

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY  
IN THE SCHOOL

by



WILLIAM STEWART SIMPKINS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

JULY, 1968

## ABSTRACT

The study made a survey of the distribution of decision-making authority in a group of elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. An analysis was made of the distribution of decision-making authority between the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and forms of higher official authority for twelve task activities. The distribution patterns were those reflected in the perceptions and preferences of teachers in fourteen Edmonton schools.

The variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by each decision source across the set of twelve task activities was taken to indicate the pattern of specification of the teacher's work role. The relative decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for each task was taken to indicate the distribution pattern of decision-making authority associated with the task.

The distribution patterns of decision-making authority were classified according to authority structures recognized in the literature on formal organization.

Criteria of distribution patterns were based on a review of the literature on authority structures in both educational and non-educational organizations. Particular account was taken of adaptive authority structures which

accommodate professional and hierarchical authority systems in the formal organization.

The instruments used in the survey were developed for the purpose of the present study.

In general, perceived patterns of role specification were similar to those characteristic of the semi-professional organization. Meaningful distribution patterns of decision-making authority identified for each of the twelve task activities were also similar to those characteristic of the semi-professional organization. The perceived distribution patterns only partially met the criteria of adaptive authority patterns.

Little support was obtained for a direct relationship between the perceived distribution of decision-making authority and schools classified according to the socioeconomic status of the community setting. Limited differences were obtained in the perceived distribution of decision-making authority in schools classified according to educational level.

There was a basic difference between the perceived and preferred patterns of role specification. As against teacher perceptions, teachers preferred the formal staff group to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority in a number of school matters external to classroom management.

Meaningful distribution patterns preferred for each task shared some of the features of those characteristic of the full-fledged professional organization. The data indicated that teachers desired a substantial shift in the balance of power perceived to exist between the teacher and higher official authority. The desire for change was noticeable in school task areas external to classroom management.

However, unqualified support for the full-fledged professional ideology was not reflected in teacher preferences. In some matters related to basic goal definition, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise major decision-making authority. Nevertheless, general support was obtained for the view that teachers favoured an allocation of authority which diffused authority among those affected by the decision. In contrast, evidence on teacher perceptions was consistent with the body of research and opinion which holds that the school remains essentially bureaucratic in organizational style, with considerable teacher autonomy being retained for immediate teaching tasks.

The preferred distribution patterns only partially met the criteria of adaptive authority patterns.

Little support was obtained for a direct relationship between the preferred distribution of decision-making

authority and schools classified according to the socio-economic status of the community setting. Again, there was little evidence of substantial variations in the preferences of teachers classified according to sex, length of experience and length of training. Limited differences were obtained in the preferred distribution of decision-making authority in schools classified according to educational level.

Evidence on teacher preferences and perceptions indicated basic differences in the kinds of organizational participation perceived and preferred by teachers. The data indicated a desire on the part of teachers for a higher degree of involvement in decision-making than that which they experienced. In addition, the data suggested that teachers wanted a greater variety of means of participation than that which they experienced.

The findings indicated that it was feasible to measure the distribution patterns of decision-making authority for selected tasks in the school. The evidence on distribution patterns provided considerable support for the value of the concepts and the methods of analysis used in the study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer acknowledges the assistance given by Dr. D. Friesen, supervisor of the thesis, and by Dr. D. A. MacKay and Dr. R. E. Baird, members of the supervisory committee. Sincere appreciation is expressed for their advice and interest.

The discussions with Mr. W. Muir, Mr. H. D. Hemphill and Mr. E. A. Holdaway on methods of data analysis were of assistance.

Sincere thanks are extended to my wife and family for their part in making the study possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction. . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	3
Importance of the Study . . . . .	6
Authority Structure and Related Organi- zational Properties . . . . .	6
Prescription of the Work Role . . . . .	9
Problems of Administration and Planning	11
Literature on organizational structure . . . . .	11
The satisfaction of organizational needs . . . . .	13
The satisfaction of teacher needs . . . . .	15
Research Methodology . . . . .	16
Summary. . . . .	18
References for Chapter I. . . . .	21
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: PART I. . . . .	23
Concept of Multiple Authority Structures	23
Variations from Polar Conceptions of Organization . . . . .	23
Organizations Employing Professionals.	26
Plans in Business and Industry . . . . .	29
Participation and the Decision-Making Process. . . . .	32

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Concept of Differential Efficiency .	36
Importance of the Task and the	
Technology . . . . .	36
Importance of Worker Characteristics .	38
Nature of the Technology . . . . .	38
Multiple Authority Structures in Schools.	39
Summary . . . . .	43
References for Chapter II. . . . .	45
III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: PART II. . . . .	49
Authority and Decision-Making . . . . .	49
Authority Structure and Formal Organi-	
zation. . . . .	50
Professional and Administrative	
Authority. . . . .	51
Probability of the Use of Authority. .	53
Authority Source or Locus of Authority.	53
Delegated Authority and Exercised	
Authority. . . . .	53
Authority as a Property and Authority	
as a Relationship . . . . .	55
Power as a Fixed or Variable Property .	55
Role Concepts and Decision-Making . . . . .	56
The Concept of Work Role . . . . .	56
Work Control Practices . . . . .	57
The Decision-Making Process . . . . .	58



CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary . . . . .	59
References for Chapter III. . . . .	61
IV. COLLECTION, CLASSIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT	
OF DATA . . . . .	63
Collection of Data . . . . .	63
Classification of Data . . . . .	66
Example: preparation of data for	
classification. . . . .	67
Classification System. . . . .	69
Rationale of the Classification System	73
Appraisal of Distribution Patterns . .	75
Appropriateness of the Guidelines. .	80
Decision-Making Authority and	
Professionalization. . . . .	82
Summary . . . . .	84
References for Chapter IV . . . . .	86
V. SUB-PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES . . . . .	89
Distribution of Decision-Making Authority	
as Perceived by Teachers. . . . .	89
Primary Hypotheses. . . . .	89
Secondary Hypotheses . . . . .	93
Formal Statement of Primary Hypotheses	95
Hypothesis 1.1. Role Specification.	96
Hypothesis 1.2. Distribution Patterns	96
Hypothesis 1.3. Distribution Patterns	97

CHAPTER	PAGE
Hypothesis 1.4. Distribution Patterns	97
Formal Statement of Secondary Hypotheses	97
Hypothesis 1.5. Group Differences . . .	98
Distribution of Decision-Making Authority	
as Preferred by Teachers . . . . .	99
Primary Hypotheses . . . . .	99
Secondary Hypotheses . . . . .	103
Formal Statement of Primary Hypotheses .	104
Hypothesis 2.1. Role Specification . .	104
Hypothesis 2.2. Distribution Patterns .	105
Hypothesis 2.3. Distribution Patterns .	106
Hypothesis 2.4. Distribution Patterns .	106
Formal Statement of Secondary Hypotheses.	106
Hypothesis 2.5. Group Differences . .	106
Hypothesis 2.6. Group Differences . .	107
Hypothesis 2.7. Group Differences . .	107
Comparison of the Perceived and	
Preferred Distribution of Decision-	
Making Authority . . . . .	107
Formal Statement of Hypotheses . . .	107
Hypothesis 3.1. Role Specification .	108
Hypothesis 3.2. Distribution Patterns	108
Hypothesis 3.3. Group Differences. .	108
Summary . . . . .	108

CHAPTER	PAGE
References for Chapter V . . . . .	110
VI. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	112
Data Collection. . . . .	112
The Sample . . . . .	114
The Instruments. . . . .	117
Statistical Techniques . . . . .	121
Computer Analysis . . . . .	121
Statistical Treatment of Data . . . . .	123
Specification of Teacher's Role. . . . .	123
Distribution Patterns of Decision-	
making Authority . . . . .	123
Limitations . . . . .	126
Summary . . . . .	128
References for Chapter VI . . . . .	129
VII. RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:	
PERCEIVED DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS . . . . .	130
Primary Hypotheses . . . . .	130
Role Specification. . . . .	130
Distribution Patterns. . . . .	141
Secondary Hypotheses. . . . .	163
Role Specification at Different	
Educational Levels . . . . .	163
Distribution Patterns at Different	
Educational Levels . . . . .	164

CHAPTER	PAGE
Item Responses at Different	
Educational Levels . . . . .	164
Role Specification and Socio-	
Economic Setting . . . . .	181
Distribution Patterns and Socio-	
Economic Setting . . . . .	182
Item Responses and Socio-Economic	
Setting . . . . .	182
Chapter Summary . . . . .	184
References for Chapter VII . . . . .	188
VIII. RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:	
PREFERRED DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS . . . . .	189
Primary Hypotheses. . . . .	189
Role Specification . . . . .	189
Distribution Patterns . . . . .	200
Secondary Hypotheses . . . . .	209
Role specification at different	
educational levels. . . . .	210
Distribution patterns at different	
educational levels. . . . .	210
Item Responses at Different	
Educational Levels . . . . .	210
Summary. . . . .	226
IX. COMPARISON OF PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED	
DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS. . . . .	233

CHAPTER	PAGE
Role Specification . . . . .	233
Distribution Patterns . . . . .	234
Comparison of Mean Preference and Perception Scores . . . . .	235
Summary . . . . .	243
X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	245
Summary . . . . .	245
The Problem . . . . .	245
Analysis of the Problem . . . . .	245
Research Design. . . . .	246
Sub-Problems and Hypotheses. . . . .	248
Results . . . . .	250
Methods of Analysis . . . . .	257
Conclusions. . . . .	258
Techniques of Data Analysis. . . . .	259
Task Differentiated Authority Structures. . . . .	259
The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in Schools . . . . .	260
Adaptive Authority Structures . . . . .	263
Variations in Teacher Perceptions and in Teacher Preferences. . . . .	263
Participation and Involvement in Decision-Making . . . . .	264
The Basic Purpose of the Study. . . . .	265

CHAPTER	PAGE
Implications . . . . .	265
References for Chapter X . . . . .	267
APPENDIX: Questionnaires Submitted to Teachers.	268

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Studies Which Have Used Similar Items to Those Included in Questionnaires Developed for the Present Study . . .	113
II. Description of Sample . . . . .	115
III. Ahmavaara Factor Match: Comparison Matrix, Two Random Samples from Test Population-- Teacher Preferences . . . . .	119
IV. Ahmavaara Factor Match: Comparison Matrix, Two Random Samples from Test Population-- Teacher Perceptions . . . . .	120
V. A Comparison of the Mean Perceived Probability of the Individual Teacher Determining Policy for <u>Task 4</u> as against Other Tasks, Staff Group A . . . . .	124
VI. Comparison of the Mean Perceived Probability of Each of the Three Decision Sources Determining Practice for Task 4, School Staff Group A . . . . .	127
VII. School Code Numbers . . . . .	131
VIII. A Comparison of Means on the Perceived Probability of the Individual Teacher Determining Action, for Task 4 as against Other Tasks . . . . .	132

TABLE	PAGE
IX. A Comparison of Means on the Perceived Probability of the Formal Staff Group Determining Action, for Task 4 as against Other Tasks . . . . .	134
X. A Comparison of Means on the Perceived Probability of Higher Official Authority Determining Action, for Task 4 as against Other Tasks . . . . .	136
XI. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Senior High School in Median Socio-Economic Area . . . . .	143
XII. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Junior High School in Median Socio-Economic Area . . . . .	144
XIII. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Junior High School in Median Socio-Economic Area . . . . .	145
XIV. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Junior High School in Median Socio-Economic Area . . . . .	146



TABLE	PAGE
XV. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Elementary School in Median Socio-Economic Area .	147
XVI. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Elementary School in Median Socio-Economic Area .	148
XVII. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Elementary School in Median Socio-Economic Area .	149
XVIII. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Senior High School in Lower Socio-Economic Area	150
XIX. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Junior High School in Lower Socio-Economic Area	151
XX. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Junior High School in Lower Socio-Economic Area	152
XXI. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Junior High School in Lower Socio-Economic Area	153
XXII. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Elementary School in Lower Socio-Economic Area .	154

TABLE	PAGE
XXIII. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Elementary School in Lower Socio-Economic Area .	155
XXIV. Preferred and Perceived Patterns of Decision-Making Authority for Elementary School in Lower Socio-Economic Area .	156
XXV. A Comparison of the Mean Perceived Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Level of Education (Senior High and Elementary)	165
XXVI. A Comparison of the Mean Perceived Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Level of Education (Junior and Senior High) .	169
XXVII. A Comparison of the Mean Perceived Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Level of Education (Junior High and Elementary). . . .	173
XXVIII. A Comparison of the Mean Perceived Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, By Socio-Economic Status of Community (Median and Lower)	183
XXIX. A Comparison of Means on the Preferred Probability of the Individual Teacher Determining Action, for Task 4 as against Other Tasks. . . . .	190

TABLE	PAGE
XXX. A Comparison of Means on the Preferred Probability of the Formal Staff Group Determining Action, for Task 4 as against Other Tasks . . . . .	192
XXXI. A Comparison of Means on the Preferred Probability of Higher Official Authority Determining Action, for Task 4 as against Other Tasks . . . . .	194
XXXII. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Level of Education (Senior High and Elementary) . . . .	212
XXXIII. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Level of Education (Senior and Junior High) . . . . .	216
XXXIV. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Level of Education (Junior High and Elementary) . . . .	220
XXXV. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action, by Socio-Economic Status of Community (Median and Lower) . . . .	224

TABLE	PAGE
XXXVI. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Deter- mining Action, by Sex Category . . .	225
XXXVII. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Deter- mining Action, by Length of Experience	227
XXXVIII. A Comparison of the Mean Preferred Probability of Decision Sources Deter- mining Action, by Length of Training .	228
XXXIX. Comparison of the Preferred and Perceived Mean Probabilities of the Individual Teacher Determining Action on Tasks, for Each School . . . . .	236
XL. Comparison of the Preferred and Perceived Mean Probabilities of the Teacher Staff Group Determining Action on Tasks, for Each School . . . . .	239
XLI. Comparison of the Preferred and Perceived Mean Probabilities of Higher Official Authority Determining Action on Tasks, for Each School . . . . .	241

## CHAPTER I

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The way in which the individual participates in organizational activities has received particular attention in the study of the relationship between the individual and the formal organization. Research has been based on a concept of participation defined in terms of the kind of member involvement in decision-making in important task areas. Investigations have analyzed both the circumstances and the consequences of the member's involvement in decision-making.

There is growing recognition that the decision-making authority exercised by a decision source may vary according to the task activity concerned. A number of schemes in industry accept this idea in delegating decision-making authority to the individual member, the formally recognized work group, and higher official authority.

Basic to these schemes is the view that there is a relationship between involvement in decision-making, individual need satisfaction, and organization performance. Of central importance is the association between the degree of decision-making authority exercised by each decision source and (a) the pattern of specification of

the member's work role, and (b) the balance of decision-making authority between the individual, the formally recognized work group, and forms of higher official authority.

The present study applied this viewpoint to a survey of selected aspects of the school organization. An analysis was made of the distribution of decision-making authority in schools as perceived and preferred by school teaching staff. The analysis of the distribution patterns of decision-making authority was undertaken in terms of authority patterns presented in the literature on formal organizations. This research approach supplemented studies more directly concerned with the association between role definition, authority distribution and the informal network of personal relationships in the organization.

The literature on the place of the school in society strongly recommends that educational organizations appraise current authority structures and plan new structures for the future. Increasingly, attention is given to the question of the distribution of decision-making authority in schools, particularly by those who hold that schools must maintain stability and flexibility in a time of rapid social and cultural change.

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study was a descriptive survey of the distribution of decision-making authority in schools. The data represented the perceptions and preferences of teachers in fourteen schools.

The research was concerned with the identification, analysis, and appraisal of the way decision-making authority was distributed between the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and forms of higher official authority. Distribution patterns were examined for twelve task activities, each concerned with the operation of the school instructional programme.

The following types of questions were asked for each of the twelve task activities. They were adapted (a) to the kind of decision source, and (b) to questions of policy and specific procedures.

In your present school, assume that questions of general principles and policy have arisen concerning the tasks listed below. In your judgment what would be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these?

To obtain teacher preferences, the question was rephrased.

In your present school, assume that questions of general principles and policy have arisen concerning the tasks listed below. What do you feel should be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these?

Teacher responses were obtained on a scale indicating five degrees of probability of a decision source determining action. Responses to the questions were taken to indicate the degree of decision-making authority exercised by the decision source concerned, as reflected in teacher perceptions and preferences.

Three general approaches were taken in the analysis of data. First, the decision-making authority exercised by each decision source for twelve task activities was taken to indicate the pattern of specification of the teacher's work role. To obtain the pattern of role specification a measure of the variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across the set of twelve task activities was made. This measure was based on significant differences in the probability of a decision source determining action on Task 4 (the presentation of subject material in the classroom) as against other task activities.

Second, the relative decision-making authority exercised by each of the three decision sources for a task activity was taken as indicating the pattern of authority relationships related to the task. To identify distribution patterns of decision-making authority, a measure was taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by each of the



three decision sources for the task concerned. This measure was based on the degree of probability of each decision-source determining action on the task. As the set of authority relationships involved decision sources in a status hierarchy, the authority relationships were accepted as an index of the authority structure directly associated with the task.

The distribution patterns of decision-making authority perceived and preferred by teachers were classified according to distribution patterns of delegated authority presented in the literature on formal organizations. The suitability of distribution patterns for the school was assessed in terms of general guidelines derived from the literature. Here, particular importance was given to the literature on the place of the skilled worker and the employed professional in the complex organization.

Third, an item by item analysis was made of the mean perceptions and preferences of teacher groups classified according to type of school, and selected categorical variables. Another focus of research concern was on differences between (a) the preferences and perceptions of teachers, (b) the preferences of teachers classified according to sex, length of training, and years of experience, and (c) the perceptions of school staff classified according to the educational level of

the school (e.g. senior high, junior high, elementary), and the socio-economic status of the school community background.

Seven urban public schools were studied in a median socio-economic area, seven in a lower socio-economic area. In each group of seven schools, there was a senior high school, three junior high schools and three elementary schools. The junior high schools and the elementary schools were feeder schools for the senior high school concerned.

### III. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study dealt with general issues and research concerns central to the study of organizational structure. The study was directly linked with theory and research concerned with the study of (a) the specification of occupational roles, and (b) the distribution of authority in complex organizations. It was also directly concerned with problems of administration and organizational planning. Most specifically, it was related to studies in educational administration which took the view that a rational approach to the planning of school authority structures helps resolve problems arising from the place the teacher holds in the school authority system.

#### Authority Structure and Related Organizational Properties

There is a relationship between authority structure

and other organizational properties. This view is firmly supported by theorists concerned with identifying and relating major organizational dimensions. Stogdill relates basic organizational segments within an input-output system. (18) An "interbehavioral system" relates inputs (human and material) to outputs (productivity, integration and morale). He holds that the exercise of authority is an important mediating variable, and defines authority as "the area of freedom for initiative exhibited by the occupants of a position." (18, p. 19) In another comprehensive analysis of organizational relationships, Hage relates organizational means (complexity, centralization, formalization, stratification) to organizational ends (adaptiveness, production, efficiency, job satisfaction). (9, p. 291) Included in the means are measures of "hierarchy of authority", e.g (a) the number of occupations whose members participate in decision-making, and (b) the number of areas in which they participate. (9, p. 291) Also included among the means is a measure of the range of variation that is tolerated within the rules defining the job. (9, p. 291) Each of these studies defines and analyses authority structures in terms similar to the approach taken in the present study. Each of the studies stresses the relationship between authority structure and other organizational attributes. This relationship is accepted

by theorists who concentrate on the association between authority structure and a specific organizational variable. For example, Pfiffner and Presthus hold that formal lines of authority can condition certain aspects of the behaviour of the individual member. (15, p. 5)

To examine authority structure is to study an aspect of the general distribution of power in the organization. Gore, while acknowledging that structure can be viewed as "rational systems of action" or "free-flowing heuristically oriented social processes" holds that "structural change may involve rationalizing a new center of power, or shifting the balance of power."

(6, p. 120) Hage and Aiken, more concerned with undertaking a specific research programme, take the view that the pattern of decision-making concerned with work activities and the allocation of resources indicates the distribution of power in an organization. (10, p. 73) They focus attention on (a) the extent to which occupants of various positions participate in decision about the allocation of resources and the development of policies, and (b) the extent to which the member or the chain of command make work decisions. In an extended analysis of the relationship between organizational participation and involvement in decision-making, Strauss holds that the delegation of decision authority is a form of power equalization. (19, p. 41) Here, power equalization

involves a reduction in the power and status differential between supervisors and subordinates.

Those interested in the planning and adaptation of authority structures are basically concerned with the distribution and balance of power in the organization. Gross holds that new organizational structures are urgently required in a changing society. (8, pp. 810-811) He predicts that new organizational structures will be based on new patterns of superior-subordinate relationships. Pfiffner and Fels consider a new superior-subordinate matrix is developing, "the exact conformation of which is not yet apparent." (14, p. 141) Steiner considers that substantial modifications to present authority structures are necessary, particularly in view of the need for organizations to be sensitive to innovation in a time of change. (17, p. 37)

This study accepted the view that organizational planning in schools must consider the relative merits of different kinds of authority structures. Hence, the main concern of the study was with the relative decision-making authority exercised by different decision sources.

#### Prescription of the Work Role

One aspect of the authority structure is closely associated with the specification of the member's work role. It is the way decision-making authority is exercised by basic decision sources for task activities directly and

indirectly related to the member's immediate work tasks.

Hickson concludes that the degree of specificity of role prescription (or the range of legitimate discretion allowed) is a central variable in theories on the structure of organizations. (11, p. 225) The theories he reviews speculate on the concomitants of specificity of role prescription, such as the degree of motivation, innovation, anxiety, power conflict, and confusion. Hickson suggests that measurement of role prescription is urgently needed on a number of counts:

... first to verify the variations discerned by general observation, second to test hypotheses about the kinds or organization in which differing specificities occur, and third to test hypotheses relating group and individual variations to structure. (11, p. 235)

A similar interest in measurement is displayed by Becker and Gordon. (2) The framework in which they present the problem is closely related to the concerns of the present study. They take the view that organizational roles are based on function (e.g. production and co-ordination) and on amount of discretion. They hold that the less the degree of role specification in the production role, the more the role moves from that of worker to that of professional. (2, p. 320) The present study was concerned with one measure of the degree of specification of the teacher's role. This measure was based on the variation in the decision-

making authority exercised by the teacher with respect to a set of school task activities.

This approach to measurement rested on the view that the degree of role prescription may vary according to the task. Argyris accepts this proposition in his search for a more flexible approach to role prescription. (11, p. 234) He takes the view that roles may have differing levels of specificity for "differing areas of decision and activity, so that the structure can be varied according to the type of decision faced." (11, p. 234)

The distribution pattern of decision-making authority was a focal point of interest in this study. It receives strong emphasis in studies directly concerned with administration and organizational planning. Increasing attention is being given to this type of question: What degree of role prescription and what kind of distribution pattern of decision-making authority is best for important tasks in a given organizational setting?

#### Problems of Administration and Planning

The present study was linked with problems of administration and organizational planning. These are discussed in the literature on authority structures and in the literature on educational administration.

Literature on organizational structure. Practical problems concerned with the degree of role prescription

and the general distribution of decision-making authority have received attention with respect to the administration of industrial and commercial undertakings. This work has been complemented by the study of authority structures which accommodate professional and bureaucratic roles in complex organizations.

The two areas of study provide distinctive frames of reference in which to view the relationship between the member and the formal organization. In the first, the member is viewed as a worker whose efforts require co-ordination with others through a common group effort to achieve greater productivity. In the second, the member is accepted as a professional whose unique knowledge must be utilized and professional rights protected to obtain his maximum contribution. In each area of concern, emphasis is given to the degree of role specification and the way decision-making authority is distributed within the organization.

In the study of industrial and commercial organizations, these problems are typically viewed within the context of the decentralization issue. Baum's view of the decentralization process is quite representative: "Decentralization ... is meant to denote the distribution, through delegation, of decision-making authority within a bureaucracy." (1, p. 23) Significantly, he counsels that "every effort should be made to focus on the scope



of decision-making with regard to the subject matter involved." (1, p. 26)

Here, the basic organizational dilemma is the degree to which there should be an upward or downward transfer of decision points with reference to specific task areas. The present study did not make distinctions between levels in the chain of command. However, it was concerned with one aspect of the downward transfer of decision points, particularly at the level of task accomplishment; that is, the distribution of decision-making authority between the teacher and the formal teacher group on the one hand and the chain of command on the other.

The satisfaction of organizational needs. School authority structure is important for the stability and adaptability of school organization in a time of social change. There is growing acceptance of Thompson's view that the organizational framework should be adapted to distinctive organizational needs in a given setting. (21) Equally strong is support for the view of Strauss that involvement in decision-making establishes interaction patterns which affect resistance to change. (19, p. 69) Thus, Moeller and Charters see the school authority structure as important in affecting the teacher's reactions to the organization and to ideas of change. (13, p. 465)

Two related issues make the planning of authority structures in schools difficult. First, what is the proper balance between flexibility and stability required of the school in current society? Second, how should current authority structures be modified? Should changes be made in the distribution of decision-making authority mainly at the managerial level, with teacher participation limited to informal consultation? Should changes be made in the distribution of decision-making authority in the school itself, with actual decision-making authority being delegated to the teacher and his group?

Certainly, dissatisfaction is expressed with traditional school organization. Gramb represents a substantial body of opinion in his view that school administration has followed too closely older bureaucratic models of business and government. He holds that the uniqueness of the school institution is not reflected in school organizational patterns:

Surely the schools are significant enough institutions to warrant a more searching analysis of its organizational structure and processes, so that in time both may become more appropriate to the function of education. (7, p. 175)

Eisenstadt holds that the growing proliferation of bureaucratic organizations does not necessarily involve a trend towards bureaucratization, the growing regimentation of organizational behaviour. (4) However, Goldhammer, in acknowledging the increase in large educational

bureaucracies, concludes that no firm guidelines exist for establishing new organizational forms in school systems. (5, p. 132)

The satisfaction of teacher needs. The role of the teacher is undergoing a process of professionalization. The professional needs of the teacher are important to the quality of school performance. These needs must be taken into account in planning the school authority structure. A substantial degree of decision-making authority may well be one of these professional needs.

More specifically, what are the teacher's needs concerning (a) the distribution of decision-making authority between the teacher and his formally recognized group on the one hand and the school administrator on the other, and (b) the degree of decision-making authority he exercises with reference to a range of task activities? Here, it is important to take account of both the immediate work tasks of the teacher and the larger concerns of the school instructional programme.

Meeting both the needs of the teacher and the needs of the school organization presents problems. One problem is to determine the distribution pattern of decision-making authority which will obtain teacher co-operation and achieve the proper co-ordination of school activities. In the business context, the issue is seen to be one of fostering individual initiative while

achieving managerial co-ordination.

This problem is difficult to resolve. A clear separation cannot be made between production and control processes, between line and staff functions, between administrative and professional functions. The undertaking of the school instructional programme is closely linked with production and control processes. Although production and co-ordination roles are assigned, they are closely interrelated in the daily work process. It is difficult to avoid ambiguous situations with reference to the distribution of decision-making authority in some task areas.

In an attempt to clarify some of these administrative problems, the present study undertook a descriptive survey of the distribution patterns of decision-making authority as perceived by teacher staff groups. These were appraised in terms of the needs of the teacher as a professional and of the school as an enterprise with characteristic organizational needs.

### Research Methodology

The present research examined the distribution of decision-making authority at the production level. It is here that the degree of specification of the member's occupational role and the distribution patterns of decision-making authority have the most direct bearing on the individual's organizational behaviour. Simon stresses the

need for research at this level of operations:

... the operative employee must be the focus of attention, for the success of the structure will be judged by his performance within it. Insight into the structure and function of an organization can be best gained by analyzing the manner in which the decisions and behavior of such employees are influenced within and by the organization.  
(16, p. 3)

Steiner holds that "for most people in organizations, most of the time, the organization is their own milieu. This part ... is their direct, day-by-day experience of the organization." (17, p. 51) These views are inherent in the proposition of Moeller and Charters that "The organizational structure of the school provides the arena where teachers' orientations to power and the realities of power meet." (13, p. 447) From an administrative point of view Goldhammer underlines the need to examine decision-making at a number of organizational levels:

The Superintendent is becoming much more the individual who is helping to structure the processes through which decisions are made rather than one who is formulating the decisions himself. (5, p. 135)

The most clearly defined research orientation in the study of the structure of school organization has used the ideal bureaucratic model as a basic point of origin in the measurement of organizational characteristics. Operationally, organizational attributes are assessed by determining the position of the school organization on a

set of dimensions indicating degree of departure from an idealized bureaucratic conception. When measuring instruments are used, amount of deviance is assessed in quantitative terms.

