

NATIONAL LIBRARY  
OTTAWA



BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE  
OTTAWA

4954

NAME OF AUTHOR... DENIS MASSÉ.....  
TITLE OF THESIS... TEACHER PARTICIPATION  
...AND... PROFESSIONAL...  
...ATTITUDES.....  
UNIVERSITY... UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA...  
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED... PH.D.....  
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED... 1969.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY  
OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies  
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and  
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be  
printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's  
written permission.

(Signed) *Denis Massé*...

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

*Faculté des Sc. de l'Éducation  
Section d'Éduc. scol.  
Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128  
Montréal, Qué.*

DATED... August 18<sup>th</sup> 1969

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TEACHER PARTICIPATION AND PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES

by



DENIS MASSÉ

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

FALL, 1969

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA  
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Teacher Participation and Professional Attitudes" submitted by Denis Massé in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

*D. J. Owsen*.....  
Supervisor

*E. A. Holdaway*.....

*E. A. Holdaway*.....

*R. Baird*.....

*Jean Yves Urolet*.....  
External Examiner

Date... *August 15, 1969* .....

## ABSTRACT

The problem investigated in this study was three-fold. First, this study examined whether teacher desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature was different from their actual degree of participation. Second, the present research studied whether teacher orientation toward professional authority was related to their orientation toward knowledge and service. Finally, an investigation was made of the relationships between teacher desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature and their professional orientation toward authority, knowledge and service.

The sample of teachers selected for this study consisted of 1,300 members of the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec. A little more than 50 per cent of the original sample provided usable returns.

The data required for testing the hypotheses advanced were collected by means of three instruments. A Teacher Information Questionnaire was used to collect general information about the teacher. A Teacher Participation Questionnaire was designed to provide information regarding the actual and preferred levels of participation in selected decision areas. Finally, a Teacher Opinion Questionnaire was used to gather information regarding teacher attitudes toward professional authority, service and knowledge. A factor analysis was performed on the last two questionnaires and four scales were developed: the Actual Participation Scale, the Preferred Participation Scale, the Professional Authority

Scale, and the Professionalism Scale.

It was found that the level of participation teachers perceived they had over a number of professional decisions was significantly different from the level they would have liked to have. On twenty-seven decision items out of thirty-five, a majority of teachers felt they were not given any degree of participation, while their expectations on all but one item were that they should be given the right, not simply to be consulted, but at least to decide with the administrative authority in matters of a professional nature.

Teacher orientation toward service and knowledge was found significantly related to their orientation toward authority. Teachers who were highly oriented toward service and knowledge were more highly oriented toward authority than were teachers who had a low orientation toward service and knowledge.

A significant relationship was found between teacher desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional authority.

However, teacher desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature was not significantly related to their orientation toward service and knowledge. Teachers who were highly oriented toward service and knowledge were not asking for a different degree of participation than were teachers who had a low orientation to professional service and knowledge. It was proposed that other factors, apart from teachers' orientation toward service and knowledge, could have affected their desire for greater participation.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his thanks to the thesis supervisor, Dr. D.A. MacKay, for his assistance during the various stages of the study. Thanks are also extended to the other committee members, Dr. E.W. Ratsoy and Dr. R.E. Baird.

Appreciation is expressed to the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec and the teachers who offered their co-operation which made this study possible.

To the University of Alberta and the Government of Québec, thanks are extended for financial assistance given to the writer in the completion of this study.

The writer wishes to acknowledge, with thanks, the co-operation given by a colleague, Miss Naomi Hersom, for her assistance in improving the written English of this thesis.

Finally, and most of all, the writer expresses his sincere thanks and appreciation to his wife, Lise, for her patience and encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Importance of the Problem . . . . .	3
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	8
Definition of Terms . . . . .	9
Delimitations, Limitations and Assumptions . . . . .	10
Delimitations . . . . .	10
Limitations . . . . .	11
Assumptions . . . . .	11
Overview of the Report . . . . .	12
References for Chapter I . . . . .	13
II. THE THEORETICAL BASIS . . . . .	15
Introduction . . . . .	15
The Concept of Participation . . . . .	15
Professional Autonomy and Modern Bureaucracies. Related Research in Non-Educational Organizations . . . . .	17  20
Teachers' Professionalization and School Systems Related Research in Educational Organizations	22 29
Teachers' Professional Authority . . . . .	33
Professionalism and Professional Authority . . . . .	36
Summary . . . . .	40
References for Chapter II . . . . .	42
III. SUB-PROBLEMS, HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES . . . . .	47

CHAPTER	PAGE
Sub-Problems and Hypotheses . . . . .	47
Sub-Problem 1 . . . . .	47
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	47
Sub-Problem 2 . . . . .	47
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	47
Sub-Problem 3 . . . . .	47
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	48
Sub-Problem 4 . . . . .	48
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	48
Significance Levels . . . . .	48
Instrumentation . . . . .	49
Teacher Information Questionnaire . . . . .	49
Teacher Opinion Questionnaire . . . . .	50
Reliability . . . . .	51
Validity . . . . .	53
Teacher Participation Questionnaire . . . . .	55
Reliability and validity . . . . .	58
Sources, Collection, and Treatment of the	
Data . . . . .	62
Sources and Collection of Data . . . . .	62
The sample . . . . .	62
Questionnaires' return . . . . .	63
Composition of the study sample . . . . .	63
Treatment of Data . . . . .	63
Scoring . . . . .	63
Statistical Treatment . . . . .	64



CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary . . . . .	70
References for Chapter III . . . . .	71
IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	72
Introduction . . . . .	72
Actual vs. Preferred Participation . . . . .	72
Sub-Problem 1 . . . . .	72
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	72
Findings . . . . .	73
Discussion . . . . .	74
Professional Authority and Professionalism . . . . .	85
Sub-Problem 2 . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	86
Findings . . . . .	86
Discussion . . . . .	87
Preferred Participation and Teacher Orientation	
Toward Authority, Knowledge and Service . . . . .	88
Sub-Problem 3 . . . . .	88
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	88
Findings . . . . .	89
Sub-Problem 4 . . . . .	90
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	90
Findings . . . . .	90
Discussion . . . . .	90
Participation and Orientation Toward	
Authority . . . . .	90

CHAPTER	PAGE
Participation and Orientation Toward	
Service and Knowledge . . . . .	92
Summary . . . . .	93
References for Chapter IV . . . . .	94
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	95
Summary . . . . .	95
The Problem . . . . .	95
The Theoretical Basis . . . . .	95
Instrumentation . . . . .	97
The Sample . . . . .	97
Treatment of the Data . . . . .	98
Hypotheses and Results . . . . .	98
Conclusions . . . . .	101
Implications . . . . .	102
For School Administrators . . . . .	102
For Further Research . . . . .	107
References for Chapter V . . . . .	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	110
APPENDIX A: Correspondence and Instruments of	
Research . . . . .	117
APPENDIX B: Factor Analysis of the PROS (5 Factors)	142
APPENDIX C: Factor Analysis of the P.P.S. and	
A.P.S. (5 Factors). . . . .	145
APPENDIX D: Composition of the Sample . . . . .	148
APPENDIX E: General Variables and the Four Scales	150

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Rotated Factor Analysis of the PROS . . . . .	52
II. Factor Analysis of the Professionalism Scale . .	56
III. Factor Analysis of the Professional Authority Scale . . . . .	56
IV. Factor Analysis of the Preferred Participation Scale . . . . .	60
V. Factor Analysis of the Actual Participation Scale . . . . .	61
VI. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Professionalism Scale . . . . .	65
VII. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Professional Authority Scale . .	66
VIII. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Preferred Participation Scale . .	67
IX. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Actual Participation Scale . . .	68

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Rotated Factor Analysis of the PROS . . . . .	52
II. Factor Analysis of the Professionalism Scale . . . . .	56
III. Factor Analysis of the Professional Authority Scale . . . . .	56
IV. Factor Analysis of the Preferred Participation Scale . . . . .	60
V. Factor Analysis of the Actual Participation Scale . . . . .	61
VI. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Professionalism Scale . . . . .	65
VII. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Professional Authority Scale . . . . .	66
VIII. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Preferred Participation Scale . . . . .	67
IX. Frequency and Percentage Distribution, Mean, Standard Deviation, Median, Range, Skewness, and Probability of Goodness of Fit to Normal Curve for the Actual Participation Scale . . . . .	68

TABLE	PAGE
X. Average Percentages of Teachers per Level for the Actual and Preferred Dimensions of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire . . . . .	73
XI. Frequency and Percentages Distributions Per Item of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire (Actual and Preferred) . . . . .	75
XII. Kruskal Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Professional Authority Scale Between Teachers High and Low on the Professionalism Scale . . . . .	87
XIII. Kruskal Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Preferred Participation Scale Between Teachers High and Low on the Professional Authority Scale . . . . .	89
XIV. Kruskal Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance on the Preferred Participation Scale Between Teachers High and Low on the Professionalism Scale . . . . .	91
XV. Table Summarizing the Relationships Found in the Study . . . . .	100
XVI. Factor Analysis of the PROS (5 Factors) . . . . .	143
XVII. Factor Analysis of the Preferred Participation Scale (5 Factors) . . . . .	146
XVIII. Factor Analysis of the Actual Participation Scale (5 Factors) . . . . .	147

TABLE	PAGE
XIX. Comparison of Study Sample to Québec's Teacher Population by Percentages . . . . .	149
XX. Influence of Sex, Age, Civil Status, Years of Education, Experience, Teaching Level, Years in the School, Number of Teachers in the School, Status in Teachers' Organization and Geographical Population on the Profes- sionalism Scale, The Professional Authority Scale, the Actual and Preferred Participation Scales . . . . .	151

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### I. INTRODUCTION

One of the more fundamental concepts dealt with by students of organizational theory is the concept "hierarchical structure of authority." First advocated by administration classicists like Fayol, Urwick and Gulick, and then re-emphasized by the multitude of Weberian apostles, this concept has been adopted by most contemporary organizations.

However, the universal appropriateness of a hierarchy of authority is now being questioned by many organizational theorists (13, p. 61; 23, p. 41; 7, p. 247). They argue that certain types of organizations, specifically those staffed with professionally trained people, should abandon the hierarchical pattern for a more professional, or collegial, type of authority structure.

The thesis that schools are staffed with professionally trained people has become very familiar. Teachers no longer seem to be asking society to recognize them as professionals. They have already been granted this status, at least in official public speeches. What teachers, through their professional associations, are now calling for, are the correlates of professional status. One could refer to higher salaries, greater control over conditions of work and employment, and more authority over professional decisions as examples of such correlates. In other words, what has been called the

professionalization "process" (22, p. vii), is well underway with respect to the teaching occupation.

If one believes students of the professions, this process cannot go on without bringing upheavals in the traditional authority structure of our school systems. Indeed, professionals should strive toward "professional authority" which could be construed as being incompatible with a hierarchical structure of authority.

If one also relies on the theory developed by students of the professions, this thrust toward professional authority would be based on two basic sets of professional attitudes: (1) the acquisition and development of a growing body of abstract knowledge, and (2) a collectivity or service orientation (14, p. 36). In other words, members of an occupation strive toward professional authority because they intend to provide the society with the best professional services possible. And, such an objective would not be realized if the decisions involved in devising these services were not taken by people possessing the knowledge and skills required "to profess these services."

This study is an attempt to discover whether such a drive toward professional authority does activate teachers and if so, whether it threatens the present hierarchical structures of our school systems. Moreover, an attempt was made to determine whether this thrust was related to teacher professional attitudes toward service and knowledge.



## II. IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Among the numerous conflicts which have developed between the professional and the bureaucratic ideologies, the first and most essential problem concerns authority. In the bureaucratic conception of an organization, authority is legitimated in terms of the position held. It is actualized by a hierarchical structure in which superiors have the right to expect that subordinates will obey them and the latter group has an obligation to obey its superiors. Such a principle might be defensible as long as it is possible to assume that persons who occupy high positions of authority also possess superior skills. However such a situation does not necessarily hold when subordinates are professionals. This does not imply that there are no exceptions to the rule or that superordinates do not possess superior skills in other areas such as administration. It means that subordinates have as much if not more competence than their superiors in a particular professional area. Parsons (20, p. 59) suggested that Weber confused authority which rests on incumbency of a legally-defined office with authority which is based on technical competence. Thus, the Weberian concept of bureaucracy failed to recognize the professional authority of subordinates and to include it in the organizational authority structure. As Scott has already pointed out, it is not the notion of hierarchical authority which is central to the professional ideology but the notion of expert knowledge:

Professionals are unaccustomed to such authority relations. Their own authority vis-a-vis clients or subordinate occupational groups is based on their superior competence, not on their occupancy of a particular organizational position (21, p. 273).

His point is also supported by Conrad:

Experience indicates that professional expertness cannot be tapped to full advantage in the usual vertical, hierarchical institutional organization. The unbending superordinate-subordinate structure is quite incompatible with the familiar professional horizontal peer structure. The supervision of professionals by laymen, or even by remote professionals, is regarded as an intrusion into employee autonomy, and is resisted at every turn (10, p. 407).

Research studies by McEwan (18), Arensberg and MacGregor (1), Moore and Renck (19) and Ben-David (4) tended to support the notion that bureaucratic structures were at odds with the professional authority expected by physicians, engineers, and scientists.

The previously quoted statements by Scott and Conrad point to one reason why professional people are asking for autonomy, that is, their possession of expertise over a body of specialized knowledge. Another reason given to justify their claim has to do with the fact that, because the body of knowledge they possess is considered to be of vital importance for the better functioning of the society (3, p. 35), professionals feel it is through their hands that society will be best protected and served.

These two reasons mentioned above are confirmed by Blackington and Patterson. They argue that a professional strives for autonomy because "he claims (1) to provide a

service to society, and (2) that he is uniquely equipped to perform this service by virtue of the training he has undergone" (6, p. 257-8).

This reasoning is part of what Greenwood has called the professional culture:

The social values of a professional group are its basic and fundamental beliefs, the unquestioned premises upon which its very existence rests. Foremost among these values is the essential worth of the service which the professional group extends to the community. The profession considers that the service is a social good and that community welfare would be immeasurably impaired by its absence. The twin concepts of professional authority and monopoly possess the force of a group value. Thus, the proposition that in all service-related matters the professional group is infinitely wiser than the laity is regarded as beyond argument (15, p. 16).

However valid may be the professionals' argument for autonomy and self-control, those responsible for administering organizations also have an argument worth looking at:

On the other side, it is an essential requirement of an effective formal organization which is devoted to the coordination of a variety of activities necessary for the realization of some specialized goal that the executive maintain adequate control over all those persons in the organization responsible for carrying out these subsidiary activities. Whereas professions find the pattern of "colleague control" most suitable, the required pattern of authority for formal organizations is "superordinate control." The former consists of control by peers, the latter of control by superiors. As a result of these different types of required authority, it is inevitable that there be a certain amount of strain when professional roles confront organizational necessities (2, p. 25).

Since school systems are recognized as bureaucratic organizations in which there exists a formal authority structure (5, p. 974) and because teachers are looked upon

as emergent professionals (16, p. 108; 8, p. 291), it is worthwhile to investigate the significance of such a confrontation in school organizations. If we believe people like Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee, school organizations are being influenced by both the forces of bureaucracy and the forces of professionalism.

With school organizations becoming more bureaucratic and school workers becoming more professional, the need to resolve the conflict between hierarchical and colleague control will intensify in the years ahead (9, p. 253).

Two writers testify to the importance and actuality of this conflict. At a recent conference of Canadian school administrators, McBeath stated that:

One of the most critical dilemmas facing modern school organizations is to reconcile the expectations of the teacher for increasing autonomy and responsibility in making decisions with the traditional demand for coordination through centralized control (17, p. 3).

Also recently, Norman Boyan, Director of the Division of Educational Laboratories for the U.S. Office of Education, stressed the fact that students of school organization have given little systematic attention to the emergent role of teachers and its impact on the school's distribution of organizational authority. As a result,

The aspirations of teachers as professionals in public bureaucracies and the militant behavior of teachers as members of extra-organizations have brought them into sharp contrast with the traditional authority structure of the school (8, p. 291).

Many studies which will be reviewed in the next chapter have stressed the increasing drive among teachers for greater

authority. The tendency has been to relate this thrust to the professionalization movement. However, if one takes a close look at the literature, he will realize that professionalism has been equated to the teachers' drive for greater autonomy. For instance, according to Corwin professionalism is "essentially a drive for status" and "the efforts of a vocation to gain full control over its work" (12, p. 222). Donald Wollett, N.E.A. consultant on collective negotiations, also equates professional orientation and teachers' desire to participate in decision-making:

The fact is that "professionalism" in public education means that teachers have an interest in every decision that affects their pupil clientele and the effectiveness of their work which reaches far beyond their narrow self interest in "bread and butter" (24, p. 225).

However, it would be unjust to limit the professionalization movement of teachers to a drive for greater authority. Even though the growth of teachers' professionalization has been identified with the challenge of the traditional ideology of lay control and the hierarchical control of administrators, it must also be associated with other characteristics. For instance, increased recognition is being given to the fact that teaching is a unique and essential social service based on particular competencies.

In this study an attempt was made to see if there was any relationship between the teachers' drive for professional authority, and their attitudes toward teaching as a unique and essential social service based on particular competencies. An attempt was also made to verify the potential

conflict suggested by the literature and research findings between the hierarchical structures of our school systems and the thrust by teachers for greater authority and participation in the decision-making process.

Finally the fact that this study has been undertaken in Québec makes it even more pertinent. Indeed, for the first time in its history, this province is experiencing a province-wide collective negotiation. At stake in this collective agreement is a demand by teacher associations for greater professional authority over many decision areas (11, ch. 4).

### III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was three-fold: (1) to determine whether or not teachers' preferred level of participation in a number of professional decisions, differed from their actual level of participation; (2) to determine whether or not teachers' orientation toward professionalism, that is, toward service and knowledge, was related to their orientation toward authority; (3) to determine whether or not teachers' preferred degree of participation in a number of professional decisions was related to their orientation toward authority, knowledge and service.

More specifically the problem was broken into the following sub-problems:

(1) Is there a significant difference between the actual level of participation teachers perceive they have in a number of professional decisions, and the level of partici-

pation they would prefer to have?

(2) Is there a significant relationship between the degree of orientation teachers have toward professional service and knowledge and the degree of orientation they have toward professional authority?

(3) Is there a significant relationship between the degree of participation preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional authority?

(4) Is there a significant relationship between the degree of participation preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional service and knowledge?

Researchable hypotheses, in relation with these sub-problems, are presented in Chapter III.

#### IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study the following terms have been defined:

Teachers. The term teacher refers to members of a school staff who are engaged only in teaching. Teachers who were part-time administrators, librarians, guidance counselors or any other educational workers were not considered in this study.

The Administrative Authority. The school administrative staff, the school board central administrative staff, the school board members, the department of education's staff, or the minister of education were identified as the administrative

authority in this study.

Decision of a Professional Nature. Any decision over matters related to the organization and the control of the teaching profession and over matters related to the practice, the organization and the control of the teaching act.

Professionalism Scale. A scale used as a measure of teachers' attitudes toward items related only to service and knowledge.

Teachers' Professionalism Score. The score received by teachers on the Professionalism Scale.

