorities for school goals.

23. Encourages us regularly to evaluate our progress toward achievement of school goals.

24. Behaves in a manner thoughtful of my personal needs.
Appendix B

Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire
### TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

A. Various decisions are made in any school or school district. How often do YOU have the opportunity to participate in decision-making in each of the following areas? Circle ONE response for EACH item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Seldom or never</th>
<th>(2) Occasionally</th>
<th>(3) Often</th>
<th>(4) Always or almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The school to which you are assigned.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The subject(s) or grade level(s) you are assigned to teach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Assignment of students to your class(es).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Removing students from your classroom for special instruction or assistance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Designing or planning the use of facilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Budget development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expenditure priorities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Staff hiring.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Evaluations of your performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Student discipline codes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Standardized testing policy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Grading policies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Procedures for reporting student achievement/progress to parents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Students rights.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. What to teach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. How to teach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. The textbooks and workbooks that will be available for use.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. The specific textbooks and workbooks that you will use in your class(es).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Staff development opportunities offered by your school/school district.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Sometimes it is important that teachers participate in school decisions that affect their work and sometimes it is less important that they do so. In your judgment and based on your experience, either participating or not participating in decision-making, how often should you have the opportunity to participate in decision-making in each of the following areas? Circle ONE response for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Seldom or never</th>
<th>(2) Occasionally</th>
<th>(3) Often</th>
<th>(4) Always or almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The school to which you are assigned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The subject(s) or grade level(s) you are assigned to teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Assignment of students to your class(es).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Removing students from your classroom for special instruction or assistance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Designing or planning the use of facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Budget development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expenditure priorities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Staff hiring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Evaluations of your performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Student discipline codes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Standardized testing policy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Grading policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Procedures for reporting student achievement/progress to parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Students rights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. What to teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. How to teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. The textbooks and workbooks that will be available for use.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. The specific textbooks and workbooks that you will use in your class(es).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Staff development opportunities offered by your school/school district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Of the items (a-s) to which you just responded, which three are the most important to you? (Put one letter in each box.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>SECOND MOST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>THIRD MOST IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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D. Please answer the following items about yourself by circling the appropriate number.

a. Do you teach at an:

Elementary school 1
High School 2
Other (Specify) __________________

f. Your race:

White 1
African-American 2
Other (Specify) __________________

b. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

0-3 1
4-9 2
10-14 3
15-19 4
20-25 5
26-30 6
Over 30 7

g. Your sex:

Female 1
Male 2

h. Your age:

less than 20 1
20-30 2
31-40 3
41-50 4
51-60 5
Over 60 6

c. What is your highest degree?

Bachelor's 1
Master's 2
Specialist 3
Doctorate 4
Other (Specify) __________________

d. Are you a member of the school-based decision making committee?

Yes 1
No 2

Thank you.
Appendix D

Correspondence to Superintendent
December 1995

Dear Superintendent:

My name is Sherry Cormier. I am a doctoral student, working on my dissertation in the Department of Educational Administration at Louisiana State University. The purpose of this correspondence is to obtain permission to conduct a research project in your school district.

The purpose of the study is to determine if a relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership behavior and teachers' participation in the decision making process in restructured schools. To conduct this study, I will ask teachers to complete two questionnaires. I will also interview teachers from some of the schools participating. Enclosed is a brief description of the research project and a copy of the questionnaires to be used in the study.

I believe that the inclusion of your school system in this study and the results will be beneficial in providing information that will enhance education for all students. Therefore, I am asking your permission to include schools housing grades kindergarten through grade five in this study.

If more information is needed please contact me at the above address.

Sincerely,

Sherry Cormier
Dear Principal:

I want to again thank you for agreeing to participate in this important study. As I mentioned before, this project is for my dissertation. I am a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Louisiana State University. I write this follow-up letter as a reminder that the two questionnaires (Leadership Behavior and Teacher Participation in Decision Making) I sent you are to be returned by the end of this week.

This study is designed to examine if a relationship exist between principals’ leadership behavior and teacher participation in decision making as perceived by teachers. It is important that all of the regular education teachers teaching kindergarten through grade five complete the questionnaires and return them to me this week. The inclusion of your school in this study and the results would be beneficial in providing information that will enhance the quality of schooling. Please note that all responses and school identities will be kept confidential.

Again, I thank you for participating in this important study. If you have any questions, please contact me at the above address.

Sincerely,

Sherry Cormier
Teachers will respond to the following interview questions.

1. What types of decisions are you involved in making in your school?

2. In what types of decisions would you like to participate?

3. In what ways does your principal foster teacher participation in decision making?
Vita

Sherry Cormier dropped out of high school at the end of her tenth grade year. She married Ed Cormier at the age of 15. In 1969 she received her GED from Eunice High School. After her third child was born, Sherry enrolled at Louisiana State University at Eunice where she earned an Associate degree in Education. In December of 1975, Sherry earned a bachelor of arts degree in Education from McNeese State University.

Sherry taught in the public school system for ten years. After school hours she worked as a volunteer in the religious education program in her Church parish. She then began the certification process through the Diocese of Lafayette. Sherry received her certification as Director of Religious Education in 1986.

In 1982, Sherry retired as a teacher in the public school system. She continued her volunteer work until 1986 when she took the position of Director of Religious Education in her Church parish. In this position she directed and coordinated all the educational and administrative activities in the parish. She implemented new programs and promoted parental involvement, especially in the sacramental programs. She worked closely with the religious education department of Diocese of Lafayette. Sherry wrote six of the eight courses required for catechist certification. She was a
mentor to future Directors of Religious Education and for candidates in the Pastoral Ministries program.

During this time Sherry enrolled at Loyola University in New Orleans. She received a master's degree in Religious Education in 1990. Upon completion of her studies at Loyola she decided to pursue a doctorate in educational administration at Louisiana State University. She was accepted as a graduate assistant in the Department of Education where she worked as an editorial assistant for the *Urban Education Journal*. While working on her doctorate, Sherry earned a master of education degree.

After completing all the required courses of study for the doctoral degree, Sherry took the position of principal at Rayne Catholic Elementary where she presently works. She is administrator to 365 students and 30 faculty and staff members. Sherry enjoys her work and plans to remain at Rayne Catholic Elementary.
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