In a more limited approach, the present study analysed the school authority structure in terms of distinctive patterns or configurations of decision-making authority associated with specific task activities. The degree of decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher, the formally recognized school staff group and forms of higher official authority was identified. This information provided the basis for analyzing distribution patterns of decision-making authority. These were taken as characteristic of the school authority structure for the task activities concerned.

#### Summary

The primary focus of the research was on the identification, analysis and appraisal of the distribution of decision-making authority between the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and forms of higher official authority. The distribution patterns of decision-making authority between these decision sources were examined for twelve task activities. The distribution patterns were those reflected in the perceptions and preferences of teacher staff groups in fourteen schools.

First, the relative decision-making authority exercised by each of the three decision sources for a task activity was taken to indicate the pattern of authority relationships associated with the task. In the analysis of data concerned with identifying distribution patterns of decision-making authority, a measure was taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by each of the three decision sources for the task activity concerned. This was based on the degree of probability of each decision source determining action for the task.

Second, the decision-making authority exercised by each decision source for the set of twelve task activities was taken to indicate the pattern of specification of the member's work role. To obtain the pattern of role specification, a measure of the variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across a set of twelve task activities was obtained. The measure was based on significant differences in the degree of probability of a decision source determining action on Task 4 (the presentation of subject material in the classroom) as against other task activities.

Third, an item by item analysis was made of the mean perceptions and preferences of teacher groups classified according to type of school and selected categorical variables.

The teacher's role was seen as subject to the process of professionalization, and the study of distribution patterns of decision-making authority was linked to the current professionalization issue in schools. It was also related to the study of authority systems which accommodate the skilled worker and the professional in different types of organizations.

The concerns of the present study were associated with general issues central to the study of authority structures in complex organizations. The study was closely linked with specific problems of administration and organizational planning, particularly with those related to the development of authority structures designed to meet the requirements of given organizational settings.



## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER I

- (1) Baum, Bernard H. Decentralization of Authority in a Bureaucracy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- (2) Becker, Selwyn W., and Gerald Gordon. "An Entrepreneurial Theory of Formal Organization Part I: Pattern of Formal Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), pp. 316-344.
- (3) Bidwell, C. E. "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 972-1022.
- (4) Eisenstadt, S. N. "Bureaucracy, Bureaucratization and Debureaucratization," Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959), pp. 302-320.
- (5) Goldhammer, Keith, et al. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.
- (6) Gore, William J. Administrative Decision-Making: A Heuristic Model. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- (7) Grambs, Jean Dresden. Schools, Scholars and Society. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- (8) Gross, Bertram M. The Managing of Organizations. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- (9) Hage, Jerald. "Axiomatic Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 289-320.
- (10) \_\_\_\_\_. and Michael Aiken. "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 72-92.
- (11) Hickson, J. J. "A Convergence in Organizational Theory," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), pp. 225-237.
- (12) Leavitt, H. J. Managerial Psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- (13) Moeller, Gerald H., and W. W. Charters. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 444-465.

- (14) Pfiffner, John M., and Marshal Fels. The Supervision of Personnel. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, 1964.
- (15) \_\_\_\_\_. and Robert V. Presthus. Public Administration. New York: Ronald Press, 1960.
- (16) Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: MacMillan, 1951.
- (17) Steiner, Gary A. The Creative Organization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- (18) Stogdill, Ralph M. "Dimensions of Organization Theory," in James D. Thompson (ed.). Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, pp. 1-56.
- (19) Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization," in Harold J. Leavitt (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pp. 41-84.
- (20) Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- (21) \_\_\_\_\_. "Bureaucracy and Innovation," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 1-20.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: PART I

#### I. CONCEPT OF MULTIPLE AUTHORITY STRUCTURES

Variations in the decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources provide a basis for multiple authority structures. The variations may occur for different task activities. This opinion was central to the design of the research instruments, the development of the system of classification, and the presentation of data. In each case, account was taken of the degree of decision-making authority exercised by each of the decision sources for a specified task.

The general concept of multiple authority systems is found in discussions of authority structures based on polar types and ideal conceptions of organizations. Organizational structure may contain a variety of forms or types of authority relationships. This proposition is basic to the analysis and planning of organizational measures in concerns which employ skilled workers and professionals.

#### Variations from Polar Conceptions of Organization

Typically, the analysis of authority structures is undertaken in terms of ideal conceptions of organizations. Of particular pertinence to this research are

studies which discuss organizations in terms of intermediate types which combine elements from ideal models. Litwak sees the professional model as consisting of "structural procedures" and organizational forms which combine properties from the bureaucratic and human relations models. (27, p. 182) He considers that a combination of the properties of each is required because the professional model is concerned with both uniform and non-uniform events. According to the type of activity, the mixture of properties taken from the bureaucratic and human relations models varies.

Other studies contend that the mixture of organizational properties may vary according to the nature of the task. Likert envisages a type of organization which combines aspects of the "scientific management system" and the "co-operative motivation system." (26, p. 83) He considers two types of work (repetitive and varied) require somewhat different kinds of management system.

Viewing bureaucracy as a control mechanism to ensure co-ordination, Becker and Gordon identify two distinct approaches to co-ordination. (5, pp. 325-329) These are the hierarchical "executive authority pattern" and the collegial system which depends on the "emergence of consensus." In an analysis of bureaucratic patterns in industry, Gouldner identifies three distinct forms of

bureaucracy. (16) In distinguishing between the "punishment centred" and the "representative" forms of bureaucracy, Gouldner considers that each may co-exist, although not equally powerfully, within an organization. Lawrence and Lorsch suggest that authority can be based either on professional knowledge and competence or on position in the hierarchy. (22, p. 34) Some forms of authority are seen to be more appropriate to certain problems of co-ordination than others.

There is further support for the view that multiple authority structures can be task differentiated. In defining authority basically in terms of decision rights, Scott takes the view that authority structures may vary according to the nature of the task:

An important feature of our view of authority which differentiates it from previous conceptions, is its emphasis on the extent to which authority rights may be task specific. A's authority rights over B may be limited to a specific task. In complex organizations, it is possible for an individual to participate in a large number of authority systems. (32, p. 104)

Strauss takes the view that members may be allowed more power equalization in some task areas than in others. (34) He considers that the feasibility of delegation may depend on task requirements and on the pattern of internal work flow. Argyris holds that the specificity of role prescription may vary according to the area of decision and activity. (19, p. 234)

### Organizations Employing Professionals

The idea of multiple authority systems, based on the concept of task differentiated authority structures, can be applied directly to organizations employing professionals. The school is such an organization in that the occupational role of the teacher is undergoing professionalization. The literature suggests that the authority structures of organizations employing professionals vary according to the level of professional development of the employee. Similarly, it is argued that the authority structure of an organization can be one index of the degree of professionalization of the employee. The present study used this index to assess the degree of professionalization of the teacher's role. The analysis of authority structures undertaken by Etzioni provided the basic reference point for estimating the degree of professionalization of the teacher's role. (15, pp. 75-93)

Etzioni has made a study of authority patterns in organizations employing members at various stages of professionalization. His evidence suggests that variations in authority structures are related to type of organization and degree of professionalization of members in production and staff roles. His analysis supports a general relationship between degree of professionalization and the distribution pattern of

decision-making authority between administrators and professionals. The distribution patterns of decision-making authority can serve to indicate the degree of professionalization of the member's occupational role. Degree of professionalization can be indicated in terms of three general categories, each concerned with a basic type of authority distribution pattern, i.e. the non-professional, the semi-professional, the full professional. Etzioni's set of categories illustrates this point. (15, pp. 78-91)

- I. Professionals in non-professional organizations  
The professional, with varying degrees of autonomy, holds essentially a staff position, rather than a firm position in the traditional line authority system concerned with defining basic goals and implementing essential task activities.
- II. Service Organizations for professionals  
A "dual" authority system in the sense that independent professionals are not subordinate to administrative authority as salaried employees.
- III. The "full-fledged" professional system  
Professionals dominate goal definition and instrumental activities (holding, in this sense, traditional line authority), while administrators, in essence, occupy a secondary "staff" position, i.e. administrative facilitation of professional decisions.
- IV. The semi-professional organization  
Here, the member occupies a somewhat subordinate position in the line authority structure of the organization. Although having special skills and a domain of authority, the semi-professional does not participate in the basic definition of the organizational goals. He is concerned more with skilled task implementation; thus, having secondary instrumental authority.

The present study stressed the shift in the balance of power between the "full-fledged" authority system and the semi-professional system. The term "non-professional" was used to indicate an authority system where member roles were low on the professionalization dimension.

The present study also assessed the general merit of the distribution patterns of decision-making authority evident in the perceptions and preferences of teachers. The literature on professionalization suggests that patterns of authority have differential value in adapting the salaried professional to the complex organization. In a normative approach, Vollmer and Mills stress the need for measures which allow the professional to retain integrity in a "more or less bureaucratic environment." (35, p. 276) Clark underlines the importance of adaptive authority structures in accommodating the professional in the University. (10) Kornhauser looks to multiple authority systems to accommodate the scientist in the industrial organization. This stimulates a "balance of freedom and power" which Kornhauser looks for in the "pluralistic character" of differentiated patterns of authority distribution. (21)

Hughes places particular emphasis on decentralized decision-making and the greater dispersion of decision authority as necessary adaptive mechanisms. (20) Barber



suggests a number of "accommodative mechanisms" to reduce strain between professional roles and organizational necessities, one of the more important of these being differentiation of authority structure. (2)

### Plans in Business and Industry

Distribution patterns of decision-making authority can be analyzed in terms of (a) the decision source, and (b) the task activity. In this study, the basic decision sources at the level of operations were the individual member, the formally recognized staff group and forms of higher official authority. These basic decision sources are recognized by business and industry in a number of plans which purport to produce distinctive patterns of decision-making authority. The distribution pattern of decision-making authority may vary according to the task activity concerned.

Each scheme departs in important respects from distribution patterns of decision-making authority commonly identified with the traditional bureaucratic model of organization. The following schemes show the variations in the distribution patterns of decision-making authority which may occur.

- I. Likert has proposed a "link-pin" structure in which a person in higher authority represents the views of his subordinates to those of similar or higher status to his own. (26) This structure permits the views of subordinates to be presented before higher

authority makes a decision. The indirect representation of the views of subordinates to levels higher in the chain of command is used for selected areas of decision.

- II. Although a number of schemes use the executive as a representative of subordinates with final responsibility for decision with top management, other schemes place direct responsibility for decisions closer to the level of production. (1) Davis describes a scheme whereby decision-making authority is delegated to individuals elected by the rest of the group because the group has decided they are most capable of holding decision-making authority for a specific task activity. (12) The pattern of authority relationships established for the task activity terminate on the return of participants to their original organizational positions after completion of the project. A well known variant is the Scanlon Plan where individuals and groups at various status levels in the organization discuss and put into effect ideas related to the immediate work situation. (25) Glacier Metal's "legislative system" uses groups where council members from various sectors of the organization participate in formulating and assessing basic policies. (8, p. 225)

- III. Argyris outlines a scheme which allows considerable responsibility to the individual member. (1, p. 210) Individuals have equal responsibility in certain areas of organization which they may not relinquish. Here, decision-making authority is delegated with reference to matters of basic policy.

The following features of the schemes are noteworthy:

- I. Each is based on a distribution pattern of decision-making authority which differs in varying degree from simple line authority structures. The variation may involve decisions concerning the member's immediate

work tasks and decisions concerning the co-ordination of the general work programme and the basic allocation of resources.

- II. Different patterns in the allocation of decision-making authority co-exist within the formal framework of the enterprise.
- III. Some schemes indicate that authority relationships may be more complex than those stressed in the discussion of classical line authority structures. The following sets of authority relationships are important: between the individual and the formally recognized work group, between the individual and a form of higher official authority, between a formally recognized work group and a form of higher official authority. This complexity points to the possible inadequacy of defining formal authority relationships solely in terms of those which hold between the individual and the chain of command.
- IV. A distinction is made between different degrees of member involvement in decision-making: (a) the member can express an opinion as an individual before higher official authority takes action, or (b) the member can express an opinion as a member of a work group

which forwards a majority opinion to higher authority for consideration, or (c) the member can have equal rights in a formally recognized work group which determines action by majority vote.

In the industrial and commercial context of these schemes, particular emphasis is placed on the decision-making authority exercised by the formally recognized work group. Typically, in matters of general import the individual member expresses an opinion as an individual, but exercises delegated authority only as a member of a work group. For the professional, there is greater emphasis on the decision-making authority he exercises as an individual.

## II. PARTICIPATION AND THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The individual member can be involved in the decision-making process in various ways. The degree and kind of involvement may vary according to the nature of the task, and to the way in which the member is concerned with the determination of action. This study was concerned with the degree of probability of a decision source determining action on a specified task activity at the point of decision.

Support for a general dimension of involvement is strong, in spite of somewhat different perspectives taken

of the decision-making process. Support is equally strong for the view that the way the member participates in the formal organization is related to the degree and kind of involvement in decisions concerned with basic organizational tasks.

Important elements in the dimension of involvement are (a) the nature of the task, (b) the nature of the decision-source, and (c) the stage of the decision-making process concerned.

McGregor sees involvement based on a dimension of participation, from discussion during preparatory stages to the exercise of delegated authority to select alternatives at the point of decision. (28, p. 126) Likert considers the dimension extends from little involvement (no communication to the member about decisions) to substantial involvement (delegation of decision-making authority to groups). Additionally, he maintains that the degree of involvement can vary from indirect participation (representation) to direct participation as a member of equal status in group decision-making. (26, p. 39)

Some accounts of involvement stress the relative importance of the task area for the member and the organization. Becker and Gordon distinguish between general and specific instructions concerning (a) organizational objectives, and (b) means of achieving objectives:

Procedures are self-determined when the human resource is given general instructions to achieve an organizational objective but is not given specific instructions about how to achieve it. Procedures are organizationally determined when the human resource is given both an organizational objective and detailed instructions on how to attain the objective. (5, p. 323)

The analysis of involvement in decision-making undertaken by Strauss highlights the importance of (a) the decision-source concerned, and (b) the distance of the individual member from various stages in the decision-making process. (34, pp. 41-84) He considers that the delegation of decision-making authority to the individual and the group can be one means of power equalization. (34, p. 58) Power equalization means a form of power convergence in which there is a movement "toward a reduction in the power and status differential between supervisors and subordinates." He makes a firm distinction between participation based on the holding of perceived, legitimate rights to determine action at the point of decision-making and participation based on less direct and more informal means of involvement. An example of more informal means of involvement is the participation by the member as a subordinate in informal discussion during preliminary stages of decision-making.

The distinctions are expressed in his classification of forms of participation according to (a) decisions made by the superior (direction), (b) decisions made jointly by

superior and subordinate (consultation), and decisions made by the subordinate on his own (delegation). (34, p. 58) The process of delegation involves granting to the member decision-making authority which gives him a measure of autonomy.

These distinctions support the legitimacy of focussing on selected aspects of the dimension of involvement in decision-making. In particular, support was given to a survey instrument developed on the basis of the following distinctions, (a) the distinction between the individual, the group, and higher official authority, (b) the distinction between types of tasks, and (c) the distinction between the legitimate authority to determine action at the point of decision and permission granted to express an opinion in preliminary, informal discussion.

Strauss cautions that the visible processes of involvement in decision-making such as consultation, direction and delegation need not reflect the realities of the influence process and the actual balance of power between decision sources. (34, p. 59) However, in a study of schools, Otto and Veldman came to the conclusion that "when group data are considered, decision point and influence on the decision seem to go hand in hand as perceived by principals and by teachers." (30, p. 157)

### III. THE CONCEPT OF DIFFERENTIAL EFFICIENCY

Criteria used to assess the value of distribution patterns of decision-making authority in schools were based on the view that distribution patterns must meet the special requirements of given organizational settings. The need to assess the value of an authority system in terms of situational demands and organizational characteristics is stressed in the literature. Dubin holds that organizational behaviour must be appropriate to the operating situation. (14, p. 48) Leavitt holds that systems of communication, systems of authority, and systems of work flow are related to the nature of the task, the technology, and the people involved. (23, 24)

The concept of differential efficiency is strongly emphasized when organizational analysis is undertaken with a view to planning. Dubin considers that "organizational costs" are incurred if managerial style is inappropriate to the nature of the task and the work process. (14, p. 16) Strauss warns that the costs and gains of changing the balance of organizational power must be carefully assessed in terms of the needs of the situation. (34, p. 53)

#### Importance of the Task and the Technology

A number of studies focus on the relationship between aspects of organizational structure and the nature of the work process. Dubin emphasizes that special



technologies are associated with particular management structures. (14, p. 11) Woodward concluded that production technology was a determinant of aspects of authority structure. (37)

This theme has been developed in some detail in a number of studies. Wilson takes the view that routine or programmed tasks are more easily subject to organizational control than non-routine activities. (36, p. 198) Drucker considers that authority patterns vary according to whether group or individual jobs are central to production processes. (13) Likert distinguishes between repetitive work, traditionally linked with the scientific management system and varied work, more closely associated with the "co-operative motivation" system. (26, p. 82) To Pelz, the efficiency of an organizational structure varies with the degree of task uniformity, the extent to which the task is defined by traditional areas of knowledge, the dependence of job performance on social skills and social relations, and the dependence of job performance on worker identification with organizational goals. (31, p. 180)

In a broader analysis of organizational structure, Litwak takes a similar view:

Complex organizations can be described in terms of three models -- Weberian, human relations and professional. The first is most efficient when dealing with uniform events and traditional areas of knowledge,

the second when dealing with non-uniform events and interpersonal relations, while the third is ideal where organizations are split, having some segments requiring uniformity and others not. (27, p. 177)

#### Importance of Worker Characteristics

Hage and Aiken support Woodward's finding that skill levels of the worker are associated with organizational structure. They take the view that the lower the skill levels of the labour resources, the less likely is a high degree of decentralization. (18, p. 91) Equally important, is the proposition that personal predispositions of the worker may be related to the nature of the authority structure. Likert found that workers whose predispositions reflect a desire to participate in decisions affecting them respond favourably to an increase in participation. (26, p. 242)

#### Nature of the Technology

To Dubin, the nature of the task and the skills and dispositions of the worker can be associated with the general character of the technology. For example, the level of commitment and skill necessary to make the commitment effective may vary with the technology. (14, p. 16) He considers the nature of the work flow important. A basic distinction is made between unit production, mass production, and continuous process production. (14, p. 14) He considers that the unit production situation, where the

skilled worker has considerable responsibility for control of output and quality, can be found in a variety of situations. Here, "The opportunity for fixing production responsibility at the worker level exists alike in manual and in scientific and intellectual operations ..." (14, p. 16)

To Likert, the nature of the task, the worker, and the technology represent the "hard, objective realities" of the situation which impose limitations on the decision-making process. (26, p. 112) The need to relate organizational structure to organizational characteristics underlies the distinction made by Becker and Gordon between the optimal and the overcomplete bureaucracy. (5, p. 334) The overcomplete bureaucracy stores more levels than are necessary to co-ordinate and control effectively. It over-coordinates beyond the level which best meets the requirements of the given situation.

On these grounds, it is necessary to take account of the realities of the work situation in the planning of school authority structures.

#### IV. MULTIPLE AUTHORITY STRUCTURES IN SCHOOLS

Account was taken of the growing professionalization of the teacher's role in the development of criteria to

evaluate authority distribution patterns. In the literature on educational organizations there is some speculation as to the most effective authority structures for schools. Much of the discussion is in terms of the balance of decision-making authority between the administrator and the professional.

Boyan makes a clear distinction between administrative and professional authority. (7) Bidwell, in his analysis of the organizational structure of the school, identifies conditions in the school which favour either bureaucratic control or greater teacher autonomy in undertaking a professional role. (6) Corwin holds that professional and bureaucratic styles of organization are present in different spheres of school activity. (11, pp. 258-263) However, there is little consideration of the exact nature of distribution patterns of decision-making authority most appropriate for specific areas of school activity. Consideration of the concept of multiple authority structures rarely goes beyond the idea of a general division of authority between the individual teacher and the administrator.

With reference to teacher preferences, Becker found that teachers wanted principals to work with them on matters of curriculum and instruction on a "collegial" (professional) basis. They wanted principals to use "administrative" (formal) authority in matters of primarily

administrative concern. (4) Indeed, Boyan considers that a growing aspiration of teachers is a "collegial base of participation in decision-making on education as an expert endeavour ..." (7, p. 8) In general terms, Boyan's viewpoint is supported by the studies of Chase (9), Moyer (29), and Sharma. (33) The latter group of studies also distinguishes between the distribution of decision-making authority for the teacher's work tasks and for matters of general administrative concern.

In general, the literature on educational administration gives little specific direction as to the criteria for authority structures in schools, beyond a broad statement of general principles. This is understandable in view of (a) the lack of knowledge concerning adaptive modes of authority distribution, (b) the uncertainty concerning the extent to which teachers regard themselves as aspirant professionals, (c) the lack of agreement on the clarity of the distinction which can be made between administrative and professional action and authority in schools, and (d) the lack of agreement on the advisability of dividing the school's decision-making structure into two distinctive jurisdictions of decision-making, the professional and the administrative.

In view of the uncertainty regarding appropriate authority structures in the literature on educational

administration, criteria in the present study were based on the literature on general organization theory. This included the literature on non-educational organizations.

The literature on the place of the skilled worker in industrial and commercial concerns had a contribution to make to the development of criteria to assess authority distribution patterns in schools. Reference has been made to schemes based on the concept of multiple authority structures. Reference has also been made to studies which point to the need to relate authority structures to the characteristics of a given work situation.

In a study of control structure in public schools, Otto and Veldman relate their findings to practices in industry. (30, p. 157) They compare the control structure of the school system with contractual arrangements for the skilled worker in a particular industry. They found support from Lortie's analysis of the teacher and the school authority system that the teacher's exercise of authority was similar, in some respects, to that of the construction worker. (30, p. 159) The present study also used the literature on industrial and commercial organizations to develop criteria for adaptive school authority structures.

### Summary

In the present chapter, viewpoints basic to the development of the general research design were discussed.

The view was accepted that variations in the distribution of decision-making authority between three decision sources provided the basis for multiple authority structures. Particular emphasis was given to the concept of task differentiated authority structures.

Evidence in the literature supported the idea that organizational authority structure could provide an important index of the degree of professionalization of the member's work role. For the purpose of the present study, the analysis of authority structures undertaken by Etzioni provided a basic reference point to assess the degree of professionalization of the teacher's role.

The proposition was accepted that distribution patterns of decision-making authority could be analyzed in terms of (a) the decision sources involved, and (b) the task activity concerned. Evidence to support this proposition was found in the literature on organizational planning in business and industry and in the literature on the decision-making process.

This study was concerned with a specific aspect of member involvement in decision-making. Opinion in the literature on decision-making in organizations suggests that it is legitimate to focus on selected aspects of the

decision-making process. Accordingly, particular attention was given to the determination of action at the point of decision by the individual, the formally recognized work group, and higher official authority.

Support for the concept of differential efficiency underlined the need to relate distribution patterns of decision-making authority to the needs and characteristics of a given organizational setting. However, there is uncertainty in the literature on educational administration as to the most appropriate authority structures for schools. For this reason, criteria of distribution patterns of decision-making authority were based on a review of the literature on authority structures in both educational and non-educational organizations.



## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER II

- (1) Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley, 1963.
- (2) Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," in Kenneth B. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 15-34.
- (3) Bass, Bernard M. Experimenting with Simulated Manufacturing Organizations. Louisiana University: Research Contract N 7 ONR 35609, Office of Naval Research, Report 27, March 1961, cited by Chris Argyris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley, 1963.
- (4) Becker, H. S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (1953), pp. 128-141.
- (5) ———. and Gerald Gordon. "An Entrepreneurial Theory of Formal Organization Part I: Pattern of Formal Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), pp. 316-344.
- (6) Bidwell, C. E. "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 972-1022.
- (7) Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and Authority Structure of the School," in Roy B. Allen, and John Schmidt (eds.). Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, University of Arkansas and the University Council for Educational Administration, 1966, pp. 1-22.
- (8) Brown, Wilfred. Explorations in Management. London: Heinemann, 1960.
- (9) Chase, F. S. "The Teacher and Policy Making," Administrator's Notebook, I (1952).
- (10) Clark, Burton R. "College Teaching," in H. M. Vollmer, and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 282-291.

- (11) Corwin, Roger G. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- (12) Davis, Keith. A Preliminary Study of Management Patterns of Research Project Managers in Manufacturing in the Phoenix Area. Arizona State University, Department of Management, 1961. (Mimeographed).
- (13) Drucker, Peter. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper and Bros., 1954.
- (14) Dubin, Robert, et al. Leadership and Productivity. California: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965.
- (15) Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- (16) Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1954.
- (17) Guest, Robert. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey, 1962.
- (18) Hage, Jerald, and Michael Aiken. "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 72-92.
- (19) Hickson, D. J. "A Convergence in Organization Theory," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), pp. 225-237.
- (20) Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- (21) Kornhauser, William. Scientists in Industry, Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California, 1962.
- (22) Lawrence, Paul R., and Jay W. Lorsch. "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 1-47.
- (23) Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

- (24) \_\_\_\_\_. "Applied Organizational Change in Industry: Structural, Technical and Human Approaches," in W. W. Cooper et al. (eds.). New Perspectives in Organizational Research. New York: John Wiley, 1962, pp. 57-70.
- (25) Ledieur, Frederick G. The Scanlon Plan. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1958.
- (26) Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- (27) Litwak, Eugene. "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict," American Journal of Sociology. 67 (1961), pp. 177-184.
- (28) McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- (29) Moyer, D. C. "Leadership that Teachers Want," Administrator's Notebook, VII (1955).
- (30) Otto, Henry J., and Donald J. Veldman. "Control Structure in Public Schools and the Decision and Influence Roles of Elementary School Principals and Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 149-161.
- (31) Pelz, Donald C., and Frank M. Andrews. Scientists in Organizations: Productive Climates for Research and Development. New York: John Wiley, 1966.
- (32) Scott, W. Richard, et al. "Organizational Evaluation and Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 93-117.
- (33) Sharma, G. L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook, VIII (1955).
- (34) Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization," in Harold J. Leavitt (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pp. 41-84.
- (35) Vollmer, H. M., and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

- (36) Wilson, James Quentin. "Innovation in Organization: Notes Toward a Theory," in James D. Thompson (ed.). Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, pp. 195-216.
- (37) Woodward, Joan. Management and Technology. London: Her Majesties Stationary Office, 1958.

## CHAPTER III

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE PART II

The present chapter discusses propositions related to the concepts of authority, role, and decision-making. The definition of concepts served two basic purposes. First, it enabled the research variable to be specified. Second, it allowed the conceptual boundaries to be delineated.

#### I. AUTHORITY AND DECISION-MAKING

Several writers develop the view that the degree of probability of a decision-source determining action is associated with the degree of decision-making authority exercised by the source. Baum holds that authority must be defined in terms of decision-making. (1) Dubin declares that the essence of an authority relationship is that one individual makes decisions that give direction to another's selection of alternatives:

In analytical terms, an authority relation exists where there are alternatives for action in a given situation. Faced with these alternatives, a person may make his own decision and thus act without reference to another decision-maker. But, if the other decision maker does make the choice for him, then an authority relation comes into existence.  
(4, p. 33)

This interpretation is in keeping with Simon's view that an authority relation arises when one person

(the subordinate) chooses from available alternatives on the basis of a decision made by another (the super-ordinate). (13, p. 11)

Operationally, decision-making authority amounts to the power to make a decision that is accepted and carried out. Decision-making authority is reflected in the action determined by the decision-source. In the context of the present study, decision-making authority was taken to indicate legitimized power. Here, legitimate referred to the intrinsic acceptance by an individual that another had the right to affect his behaviour.

Dahl makes the important point that the amount of an individual's power can be best expressed in relative rather than absolute terms. (3) The methods of analyzing and presenting the data were based primarily on this proposition. In the present study, the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a source was compared with, and related to, that exercised by other decision sources. The degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source was also compared across a number of task activities.

#### Authority Structure and Formal Organization

The distribution of decision-making authority for key work decisions is central to the structure of the organization. Structure is taken to be the programmes of

action embodied in the relationships between people in an organization. Katz holds that:

Authority structure describes the way in which the managerial system is organized with respect to the sources of decision-making and its implementation. (8, p. 44)

To Simon, administrative organization is essentially decision-making:

What is a scientifically relevant description of an organization? It is a description that, so far as possible, designates for each person in the organization what decision that person makes, and the influence to which he is subject in making each of these decisions. (13, p. 37)

Peabody and Rourke point to the well defined research tradition which approaches the analysis of organizational structure through the study of formal decision authority. (11, p. 813)

#### Professional and Administrative Authority

The present study dealt with two distinct forms of authority, professional and administrative. To Etzioni,

... the most basic principle of administrative authority and the most basic principle of authority based on knowledge -- or professional authority -- not only are not identical but are quite incompatible. (6, p. 76)

Theorists such as Hughes (7), Etzioni (6), and Vollmer and Mills (17) hold that both the individual and the organization may be subject to the processes of professionalization and bureaucratization. Each of the processes is concerned with a different authority system.