Teachers' Professional Authority Score. The score received by teachers on the Professional Authority Scale.

Teachers' Preferred Participation Score. The score received by teachers on the Preferred Participation Scale.

Teachers' Actual Participation Score. The score received by teachers on the Actual Participation Scale.

Levels of Participation. The Actual and Preferred Participation Scales contained four levels of participation: (1) no participation; (2) consultative participation; (3) collegial participation, and (4) autonomous participation.

Degree of Participation. The amount of participation teachers have in decisions as measured by the Actual Participation Scale or the Preferred Participation Scale.

## V. DELIMITATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

### Delimitations

This study had the following delimitations:



(1) It was limited to a random sample of the members of the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec, that is, to a random sample of teachers of the elementary and secondary French public school system of Québec during the 1967-68 school year. This system includes approximately 85 per cent of the teaching force at the two levels mentioned.

(2) The study was concerned with teachers' professional role orientation toward authority, knowledge and service as indicated by cognitive responses rather than by overtly active behavior.

#### Limitations

(1) Generalizations which are drawn from this study should be limited to the population sampled, keeping in mind the biases occasioned by the fact that only 50 per cent of the sample did participate.

(2) The four levels of participation used in this study may not cover all possible situations teachers encounter in the school system and therefore might compel the respondents to give answers which do not accurately correspond to their perception.

(3) The limited number of items used in the Actual Participation Scale, the Preferred Participation Scale, the Professionalism Scale, and the Professional Authority Scale has imposed a constraint on the concepts this study attempted to measure.

#### Assumptions

(1) The first basic assumption was that professionalism

is a continuum on which it is possible to locate teaching.

(2) The second basic assumption was that the four levels of participation represented an ascending continuum from no participation to autonomous participation. It was also assumed that the higher the level of participation, the higher was the degree of authority possessed by the participants.

(3) The major methodological assumptions underlying this study were that the sample selected adequately represented the population, and that the instruments used produced valid and reliable measures of the concepts being measured.

## VI. OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT

In the first chapter the problem was stated and arguments were advanced to suggest the significance of the study. Chapter II presents a review of the literature and research findings related to the conceptual bases of this study. Chapter III outlines the sub-problems and hypotheses flowing out of the problem, and also the research methodology employed in the study. Chapter IV is devoted to an analysis and discussion of the results of the study and Chapter V contains a summary of findings with a statement of conclusions and implications for further research.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER I

- (1) Arensberg, C.M. and D. MacGregor. "Determination of Morale in an Industrial Company," Applied Anthropology, I, January-March, 1942, pp. 12-34.
- (2) Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," The Professions in America, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965 pp. 15-34.
- (3) Becker, Howard S. "The Nature of a Profession," Education for the Professions, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, pp. 27-46.
- (4) Ben-David, J. "The Professional Role of the Physician in Bureaucratized Medicine: A Study in Role Conflict," Human Relations, XI, August 1958, pp. 255-274.
- (5) Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as a Formal Organization," Handbook of Organizations, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp. 972-1022
- (6) Blackington II, Frank H., Robert S. Patterson. School, Society, and the Professional Educator, Montréal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- (7) Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations, San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- (8) Boyan, Norman J. "Emergent Role of Teacher and Authority Structure of School," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, 1967, pp. 291-304.
- (9) Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee. The Organization and Control of American Schools, Columbus, Ohio: Charles B. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.
- (10) Conrad, Donald L. "Collective Negotiations and Professionalism," Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967, pp. 405-411.
- (11) Corporation des Enseignants du Québec, "Projet de Convention Collective Provinciale des Enseignants du Québec," Québec: Corporation des enseignants du Québec, 1968.
- (12) Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

- (13) Etzioni, Amitai. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV June 1959, pp. 43-67.
- (14) Goode, William. "Professions and Non-Professions," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 33-45
- (15) Greenwood, Ernest. "The Elements of Professionalization," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 9-18.
- (16) Griffiths, Daniel. "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternatives to the Status Quo," Struggle for Power in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 96-110.
- (17) McBeath, A. "The Changing Role of the Teacher and Implications for Administrators," Paper read at 1968 CEA Banff Short Course, Banff, 1968.
- (18) McEwan, William J. "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, I 1956, pp. 208-229.
- (19) Moore, D.G. and R. Renck. "The Professional Employee in Industry," Journal of Business, XXVIII January 1955, pp. 58-66.
- (20) Parsons, Talcott. "Introduction to Max Weber," The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations, A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (trans.), Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1947.
- (21) Scott, Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies--Areas of Conflict," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 264-275.
- (22) Vollmer, Howard M., Donald L. Mills. Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- (23) Wade, L.L. "Professionals in Organizations: A Neoteric Model," Human Organization, XXVI Spring/Summer, 1967, pp. 40-46.
- (24) Wollett, Donald H. "Professional Negotiations: What is the Thing," Collective Negotiations for Teachers, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

## CHAPTER II

### THE THEORETICAL BASIS

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the related literature and research findings related to the problem under study. First, attention is given to the concept of participation and to its importance in organizations which employ professionals. Secondly, literature on the conflict between professional autonomy and bureaucratic imperatives is reviewed. This chapter concludes with a statement of the relevance and the possible implications of this conflict for school systems.

#### II. THE CONCEPT OF PARTICIPATION

The main thrust of the "human relations movement" has been toward what Harold Leavitt has called "power-equalization," that is, toward a reduction in the power and status differential between supervisors and subordinates. This movement represents a reaction against the emphasis of rigid hierarchical control, in order to encourage spontaneity on the part of subordinates (50, p. 41). To achieve this power-equalization, one approach which has been proposed has come to be known as "participation" and "participative management" (50,p.41). It is looked upon as a means of permitting subordinates to take part in the decision-making process and thus to enlist individual creativity and enthusiasm" (43,p.43).

Tannenbaum refers to participation as "essentially . . . a matter of some degree of control by subordinates over work-related matters" (51, p. 98). This point of view is also stressed by Strauss:

Participation, as a form of equalization, gives subordinates greater freedom to set goals and/or to determine how to work for them--in other words, it provides greater autonomy (50, p. 62).

As a means to control and to acquire greater autonomy in work-related matters, participation is bound to be very important to organizations employing professionals.

Indeed, one condition which characterizes organizations of our time is the increasing number of professionals on their staff. During the last decade this has been the object of much attention by sociologists and students of organizational theory. Publications such as The Professions in America (34), The Professional in the Organization (1), Professionalization (53), and a special issue of the Administrative Science Quarterly on "Professionals in Organizations" (2) are but some examples giving evidence of the importance attached to this problem.

Among the implications arising from the growing proportion of professionals in organizations, two are of some importance for this study: first, professional people, because they see themselves as "experts," have a fundamental need for autonomy and self-control with regard to decisions on how and what to do in the practice of their professional activities; second, the traditional hierarchical structure we find in

modern bureaucracies, which is based on legal status, is at odds with this need.

### III. PROFESSIONAL AUTONOMY AND MODERN BUREAUCRACIES

Blau and Scott recognized these implications when they contrasted bureaucratic discipline with professional expertness:

The bureaucratic official's authority rests on legal contract backed by formal sanctions, but the professional's authority is rooted in his acknowledged technical expertness (13, p. 245).

Similarly, Etzioni (22, pp. 75-93) described the situation by stressing the conflict between administrative and professional authority:

Administration assumes a power hierarchy. Without a clear ordering of higher and lower in rank, in which the higher in rank have more power than the lower ones and hence can control and coordinate the latter's activities, the basic principle of administration is violated; the organization ceases to be a coordinated tool. However, knowledge is largely an individual property; unlike other organization means, it cannot be transferred from one person to another by decree. Creativity is basically individual and can only to a very limited degree be ordered and coordinated by the superior in rank. Even the application of knowledge is basically an individual act, at least in the sense that the individual professional has the ultimate responsibility for his professional decision (22, p. 76).

That autonomy is a professional need has already been recognized by most students of professionalism (28, p. 22).

Clayton is quoted as considering that:

A profession involves autonomous decision-making by individuals, by groups of members, by the professional group as a whole, and acceptance

of responsibility for decisions and acts performed in carrying out the service (46, p. 32).

Analyzing the professional movement, Hughes argued that:

Another set of themes in professionalizing movements has to do with a change of status of the occupation in relation to its own past, and to the other people--clients, public, other occupations--involved in its work drama. Changes sought are more independence, more recognition, a higher place, a clearer distinction between those in the profession and those outside and a large measure of autonomy in choosing colleagues and successors (29, p. 7).

To Corwin, professionalization is essentially a drive for status. "It represents the efforts of a vocation to gain full control over its work and to enhance its social and economical position in the society in the process" (20, p. 222).

That the traditional hierarchical structure is at odds with the orientation of professional people toward autonomy is also well supported by the literature. For instance, according to Abrahamson the conflicts which arise from the presence of professional employees in organizations stemmed to a large extent from their quest for autonomy or professional freedom (1, p. 102). In a recent article entitled "The Sociology of Professions," Barber expressed this point of view:

One of the essential attributes of the professional role, we have seen, is autonomy, or self-control by the professionals themselves with regard to the development and application of the body of generalized knowledge in which they alone are expert. On the other side, it is an essential requirement of an effective formal organization which is devoted to the



coordination of a variety of activities necessary for the realization of some specialized goal that the executive maintain adequate control over all those persons in the organization responsible for carrying out these subsidiary activities. Whereas professions find the pattern of "colleague control" most suitable, the required pattern of authority for formal organizations is "superordinate control." The former consists of control by peers, the latter of control by superiors. As a result of these different types of required authority, it is inevitable that there be a certain amount of strain when professional roles confront organizational necessities (7, p. 25).

In an analysis of possible areas of conflict for professionals working in bureaucracies, Scott stressed the same phenomenon:

When professionals are employed by organizations, there is a fundamental change in their situation. They must sacrifice some of their autonomy and conform to certain organizational rules . . . . The professional expects to be allowed maximum discretion in the selection of means for achieving desired results, being constrained in his operations only by internalized norms which indicate accepted procedures. The bureaucracy, however, super-imposes its own rules on the professional constraining his behavior in various ways and specifically restricting his choice of means (44, p. 270).

Later, in the same article he emphasized that:

Professionals are unaccustomed to such bureaucratic authority relations. Their own authority vis-a-vis clients or subordinate occupational groups is based on their superior competence, not on their occupancy of a particular organizational position. The fact that they have acquired complete skills and have internalized norms and standards makes unnecessary the existence of workers specialized in supervision. Each worker is expected to function independently and autonomously. Although he may seek out the help of his more competent or experienced colleagues, he receives advice and counsel from them, not orders, makes his own decisions, and faces the consequences (44, p. 273).

### Related Research in Non-educational Organizations

The conflicts expressed in the literature between bureaucratic and professional authority have been supported by some empirical findings. Indeed, according to Scott a great many studies indicate that professionals are uncomfortable with bureaucratic authority, at least to the extent of expressing their dissatisfaction with supervisory arrangements and complaining about managerial interference in the exercise of their professional tasks (44, p. 273).

A study done by Arensberg and MacGregor in an electrical equipment company revealed the unhappiness of a group of design engineers. They complained mainly about the fact that managers were making decisions which were arbitrary, inconsistent and which most seriously interfered with their prerogatives to make decisions of a professional nature (5).

In a survey of more than five hundred engineers and natural scientists, Moore and Renck found that in comparison to the average employee, this group had a low opinion of the technical competence of their supervisors and administrators (39). Ben-David also reported that physicians employed by Israeli medical care organizations complained about administrative interference in the exercise of their profession (10).

After studying the attitudes of professional workers in a public welfare agency, Scott reported that professionally oriented workers were more critical of the system than non-professional oriented workers even though they enjoyed more freedom (44). Examining the incongruity between the profes-

sional role of the physician in the army and the bureaucratic principles of a military organization, McEwan (36) found that the professional's self-concept as an individual capable of critical ability and originality of thought could only be superficially followed in the structure of a military organization. His conclusions were that the bureaucratic principles on which the military system was organized and the subordinate-superordinate relationships that existed were incompatible with the professional's need for creative thinking and the equality feelings that prevail among professionals. Finally, at the end of an analysis of the role of scientists in research organizations, Vollmer concluded that only in less bureaucratized and more permissive organizations, can individual activity be expected to be associated with markedly increased professional productivity (51).

In summary, the literature and studies which have been cited indicate the existence of the problem faced by professionals entering bureaucratic organizations. First it was pointed out that the professionalization movement taking place in modern organizations has been characterized by a drive toward autonomy. In essence, it is a thrust toward a better status, a greater independence and authority over decisions which have to do with professional matters. Such a thrust relies essentially on the possession of expert knowledge and its scope refers to the amount of authority acquired or granted to a professional, a group of professionals or a professional association over a range of decisions (32, p. 89). Secondly,

the literature also identifies the constraints the formal authority relations impose on this drive.

#### IV. TEACHER PROFESSIONALIZATION AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Since a school system is to some degree recognized as a bureaucratic organization in which there exists a formal authority structure (12, p. 974) and because teachers are looked upon as emergent professionals (25, p. 108; 14, p. 291), it is worthwhile to determine if the conflict just described is of any significance in school organizations.

One might infer from the preceding section that school teachers, assuming they are moving forward along the professionalism continuum, have a fundamental orientation toward autonomy; also that such an orientation, possibly manifested in their desire to participate in decision-making, is at odds with the present authority structure of our school systems. The task is now to see if such inferences can be drawn from the literature and related research.

Whether teachers can be considered professionals and where the teaching profession stands on a professionalism continuum are still debatable matters, if not controversial issues. Recent studies by Hrynyk (28, p. 221), Corwin (21, p. 49), Robinson (41, p. 199), and Scharf (43, p. 262), showed that teachers exhibited wide variations in professional role orientation and hence in their predisposition to professional behavior. Considerable variation existed in teachers' orientation toward characteristics or dimensions

of professionalism. But until more evidence is available, one has to rely mostly on opinions and value judgements. This might explain Cheek's contention that there is little consensus regarding the extent to which teaching is a professional role (19, p. 15).

A recent study by Carson, Goldhammer and Pellegrin identifies two different views on this matter of teacher professionalization (17). The first, which they admit is the most prominent at the present time, represents an ideology favoring local and lay control of schools. It supports the ideas that laymen are best qualified to make decisions affecting education; that teachers should be assigned a passive role in the policy formulation process; that teachers are public employees, and therefore disqualified from participation in decision-making affairs; and "that no special expertise or professional competence is required in order to make educational decisions" (17, p. 2).

This philosophy of school administration is supported and recognized widely even in some recent literature. Corwin's book, A Sociology of Education, is illuminating in this respect. He recognized that teachers have virtually no control over their standards of work (20, p. 241), and do not control important phases of their classroom work (20, p. 242). A recent publication called Struggle for Power in Education, stressed that:

Most public school teachers today are not professionals. They work in fully organized school districts, they work regular, assigned

hours, most of them teach from syllabi which they have not prepared, and their decision-making is restricted to narrow areas. Administrators consider teachers mainly as interchangeable parts of a large machine--the school system (25, p. 108).

In this same publication, Hall, analyzing the social structure of the teaching profession concludes:

There is very little of a professional character to school teaching. If, by profession, three things are meant--that teachers are highly dedicated in a selfless fashion to their work; that they have achieved a high level of knowledge and expertise; and that they are prepared to make important decisions about the organization and control of their work, then teaching ranks low on any professional scale (26, p. 47).

Wittlin points out the same weakness:

The professional status of the school teacher is altogether questioned on the grounds of his limited autonomy, of his restrictions in decision-making concerning what and how he teaches, and his position as a strictly supervised employee (55, p. 93).

In a recent article Anderson observed that teachers are viewed merely as employees of the school system, hired to carry out a prescribed job, and not as professionally responsible members of a profession (3, p. 140).

If the preceding quotations are more likely to reflect the American side of the picture, a few statements made by Canadian writers suggest that our situation is not very different. In the publication on The Professional Status of Teachers published in 1961 by the Canadian Conference on Education, the following statement described the situation:

It is frequently pointed out that more freedom and less supervision will prevail as teachers generally become better qualified on paper and more competent in practice. This is probably true so

far as the efforts of the organized profession is concerned, but he would be a starry-eyed optimist indeed who did not also take into account the long history in most provinces of detailed provincial prescription of courses, authorized textbooks, departmental inspection of the experienced as well as of the unexperienced teachers, and of administrative supervision within school board areas large enough to employ their own inspectorial personnel. That some of this is necessary is taken for granted, that much of it ought to be disappearing if teachers are to have full professional status is not yet accepted very widely in this country (40, p. 39).

In a controversial book entitled The Politics of Education, MacKinnon drew a sad picture of the teacher situation in Canada:

The crisis is particularly lively because the state, being completely in control, is doing an abnormal amount of telling, not only to young scholars, but to schools and teachers as well. For the children it provides an official programming of studies with official texts, official examinations, and official certificates, all carefully arranged and "authorized" by official regulations and instructions. To the schools, the state give no power of their own; and the teaching profession is a kind of low-drawer civil service, trained, licensed, hired, inspected, and directed by the state (38, p. 4).

To further support his argument he added:

It is widely assumed that teachers have a major part in planning the school curriculum. In fact, they do not. Practically all published studies on curricula come from professional "educators." All the final requirements come from officials. Teachers are sometimes consulted by means of questionnaires or curriculum committees. But there is little they can do on their own. They can only recommend; they have no power to adopt (38, p. 124).

The following position taken recently by L.C. Duddridge, president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, and cited by McBeath, testified to the commonly accepted

ideology identified by Carson, Goldhammer and Pellegrin:

School boards must retain for themselves and jealously guard their rights to make the final decisions about our educational programs. When we give up or permit the right of the public in education to be taken away from us we have failed those who elected us . . . . (35, p. 8).

In brief, the traditional position undoubtedly refuses to recognize in practice the professional status of the teacher and any right of professional authority in the decision-making process. Moreover this philosophy of administration clings to the traditional hierarchical structure of authority which is rooted in lay and public legal control. In such a structure, authority is delegated from the top down, the teacher being at the bottom of the ladder with almost no power of decision.

The second ideology mentioned by Carson, Goldhammer and Pellegrin is the result of concerted movements made to increase the power of the teacher and to improve his status: the trend toward teacher militancy, the collective negotiations movement, and the professionalization movement. According to the authors this last movement is less attention-getting and spectacular, but has a widespread and pervasive influence which has gained considerable momentum during the past decade. All three movements reflect an ideological orientation emphasizing the necessity for greater teacher involvement in decisions about educational matters and recognition of the teacher's professional expertise (17, p. 3).

As one may readily suspect, this ideology is directly in opposition to the traditional point of view:



The traditional paternalistic system in education stands squarely in opposition to the true professional status for teachers; as teachers seek professionalism they seek to counteract the paternal role of school authorities which has influenced policy-making in education for the past century (6, p. 7).

Corwin also stressed that "in order for teachers to professionalize they must take power from the lay boards of control and from the entrenched (sic) administrators appointed by these boards" (20, p. 222). Numerous reasons are advanced to explain why the teachers' professionalization movement counteracts the traditional trend of administration. Indeed this movement stresses the facts that teachers bring to their work increased levels of preparation and expertise. There is continuous upgrading of teachers' professional preparation. New structural arrangements such as team teaching and the employment of para-professionals are introduced in school organizations. The existence of strong teacher organizations has influenced the teachers to act more like professionals and to aspire to a professional level of social and economic rewards (14, pp. 291-292). The following statement by Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee supports the growth of professionalism among teachers:

As one examines what has been happening to teachers, the growth toward professionalism is apparent. Teachers are expected to acquire a larger body of knowledge than was once the case. The period of training is being increased. The need for in-service education in order to keep abreast of new knowledge is more generally recognized. Obviously, some teachers in our best schools and many teachers in colleges would meet the professional criterion of having acquired

a specialized body of knowledge and skill (15, p. 242).

Even though teachers are still considered by many people as "semi-professionals" (22, p. 78) or "aspirant professionals" (14, p. 293), many educational theorists and researchers believe, like Griffiths that:

. . . most teachers now aspire to be professionals, to be permitted to make decisions on a wide range of topics, to determine their own personal teaching materials and content, and to be self-initiating in professional work (25, p. 108).

According to McKean teachers increasingly are demanding a real part in making decisions affecting themselves directly and their work in the schools. They want to be involved in the decision-making process, to prove that they are now well-qualified to participate (37, p. 286). Going even further, Corwin pointed out that teachers are not merely expressing a desire to be consulted; consultation is not authority to decide. Teachers today are seeking the authority to decide (20, p. 277), because "decision is the crux of professional authority" (20, p. 242). This desire is also stressed by Lane:

Many school boards and administrators today are talking about 'allowing' teachers to participate more in the decision process. However, teachers appear to want the authority to make certain types of decisions, not merely the opportunity to become involved with some stages of decision-making at the discretion of the administration (30, p. 415).

Commenting on the conflict between the two ideologies related to the professionalization movement, Campbell, Cunningham and McPhee made this pertinent statement:

But the dilemma persists. How can the source of discipline be shifted from the administrative hierarchy to the colleague group? We suspect that this shift can not be made except as teachers are professionally ready for it. But teachers, may never get professionally ready until they have the obligation to accept greater responsibility for the control of teaching (15, p. 244).

In other words, it is impossible for teachers to become professionals, if they do not take greater responsibility in decisions which have to do with teaching.

#### Related Research in Educational Organizations

In his 1954 study, Sharma reported that teachers want more autonomy in the schools in which they teach and that significant differences exist between what they desire and current practice insofar as participation by their groups is concerned (47). He found that sharp differences existed between what teachers desired and current practice with regard to decision-making by groups of teachers, particularly when these decisions related to instruction and curriculum. According to his results teachers wanted to have a major part in decisions such as: the selection of materials for a subject or a class, the determination of the objectives for the total instructional program, the determination of objectives for a particular subject matter field, the planning of a school plant in relation to the educational program.

In a study of public school teachers, Becker reported that conflict arises when the principal ignores his teacher need for professional independence (9, p. 248). Corwin, in a study done with public high school teachers, found that

teachers who are highly professional have twice the rate of conflicts with the authority than low professionally oriented teachers (20, pp. 258-268).

Carson, after completing a research project in three Oregon communities, concluded that teachers felt they should be involved in educational decision-making to a greater extent than they had been (18). However, he found no significant differences between the types and levels of participation to which teachers aspired and their perceptions of what already existed. Among the areas in which these teachers thought they should be involved and in fact were involved, the majority of respondents mentioned: (a) determining method of instruction within the classroom; (b) curriculum planning and development; (c) organization and content of curriculum; (d) determining schedule in the teacher's own room; and (e) selection of instructional supplies (17, p. 10).

More recent findings by Benner showed a lack of congruency between actual and ideal participation in all decision areas except pupil discipline. Among these areas were decisions related to the evaluation of teachers, in-service education, assignments of teaching and non-teaching loads, teaching methods, teaching materials, evaluation of curriculum, setting educational goals, class and school rules and regulations (11, p. 124).

In his doctoral thesis, Walters concluded that teacher involvement in the administration of public schools was quite limited. However, a large number of teachers in his sample

believed that the administrative staff should share the decision-making roles with teachers. Among the ten highest ranking practices in which the respondents thought they were or should be involved, were the selection of instructional aids and supplies, the selection of books, and the planning and evaluation of the curriculum (54, p. 152-153).

Another recent study by Archambault revealed that teachers wanted greater participation in decisions concerning personnel administration and the educational program than school board members, superintendents and principals thought they should have (4, p. 163). The author also pointed out that the more education and the more years of teaching experience the greater the teacher's desire to participate at a higher level in the school hierarchical authority structure (4, p. 142).

A similar research study by Sasse on teachers' and administrators' participation in decision-making and curriculum development revealed that teachers participated most in the area of pupil personnel and were less involved in curriculum, business management, community relations and staff personnel (42).

In a study undertaken by Simpkins in Alberta, significant variations were obtained in the degree of decision-making authority preferred for each decision across a set of twelve task activities. The data suggested that, in the area of classroom management, school staff preferred that major decision-making authority be exercised by the individual

teacher (48, p. 255). Teachers preferred the formal staff group to exercise major decision-making in: (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; (c) the determination of the allocation of money to the teacher or departments for instructional aids and equipment (48, p. 209).

A research project by Balentine found that board chairmen, superintendents, and teacher organization presidents agreed that teachers should participate to a much greater degree than was the case. However, teacher organization presidents indicated that teachers should have the major role, while the board chairmen and the superintendents indicated that the latter should have the major role (8).

It is possible to infer from these research findings that teachers have expressed a greater desire for power in the decision-making structure, especially when it affects the organization and content of the instructional program. However, the results of a recent study recommend a careful interpretation of the above findings. Examining the relationship between principals' behavioral patterns and teachers' attitudes toward their building administrators, Goldman and Heald found that a discrepancy existed between those goals teachers claim to seek, that is, those related to egalitarian relationships and to staff involvement, and those which are actually prized, that is those related to the social support of teachers by principals. They concluded that:

The heavy emphasis placed on Social Support of Teachers is understandable when viewed in a more comprehensive manner. The investigation of educators' needs from which this data emanated brought to light information indicating that teachers were generally an insecure group. This insecurity might (sic) well be the reason for their decision not to stress egalitarian relationships and staff involvement as major factors in evaluation of administrative behavior. Should this be true, it will be necessary for administrators to provide a highly supportive atmosphere prior to initiating any changes in administrative structure which would bring about greater teacher involvement in the decision-making processes of the schools. Changes in that direction, if expected to succeed, will apparently have to be curtailed until teachers are sufficiently secure to deal with the insecurity that change breeds (23, p. 19).

#### V. TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY

If the professionalization movement which characterizes teaching is mainly associated with a thrust toward greater authority, it is important to understand what is at the present time the content and nature of the teachers' professional authority and what it should be according to advocates of the teaching profession. It must be stressed from the beginning that the literature on this topic is conflicting and often evasive. The following statement by Lieberman points out the fundamental reason for such a state of affairs: "Since there is much disagreement over the functions of education, whatever teachers do will appear to many persons to exceed the scope of their professional autonomy" (32, p. 90).

Lieberman contended that the teachers' scope of professional autonomy should include the following decision matters:

The subjects to be taught and the materials (such as textbooks) to be used in teaching them; the criteria to be used in deciding who should be admitted, retained, and graduated at all levels; the forms to be used in reporting pupil progress; school boundary lines and the criteria for permitting students to attend schools outside the boundary lines; the qualifications for entrance into teacher training; the length and content of the teacher training program; the standards for entry into and expulsion from education; the standards of professional conduct and the power to judge if and when practitioners have violated these standards; and who should lead the profession and speak for it on matters of broad professional concern (32, p. 91).

Corwin argued that teachers should have authority over their standards of work, the subjects to be taught, the materials to be used, the criteria for deciding who should be admitted, retained, and graduated from training schools, the qualifications for teacher training, the forms to be used in reporting pupil progress, school boundary lines and the criteria for permitting students to attend, and "other matters that affect teaching" (20, p. 241).

In contrast to these elaborated and specific statements, there are many which are much less precise. For instance, according to Wollett (56) and to Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware (44), professional decision matters should include "every decision that affects their pupil clientele and the effectiveness of their work . . ." (56, p. 3). The NEA and AFT have argued that teachers are interested in the entire school program and should negotiate on all matters of professional concern to them, such as educational priorities, curriculum, textbooks, extra-curricular activities, "anything to do with the operation of the school" (33, p. 243). According to



Wittlin a teacher should have authority over "what and how he teaches . . ." and the control of his work (55, p. 93). For Hall, autonomy meant authority for decisions regarding the organization and the control of their work (26, p. 47); for Griffiths it meant authority over "a wide range of topics" (25, p. 108); and finally for Anderson professional autonomy should be exercised in "a wide variety of decisions concerning conduct of members" (3, p. 141).

In a recent publication Lieberman and Moskow objected to the broad interpretation given to "professional decision matters" by Wallett, Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware, and the NEA and AFT. They proposed the following typology instead:

- (1) "professional matters" for matters to be decided by teachers and which should not be subject to negotiations;
- (2) "employment matter," for matters to be decided by some form of administrative action and which may be subject to negotiations (33, p. 242).

Unfortunately, one is left with the following statement which, as it will be seen, does little to change the conflicting state of affairs mentioned earlier:

What is the criterion for deciding that a particular decision or policy is a 'professional matter' or an 'employment matter'?

One must look to the consequences of having a decision made by teachers or by administrators; then on the basis of a judgement as to which set of consequences is more in the public interest, one can decide who should make the decision (33, p. 242).

Carson, Goldhammer and Pellegrin have pointed out the prevalent ideology which denies any real professional status for teachers and insists "that laymen (that is, non-educators)

are best qualified to make decisions affecting education" (17, p. 2). Such an ideology gave rise to another advocating that every decision with regard to the entire school program should be a professional matter (33, p. 243).

To avoid the pitfalls present in the two ideologies already identified, a decision of a professional nature is defined here as any decision having to do with matters related to the organization and the control of the teaching profession itself, as well as with matters related to the practice, the organization and the control of the teaching act.

## VI. PROFESSIONALISM AND PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY

The most common approach used to arrive at a definition of professionalism has been inductive. It has consisted of an examination of the characteristics of those currently called "professionals." From this basic material a common denominator of essential criteria has been selected. The extent to which these criteria were met by different occupations indicated their position on a professionalization continuum. A different approach has been used recently by Hicks and Blackington. They contended that the definition of the term profession is not an empirical, but a philosophical task. They argued:

It will not do anyone any good to go out and look for the characteristics of professions in order to compile a definition, because he will have to have prior knowledge of what a profession is before he can tell whether the characteristics

he sees belong to it or not. To assume otherwise is to make the fundamental intellectual error which pervades much standard sittings in all fields of human endeavor; that error is the failure to recognize a philosophical task when confronted by one (27, p. 30).

According to Hicks and Blackington professionalism is based on two fundamental dimensions.

The word "profession" clearly implies that members profess something. What do they profess? They profess just what they ought to--namely that they are different from the larger society in at least two basic ways:

(1) That social function is the primary reference point for guiding their activity (work).

(2) They possess, at this point in time, a specialized knowledge and means of verifying claims to knowledge that enable them to perform this function with an economy unique to that individual or group.

Here, when all is said and done, are the two basic, definitive dimensions of a real profession. They stand as criteria by which any claim to professionalism must be judged (27, p. 21).

Therefore the individual, as well as the group, is professional only insofar as those attitudes, that is, orientation toward service and knowledge are reflected in behavior (27, p. 23). Moreover, neither social intent nor skill, taken in isolation is sufficient for professionalism (27, p. 16). All the other criteria, characteristics or attributes such as autonomy or organizational membership, though they may be necessary for a profession, are not sufficient or unique to professional groups (27, p. 19).

This point of view had been implicitly recognized by students of the survey approach. For instance, as early as 1928, Carr-Saunders wrote:

A profession may perhaps be defined as an occupation based upon specialized intellectual

study and training, the purpose of which is to supply skilled service or advice to others for a definite fee or salary (16, p. 4).

More recently Goode reconciled the two approaches:

Any lengthy analysis of the characteristics of a profession will note that it is autonomous, is organized in professional associations, its members receive higher incomes than most workers and occupy a high proportion of the governing posts in our society and so on. Two traits, conspicuous because they seem to be found in all definitions, are sociologically central, because they are the main determinants of the others. Any program of action which relies on public relations techniques, or organized demands for higher salaries, or the formulation of a code of ethics, will fail unless it changes these two characteristics as well. These two are: (1) prolonged specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge, and (2) a collectivity or service orientation (24, p. 4).

If professionals are people mainly preoccupied with giving society skilled services, they are likely to make sure that decisions directly affecting these skilled services, are sound and compatible with the latter. Among these decisions are those related to the nature and content of the service. In education, this would involve decisions with respect to the content and the organization of instruction. Also, having to be preoccupied with the "skill" aspect of the service, professionals need to be preoccupied with decisions related to who should be admitted into the profession, what kind of training should be received, and what norms should be abided by.

In order to insure that the best decisions are taken, professionals are faced with the following possibilities. They can make the decisions themselves. If the society does

not yield them this power, they have to endeavor as much as possible to influence the decisions. The latter strategy may be accomplished by asking those in power to be invited to participate in the making of what they consider to be professional decisions. Finally, if they cannot ensure formal participation, a minimum request would be for consultation, in order to make sure that the people who are making decisions will decide as much as possible in accordance with the professionals' interests.

Assuming that professionals' interests are primarily concerned with providing skilled services, it follows that those who would most likely make decisions in accordance with such interests are the professionals themselves. Therefore, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that professional people would first ask to make the decisions by themselves in an autonomous way. They would resign themselves either to making decisions jointly with governmental authorities, or to being consulted, only if they were not granted complete autonomy. In other words, teachers who are really professionally minded would first prefer members of their profession to make decisions related to the performance of skilled services. However, it must be pointed out that two studies have attempted to discover a relationship between teachers' orientation toward authority and their orientation toward service and knowledge. Both Corwin (21) and Hrynyk (28) found no significant relationship to support the above proposition. The correlations were not higher than .11.

It has been seen earlier that according to the theory on professionalism, professionals should be oriented toward autonomy in order to insure the practice of the best "skilled services." It has also been pointed out at the beginning of this chapter that participation is essentially a means to control and to acquire greater autonomy over work-related matters. It is therefore possible to hypothesize that professional drive to participate in decision-making should be related to orientation toward authority, knowledge and service. Indeed, professionally-minded persons should look for the greatest degree of participation possible in order to exercise as much control as they can over decisions of a professional nature and consequently be able to insure the society of the best "skilled services."

## VII. SUMMARY

This chapter was concerned with a review of the literature and research findings relevant to the problem stated in Chapter I. It was found that participation is one way by which professionals may increase their control and acquire greater autonomy over decisions of a professional nature. However according to the literature and research findings the present decision-making structures of our bureaucracies are preventing professionals from acquiring such autonomy. The fact that this conflict is present in our school systems was also supported. Indeed, the degree of participation teachers would like to have in decisions of a professional

nature appears to be significantly different from the amount of participation the actual decision-making structures allow them to have. Moreover, there is much disagreement over the actual and ideal scope of teacher professional autonomy.

According to the literature presented on professionalism, there should be a relationship between a profession's orientation toward authority and its orientation toward knowledge and service. However, the research findings have not demonstrated that any significant relationship exists.

Finally, it was possible to hypothesize on the basis of the theory reviewed that the professional drive to participate in decision-making is related to orientation toward authority, knowledge and service.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER II

- (1) Abrahamson, Mark. The Professional in the Organization, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.
- (2) Administrative Science Quarterly, X, June 1965, Ithaca, New York: The Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, 1965.
- (3) Anderson, James G. "The Authority Structure of the School: System of Social Exchange," Educational Administration Quarterly, III, Spring, 1967, pp. 130-148.
- (4) Archambault, Eldon D. "Teacher Role in School Policy Development," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.
- (5) Arensberg, C.M. and D. MacGregor. "Determination of Morale in an Industrial Company," Applied Anthropology, I, January-March, 1942, pp. 12-34.
- (6) Azzarelli, Joseph J. "Four Viewpoints," Struggle for Power in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 1-15.
- (7) Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," The Professions in America, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 15-34.
- (8) Balentine, Robert G. "A Study of Teacher Participation in School Policy Formulation in New Jersey," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Jersey, 1968.
- (9) Becker, Howard S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Complex Organizations, Toronto: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1961, pp. 243-251.
- (10) Ben-David, J. "The Professional Role of the Physician in Bureaucratized Medicine: A Study in Role Conflict," Human Relations, XI August 1958, pp. 255-274.
- (11) Benner, Thomas E. "An Investigation Comparing Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of Actual and Ideal Decision-Making Participation Patterns in Selected Elementary School Districts in Illinois," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966.



- (12) Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as a Formal Organization," Handbook of Organizations, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- (13) Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations, San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- (14) Boyan, Norman J. "Emergent Role of Teacher and Authority Structure of School," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, 1967, pp. 291-304.
- (15) Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee. The Organization and Control of American Schools, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc., 1965.
- (16) Carr-Saunders, A.M. "Professionalization in Historical Perspectives," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, p. 2-9.
- (17) Carson, Robert B., K. Goldhammer, R.J. Pellegrin, Teacher Participation in the Community, Eugene, Ore: CASEA, 1967.
- (18) Carson, Robert B. "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making in Education and Other Local Community Activities in Three Oregon Communities," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1965.
- (19) Cheek, Neil H. "The Social Role of the Professional," The Professional in the Organization, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967, pp. 9-16.
- (20) Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- (21) Corwin, Ronald G. "The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools," Columbus: Ohio State University, 1964. (Mimeographed).
- (22) Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations, Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- (23) Goldman, Harvey, and James E. Heald. "Teacher Expectations of Administrative Behavior," Educational Administration Quarterly, IV Autumn, 1968, pp. 29-40.
- (24) Goode, William. "Professions and Non-Professions," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

- (25) Griffiths, Daniel. "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternatives to the Status Quo," Struggle for Power in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 96-110.
- (26) Hall, Oswald. "The Social Structure of the Teaching Profession," Struggle for Power in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 35-48.
- (27) Hicks, William V. and Frank H. Blackington III, "The Profession as an Idea," School, Society, and the Professional Educator, Montreal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, pp. 16-28.
- (28) Hrynyk, Nicholas P. "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.
- (29) Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," The Professions in America, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- (30) Lane, Willard, Ronald Corwin, William Monahan. Foundations of Educational Administration, New York: MacMillan, 1967.
- (31) Leavitt, Harold J. The Social Science of Organizations, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- (32) Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
- (33) Lieberman, Myron, and Michael H. Moskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers, Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1966.
- (34) Lynn, Kenneth S. The Professions in America, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.
- (35) McBeath, A.C. "The Changing Role of the Teacher and Implications for Administrators," Paper read at 1968 CEA Banff Short Course, Banff, 1968.
- (36) McEwan, William J. "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, I, 1956, pp. 208-229.
- (37) McKean, Robert C. "Decision-Making: The Administrator Needs a New Outlook," Clearing House, XLI, 1967, pp. 285-287.