Differences between the authority systems have been identified by Scott. (12, p. 265)

In the professional model, the authority system provides that the major controls are those which the worker applies to his own performance. The authority system is linked with high worker skills and high member internalized work standards. The worker expects to direct his own activities towards the desired ends and to assume responsibility for his decisions and actions. In the bureaucratic model, the authority system provides that rules must be specified and enforced and the efforts of workers closely co-ordinated. The authority system is linked with partial worker skills and partial worker internalization of standards. In this situation, the worker "exercises little discretion, his activities are guided by a set of general rules, and he is expected to follow regularized procedures ...." (12, p. 269) This analysis parallels Etzioni's view that professionalization is based on knowledge, and administrative authority is based on the organization's rules and regulations as approved by superior rank. (6, p. 77)

In this study professional authority was represented in the decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher and his formally recognized work group. Administrative authority was represented in the decision-making authority exercised by higher official authority.



### Probability of the Use of Authority

Weber considers that a direct index of authority can be the degree of probability of a decision source determining action. Determining action means making decisions in the form of commands which are obeyed. (19) Authority is the making of a decision which is accepted by self or other.

In this study, measurement of authority was based on the view that there were degrees of probability of a decision source determining action. The degrees of probability were taken to indicate the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source.

### Authority Source or Locus of Authority

Blau indicates that the source of authority "may be a person or it may be an impersonal institution...." (2, p. 28) In the present study, the term "decision source" indicated the locus of authority with respect to the individual (the teacher), a work group (the formally recognized staff group), and the chain of command (forms of higher official authority).

### Delegated Authority and Exercised Authority

Peabody points out that the concepts of having, exercising, and delegating authority are commonly used in the literature on administration and management. (10, p. 22) The present study stressed the distinction between

the exercise and the delegation of authority. When teacher staff groups reported on the degree of probability of decision sources actually determining action, they reported on the perceived degree of decision-making authority exercised by the decision sources. When observed distribution patterns of decision-making authority were classified according to distribution patterns in the literature, the classification was undertaken primarily in terms of delegated authority.

Ideal authority patterns in the literature emphasize the delegation of legal authority to positions in the organization. However, the decision-making authority related to observed role behaviour may have a more complex base. In varying degrees, the functional authority expressed in role behaviour may be based on legal, traditional and charismatic authority. (19)

Although the basis of the reported and delegated patterns of decision-making authority may differ, each is concerned with the exercise of legitimate power in formal work tasks and relationships. Further, each is an expression of formal authority in the sense that "authority is confined to the relationship between people occupying hierarchical positions in formal organizations concerned with formal work tasks." (10, p. 7)

### Authority as a Property and Authority as a Relationship

Peabody makes an analytical distinction between organizational authority as (a) a property or attribute of an individual or group, and (b) as a relation between two or more individuals or groups. (10, p. 133) Organizational authority as a relationship between decision-making sources received particular emphasis in the present study. The distribution patterns of decision-making authority were based on an analysis of the authority relationships between the three decision sources.

Further, the set of distribution patterns was taken as a part of the organizational authority structure. This view was based on the grounds that the authority relations involved sources arranged in a formal hierarchy. Peabody accepts the view that an important dimension of authority relations is hierarchy ("authority relations take place between persons or positions of differing ranks"). (10, p. 134) The hierarchy of authority relations concerned with key work tasks is central to the formal authority system in the organization.

### Power as a Fixed or Variable Property

The decision-making authority exercised by two decision sources may be significantly high with reference to a third. Lammers holds that power is not necessarily a fixed quantity in organizations. (9) Granting power

to subordinates by giving them effective opportunities to participate in decisions may increase both the power of superiors and subordinates. In this connection, Lammers identifies two kinds of involvement in decision-making, direct personal participation, and indirect representation. He is particularly concerned with methods of direct participation, with the member participating as an individual or as a member of a colleague group.

Tannenbaum takes a similar view:

A major assumption is that the total amount of control or influence in an organization is not a constant fixed amount, but that it may vary. Increasing the influence of one group (e.g. the workers) in an organization does not necessarily imply decreasing that of others (e.g. supervisors and managers). (16, p. 237)

To increase the decision-making authority of a decision source does not necessarily mean a reduction in the decision-making authority of another source. In the present study, this view gave broad logical support for the proposition that the decision-making authority of two decision sources in a task area could be both high with reference to a third.

## II. ROLE CONCEPTS AND DECISION-MAKING

### The Concept of Work Role

A study of task activities directly concerned with the teacher's work focussed attention on one important aspect of the teacher's role. This aspect was the member's

work role as defined by Vroom: "a set of functions to be performed by a role occupant, the performance of which contributes to the production of goods and services." (18, p. 6) Dubin also takes the view that the work role refers specifically to a set of explicit work tasks. He considers that work tasks are but one of the components which constitute the member's position. (4, p. 88)

Further, the teacher's formal work tasks comprise but one of the sets of activities with which he is concerned in the school. Dubin identifies four basic behaviour systems in the organization: the technological, the formal, the non-formal, the informal. In the present study, task activities were selected which had particular relevance to the school's technological behaviour system. (4, p. 88)

#### Work Control Practices

The allocation of decision-making authority is one means of co-ordinating and controlling member's activities. Dubin assumes that co-ordinating, controlling, directing, and innovating are distinctive forms of authority relationships. (4, p. 342) Tannenbaum views control as a process in which one determines what another person or group will do. (16, p. 239)

However, it was recognized that constraints on the decision-making process can be imposed through general rules and regulations, through "operating procedures,

instructions and methods," (5), and through various degrees of personal surveillance.

### The Decision-Making Process

On the view that decision-making involves a conscious choice of action, Dubin considers that three basic steps are involved:

First, an individual must be aware of as many as possible of the alternatives relevant to the decision.... Secondly, he must define each of these alternatives. Thirdly, the individual must exercise choice between alternatives, i.e. make a decision. (4, p. 343)

The present study was concerned with the third stage of decision-making, the selection of a behaviour alternative which determines a course of action. Steps in the decision-making cycle which involve consultation, evaluation and reformulation were outside the scope of the study.

Simon points out that two basic approaches can be made to the study of organizations through the examination of decision processes. (13, p. 220) The "anatomy of the organization" can be analyzed through the study of the distribution of decision-making functions. On the other hand, the "physiology of the organization" can be examined through an analysis of processes whereby the organization influences its members' decisions.

The present study was limited to one aspect of the study of the distribution of decision-making functions,

a study of the actual exercise of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers. No account was taken of influence processes or the set of interpersonal relationships within which decisions were made. The study was primarily concerned with the following question: Who appeared to make the choices which determined action at specified decision points?

This question was directed at an aspect of the apparent distribution of decision-making authority, the visible "anatomy of the organization."

### Summary

The literature which has been reviewed suggested that the degree of probability of a decision-source determining action was associated with the degree of decision-making authority exercised by the source. Further, the view was taken that the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source was better expressed in relative than in absolute terms. These propositions were basic to the means taken to analyze, present and interpret data in the present study.

Further, professional authority was seen to be represented in the decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher and his formally recognized work group. Administrative authority was taken to be represented in the decision-making authority exercised by

higher official authority. A distinction was also made between the concepts of delegated and exercised authority. However, it was considered that each was represented in the exercise of legitimate power concerned with formal work tasks and work relationships.

Propositions concerning the nature of authority were linked with the analysis and interpretation of data. Further, the study was seen to be concerned with selected aspects of the teacher's work role and of decision-making processes in schools.



## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER III

- (1) Baum, Bernard H. Decentralization of Authority in a Bureaucracy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- (2) Blau, Peter M. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- (3) Dahl, Robert. "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 11 (1957), pp. 201-215.
- (4) Dubin, Robert. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_. Human Relations in Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- (6) Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- (7) Hughes, Everett C. "The Professions in Society," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 26 (1960), pp. 54-61.
- (8) Katz, Daniel. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1966.
- (9) Lammers, C. J. "Power and Participation in Decision-Making in Formal Organizations," American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1967), pp. 201-216.
- (10) Peabody, Robert L. Organizational Authority. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.
- (11) \_\_\_\_\_. and Francis E. Rourke. "Public Bureaucracies," in G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 802-838.
- (12) Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," in H. M. Vollmer, and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 265-275.
- (13) Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: MacMillan, 1951.
- (14) Smith, C. G., and A. S. Tannenbaum. "Organizational Control Structure: A Comparative Analysis," Human Relations, 16 (1963), pp. 299-316.

- (15) Steiner, Barry A.(ed.). The Creative Organization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- (16) Tannenbaum, Arnold S. "Control in Organizations: Individual Adjustment and Organizational Performance," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (1962), pp. 236-257.
- (17) Vollmer, H. M., and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- (18) Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- (19) Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. (A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, eds.). Glencoe: Free Press and Falcon Wing Press, 1947.

## CHAPTER IV

### COLLECTION, CLASSIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF DATA

#### I. COLLECTION OF DATA

The propositions set out in the survey of the literature provided guidelines for the design of the research instruments. The following five distinctions were supported.

- I. The distinction between degrees of probability of a decision source determining action with respect to a task activity (e.g. extremely high, moderately high, impossible to judge, moderately low, extremely low).
- II. The distinction between three decision sources: the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and higher official authority.
- III. The distinction between task activities grouped under the following task areas:  
Curriculum Planning and Adaptation.  
(1) Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum. (2) Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum. (3) Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.  
Classroom Management. (4) Determination of the

way a subject matter field is presented in class. (5) Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing. (6) Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.

Arrangement of School Instructional Programme.

(7) Determination of the size and composition of classes. (8) Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils. (9) Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.

General School Organization. (10) Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers. (11) Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling. (12) Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.

The twelve task activities include a number of tasks used in previous studies. (infra, p. 112) They were selected and grouped on the basis of two pilot studies concerned with the development of the instruments used in this study. (infra, p. 117) The selection, phrasing, and grouping of items were based on the responses and comments of

a group of graduate and undergraduate students in education, school teachers, and professors in education. For the purpose of the statistical analysis, Task 4 (the determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class) was accepted as a task activity central to the work role of the teacher.

IV. The distinction between distribution patterns of decision-making authority which vary according to the task activity concerned. (supra, p. 25)

V. The distinction between decisions on policy and principles, and decisions on specific procedures and practice.

Decisions have been classified according to the nature of the task. For example, the following distinctions have been made: (a) job or agency wide decisions (18, p. 510), (b) control of resources or control of activities (28, p. 304), (c) the setting of ends or the choice of means (15, p. 229), or (d) planning involving general goals or routine decisions concerning direct action (16, p. 19). These classifications are supported by Katz who distinguishes between authority to legislate

on policy as against practice. (21, p. 44)  
They are inherent in the distinction Blau  
makes between basic or elementary decisions.  
(5, p. 186) In the present study, policy  
decisions represented the mental planning  
involved in determining goals and principles  
in task areas.

## II. CLASSIFICATION OF DATA

The distribution patterns of decision-making  
authority were classified according to generally recognized  
authority systems.

For each school, the degree of probability of each  
decision source determining action on each of the twelve  
task activities was calculated. Calculations were based  
on the mean group scores of each school staff. It was  
established whether the mean degree of probability of  
each of the three decision sources determining action on  
a task activity was significantly higher or lower than the  
mean degrees of probability for the other two decision  
sources. The relative standing of the mean probability  
scores for the three decision sources provided the basis  
for determining the pattern of authority relationships  
for the task concerned. The distribution pattern of  
decision-making authority was classified according to  
authority patterns identified in the literature.

First, the mean perceived probability score for each of the decision sources determining action on a task activity was calculated. Second, significant differences between the mean probability scores were determined. Third, the direction of any significant differences between mean probability scores was noted. Fourth, meaningful patterns of decision-making authority were identified. The patterns were based on the standing of each mean probability score relative to the others (e.g. whether a mean probability score was similar, lower, higher, or intermediate with respect to the other two).

This process of identification was repeated for each of the twelve task activities in each school.

Example: preparation of data for classification.

If the mean probability score of higher official authority determining action on a task was significantly higher than the mean probability scores for the staff group and the individual teacher, with no significant difference between the mean probability scores of the staff group and the individual teacher, the set of inferred authority relationships was classified as a Basic Higher Authority Distribution Pattern. For example:

<u>Pattern: Basic Higher Authority</u>		
<u>Decision Source</u>	<u>Relative Probability of Decision Source Determining Action</u>	
	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Direct Action</u>
Higher Official Authority	higher	higher
Formal Staff Group	lower	lower
Individual Teacher	lower	lower

The calculations basic to the identification of this distribution pattern could be as follows:

The staff of school A has response distributions for the task area, "The determination of the basic outline of the curriculum." The responses are obtained on six five-point scales, indicating the probability of each of the three decision sources determining action on both policy and specific procedures. The scales run from extremely high (5 points) to extremely low (1 point). They show the degree of probability of action being determined. The relative standing of the mean degrees of probability are indicated below.

<u>Pattern: Basic Higher Authority</u>				
<u>Decision Source</u>	<u>Relative Probability of Decision Sources Determining Action</u>			
	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Direct Action</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Higher Official Authority	higher	4.5	higher	4.2
Formal Staff Group	lower	1.4	lower	1.1
Individual Teacher	lower	1.9	lower	1.3

The relative standing of the mean probability score of each decision source determining action on a task provided the basis for identifying the distribution pattern of decision-making authority for the task. For this example,



the distribution pattern, in which the mean scores of two decision sources were significantly lower than the score of the third decision source, was classified as a Basic Higher Authority Pattern.

### Classification System

The classification of distribution patterns of decision-making authority was based on sets of authority patterns recognized in the literature on complex organizations.

#### PATTERN OF AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIPS

#### RELATIVE PROBABILITY OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION

INDIVIDUAL      GROUP      HIGHER AUTH.

### I. Traditional Distribution Patterns - Basic Forms

#### A. Basic Higher Authority

Policy and direct action	lower	lower	higher
-----------------------------	-------	-------	--------

#### B. Basic Group Authority

Policy and direct action	lower	higher	lower
-----------------------------	-------	--------	-------

#### C. Basic Individual Authority

Policy and direct action	higher	lower	lower
-----------------------------	--------	-------	-------

### II. Traditional Distribution Patterns - Minor Variants

Relative probability levels indicate one of the above general distribution patterns, with a decision source occupying an intermediate position with respect to the other two.

	<u>INDIVIDUAL</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>HIGHER AUTH.</u>
<u>EXAMPLE</u>			
Policy and direct action	lower	inter- mediate	higher
<u>PATTERN OF AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIPS</u>	<u>RELATIVE PROBABILITY OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION</u>		

### III. Distribution Patterns - Major Variants

#### A. Alternate Distribution Patterns -

One decision source dominates with respect to policy, another dominates with respect to direct action.

##### 1. Basic Higher Auth. Group Implementive

Policy	lower	lower	higher
Direct Action	lower	higher	lower

##### 2. Basic Higher Auth. Indiv. Implementive

Policy	lower	lower	higher
Direct Action	higher	lower	lower

##### 3. Basic Group Auth. Indiv. Implementive

Policy	lower	higher	lower
Direct Action	higher	lower	lower

##### 4. Basic Group Auth. Higher Auth. Implem.

Policy	lower	higher	lower
Direct Action	lower	lower	higher

## B. Dual Distribution Patterns

The relative probability of two of the sources determining action is significantly higher than the third, with no significant difference between the probability levels of the two higher sources.

### EXAMPLE

	<u>INDIVIDUAL</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>HIGHER AUTH.</u>
<u>Dual Group - Higher Authority</u>			
Policy	lower	higher	higher
Direct Action	lower	higher	higher

### PATTERN OF AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIPS

### RELATIVE PROBABILITY OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION

#### 2. Dual Group - Indiv. Authority

Policy	higher	higher	lower
Direct Action	higher	higher	lower

#### 3. Dual Higher Auth. - Indiv. Authority

Policy	higher	lower	higher
Direct Action	higher	lower	higher

## C. Mixed Distribution Patterns

Mixture of above patterns, in such a way that there is no basic shift in the distribution of the balance of decision authority between the determination of policy and the determination of specific procedures.

### 1. Mixed patterns within a basic higher authority distribution pattern. e.g.

Policy	lower	inter-mediate	higher
Direct Action	lower	higher	higher

2. Mixed patterns within a basic group authority distribution pattern, e.g.

Policy	higher	higher	lower
Direct Action	inter- mediate	higher	lower

3. Mixed patterns within a basic individual authority framework, e.g.

Policy	higher	lower	lower
Direct Action	higher	inter- mediate	lower

4. Mixture of above patterns, in such a way that there is a basic shift in the distribution or the balance of decision authority between the determination of policy and the determination of specific procedures.

EXAMPLE

Policy	lower	lower	higher
Direct Action	higher	higher	lower

PATTERN OF AUTHORITY  
RELATIONSHIPS

RELATIVE PROBABILITY OF DECISION  
SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION

IV. A. Partial Diffuse Distribution Patterns

Diffuse is taken to mean an absence of firm structure, i.e. of representative, recurrent, predictable systems of action. Where data indicate that the degree of probability of a decision source determining action is not significantly higher or lower than the other two for policy or direct action, but that relationships between five probability levels can be obtained for the task area, the system of classification is applied. A case in point would be the following pattern:

<u>EXAMPLE</u>	<u>INDIVIDUAL</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>HIGHER AUTH.</u>
Policy	lower	higher	?
Direct Action	lower	higher	lower

Although the distribution pattern is not complete, the patterns are classified according to the following basic patterns:

1. Basic Higher Authority
2. Basic Group Authority
3. Basic Individual Authority

B. Complete Diffuse Distribution Patterns

Distribution patterns which are not subject to meaningful interpretation in terms of the literature on authority structures.

EXAMPLES:

- A. No significant differences between the probability levels of the sources determining action:
- B. A clear directional relationship between only two of the three probability levels for both policy and practice:

<u>EXAMPLE</u>	<u>INDIVIDUAL</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>HIGHER AUTH.</u>
Policy	higher	?	lower
Direct Action	higher	?	lower

Rationale of the Classification System

The categories were accepted as scientifically useful because they were based on paradigms of authority distribution generally recognized in the literature. Thus, distribution patterns of decision-making authority were classified in terms of authority relationships which had received general recognition in organization theory. This allowed a theoretically informed study of the distribution patterns to be made.

For example, the classification of a pattern of decision-making authority as a Basic Group Authority pattern allowed the set of authority relationships concerned to be considered as an adaptive authority structure in the school organization. It also permitted the set of authority relationships to be linked with a general professionalization dimension underlying the definition of teacher's role.

Argyris and Likert are two theorists who have related distinctive patterns of decision-making authority to basic models and dimensions of organization. Likert differentiates various types of authoritative and participative authority systems along a dimension of organizational control. (26, p. 223) Argyris classifies distinctive patterns of authority distribution along a bi-polar dimension, from the authoritarian, "pyramidal" organization to the "participative" organization. (1, pp. 166 ff.)

The Basic Higher Authority pattern, and its variants, is inherent in the Argyris concept of the authoritarian organization and the Likert definition of "exploitive authoritative" management. The pattern, Basic Group Authority, provides the basis of the Likert concept of the "participative group" and is similar in general terms to the "participative" style of organization discussed by Argyris. However, it is difficult to find a close parallel

to the pattern, Basic Individual Authority as a pervasive form of authority distribution in the usual classification of management systems. It provides a logical, if not an empirical, extension of the Argyris "participative" organization. Indeed, it bears close resemblance to the independent professional mode of organization, where the colleague group provides informal controls only and administration plays a secondary facilitative role. However, in a restricted sense, the pattern is accepted as legitimate for specific task areas within an organization.

The modified sets of distribution patterns included in the classification system find varying degrees of recognition in the literature, particularly with respect to non-educational organizations.

### III. APPRAISAL OF DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS

Which distribution patterns are most effective in organizations employing professionals at given stages of professionalization? When the problem of the allocation of decision-making authority was considered in both non-educational and educational organizations, two general guidelines were identified. Although broad in conception, they were sufficiently precise to serve as criteria of the basic worth of distribution patterns in schools. Here, the purpose was to assess the general adaptive value of

distribution patterns, i.e. to judge the extent to which they met both professional and organizational needs.

Guideline I. Accommodative patterns of organization involve differentiated authority structures where occupational roles are undergoing professionalization in a complex organization. With reference to non-educational organizations, Barber holds that "differentiation of roles in a variety of specialized substructures of the organization" must be accompanied by "an accommodation between the organization's need for the pattern of superordinate control and the professional's need for the colleague control pattern of authority." (2, pp. 26-27) The principle of differentiation can be applied in different ways. For the purpose of this study, it was taken to involve the exercise of major decision-making authority by a decision source in certain task areas. For example, major decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher in classroom management, major decision-making authority exercised by higher official authority in certain administrative activities.

Guideline II. Accommodative patterns of organization involve integrated authority structures where occupational roles are undergoing professionalization. As Barber points out, differentiation must be accompanied by an accommodation of professional and hierarchical



control patterns of authority. (2, p. 23)

In schools, differentiation of authority structures should not lead to a dichotomy of administrative and professional activities. A number of basic task activities are functionally interdependent. It would be dysfunctional to remove a basic decision-making source from matters of mutual concern. Indeed, with reference to the non-educational organization, Kornhauser holds that the contiguity of the professional with other forms of authority distribution may lead to adaptive authority structures:

... the tension between the autonomy and integration of professional groups, production groups, and other participants tends to summon a more effective structure than is attained where they are isolated from one another or where one absorbs the others. (22, p. 293)

On this view, shared areas of decision-making in matters of mutual concern may encourage the interdependence of professional and administrative authority systems. This proposition is consistent with a viewpoint which sees virtue in multiple authority systems, where the distribution pattern of authority can vary according to the task activity.

Integration can be achieved in a number of ways. For the purpose of the present study, the following forms of integration were emphasized. In areas of direct interest to each, the teacher and the administrator may both exercise decision-making authority. For example, with respect to the determination of the detailed content

of a curriculum, the administrator may exercise major authority for determining basic policy, the individual teacher may exercise major authority in determining specific adaptations and procedures. Again, with respect to the arrangement of the school instructional programme, the formal staff group may exercise major authority with respect to one task, higher official authority may exercise major authority with respect to another.

Which areas of school activity are best set aside as arenas in which decision-making authority is exercised primarily by the teacher, the formal staff group, or higher official authority? Which areas of school activity are best shared by the formal staff group and higher official authority, or by the formal staff group and the individual teacher?

Broadly, the principles of interdependence and differentiation may be applied in the following ways:

I. Differentiation in schools. The individual teacher dominates decision-making in classroom management, either on his own initiative or in concert with the formally recognized teacher group. Administrative authority dominates in matters of basic concern to the general administration of the school, particularly where outside interests are directly concerned. It would be non-adaptive if decision-making authority were limited to higher official authority with respect to policy and specific

procedures for classroom management. It would be non-adaptive if decision-making authority were limited to the individual teacher or the formally recognized staff group in matters of direct concern to interests external to the school.

II. Integration in schools. In matters of apparently mutual concern, the individual teacher or the formal staff group exercise major decision-making authority with respect to some decisions, higher official authority exercise major decision-making authority with respect to the others. For example, higher official authority determines policy on a matter, the individual teacher determines actual practice. Or, in a general task area, the formal staff group determines action on one task activity, the individual teacher determines action on another task activity.

Applying these guidelines, the Basic Individual Authority Pattern and variants and the Basic Group Authority Pattern and variants characterize the greater proportion of distribution patterns in the area of classroom management, the Basic Higher Authority Pattern and variants would characterize the greater proportion of distribution patterns in the area of general school administration. A mixture of distribution patterns characterize distribution patterns in the areas of curriculum planning and the arrangement of the school instructional programme.

### Appropriateness of the Guidelines

Can the guidelines be applied directly to schools? The concept of differential efficiency underlined the need to take account of situational needs and restraints in planning authority structures for a given organizational situation. In assessing the suitability of authority structures for given organizational settings, particular attention was given to the characteristics of the individual and to the nature of the work processes. (supra, p. 36)

Individual characteristics. La Porte notes that in organizations that depend upon professionals for achievement of organizational goals, professional rather than bureaucratic values tend to develop. (23, p. 38) In this study, the teacher was considered to have access to the levels of skills and knowledge consistent with an occupational role undergoing professionalization. It was assumed that he held the values of an aspirant professional. Thus, he was seen to welcome a considerable range of discretion with reference to immediate work tasks, and to welcome involvement in important matters related to general school organization.

Work processes in schools. The nature of the task and the work technology in schools allows some latitude with respect to the distribution of decision-making authority. Dubin holds the view that:

The opportunity for fixing production responsibility at the worker level exists alike in manual and in scientific and intellectual operations, providing they involve unit-production technologies .... as against large batch mass production or continuous process production. (13, p. 16)

On the grounds that classroom teaching bears a general resemblance to unit production methods, it was reasonable to conclude that a measure of teacher autonomy is a viable goal for supervisory practices in schools. Here, classroom teaching was seen as the educational equivalent of industrial unit production where the individual is concerned with substantial sub-assemblies of the entire product. In this situation, the decision point may be set at too high a level. Job decisions concerning the choice of means may be a matter of direct concern to the individual teacher and the formally recognized staff group. Other job decisions may be of mutual concern to the staff group and higher official authority.

On the other hand, the decision point may be set too low. Although the work flow in schools may not be of the continuous demand type, with a number of workers sequentially concerned with the product, there is a need for a measure of integration and control. Pupils proceed in an orderly progression through grade levels. External expectations must be met. The work of schools must be co-ordinated. Traditional patterns of operation have

developed over time in response to environmental social pressures. In some matters there is a need to use higher official authority as the basis for control and co-ordination.

#### Decision-making Authority and Professionalization

Particular sets of distribution patterns are characteristic of the full professional, the semi-professional and the non-professional organization. In establishing the relationship between distribution patterns of decision-making authority and degree of professionalization, particular reliance was placed on Etzioni's analysis of organizations. (14, p. 77) The following relationships were accepted in the task areas selected for study.

#### Task Area A - Curriculum Development and Adaptation.

As the organization moves from a professional to a non-professional organization, the probability of the administrator determining action increases, and the probability of the professional in the production role (and his formal group) determining action decreases. In the semi-professional organization, the administrator exercises major decision-making authority with reference to the definition of basic goals and policy, the professional exercises major decision-making authority with reference to the secondary, instrumental adaptation of policy.

#### Task Area B - Classroom Management. As the organi-

zation moves from a professional to a non-professional organization, the probability of the administrator determining action increases, and the probability of the professional in the production role (and his formal group) determining action decreases. In the semi-professional organization, the administrator exercises major decision-making authority with reference to the general definition of work goals, the professional in the production role exercises major decision-making authority with reference to immediate means and work tasks.

Task Area C - Arrangement of Instructional Programme.

As the organization moves from a professional to a non-professional organization, the probability of the administrator determining action increases, the probability of the professional in the production role (and his formal group) determining action decreases. In the semi-professional organization, the professional in the production role exercises minor decision-making authority with reference to the allocation of resources and the co-ordination of the work programme.

Task Area D - General School Administration. As the organization moves from a professional to a non-professional organization, the probability of the administrator determining action increases, the probability of the professional in the production role (and his formal group) determining action

decreases. In the semi-professional organization, the professional in the production role exercises minor decision-making authority with reference to matters of basic policy and general means.

On the basis of the analysis of the authority structure of the school as a semi-professional organization, general conclusions were drawn concerning (a) the definition of teacher work roles, and (b) distribution patterns of decision-making authority in the schools selected for study.

For example, it was anticipated that the teacher would exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority in matters concerning classroom management than he would in other task areas. It was anticipated that higher official authority would exercise a lower degree of decision-making authority in matters concerning classroom management than it would in other task areas.

### Summary

The general research design was developed with the aim of studying patterns of decision-making authority in schools. The design of the instruments was based on distinctions made in the planning of industrial and commercial organizations and in the analysis of decision-making in formal organizations. The development of a system of classification to analyze the data was based



on concepts developed in the analysis of authority structures in complex organizations. Criteria to assess the suitability of authority distribution patterns in schools were based on guidelines suggested in the literature on adaptive authority structures in professional organizations.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER IV

- (1) Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley, 1963.
- (2) Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of Professions," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 15-34.
- (3) Becker, H. S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (1953), pp. 128-141.
- (4) Bidwell, C. E. "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 972-1022.
- (5) Blau, Peter M. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- (6) Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and Authority Structure of the School," in Roy B. Allen, and John Schmidt (eds.). Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, University of Arkansas and the University Council for Educational Administration, 1966, pp. 1-22.
- (7) Brown, Wilfred. Explorations in Management. London: Heinemann, 1960.
- (8) Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.
- (9) Chase, F. S. "The Teacher and Policy Making," Administrator's Notebook, I (1952).
- (10) Clark, Burton R. "College Teaching," in H. M. Vollmer, and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 282-291.
- (11) Corwin, Roger G. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- (12) Davis, Keith. A Preliminary Study of Management Patterns of Research Project Managers in Manufacturing in the Phoenix Area. Arizona State University, Department of Management, 1961. (Mimeographed).