- (38) MacKinnon, Frank. The Politics of Education, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.
- (39) Moore, D.G. and R. Renck. "The Professional Employee in Industry," Journal of Business, XXVIII, January, 1955, pp. 58-66.
- (40) Paton, James M. Professional Status of Teachers, Ottawa: Canadian Conference on Education, 1961.
- (41) Robinson, Norman. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1966.
- (42) Sasse, Edward B. "Teacher and Administrator Participation in Decision-Making and Curriculum Development," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.
- (43) Scharf, Murray P. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between the Professional Role Orientation and Social Structure of Teacher Groups," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1967.
- (44) Scott, Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies--Areas of Conflict," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 264-275.
- (45) Scott, Richard. "Reactions to Supervision in a Heteronomous Professional Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, X, June 1965, pp. 65-81.
- (46) Shaffer, John. "Professionalization of Power in Education," Educational Theory, XVII, 1967, pp. 32-39.
- (47) Sharma, Chiranjī S. "Who Should Make What Decisions," Administrator's Notebook, III, April, 1955.
- (48) Simpkins, William S. "The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in the School," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1968.
- (49) Stinnett, R.M., Jack H. Kleinmann, Martha L. Ware. Professional Negotiation in Public Education, London: Collier-Macmillan, 1966.
- (50) Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization," The Social Science of Organizations, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

- (51) Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of the Work Organization, Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966.
- (52) Vollmer, Howard. "Professional Adaptation to Organizations," Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966; pp. 275-282.
- (53) Vollmer, Howard M., Donald L. Mills. Professionalization, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- (54) Walters, Robert N. "An Analysis of the Extent to Which Teachers Participate in the Administration of the Public Schools of Mississippi," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1967.
- (55) Wittlin, Alma S. "The Teachers," The Professions in America, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 91-109.
- (56) Wollett, Donald H. "Professional Negotiations: What is the Thing," Collective Negotiations for Teachers, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

## CHAPTER III

### SUB-PROBLEMS, HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH PROCEDURES

#### I. SUB-PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES

The theoretical framework proposed in Chapter II suggested four researchable sub-problems. These are presented below with their related hypotheses.

##### Sub-Problem 1

To determine whether there is a significant difference between the actual level of participation teachers perceive they have in a number of professional decisions, and the level of participation they would prefer to have.

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant difference between the levels of participation perceived and preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature.

##### Sub-Problem 2

To determine whether there is a significant relationship between teacher orientation toward professional service and knowledge and their orientation toward professional authority.

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant relationship between the scores teachers have on the Professional Authority Scale and the scores they have on the Professionalism Scale.

##### Sub-Problem 3

To determine whether there is a significant relation-

ship between the degree of participation preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional authority.

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Preferred Participation Scale and their scores on the Professional Authority Scale.

#### Sub-Problem 4

To determine whether there is a significant relationship between the degree of participation preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional service and knowledge.

Hypothesis 4. There is a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Preferred Participation Scale and their scores on the Professionalism Scale.

#### Significance Levels

In all tests of significance in this study a criterion level of 0.05 was maintained. All probability levels have been reported. This provides more information about these significance tests than would the simpler acceptance or rejection using the 0.05 criterion. As Seigel points out:

In reporting his findings, the researcher should indicate the actual probability level associated with his findings, so that the reader may use his own judgment in deciding whether or not the null hypothesis should be rejected (11, p. 9).

## II. INSTRUMENTATION

The data required for testing the hypotheses advanced for this study were collected by means of three instruments. A Teacher Information Questionnaire was used to collect general information about the teachers; a Teacher Participation Questionnaire which was designed to provide information regarding the actual and preferred levels of participation in selected decision areas; and finally a Teacher Opinion Questionnaire was used to gather information regarding teacher attitudes toward professional service and knowledge and professional authority. This chapter deals with the development of the TPQ and the utilization of both the TPQ and TOQ in the research analysis. Copies of the three instruments have been included in Appendix A, together with English translations.

### Teacher Information Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed to obtain the following kinds of information from teachers: sex, age, marital status, teaching experience, teaching level, type of academic and professional preparation, length of time in the present school, type of membership in the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec, school size, and school demography. Since generalizations from a study are only possible where the sample is truly random, these personal variables served a useful purpose in comparing the sample in the present study with the total population of Québec teachers. Part of this information may

serve in further research studies.

#### Teacher Opinion Questionnaire

The questionnaire developed by Hrynyk (5) originally contained three sections: a section on background information, a second on educational-personal information, and a third on professional orientation. Only the final part was employed in this study.

The Professional Role Orientation Scale was a modification of Corwin's Professional Role Orientation Scale (3). It consisted of forty-seven items, each constructed as a Likert-summational rating scale. The scale was divided into five sub-scales, measuring five theoretical dimensions of teacher professional orientation: knowledge, service, core-organization, colleague-profession and student-autonomy (5, p. 94).

Principal axis factoring was performed specifying five factors. The first three factors had almost equal eigenvalues. However, a graph plotting the eigenvalues showed a sharp break between eigenvalues for factors three and four. In terms of meaningfulness, the last two factors were mixed. Most items related to service and knowledge loaded on factor one, items related to core-organization loaded on factor two, and items related to student-autonomy loaded on factor three. A certain number of items originally classified with other dimensions and which seemed to measure attitudes toward knowledge and service, and toward authority also loaded under factor one and three (Table XV, Appendix B).



Therefore a three factor analysis was seen as a following step. Once more a rotated varimax technique yielded almost equal eigenvalues for the three factors. All items with loadings of 0.300 or greater in the first factor, were related to the knowledge and service dimensions, with the exception of number thirteen. The same was true with regard to the second and third factors. All items with loadings of 0.300 or greater in the second factor were related to teacher attitudes toward core-organization and toward authority in the third factor (Table I).

Knowledge orientation and service orientation have been identified in the second chapter as the two basic dimensions of professionalism. Because these two dimensions were taken care of by the same factor, it was thought justifiable to use the sixteen items loading under factor one as an empirical scale of professionalism. Among these sixteen items, ten purported to measure attitudes toward service, and six related to attitudes toward knowledge. The ten items loading under the third factor were used as a scale to measure professional authority.

Reliability. In order to measure the reliability of the two scales, the Kuder-Richardson (Formula 20) test was selected. This test looks at internal consistency. It is based on both the average correlation among items (the internal consistency) and the number of items. Lord and Novick have demonstrated that this coefficient of reliability consists of the mean of all the split-halves that could be

TABLE I

## ROTATED FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PROS

Item No.	Communa- lities	Professional* Organization	Service- Knowledge	Professional Authority
39	.605	.777		
40	.569	.749		
6	.524	.724		
23	.476	.688		
17	.503	.675		
35	.444	.634		
36	.187	.367		
45	.373		.591	
2	.325		.563	
27	.313		.558	
38	.315		.554	
44	.279		.497	
19	.288		.489	
32	.252		.480	
30	.224		.445	
18	.258		.415	
12	.209		.396	
9	.184		.392	
46	.164		.383	
41	.154		.350	
16	.200		.349	
22	.120		.332	
21	.154		.300	
29	.454			.664
43	.379			.588
31	.374			.577
1	.346			.574
10	.358			.554
8	.366			.545
5	.268			.515
3	.285			.497
7	.260			.481
26	.204			.439
	10.417	3.623	3.460	3.334

\* This scale was not used in the present study.

run with a test (8, p. 93). The technique used was the one presented by Ebel (4, p. 322).

The reliability coefficient of the Professionalism and Professional Authority scales were respectively .74 and .75. According to Bruning and Kintz, a high reliability coefficient (.70 and higher) means that the test accurately measured some characteristic of the people taking it. Further it means, that the individual items on the test produced similar patterns of response in different people. A high value indicates that the test items are homogeneous (1, p. 191).

Validity. Hrynyk's PROS had already been validated by determining its ability to discriminate between groups of teachers classified as "high" or "low" on professionalism. It was found that every teacher in the high rated group scored higher than every teacher in the low rated group (5, p. 100).

However, the fact that only twenty-six items of the PROS scale were used in this study and that they were divided into two new scales invited us to take a closer examination of the validity of the scales.

A look at the content validity of a test, according to Nunnally (10, p. 81), should invite the researcher to look at two major standards: (1) a representative collection of items and (2) "sensible" methods of test construction. The first standard is difficult to evaluate. As Nunnally points out the selection of items usually involves questions of values

(10, p. 81). Whether or not the items included in our two tests were representative of all the possible items that could be included to measure the dimensions of the two scales, is a question too complex to be answered. For that reason the validity of the tests was limited. However this kind of limitation never can be overcome. Nunnally suggests:

Even though there often are problems with ensuring content validity, inevitably content validity rests mainly on "appeals to reason" regarding the adequacy with which important content has been sampled and on the adequacy with which the content has been cast in the form of test items (10, p. 82).

There are different ways to take care of the second standard regarding "sensible" methods of test construction. One is to look at the internal consistency among the items of a test, i.e., to see if the items measure something in common. As Nunnally indicates, it is not an infallible guide, but it certainly appeals to reason (10, p. 82). This technique is also recognized as a valuable one by Bruning and Kintz. They argue that a high KR-20 coefficient of reliability indicates that the test items are homogeneous and that therefore it can be assumed they are valid (1, p. 191).

Validity may also be indicated by the common factor variance (6, p. 455), that is, the variance of a measure that is shared with other measures. It has been called "factorial validity" and is mainly considered as a construct validity, determining the "internal statistical structure of a set of variables said to measure a construct" (10, p. 101).

If each of the two scales is taken as a single test,

the common factor variance ( $h^2$ ) of the individual items varies between .12 and .31 on the Professionalism Scale and between .21 and .43 on the Professional Authority Scale (Tables II and III). Each item of these two tests has measured a portion of the "construct" or dimension. However it must be noted that the two tests accounted for only 20 per cent and 31 per cent of their total variance respectively.

Two limitations must therefore be considered when using the two scales. First consistency is a necessary but not sufficient and infallible condition for content and construct validity of tests; (10, p. 92); secondly, it is necessary to assume that the theory which underlies the two scales used in the present study is sound (10, p. 93).

#### Teacher Participation Questionnaire

This questionnaire was constructed specifically for the present study. It consisted of thirty-five decision-items, each accompanied by two four-point summational rating scales. These two scales were constructed to measure actual degree of teacher participation in a number of professional decisions, and preferred degree of participation. The four alternatives used in each item were intended to represent different levels of participation.

The first alternative was entitled No Participation and was defined as a decision-making situation in which teachers could not participate or should not participate, and the decision was made by the administrative authority. The second alternative called Consultative Participation was

TABLE II

## FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONALISM SCALE

Item No.	Communalities	P.S.
2	0.312	0.559
9	0.182	0.427
12	0.192	0.439
16	0.161	0.401
18	0.228	0.478
19	0.270	0.520
21	0.123	0.350
22	0.121	0.348
27	0.310	0.556
30	0.218	0.467
32	0.228	0.478
38	0.289	0.538
41	0.145	0.381
44	0.197	0.444
45	0.294	0.542
46	0.120	0.347
	3.392	3.392

TABLE III

## FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY SCALE

Item No.	Communalities	P.A.S.
1	0.358	0.598
3	0.266	0.515
5	0.267	0.517
7	0.252	0.502
8	0.340	0.583
10	0.349	0.591
26	0.210	0.458
29	0.429	0.655
31	0.352	0.594
43	0.310	0.557
	3.133	3.133

defined as a decision-making situation in which teachers were or should have been consulted, individually or in groups, by the administrative authority who made or should have made the decision. The third alternative was called Collegial Participation. It was defined as a decision-making situation in which teachers and the administrative authority jointly reached an agreement or should have jointly reached an agreement with respect to the decision. Finally, the fourth alternative was called Autonomous Participation and was defined as a decision-making situation in which teachers made or should have made the decision themselves either individually, in groups, or through their local, regional or provincial association.

The two scales were scored in the following way:

<u>Level of Participation</u>	<u>Score</u>
No Participation	1
Consultative Participation	2
Collegial Participation	3
Autonomous Participation	4

The total scores on items related to actual and preferred degrees of participation were called the Actual Participation Score and the Preferred Participation Score.

Thirty-five decision-items were chosen for the construction of the participation questionnaire. These items related either to the organization and the control of the teaching profession, or to the practice, the organization and the control of the teaching act. Decision-items were selected from three sources: (1) the literature on teacher professional autonomy; (2) proposals presented by Québec

teacher associations to the government and school boards for negotiation; and (3) related research findings.

A factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on items contained on the two scales. Five factors were specified because it was possible to identify at least five different decision-making areas: the teaching profession, curriculum, pupil personnel, and the organization of the instructional program at the school and at the system levels. The first factor analysis demonstrated that for each scale there seemed to be one general factor which accounted for most of the variance. Many dimensions were present as illustrated by the following: in each scale nine eigenvalues had a value of at least 1.000 (Appendix C, Table XVII). However, because of the size of the first eigenvalue on both scales, that is 7.236 and 8.260, in comparison with the following eigenvalues, that is 1.909 and 2.190, it seemed that a general factor was present in each of the scales. This impression was confirmed when an analysis calling for one general factor was completed. Only three items did not load at 0.300 on the Preferred Participation Scale, while two did not load on the Actual Participation Scale (Tables IV and V). It was therefore decided to delete these five decision-items from both scales, that is, numbers 3, 6, 7, 15, and 17, and to continue the statistical analysis using total scores rather than sub-scale scores.

Reliability and validity. The same techniques used to test the reliability and validity of the Professionalism and



Professional Authority scales, served to test the reliability and validity of the Preferred and Actual Participation scales. In addition, an initial draft of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire was submitted to a group of sixty teachers enrolled in graduate work at La Faculté des Sciences de l'Éducation, University of Montréal. The purpose of this pre-test was to ensure that the decision-items chosen were adapted to the Québec situation. They were also invited to indicate any decision-item that seemed complicated or unclear. As a result, several decision-items were re-written as two items; others were eliminated. At the suggestion of a group of staff members of the CEQ, the questionnaire was reviewed to include some of the decision-items presented in the provincial collective bargaining agreement (2, ch. 4).

Once more, it is possible to question the representativeness of the items selected. This is recognized as a limitation of the two scales. Looking at construction, it was found that the internal consistency among the items of each test was high. Indeed, the K-R 20 yielded coefficients of reliability of .88 for the Preferred Participation Scale and of .89 for the Actual Participation Scale. It was therefore possible to assume that the items were homogeneous and also measuring something in common.

A look at the factorial validity of the two tests revealed that the common factor variance for individual items ranged between .117 and .362 on the P.P.S. and between .119 and .445 on the A.P.S. It was possible to assume that

TABLE IV

## FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALE

Item No.	Communalities	P.P.S.
1	0.131	0.362
2	0.121	0.347
4	0.163	0.403
5	0.205	0.453
8	0.126	0.356
9	0.145	0.380
10	0.234	0.483
11	0.180	0.424
12	0.227	0.477
13	0.179	0.423
14	0.186	0.431
16	0.199	0.446
18	0.297	0.545
19	0.231	0.481
20	0.275	0.524
21	0.249	0.499
22	0.274	0.524
23	0.237	0.487
24	0.307	0.554
25	0.274	0.523
26	0.178	0.422
27	0.224	0.474
28	0.236	0.486
29	0.122	0.350
30	0.261	0.511
31	0.273	0.523
32	0.207	0.454
33	0.330	0.575
34	0.338	0.581
35	0.345	0.588
	6.755	6.755

TABLE V

## FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE ACTUAL PARTICIPATION SCALE

Item No.	Communalities	A.P.S.
1	0.317	0.563
2	0.260	0.510
4	0.287	0.535
5	0.168	0.409
8	0.256	0.506
9	0.219	0.468
10	0.244	0.494
11	0.241	0.491
12	0.230	0.480
13	0.201	0.449
14	0.264	0.513
16	0.178	0.421
18	0.282	0.531
19	0.115	0.340
20	0.330	0.575
21	0.240	0.490
22	0.224	0.474
23	0.225	0.474
24	0.433	0.658
25	0.288	0.537
26	0.257	0.507
27	0.151	0.388
28	0.224	0.474
29	0.145	0.381
30	0.298	0.546
31	0.328	0.572
32	0.301	0.548
33	0.213	0.461
34	0.313	0.559
35	0.338	0.581
	7.570	7.570

each item was measuring something in common with the general factor.

In brief, the four scales used in the study were found highly reliable and were found to exhibit a degree of validity deemed sufficient for the present study.

### III. SOURCES, COLLECTION, AND TREATMENT OF THE DATA

A description of the procedures used in selecting the respondents who provided the data for this study, of the methods used to collect the data, and of the statistical treatment of the data are included in this section. The frequency distribution, means, standard deviations and ranges of scores of the respondents on each of the four scales used in this study are also presented.

#### Sources and Collection of Data

Since the study involved responses to items which elicited information about the Corporation des Enseignants de Québec, an outline of the investigation was submitted to the Corporation with a request for approval and cooperation. The Corporation approved the study and arranged for the distribution of the questionnaires.

The sample. The teacher sample selected for this study consisted of 1,300 members of the C.E.Q.'s 65,000 membership. The selection was made using a table of random numbers. Only teachers from the kindergarten, elementary and secondary levels from the roster for the 1967-68 school year were chosen.

Questionnaires' return. The sample for the study constituted 655 usable questionnaires or approximately 50 per cent of the original sample.

Composition of the study sample. The composition of the sample used as the source of data for the study was compared with the composition of the Québec teacher population of 1966/67 (9). Details of the comparison are provided in Table XVIII of Appendix D. It was found that sex and years of education for teachers in the sample differed significantly from the composition of the Québec teacher population. However, sex was the only variable that significantly influenced the way the scores were distributed above and below the median on one of the four scales, the Preferred Participation Scale, used in this study (Table XIX, Appendix E). To the extent that this variable had some effect on the results, statistical inferences extended to the total teacher population must be subject to this limitation.

#### Treatment of Data

The description of the treatment of the data is divided into two parts, namely scoring procedures and results and a description of statistical procedures applied to the data.

Scoring. Responses to the questionnaires were placed on IBM punch cards. The Teacher Opinion Questionnaire was scored on a five-point summational rating scale. If a response to an item was not indicated by the teacher, a value of three was assigned. Teachers' Actual and Preferred Participation scales consisted of four category summational rating

scales. Where the response to items on these scales was not indicated, the questionnaires were discarded. The four response categories were also used as nominal categories or levels of participation.

The total scores on the four scales provided an empirical assessment of professionalism, professional authority, actual and preferred degrees of teacher participation. Means, standard deviations, and range were computed for each of the four scales. A cross-classification program provided a frequency count of the scores of the various groupings of teachers in each classification category. Finally a test of goodness of fit to the normal curve was administered to each scale. The scoring results are shown in Tables VI to IX. An examination of these tables showed that the distributions of scores for the four scales did not meet the test of goodness of fit to the normal curve. It was decided, therefore, to use non-parametric statistics in the analysis of these distributions.

Statistical treatment. Three different statistics were used to test the hypotheses proposed for the present study. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was chosen to search for possible relationships or associations between teacher orientation toward professional service and knowledge, professional authority, and desire to participate in decisions. As Siegel points out: "Of all the statistics based on ranks, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was the earliest to be developed, and is perhaps the best known today" (11, p. 202).