- (13) Dubin, Robert. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- (14) Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- (15) Friedman, John. "A Conceptual Model for the Analysis of Planning Behavior," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 225-252.
- (16) Gore, William J. Administrative Decision-Making, A Heuristic Model. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- (17) Guest, Robert. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey, 1962.
- (18) Hage, Jerald, and Michael Aiken. "Program Change and Organizational Properties: A Comparative Analysis," The American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1967), pp. 503-520.
- (19) Hall, Richard H., and Charles R. Little. "A Note on Bureaucracy and Its 'Correlates'," American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1966), pp. 267-272.
- (20) Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- (21) Katz, Daniel. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1966.
- (22) Kornhauser, William. Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California, 1962.
- (23) La Porte, Todd R. "Conditions of Strain and Accommodation in Industrial Research Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 21-38.
- (24) Lawrence, Paul R., and Jay W. Lorsch. "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 1-47.
- (25) Ledieur, Frederick G. The Scanlon Plan. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1958.

- (26) Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- (27) Moyer, D. C. "Leadership that Teachers Want," Administrator's Notebook, VII (1955).
- (28) Pugh, D. S. et al. "A Conceptual Scheme for Organizational Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (1963), pp. 288-315.
- (29) Sharma, G. L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook, VIII (1955).
- (30) Vollmer, H. M. and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

## CHAPTER V

### SUB-PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES

#### I. DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

##### Primary Hypotheses

The primary hypotheses were related to the central concerns of the study: the identification, analysis and appraisal of distribution patterns of decision-making authority as perceived by teacher staff groups. The distribution patterns were analyzed according to patterns of decision-making authority recognized in the literature on formal organizations.

A specific question arose concerning the extent to which the probability of the decision-sources determining action varied significantly across the set of twelve task activities. For example, does the degree of probability of the individual teacher determining action vary according to the task concerned? A common-sense view suggested that the teacher decides less in the area of administration than he does in the field of classroom management. Research supports this view. Mackay concludes that schools depart substantially from the ideal Weberian concept of bureau-

cracy. (10, p. 167) However, he concludes that, in spite of differences between schools, the school remains essentially bureaucratic in organizational style. The teacher can have considerable authority with reference to the classroom. There is less probability of the teacher determining administrative action. Bidwell concludes that conditions in schools favour a considerable degree of teacher autonomy with respect to immediate teaching tasks. However, he considers forces inherent in the school setting favour bureaucratic authority in matters external to the classroom. (2, pp. 1012-1016)

In the literature on the school organization, there is little evidence on the specific part the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and higher official authority play with reference to a variety of school tasks. On the other hand, there is no lack of opinion on the distribution of authority which exists in schools. Wittlin holds that the teacher is not a professional, "on the grounds of his limited autonomy, of his restrictions in decision authority concerning what and how he teaches, and for his position as a strictly supervised employee." (17, p. 93)

With specific reference to the elementary school, Etzioni concludes:

Professional work here has less autonomy; that is, it is more controlled by those high in ranks and less subject to the discretion

of the professional than in full-fledged professional organizations, though it is still characterized by greater autonomy, than blue or white collar work. (5, p. 87)

It is generally accepted that schools at higher stages in the educational process are characterized by a higher degree of professionalization. However, research and opinion support the view that the school, in general, is a semi-professional type of organization.

Thus, the weight of research and opinion suggests that the power structure is slanted in favour of administrative authority in the arrangement of the instructional programme, and in the development of the curriculum. Administrative authority dominates with respect to basic goal determination and basic task definition. It dominates in the allocation and control of resources and the co-ordination of the work programme. The individual teacher exercises considerable discretion in the definition of elementary tasks related to his secondary production role.

On these grounds, it was anticipated the teacher had a higher probability of determining action in the area of classroom management, a lower probability of determining action in the areas of curriculum development, arrangement of the school instructional programme, and general school administration. It was anticipated that a similar pattern of variation was characteristic of the

formally recognized staff group, with the reverse holding true for higher official authority.

This general pattern of role prescription is supported by Moeller and Charters. They consider that, although teachers have considerable autonomy in the classroom "fortified by professional norms and protected by physical insulation from observability," in matters of school policy "teachers traditionally have lacked power" and are "frequently prey to arbitrary manipulation of conditions of work." (11, p. 45) Goldhammer holds that the educational organization is "based upon a hierarchical model" and is characterized by a "paternalistic administration of group life." (6, p. 130) In a study of commercial and industrial settings, Hage and Aiken found that "the greater the emphasis on the chain of command for work decisions," the less the professional activity. (8, p. 88)

The literature on school organization suggests that the pattern of role prescription for the teacher is that characteristic of the semi-professional organization. The literature also suggests that the following distribution patterns of decision-making authority characterize the school as a semi-professional organization: (a) a predominance of Basic Higher Authority patterns or variants in matters external to classroom management, (b) a predominance of Basic Individual Authority patterns or variants, and Basic



Group Authority patterns or variants in the area of classroom management.

### Secondary Hypotheses

The secondary hypotheses were concerned with differences between schools at various educational levels (e.g. senior high, junior high, elementary), and between schools classified according to socio-economic status of the community (e.g. median versus lower socio-economic levels).

Expectations concerning the differences between schools are best made on the basis of extensive evidence on the organizational structure of the schools. At present, there is insufficient evidence on school organizational structure to allow firm predictions. For the purpose of the present study, anticipated differences between schools were based on general viewpoints presented in the literature.

It was anticipated there would be significant differences between schools classified according to educational level. A proposition implicit in many discussions on school organization is that a higher degree of professionalization is characteristic of schools at higher educational levels. Thus, although schools were considered to fall within a broad semi-professional category, it was expected that differences

in professionalization would occur between schools classified according to educational level.

This view assumed that the degree of professionalization evident in the distribution of decision-making authority in schools was to some extent situationally specific, e.g. degree of professionalization varied directly with level of education.

On these grounds, it was anticipated that there would be a higher probability of the individual teacher determining action in schools at the higher educational levels. Similarly, it was expected that there would be a greater proportion of Basic Individual Authority patterns and variants and Basic Group Authority patterns and variants in schools at higher educational levels.

A second question concerned differences between schools classified according to the socio-economic status of the school locality. Again, firm evidence was lacking to support the view that marked differences would occur between the schools.

However, a plausible case could be made for the view that there was a higher degree of professionalization in schools in the higher status community settings. It could be argued that the school, as a service, client-oriented organization, was closely linked with significant primary and secondary groups in the immediate community. It was highly visible to the community in dealing with

informal and formal client groupings. These groups might or might not have values similar to those held by the school.

Further, it could be argued that the conflict between school and client-community values was greater when the school was set within lower status socio-economic backgrounds. Under these circumstances, problems of control and co-ordination faced by the school could intensify. Anderson suggests that there is a tendency for administrators to become more authoritative in the face of greater risk, in the attempt to guarantee responsible and predictable action on the part of subordinates. (1, p. 138) Willower considers that teachers and administrators adapt to pressures from unselected pupil clients and from the community. (16, p. 93) He recalls that "Waller believed that administrators respond to student staff conflict and to community pressure by exerting primarily dominative authority over teachers." (16, p. 93) Bidwell holds that professionalization of staff roles as an "organization attribute" must be related to the influence of the client group and the nature of the school setting. (2, p. 1012)

#### Formal Statement of Primary Hypotheses

Matters of Primary Concern. The identification,

analysis, and appraisal of distribution patterns of decision-making authority in each school as perceived by each staff group were the central concerns of the study.

Hypothesis 1.1. Role Specification. There is a marked variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by each decision source in the various task areas: or, the responses of each school staff group indicate that the mean perceived probability of each decision source determining action varies significantly across the set of twelve task activities.

Hypothesis 1.1a. The high mean probability of the individual teacher determining action on Task 4 is significantly higher than for tasks external to classroom management.

Hypothesis 1.1b. The high mean probability of the formal staff group determining action on Task 4 is significantly higher than for tasks external to classroom management.

Hypothesis 1.1c. The low mean probability of higher official authority determining action on Task 4 is significantly lower than for tasks external to classroom management.

Hypothesis 1.2. Distribution Patterns. There is a

basic difference in the relative part each decision source plays with reference to the determination of a specific task; or, there is a significant difference in the degree of probability of one source as against the others determining action on a specific task.

Hypothesis 1.2a. Meaningful distribution patterns can be identified for each task. Patterns are meaningful when significant differences are obtained in at least five of the six sets of relationships.

Hypothesis 1.3. Distribution Patterns. Meaningful patterns of authority distribution, classified according to recognized authority patterns, are those most characteristic of the semi-professional organization.

Hypothesis 1.3a. In the area of classroom management, Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants and Basic Group Authority Patterns and variants are most frequent; in task activities external to classroom management, Basic Higher Authority Patterns and variants are most frequent.

Hypothesis 1.4. Distribution Patterns. Meaningful patterns of authority distribution do not meet the criteria of adaptive distribution patterns.

#### Formal Statement of Secondary Hypotheses

Matters of secondary concern were the identification of similarities and differences in the distribution of

decision-making authority between schools at different educational levels, and between schools in different socio-economic settings.

Hypothesis 1.5. Group Differences. Significant differences in the distribution of decision-making authority occur between schools at different levels of education and between schools in different socio-economic settings.

Hypothesis 1.5a. Role Specification. At the higher educational levels, the probability of the teacher and the formal staff group determining action is higher than at the lower educational levels.

Hypothesis 1.5b. Role Specification. At the higher educational levels, the probability of higher official authority determining action is lower than at the lower educational levels.

Hypothesis 1.5c. Distribution Patterns. At the higher educational levels, distribution patterns of decision-making authority characteristic of the professional organization occur more frequently than at the lower educational levels.

Hypothesis 1.5d. Role Specification. In schools in lower socio-economic settings, the probability of the teacher and the formal staff group determining action is lower than in schools in median socio-economic settings.

Hypothesis 1.5e. Role Specification. In schools in lower socio-economic settings, the probability of higher official authority determining action is higher than in schools in median socio-economic settings.

Hypothesis 1.5f. Distribution Patterns. In schools in lower socio-economic settings, distribution patterns of decision-making authority characteristic of the professional organization occur less frequently than in schools in median socio-economic settings.

## II. DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY AS PREFERRED BY TEACHERS

### Primary Hypotheses

The primary hypotheses were related to the identification, analysis and appraisal of preferred distribution patterns of decision-making authority. The distribution patterns were analyzed according to patterns of decision-making authority recognized in the literature on formal organizations. First, attention was focussed on the relationship between the preferred distribution of decision-making authority and the specification of the teacher's role. Second, preferred distribution patterns of decision-making authority associated with the twelve task activities were studied.

A specific question concerned the extent to which the preferred probability of the decision sources

determining action varied significantly across the set of twelve task activities. For example, how does the preferred probability of the individual teacher determining action vary according to the task concerned.

The literature on the place of the teacher in the authority system supports the view that the teacher wants participation in decisions directly related to immediate work tasks. It is less helpful in suggesting the degree of decision-making authority desired by the teacher for specific tasks external to classroom management. The literature does suggest that the teacher shows less interest in decisions concerning general administration than in decisions directly related to classroom management. However, as Bridges notes, "It is not clear where the teacher's 'zone of indifference' lies." (5, p. 52)

Mackay found that, in some respects, the teachers he studied desired a greater degree of bureaucratization of the school organization than they were experiencing. (10) On the other hand, he found marked differences in the degree of bureaucratization experienced in different schools. Are teachers similar to salaried professionals in other organizations who had "bureaucratic orientations" which "accommodated to the demands of the organization by giving up professional commitments"? (13, p. 269)

Goldhammer takes the position that there is a desire among teachers for structure which diffuses



responsibility for decision-making among individuals affected by the decision. (6, p. 132) However, confusion exists as to teachers' preferences concerning the place of the formally recognized staff group in decision-making. Goslin considers that feelings of collegiality may be quite weak in teaching. (7, p. 135) Strauss indicates some of the complexities of the issue by raising the following question: Do members prefer the achievement and individualism inherent in authority exercised by the individual, or the equality and conformity associated with authority exercised by a staff group? (15, p. 41-45)

In view of the lack of clear direction from the literature, predictions were based on the proposition that teachers were undergoing professionalization in a semi-professional organization. With reference to the preferences of members in this type of occupational role, Etzioni states that:

... the semi-professional subordinates tend to adopt the full-fledged professions as their reference group in the sense that they view themselves as full-fledged professionals and feel that they should be given more discretion and be less controlled. (5, p. 89)

It was difficult to estimate the degree to which teachers identified themselves with the full-fledged professional. As Etzioni points out, there is the possibility that a special relationship may exist between

the semi-professional and the administrator in schools. There may be a general compatibility of outlook based on the practice of teachers being promoted into administrative positions. Thus, the extent of the difference between actual and teacher preferred authority structures may not be as great as in other types of semi-professional organization. Further, teachers may view administration as giving the protection required for work in a highly visible and complex work situation.

However, on the grounds that the teacher's role is undergoing professionalization, it was accepted that teachers generally subscribe to a professional ideology. Strauss considers, "Professions place high value on autonomy, inner direction and question for maximum self-development. As much as any other group in society, their existence is work oriented." (15, p. 48)

An important question concerns the extent to which teachers desire to exercise decision-making authority in matters external to classroom management. The literature on professionalization offers some support for the view that member aspiration for decision-making authority in some matters external to the immediate work situation is part of the full-fledged professional ideology.

Hage and Aiken suggest that the greater the professional activity, the greater the demands for participation in organizational decision-making. (8, p. 84)

They attribute particular significance to case studies which indicate that professionals demand not only job autonomy, but more power in general. This trend is particularly strong where professionals are directly concerned with basic task accomplishment. In contrast is the position of the non-professional employee who is more concerned with limited control over his immediate work tasks.

Thus, it was anticipated that, in some administrative matters, teachers would prefer a degree of decision-making authority equal to that which they desired in the classroom. It was expected that teachers would prefer a similar authority distribution pattern with respect to the authority exercised by the formal staff group. Further, it was predicted that teachers would prefer a comparatively low degree of decision-making authority exercised by higher official authority.

On these grounds, it was anticipated that teachers would prefer a predominance of Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants and Basic Group Authority Patterns and variants for matters internal and external to classroom management.

### Secondary Hypotheses

The secondary hypotheses were concerned with differences in the preferences of school staff in schools

at various educational levels (e.g. senior high, junior high, elementary), and in schools classified according to socio-economic status of the community (e.g. median versus lower socio-economic levels). The hypotheses were also concerned with differences in the preferences of teachers classified according to sex, length of experience, and length of training.

Etzioni's view that semi-professionals tend to adopt the full-fledged professions as their reference group was accepted as characteristic of teachers in the general test group. That is, a preference for the full-fledged professional ideology was taken as characteristic of the teacher group selected for the purposes of this study. Thus, it was anticipated that there would be no significant differences in the preferences of teachers classified according to type of school and selected categorical variables.

#### Formal Statement of Primary Hypotheses

Matters of Primary Concern. The identification, analysis, and appraisal of preferred distribution patterns of decision-making authority were central to the study of teacher preferences.

Hypothesis 2.1. Role Specification. There is a marked variation in the degree of decision-making authority

preferred for each decision source in the various task areas; or, the responses of each school staff group indicate that the preferred probability of each decision source determining action varies significantly across the set of twelve task activities.

Hypothesis 2.1a. The high mean preferred probability of the individual teacher determining action on Task 4 is similar to the probability preferred for other task activities.

Hypothesis 2.1b. The high mean preferred probability of the formal staff group determining action on Task 4 is similar to the probability preferred for other task activities.

Hypothesis 2.1c. The low mean preferred probability of higher official authority determining action on Task 4 is similar to the probability preferred for other task activities.

Hypothesis 2.2. Distribution Patterns. There is a basic difference in the relative part preferred for each source with reference to the determination of any task; or there is a significant difference in the preferred degree of probability of one source as against the others determining action on a specific task.

Hypothesis 2.2a. Meaningful distribution patterns of decision-making authority, based on significant differ-

ences in the probability of each decision source determining action, can be identified for each task.

Hypothesis 2.3. Distribution Patterns. Meaningful patterns of preferred authority distribution, classified according to recognized authority patterns, are those most characteristic of the full-fledged professional organization.

Hypothesis 2.3a. Basic Individual Authority Patterns and Variants, and Basic Group Authority Patterns and Variants are most frequent, in task areas internal and external to classroom management.

Hypothesis 2.4. Distribution Patterns. Meaningful patterns of authority distribution do not meet the criteria of adaptive distribution patterns.

#### Formal Statement of Secondary Hypotheses

Matters of secondary concern were the identification of similarities and differences in the preferred distribution of decision-making authority between schools at different educational levels and between schools in different socio-economic settings. Also, the identification of similarities and differences in the responses of teachers classified according to selected categorical variables.

Hypothesis 2.5. Group Differences. Significant

differences do not occur in the preferences of school staff classified according to the educational level of the school.

Hypothesis 2.6. Group Differences. Significant differences do not occur in the preferences of school staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the school community setting.

Hypothesis 2.7. Group Differences. Significant differences do not occur in the preferences of teachers classified according to selected categorical variables.

### III. COMPARISON OF THE PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

This study took the position that a higher degree of professionalization would be reflected in teacher preferences than in teacher perceptions. Thus, it was anticipated that there would be significant differences between the stated preferences and perceptions of teachers in the direction indicated.

#### Formal Statement of Hypotheses

Matters of Concern. A comparison of the mean preferences and perceptions of teachers in the total test group. A comparison of preferred and perceived distribution patterns, and of preferred and perceived

patterns of role specification.

Hypothesis 3.1. Role Specification. There are marked differences in the preferred and perceived patterns of role specification. Differences are those which occur between role specification in the semi-professional (the perceived) and the professional (the preferred) organization.

Hypothesis 3.2. Distribution Patterns. There are marked differences in the preferred and perceived distribution patterns of decision-making authority for each of the twelve task activities. Differences are those which occur between the semi-professional (the perceived) and the professional (the preferred) organization.

Hypothesis 3.3. Group Differences. There are significant differences in the mean preference and perception scores of teachers in the total test group.

Hypothesis 3.3a. The mean preferred probability of the individual teacher and of the staff group determining action is significantly higher than the mean perceived probability.

Hypothesis 3.3b. The mean preferred probability of higher official authority determining action is significantly lower than the mean perceived probability.

### Summary

The primary hypotheses were related to the central



concerns of the study: the identification, analysis and appraisal of distribution patterns of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teacher staff groups. Hypotheses concerning staff perceptions were based on the view that the school is a semi-professional type of organization. Hypotheses concerning staff preferences were based on the view that teachers tend to adopt the full-fledged professional as a reference group.

The secondary hypotheses were concerned with the comparison of the responses of staff groups classified according to the educational level of the school and to the socio-economic level of the school community setting.

Hypotheses concerning differences in staff perceptions were based on the view that the perceived distribution of authority expresses a higher degree of professionalization in schools at higher educational levels, and in schools in higher status socio-economic settings. Hypotheses concerning differences in staff preferences were based on the view that the preferred distribution of authority was similar for teachers grouped according to selected variables (i.e. grouped according to type of school and selected categorical variables).

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER V

- (1) Anderson, James G. "The Authority Structure of the School: System of Social Exchange," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 1-21.
- (2) Bidwell, C. E. "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 972-1022.
- (3) Bridges, Edwin M. "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making," Administrator's Notebook, XII (1964).
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_. "A Model for Shared Decision-Making in the School Principalship," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 49-61.
- (5) Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- (6) Goldhammer, Keith, et al. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.
- (7) Goslin, David A. The School in Contemporary Society. Chicago: Scott-Foresman, 1965.
- (8) Hage, Jerald, and Michael Aiken. "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 72-92.
- (9) Leavitt, Harold J. (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- (10) Mackay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and the Relation to Other Characteristics of School Organizations." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.
- (11) Moeller, Gerald H., and W. W. Charters. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 444-465.

- (12) Pugh, D. S., et al. "A Conceptual Scheme for Organizational Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (1963), pp. 288-315.
- (13) Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," in H. M. Vollmer, and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 265-275.
- (14) Steiner, Gary A. The Creative Organization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- (15) Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization," in Harold J. Leavitt (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pp. 41-84.
- (16) Willower, Donald J. "The Handbook of Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 89-99.
- (17) Wittlin, Alma S. "The Teacher," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 91-110.

## CHAPTER VI

### METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this study, research techniques were developed to enable a study of distribution patterns of decision-making authority to be made. The techniques were based on the proposition that authority is better expressed in relative than in absolute terms.

#### Data Collection

Two descriptive survey instruments were developed. They were designed to measure the perceived and preferred probability of each of the decision sources determining action on twelve task activities in the school.

Each instrument contained seventy-two items, distributed in the following way among the three decision sources:

	<u>Individual</u> <u>Teacher</u>		<u>Higher</u> <u>Authority</u>		<u>Staff</u> <u>Group</u>	
	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Practice</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Practice</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Practice</u>
Number of task activi- ties (items)	12	12	12	12	12	12

Table I indicates representative studies which have used items similar to those used in the instruments.

TABLE I  
STUDIES WHICH HAVE USED SIMILAR ITEMS  
TO THOSE INCLUDED IN QUESTIONNAIRES  
DEVELOPED FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

<u>Present study</u> Item no.	<u>Similar items used in related studies</u>		
	Study A <sup>a</sup>	Study B <sup>b</sup>	Study C <sup>c</sup>
1		x	x
2		x	x
3	x	x	x
4	x	x	x
5			
6			
7			
8	x	x	x
9	x	x	x
10	x	x	
11	x	x	
12	x	x	x

<sup>a</sup>Wisconsin Study, Chapter VI.

<sup>b</sup>Sharma Study, Chapter VI.

<sup>c</sup>West Chester Study, Chapter VI.

Responses to each item were obtained on a five point scale, indicating the degree of probability of a decision source determining policy or direct action with respect to the task activity concerned. The following Likert type scale was used:

<u>Probability Level</u>	<u>Numerical Rating</u>
Extremely high	5
Moderately high	4
Impossible to judge	3
Moderately low	2
Extremely low	1

### The Sample

Fourteen urban schools were included in the study, two senior high schools, six junior high schools and six elementary schools. Data concerned with the sample are set out in Table II.

The sample contained schools with a minimum of fourteen teachers and schools which organized instruction on the self-contained classroom. The test group of schools included seven schools from a median socio-economic area, seven from the lowest socio-economic area. Each group of seven schools contained a senior high school and a sample of feeder schools (three junior high, three elementary).

Four schools were discarded from the eighteen selected for study because it was felt that the incompleteness of their returns might bias the sample. To this end,

TABLE II  
DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Schools <sup>a</sup>	Categorical Variables							
	Sex		Experience (Yrs.)			Training (Yrs.)		
	M	F	1	2-5	6+	1-2	3-4	5-6
<u>Senior High</u>								
(02) Low Status	27	16	5	23	15	1	29	13
(01) Median Status	38	23	3	24	34	2	27	32
<u>Junior High</u>								
Low Status								
(03)	12	8	4	7	9	6	14	-
(04)	16	7	4	12	7	3	13	7
(05)	8	13	4	12	5	6	14	1
Median Status								
(06)	8	15	2	11	10	4	14	5
(07)	14	10	3	10	11	3	15	6
(08)	9	18	6	9	12	6	12	9
<u>Elementary</u>								
Low Status								
(09)	2	12	2	6	6	9	4	1
(10)	3	10	2	5	6	6	6	1
(11)	2	13	-	9	6	6	8	1
Median Status								
(12)	7	17	2	14	8	7	15	2
(13)	5	12	-	4	13	9	8	-
(14)	3	15	2	4	12	11	6	1
Total	154	189	39	150	154	79	185	79

<sup>a</sup>Grouped according to educational level and socio-economic status of community.

schools with less than seventy per cent of the total questionnaires usable (through lack of returns or spoiling) were discarded. The following schools remained in the test group:

<u>Median socio-economic area</u>		<u>Lowest socio-economic area</u>	
<u>School level</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>School level</u>	<u>N</u>
Senior High	1	Senior High	1
Junior High	3	Junior High	3
Elementary	3	Elementary	3

The fourteen schools remaining in the test group included a population of three hundred and forty-three teachers.

The socio-economic status of the median and lower socio-economic areas was determined primarily on the basis of a previous survey of senior high schools in the Edmonton Public School Board Area. (5) The survey made use of the Gough Home Index Scale adapted for Canadian usage. (3) A chi square test of the significance of the difference between Gough score distributions for the two socio-economic areas concerned with the present study was significant at the .01 level of confidence. General support for basic differences in the two socio-economic areas came from wage levels in census data presented by the Canadian Bureau of Statistics. (2) Wage levels were substantially higher in the median socio-economic area than in the lowest socio-economic area.



### The Instruments

Two pilot studies examined the adequacy of the selection, grouping, and phrasing of items, and the general format of each instrument. Items referred to a set of task activities directly relevant to the school instructional programme. In this sense, the study was more specialized than previous studies dealing with decision-making authority in school systems. Sharma examined decision-making on such matters as salaries and the selection of teachers. (9) The Wisconsin study included items presented in general terms (e.g. "the decision on the adequacy of teacher performance") and items relating to the overall operation of the school system. (4) The West Chester Study was less concerned with details of classroom management than this study. (11) However, reference to Table I shows that a number of items used in the present study refer to tasks also included in these representative studies.

Since the purpose of the pilot studies was to check on content and form of presentation, reliability studies were not undertaken before the instruments were applied to the test group. For the test group, a number of standard tests of reliability were not appropriate. Guilford notes that split-half reliability measures are not meaningful in a heterogeneous type of test. (6, p. 450) Horst points out that it is difficult to use test-retest

measures in a situation where the initial test is given to subjects in different situations over a time period (in this case, five weeks). (7, p. 278)

The measure of reliability developed for the purpose of the present study assumed that two random groups taken from the test population represented two identical groups. Similar group score distributions on each test item should be obtained for these groups. Correlation techniques were not appropriate to test score distributions of the two randomly selected groups. More appropriate, was a comparison of factorial structure inherent in the responses of each random group. Essentially, the measure of reliability was based on assumptions in AhmaVaara's mathematical theory of factorial invariance.

Reference to Tables III and IV indicate that the similarity of structure between the two random groups was high. Within its general limitations as a measure of reliability, the data in the comparison matrix suggest that the reliability of the two instruments was acceptable for the purpose of the present study. In further studies, the measurement of reliability should be supplemented by additional techniques.

Within the limitations of a method of reliability based solely on a comparison of group differences, the technique provided an acceptable index of consistency. Certainly, the method of testing reliability was appropriate

TABLE III

AHMAVAARA FACTOR MATCH: COMPARISON MATRIX, TWO  
RANDOM SAMPLES FROM TEST POPULATION--TEACHER  
PREFERENCES

Random Group II Factors	Random Group I Factors					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	0.99	-0.01	0.11	-0.13	0.01	-0.01
2	0.03	0.98	-0.08	0.14	-0.09	0.05
3	0.06	0.09	0.99	0.09	-0.06	0.01
4	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.99	0.08	0.12
5	0.12	-0.02	-0.01	-0.18	-0.97	-0.08
6	0.06	-0.26	-0.10	0.12	0.08	0.95

TABLE IV

AHMAVAARA FACTOR MATCH: COMPARISON MATRIX,  
TWO RANDOM SAMPLES FROM TEST POPULATION  
--TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

Random Group II Factors	Random Group I Factors					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	-0.88	-0.46	0.04	0.09	0.04	-0.01
2	0.39	0.78	0.09	0.18	0.41	0.21
3	0.06	-0.01	-0.98	0.02	-0.13	0.14
4	0.05	0.09	0.15	-0.96	-0.19	-0.11
5	-0.01	0.21	0.10	-0.06	-0.94	-0.25
6	0.16	-0.18	0.08	-0.09	-0.26	0.93

for a study which emphasized the analysis of mean group responses.