TABLE VI  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, MEDIAN,  
 RANGE, SKEWNESS, AND PROBABILITY OF GOODNESS OF FIT TO NORMAL CURVE  
 FOR THE PROFESSIONALISM SCALE

Score Interval	Freq.	%	Mean	S.D.	Median	Range	Skewness	P
30 - 39	7	1.0	58.14	7.57	58.41	46	-0.08	.000
40 - 49	73	11.1						
50 - 59	281	42.9						
60 - 69	249	38.0						
70 - 79	43	6.5						
80 - 89	2	0.3						

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, MEDIAN, RANGE, SKEWNESS, AND PROBABILITY OF GOODNESS OF FIT TO NORMAL CURVE FOR THE PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY SCALE

Score Interval	Freq.	%	Mean	S.D.	Median	Range	Skewness	P
10 - 19	1	0.1	36.99	5.82	37.59	32	-0.336	.000
20 - 29	66	10.						
30 - 39	359	54.8						
40 - 49	225	34.3						
50 - 59	4	0.6						



TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, MEDIAN, RANGE, SKEWNESS, AND PROBABILITY OF GOODNESS OF FIT TO NORMAL CURVE FOR THE PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALE

Score Interval	Freq.	%	Mean	S.D.	Median	Range	Skewness	P
50 - 59	3	0.4	86.76	9.25	88.12	59	-0.488	.000
60 - 69	35	5.3						
70 - 79	100	15.2						
80 - 89	228	34.8						
90 - 99	256	39.0						
100-109	29	4.4						
110-119	4	0.6						

TABLE IX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION, MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, MEDIAN, RANGE, SKEWNESS, AND PROBABILITY OF GOODNESS OF FIT TO THE NORMAL CURVE FOR THE ACTUAL PARTICIPATION SCALE

Score Interval	Freq.	%	Mean	S.D.	Median	Range	Skewness	P
30 - 39	226	34.6	46.23	11.52	44.69	72	1.335	.000
40 - 49	224	34.1						
50 - 59	130	19.8						
60 - 69	46	7.0						
70 - 79	29	4.4						
80 - 89	5	0.7						
90 - 99	2	0.3						
100 - 109	2	0.3						

The efficiency of this test when compared with the most powerful parametric correlation, the Pearson  $r$ , is about 91 per cent (11, p. 213). To test the significance of the  $r$ 's; the formula suggested by Kendall was used:

$$T = r_s \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - r_s^2}}$$

To further the investigation of the above relationships, it was thought useful to verify whether the way different groups of teachers scored on one scale was related to the way they scored on other scales. Two tests could be used, the median test and the Kruskal-Wallis test. However, the latter has been found to be more efficient because it uses more of the information, that is, it converts the scores to ranks, whereas the median test converts them simply to either pluses or minuses. The Kruskal-Wallis test also preserves the magnitude of the scores more fully than does the median test. Finally, according to Siegel, this test seems to be the most sensitive and efficient of the non-parametric tests for  $k$  samples of scores. It has power-efficiency of 95.5 per cent, when compared with the  $F$  test, the most powerful parametric test (11, p. 194).

Finally, the  $\chi^2$  test for independent samples was used to determine if there were any significant differences between the actual and preferred levels of participation. Because the four levels of participation were considered as discrete nominal categories, the  $\chi^2$  test was most appropriate.

## IV. SUMMARY

This chapter has restated the sub-problems. The hypotheses to test these researchable sub-problems were added. A level of .05 was set for all tests of significance. Following were a description of the instruments used to collect data, a discussion on the content, reliability and validity of the four scales used in this study, a description of the methods of collecting the data, an examination of the distributions of scores on the four scales, and a discussion on the three statistical techniques that were used to analyse the data, that is, the Spearman Rho, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance and the chi-square.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER III

- (1) Bruning, James L. and B.L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.
- (2) Corporation des Enseignants du Québec. "Projet de Convention Collective Provinciale des Enseignants du Québec." Québec: C.E.Q., 1968.
- (3) Corwin, Ronald G. "The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools," Columbus: Ohio State University, 1963, (Mimeographed).
- (4) Ebel, Robert L. Measuring Educational Achievement, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- (5) Hrynyk, Nicholas P. "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.
- (6) Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1967.
- (7) Kuder, G.F. and Richardson, M.W. "The Theory of Estimation of Test Reliability," Psychometrika, II 1937, pp. 151-160.
- (8) Lord, Frederic M. and Novick, Melvin R. Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores, Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- (9) Ministère de l'Education. "Statistiques de l'Enseignement 1966/67," Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, 1968.
- (10) Nunnally, Jum C. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- (11) Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

#### I. INTRODUCTION

The problem investigated in this analysis was three-fold: (1) to determine whether or not teachers' preferred level of participation in a number of professional decisions, differed from their actual level of participation; (2) to determine whether or not teacher orientations toward professional service and knowledge was related to their orientations toward professional authority; (3) to determine whether or not teachers' preferred degree of participation in a number of professional decisions was related to their orientations toward professional authority, and professional knowledge and service.

Four sub-problems were analyzed in an attempt to explore the problem.

#### II. ACTUAL VS. PREFERRED PARTICIPATION

##### Sub-Problem 1

The first sub-problem was to determine whether there was a significant difference between the actual level of participation teachers perceived they had in a number of professional decisions and the level of participation they would have preferred to have.

Hypothesis 1. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between the levels of partici-

pation perceived and preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature.

Chi-square was used to test this hypothesis:

$$H_0 : \chi^2 < 3.84$$

$$H_1 : \chi \geq 3.84$$

Findings. In a first step to test Hypothesis I, three chi-square tests were completed using average score percentages per level as reported in Table X:

TABLE X

AVERAGE PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS PER LEVEL FOR THE ACTUAL AND PREFERRED DIMENSIONS OF THE TEACHER PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE

	No Partici- pation Level	Consul- tation Level	Co-decision Level	Autonomy Level
Actual	61.32%	20.21%	11.17%	9.06%
Preferred	2.54%	19.82%	59.12%	18.52%
Difference	58.78%	0.39%	47.95%	9.46%

The first chi-square was computed using the four levels of participation as discrete categories. It was found significant at .001 level.

A second chi-square was calculated grouping "no participation" and "consultation" levels against "co-decision" and "autonomy" levels. It was also found significant at .001 level.

However a third chi-square was found significant only at .02 level when grouping the first three levels against the

"autonomy" level.

To further the testing of Hypothesis I, three chi-squares were computed on each of the thirty-five individual decision-items (Table XI). The same grouping procedures mentioned previously were used. This time all chi-squares were significant at .001 level.

The null hypothesis was therefore rejected in favor of  $H_1$ .

### Discussion

Inspection of the distribution of scores for each individual item (Table XI), as well as the percentages per level for the total questionnaire (Table X), revealed that teachers desired to have a degree of participation significantly different from the degree they perceived they had.

If participation is looked at as a means to acquire greater control over work related matters the results of this study support the position held by Griffiths, Boyan and others who argued that teachers are presently manifesting a thrust toward greater authority. These results are similar to the findings of other research studies which had indicated that teachers wanted more authority than they had in the actual decision-making structures of our school systems (Sharma, Carson, Benner, Walter, Archambault, Sasse, and Simpkins).



TABLE XI  
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGES DISTRIBUTIONS PER ITEM  
 OF THE TEACHER PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE  
 (ACTUAL AND PREFERRED)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
1. Introduction of new teaching methods	A 421 64.3%	120 18.3%	85 13.0%	29 4.4%
	P 2 0.3%	75 11.5%	505 77.1%	73 11.1%
2. Deciding on instructional methods which teachers should use	A 325 49.6%	192 29.3%	73 11.1%	65 9.9%
	P 2 0.3%	55 8.4%	396 60.5%	202 30.8%
3. Determining which individual teachers require further professional education	A 351 53.6%	157 24.0%	53 8.1%	94 14.4%
	P 8 1.2%	88 13.4%	385 58.8%	174 26.6%
4. Establishing the broad outlines for instructional programs at the secondary or elementary levels	A 466 71.1%	122 18.6%	51 7.8%	16 2.4%
	P 10 1.5%	124 18.9%	436 66.6%	85 13.0%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.		No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
5. Evaluating teachers' professional qualifications	A	535 81.7%	68 10.4%	48 7.3%	4 0.6%
	P	44 6.7%	154 23.5%	397 60.6%	60 9.2%
6. Suspending a teacher's diploma	A	596 91.0%	32 4.9%	24 3.7%	3 0.5%
	P	49 7.5%	176 26.9%	354 54.1%	76 11.6%
7. Organizing extra-curricular activities	A	199 30.4%	217 33.1%	141 21.5%	98 15.0%
	P	14 2.1%	61 9.3%	432 66.0%	148 22.6%
8. Establishing regulations concerning student behavior in school	A	213 32.5%	212 32.4%	184 28.1%	46 7.0%
	P	5 0.8%	94 14.4%	461 70.4%	95 14.5%
9. Assigning the subject or subjects which a teacher will teach	A	260 39.7%	216 33.0%	144 22.0%	35 5.3%
	P	7 1.1%	89 13.6%	394 60.2%	165 25.2%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
10. Determining the length of teaching periods	A 509 77.7%	80 12.2%	55 8.4%	11 1.7%
	P 17 2.6%	153 23.4%	435 66.4%	50 7.6%
11. Establishing methods to be used in evaluating students	A 342 52.2%	194 29.6%	98 15.0%	21 3.2%
	P 15 2.3%	134 20.5%	415 63.4%	91 13.9%
12. Establishing criteria for the evaluation of teacher competency	A 538 82.1%	73 11.1%	39 6.0%	5 0.8%
	P 37 5.6%	170 26.0%	398 60.8%	50 7.6%
13. Establishing educational specifications for new school buildings	A 543 82.9%	89 13.6%	23 3.5%	0 0.0%
	P 27 4.1%	297 45.3%	311 47.5%	20 3.1%
14. Determining priorities in the retraining of teachers	A 457 69.8%	131 20.0%	35 5.3%	32 4.9%
	P 17 2.6%	157 24.0%	377 57.6%	104 15.9%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
15. Determining the types of assignments to be given to students	A 62 9.5%	174 26.6%	136 20.8%	283 43.2%
	P 1 0.2%	42 6.4%	186 28.4%	426 65.0%
16. Drawing up time-tables for the school	A 260 39.7%	167 25.5%	165 25.2%	63 9.6%
	P 10 1.5%	101 15.4%	415 63.4%	129 19.7%
17. Deciding which teachers will be members of the school council	A 61 9.3%	101 15.4%	164 25.0%	329 50.2%
	P 4 0.6%	42 6.4%	211 32.2%	398 60.8%
18. Defining objectives for the supervision of teachers	A 461 70.4%	124 18.9%	59 9.0%	11 1.7%
	P 24 3.7%	152 23.2%	440 67.2%	39 6.0%
19. Determining program content for teacher workshops	A 325 49.6%	175 26.7%	95 14.5%	60 9.2%
	P 8 1.2%	128 19.5%	399 60.9%	120 18.3%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
20. Selecting textbooks	A 476 72.7%	118 18.0%	40 6.1%	21 3.2%
	P 4 0.6%	107 16.3%	397 60.6%	147 22.5%
21. Determining the number of periods one should teach per week	A 512 78.2%	57 8.7%	79 12.1%	7 1.1%
	P 19 2.9%	118 18.0%	462 70.5%	56 8.5%
22. Drawing up a code of ethics to which teachers must adhere	A 423 64.6%	115 17.6%	63 9.6%	54 8.2%
	P 23 3.5%	117 17.9%	341 52.1%	174 26.6%
23. Determining the need for specialist-coordinators or coordinators in a school or a school system	A 562 85.8%	74 11.3%	16 2.4%	3 0.5%
	P 22 3.4%	199 30.4%	392 59.8%	42 6.4%
24. Introducing new courses of study	A 492 75.1%	115 17.5%	35 5.3%	13 2.0%
	P 13 2.0%	178 27.2%	414 63.2%	50 7.6%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
25. Deciding on the methods to be used in grouping students	A 346 52.8%	207 31.6%	70 10.7%	32 4.9%
	P 11 1.7%	131 20.0%	405 61.8%	108 16.5%
26. Deciding the grade level at which individual teachers will teach	A 330 50.4%	221 33.7%	79 12.1%	25 3.8%
	P 11 1.7%	127 19.4%	418 63.8%	99 15.1%
27. Determining the amount of the school budget which should be spent for instructional purposes	A 554 84.6%	54 8.2%	41 6.3%	6 0.9%
	P 28 4.3%	194 29.6%	387 59.1%	46 7.0%
28. Determining the priorities in relation to educational research	A 484 73.9%	115 17.6%	42 6.4%	14 2.1%
	P 13 2.0%	180 27.5%	388 59.2%	74 11.3%
29. Developing tests and examinations to evaluate student programs	A 167 25.5%	176 26.9%	129 19.7%	183 27.9%
	P 2 0.3%	53 8.1%	299 45.6%	301 46.0%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
30. Determining the content of teacher training programs	A 509 77.7%	104 15.9%	28 4.3%	14 2.1%
	P 16 2.4%	172 26.3%	373 56.9%	94 14.4%
31. Selecting teaching materials, audio-visual materials, etc.	A 367 56.0%	204 31.1%	66 10.1%	18 2.7%
	P 4 0.6%	126 19.2%	399 60.9%	126 19.2%
32. Determining the formal structures to be established in the school	A 274 41.8%	220 33.6%	116 17.7%	45 6.9%
	P 5 0.8%	103 15.7%	431 65.8%	116 17.7%
33. Determining the minimum requirements for entry into the teaching profession	A 596 91.0%	34 5.2%	22 3.4%	3 0.5%
	P 84 12.8%	162 24.7%	305 46.6%	104 15.9%
34. Selecting the subjects to be included in the school program	A 557 85.0%	66 10.1%	23 3.5%	9 1.4%
	P 17 2.6%	157 24.0%	407 62.1%	74 11.3%

TABLE XI (continued)

Level/Item No.	No Partici- pation	Consul- tation	Co- decision	Autonomy
35. Determining the subject matter to be taught	A 486 74.2%	110 16.8%	40 6.1%	19 2.9%
	P 9 1.4%	128 19.5%	388 59.2%	130 19.8%



The teachers' general feeling in this research was that they should share with the administrative authority in decisions of a professional nature. However, it was found that only one-fourth of the respondent teachers perceived they had such authority, and only in two decision-items: items eight (Establishing regulations concerning student behavior in school) and sixteen (Drawing up timetables for the school). Yet teachers perceived themselves to have autonomy over three other decision-items: items fifteen (Determining the types of assignments to be given to students), seventeen (Deciding which teachers will be members of the school council) and twenty-nine (Developing tests and examinations to evaluate student progress).

On only one item were teachers divided with respect to at least a collegial participation. Indeed, in item thirteen (Establishing educational specifications for new school buildings) almost half of them were satisfied to be consulted, while the other half wanted to decide with the administrative authority.

The greatest point of difference between the actual and preferred teacher participation was apparent where teachers felt they were ignored by the administrative authority in the actual decision-making structures. At least half of the teachers perceived they had no participation in twenty-seven of the thirty-five items. On only one item (item 33: Determining the minimum requirements for entry into the teaching profession) did more than 10% of the teachers (more

precisely 12.8%) wish not to be involved.

It is also worth pointing out that teachers in the study sample rejected consultation as a satisfactory measure by a proportion of 80 per cent. As Corwin suggests (1, p. 415), this might be explained by the fact that consultation, either discretionary or compulsory, ultimately empowers the administration to decide by itself, possibly ignoring the teachers' suggestions.

However, this study found that this is the more familiar type of participation teachers perceived they have at the present time. Indeed, about one-fourth of the teachers felt that they are consulted in some thirteen odd decision-items. The latter are either related to pupil personnel (items 7, 8, 11, 15, 25 and 29) or to teaching organization within the school unit (items 2, 9, 16, 19, 26, 31, and 32).

Finally, it must be stressed that teachers, even though they were asking for twice as much autonomy, did not ask for complete autonomy by a proportion of 80 per cent. For only seven items did at least 25% of the teachers ask for autonomy. They already felt that they had such authority on three of them (items 5, 17, and 29). Two others (items 2 and 9) were related to teaching organization within the school unit, and the last two (items 3 and 22) were related to the control of professional members. Therefore the proposition held by students of the professions that professionals are demanding a monopoly of authority over decisions of a professional nature was not sustained as far as the teachers participating

in this research study were concerned.

It might be interpreted by some that this is an argument to explain that teachers at the moment are not truly professional. However to do so, hazardous assumptions would have to be made: first that a full-fledged professional teacher would demand complete authority over all decisions of a professional nature; second, that it is possible to find professionals desiring complete autonomy in publicly-controlled organizations.

With respect to the first assumption, this study did not discover any teacher who wished complete autonomy. Only eleven teachers had an average of 3.5 per item on the Preferred Participation four-point scale. Such an assumption would appear to be untenable. Secondly, no research study has confirmed or supported the second assumption. The literature and reports of research have described a state of conflict between bureaucratic and professional principles. Such a situation was supported by the results of this investigation as far as teachers' demands for greater authority are concerned. Indeed, the actual decision-making structures of school systems at the school level, the district level, as well as at the provincial level have been perceived by teachers to be in opposition to the kind of control and authority they would like to exercise over decisions of a professional nature.

## II. PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY AND PROFESSIONALISM

### Sub-Problem 2

The second sub-problem was to determine whether there

was a significant relationship between teacher orientation toward professional service and knowledge and their orientation toward professional authority.

Hypothesis 2. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Professionalism Scale and their scores on the Professional Authority Scale.

Findings. This hypothesis was tested in two different ways. First, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to determine if the two variables under study were associated and if the observed value of rho would differ from zero not only by chance:

$$H_0: t < 1.96$$

$$H_1: t \geq 1.96$$

A correlation coefficient of .22 and a t value of 5.65 were obtained. The t value was significant at the .001 level indicating that the null hypothesis could be rejected and that Hypothesis 2 be accepted. The degree of association between professional authority and professionalism was in the order of 5 per cent, that is the teacher professionalism scores explained only 5 per cent of the variance in their professional authority scores.

Further to evidence the relationship between the two variables, a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if teachers who were scoring high on the Professionalism Scale would be scoring significantly higher on the Professional Authority Scale than teachers scoring low

on the Professionalism Scale.

$$H_0: H < 3.84$$

$$H_1: H \geq 3.84$$

The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded an H of 16.33 significant at the .001 level. The direction of the sums of ranks also confirmed Hypothesis 2. Teachers who scored low on the Professional Authority scale had a sum of ranks of 100,440 on the Professionalism Scale, in comparison with a sum of ranks of 114,400 for those who were scoring high (Table XII).

TABLE XII

KRUSKAL WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY SCALE BETWEEN TEACHERS HIGH AND LOW ON THE PROFESSIONALISM SCALE

	Lo - P.S.*	Hi - P.S.*
Sum of Ranks on the P.A.S.	100,440	114,400
	(N=349)	(N=306)
Degree of Freedom	1	
H	16.331	
P	.001	

\* Divided at the Median.

Discussion

The proposition that professionally-oriented people, defined as persons oriented toward knowledge and service,

are demanding authority in order to insure that society will have the best "skilled services" possible was supported by the results of the present study. Even though the degree of association between orientation toward professional knowledge and service, and orientation toward professional authority was somewhat low ( $r_s = .22$ ), it was nevertheless a significant association. Moreover the fact that teachers who were highly oriented toward professional knowledge and service desired greater professional authority provided additional evidence.