### Statistical Techniques

The t test of significance was used to test the significance of mean differences between response distributions of each school staff group, and of mean differences between the response distributions of schools classified according to level of schooling and socio-economic status of community background. The t test of significance was also used to test the significance of mean differences between response distributions of teachers classified according to sex. One way analysis of variance was used to test the significance of mean differences between response distributions of teachers classified according to length of training and length of experience. Factor analysis was used (a) as a statistical technique contributing to the development of the two instruments, and (b) as a means of testing the reliability of the two instruments. Chi square was used to test the significance of differences between score distributions on the Gough Scale which indicated the socio-economic status of the two school districts selected for study.

### Computer Analysis

Teacher responses to each questionnaire were placed on IBM cards. Information about (a) the socio-economic

status of the school community setting, (b) the educational level of the school (elementary, junior high, senior high), and (c) the sex, length of training, length of experience of the teacher were also included on the cards.

A computer programme was written at the University of Alberta. It included the following types of analysis:

- (1) One way analysis of variance of teachers' scores, on the basis of years of teaching and years of training.
- (2) t tests of correlated means for the following variables: (a) mean perception scores of each staff group classified according to decision source and task area, (b) mean preferences scores of each staff group classified according to decision source and task area, (c) differences between mean perceived and preferred probability scores of total test sample.
- (3) t tests of uncorrelated means for the following variables: (a) differences between mean staff responses of staff classified according to educational level of the school and socioeconomic status of school locality, for both staff preferences and perceptions, (b) differences between mean staff responses of teachers classified according to selected categorical variables, for both preferences and perceptions.
- (4) Factor analysis of (a) subject responses in pilot studies, (b) of teacher responses in two randomly selected groups taken from test group. Associated with the factor analysis of teacher responses in the two randomly selected groups was an AhmaVaara Factor Match Programme, to compare the factorial structure of the two groups.

### Statistical Treatment of the Data

Specification of the teacher's role. To determine the pattern of role specification, a measure of the variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across a set of twelve task activities was obtained. This was based on significant differences in the degree of probability of a decision source determining action on Task 4 as against other tasks. (supra, p. 4 ) Table V gives an example of the type of statistical analysis undertaken. The t test of significance for correlated means was used to test differences between the mean probability scores of each teacher staff group. Later tables which set out the data on patterns of role specification focus on the direction of significant differences between mean scores, e.g. the data presented in the final column of Table V.

Distribution patterns of decision-making authority. Reference has been made to the general statistical basis for identifying the distribution pattern of decision-making authority associated with each task. (supra, p. 67 ) To identify distribution patterns of decision-making authority, a measure was taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for the specific task activity. This was based on the relative degree of probability of each decision-

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF THE INDIVIDUAL TEACHER DETERMINING POLICY  
FOR TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS, STAFF GROUP A

Task area	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t	Direction of significant difference
1	61	1.79	1.26	13.86 <sup>a</sup>	lower
2	61	2.66	1.39	9.34 <sup>a</sup>	lower
3	61	2.09	1.26	10.84 <sup>a</sup>	lower
4	-	4.33	-	-	-
5	61	4.28	0.68	0.31	nil
6	61	4.38	0.85	0.35	nil
7	61	1.39	0.54	18.72 <sup>a</sup>	lower
8	61	3.57	1.03	5.0 <sup>a</sup>	lower
9	61	1.70	1.05	14.23 <sup>a</sup>	lower
10	61	1.66	0.70	17.10 <sup>a</sup>	lower
11	61	2.39	1.20	11.75 <sup>a</sup>	lower
12	61	1.97	1.01	13.03 <sup>a</sup>	lower

<sup>a</sup>significant at the .01 level.



source determining action on the task activity concerned. Here, the type of statistical analysis undertaken is set out in detail.

Example. The identification of the distribution pattern of decision-making authority associated with determining specific procedures for Task 1 (School X). After the t test of correlated means was applied to the mean probability scores for the three decision sources, the following sets of relationships were obtained:

- (a) The mean probability of the individual teacher determining specific procedures was significantly higher than the mean probability of the formal staff group determining specific procedures.
- (b) The mean probability of the individual teacher determining specific procedures was significantly higher than the mean probability of higher official authority determining specific procedures.
- (c) There was no significant difference between the mean probabilities of the formal staff group and higher official authority determining specific procedures.

On the basis of the three sets of relationships the following distribution-pattern of decision-making authority was obtained:

<u>Decision Source</u>	<u>Relative Standing</u>
Individual	Higher (H)
Group	Lower (L)
Higher official authority	Lower (L)

This authority pattern conformed to the Basic

Individual Authority Pattern (supra, p. 69)

Thus, if the mean probability of the individual teacher determining action was significantly higher than the mean probabilities for the formal staff group and higher official authority, with no significant difference occurring between the mean probabilities for the formal staff group and higher official authority, the following distribution pattern was obtained:  
Individual (H), Group (L), Higher Official Authority (L).

The statistical calculations concerned with this example are set out in Table VI. Later tables which set out the data on distribution patterns of decision-making authority present the distribution patterns classified according to the scheme developed in the present study.

Limitations

(1) Conclusions arrived at in the study were limited to the schools included in the test group.

(2) The findings of the study were limited by the general research methodology, i.e. a broad type of descriptive study directed towards the initial exploration of a problem area, one which Vroom has described as a "correlational study." (10, p. 271)  
The nature of the relationship between a large number of variables was studied simultaneously. In the present

TABLE VI  
COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PERCEIVED PROBABILITY OF  
EACH OF THE THREE DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING  
PRACTICE FOR TASK 4, SCHOOL STAFF GROUP A

Decision sources	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t	Relative standing of means
Individual	61	4.41	0.95	11.56 <sup>a</sup>	higher
Group	61	2.13	1.19		lower
Individual	61	4.41	0.95	15.19 <sup>a</sup>	higher
Higher auth.	61	1.74	0.83		lower
Group	61	2.13	1.19	2.31	no significant difference
Higher auth.	61	1.74	0.83		

<sup>a</sup>significant at the .01 level.

study, attention was focussed on patterns of relationships evident in the network of associations between variables.

(3) The variables selected for study represented selected aspects of more inclusive concepts. (supra, pp.50-60)

(4) The variables selected for study were limited to a restricted range of possible intra-organizational variables, e.g. no account was taken of the psychological aspects of interpersonal relationships in organizations.

(5) Data were collected solely by means of written inventories, i.e. conclusions were based on the written responses of teachers.

(6) Statistical techniques were based solely on group response distributions and were concerned only with the comparison of mean scores. It was assumed that group responses were normally distributed.

(7) The significance of differences between response distributions was assessed at the .01 level of confidence.

### Summary

Research techniques were developed with the aim of studying patterns of relationships between selected variables. The review of the methodology discussed (a) methods of data collection, (b) the selection of the sample, (c) the development of instruments, (d) statistical treatment of the data, and (e) limitations of the study.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER VI

- (1) AhmaVaara, Yrjo. "The Mathematical Theory of Factorial Invariance Under Selection," Psychometrika, 19 (1954), pp. 27-38.
- (2) Dominion Bureau of Statistics. 1961 Census of Canada. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1962.
- (3) Elley, Warwick B. "A Comparative Analysis of the Socio-Economic Bias in Selected Intelligence Tests." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.
- (4) Eye, Glen G., et al. Relationship between Instructional Change and the Extent to Which School Administrators and Teachers agree on the Location of Responsibilities for Administrative Decision. Cooperative Research Project No. 5-0443 (1913). Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin, 1966.
- (5) Friesen, D. Edmonton High School Study. Publication in Progress: The University of Alberta, 1968.
- (6) Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.
- (7) Horst, Paul. Psychological Measurement and Prediction. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1966.
- (8) Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. San Francisco: Chandler, 1964.
- (9) Sharma, G. L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook, VIII (1955).
- (10) Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- (11) West Chester Public Schools and West Chester Joint Secondary Schools. Administrative Staffing Study, quoted in D. E. Griffiths et al. Organizing Schools for Effective Education. Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1962.

## CHAPTER VII

### RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

#### PERCEIVED DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS

##### I. PRIMARY HYPOTHESES

The primary hypotheses were concerned with the identification, analysis, and assessment of distribution patterns of decision-making authority as perceived by teachers.

##### Role Specification

A linear perspective was taken in the analysis of data related to the perceived pattern of role specification. A measure of the variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across a set of twelve task activities was obtained. This was based on significant differences in the mean probability of a decision source determining action on Task 4 as against other tasks. (supra, p.123) The data in Tables VIII to X compared the mean perceived probability for each task with the mean perceived probability for Task 4. The Tables indicated the direction of any significant differences.

Table VIII showed that, in the great majority of cases, the probability of the individual teacher determining action in matters external to classroom management

TABLE VII  
SCHOOL CODE NUMBERS

Level of Education	Socio-economic status of community setting	School Code Number
<u>Senior High</u>	median	01
	lower	02
<u>Junior High</u>	lower	03
		04
		05
	median	06
		07
		08
<u>Elementary</u>	lower	09
		10
		11
	median	12
		13
		14

TABLE VIII

A COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF THE INDIVIDUAL TEACHER DETERMINING ACTION, FOR  
TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	4.33	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.41	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.53	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.56	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.40	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.40	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.39	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.26	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.81	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.39	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
06												
Policy	4.78	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.52	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
07												
Policy	4.37	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.46	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.  
H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.  
L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.  
Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.



TABLE VIII (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	4.48	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.48	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.50	L	L	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	N	L
Practice	4.57	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.77	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.39	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.40	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.13	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
12												
Policy	4.21	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.00	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
13												
Policy	4.23	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.01	L	L	L	L	N	L	N	L	L	N	L
14												
Policy	3.84	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	L
Practice	3.94	L	L	L	L	N	L	N	L	L	N	L

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.  
 H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.  
 L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF THE FORMAL STAFF GROUP DETERMINING ACTION, FOR  
TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>											
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>													
01													
Policy	2.99	L	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	L	N	N	
Practice	2.13	N	H	H	H	N	L	H	H	N	H	H	
02 <sup>x</sup>													
Policy	2.98	L	N	N	N	L	L	N	L	L	N	N	
Practice	2.42	N	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>													
03 <sup>x</sup>													
Policy	2.85	L	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	H	
Practice	3.10	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	N	L	N	N	
04 <sup>x</sup>													
Policy	3.08	L	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	N	N	N	
Practice	2.87	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
05 <sup>x</sup>													
Policy	3.43	L	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	L	N	N	
Practice	3.05	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	
06													
Policy	3.65	L	N	L	N	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	
Practice	3.13	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	N	
07													
Policy	2.62	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	
Practice	2.91	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup>Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE IX (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	2.81	L	N	L	N	L	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.37	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.28	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.50	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.15	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.92	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.20	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.93	N	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	N	N	N
12												
Policy	2.08	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.70	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
13												
Policy	2.17	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.00	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H
14												
Policy	2.22	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	1.94	N	N	N	H	H	N	N	N	N	H	N

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.  
H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.  
L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE X

A COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF HIGHER OFFICIAL AUTHORITY DETERMINING ACTION,  
FOR TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	1.62	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.73	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.88	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.02	H	H	H	N	L	H	H	H	H	H	H
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.30	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	2.40	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	N
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.21	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.52	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	N	H	H
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.95	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	2.19	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
06												
Policy	1.78	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	1.48	H	H	H	L	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
07												
Policy	2.04	H	N	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.15	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.  
H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.  
L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE X (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	1.81	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.96	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.71	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.36	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.15	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.84	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.60	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	N	N	H
Practice	2.06	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
12												
Policy	2.33	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.08	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
13												
Policy	2.88	H	N	H	N	L	H	H	H	H	N	N
Practice	2.35	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
14												
Policy	2.44	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	2.22	H	H	H	H	N	H	N	H	H	H	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

was significantly lower than that for Task 4. In no case was the probability higher. In general, the perceived probability of the individual teacher determining action on Task 4 was high.

Table IX indicated that, for the total test group, the probability of the formal staff group determining action in matters external to classroom management was significantly higher than for Task 4 in only thirteen of a possible 252 cases. In general, the perceived probability of the formal staff group determining action on Task 4 was in the moderately low to mean probability range.

Table X revealed that, for the total test group, the probability of higher official authority determining action in matters external to classroom management was significantly higher than that for Task 4 in the great majority of cases. In no case was the probability lower. In general, the perceived probability of higher official authority determining action on Task 4 was in the extremely low to mean probability range.

The data in Tables VIII to X provided only a general index of role specification. The direction of significant differences from a basic reference task was shown. Absolute values showing the mean perceived probability for each activity were not indicated.

With reference to Hypothesis 1.1 it was apparent

that the perceived probability of each decision source determining action varied across the set of twelve task activities.

Hypothesis 1.1a stated that the high mean probability of the individual determining action for Task 4 would be significantly higher than for tasks external to classroom management. Table VIII indicated that there were only minor departures from this anticipated pattern of variation. The pattern held for all schools in the area of curriculum development (task activities 1 - 3) and for eleven of the fourteen schools in the area related to the arrangement of the school instructional programme (task activities 7 - 9). In the latter task area, the pattern of variation also characterized fourteen of the eighteen task activities in the remaining three schools. The basic pattern also held for nine of the fourteen schools in the area of general school administration (task activities 10 - 12). For the remaining five schools, it was apparent in twenty-three of the thirty tasks in general school administration.

Hypothesis 1.1b stated that the high mean probability of the formal staff group determining action on Task 4 would be significantly higher than for tasks external to classroom management. Table IX indicated there was little support for the anticipated pattern of differences. For the total test sample, the hypothesized relationships held

in only three of the possible eighty-four task activities in the area of curriculum development, in two of the task activities concerned with the arrangement of the school instructional programme, and in eight of the task activities concerned with general school organization.

Hypothesis 1.1c stated that the low mean probability of higher official authority determining action on Task 4 would be significantly lower than for tasks external to classroom management. Trends in the data presented in Table X provided strong support for the hypothesis. For the total test group, the anticipated pattern of differences was evident in eighty-three of the possible eighty-four task activities in the area of curriculum development, in eighty-three task activities in the area concerned with the arrangement of the school instructional programme, in eighty-three task activities in the area of general school organization.

For two of the three sub-hypotheses, trends in the data were as expected. Mean score differences were in the direction anticipated for the individual teacher and for higher official authority. However, the data did not give a clear indication of the relative role the formal staff group played in determining matters internal and external to classroom management.

A striking feature of the data was the difference in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by



the individual teacher and higher official authority in classroom management as against other areas. The data suggested that in no other school activity was the teacher perceived to exercise a degree of authority as high as that exercised in classroom management.

Conversely, it was apparent that, in no other school activity was higher official authority perceived to exercise a degree of authority as low as that exercised in classroom management.

In the perceptions of teachers, the formal staff group exercised a degree of decision-making authority intermediate to the authority exercised by other decision sources in the area of classroom management. The probability of the formal staff group determining action was in the moderately low to mean probability range. At most, it was perceived to exercise a similar degree of authority in some matters external to the classroom. It was difficult to identify a distinctive pattern of decision-making authority exercised by this decision source across the set of task activities.

#### Distribution Patterns

To identify perceived distribution patterns of decision-making authority, a measure was taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for each task activity.

(supra, p. 67) The measure was based on the degree of probability of each decision-source determining action for the task activity concerned. Tables XI to XXIV summarized the preferred and perceived distribution patterns for each school. In the tables, distribution patterns were classified according to the classification system developed for the purpose of this study. (supra, p. 69)

Hypothesis 1.2. With reference to Hypothesis 1.2, data in Tables XI to XXIV indicated that significant differences in the probability of one decision source ~~as~~ against the other determining action were not obtained on all tasks. This was demonstrated by the number of diffuse distribution patterns obtained. These were patterns in which the number of significant differences between the probabilities of decision sources determining action on a task were not obtained in at least five of the six possible sets of relationships. (supra, p. 72)

However, meaningful distribution patterns were obtained for the majority of tasks in each of the schools surveyed. For schools in the total test sample, the number of meaningful distribution patterns ranged from seven to the maximum of twelve. Ten or more meaningful patterns were identified in eight of the fourteen schools.

Hypothesis 1.3. This hypothesis stated that meaningful patterns of authority distribution would be those

TABLE XI

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 01 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.		
<u>II. Traditional Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		12, 11, 3, 7, 9, 10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4, 5, 6	4, 5, 6
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher	10, 12	
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-indiv.	3	
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.	1	
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.	2, 8	
4. Basic mixed		
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		8
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.	9	
<u>B. Complete</u>		
	7, 11	2

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XII

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 06 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.		
<u>II. Traditional Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,6	4,5,6
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		7
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.	2,11	
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		9
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.	5	
4. Basic mixed		
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		3
2. Group auth.	3,10,12	
3. Indiv. auth.		
<u>B. Complete</u>		
	1,7,8,9	2,8,11,12

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XIII  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 07 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<b>I. <u>Traditional</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		3, 7
B. Group auth.	12	
C. Individ. auth.		4
<b>II. <u>Traditional</u>     <u>Minor Variants</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		9, 10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4, 5, 11	5, 6
<b>III. <u>Major Variants</u></b>		
A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
B. <u>Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		12
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.	2, 8	
C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		1
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed	6	
<b>IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u></b>		
A. <u>Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
B. <u>Complete</u>	1, 3, 7, 9, 10	2, 8, 11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XIV  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 08 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<b>I. <u>Traditional</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		3,8,10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	6,11	
<b>II. <u>Traditional</u> <u>Minor Variants</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		1,7,9,12
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,5	4
<b>III. <u>Major Variants</u></b>		
A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
B. <u>Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<b>IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u></b>		
A. <u>Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		2
2. Group auth.	12	
3. Individ. auth.	2	5
B. <u>Complete</u>	1,3,7,8,9,10	11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XV  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 12 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<b>I. <u>Traditional</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		3,7,8
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,5,	4,6
<b>II. <u>Traditional</u> <u>Minor Variants</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		1,2,9,10,11
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	6	5
<b>III. <u>Major Variants</u></b>		
<b>A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u></b>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<b>B. <u>Dual Patterns</u></b>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
<b>C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u></b>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<b>IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u></b>		
<b>A. <u>Partial</u></b>		
1. Higher auth.		11
2. Group auth.		9
3. Individ. auth.		3
<b>B. <u>Complete</u></b>		1,7,8,10,11,12

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XVI  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 13 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1,3,7,10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,6	
<u>II. Traditional Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		9
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	5	
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.	7,11	
4. Basic mixed		
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.	1	8
2. Group auth.	12	12
3. Indiv. auth.		
<u>B. Complete</u>		
	2,3,8,9,10	2,5,11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.



TABLE XVII  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN  
MEDIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 14 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<b>I. <u>Traditional</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.	1	2,3
B. Group auth.	12	
C. Individ. auth.	6	4
<b>II. <u>Traditional</u>     <u>Minor Variants</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		1,7,9,10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,8	6
<b>III. <u>Major Variants</u></b>		
A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
B. <u>Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Individ-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		
3. Individ. auth.	5,11	8
4. Basic mixed		
<b>IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u></b>		
A. <u>Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		12
2. Group auth.		
3. Individ. auth.		
B. <u>Complete</u>	2,3,7,9,10	5,11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XVIII

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 02 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		3
B. Group auth.	12	
C. Individ. auth.		
<u>II. Traditional Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		7,9,10,12
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,5,6	4,5,6
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher	9	
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		11
2. Group auth.	2,8	
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		1
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
<u>B. Complete</u>		
	1,3,7,10,11	2,8

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XIX  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 03 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<hr/>		
I. <u>Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1,3,10
B. Group auth.	12	
C. Individ. auth.		4,6,7
<hr/>		
II. <u>Traditional</u> <u>Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,5,6	
<hr/>		
III. <u>Major Variants</u>		
A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
B. <u>Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.	8	
C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		9
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<hr/>		
IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u>		
A. <u>Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.	1	12
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
B. <u>Complete</u>		
	2,3,7,9,10,11	2,5,8,11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XX

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 04 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<b>I. <u>Traditional</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		2
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.		4,5,6
<b>II. <u>Traditional</u> <u>Minor Variants</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		1,3
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,5,6	
<b>III. <u>Major Variants</u></b>		
<b>A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u></b>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<b>B. <u>Dual Patterns</u></b>		
1. Dual Group-higher		12
2. Dual Individ-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.	3	
<b>C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u></b>		
1. Higher auth.		7,9,10
2. Group auth.	8	
3. Individ. auth.	2	
4. Basic mixed		
<b>IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u></b>		
<b>A. <u>Partial</u></b>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.	12	
3. Individ. auth.		
<b>B. <u>Complete</u></b>		
	1,7,9,10,11	8,11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XXI

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 05 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1,3
B. Group auth.	9,12	
C. Individ. auth.	4,6,11	
<u>II. Traditional     Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		7,10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	5	4,6
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		5
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		9
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		12
3. Indiv. auth.		
<u>B. Complete</u>	1,2,3,7,8,10	2,8

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XXII

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 09 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1,2,3,7,9
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,5,6	4,6
<u>II. Traditional Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.		
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Indiv-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.	9	
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
4. Basic mixed	12	
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.	1	
2. Group auth.		
3. Indiv. auth.		
<u>B. Complete</u>		
	2,3,7,8,10,11	5,8,11,12

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XXIII

PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 10 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<b>I. <u>Traditional</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	6	4,6
<b>II. <u>Traditional</u>     <u>Minor Variants</u></b>		
A. Higher auth.		1,7
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4	
<b>III. <u>Major Variants</u></b>		
A. <u>Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
B. <u>Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Individ-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
C. <u>Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.		
2. Group auth.	10	
3. Individ. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<b>IV. <u>Diffuse Patterns</u></b>		
A. <u>Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.	1,8,11	9,10,12
2. Group auth.		
3. Individ. auth.		
B. <u>Complete</u>	2,3,5,7,9,12	2,3,5,8,11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

TABLE XXIV  
PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED PATTERNS OF DECISION-MAKING  
AUTHORITY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN  
LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA

Classification of Distribution Patterns	Task Areas <sup>a</sup> School 11 <sup>b</sup>	
	Preferred	Perceived
<u>I. Traditional</u>		
A. Higher auth.		7,10
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	4,7	4,6
<u>II. Traditional Minor Variants</u>		
A. Higher auth.		1
B. Group auth.		
C. Individ. auth.	6	
<u>III. Major Variants</u>		
<u>A. Alternate Patterns</u>		
1. Variation in policy as against practice		
<u>B. Dual Patterns</u>		
1. Dual Group-higher		
2. Dual Individ-higher		
3. Dual Group-individ.		
<u>C. Mixed Patterns</u>		
1. Higher auth.	5	2,9
2. Group auth.		
3. Individ. auth.		
4. Basic mixed		
<u>IV. Diffuse Patterns</u>		
<u>A. Partial</u>		
1. Higher auth.		3,8,12
2. Group auth.	9,10	
3. Individ. auth.		5
<u>B. Complete</u>		
	1,2,3,8,11,12	11

<sup>a</sup>Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>b</sup>For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.



characteristic of the semi-professional organization. The data in Tables XI to XXIV provided strong support for this hypothesis.

In the area of classroom management, the Basic Individual Authority Pattern and minor variants occurred in thirty-five of the thirty-six meaningful distribution patterns identified for the total test sample. The exception was a Dual Individual-Group Pattern.

In the area of curriculum development, the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern and minor variants occurred in thirty-two of the thirty three distribution patterns identified for the total test sample. The exception was a Mixed Higher Official Authority Pattern. However, the mixed pattern did not involve a basic change in the balance of power expressed in the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern.

In the task area concerned with the arrangement of the school instructional programme, the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern and minor variants occurred in twenty-seven of the thirty-five meaningful distribution patterns identified for the total test sample. Of the remaining major variants of basic distribution patterns, only one indicated an appreciable shift in the balance of power characteristic of the Higher Official Authority Pattern. This was a Dual Group-Higher Official Authority Pattern.

In the task area concerned with general school administration, the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern and minor variants occurred in twenty-five of the thirty meaningful distribution patterns identified for the total test sample. Of the remaining five major variants, one was consistent with the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern. The remaining four patterns indicated a major shift in the balance of power inherent in the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern. One was a partially diffuse Basic Group Authority Pattern, and three were Dual Group-Higher Official Authority Patterns

Meaningful distribution patterns were not identified for all task activities. Further, there was some variation between schools as to the type of distribution pattern associated with specific task activities. However, basic trends were evident in the data for the total test group.

A marked trend was the dominance of perceived Individual Authority Patterns and variants in the area of classroom management. Equally striking was the dominance of Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants in task areas external to classroom management. The data gave considerable support for the conclusion that the perceived distribution patterns were those characteristic of the semi-professional organization. In the perceptions of the school staff, particular weight was given to major decision-making authority exercised by the individual

teacher for immediate classroom tasks. In this regard, higher official authority and the formal work group exercised minor decision-making authority. In matters concerned with the definition of basic ends and means (e.g. the co-ordination and control of the school work-programme), higher official authority was perceived to exercise major decision-making authority.

For the purpose of the present study, a dimension of professionalization was proposed, ranging from the non-professional, through the semi-professional, to the full-fledged professional. If attention were limited to the decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher in classroom management, the degree of perceived professionalization of the teacher's role appeared high. This impression was reinforced by the minor decision-making authority perceived to be exercised by higher official authority in this area. However, a marked contrast was evident in task activities external to the immediate work situation. Here, the individual teacher and the formal staff group were perceived to exercise minor decision-making authority. If attention were focussed on the decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher and the formal staff group in task areas external to classroom management, the perceived degree of professionalization of the teacher's role appeared low.

However, when account was taken of the decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher and the formal staff group in matters both internal and external to classroom management, a more balanced assessment of the professionalization of the teacher's role was possible. In this case, the professionalization of the teacher's role appeared similar to that characteristic of the production member in the semi-professional organization. In the semi-professional organization, the member exercises a high degree of decision-making authority with reference to his immediate work tasks, and a low degree of decision-making authority with reference to matters of general administration.

This general conclusion was subject to a number of qualifications. First, there was the conceptual limitation imposed by the index of professionalization. It was limited to a single basic index, the distribution of decision-making authority in the school. Second, there was a methodological limitation. Particular emphasis was given to the general direction of significant differences in determining the relative decision-making authority exercised by decision sources. Third, there were limitations inherent in the nature of the data, i.e. meaningful distribution patterns were not identified for all task activities.

However, evidence drawn from Tables VIII to X

concerning role specification was generally consistent with trends evident in Tables XI to XXIV. Data from both sources suggested that the pattern of role specification of the teacher and the distribution patterns of decision-making authority were generally consistent with the authority system of the semi-professional organization.

Certainly, the data suggested that firm conclusions concerning the distribution of decision-making authority could be made. In general, relatively clear and consistent patterns of authority relationships were evident in staff group perceptions. In spite of a lack of clarity in the data in some task areas, general conclusions could be drawn concerning perceived authority distribution patterns. For example, (a) in the determination of action concerned with the instructional work of the school, the downward transfer of decision points occurred mainly in the area of classroom management, and (b) the decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group was secondary to the authority of the individual teacher in the classroom, and secondary to the chain of command in matters external to the classroom. The co-ordination and control of the general work programme as perceived were firmly based on administrative authority.

Hypothesis 1.4. This hypothesis stated that distinctive and meaningful patterns of authority distri-

bution would not meet the criteria of adaptive distribution patterns. Data in Tables XI to XXIV suggested that the perceived distribution patterns only partially satisfied the criteria of adaptive authority patterns.

There was evidence of differentiation. The Basic Individual Authority Pattern and variants dominated in the area of classroom management, and the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern and variants dominated in the area of general school administration. However, there was little evidence of integration in the interstitial areas of curriculum development and arrangement of the school instructional programme. In this study, it was recognized that restraints operated which limited the possible variation in authority distribution patterns in these task areas. However, there was little evidence of the variety of adaptive patterns in these task areas which appeared possible within the limitations recognized.

In the designated task areas, integration was indicated by authority distribution patterns which showed that decision-making authority was reasonably distributed among the decision sources. For example, a decision source might exercise major decision-making authority for policy in a task activity. Another source might exercise major decision-making authority in the determination of specific procedures in the same task area. Or, major decision-making authority might be exercised by a number

of decision sources for specific activities within a general task area. For schools in the present study, the number of perceived authority distribution patterns which met the criteria of integration were negligible.

## II. SECONDARY HYPOTHESES

The secondary hypotheses were concerned with similarities and differences in the perceived distribution of decision-making authority between schools at different educational levels and between schools in different socio-economic settings.

As in other phases of the study, the presentation of data emphasized the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by decision sources for each task activity. Attention was also given to the variation in the decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across a set of task activities. In addition, an item by item analysis was made of differences in the mean perceptions of staff classified according to type of school.

### Role Specification at Different Educational Levels

An inspection of Tables VIII to X showed that some variation did occur in the pattern of role specification between schools classified according to educational level. However, only minor variations were apparent. There was

little evidence to support a direct relationship between perceived patterns of role specification and schools classified according to educational level.