The findings from the sample of teachers used in this study supports the argument that teachers, becoming more professionally oriented, are requesting a greater degree of authority and control over decisions related to educational matters.

### III. PREFERRED PARTICIPATION AND TEACHER ORIENTATION TOWARD AUTHORITY, KNOWLEDGE AND SERVICE

#### Sub-Problem 3

The first sub-problem which was looked at in this section, sought to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the degree of participation preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional authority.

Hypothesis 3. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Preferred Participation Scale and their scores on the Professional Authority Scale.

Once more the Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient

and the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance served to test Hypothesis 3.

Findings. First, a Spearman rho of .28 and a t value of 7.59, significant at the .001 level, were obtained. However only eight per cent of the scores teachers had on the Preferred Participation Scale were explained by their scores on the Professional Authority Scale.

Secondly, the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded an H of 40.67 significant at the .001 level. The direction of the sums of ranks confirmed the Hypothesis 3. Indeed teachers who scored low on the Preferred Participation Scale had a sum of ranks of 99,076 (N=349) on the Professional Authority Scale, in comparison to a sum of ranks of 115,764 (N=306) for those who scored high (Table XIII). In both cases, the null hypothesis was rejected, and  $H_1$  accepted.

TABLE XIII

KRUSKAL WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE  
PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALE BETWEEN TEACHERS  
HIGH AND LOW ON THE PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY SCALE

	Lo - P.A.S.*	Hi - P.A.S.*
Sum of Ranks on the P.O.S.	99,076 (N=349)	115,764 (N=306)
Degree of Freedom	1	
H	40.666	
P	.001	

\* Divided at the Median.

#### Sub-Problem 4

The fourth sub-problem was to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the degree of participation preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature and their orientation toward professional service and knowledge.

Hypothesis 4. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Professionalism scale and their scores on the Preferred Participation Scale.

The same two tests were used.

Findings. A correlation coefficient of  $-0.01$  and a  $t$  value of  $-0.15$  were obtained. It revealed almost no association between the teacher scores on the Preferred Participation Scale and their scores on the Professionalism Scale.

The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance provided further evidence on the independence between the two variables. It yielded an  $H$  of  $1.279$  which was not significant. Teachers who scored low on the Preferred Participation Scale had a sum of ranks of  $109,386$  ( $N=349$ ) on the Professionalism Scale, in comparison to the sum of ranks of  $105,454$  ( $N=306$ ) for those who scored high (Table XIV). In both cases the null hypothesis was retained, rejecting Hypothesis 4.

#### Discussion

Participation and Orientation Towards Authority. The results of the tests for Hypothesis 4 supported Tannenbaum's and Strauss's contention that participation is a means by



TABLE XIV

KRUSKAL WALLIS ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE  
PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALE BETWEEN TEACHERS  
HIGH AND LOW ON THE PROFESSIONALISM SCALE

	Lo - P.S.*	Hi - P.S.*
Sum of Ranks on the P.P.S.	112,944.50 (N=349)	101,895.50 (N=306)
Degree of Freedom	1	
H	1.279	
P	.30 (N.S.)	

\* Divided at the Median.

which to acquire authority. Teachers who were highly oriented toward authority manifested a greater desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature than those who were less oriented toward authority.

The association between these two variables is in line with the principle developed by two political scientists, Lasswell and Kaplan that "Power is participation in the making of decisions" (3, p. 74). Teachers are manifesting themselves as "power-seekers" when they ask for greater participation. They seek to gain authority. However, as Dahl points out "to seek power and to gain power are by no means the same thing" (2, p. 63). This study was confined to the thrust for power by teachers.

Participation and Orientation Toward Service and Knowledge. It was argued earlier that if professionally-minded people are asking for authority and if participation is a means by which to acquire authority, then professionalism should be related to a desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature. This argument was not supported by the findings. A correlation of  $-0.01$  was obtained between desire to participate and orientation toward service and knowledge. It was impossible to predict the teachers' preferred participation scores from the teachers' professionalism score. Highly professionally-oriented teachers, that is, teachers highly oriented toward service and knowledge, did not request a degree of participation significantly different from teachers who were low on the professionalism scale.

One possible explanation of such a result is that factors other than teachers' attitudes toward service and knowledge can predict teachers' desire for greater participation in decisions of a professional nature. Moreover, it has been found that professionalism accounted for only a small portion of teachers' scores on the Professional Authority Scale, more precisely 5 per cent. Other factors such as need-dispositions and role-expectations might possibly account for a large portion of teachers' scores on the Preferred Participation Scale. For example, such a factor could be the dissatisfaction encountered by both highly and lowly professionally-oriented teachers with the

autocratic leadership of their school administrators.

It is therefore possible to conceive that highly professionally-oriented teachers could either ask for more or fewer degrees of participation depending on their degree of satisfaction with the actual decision-making structures. This could explain the low correlation coefficient obtained and the small amount of variance measured by the Kruskal-Wallis test between these two variables.

#### V. SUMMARY

The research hypotheses advanced in the present study were accepted with the exception of the hypothesis related to Sub-Problem 4. The results of this study supported the concept found in the literature and those research findings which suggest that teachers are involved in a thrust toward greater authority and that present decision-making structures in school systems are at odds with their drive for professional autonomy.

Support was also found for the proposition that teachers who are more professionally-oriented, are demanding a greater degree of authority. Teachers who had high ratings on the Professionalism scale had high scores on the Professional Authority Scale as well.

Finally teachers' drive toward participation was related to teacher orientation toward authority, but not to teacher orientation toward service and knowledge. It was argued that factors other than the professional-orientation of teachers could affect their desire to participate more significantly.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER IV

- (1) Corwin, Ronald. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- (2) Dahl, Robert A. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- (3) Lasswell, Harold D. and Abraham Kaplan. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

##### The Problem

The problem investigated in this study was threefold. First, this study examined whether teachers' desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature, was different from their actual degree of participation. Second, the present research studied whether teacher orientation toward professional authority was related to their orientation toward knowledge and service. Finally, an investigation was made of the relationships between teacher desire to participate in decisions of a professional nature and their professional orientation toward authority, knowledge and service.

##### The Theoretical Basis

Participation has been looked upon as a means of permitting subordinates to take part in the decision-making process (10, p. 43). Tannenbaum refers to participation as "essentially a matter of some degree of control by subordinates over work-related matters" (11, p. 98), while Strauss defines participation as a form of power-equalization which provides subordinates with greater autonomy (10, p. 62).

It has been recognized that one of the essential attributes of the professional role is autonomy or self-

control by professionals themselves over matters of a professional nature. However, where professionals are employed, this is believed to be in opposition to the formal organization's control structure, based on a hierarchical authority structure rather than a collegial or expert authority structure.

As emergent professionals working in bureaucratic systems teachers ask for greater authority. Participation, as one means by which teachers can increase their degree of authority and control over work related matters, may be expected to be in conflict with the actual bureaucratic decision-making structures of our school systems. One way to study such a dilemma is to compare the teachers' desire to participate in a number of professional decisions with the degree of participation they perceive they have. Research by Sharma, Carson, Benner and others has indicated that teachers were indeed asking for greater participation than they were allowed to have.

Teacher desire for greater autonomy has often been associated with the professionalization of their occupation. Professionalism is defined basically in terms of attitudes toward knowledge and service. On the other hand professional authority is believed to arise from the professionals' eagerness to insure that society receives the best skilled services possible. It was therefore interesting to determine whether such a relationship existed in the world of the teaching profession and also to determine the extent to which partici-

pation was related to professional attitudes.

### Instrumentation

Four scales which were found to be highly reliable and which were considered valid were developed to deal with these problems. The Professional Authority Scale and the Professionalism Scale were constructed after performing a factor analysis of Hrynyk's Teacher Opinion Questionnaire, section C(6). Sixteen items, ten related to service orientation and six to knowledge orientation, were used in the present study to make up the Professionalism Scale. Ten items made up the Professional Authority Scale.

The two other scales, consisting of 30 items each, were developed after a factor analysis of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire, which was constructed especially for this study. These two scales were the Preferred Participation Scale and the Actual Participation Scale.

### The Sample

The sample of teachers selected for this study consisted of 1,300 members of the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec. A little more than 50 per cent of the original sample, 655 teachers, provided usable returns. It was found that the composition of this sample differed significantly from the composition of the Québec teacher population on two variables, sex and years of education. However, sex was the only general variable that was related to the way teachers answered, and this relationship was evident only in the case of the Preferred

Participation Scale.

#### Treatment of the Data

None of the distributions on the four scales met a test of goodness of fit to the normal curve. It was decided, therefore, that non-parametric statistics should be employed in the treatment of data. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used as a measure of association. To test its significance the  $t$ -value was thought to be appropriate. The Kruskal-Wallis test, which is considered as the most sensitive and efficient non-parametric test, was used to determine if the way different groups of teachers scored on one scale had anything to do with the way they scored on the other scales. Finally, the  $\chi^2$  test for  $k$  independent samples was used to determine if there were significant differences between the actual and preferred levels of teacher participation.

#### Hypotheses and Results

Hypothesis 1, that there would be a significant difference between the levels of participation perceived and preferred by teachers in decisions of a professional nature was supported. By looking at total scores and also at each individual decision-item of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire, it was found that teachers desired to have a degree of participation significantly different from the degree they perceived they had.

Chi-squares were found significant at the .001 level, except in one case, when looking at the total scores grouping the



first three levels against the "autonomy" level.

Hypothesis 2, that there would be a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Professionalism Scale and their scores on the Professional Authority Scale, was supported. A correlation coefficient of .22 was found significant at the .001 level (Table XV). A Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance also revealed that teachers who obtained high scores on the Professionalism Scale had scores significantly higher on the Professional Authority Scale than teachers who scored low on the Professionalism Scale.

Hypothesis 3, that there would be a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Preferred Participation Scale and their scores on the Professional Authority Scale, was supported. A correlation coefficient of .28 was found significant at the .001 level (Table XV). Also, it was found that teachers who obtained high scores on the Professional Authority Scale also had scores significantly higher on the Preferred Participation Scale than teachers who scored low on the Professional Authority Scale.

Hypothesis 4, that there would be a significant relationship between teacher scores on the Professionalism Scale and their scores on the Preferred Participation Scale, was rejected. A non-significant correlation coefficient of -0.01 was found (Table XV). A Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance added some support to this finding. Indeed teachers who obtained high scores on the Professionalism Scale did not score significantly higher on the Preferred Participation Scale than teachers who scored low on the Professionalism Scale.

TABLE XV

SUMMARY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS FOUND  
IN THE PRESENT STUDY

	PROFES- SIONALISM SCALE	PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY SCALE	PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALE	ACTUAL PARTICIPATION SCALE
Professionalism Scale	-	.22*	-.01***	-.05***
Professional Authority Scale		-	.28*	-.19*
Preferred Partici- pation Scale			-	.09**
Actual Participation Scale				-

\* Significant at .001 level.

\*\* Significant at .05 level.

\*\*\* Not significant at .05 level.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions which are presented here are valid only for the population represented by the sample. Moreover, any inferences or conclusions drawn from the findings should be viewed with care, keeping in mind the limitations imposed by the responding sample and by the underlying assumptions regarding the instruments.

On the basis of the results obtained in this study the following conclusions can be drawn:

(1) The level of participation that teachers perceived they had over a number of professional decisions was significantly different from the level they would have liked to have. It would appear that at the present time the decision-making structures which relate to decisions of a professional nature are in conflict with teacher drive for greater authority. Indeed this research found that on twenty-seven decision-items out of thirty-five, a majority of teachers felt they were not given any degree of participation, while their expectations on all but one item were that they should be given the right, not simply to be consulted, but at least to decide with the administrative authority in matters of a professional nature. This study supports the position held by advocates of the teaching profession who argue that teachers are striving for greater autonomy. However, it does not sustain the hopes of people like Lieberman or Corwin who claim that teachers should be asking for complete autonomy in professional matters.

(2) The proposition held by students of the professions, that professionally-oriented people are demanding authority in order to insure that society will have the best "skilled services" possible, was given some support by the results of the present study. It was found: (a) that teacher orientation toward service and knowledge was significantly related to their orientation toward authority; (b) that teachers who are highly oriented toward service and knowledge are more highly oriented toward authority than are teachers who have a low orientation toward service and knowledge.

(3) No significant relationship was found between teacher desire to participate and their orientation toward service and knowledge. Teachers who were highly oriented toward service and knowledge were not asking for a different degree of participation than were teachers who had a low orientation to professional service and knowledge. It was proposed that other factors, apart from teachers' orientation toward service and knowledge, could have affected their desire for greater participation.

### III. IMPLICATIONS

#### For School Administrators

Among all the possible implications which can be drawn from the results of the present study, the one which deserves priority has to do with the design of an appropriate model of authority structure for our school system. If teachers are now showing signs of a highly professionally-oriented group,

that is, a group oriented toward service, knowledge, and authority, it is perhaps at the demand of the public itself. Indeed, teachers have been asked to become more competent: they have been told to become better prepared academically if they wish to be granted professional status. This has now produced the highest calibre of teachers ever witnessed in the history of our public education systems. What had not been fully expected by the public was the major side-effect of its demand. Indeed this advanced training has provided the impetus for teachers to challenge the organizational rules which may prevent them from becoming involved in educational decision-making. The time has now come for the public and their representatives "to welcome the desire by teachers for more involvement in decision-making as a sign that the profession is maturing" (3, p. 160).

Unfortunately, the same people that were pressing teachers to become more professional are now telling them that they are not ready for greater autonomy. As Lieberman points out, "this is the epitaph on innumerable requests by teachers for more power over professional matters" (9, p. 231). Many people agree that teachers should have more power, but as Lieberman also points out, they show an appalling naivety by telling teachers that they must wait until they are accorded more respect by the public, or until they are more deserving of power. This is what he calls the "oven theory of power" (9, p. 231).

Reacting to this rebuff, teachers have decided to

fight their way through by uniting under more militant associations and by threatening the population with strikes, mass resignation and many other desperate measures. One interesting example of this among many others, took place in Québec during the 1968-69 school year. For many months, teachers had threatened the government with strikes, mass resignations and other actions. One of the many things at stake in this never-ending negotiation, had to do with the right by teachers to "co-decide" with the administrative authority (either the government, the school board, the general-director or the principal) on a number of educational matters (2). On the other hand, the employers' representatives objected to the implementation of "co-decision" on the grounds that the actual laws did not allow them to delegate their powers to the teachers (7; 8).

Such an example points to the necessity of re-examining the authority structure of our school systems. School management must begin to realize that its traditional domination of the school decision machinery must be altered to meet this new reality called "the professionalization of teachers." Provincial legislatures must respond to this phenomenon by implementing laws which redefine the areas of administrative and professional responsibilities. If there is no attempt at restructuring the actual bargaining process, one could expect an ever increasing conflict between teachers and the school management. As Wildman has observed, the search for power equalization in school systems through standard patterns of collective negotiations will inevitably lead to institu-

tionalization of conflict between teachers on the one hand, and governing boards and administrators on the other hand (12).

A possible solution to the institutionalization of conflict would be to separate the decision areas of working conditions and salary from the decision area of educational program development. This solution has been advocated recently by many people (1; 5; 13). Williams has called it "the academic alternative" in opposition to the industrial relations approach:

The selection of the industrial relations approach or the academic alternative involves more than the mere question of to whom the teachers will give primary allegiance. It involves the question of the proper allocation of supervisory and administrative authority. Supervisory authority is defined here as responsibility for the governance of professional activities of teachers, including teaching competence, curriculum determination, and staff selection. Administrative authority here refers to responsibility for such matters as plant maintenance, schedules, budget, administration, and supervision of non-professional employees (13, p. 573).

Boyan argues that the separation between Administrative and Supervisory dimensions of authority would permit administrators to serve as executives of governing boards when negotiating with teachers on matters of salary and conditions of work, and at the same time would encourage preservation of professional identity in deciding on matters of curriculum and instruction (1, p. 300).

However many problems may be foreseen in implementing such authority structure. First an agreement on the nature of the supervisory dimension of authority would have to be

reached. Lieberman has already pointed out that disagreement over the functions of education are paralleled by disagreement over the nature of the teacher's expert authority (9, p. 91).

A second problem has to do with the selection of the administrators. Should they be chosen by the governing board or should they be elected by the teachers themselves? To whom would they be responsible? Is it possible for a school administrator to struggle for the best teaching situation while having to fight at the same time for the best financial situation of the school board? In other words is it possible to profess two sets of ideals: those of a professional school administrator and those of a professional teacher?

In face of such important problems, it would appear that Etzioni's proposition offers a neater separation between administrative and professional matters. He suggests the model presently used in hospitals where professionals are elected by their peers on the board. Administrators have no hierarchical authority over doctors in professional areas. On the contrary, they are in a staff relationship to a board where medical doctors are in the majority (4). However, such a model is quite a leap from the actual school board-government-teachers situation and therefore appears less realistic in relation to the actual state of the teaching profession.

In light of the results of the present study, it would appear that the first model is more appropriate. Indeed, teachers do not ask for complete professional autonomy, but



rather for a co-managerial system with an "external" administrative authority. Therefore, professional administrators could still be selected by and responsible to their governing boards. Their first task would be to design a collegial decision-making structure where the teaching staff and administrators could jointly reach agreement over decisions of a professional nature. There would still be a problem of identifying the professional areas. The results of the present study seem to suggest that teachers are asking for greater control over all decision areas related to the teaching profession. However, decisions related to pupil personnel and to the organization of teaching both within the classroom and the school unit could be suggested as desirable teacher professional areas.

#### For Further Research

If teacher orientation toward authority is not highly associated with basic professional attitudes such as knowledge and service, it would seem important to examine the degree of association it has with other factors such as administrative leadership, lack of adequate teaching facilities, morale, teacher trust in the administrative authority, or sheer lack of teacher participation in school management.

Research is also needed to develop and improve instruments which would measure with greater accuracy teacher attitudes toward authority, service and knowledge. Indeed the instruments used in this study accounted for a small proportion of the variance.

Further research similar to that undertaken in the present study should be done in order to determine what professional administrators, lay people, and students think are and should be the autonomous areas of teachers.

The different forms of participation presently used to involve teachers in decisions should be investigated and those which teachers favor should be identified. The results of this study makes it even more urgent to know what teachers consider to be the characteristics of a collegial structure of authority.