#### Distribution Patterns at Different Educational Levels

An inspection of Tables XI to XXIV indicated that variations did occur in distribution patterns of decision-making authority between schools. However, there was no strong evidence for a direct relationship between the perceived distribution pattern for each task and schools classified according to educational level.

#### Item Responses at Different Educational Levels

An item by item comparison was made of mean staff perceptions, with school staff classified according to the educational level of the school. Tables XXV to XXVII summarized the data concerning the comparison of mean perceived probabilities by level of education.

Senior High and Elementary Levels. Significant differences between the mean perceived probabilities of decision sources determining action were obtained on only twenty-six of the seventy-two items. For the twenty-six items, meaningful patterns of differences were identified.

For some activities, the individual teacher was perceived to have a higher probability of determining action at the senior high than at the elementary level in the areas



TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION (SENIOR HIGH AND ELEMENTARY)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
5. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	4.35	5.25
	elementary	3.69	
6. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	4.39	3.15
	elementary	3.96	
8. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	3.49	2.75
	elementary	3.04	
11. <u>Individual</u> Policy	senior	2.30	4.23
	<u>elementary</u>	3.12	
12. <u>Individual</u> Policy	senior	1.82	3.52
	<u>elementary</u>	2.33	
2. <u>Staff Group</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	2.94	4.32
	elementary	2.12	
4. <u>Staff Group</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	2.94	4.46
	elementary	2.12	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is significantly higher than the other.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXV (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
5. <u>Staff Group</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	3.48	5.01
	<u>elementary</u>	2.60	
6. <u>Staff Group</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	2.67	3.11
	<u>elementary</u>	2.13	
7. <u>Staff Group</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	1.81	2.47
	<u>elementary</u>	2.22	
2. <u>Official Auth.</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	2.89	5.13
	<u>elementary</u>	3.78	
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	1.73	4.77
	<u>elementary</u>	2.38	
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	2.09	7.72
	<u>elementary</u>	3.26	
6. <u>Official Auth.</u> <u>Policy</u>	<u>senior</u>	1.67	2.36
	<u>elementary</u>	1.99	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is significantly higher than the other.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXV (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
1. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	2.12	3.66
	elementary	1.56	
2. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	3.31	4.57
	elementary	2.48	
4. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	4.47	2.50
	elementary	4.15	
5. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	4.28	5.25
	elementary	3.61	
2. <u>Staff Group</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	2.85	3.06
	elementary	2.29	
3. <u>Staff Group</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	2.73	3.63
	elementary	2.09	
5. <u>Staff Group</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	3.07	2.68
	elementary	2.57	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is significantly higher than the other.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXV (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
6. <u>Staff Group</u> Practice	senior	1.99	2.58
	<u>elementary</u>	2.40	
1. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	3.85	2.78
	<u>elementary</u>	4.32	
2. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	3.10	3.98
	<u>elementary</u>	3.80	
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	2.03	7.56
	<u>elementary</u>	3.07	
6. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	1.71	3.30
	<u>elementary</u>	2.11	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is significantly higher than the other.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVI

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION (JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
8. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	3.49	4.44
	<u>junior</u>	2.81	
11. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	2.30	8.12
	<u>junior</u>	3.59	
12. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	1.82	4.13
	<u>junior</u>	2.42	
8. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	2.89	2.26
	<u>junior</u>	3.25	
9. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	1.64	3.02
	<u>junior</u>	2.05	
11. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	2.64	5.45
	<u>junior</u>	3.50	
12. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	1.98	2.58
	<u>junior</u>	2.38	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVI (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
7. <u>Group</u> Policy	senior	1.81	2.88
	<u>junior</u>	2.22	
8. <u>Group</u> Policy	senior	2.92	2.34
	<u>junior</u>	3.32	
9. <u>Group</u> Policy	senior	1.91	3.04
	<u>junior</u>	2.36	
12. <u>Group</u> Policy	senior	2.87	5.02
	<u>junior</u>	3.72	
3. <u>Group</u> Practice	senior	2.25	3.87
	<u>junior</u>	2.88	
6. <u>Group</u> Practice	senior	1.99	3.89
	<u>junior</u>	2.61	
7. <u>Group</u> Practice	senior	1.81	3.96
	<u>junior</u>	2.39	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVI (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
8. <u>Group</u> Practice	senior	2.67	3.56
	<u>junior</u>	3.27	
11. <u>Group</u> Practice	senior	2.93	3.26
	<u>junior</u>	3.44	
12. <u>Group</u> Practice	senior	3.01	3.67
	<u>junior</u>	3.59	
2. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	senior	2.89	3.14
	<u>junior</u>	3.43	
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	senior	2.09	2.68
	<u>junior</u>	2.49	
7. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	4.39	2.90
	junior	4.00	
11. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	3.70	2.74
	junior	3.22	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVI (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
12. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>senior</u>	4.11	2.80
	junior	3.65	
1. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	3.85	3.06
	<u>junior</u>	4.32	
2. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	3.10	2.63
	<u>junior</u>	3.55	
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	senior	2.03	3.56
	<u>junior</u>	2.54	
11. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	3.76	2.44
	junior	3.36	
12. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>senior</u>	4.19	3.65
	junior	3.66	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.



TABLE XXVII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION (JUNIOR HIGH AND ELEMENTARY)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
3. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Junior H.	1.95	2.38
	<u>Elementary</u>	2.32	
4. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.54	2.43
	Elementary	4.29	
5. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.14	3.32
	Elementary	3.69	
6. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.45	4.06
	Elementary	3.96	
11. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.59	2.75
	Elementary	3.12	
2. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	2.93	2.49
	Elementary	2.48	
5. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.06	3.23
	Elementary	3.61	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
9. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	2.05	3.75
	Elementary	1.53	
11. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.50	2.88
	Elementary	2.98	
4. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.07	4.94
	Elementary	2.18	
5. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.41	4.86
	Elementary	2.60	
6. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	2.71	3.40
	Elementary	2.13	
8. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.32	4.95
	Elementary	2.50	
11. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.42	2.85
	Elementary	2.93	

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
12. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	3.72 2.95	4.57
2. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	2.70 2.29	2.43
4. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	2.88 2.49	2.44
5. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	3.28 2.57	4.16
8. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	3.27 2.48	5.14
11. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	3.44 2.96	3.01
12. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u> Elementary	3.59 2.91	4.01

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	Junior H. <u>Elementary</u>	2.01 2.38	2.52
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	Junior H. <u>Elementary</u>	2.49 3.26	4.89
7. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	Junior H. <u>Elementary</u>	4.00 4.48	3.37
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Junior H. <u>Elementary</u>	2.54 3.07	3.69
7. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Junior H. <u>Elementary</u>	3.95 4.33	2.57

<sup>a</sup> The mean perceived probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

of (a) curriculum development, and (b) the arrangement of the school instructional programme. In the area of general school administration, the individual teacher was perceived to have a lower probability of determining action at the senior high than at the elementary level.

For significant items in the areas of (a) curriculum development and (b) arrangement of the school instructional programme, the formal staff group was perceived to have a higher probability of determining action at the senior high than at the elementary level. For significant items in the same areas, higher official authority was perceived to have a lower probability of determining action at the senior high than at the elementary level.

For significant items in the area of classroom management, the individual teacher was perceived to have a higher probability of determining action at the senior high level in all cases, the formal staff group in the majority of cases. For significant items in the same area, higher official authority was perceived to have a lower probability of determining action at the high school than at the elementary level.

The pattern of differences for the twenty-six items supported the view that the individual teacher and the formal staff group were perceived to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority at the higher

educational level in some activities. The most significant exception to this trend was the lower probability perceived for the individual teacher determining action in the area of general school administration at the senior high level.

For the great majority of items, there were no significant differences in the perceptions of school staffs classified according to senior high and elementary levels. However, the pattern of significant differences was meaningful enough to suggest a tentative conclusion concerning perceived professionalization in schools. The data suggested that, in limited respects, the pattern of professionalization was situationally specific. Compared with the elementary teacher, the senior high teacher perceived the individual and the formal staff group to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority with respect to the immediate instructional programme. However, in relation to the elementary teacher, the senior high teacher was also perceived to exercise a lower degree of decision-making authority with respect to general school administration.

Senior High and Junior High Levels. Significant differences between the perceived probability of decision sources determining action were obtained on only twenty-seven of the possible seventy-two items. For the twenty-

seven items, meaningful patterns of differences were identified.

For six of the seven items concerned with the decision-making authority of the individual teacher, the probability of the individual teacher determining action was perceived to be higher at the Junior High level. For the ten significant items concerned with the decision-making authority of the formal staff group, the probability of the staff group determining action was perceived to be higher at the Junior High level. For five of the ten significant items concerned with the decision-making authority of higher official authority, the probability of higher official authority determining action was perceived to be lower at the Junior High level. The five items fell within the task areas of general school administration and arrangement of the instructional programme. The relationship concerning higher official authority was reversed for the other five items, which fell within the areas of curriculum development and classroom management.

For the majority of the twenty-seven items, the individual teacher and the formal staff group was perceived to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority at the Junior High level. In the task areas of general school administration and arrangement of the instructional programme, the degree of decision-making authority exercised

by higher official authority was perceived to be lower at the Junior High level. An important exception to this trend was the higher perceived probability of higher official authority determining action in the areas of curriculum development and classroom management at the Junior High level. With this exception, the results ran counter to the anticipated direction of significant differences. It was expected that a higher degree of professionalization would be perceived at the senior high level.

Junior High and Elementary Levels. Significant differences between the perceived probability levels of decision sources determining action were obtained on only twenty-six of the possible seventy-two items. For the significant items, meaningful trends were identified.

For twenty-five of the twenty-six significant items, the pattern of significant differences was similar to that which held between the senior high and elementary levels. The probability of higher official authority determining action at the elementary level was higher, the probability of the individual teacher and the formal staff group determining action at the elementary level was lower.

In general, the pattern of differences between the junior high and elementary levels on the one hand and the senior high and elementary levels on the other was consistent



with the view that, in some matters, the teacher exercised higher decision-making authority at the higher educational levels. In general, the reverse trend held true when the senior high and junior high levels were compared. This trend was not anticipated from the theoretical position taken in this study. It was predicted that a higher degree of professionalization would be reflected in the perceived distribution of decision-making authority at higher educational levels.

In summary, when school levels were compared significant differences were not obtained on the majority of items. A meaningful pattern of significant differences was obtained when one school level was compared with another. However, only a minority of items were involved. Further, a similar trend did not characterize the pattern of differences between the three school levels. Strong, consistent support was not obtained for Hypotheses 1.5a, 1.5b and 1.5c. Nevertheless, trends in the data were sufficiently strong to suggest the provisional view that the character of perceived professionalization in schools was situationally specific to a limited degree. Of particular interest, was the comparatively high decision-making authority exercised by the teacher at the junior high level in some task activities.

#### Role Specification and Socio-Economic Setting

Tables VIII to X indicated that variations occurred

in the pattern of role specification between schools classified according to socio-economic setting. However, only minor differences in the pattern of role specification were evident. There was no strong evidence of a basic relationship between the perceived pattern of role specification and schools classified according to socio-economic status of the community setting.

#### Distribution Patterns and Socio-Economic Setting

The data in Tables XI to XXIV showed that some variations did occur between schools in the distribution patterns of decision-making authority. However, consistent evidence was lacking to support a basic relationship between perceived distribution patterns and schools classified according to socio-economic status of the community setting.

#### Item Responses and Socio-Economic Setting

An item by item comparison was made of mean staff perceptions, with school staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the school community. Table XXVIII summarized the data on the comparison of the mean perceived probabilities of decision sources determining action, by socio-economic status of the community setting. (supra, p.183) Significant differences were obtained on only four of the seventy-two items. Sub-hypotheses 1.5d, 1.5e and 1.5f were not supported.

TABLE XXVIII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PERCEIVED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF COMMUNITY  
(MEDIAN AND LOWER)

Questionnaire Item No.	Community Status <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
4. <u>Group</u> Practice	Median <u>Lower</u>	2.42 2.77	2.54
1. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Median <u>Lower</u>	4.32 3.99	2.68
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Median <u>Lower</u>	1.93 2.19	2.38
8. <u>Group</u> Policy	Median <u>Lower</u>	2.75 3.24	3.37

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the status group underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

### Chapter Summary

The perceived mean probability of each decision source determining action varied significantly across the set of twelve task activities. The patterns of variation for the individual teacher and higher official authority determining action were consistent with the view of the school as a semi-professional organization. However, the pattern of variation for the formal staff group did not give direct support for this conception of the school organization. In the perceptions of teachers, the formal staff group tended to exercise a degree of decision-making authority intermediate to the other decision sources in the area of classroom management. Typically, the degree of decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group was in the moderately low to mean probability range in this task area.

For the total test group, meaningful distribution patterns of decision-making authority were identified for the great majority of task activities. Marked trends in the data on distribution patterns supported the view that the perceived distribution patterns were consistent with those expected in the semi-professional organization. Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants were predominant in the area of classroom management, and Basic Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants were in the large majority of task areas external to classroom

management.

For the total test sample, meaningful distribution patterns only partially met the criteria of adaptive authority distribution patterns. There was evidence of differentiation in the distribution of decision-making authority in the areas of classroom management and general school administration. However, there was little evidence of integration in the distribution of decision-making authority in interstitial task areas.

Little support was obtained for a direct relationship between the distribution of decision-making authority and schools classified according to the socio-economic status of the community setting.

Again, strong evidence was lacking to support a direct relationship between the educational level of the schools and (a) patterns of role specification, and (b) distribution patterns of decision-making authority related to each task. In the great majority of cases, significant differences were not obtained in an item by item comparison of mean staff perceptions classified according to the educational level of the school. However, a meaningful pattern of differences was identified for a minority of items. The pattern of differences suggested that the character of professionalization reflected in teacher perceptions was situationally specific to a limited extent. In some respects, a higher degree of professional-

ization was perceived in junior high schools than in senior high and elementary schools.

Evidence on the perceived distribution of decision-making authority was generally consistent with previous research on school organization. In particular, evidence supported the view that a considerable degree of teacher autonomy existed within the classroom. Evidence also suggested that administrative authority was dominant in school matters external to the classroom.

Thus, data on perceived distribution patterns supported the conclusion that the power structure of the schools was slanted in favour of administrative authority in matters concerning (a) the basic determination of school goals and means, and (b) the allocation of resources and the control of the general work programme in schools. The evidence pointed to the apparent isolation of the self-contained classroom in the school authority structure. Here, teacher perceptions were consistent with Lortie's view that teachers operating within the self-contained classroom work within a somewhat self-contained spatial and social unit within the school. (2) Certainly, there was strong evidence of a marked difference in the perceived distribution of decision-making authority for task activities internal and external to classroom management.

The data also suggested that teachers perceived consistent programmes of action related to the determination

of the majority of the task activities. In general outline, these appeared similar to those operating in some non-educational settings. Otto and Veldman draw a parallel between the decision-making authority exercised by the teacher within the classroom and the situation in the construction industry where:

... contracts contain specifications of the goals of work and prices and are usually accompanied by blueprints; they do not contain actual directions of work because these have already been incorporated in the professionalized culture of the workers.  
(3, p. 157)

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER VII

- (1) Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 11 (1957), pp. 201-215.
- (2) Lortie, Dan C. "The Teacher and Team Teaching: Suggestions for Long-Range Research," in Judson T. Shaplin, and Henry F. Olds, Jr. (eds.). Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1964, pp. 270-305.
- (3) Otto, Henry J., and Donald J. Veldman. "Control Structure in Public Schools and the Decision and Influence Roles of Elementary School Principals and Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 149-161.



## CHAPTER VIII

### RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

#### PREFERRED DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS

##### I. PRIMARY HYPOTHESES

The primary hypotheses were concerned with the identification, analysis, and assessment of distribution patterns of decision-making authority as preferred by teachers. As with the analysis of teacher perceptions, the presentation and analysis of the data were consistent with the view that the authority of a decision source was better represented in relative than in absolute terms.

##### Role Specification

As with the study of teacher perceptions, a linear perspective was taken in the analysis of data relating to the preferred pattern of role specification. A measure of the variation in the preferred degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across a set of twelve task activities was obtained. This was based on significant differences in the mean degree of probability preferred for a decision source determining action on Task 4 as against other tasks. (supra, p. 123) The data in Tables XXIX to XXXI compared the mean preferred probability for each task with the mean preferred probability for Task 4. The Tables indicated the

TABLE XXIX

A COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF THE INDIVIDUAL TEACHER DETERMINING ACTION, FOR  
TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	4.59	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.67	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.62	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.58	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.60	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.55	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	L	L	L	L
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.47	L	N	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.65	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.52	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.71	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
06												
Policy	4.78	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.73	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L
07												
Policy	4.83	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.83	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE XXIX (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	4.74	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.52	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.64	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	L	N	N	N
Practice	4.14	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	N
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.70	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.54	L	L	L	L	H	L	L	L	L	L	L
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	4.33	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	L
Practice	4.40	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
12												
Policy	4.62	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	4.04	N	N	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	N
13												
Policy	4.23	L	N	L	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	L
Practice	4.59	L	N	L	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	L
14												
Policy	4.44	L	N	L	N	N	N	N	L	N	L	L
Practice	4.50	L	L	L	N	N	L	N	L	N	N	L

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE XXX

A COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF THE FORMAL STAFF GROUP DETERMINING ACTION, FOR  
TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	2.23	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.75	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.67	N	H	H	N	N	H	H	N	N	H	H
Practice	2.26	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	N	H	H
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	3.10	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	H
Practice	2.65	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.08	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.48	N	H	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	N	H
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.62	N	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	N	N	H
Practice	2.95	N	N	N	N	L	N	H	H	H	N	H
06												
Policy	3.21	L	N	H	H	N	N	N	N	H	H	H
Practice	3.22	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
07												
Policy	2.87	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.50	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE XXX (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	2.48	N	N	H	N	N	H	N	H	N	N	N
Practice	2.40	N	N	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.43	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Practice	2.21	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	N	H	H
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.23	H	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	H
Practice	2.77	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.53	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	H
Practice	2.40	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	H	H
12												
Policy	2.54	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	N
Practice	2.21	H	N	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
13												
Policy	2.35	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.00	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H
14												
Policy	2.34	N	N	H	N	N	N	N	H	H	H	H
Practice	2.44	N	N	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p.131

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup>Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE XXXI

A COMPARISON OF MEANS ON THE PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF HIGHER OFFICIAL AUTHORITY DETERMINING ACTION,  
FOR TASK 4 AS AGAINST OTHER TASKS

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	1.44	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.54	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.51	H	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.28	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.75	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	1.60	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.17	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N
Practice	1.83	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.90	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	2.09	H	H	H	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	H
06												
Policy	1.87	H	H	H	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	N
Practice	1.78	H	N	H	N	N	N	N	H	H	H	H
07												
Policy	1.54	H	N	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.54	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

TABLE XXXI (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Task Four Mean	Tasks <sup>b</sup>										
		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	1.56	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.89	H	N	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.93	H	N	H	N	N	H	N	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.71	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	1.54	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.61	H	H	H	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	H
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	2.01	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	N	N	N	N
Practice	1.93	H	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	N
12												
Policy	1.62	H	N	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	1.75	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
13												
Policy	1.94	H	N	H	N	N	H	H	N	H	N	N
Practice	1.89	H	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	L	H
14												
Policy	2.12	H	H	H	L	L	N	N	H	N	N	N
Practice	1.61	H	H	N	N	H	N	N	H	H	H	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at the .01 level.

H significantly higher than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

L significantly lower than Task 4 mean at the .01 level.

Task activities numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic communities.

direction of any significant differences.

Table XXIX showed that, in the great majority of cases, the preferred probability of the individual teacher determining action in matters external to classroom management was significantly lower than for Task 4. In general, the preferred probability of the individual teacher determining action on Task 4 was high.

The data in Table XXX indicated that, in the great majority of cases, the preferred probability of the formal staff group determining action in matters external to classroom management was equal to or higher than the preferred probability level for Task 4. In general, the preferred probability level for this decision source determining action on Task 4 was within the moderately low to mean probability range.

Table XXXI revealed that, in the great majority of cases, the preferred probability of higher official authority determining action in matters external to classroom management was equal to or higher than the level for Task 4. Typically, the preferred probability of higher official authority determining action on Task 4 was within the extremely low to moderately low probability range.

Discussion. The data in Tables XXIX to XXXI presented only a general index of role specification. The



direction of significant differences from a basic reference task was shown. Absolute values indicating the precise degree of probability for each task activity were not given.

With reference to Hypothesis 2.1 it was apparent that the preferred probability of each decision source determining action did vary significantly across the set of twelve task activities.

Hypothesis 2.1a stated that the high mean preferred probability of the individual teacher determining action on Task 4 would be similar to the probability preferred for other task activities. The data presented in Table XXIX did not support this hypothesis. For the total test group, the preferred probability of the individual teacher determining action in matters external to classroom management was generally lower than the preferred probability for Task 4. This was the case in seventy-six of the eighty-four task activities in the area of curriculum development, in seventy-six of the eighty-four task activities related to arranging the school instructional programme, and in seventy-three of the eighty-four task activities in general school administration.

Hypothesis 2.1b stated that the high mean preferred probability of the formal staff group determining action on Task 4 would be similar to the probability preferred for other task activities. The data as presented in Table

XXX did not provide strong support for this hypothesis. For the total test group, the preferred probability of the formal staff group determining action in matters external to classroom management was higher than the preferred probability for Task 4 in a substantial number of tasks. This was the case in thirty-seven of the eighty four task activities in the area of curriculum development, in thirty-five of the eighty-four task activities related to arranging the school instructional programme, and in sixty-one of the activities connected with general school administration.

Hypothesis 2.1c stated that the low mean preferred probability of higher official authority determining action on Task 4 would be similar to the probability preferred for other task activities. The data as presented in Table XXXI did not support this hypothesis. For the total test group, the preferred probability of higher official authority determining action in matters external to classroom management was generally higher than for task activities internal to classroom management. This occurred in sixty-five of the eighty-four task activities in the area of curriculum development, in sixty-six of the eighty-four task activities related to arranging the school instructional programme, and in sixty-three of the eighty-four task activities concerning general school administration.

Strong support was not obtained for the three sub-hypotheses. In relatively few instances was the high degree of probability preferred for the individual teacher determining action on Task 4 equalled for tasks external to classroom management. In a substantial majority of cases, the low degree of probability preferred for higher official authority determining action on Task 4 was higher for tasks external to classroom management. In a substantial minority of cases, the moderately low degree of probability preferred for the formal staff group determining action on Task 4 was lower than the preferred probabilities for tasks external to classroom management.

The data did not provide direct support for the view that teachers desired a pattern of role prescription typical of the full-fledged professional in the formal organization. However, the data did not necessarily provide evidence contrary to the view that teachers desired some of the features of the full-fledged professional role. The general form of the data allowed the possibilities that (a) although less decision-making authority was preferred for the individual teacher in matters external to classroom-management, even less might be preferred for higher official authority, and (b) a high degree of decision-making authority might be preferred for the formal staff group in some matters external to classroom-

management.

The data suggested that the teachers as a whole did not take an extreme stand on the matter of the distribution of decision-making authority in the school. Although teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise a minor degree of decision-making authority in the classroom, in only a minority of task activities was an equally low probability preferred in matters external to classroom management.

#### Distribution Patterns

To identify preferred distribution patterns of decision-making authority, a measure was taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for each task activity. (supra, p.123) The measure was based on the preferred degree of probability of each decision source determining action on the task concerned. Tables XI to XXIV summarized the distribution patterns preferred for each school. (supra, pp.143-156) Distribution patterns were classified according to the classification system developed for the purpose of this study.

Hypothesis 2.2 stated that there would be a significant difference in the preferred degree of probability of one source as against the others determining action on a specific task. The data as summarized in Tables XI to XXIV

showed that significant differences in the degree of probability of one source as against the others determining action were not obtained for all tasks. This was indicated by the number of diffuse distribution patterns. These were patterns in which significant differences between the probabilities of decision sources determining action were obtained in less than five of the six sets of comparisons made for each task. (supra, p. 72)

Meaningful distribution patterns were obtained for at least fifty per cent of task activities in each school. For schools in the total test group, meaningful patterns obtained ranged from six to nine, with six being identified in seven schools and seven patterns in five schools.

The substantial proportion of non-meaningful patterns might well have been related to a wide range of differences in the stated preferences of teachers. However, a sufficient number of meaningful patterns were obtained to allow a provisional analysis of teacher preferences.

Hypothesis 2.3. This hypothesis stated that distinctive and meaningful patterns of authority distribution would be those characteristic of the full-fledged professional organization. The general conclusion drawn from the data summarized in Tables XI to XXIV was that the distribution

patterns for each task were partly consistent with authority structures identified with the full-fledged professional organization. Evidence strongly suggested that a desire for some aspects of the authority structures of the full professional model was reflected in teacher preferences.

In the area of classroom management, the Basic Individual Authority Pattern and minor variants occurred in thirty-eight of the forty-two meaningful patterns identified for the total test sample. In one only of the remaining task activities was there a marked shift in the balance of power characteristic of the Basic Individual Authority Pattern. This pattern was a mixed Higher Official Authority Pattern.

In the area of curriculum development, the Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern and minor variants were preferred in all six of the meaningful patterns identified for Task Activity 1. For Task Activity 2 major variants of basic patterns were preferred. Of these, four were Basic Individual Authority Patterns, two were Dual Group-Individual Authority Patterns, and one was a Basic Group Authority Pattern. For Task Activity 3, one was a Partially-Diffuse Group Authority Pattern, one was a Partially-Diffuse Individual Authority Pattern, and two were Dual Group-Individual Authority Patterns.

Fourteen meaningful distribution patterns were

obtained in the task area related to the arrangement of the school instructional programme. One was a Basic Higher Authority Pattern, five were Basic Individual Authority Patterns, five were Basic Group Authority Patterns, and three were Dual Group-Individual Authority Patterns.

Twenty-two meaningful patterns were identified in the task area of general school administration. One was a Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern, five were Basic Individual Authority Patterns or variants, twelve were Basic Group Authority Patterns or variants. In addition, four distribution patterns were major variants of basic distribution patterns. Two were Dual Group-Higher Official Authority Patterns, one was a Dual Group-Individual Authority Pattern, and one was a Mixed Pattern involving Group and Individual decision sources.

Hypothesis 2.3a stated that in the area of classroom management, Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants, and Basic Group Authority Patterns and variants would be most frequent; in tasks external to classroom management, these two basic patterns and variants would be most frequent. Only partial support was obtained for this hypothesis.

As predicted, Basic Individual Authority Patterns were most frequent in the area of classroom management. However, no Basic Group Authority Patterns or variants were

preferred in this area. In task areas external to classroom management, Basic Individual Authority Patterns and Basic Group Authority Patterns, with variants, were preferred in thirty-four of the fifty-three meaningful patterns. In addition, ten dual authority patterns were preferred. Eight were patterns in which the individual teacher and the formal staff group exercised major decision-making authority for the task concerned. A mixed authority pattern also indicated major decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher and the formal staff group.

However, general trends in teacher preferences for the total test group were not characteristic of all task areas. The striking exceptions were the distribution patterns preferred for Task Activity 1 (the determination of the basic outline of the curriculum). For this task, the meaningful distribution patterns preferred were Basic Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants. Of the meaningful patterns related to the arrangement of the school instructional programme, only one was a Higher Official Authority Pattern. Of the meaningful patterns related to general school administration, one was a Basic Higher Official Authority Pattern and two were Dual Group-Higher Official Authority Patterns. Most marked was the desire for the individual teacher and/or the formal staff group to exercise major decision-making authority in



each of these task areas.

For the purpose of the present study, a dimension of professionalization was accepted, ranging from the non-professional, through the semi-professional, to the full-fledged professional. If attention were limited to the decision-making authority preferred for the individual teacher in classroom management, the degree of preferred professionalization of the teacher's role appeared high. This interpretation was supported by the minor decision-making authority preferred for higher official authority in this area. However, it was also apparent that school staff preferred the formal staff group to exercise secondary decision-making authority in this task area.

A high degree of professionalization was reflected in the distribution patterns preferred for task areas external to classroom management. However, there was an important exception to this trend. In the preferences of school staff, higher official authority dominated decision-making in the determination of the basic outline of a curriculum. This task was concerned with defining basic operational goals of the school. As such, it was important in giving direction to the instrumental activities of the school and the nature of the teacher's tasks. In only a few instances, did school staff prefer higher official authority to exercise major decision-making authority in tasks related to general school administration

and the arrangement of the school instructional programme.

Subject to the qualifications noted, it was apparent that a considerable degree of professionalization was reflected in the preferred patterns of decision-making authority. The character of the professionalization went beyond the semi-professional stage. With the emphasis on the decision-making authority exercised by the individual and the formal staff group in important tasks concerned with general administration and the school instructional programme, the nature of the preferred authority distribution was similar to that of the full-fledged professional model.