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER V

- (1) Boyan, Norman J. "Emergent Role of Teacher and Authority Structure," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, 1967, pp. 291-304.
- (2) Corporation des Enseignants du Québec, "Projet de Convention Collective Provinciale des Enseignants du Québec." Québec, 1968.
- (3) English, Fenwick. "The Ailing Principalship," Phi Delta Kappan, I, November 1967, pp. 158-161.
- (4) Etzioni, Amitai. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV, 1959, pp. 43-67.
- (5) Griffiths, Daniel. "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternatives to the Status Quo," Struggle for Power in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 96-110.
- (6) Hrynyk, Nicholas P. "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.
- (7) Le Devoir. May 7, 1969.
- (8) Le Devoir. May 8, 1969.
- (9) Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1956.
- (10) Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power Equalization," The Social Science of Organizations, Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1962, pp. 39-84.
- (11) Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of the Work Organizations, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966.
- (12) Wildman, W.A. "Teacher Collective Action in the United States," Negotiations in Schools, Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1965, pp. 20-34.
- (13) Williams, Richard C. "An Academic Alternative to Collective Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, IL, 1968, pp. 571-574.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOKS

- Abrahamson, Mark. The Professional in the Organization. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.
- Azzarelli, Joseph J. "Four Viewpoints," Struggle for Power in Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 1-15.
- Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 15-34.
- Becker, Howard S. "The Nature of a Profession," Education for the Professions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, pp. 27-46.
- Becker, Howard S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Complex Organizations. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, pp. 243-251.
- Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as a Formal Organization," Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Blackington III, Frank H., Robert S. Patterson. School, Society, and the Professional Educator. Montréal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.
- Bruning, James L. and B.L. Kintz. Computational Handbook of Statistics. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.
- Campbell, Roald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.
- Carr-Saunders, A.M. "Professionalization in Historical Perspectives," Professionalization. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 2-9.
- Carson, Robert B., Keith Goldhammer, Ronald J. Pellegrin. Teacher Participation in the Community. Eugene, Oregon: CASEA, 1967.
- Cheek, Neil H. "The Social Role of the Professional," The Professional in the Organization. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967, pp. 9-16.

- Conrad, Donald L. "Collective Negotiations and Professionalism," Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967, pp. 405-411.
- Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.
- Dahl, Robert A. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Ebel, Robert L. Measuring Educational Achievement. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.
- Goode, William. "Professions and Non-Professions," Professionalization. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 33-45.
- Greenwood, Ernest. "The Elements of Professionalization," Professionalization. Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966, pp. 9-18.
- Griffiths, Daniel. "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternatives to the Status Quo," Struggle for Power in Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 96-110.
- Hall, Oswald. "The Social Structure of the Teaching Profession," Struggle for Power in Education, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966, pp. 35-48.
- Hicks, William V. and Frank H. Blackington III. "The Profession as an Idea," School, Society, and the Professional Educator. Montréal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, pp. 16-28.
- Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Lane, Willard, Ronald Corwin, William Monahan. Foundations of Educational Administration. New York: MacMillan, 1967.
- Lasswell, Harold D. and Abraham Kaplan. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

- Leavitt, Harold J. The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
- Lieberman, Myron, and Michael H. Moskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Lord, Frederic M. and Novick, Melvin R. Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- Lynn, Kenneth S. The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.
- MacKinnon, Frank. The Politics of Education. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.
- Nunnally, Jum C. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Paton, James M. Professional Status of Teachers. Ottawa: Canadian Conference on Education, 1961.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Introduction to Max Weber," The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (Trans.). Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1947.
- Scott, Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies--Areas of Conflict," Professionalization. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 264-275.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Stinnett, R.M., Jack H. Kleinmann, Martha L. Ware. Professional Negotiation in Public Education. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1966.
- Strauss, George. "Some Notes on Power-Equalization," The Social Science of Organizations. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S. Social Psychology of the Work Organization. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966.
- Vollmer, Howard. "Professional Adaptation to Organizations," Professionalization. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966, pp. 275-282.
- Vollmer, Howard M., Donald L. Mills. Professionalization. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

- Wildman, W.A. "Teacher Collective Action in the United States," Negotiations in Schools. Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1965, pp. 20-34.
- Wittlin, Alma S. "The Teachers," The Professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965, pp. 91-100.
- Wollett, Donald H. "Professional Negotiations: What is the Thing," Collective Negotiations for Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

#### PERIODICALS

- Administrative Science Quarterly. X, June 1965. Ithaca, New York: The Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, 1965.
- Anderson, James G. "The Authority Structure of the School: System of Social Exchange," Educational Administration Quarterly, III, Spring 1967, pp. 130-148.
- Arensberg, C.M. and D. MacGregor. "Determination of Morale in an Industrial Company," Applied Anthropology, I, January-March 1942, pp. 12-34.
- Ben-David, J. "The Professional Role of the Physician in Bureaucratized Medicine: A Study in Role Conflict," Human Relations, XI, August 1958, pp. 255-274.
- Boyan, Norman J. "Emergent Role of Teacher and Authority Structure of School," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, 1967, pp. 291-304.
- English, Fenwick. "The Ailing Principals," Phi Delta Kappan, L, November 1967, pp. 158-161.
- Etzioni, Amitai. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV, June 1959, pp. 43-67.
- Goldman, Harvey, and James E. Heald. "Teacher Expectations of Administrative Behavior," Educational Administration Quarterly, IV, Autumn 1968, pp. 29-40.
- Kuder, G.F. and Richardson, M.W. "The Theory of Estimation of Test Reliability," Psychometrika, II, 1937, pp. 151-160.



- McEwan, William J. "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, I, 1956, pp. 208-229.
- McKean, Robert C. "Decision-Making: The Administrator Needs a New Outlook," Clearing House, XLI, 1967, pp. 285-287.
- Moore, D.G. and R. Renck. "The Professional Employee in Industry," Journal of Business, XXVIII, January 1955, pp. 58-66.
- Scott, Richard. "Reactions to Supervision in a Heteronomous Professional Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, X, June 1965, pp. 65-81.
- Shaffer, John. "Professionalization of Power in Education," Educational Theory, XVII, 1967, pp. 32-39.
- Sharma, Chiranji S. "Who Should Make What Decision," Administrator's Notebook, III, April 1955.
- Wade, L.L. "Professionals in Organizations: A Neoteric Model," Human Organization, XXVI, Spring/Summer 1967, pp. 40-46.
- Williams, Richard C. "An Academic Alternative to Collective Negotiations," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX, 1968, pp. 571-574.

#### OTHER SOURCES

- Archambault, Eldon D. "Teacher Role in School Policy Development," Unpublished doctoral dissertation University of Iowa, 1967.
- Balentine, Robert G. "A Study of Teacher Participation in School Policy Formulation in New Jersey." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Jersey, 1968.
- Benner, Thomas E. "An Investigation Comparing Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of Actual and Ideal Decision-Making Participation Patterns in Selected Elementary School Districts in Illinois." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966.
- Carson, Robert B. "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making in Education and Other Local Community Activities in Three Oregon Communities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1965.

- Corporation des Enseignants du Québec. "Projet de Convention Collective Provinciale des Enseignants du Québec." Québec, 1968.
- Corwin, Ronald G. "The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools." Columbus: Ohio State University, 1964. (Mimeographed).
- Hrynyk, Nicholas P. "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.
- Le Devoir. May 7, 1969.
- Le Devoir. May 8, 1969.
- McBeath, A. "The Changing Role of the Teacher and Implications for Administrators." Paper read at 1968 CEA Banff Short Course, Banff, 1968.
- Ministère de l'Éducation. "Statistiques de l'Enseignement 1966/67." 8 volumes. Québec, 1968.
- Robinson, Norman. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1966.
- Sasse, Edward B. "Teacher and Administrator Participation in Decision-Making and Curriculum Development." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.
- Scharf, Murray P. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between the Professional Role Orientation and Social Structure of Teacher Groups," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1967.
- Simpkins, William S. "The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in the School." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1968.
- Walters, Robert N. "An Analysis of the Extent to which Teachers Participate in the Administration of the Public Schools of Mississippi." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1967.

APPENDIX A



Sainte-Foy, le 27 janvier 1969.

Cher (e) Collègue,

Vous trouverez ci-inclus un questionnaire que je vous demande de bien vouloir compléter avec le 5 février prochain.

Monsieur Denis Massé, étudiant en administration scolaire, prépare actuellement une thèse de doctorat qui porte justement sur le statut professionnel des enseignants et leur degré de participation. Quoique cette recherche n'est pas faite pour le compte de la Corporation des enseignants, eu égard au sujet de sa recherche, nous avons cru bon de lui accorder notre collaboration. Nous avons choisi 1,300 enseignants parmi les 65,000 membres de la Corporation. Votre nom a été choisi au hasard et nous espérons que vous voudrez bien prendre les quelques minutes nécessaires pour compléter le questionnaire ci-joint. Une enveloppe retour affranchie vous est fournie pour faciliter votre travail.

Soyez assuré(e) de notre entière discrétion et de celle de monsieur Massé et soyez aussi assuré(e) que les informations recueillies ne seront utilisées à des fins autres que celle du bien-être de nos membres. Il y a deux raisons qui motivent le fait que nous vous demandons d'indiquer vos noms et adresse:

1. Nous voulons être en mesure de retracer les gens qui n'auront pas répondu à la date limite.
2. Monsieur Massé s'engage à vous faire parvenir un bref rapport de sa recherche.

Nous vous remercions très sincèrement de votre collaboration et nous vous prions de nous croire,

Votre tout dévoué

Guy Marion, Ph.D (adm.scol.)  
Chargé de recherche.



Sainte-Foy, le 31 janvier 1969.

Cher (e) Collègue,

Vous avez reçu il y a quelque temps un questionnaire portant sur le statut professionnel des enseignants et leur degré de participation aux décisions.

La présente est une LETTRE DE RAPPEL pour vous inciter à nous retourner le questionnaire dûment rempli. Si vous avez omis de le faire, nous nous permettons d'insister sur l'URGENCE d'une réponse.

Nous remercions ceux qui ont déjà fait parvenir leur réponse.

Comptant sur votre prompt collaboration et vous en remerciant à l'avance, je vous prie de me croire,

Votre tout dévoué

Guy Marion, Ph.D (adm.scol.)

Chargé de recherche.

# **recherche sur le statut professionnel des enseignants et leur degré de participation aux décisions**

Veillez retourner ce questionnaire avant le 5 février 1969 à:

Service de recherche  
a/s M. Denis Massé

Corporation des enseignants du Québec,  
2336, chemin Ste-Foy, Québec 10, QUEBEC.

février 1969

Ce questionnaire comporte trois sections:

Section A: Questionnaire sur la participation des enseignants

Section B: Questionnaire d'opinion

Section C: Information d'ordre général

INSTRUCTIONS GENERALES

1. Répondez à toutes les questions.
2. Ne formulez qu'un seul choix par question en cochant la case appropriée.
3. Lisez attentivement les instructions relatives à chaque question avant de répondre.

# SECTION A

## Questionnaire sur la participation des enseignants

### INSTRUCTIONS

Pour chacune des activités contenues dans ce questionnaire, choisissez parmi les quatre (4) degrés de participation décrits ci-dessous (a) celui qui selon vous correspond le plus au degré de participation actuel des enseignants, et (b) celui auquel devrait avoir droit les enseignants. Pour répondre, cochez dans la série de chiffres apparaissant à la suite du sigle PA (participation actuelle)

1 2 3 4 , la case qui selon vous correspond le plus à la participation actuelle des enseignants, et dans la série de chiffres apparaissant à la suite du sigle PS (participation souhaitée):

1 2 3 4 , la case qui à votre avis correspond le plus au degré de participation auquel devraient avoir droit les enseignants.

Les quatre degrés de participation aux décisions sont les suivants:

1er degré: Les enseignants de participent pas ( ne devraient pas participer) aux décisions en cette matière. Les décisions sont prises (devraient être prises) unilatéralement par l'administration. (1)

2ème degré: Quoique l'administration doive seule prendre les décisions en cette matière, elle doit (devrait) obtenir l'avis des enseignants soit individuellement, soit en groupe, avant de décider.

3ème degré: Les enseignants et l'administration, possiblement en comité, s'entendent ensemble ( devraient s'entendre ensemble) sur les décisions à prendre en cette matière.

4ème degré: Les enseignants eux-mêmes décident ( devraient décider ) en cette matière. Il le font:

- soit individuellement,
- soit en équipe ou en groupe de travail au niveau de l'école ou de la commission scolaire,
- soit par l'entremise de leur association locale, régionale, ou provinciale (CEQ).

### EXEMPLE

Supposons qu'à l'activité suivante: "Evaluation des méthodes d'enseignement", les enseignants ne participent pas, selon vous, aux décisions en cette matière (1er degré), vous cochez la case 1, apparaissant à la suite du sigle PA. Si pour cette même activité, vous croyez que les enseignants et l'administration devraient s'entendre ensemble sur les décisions à prendre (3ème degré), il suffit alors de cocher la case 3 apparaissant à la suite du sigle PS.

1) L'évaluation des méthodes d'enseignement

PA:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1	2	3	4
PS:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1	2	3	4

(1) Nous entendons ici par "l'administration", soit le personnel administratif d'une école ou d'une commission scolaire (c'est-à-dire le principal, le directeur général, ou leurs adjoints respectifs,) soit la commission scolaire elle-même, soit enfin le ministère de l'Éducation et ses représentants.



		<u>1er degré</u> décision uni- latérale de la C.S.	<u>2ème degré</u> avis des enseignants	<u>3ème degré</u> s'entendre ensemble	<u>4ème degré</u> décision des enseignants
<b>1</b>	L'introduction de nouvelles méthodes d'enseignement.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>2</b>	Le choix des méthodes d'enseignement dont doivent se servir les maîtres.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>3</b>	La détermination des besoins de recyclage pour certains membres de la profession.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>4</b>	L'établissement des grandes lignes des programmes d'enseignement au secondaire et à l'élémentaire.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>5</b>	L'évaluation des qualifications professionnelles des enseignants	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>6</b>	La suspension des brevets d'enseignement.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>7</b>	L'organisation des activités parascolaires.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>8</b>	L'établissement des règlements concernant le comportement des élèves dans l'école.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>9</b>	L'attribution de la ou des matière(s) qu'un maître devra enseigner.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>10</b>	La détermination de la durée des périodes d'enseignement.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>11</b>	L'établissement des modes d'évaluation de la clientèle étudiante.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>4</b>					

		1er degré décision uni- latérale de la C.S.	2ème degré avis des enseignants	3ème degré s'entendre ensemble	4ème degré décision des enseignants
<b>12</b>	L'établissement des critères d'évaluation du personnel enseignant.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>13</b>	La détermination des plans et devis pédagogiques lors de la planification de nouvelles constructions scolaires.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>14</b>	La détermination des priorités relatives au recyclage des maîtres.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>15</b>	La détermination des types de travaux ou devoirs à assigner aux élèves.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>16</b>	L'élaboration des horaires dans l'école.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>17</b>	La nomination des enseignants devant siéger au conseil d'école.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>18</b>	La définition des objectifs de la supervision de l'enseignement.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>19</b>	L'élaboration du contenu des journées d'information pédagogique.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>20</b>	La sélection des manuels scolaires.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>21</b>	La détermination du nombre de périodes d'enseignement.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>22</b>	La détermination des normes d'éthiques professionnelles auxquelles doivent se soumettre les enseignants.	PA: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 PS: <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>5</b>					

		<u>1er degré</u> décision uni- latérale de la C.S.	<u>2ème degré</u> avis des enseignants	<u>3ème degré</u> s'entendre ensemble	<u>4ème degré</u> décision des enseignants
<b>23</b> La détermination du besoin de spécialistes-conseils ou coordonnateurs dans une école ou une commission scolaire.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>24</b> L'introduction de nouveaux cours.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>25</b> La détermination des modes à suivre dans le classement des élèves.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>26</b> L'attribution des niveaux auxquels seront affectés les enseignants.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>27</b> La répartition de la part du budget de l'école consacrée à des fins pédagogiques.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>28</b> La détermination des priorités relatives à la recherche pédagogique.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>29</b> L'élaboration des questionnaires ou examens destinés à évaluer le progrès des élèves.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>30</b> La détermination du contenu des programmes de formation des maîtres.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>31</b> La sélection du matériel didactique, audio-visuel, ou autre.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>32</b> La définition des structures formelles à implanter dans l'école (i.e. la répartition des tâches, la création des départements, l'institution de comités ou conseils dans l'école.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>6</b>					

		<u>1er degré</u> décision unilatérale de la C.S.	<u>2ème degré</u> avis des enseignants	<u>3ème degré</u> s'entendre ensemble	<u>4ème degré</u> décision des enseignants
<b>33</b> La détermination des qualifications minima pour entrer dans la profession.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>34</b> Le choix des matières qui doivent figurer au programme.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4
<b>35</b> L'établissement du contenu des matières.	PA: PS:	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 4

# SECTION B

## QUESTIONNAIRE D'OPINION

### INSTRUCTIONS

Veillez exprimer la mesure de votre accord ou de votre désaccord avec chacune des opinions émises. Il suffit de cocher la case correspondant à l'expression la plus susceptible de gagner votre adhésion personnelle. (Totalement d'accord - D'accord - Indécis - En désaccord - Totalement en désaccord ). Répondez rapidement. Votre première réaction est celle qui importe le plus.

Il importe de réagir à chacune des opinions émises, même si vous avez parfois l'impression de ne pas avoir toute l'information voulue pour porter un jugement.