However, there were some apparent inconsistencies in the data. Evidence on the preferred pattern of role specification as revealed in Tables XXIX to XXXI did not directly support the data on preferred distribution patterns presented in Tables XI to XXIV. A higher degree of professionalization was expressed in the distribution patterns for each task than in patterns of role specification. Nevertheless, data on the preferred pattern of role specification did not necessarily provide evidence contrary to the view that teachers preferred a pattern of role specification similar in important respects to the full-fledged professional model. In the majority of cases, although less decision-making authority was preferred for the individual teacher in matters external to classroom-

management, even less was preferred for higher official authority. Also, in some key task activities external to classroom management, there was a strong preference for major decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group. The apparent inconsistencies appeared to result from the measure of role specification being less precise than the measure related to the distribution pattern for each task activity.

The limitations noted with respect to the conclusions drawn concerning staff perceptions also applied to the findings on staff preferences. (supra, p.160) In the latter case, the high proportion of task activities for which meaningful distribution patterns were not identified made conclusions tentative. However, trends in the data were sufficiently marked to warrant provisional conclusions: (a) in the area of classroom management, teachers preferred that major authority be exercised by the individual teacher, (b) in the areas related to the arrangement of the school instructional programme and general school administration, teachers generally preferred that major authority be exercised by the formal staff group and/or the individual teacher, and (c) in some matters of basic goal definition, teachers preferred that major authority be exercised by higher official authority.

The evidence strongly suggested that teachers desired a substantial shift in the balance of power

perceived to exist between the professional and the administrator in some school activities.

Hypothesis 2.4. This hypothesis stated that meaningful patterns of preferred authority distribution would not meet the criteria of adaptive distribution patterns. Data as shown in Tables XI to XXIV suggested that the criteria of adaptive authority patterns were met only in part.

There was some evidence of differentiation. The Basic Individual Authority Pattern and variants dominated the task area of classroom management. However, Basic Higher Authority Patterns and variants were rare in the areas related to the arrangement of the school instructional programme and general school administration. In the latter areas, school staff generally preferred the processes of co-ordination and control to be based on individual and group authority. However, in the present study it was considered to be adaptive if higher official authority played a prominent part in general school administration.

In the interstitial area of curriculum development there was some evidence of integration. Higher official authority dominated in Task Activity 1 and the formal staff group dominated in Task Activity 2. This form of integration partly met the criteria of adaptive authority patterns. However, in the other interstitial area (the

arrangement of the school instructional programme) there was little evidence of integration. In general, the formal staff group was preferred as the prime authority base for co-ordination and control in this area.

For some tasks, teachers appeared to make a clear distinction between decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher and decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group. They preferred the formal staff group to exercise major decision-making authority in the following task activities: (a) the determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body, (b) the determination of the teaching load and other duties for teachers, and (c) the determination of the allocation of money to the teacher or departments for instructional aids and equipment. They preferred the individual teacher to exercise major decision-making authority in the following task activities: (a) classroom management, (b) determination of the detailed content of the curriculum, and (c) determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.

## II. SECONDARY HYPOTHESES

The secondary hypotheses were concerned with similarities and differences in the preferred distribution of decision-making authority between schools classified

according to educational level and to socio-economic status of the community. In addition, a comparison was made of the preferences of teachers classified according to selected categorical variables.

#### Hypothesis 2.5

This hypothesis stated that significant differences would not occur in the preferences of school staff classified according to educational level.

##### Role specification at different educational levels.

An inspection of Tables XXIX to XXXI showed that only minor variations occurred in the preferred patterns of role specification between schools. There was no evidence to support a direct relationship between the preferred pattern of role specification and teacher staff classified according to the educational level of the school.

##### Distribution patterns at different educational levels.

An inspection of Tables XI to XXIV indicated that only minor variations occurred in the preferred distribution patterns of decision-making authority between schools. There was no evidence to support a direct relationship between preferred distribution patterns and the educational level of the school.

#### Item Responses at Different Educational Levels

An item by item comparison was made of mean staff

preference scores, with staff classified according to the educational level of the school. Tables XXXII to XXXIV summarized the data on the mean preferred probabilities of decision sources determining action, by level of education. (infra, pp. 212-221).

Senior high and elementary levels. Significant differences between the mean probabilities of decision sources determining action were obtained on twenty-four of the seventy-two items.

For the twenty-four items, a meaningful pattern of differences was obtained. At the senior high level, a higher probability of determining action in the area of classroom management was preferred for the individual teacher. In contrast, a lower probability of determining action was preferred for the individual teacher in the area of general school administration. At the senior high level, a lower probability of determining action was preferred for the formal staff group in four of five task activities. At the senior high level, a lower probability of determining action was preferred for higher official authority in the area of classroom management, and a higher probability was preferred in some tasks external to the classroom.

Senior high and junior high levels. Significant differences between the mean probabilities of decision

TABLE XXXII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION (SENIOR HIGH AND ELEMENTARY)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
5. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u>	4.42	2.55
	Elementary	4.15	
8. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u>	4.10	2.82
	Elementary	3.66	
11. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Senior	3.17	4.47
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.93	
12. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Senior	2.55	3.38
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.17	
4. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Senior</u>	4.63	2.89
	Elementary	4.35	
5. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Senior</u>	4.40	2.63
	Elementary	4.11	
12. <u>Individual</u> Practice	Senior	2.57	2.45
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.02	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.



TABLE XXXII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
7. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	3.07	2.46
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.50	
9. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	3.47	3.54
	<u>Elementary</u>	4.03	
10. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	3.02	3.12
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.59	
3. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Senior</u>	3.31	3.48
	Elementary	2.70	
5. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	2.43	3.53
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.04	
9. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	3.25	3.51
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.84	
10. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	2.98	2.38
	<u>Elementary</u>	3.43	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
12. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	3.85 4.24	3.05
2. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	2.25 2.83	3.22
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	1.47 1.87	3.53
9. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u> Elementary	3.46 3.02	2.45
11. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u> Elementary	3.37 2.50	4.81
2. <u>Higher Auth.</u> Practice	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	2.12 2.94	4.50
3. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	2.56 3.13	3.02

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	1.43 1.75	2.88
5. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Senior <u>Elementary</u>	1.84 2.35	2.88
11. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>Senior</u> Elementary	3.12 2.54	3.04

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXIII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION (SENIOR AND JUNIOR HIGH)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
1. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Senior	2.23	3.21
	<u>Junior</u>	2.78	
8. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Senior	4.10	3.14
	Junior	3.67	
11. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Senior	3.17	5.29
	<u>Junior</u>	3.96	
12. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Senior	2.55	3.50
	<u>Junior</u>	3.13	
1. <u>Individual</u> Practice	Senior	2.55	2.74
	<u>Junior</u>	3.03	
11. <u>Individual</u> Practice	Senior	3.18	4.23
	<u>Junior</u>	3.86	
12. <u>Individual</u> Practice	Senior	2.57	3.29
	<u>Junior</u>	3.11	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXIII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
5. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	2.62	2.59
	<u>Junior</u>	3.06	
6. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	2.09	2.98
	<u>Junior</u>	2.56	
7. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	3.07	3.67
	<u>Junior</u>	3.65	
8. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	3.28	2.66
	<u>Junior</u>	3.70	
10. <u>Group</u> Policy	Senior	3.02	2.75
	<u>Junior</u>	3.49	
2. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	2.80	3.74
	<u>Junior</u>	3.42	
4. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	1.96	4.32
	<u>Junior</u>	2.69	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXIII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
5. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	2.43	3.83
	<u>Junior</u>	3.08	
6. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	1.98	2.79
	<u>Junior</u>	2.43	
8. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	3.35	2.45
	<u>Junior</u>	3.72	
9. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	3.25	2.83
	<u>Junior</u>	3.67	
10. <u>Group</u> Practice	Senior	2.98	2.76
	Junior	3.44	
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	Senior	1.47	2.75
	<u>Junior</u>	1.79	
9. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u>	3.46	2.41
	Junior	3.06	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXIII (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
10. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u>	3.37	4.78
	Junior	2.54	
11. <u>Official Auth.</u> Policy	<u>Senior</u>	3.60	4.23
	Junior	2.85	
4. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	Senior	1.43	3.04
	<u>Junior</u>	1.79	
11. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>Senior</u>	3.38	2.51
	Junior	3.12	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXIV

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION (JUNIOR HIGH AND ELEMENTARY)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
5. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.38	2.45
	Elementary	4.15	
4. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.67	3.28
	Elementary	4.35	
5. <u>Individual</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	4.50	4.26
	Elementary	4.11	
8. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.70	2.74
	Elementary	3.28	
1. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.40	2.71
	Elementary	2.95	
2. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.40	2.72
	Elementary	2.95	
3. <u>Group</u> Practice	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.43	4.62
	Elementary	2.70	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.



TABLE XXXIV (continued)

Questionnaire Item No.	School Type <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
8.	<u>Junior H.</u>	3.72	4.04
<u>Group</u> Practice	Elementary	3.09	
2.	Junior H.	2.45	2.74
<u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>Elementary</u>	2.94	
5.	Junior H.	1.96	2.88
<u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>Elementary</u>	2.35	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the school underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

sources determining action were obtained on twenty-four of the seventy-two items.

For the twenty-four items, a meaningful pattern of differences was identified. At the senior high level, a lower probability of determining action in three of four task activities external to classroom management was preferred for the individual teacher. At the senior high level, a lower probability of determining action in task activities internal and external to classroom management was preferred for the formal staff group. At the senior high level, a higher probability of determining action in tasks external to classroom management was preferred for higher official authority.

Junior high and elementary levels. Significant differences between the mean probabilities of decision sources determining action were obtained on ten of the seventy-two items. At the junior high level, a higher probability of determining action on some matters was preferred for the individual teacher and the formal staff group. A lower probability of determining action on some matters was preferred for higher official authority.

The pattern of significant differences between schools at different educational levels yielded only provisional conclusions. Significant differences were obtained on only a minority of items. However, the

data suggested that, to a limited extent, there were differences in the character of professionalization reflected in the preferences of teachers in senior high as against junior high and elementary schools. At the senior high level there was somewhat greater concern with the dominance of the individual teacher in the area of classroom management, somewhat less concern with the dominance of the individual teacher and the formal staff group in certain tasks external to classroom management.

Hypothesis 2.6. This hypothesis stated that significant differences would not occur in the preferences of school staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the community setting.

Reference to Table XXXV showed little evidence to support a direct relationship between the socio-economic setting of schools and the preferred pattern of role specification and the preferred distribution pattern of decision-making authority for each task. Significant differences between mean preference scores were obtained on only five of the seventy-two items. Little support was obtained for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2.7. This hypothesis stated that significant differences would not occur in the preferences of teachers classified according to selected categorical variables. Table XXXVI indicated that significant

TABLE XXXV

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF COMMUNITY  
(MEDIAN AND LOWER)

Questionnaire Item No.	Community Status <sup>a</sup>	Mean <sup>w</sup>	t <sup>b</sup>
7. <u>Individual</u> Policy	<u>Median</u>	3.19	2.57
	Lower	2.83	
12. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Median</u>	3.89	2.62
	<u>Lower</u>	4.18	
6. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Median</u>	2.11	2.77
	<u>Lower</u>	2.48	
8. <u>Group</u> Policy	<u>Median</u>	3.28	2.43
	Lower	3.60	
3. <u>Official Auth.</u> Practice	<u>Median</u>	2.71	2.48
	<u>Lower</u>	3.07	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the status group underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXVI

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY SEX CATEGORY

Questionnaire Item No.	Sex Category <sup>a</sup>	Mean	t <sup>b</sup>
10. <u>Individual</u> Policy	Male	2.63	2.50
	<u>Female</u>	2.99	

<sup>a</sup> The mean preferred probability level of the status group underlined is the significantly higher of the two.

<sup>b</sup> t significant at the .01 level.

differences between the mean preference scores of male and female teachers were obtained on one item only. Reference to Table XXXVII showed that significant differences between the mean preference scores of teachers classified according to length of experience were obtained on one item only.

Table XXXVIII indicated that significant differences between the mean preference scores of teachers classified according to length of training were obtained on eight items. For seven of the eight items, teachers with the longest period of training preferred a lower degree of decision-making authority exercised by higher official authority, a higher degree of decision-making authority exercised by the individual teacher. Little support was obtained for this hypothesis.

#### Summary

There was a marked variation in the preferred probability of each decision source determining action across the set of twelve task activities. Hypotheses concerning the pattern of preferred role prescription were based on the view that teachers would desire a pattern of role specification characteristic of the full-fledged professional. The data did not directly support this hypothesis. However, because of its general nature, the data did not necessarily provide evidence

TABLE XXXVII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE

Questionnaire Item No.	Length of Experience	Mean	F <sup>a</sup>
3. <u>Individual</u> <u>Policy</u>	Higher	3.31	5.02
	Median	3.72	
	Lower	3.73	

<sup>a</sup>F significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXXVIII

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN PREFERRED PROBABILITY  
OF DECISION SOURCES DETERMINING ACTION,  
BY LENGTH OF TRAINING

Questionnaire Item No.	Mean Preferred Probability Level <sup>a</sup> Length of Training		
	1 - 2 yrs.	3 - 4 yrs.	5 - 6 yrs.
<u>Task 6</u> <u>Individual</u> <u>Policy</u>	4.12	4.33	4.44
<u>Task 8</u> <u>Individual</u> <u>Practice</u>	3.83	3.75	3.33
<u>Task 3</u> <u>Higher Authority</u> <u>Practice</u>	3.25	2.84	2.56
<u>Task 4</u> <u>Higher Authority</u> <u>Practice</u>	1.97	1.64	1.44
<u>Task 4</u> <u>Higher Authority</u> <u>Policy</u>	3.12	2.78	2.85
<u>Task 5</u> <u>Higher Authority</u> <u>Practice</u>	2.51	1.95	1.78
<u>Task 6</u> <u>Higher Authority</u> <u>Practice</u>	2.10	1.71	1.65

<sup>a</sup>F significant at the .01 level.



directly contrary to the view that teachers preferred some of the features of the full professional role.

The data suggested that teachers preferred the individual teacher to exercise less decision-making authority in matters external to the classroom than in the area of classroom management. However, there remained the possibility that teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise even less decision-making authority than the individual teacher in matters external to classroom management. There also remained the possibility that teachers preferred the formal staff group to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority than higher official authority in some matters external to classroom management.

The preferred distribution pattern of decision-making authority related to each task activity allowed more definite conclusions to be drawn concerning teacher preferences. The meaningful distribution patterns strongly suggested that teachers preferred a degree of professionalization which went beyond the semi-professional level in important task activities. As against teacher perceptions, there was greater emphasis on the decision-making authority exercised by the individual and the formal staff group in the arrangement of the school instructional programme and in general school administration. Teacher preferences in these areas indicated

a desire for a substantial shift in the balance of power between the professional and the administrator. However, the possible extent of the desired change could be over estimated. In some tasks related to curriculum development, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise major decision-making authority.

The meaningful distribution patterns identified in teacher preferences only partially met the criteria of adaptive authority patterns. There was evidence of differentiation in the distribution of decision-making authority in the area of classroom management. Teachers preferred the individual teacher to exercise major decision-making authority. However, in the area of general school administration, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise minor decision-making authority. There was evidence of integration in the development and adaptation of the curriculum. Teachers preferred that each of the decision sources be involved in determining action. However, in the area concerned with arranging the school instructional programme, teachers preferred higher official authority to play only a minor decision-making role.

Marked differences did not occur between the mean preference scores of school staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the school setting, and between the mean preference scores of teachers classified

according to sex, length of experience and length of training. However, significant differences between the mean preference scores of school staff classified according to the educational level of the school occurred for approximately one-third of the items. For these items, meaningful patterns of differences were identified.

The data suggested that there were limited differences in the character of professionalization preferred by teachers in senior high as against junior high and elementary schools. Senior high teachers preferred a higher degree of decision-making authority to be exercised by the individual teacher for some tasks in the area of classroom management. Senior high teachers preferred a lower degree of decision-making authority to be exercised by the individual teacher and the formal staff group in some tasks external to classroom management.

For the total test group, meaningful distribution patterns were not identified for a substantial minority of task activities. Conclusions concerning the distribution patterns reflected in teacher preferences were provisional. However, trends in the data suggested that teachers tended to prefer an authority structure similar, in important respects, to that of the full-fledged professional organization. Unqualified support for the full-fledged professional ideology was not reflected in teacher

preferences. For example, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise major decision-making authority in the determination of the basic outline of the curriculum.

Two somewhat extreme stands are taken in the literature on teacher professionalization. On the one hand, it is suggested that the teacher does not desire real involvement in the determination of matters external to the classroom. On the other hand, it is suggested that the teacher aspires to full-fledged professional status. (supra, p.101) In the present study, a form of involvement in school decision-making was reflected in teacher preferences which was not consistent with either of these viewpoints. Evidence strongly suggested that (a) for some task activities, teachers preferred not to exercise major authority, either as an individual or as a member of a formal staff group, (b) for some task activities, teachers preferred to exercise major authority as an individual, and (c) for some task activities, teachers preferred to exercise major authority as a member of a formal staff group. For the total test group, there was evidence of a desire on the part of teachers for more power in general. However, there was also evidence that the kind of involvement in decision-making preferred by teachers varied substantially with the nature of the task.

## CHAPTER IX

### COMPARISON OF PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS

#### Role Specification

The data provided in Tables VIII to X compared the mean perceived probability of decision sources determining action on Task 4 as against other tasks. (supra, pp.132-138) Parallel data on the mean preferred probability of decision sources determining action were presented in Tables XXIX to XXXI. (supra, pp.190-195) The most striking difference between the preferences and perceptions of staff groups was the variation in the decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group across the set of twelve task activities. Inspection of the data indicated that the preferred and perceived probabilities of the formal staff group determining action within the area of classroom management was in the moderately low to mean probability range. However, as against teacher perceptions, teachers preferred the formal staff group to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority in some key tasks external to classroom management.

Some support was obtained for Hypothesis 3.1 which stated that there would be differences in the perceived and preferred patterns of role specification. It was

expected that the differences would be those expected to occur between the semi-professional (the perceived) and the professional (the preferred) organization. The most marked difference concerned the variation in the decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group across the set of twelve task activities. As against teacher perceptions, a higher degree of decision-making authority was preferred for important tasks external to classroom management.

#### Distribution Patterns

Hypothesis 3.2 stated that there would be marked differences in the preferred and perceived distribution patterns of decision-making authority for each of the twelve task activities. Differences would be those which would occur between the semi-professional (the perceived) and the professional (the preferred) organization.

The data in Tables XI to XXIV summarized the preferred and perceived distribution patterns for each of the twelve tasks in each school. (supra, pp. 143-156) The evidence strongly supported a basic difference in the preferred and perceived distribution patterns of decision-making authority. In general, the preferred patterns of decision-making authority reflected a higher degree of professionalization than the perceived.

A striking feature of the data was the similarity in

the preferred and perceived distribution patterns in the area of classroom management. In each case, distribution patterns were those in which the individual teacher exercised major decision-making authority. In contrast, were the differences in the preferred and perceived distribution patterns in task areas external to classroom management. In these areas, the great majority of preferred distribution patterns were Individual Authority Patterns and variants and Group Authority Patterns and variants. The great majority of perceived distribution patterns were Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants.

#### Comparison of Mean Preference and Perception Scores

Hypothesis 3.3 stated there would be significant differences in the mean preference and perception scores of teachers in the total test group. Qualified support was obtained for this hypothesis. Hypothesis 3.3a stated that the mean preferred probability of the individual teacher and of the staff group determining action would be significantly higher than the mean perceived probability. The data summarized in Table XXXIX indicated that, for items on which significant differences were obtained, the preferred mean probability of the individual teacher determining action was higher than the perceived. However, significant differences were

TABLE XXXIX

COMPARISON OF THE PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED MEAN  
PROBABILITIES OF THE INDIVIDUAL TEACHER  
DETERMINING ACTION ON TASKS, FOR EACH SCHOOL

School <sup>a</sup>	Relation of preferred mean to perceived <sup>b</sup> Tasks <sup>c</sup>											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	N	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
Practice	N	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	N
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	H	N	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	N	N	N
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	N
Practice	H	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	N
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	H	H
Practice	H	H	H	N	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	N
Practice	H	N	H	H	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	N
06												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	H
Practice	H	N	H	H	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	H
07												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	N

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at .01 level.

H significantly higher than perceptions at .01 level.

L significantly lower than perceptions at .01 level.

<sup>c</sup> Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic area.



TABLE XXXIX (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Relation of preferred mean to perceived <sup>b</sup> Tasks <sup>c</sup>											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	H	N
Practice	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	H	H
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	H	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	N
Practice	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	N	N
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	H	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	N
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	N
12												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	H	H
Practice	H	H	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H
13												
Policy	N	N	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	H	N
Practice	H	N	H	N	H	N	H	N	N	H	N	N
14												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	N	N
Practice	H	H	H	N	H	H	H	H	H	H	N	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at .01 level.

H significantly higher than perceptions at .01 level.

L significantly lower than perceptions at .01 level.

<sup>c</sup> Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic area.

obtained on only fifty-one per cent of items.

The data in Table XL showed that for items on which significant differences were obtained, the preferred mean probability of the formal staff group determining action was higher than the perceived in ninety-one per cent of items.

However, significant differences were obtained on only forty-eight per cent of items.

Hypothesis 3.3b stated that the mean preferred probability of higher official authority determining action would be significantly lower than the mean perceived probability. Inspection of Table XLI revealed that, for items on which significant differences were obtained, the preferred mean probability of higher official authority determining action was lower than the perceived. However, significant differences were obtained on only fifty-one per cent of items.

For the items on which significant differences were obtained, trends in the data were as predicted. For the individual teacher determining action, the preferred probability was significantly higher than the perceived. For the formal staff group determining action, the preferred probability was significantly higher than the perceived. For higher official authority determining action, the preferred probability was significantly lower than the perceived.

TABLE XL

COMPARISON OF THE PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED MEAN  
PROBABILITIES OF THE TEACHER STAFF GROUP  
DETERMINING ACTION ON TASKS, FOR EACH SCHOOL

School <sup>a</sup>	Relation of preferred mean to perceived <sup>b</sup> Tasks <sup>c</sup>											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	H	N	H	L	L	L	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	N	H	H	N	H
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	N	H	N	L	N	H	N	H	H	H	H
Practice	N	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	N	N
Practice	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	H	N	N
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	H	H	L	L	L	H	H	H	H	N	N
Practice	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	N	N	N	N
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	N	H	N	L	N	H	N	H	H	N	N
Practice	H	N	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	N
06												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	H
Practice	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	N
07												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	N
Practice	H	H	H	N	L	N	H	N	H	H	N	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at .01 level.

H significantly higher than perceptions at .01 level.

L significantly lower than perceptions at .01 level.

<sup>c</sup> Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic area.

TABLE XL (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Relation of preferred mean to perceived <sup>b</sup> Tasks <sup>c</sup>											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	H	L	H	L	N	L	H	L	H	H	L	L
Practice	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	N	N	N
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	N	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	N	N	N
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	H	N
Practice	H	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	N	H
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	N	H	N	H	N	N	H	N	N	N	H
Practice	N	N	H	N	N	N	H	H	N	H	N	N
12												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	H	H	H	N	H
Practice	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	H	N	H	N
13												
Policy	H	H	N	N	N	N	N	H	H	H	N	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	H	N	N	H
14												
Policy	H	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	N
Practice	N	H	H	N	N	N	H	N	H	H	N	H

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at .01 level.

H significantly higher than perceptions at .01 level.

L significantly lower than perceptions at .01 level.

<sup>c</sup> Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic area.

TABLE XLI

COMPARISON OF THE PREFERRED AND PERCEIVED MEAN  
PROBABILITIES OF HIGHER OFFICIAL AUTHORITY  
DETERMINING ACTION ON TASKS, FOR EACH SCHOOL

School <sup>a</sup>	Relation of preferred mean to perceived <sup>b</sup> Tasks <sup>c</sup>											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<u>SENIOR HIGH</u>												
01												
Policy	N	L	L	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	L	L	L	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
02 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	L	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
Practice	N	L	L	L	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
<u>JUNIOR HIGH</u>												
03 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	L	N	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	L	L
Practice	N	L	L	N	L	N	N	L	N	L	N	N
04 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	L	L	L	N	N	N	L	L	L	N	L	L
Practice	N	L	L	N	L	N	N	L	N	L	N	N
05 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	N	L	N	N	N	N	L	L	L	N	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	N
06												
Policy	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	N	N	L	N	N
Practice	N	L	L	N	N	N	L	N	N	L	N	N
07												
Policy	L	L	L	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
Practice	L	N	N	N	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	N

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at .01 level.

H significantly higher than perceptions at .01 level.

L significantly lower than perceptions at .01 level.

<sup>c</sup> Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic area.

TABLE XLI (continued)

School <sup>a</sup>	Relation of preferred mean to perceived <sup>b</sup> Tasks <sup>c</sup>											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
08												
Policy	L	L	L	N	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	L	L	L	N	N	N	L	N	N	L	L	L
<u>ELEMENTARY</u>												
09 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	L	N	L	N	N	N	L	L	N	L	N	N
Practice	L	L	L	N	N	N	L	N	L	L	N	N
10 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	N	L	L	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	L	N	N	L	N
11 <sup>x</sup>												
Policy	N	N	N	N	L	N	N	N	L	N	L	N
Practice	N	N	N	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
12												
Policy	L	L	L	L	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	L
Practice	L	L	L	N	N	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
13												
Policy	N	L	L	L	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
Practice	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	L	L	L	L	L
14												
Policy	N	N	N	N	L	N	L	L	L	L	N	L
Practice	N	N	N	L	L	N	L	N	L	L	L	L

<sup>a</sup> For school code numbers, see Table VII, p. 131.

<sup>b</sup> N no significant difference at .01 level.

H significantly higher than perceptions at .01 level.

L significantly lower than perceptions at .01 level.

<sup>c</sup> Task areas numbered as in questionnaires.

<sup>x</sup> Schools in lower socio-economic area.

## Summary

Role specification. A marked difference in teacher preferences and perceptions concerned the variation in the decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group across the set of twelve task activities. Within the area of classroom management, the mean preferred and perceived probabilities of the formal staff group determining action were in the moderately low to mean probability range. However, as against teacher perceptions, teachers preferred the formal staff group to exercise a higher degree of decision-making authority in important tasks external to classroom management.

Distribution patterns. Another prominent feature of the data was the similarity in the preferred and perceived authority distribution patterns related to classroom management. In each case, Individual Authority Patterns or variants were most frequent. In contrast, were the substantial differences in the preferences and perceptions of teachers related to task areas external to classroom management. Here, Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants were generally reflected in teacher perceptions. However, teachers typically preferred Individual Authority Patterns and variants and Group Authority Patterns and variants in these areas.

Neither the preferred nor perceived distribution patterns related to each task completely met the criteria of adaptive distribution patterns. A somewhat greater variety of distribution patterns was reflected in teacher preferences. However, the general nature of the criteria did not allow conclusions to be drawn concerning the relative standing of preferred and perceived distribution patterns as adaptive authority structures. Both the preferred and the perceived distribution patterns met some of the criteria of adaptive authority structures but not others.

Comparison of mean preference and perception scores.

A comparison of mean preference and perception scores gave qualified support for the view that a higher degree of professionalization was reflected in teacher preferences than in teacher perceptions. For items on which significant differences were obtained, trends in the data were consistent with this view. However, significant differences were not obtained on a substantial proportion of items.



## CHAPTER X

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

##### The Problem

The general purpose of the study was to make a survey of the distribution of decision-making authority in a group of elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Specific attention was focussed on the distribution of decision-making authority between the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and forms of higher official authority for twelve task activities. The distribution patterns were those reflected in the perceptions and preferences of teachers in fourteen Edmonton schools.

##### Analysis of the Problem

The study was concerned with one aspect of a general dimension of member involvement in the decision-making process. This was the determination of action by the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group and higher official authority at the point of decision.

The proposition was accepted that there was an association between the degree of probability of the decision sources determining action and (a) the pattern of specification of the teacher's work role, and (b) the

balance of decision-making authority between the individual teacher, the formally recognized staff group, and higher official authority for each task.

The variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by each decision source across the set of twelve task activities was taken to indicate the pattern of specification of the teacher's work role. The relative decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for each task was taken to indicate the distribution pattern of decision-making authority associated with the task. The distribution pattern of decision-making authority associated with each task was classified according to authority structures recognized in the literature on formal organization. The classification of each distribution pattern according to recognized authority structures provided the basis for the study of task differentiated authority structures in schools.

Criteria of distribution patterns were based on a review of the literature on authority structures in both educational and non-educational organizations. Particular account was taken of adaptive authority structures which accommodate professional and hierarchical authority systems in the formal organization.

### Research Design

The central purpose of the research design was to

undertake the identification, analysis, and appraisal of meaningful patterns in the network of associations between the variables selected for study.

A number of propositions were basic to the development of methods used to analyse, present, and interpret the data. It was accepted that the degree of probability of a decision-source determining action was associated with the degree of decision-making authority exercised by the source. It was judged that the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source was better expressed in relative than in absolute terms. It was proposed that distribution patterns of decision-making authority could be classified and interpreted in terms of authority structures recognized in the literature on formal organizations.

In the analysis of data, three general approaches were taken. To obtain the pattern of role specification, a measure of the variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by a decision source across the set of twelve task activities was obtained. The measure was based on significant differences in the degrees of probability of a decision source determining action on a reference task (the determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class) as against other task activities.

To identify distribution patterns of decision-making authority, a measure was taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for each task activity. The measure was based on the relative degree of probability of each decision source determining action on the task concerned.

Finally, an item by item analysis was made of the mean perception and preference scores of teachers classified according to type of school and selected categorical variables.

#### Sub-Problems and Hypotheses

The primary hypotheses were concerned with the identification, analysis, and appraisal of distribution patterns of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teacher staff groups.

One set of hypotheses was concerned with the degree of specification of the teacher's work role, as indicated by the extent to which the decision-making authority exercised by a decision source varied across the set of twelve task activities. It was hypothesized that the pattern of role specification reflected in staff perceptions would be that characteristic of the semi-professional organization. Also, it was hypothesized that the preferred pattern of role specification would be that characteristic

of the full-fledged professional organization.

Another set of hypotheses dealt with the distribution pattern of decision-making authority associated with each task activity. It was hypothesized that meaningful distribution patterns would be identified, classified according to distribution patterns recognized in the literature. Also, it was hypothesized that perceived distribution patterns would be those characteristic of the semi-professional organization, and preferred distribution patterns would be those characteristic of the full-fledged professional organization.

The final set of hypotheses considered the extent to which distribution patterns of decision-making authority met the criteria of adaptive authority structures. Adaptive authority structures were those which helped satisfy both individual and organizational needs in the school. It was hypothesized that neither the perceived nor the preferred distribution patterns would completely meet the criteria of adaptive distribution patterns.

The secondary hypotheses were concerned with a comparison of mean group responses, with teacher staff groups classified according to the educational level and to the socio-economic setting of the school, and with teachers classified according to selected categorical variables.

It was hypothesized that significant differences in the perceived distribution of decision-making authority would occur between schools classified according to educational level, and to the socio-economic status of the community setting. It was hypothesized that a higher degree of professionalization would be evident in distribution patterns perceived in schools at higher educational levels and in schools in the higher status socio-economic settings.

Also, it was hypothesized that significant differences in the preferred distribution of decision-making authority would not occur between school staff classified according to type of school and to selected categorical variables.

## Results

Teacher perceptions. To determine the pattern of role specification, a measure was taken of the variation in the degree of decision-making authority exercised by each decision source across the set of twelve task activities. In the area of classroom management, the individual teacher was perceived to exercise a significantly higher degree of authority than in other task areas. In the area of classroom management, higher official authority was perceived to exercise a significantly lower degree of authority than in other task areas. These patterns of

role specification were consistent with those characteristic of the semi-professional organization. However, a clear indication was not obtained of the pattern of variation in degree of the decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff group.

A measure was also taken of the relative degree of decision-making authority exercised by the three decision sources for each task activity. It was found that meaningful distribution patterns of decision-making authority could be identified for the majority of tasks in each school. Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants were predominant in the area of classroom management. Basic Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants were in the majority in task areas external to classroom management. The results suggested that teachers perceived dominant decision-making authority to be exercised by the individual teacher in the classroom, and dominant authority to be exercised by higher official authority in areas external to classroom management. The results also suggested that teachers perceived the formal staff group to exercise minor decision-making authority in most task areas. In general, the meaningful distribution patterns perceived for the total test group were similar to those characteristic of the semi-professional organization.

Perceived distribution patterns only partially met the criteria of adaptive authority distribution patterns. There was evidence of differentiation of decision-making authority in the areas of classroom management and of general school administration. The individual teacher was perceived to exercise major decision-making authority in classroom management, and higher official authority was perceived to exercise major decision-making authority in the area of general school administration. However, there was little evidence of integration of decision-making authority in the interstitial areas of curriculum development and of the arrangement of the school instructional programme. Typically, higher official authority was perceived to exercise major decision-making authority in these areas.

With reference to the secondary hypotheses, little support was obtained for a direct relationship between the perceived distribution of decision-making authority and schools classified according to the socio-economic status of the community setting.

Again, there was lack of strong evidence to support a direct relationship between the perceived distribution of decision-making authority and schools classified according to educational level. However, significant differences between mean perception scores were obtained



on approximately one-third of the items. For these, items, meaningful patterns of differences were identified. The differences suggested that, to a limited extent, the character of perceived professionalization was situationally specific. In some matters, a higher degree of professionalization was perceived in junior high schools than in senior high and elementary schools. However, it was recalled that the basic index of professionalization used in this study was limited to the perceived distribution of decision-making authority in schools.

Teacher preferences. Significant variations were obtained in the degree of decision-making authority preferred for each decision source across the set of twelve task activities. The variations concerning the authority of the individual teacher did not provide direct support for the view that the teachers preferred a pattern of role specification identical with that of the full-fledged professional organization. The high degree of decision-making authority preferred for the individual teacher in the area of classroom management was not equalled in external task areas. The low degree of decision-making authority preferred for higher official authority in the area of classroom management was rarely as low in external task areas. However, as against the moderate degree of decision-making authority preferred for the formal

staff group in the area of classroom management, a higher degree of decision-making authority was preferred for this decision source in a number of external task activities.

For teacher preferences, meaningful distribution patterns of decision-making authority were identified for fifty per cent or more of task activities in each school. The substantial proportion of task activities for which meaningful patterns were not identified permitted provisional conclusions only to be drawn from the data.

Within this limitation, meaningful distribution patterns suggested that school staff preferred a form of authority distribution which went beyond that characteristic of the semi-professional organization. Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants were predominant in the area of classroom management. Basic Individual Authority Patterns and variants, and Basic Group Authority Patterns and variants were in the majority in task areas external to classroom management. Trends in the data suggested that, in the area of classroom management, school staff preferred that major decision-making authority be exercised by the individual teacher. Further, the data showed that, in the majority of task activities external to classroom management, school staff preferred major decision-making authority to be exercised by the individual teacher and/or the formal staff group.

The evidence on teacher preferences suggested that teachers desired a substantial shift in the perceived balance of power between professional and administrative authority in important task areas. However, unqualified support for the full-fledged professional ideology was not reflected in teacher preferences. For example, for the determination of the basic outline of the curriculum, school staff preferred that major decision-making authority be exercised by higher official authority.

Meaningful distribution patterns reflected in teacher preferences only partially met the criteria of adaptive authority distribution patterns. There was little evidence of differentiation of decision-making authority in the area of general school administration. Teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise only minor decision-making authority in this task area. There was little evidence of integration in the area related to the arrangement of the school instructional programme. Again, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise minor decision-making authority in this task area.

With reference to the secondary hypotheses, little support was obtained for a direct relationship between the preferences of teachers and school staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the school

community setting. Again, little support was obtained for substantial variations in the preferences of teachers classified according to sex, length of experience and length of training.

There was lack of strong evidence for a direct relationship between the preferred distribution of decision-making authority and schools classified according to educational level. However, significant differences between mean preferences scores occurred for approximately one-third of the items. The pattern of significant differences suggested that, to a limited extent, the character of the authority distribution preferred varied according to the educational level of the school. In some matters, senior high staff, as against junior high and elementary staff, preferred a higher degree of decision-making authority for the individual teacher in the area of classroom management. On the other hand, senior high staff, as against junior high and elementary staff, preferred a lower degree of decision-making authority for the individual teacher and the formal staff group in some matters external to classroom management.

#### Comparison of teacher perceptions and preferences.

The most noticeable difference between preferred and perceived patterns of role specification concerned the decision-making authority exercised by the formal staff

group. As against teacher perceptions, a higher degree of decision-making authority was preferred for this decision source in important matters external to classroom management.

There were substantial differences between the preferred and perceived patterns of decision-making authority associated with each of the twelve task activities. The differences were most marked in task areas external to classroom management. In these areas, the most frequently perceived distribution patterns were Higher Official Authority Patterns and variants. On the other hand, the most frequently preferred distribution patterns were Individual Authority Patterns and variants, and Group Authority Patterns and variants.

Teacher preferences and perceptions were similar in the area of classroom management. In each case, Individual Authority Patterns and variants were most frequent.

#### Methods of Analysis

Three basic procedures were used in the analysis of data. Evidence suggested that the analysis of distribution patterns associated with each of the twelve task activities provided the most accurate and meaningful data. The method of analysis took account of both mean score values and the direction of significant differences between mean scores. Data obtained from the analysis of patterns of role

specification gave limited support for the conclusions based on task differentiated distribution patterns. In this case, the nature of the data was less precise. The method of analysis placed particular emphasis on the direction of significant differences between mean scores, and took less account of mean score values.

An item by item comparison of mean preference and perception scores provided only general support for conclusions based on task differentiated authority patterns. This type of analysis did not take into account the pattern of relationships between mean scores.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions drawn from the present study were subject to a number of qualifications. There were conceptual limitations. Attention was limited to a specific aspect of member involvement in the decision-making process. A single index of professionalization was used. There were methodological limitations. The data were based on written questionnaire responses in a small group of schools. Some techniques of data analysis provided more precise information than others. Meaningful distribution patterns of decision-making authority were not obtained for all task activities.

However, meaningful trends identified in the data

suggested provisional conclusions which merit further consideration.

### Techniques of Data Analysis

The method of analysis used to measure the patterns of role specification proved too general to allow precise patterns of role specification to be obtained. However, the data obtained were of sufficient value to suggest that the technique of data analysis warranted further refinement. The concept of a pattern of role specification helped summarize the variations in the degree of specificity of role prescription across a set of task activities.

More valuable, was the analysis of distribution patterns of decision-making authority associated with each task. The meaningful data obtained by this method of analysis provided indirect but strong support for the validity of the technique. The distribution patterns helped summarize the configuration of authority relationships associated with each task. The nature of the data obtained was of sufficient value to conclude that the technique merited further development.

### Task Differentiated Authority Structures

As applied in this study, the concept of multiple authority structures was based on the view that distribution patterns of decision-making authority could vary from task

to task. The concept of task differentiated authority structures proved helpful in the analysis of the distribution of authority in schools. Insight was obtained into the hierarchy of authority relationships associated with important task activities. Applied with more refined techniques of measurement, the concept should contribute further to the analysis of school organizational structure.

#### The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in Schools

Teacher perceptions. The high proportion of meaningful distribution patterns perceived by teachers strongly suggested that teachers perceived consistent sets of routines associated with the determination of action in schools.

Reflected in teacher perceptions was a general division of decision-making authority in schools, into administrative and professional spheres of activity. In the area of classroom management, teachers perceived the individual teacher to exercise major decision-making authority, with the formal staff group and higher official authority exercising minor decision-making authority. In task areas external to classroom management, teachers perceived higher official authority to exercise major decision-making authority, with the individual teacher



and the formal staff group exercising minor decision-making authority. Noticeable, was the lack of major decision-making authority perceived for the formal staff group.

Evidence obtained from teacher perceptions was consistent with the substantial body of research and opinion which holds that the school remains essentially bureaucratic in organizational style, with considerable teacher autonomy being retained for immediate teaching tasks. The data provided strong support for the view of Otto and Veldman, that "the self-contained classroom organization is more than a physical reality; it is also a social system in which the teacher is separated from immediate supervision ...." (1, p. 159)

The evidence on teacher perceptions strongly suggested that the perceived distribution patterns of decision-making authority were similar to those characteristic of the semi-professional organization.

Teacher preferences. Meaningful distribution patterns reflected in teacher preferences indicated that teachers desired a substantial shift in the balance of power perceived to exist between higher official authority and the teacher. The desire for change was apparent in the majority of task areas external to classroom management. In these areas, teachers generally preferred the individual

teacher and/or the formal staff group to exercise major decision-making authority, with higher official authority exercising minor decision-making authority.

However, unqualified support for the full-fledged professional ideology was not expressed in teacher preferences. For example, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise major decision-making authority in the determination of the basic outline of the curriculum. Nevertheless, evidence on teacher preferences supported one view expressed in the literature, that there is a desire among teachers for an allocation of authority which diffuses authority among those affected by the decision.

The evidence on teacher preferences indicated that teacher desired a form of authority distribution which shared some of the characteristics of the full-fledged professional organization.

Of particular interest, was the kind of teacher involvement desired by teachers. Evidence on teacher preferences suggested that teachers desired a type of participation which varied considerably with the nature of the task. As against teacher perceptions, teachers preferred a greater variety of distribution patterns of decision-making authority.

### Adaptive Authority Structures

Neither the preferred nor the perceived distribution patterns completely met the criteria of adaptive authority structures in schools. Teachers perceived the individual teacher and the formal staff group to exercise minor decision-making authority in tasks external to classroom management. In contrast, teachers preferred higher official authority to exercise minor decision-making authority in the majority of tasks external to classroom management.

### Variations in Teacher Perceptions and in Teacher Preferences

There was little evidence of significant differences in the perceptions of teaching staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the school community setting. Strong support was not obtained for a direct relationship between the perceptions of teaching staff classified according to educational level. However, significant differences obtained on a minority of items suggested that the character of perceived professionalization differed, to a limited extent, between educational levels.

There were few significant differences in the preferences of teaching staff classified according to the socio-economic status of the school community setting, and in the preferences of teachers classified according to

sex, length of experience and length of training. Strong support was not obtained for a direct relationship between the preferences of teaching staff classified according to educational level. However, significant differences obtained on a minority of items suggested that the nature of preferred professionalization varied, to a limited extent, between educational levels.

#### Participation and Involvement in Decision-Making

Evidence on teacher preferences and perceptions suggested basic differences in the types of organizational participation perceived and preferred by teachers. The data on teacher preferences indicated that teachers generally desired a higher degree of involvement in decision-making than that which they experienced. Also, the data suggested that teachers wanted to be concerned in a greater variety of participation procedures than that which they experienced.

Evidence on teacher preferences indicated that teachers desired a type of participation which varied substantially with the nature of the task. For example, (a) for some task activities, teachers preferred not to exercise major authority, either as an individual or as a member of a formal staff group, (b) for some task activities, teachers preferred to exercise major authority as an individual, and (c) for some task activities,

teachers preferred to exercise major authority as a member of a formal staff group.

The evidence on teachers preferences raised the issue of the extent to which diverse patterns of decision-making authority could co-exist within the formal framework of the school organization.

### The Basic Purpose of the Study

The prime focus of the study was on the study of distribution patterns of decision-making authority in a group of schools. The distinctive configurations of decision-making authority identified indicated that it was feasible to measure distribution patterns of decision-making authority for selected task activities. The evidence also showed that meaningful distribution patterns could be related to issues current in the field of school organization and administration. The findings provided considerable support for the value of the theoretical concepts and methods of analysis used in the study.

### III. IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the study had implications for the study of educational administration.

First, the study suggested ways in which the distribution of decision-making in schools could be studied. With refinement, the methods should be of value in further

research on the organizational structure of the school.

Second, the study provided data on the perceptions and preferences of teachers concerning the distribution of decision-making authority in a group of schools. Evidence obtained in this type of research should prove helpful in the planning of school organizational structure.

Third, the study suggested the following lines of research, (a) the further development of methods of analysis used in the present study, and (b) a theoretical review of the types of authority distribution pattern identified in the study.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER X

- (1) Otto, Henry J., and Donald J. Veldman. "Control Structure in Public Schools and the Decision and Influence Roles of Elementary School Principals and Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 149-161.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A. BOOKS

- Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley, 1963.
- Baum, Bernard H. Decentralization of Authority in a Bureaucracy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.
- Blau, Peter M. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- Brown, Wilfred. Explorations in Management. London: Heinemann, 1960.
- Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1962.
- Corwin, Roger G. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Drucker, Peter. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper and Bros., 1954.
- Dubin, Robert. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Human Relations in Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. et al. Leadership and Productivity. California: Chandler Publishing Co., 1965.
- Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Friesen, D. Edmonton High School Study. Publication in Progress: The University of Alberta, 1968.
- Goldhammer, Keith, et al. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration. Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.
- Gore, William J. Administrative Decision-Making: A Heuristic Model. New York: John Wiley, 1964.



- Goslin, David A. The School in Contemporary Society. Chicago: Scott-Foresman, 1965.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1954.
- Grambs, Jean Dresden. Schools, Scholars and Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Gross, Bertram M. The Managing of Organizations. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Guest, Robert. Organizational Change: The Effect of Successful Leadership. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin-Dorsey, 1962.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.
- Horst, Paul. Psychological Measurement and Prediction. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1966.
- Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. San Francisco: Chandler, 1964.
- Katz, Daniel. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1966.
- Kornhauser, William. Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California, 1962.
- Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Ledieur, Frederick G. The Scanlon Plan. Cambridge, Massachussetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1958.
- Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Peabody, Robert L. Organizational Authority. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.
- Pelz, Donald C., and Frank M. Andrews. Scientists in Organizations: Productive Climates for Research and Development. New York: John Wiley, 1966.

- Pfiffner, John M., and Marshal Fels. The Supervision of Personnel. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Robert V. Presthus. Public Administration. New York: Ronald Press, 1960.
- Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: MacMillan, 1951.
- Steiner, Gary A. The Creative Organization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Vollmer, H. M., and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. (A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, eds.). Glencoe: Free Press and Falcon Wing Press, 1947.
- Woodward, Joan. Management and Technology. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1958.

#### B. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

- Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of Professions," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 15-34.
- Bidwell, C. E. "The School as a Formal Organization," in J. G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 972-1022.
- Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and Authority Structure of the School," in Roy B. Allen, and John Schmidt (eds.). Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, University of Arkansas and the University Council for Educational Administration, 1966, pp. 1-22.
- Clark, Burton R. "College Teaching," in H. M. Vollmer, and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 282-291.

- Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- Leavitt, Harold J. "Applied Organizational Change in Industry: Structural, Technical and Human Approaches," in W. W. Cooper et al. (eds.). New Perspectives in Organizational Research. New York: John Wiley, 1962, pp. 57-70.
- Lortie, Dan C. "The Teacher and Team Teaching: Suggestions for Long-Range Research," in Judson T. Shaplin, and Henry F. Olds, Jr. (eds.). Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1964, pp. 270-305.
- Peabody, Robert L., and Francis E. Rourke. "Public Bureaucracies," in G. March (ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 802-838.
- Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict," in H. M. Vollmer, and D. L. Mills (eds.). Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 265-275.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. "Dimensions of Organization Theory," in James D. Thompson (eds.). Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, pp. 1-56.
- Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization," in Harold J. Leavitt (ed.). The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pp. 41-84.
- Wilson, James Quentin. "Innovation in Organization: Notes Toward a Theory," in James D. Thompson (ed.). Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, pp. 195-216.
- Wittlin, Alma S. "The Teacher," in Kenneth S. Lynn (ed.). The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 91-110.

#### C. PERIODICALS

- Ahmad Varra, Yrjo. "The Mathematical Theory of Factorial Invariance Under Selection," Psychometrika, 19 (1954), pp. 27-38.

- Anderson, James G. "The Authority Structure of the School: System of Social Exchange," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 1-21.
- Becker, H. S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (1953), pp. 128-141.
- Becker, Selwyn W., and Gerald Gordon. "An Entrepreneurial Theory of Formal Organization Part I: Pattern of Formal Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), pp. 316-344.
- Bridges, Edwin M. "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making," Administrator's Notebook, XII (1964).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Model for Shared Decision-Making in the School Principalsip," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 49-61.
- Chase, F. S. "The Teacher and Policy Making," Administrator's Notebook, I (1952).
- Dahl, Robert. "The Concept of Power," Behavioral Science, 11 (1957), pp. 201-215.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. "Bureaucracy, Bureaucratization and Debureaucratization," Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959), pp. 302-320.
- Friedman, John. "A Conceptual Model for the Analysis of Planning Behavior," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 225-252.
- Hage, Jerald. "Axiomatic Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 289-320.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Michael Aiken. "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 72-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Michael Aiken. "Program Change and Organizational Properties: A Comparative Analysis," The American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1967), pp. 503-520.
- Hall, Richard H., and Charles R. Little. "A Note on Bureaucracy and Its 'Correlates'," American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1966), pp. 267-272.
- Hickson, D. J. "A Convergence in Organization Theory," Administrative Science Quarterly, 11 (1966), pp. 225-237.

- Hughes, Everett C. "The Professions in Society," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 26 (1960), pp. 54-61.
- Lammers, C. J. "Power and Participation in Decision-Making in Formal Organizations," American Journal of Sociology, 73 (1967), pp. 201-216.
- La Porte, Todd R. "Conditions of Strain and Accommodation in Industrial Research Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 21-38.
- Lawrence, Paul R., and Jay W. Lorsch. "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 1-47.
- Litwak, Eugene. "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict," American Journal of Sociology, 67 (1961), pp. 177-184.
- Moeller, Gerald H., and W. W. Charters. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp. 444-465.
- Moyer, D. C. "Leadership that Teachers Want," Administrator's Notebook, VII (1955).
- Otto, Henry J., and Donald J. Veldman. "Control Structure in Public Schools and the Decision and Influence Roles of Elementary School Principals and Teachers," Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967), pp. 149-161.
- Pugh, D. S. et al. "A Conceptual Scheme for Organizational Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8 (1963), pp. 288-315.
- Scott, W. Richard, et al. "Organizational Evaluation and Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), pp. 93-117.
- Sharma, G. L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook, VIII (1955).
- Smith, C. G., and A. S. Tannenbaum. "Organizational Control Structure: A Comparative Analysis," Human Relations, 16 (1963), pp. 299-316.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. "Control in Organizations: Individual Adjustment and Organizational Performance," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7 (1962), pp. 236-257.

Thompson, Victor A. "Bureaucracy and Innovation,"  
Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (1965), pp.  
1-20.

Willower, Donald J. "The Handbook of Organizations,"  
Educational Administration Quarterly, III (1967),  
pp. 89-99.

#### D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Davis, Keith. "A Preliminary Study of Management Patterns  
of Research Project Managers in Manufacturing in the  
Phoenix Area." Arizona State University, Department  
of Management, 1961. (Mimeographed).

Elley, Warwick B. "A Comparative Analysis of the Socio-  
Economic Bias in Selected Intelligence Tests."  
Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, The University of  
Alberta, Edmonton, 1961.

Mackay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic  
Dimensions and the Relation to Other Characteristics  
of School Organizations." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation,  
The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

**APPENDIX**

**QUESTIONNAIRES SUBMITTED TO TEACHERS**

## SCHOOL SURVEY

## PART A: AUTHORITY FOR DECISIONS IN SCHOOLS

Instructions

In this survey, teachers are asked to indicate the probability of certain events happening in their present school, i.e. if certain matters arise, what is the probability of the individual teacher, of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting, of a higher official authority actually deciding the issues?

There are five levels of probability of each of the above sources actually deciding an issue. FOR EACH ITEM, CIRCLE THE LETTER GROUP WHICH YOU FEEL COMES CLOSEST TO DESCRIBING WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IN YOUR SCHOOL. THE LETTER GROUPS ARE:

EH -- EXTREMELY HIGH	(Probability of occurrence)
MH -- MODERATELY HIGH	(Probability of occurrence)
IMP-- IMPOSSIBLE TO JUDGE	(Probability of occurrence)
ML -- MODERATELY LOW	(Probability of occurrence)
EL -- EXTREMELY LOW	(Probability of occurrence)

Sample Question

In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the task listed below.

In your judgment, what would be the probability of the INDIVIDUAL TEACHER actually determining these for himself?

Task	Probability of the individual teacher actually determining general principles and policy.
------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- 
1. Determining the way parents are informed of their children's progress.

EH MH IMP ML **EL**

COMMENT: A circle around EL indicates that, in your judgment, there is an extremely low probability of the individual teacher actually determining the policy required to guide action on this matter.



### Meaning of Terms

Individual Teacher -- The regular classroom teacher.

Majority Opinion of a Teacher Staff Meeting -- A majority decision made by one of the following school staff groups, whichever you feel is most appropriate to the particular issue: general meeting of the total school teaching staff, meeting of a subject department staff, meeting of a grade staff.

A Higher Official Authority -- A form of official authority higher than that of the individual teacher, whichever you feel is most directly concerned with the particular issue: e.g. subject co-ordinator, school principal, a school administrator, School Board or representative, Department of Education or representative.

### Personal Information

Please check the appropriate answer.

- (1) Years of teaching experience, including the present year.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1) 1 year  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) 2-5 years  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (3) 6 years or more

- (2) Your sex.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1) Male  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Female

- (3) Please indicate main subject speciality if any \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Please indicate years of training you are credited with for salary purposes.  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## I. QUESTIONS OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY

- A. In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

In your judgment, what would be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these for himself?

Tasks	Probability of the individual teacher actually determining general principles and policy
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- B. In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

In your judgment, what would be the probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining these?

Tasks	Probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining general principles and policy
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- C. In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

In your judgment, what would be the probability of a higher official authority actually determining these?

Tasks	Probability of a higher official authority actually determining general principles and policy
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

## II. QUESTIONS OF SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION

- A. In your present school, assume that questions of SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

In your judgment, what would be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these for himself?

Tasks	Probability of the individual teacher actually determining specific procedures and direct action
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- B. In your present school, assume that questions of SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

In your judgment, what would be the probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining these?

Tasks	Probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining specific procedures and direct action
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- C. In your present school, assume that questions of SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

In your judgment what would be the probability of a higher official authority actually determining these?

Tasks	Probability of a higher official authority actually determining specific procedures and direct action
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

PART B: PREFERENCES CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY FOR  
DECISIONS IN SCHOOLS

Instructions

In this part of the survey, teachers are asked to indicate their own feelings on who should decide certain issues in their present school, i.e. if certain matters arise, what do you feel should be the probability of the individual teacher, of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting, of a higher official authority actually deciding the issues?

There are five levels of probability of each of the above sources actually deciding an issue. FOR EACH ITEM, CIRCLE THE LETTER GROUP WHICH COMES CLOSEST TO DESCRIBING WHAT YOU FEEL SHOULD HAPPEN IN YOUR SCHOOL.

EH --	EXTREMELY HIGH	(Probability of occurrence)
MH --	MODERATELY HIGH	(Probability of occurrence)
IMP--	IMPOSSIBLE TO JUDGE	(Probability of occurrence)
ML --	MODERATELY LOW	(Probability of occurrence)
EL --	EXTREMELY LOW	(Probability of occurrence)

Sample Question

In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the task listed below.

In your judgment, what should be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these for himself?

Task	Preferred probability of the individual teacher actually determining principles and policy
1. Determining the way parents are informed of their children's progress.	EH MH IMP ML (EL)

Comment: A circle around EL indicates that, in your judgment, there should be an extremely low probability of the individual teacher actually determining the policy required to guide action on this matter.



## I. QUESTIONS OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY

- A. In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

What do you feel should be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these for himself?

Tasks	Preferred probability of the individual teacher actually determining general principles and policy
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- B. In your present school, assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

What do you feel should be the probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining these?

Tasks	Preferred probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining general principles and policy
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- C. In your present school assume that questions of GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICY have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

What do you feel should be the probability of a higher official authority actually determining these?

Tasks	Preferred probability of a higher official authority actually determining general principles and policy
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

## II. QUESTIONS OF SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION

- A. In your present school, assume that questions of SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

What do you feel should be the probability of the individual teacher actually determining these for himself?

Tasks	Preferred probability of the individual teacher actually determining specific procedures and direct action
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- B. In your present school, assume that questions of SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

What do you feel should be the probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining these?

Tasks	Preferred probability of a majority opinion of a teacher staff meeting actually determining specific procedures and direct action
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers of departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL

- C. In your present school, assume that questions of SPECIFIC PROCEDURES AND DIRECT ACTION have arisen concerning the tasks listed below.

What do you feel should be the probability of a higher official authority actually determining these?

Tasks	Preferred probability of a higher official authority actually determining specific procedures and direct action
<hr/>	
1. Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
2. Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.	EH MH IMP ML EL
4. Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in class.	EH MH IMP ML EL
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	EH MH IMP ML EL
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.	EH MH IMP ML EL
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	EH MH IMP ML EL
8. Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.	EH MH IMP ML EL
9. Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.	EH MH IMP ML EL
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	EH MH IMP ML EL
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	EH MH IMP ML EL
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	EH MH IMP ML EL