<b>1</b>	Un enseignant devrait continuellement se servir des meilleures méthodes d'enseignement, même si les autorités administratives en favorisent d'autres.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>2</b>	L'enseignant devrait être prêt à consacrer toute sa vie à l'enseignement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>3</b>	Un enseignant ne devrait jamais se conformer à un ordre, à moins d'être assuré que ce soit dans le meilleur intérêt de l'élève.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>4</b>	A cause de la pénurie d'enseignants au Québec, il devrait être permis d'enseigner, même sans les qualifications requisés par la loi ou les règlements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>5</b>	On devrait permettre aux enseignants eux-mêmes de prendre les décisions qui s'imposent en ce qui concerne les problèmes qui surgissent en classe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>6</b>	La Corporation des enseignants du Québec (CEQ) est l'organisme le mieux désigné pour veiller à la mise en application d'un code d'éthique professionnelle pour les enseignants.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>7</b>	Seuls les enseignants peuvent répondre aux besoins pédagogiques des élèves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>8</b>	Les enseignants devraient tenter de se conformer à ce qu'ils croient être les standards de leur profession, même si les administrateurs scolaires ou la société ne semblent pas respecter ces standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>9</b>	Un enseignant devrait être membre d'au moins une association professionnelle (i.e. une association des professeurs de français, d'histoire, de méthodes actives, etc...) et d'y prendre part d'une façon active.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>10</b>	Des enseignants qualifiés devraient avoir le dernier mot en ce qui concerne les décisions d'importance majeure en matière d'enseignement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>11</b>	La CEQ n'est pas assez sévère envers les enseignants qui ne se conforment pas aux standards de la profession.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>12</b>	La connaissance de théories éducationnelles est d'une importance primordiale pour un enseignement efficace.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>13</b>	Le respect accordé à une école par d'autres enseignants dans la province est un critère important pour juger de la qualité de ladite école.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1

En désaccord

Indécis

D'accord

Totalement d'accord

<b>14</b>	L'école constitue le meilleur véhicule de changement dans la société.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>15</b>	Il devrait être permis d'enseigner au Québec même sans la possession d'un brevet "A", d'un baccalauréat en pédagogie, ou de l'équivalent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>16</b>	L'enseignant est responsable de promouvoir, par ses contacts avec les élèves, les changements qui s'imposent dans la société.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>17</b>	Dans un cas de mésentente entre la C.E.Q. et les autorités provinciales, l'enseignant se doit d'être d'abord loyal à la C.E.Q.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>18</b>	Dans l'exercice de sa profession, un enseignant devrait se baser sur ses connaissances des publications et des recherches relatives à l'enseignement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>19</b>	Les enseignants devraient s'abonner et lire les revues pédagogiques les plus importantes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>20</b>	Un enseignant devrait porter plus d'attention aux vues exprimées par d'autres enseignants qu'à celles exprimées par le public en général.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>21</b>	Il est essentiel qu'un enseignant soit compétent dans une discipline.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>22</b>	Les enseignants devraient se préoccuper plus qu'ils ne le font présentement de l'adaptation des programmes aux besoins de tous et de chacun des élèves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>23</b>	Je n'ai pas l'impression de faire vraiment partie de la C.E.Q.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>24</b>	Un bon enseignant devrait être intéressé à une promotion même si cela l'empêchait de travailler directement avec les enfants ou les adolescents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		1	2	3	4	5

En désaccord

Indécis

D'accord

Totalement d'accord

<b>25</b>	Les changements engendrés chez les jeunes sont les résultats les plus importants qui découlent du travail de l'enseignant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>26</b>	Les décisions concernant les manuels scolaires, les volumes de consultation et les programmes d'études devraient être prises par des enseignants ou des groupes d'enseignants et non par le Ministère de l'Éducation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>27</b>	La responsabilité primordiale de l'enseignant est de servir le milieu dans lequel il enseigne.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>28</b>	La société québécoise ne pourrait survivre sans les services des enseignants.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>29</b>	Un enseignant devrait tenter de mettre en pratique les standards et les objectifs d'un bon enseignement tels qu'il les conçoit, même si les règlements de l'école s'y opposent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>30</b>	Le succès de ses anciens élèves procure à l'enseignant sa plus grande satisfaction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>31</b>	Un bon enseignant ne devrait rien faire qui puisse mettre en danger les intérêts de ses élèves, quelle que soit la personne qui donne l'ordre ou quoi qu'en disent les règlements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>32</b>	Un enseignant devrait encourager autant d'élèves que possible à embrasser la carrière de l'enseignement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>33</b>	Tous les élèves, peu importe leur statut social ou leur habileté intellectuelle, ont droit d'être traités sur un pied d'égalité par l'enseignant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>34</b>	Les problèmes d'importance mineure ne devraient pas nécessairement être référés à l'autorité supérieure pour une décision finale.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>35</b>	Seule la C.E.Q. devrait parler au nom de tous les enseignants en matière d'ordre professionnel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1



<b>36</b>	Tous les enseignants devraient être soumis à un code commun d'éthique professionnelle.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>37</b>	Les enseignants devraient être évalués sur la base de leur connaissance de la matière qu'ils enseignent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>38</b>	Je préfère l'enseignement à tout autre gagne-pain.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>39</b>	Si j'en avais le choix, je ne ferais pas partie de la C.E.Q.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>40</b>	Il devrait être plus important pour les enseignants d'être membres de la C.E.Q. que d'être membres de toute autre organisation professionnelle.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>41</b>	Les enseignants devraient être évalués sur la base de leur habileté à communiquer leur savoir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>42</b>	La C.E.Q. n'exerce pas assez de contrôle en matière d'enseignement dans le Québec.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>43</b>	Il ne devrait pas être permis à un enseignant de violer les règlements imposés par les autorités administratives, même s'il lui semble que ce soit dans le meilleur intérêt de l'élève.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>44</b>	On devrait s'attendre à ce que les enseignants consacrent des heures supplémentaires de travail à aider les étudiants qui ne réussissent pas dans leurs études.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>45</b>	A cause de l'occasion unique que m'offre l'enseignement de servir la société, je continuerais d'enseigner même si je pouvais gagner un meilleur salaire dans une autre profession.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>46</b>	Les enseignants devraient être prêts à travailler pour n'importe laquelle des commissions scolaires du Québec, où leurs services seraient requis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1
<b>47</b>	Toutes choses égales, un enseignant qui s'est mérité de hautes notes à l'école normale ou à l'université sera meilleur enseignant que celui qui s'est vu accorder des notes moyennes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		5	4	3	2	1

# SECTION C

## INFORMATION D'ORDRE GENERAL

### 1) SEXE

1  Masculin

2  Féminin

### 2) AGE

1  moins de 20 ans

4  40 à 49 ans

2  20 à 29 ans

5  50 à 59 ans

3  30 à 39 ans

6  60 ans et plus

### 3) STATUT CIVIL

1  laïque

2  religieux

### 4) ANNEES DE SCOLARITE (selon la convention collective en vigueur)

1  moins de 12 ans

3  15-17 ans

2  12-14 ans

4  plus de 17 ans

### 5) ANNEES D'EXPERIENCE DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT (inclure l'année en cours)

1  moins de 2 ans

5  de 11 à 13 ans

2  de 2 à 4 ans

6  de 14 à 16 ans

3  de 5 à 7 ans

7  plus de 16 ans

4  de 8 à 10 ans

### 6) NIVEAU D'ENSEIGNEMENT ACTUEL

1  Maternelle

2  Elémentaire

3  Secondaire

### 7) NOMBRE D'ANNEE(s) PASSEE(s) DANS LA PRESENTE INSTITUTION

1  moins d'un an

4  7 à 9 ans

2  1 à 3 ans

5  10 ans et plus

3  4 à 6 ans

### 8) NOMBRE D'ENSEIGNANTS DANS VOTRE ECOLE

1  moins de 10

5  entre 40 et 49

2  entre 10 et 19

6  entre 50 et 59

3  entre 20 et 29

7  entre 60 et 69

4  entre 30 et 39

8  70 et plus

### 9) VOTRE STATUT ACTUEL DANS LA CEQ OU DANS VOTRE ASSOCIATION (ou section)

1  simple membre

4  Membre du Comité exécutif ou du Conseil d'administration de votre Section ou fédération (régionale ou provinciale).

2  responsable ou délégué d'école au sein de votre association ou syndicat.

5  Délégué au Congrès de la CEQ, délégué de votre section ou fédération au Conseil provincial.

3  Membre du comité exécutif ou du conseil d'administration de votre association ou syndicat.

6  Non membre de la CEQ

### 10) POPULATION DE LA LOCALITE OU VOUS ENSEIGNEZ

1  moins de 10,000

4  entre 30,000 et 39,999

2  entre 10,000 et 19,999

5  entre 40,000 et 49,999

3  entre 20,000 et 29,999

6  50,000 et plus

Votre nom.....
.....
Adresse.....
.....
Tel:.....

# TEACHER PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Answer all questions.
2. Make only one choice in each case.
3. Read carefully the instructions relating to each question before answering.

# SECTION A

## TEACHER PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE

### INSTRUCTIONS

For each of the decision items in the questionnaire, four degrees of teacher participation are given. These are:

1. "No Teacher Participation" Teachers do not participate (should not participate) in making decisions related to this matter. These decisions are made by administrators.<sup>1</sup>
2. "Advice of Teachers" Teachers participate (should participate) in making decisions related to this matter. They are (should be) consulted, individually or in groups, by administrators<sup>1</sup> who make (or should make) the decisions.
3. "Cooperative Decision" Teachers and administrators<sup>1</sup>, possibly in committees, jointly reach (should reach) the decisions related to this matter.
4. "Teacher(s') Decision" The decisions related to this matter are (should be) made by teachers: (a) individually (b) in working groups, that is, by a school or school district teaching staff (c) by their local, regional, or provincial association (PAPT).

To answer each decision item in the questionnaire:

- A. Check one of the four boxes following the word ACTUAL to record your opinion on how the decision is actually made at the present time in Quebec;

AND

- B. Check one of the four boxes following the word PREFERRED to record your preference for how the decision should be made.

### EXAMPLE

Suppose, in the decision item "Evaluating teaching methods", you believe that teachers do not participate in this matter. Then you would check the first box following the word ACTUAL. If for this same decision item, you believe that teachers and administrators, possibly in committees, should jointly reach a decision related to this matter, then you would check the third box following the word PREFERRED.

		No Teacher Participation	Advice of Teachers	Cooperative Decision	Teacher(s') Decision
1. Evaluating teaching methods	Actual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup>By "administrators" one means either the administrative personnel of a school or a school board (the principal, superintendent, or director, and their assistants) or the school board itself, or even the Minister of Education and his representatives.

Decision Item		No Teacher Participation	Advice of Teachers	Cooperative Decision	Teacher(s') Decision
1. Introduction of new teaching methods	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Deciding on instructional methods which teachers should use	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Determining which individual teachers require further professional education	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Establishing the broad outlines for instructional programs at the secondary or elementary levels	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Evaluating teachers' professional qualifications	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Suspending a teacher's diploma	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Organizing extra-curricular activities	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Establishing regulations concerning student behavior in school	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Assigning the subject or subjects which a teacher will teach	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Determining the length of teaching periods	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Establishing methods to be used in evaluating students	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Establishing criteria for the evaluation of teacher competency	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Decision Item		No Teacher Participation	Advice of Teachers	Cooperative Decision	Teacher(s') Decision
13. Establishing educational specifications for new school buildings	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Determining priorities in the retraining of teachers	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Determining the types of assignments to be given to students	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Drawing up timetables for the school	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Deciding which teachers will be members of the school council	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Defining objectives for the supervision of teachers	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Determining program content for teacher workshops	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Selecting textbooks	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Determining the number of periods one should teach per week	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Drawing up a code of ethics to which teachers must adhere	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Determining the need for specialist-consultants or coordinators in a school or school system.	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Introducing new courses of study	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Decision Item		No Teacher Participation	Advice of Teachers	Cooperative Decision	Teacher(s) Decision
25. Deciding on the methods to be used in grouping students	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Deciding the grade level at which individual teachers will teach	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. Determining the amount of the school budget which should be spent for instructional purposes	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. Determining the priorities in relation to educational research	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Developing tests and examinations to evaluate student progress	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. Determining the content of teacher training programs	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. Selecting teaching materials, audio-visual materials, etc.	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. Determining the formal structures to be established in the school; ie., the distribution of workload, the formation of departments, the establishment of committees or councils in the school	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. Determining the minimum requirements for entry into the teaching profession	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. Selecting the subjects to be included in the school program	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. Determining the subject matter to be taught	Actual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Preferred	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## TEACHER OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE (PROS)

- (1) A teacher should consistently use the best educational practices even though the administration prefers other views. (P.A.S.)
- (2) A teacher should be prepared to devote the whole of his working lifetime to the occupation of teaching. (P.S.)
- (3) Unless a teacher is satisfied that it is best for the student, a teacher should not do anything which the teacher is told to do. (P.A.S.)
- (4) In view of the teacher shortage, persons who do not meet Québec certification requirements should be allowed to teach.
- (5) Teachers should be allowed to make their own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom. (P.A.S.)
- (6) The Corporation des Enseignants du Québec is the best body to oversee the enforcement of a code of ethics for teachers.
- (7) Only teachers can satisfy the educational needs of students. (P.A.S.)
- (8) Teachers should try to live up to what they think are the standards of the profession even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect these standards. (P.A.S.)
- (9) A teacher should be a member of at least one educational organization and should take an active part in it. (P.S.)
- (10) The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be exercised by qualified teachers. (P.A.S.)
- (11) Non-Conformist members are given too much freedom by the Corporation.
- (12) Knowledge of educational theory is vital for effective teaching. (P.S.)
- (13) The degree of respect that it commands from other teachers around the province is a major criterion of a good school.
- (14) The best way to produce social change is through the schools.
- (15) Persons should be allowed to teach in Québec even if they do not hold at least the equivalent of a B. Ed. or Brevet A.



- (16) A teacher has the responsibility to promote needed changes in society through his contact with students in the classroom. (P.S.)
- (17) In case of a dispute between the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec, at the provincial level, and some other provincial authority or agency, the teacher owes his prime loyalty to the C.E.Q.
- (18) A teacher's practice should be based primarily on his acquaintance with educational literature and research. (P.S.)
- (19) Teachers should subscribe to and read the major professional journals. (P.S.)
- (20) A teacher should give more consideration to the views of other teachers than to those of the public.
- (21) It is vital that a teacher should possess a knowledge of subject matter. (P.S.)
- (22) Teachers should not be more concerned than they presently are about the adequacy of the schools' program for all students. (P.S.)
- (23) I do not feel that I am a real integral part of the CEQ.
- (24) A good teacher should be interested in promotions even if they deny him the opportunity to work directly with children.
- (25) The most useful results of a teacher's work are the changes produced in young people.
- (26) Decisions concerning textbooks, references and courses of study should be made by teachers or groups of teachers and not by the Department of Education. (P.A.S.)
- (27) A teacher's primary responsibility is to serve the community in which he teaches. (P.A.S.)
- (28) Québec society would not be able to survive without the services of teachers.
- (29) A teacher should try to put his standards and ideals of good teaching into practice even if the procedures of the school prohibit it. (P.A.S.)
- (30) The greatest satisfaction in teaching is seeing the success of former students. (P.S.)
- (31) A good teacher should not do anything that may jeopardize the interests of his students, regardless of who gives the directive or what the rules state. (P.A.S.)

- (32) A teacher should encourage as many of his students as possible to enter teaching. (P.S.)
- (33) Every student, no matter what his social status or ability, should receive equal educational service from a teacher.
- (34) Small matters should not have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.
- (35) Only the C.E.Q. should speak for all teachers on professional matters.
- (36) All teachers should be subject to a common code of ethics or standards of professional conduct.
- (37) Teachers should be evaluated primarily on the basis of their knowledge of the subject that they teach.
- (38) I would rather teach than do anything else for a living. (P.S.)
- (39) If I had the choice I would not belong to the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec.
- (40) Membership in the Corporation des enseignants du Québec should be more important to teachers than membership in most other organizations to which they belong.
- (41) Teachers should be evaluated primarily on the basis of their ability to communicate knowledge. (P.S.)
- (42) The provincial association does not exercise enough control over educational matters in the province.
- (43) It should not be permissible for a teacher to violate rules even if it is felt that the best interests of the student will be served in doing so. (P.A.S.)
- (44) Teachers should be expected to give after hours instruction to pupils who are not doing well at their school work. (P.S.)
- (45) Because of what I am able to do for society I would continue to teach even if I could earn more money at another vocation. (P.S.)
- (46) Teachers should be equally ready to work for any school board in the province wherever their services are needed. (P.S.)
- (47) A teacher who has earned superior grades while at the normal school or the university will be a better teacher than the one who earned average grades.



APPENDIX B

TABLE XVI

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PROS (5 FACTORS)  
ROTATED FACTORS (VARIMAX)

Communalities		1	2	3	4	5
1	0.376	0.025	0.090	0.549	-0.032	0.255
2	0.339	0.567	0.009	0.092	0.088	0.025
3	0.356	0.233	-0.013	0.535	-0.104	-0.065
4	0.014	-0.009	-0.015	-0.100	0.050	-0.033
5	0.268	-0.051	0.030	0.487	0.065	0.153
6	0.532	0.070	0.703	0.002	0.183	0.002
7	0.296	0.089	0.163	0.496	0.099	-0.078
8	0.398	0.041	0.176	0.482	0.284	0.229
9	0.238	0.265	0.077	-0.034	0.195	0.351
10	0.354	0.019	0.184	0.504	0.215	0.139
11	0.302	0.108	0.003	-0.031	0.517	0.146
12	0.210	0.384	0.195	-0.036	0.101	0.114
13	0.274	0.478	0.178	0.008	0.093	-0.074
14	0.172	0.248	0.170	0.130	0.013	0.253
15	0.191	-0.030	-0.112	-0.041	0.419	-0.019
16	0.228	0.273	-0.033	0.244	0.136	0.273
17	0.518	-0.017	0.680	0.215	0.028	0.093
18	0.253	0.388	0.161	0.147	0.205	0.116
19	0.353	0.361	0.133	-0.125	0.161	0.405
20	0.151	0.207	0.188	0.201	0.161	0.085
21	0.276	0.217	0.030	0.144	0.415	0.188
22	0.238	0.198	-0.105	0.017	0.215	0.376
23	0.578	0.017	0.741	0.044	-0.158	-0.034
24	0.198	-0.137	-0.106	0.120	-0.388	0.059
25	0.081	0.233	0.017	0.138	0.082	0.011
26	0.265	-0.054	0.107	0.393	-0.056	0.306
27	0.322	0.506	-0.034	0.025	0.003	0.254
28	0.301	0.116	0.208	0.109	0.143	0.460
29	0.461	0.120	-0.054	0.663	0.064	-0.021
30	0.262	0.482	0.106	0.129	0.035	0.033
31	0.417	0.237	-0.045	0.595	-0.036	-0.062
32	0.353	0.556	0.167	0.006	-0.025	-0.123
33	0.281	0.054	0.087	0.151	0.017	0.497
34	0.314	-0.043	-0.019	0.105	0.184	0.516
35	0.467	0.086	0.583	0.163	0.303	0.051
36	0.421	0.089	0.228	0.078	0.560	0.204
37	0.295	0.284	-0.001	0.284	0.212	-0.298
38	0.484	0.529	0.013	0.101	-0.351	0.265
39	0.634	0.033	0.787	0.037	-0.024	0.106
40	0.590	0.108	0.758	0.014	0.027	0.054
41	0.182	0.351	0.022	0.166	0.178	0.001

Communalities	1	2	3	4	5	
42	0.254	-0.000	0.077	0.111	0.473	0.113
43	0.411	-0.178	0.009	0.608	-0.090	-0.038
44	0.259	0.454	-0.201	-0.078	0.020	0.079
45	0.566	0.573	-0.089	-0.017	-0.419	0.231
46	0.198	0.417	-0.111	-0.060	0.007	-0.091
47	0.276	0.223	0.065	-0.026	0.200	-0.426
	15.209	3.661	3.592	3.393	2.330	2.233

NOTE:

Below is the classification of items according to the five sub-scales of Hrynyk's questionnaire.

Student-Autonomy: 3, 5, 10, 24, 26, 34, 43.

Colleague-Profession: 1, 8, 9, 13, 19, 20, 22, 29.

Knowledge: 4, 12, 15, 18, 21, 37, 41, 47.

Core-Organization: 6, 11, 17, 23, 36, 35, 39, 40, 42.

Service: 2, 7, 14, 16, 24, 25, 27, 30, 28, 33, 32, 38, 44, 46.

Leaf 144 missing in page numbering

APPENDIX C



TABLE XVII  
 FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALE  
 (5 factors)  
 ROTATED FACTORS (VARIMAX)

Communalities	1	2	3	4	5	
1	0.285	0.192	0.045	0.483	0.097	-0.062
2	0.437	-0.021	0.074	0.637	0.049	0.150
3	0.280	0.070	0.329	-0.048	-0.060	0.402
4	0.318	0.164	0.146	0.507	-0.036	0.108
5	0.485	0.062	0.675	0.145	0.033	-0.055
6	0.424	0.084	0.617	0.165	0.045	-0.088
7	0.180	-0.014	0.080	0.086	0.396	0.096
8	0.512	0.164	0.063	-0.064	0.689	0.044
9	0.332	-0.063	0.211	0.410	0.199	0.274
10	0.484	0.028	0.333	0.384	0.457	-0.127
11	0.201	0.231	0.188	0.132	0.256	0.169
12	0.385	0.075	0.575	0.127	0.170	0.068
13	0.214	0.276	0.279	0.239	0.045	-0.031
14	0.359	0.166	0.488	0.014	-0.015	0.306
15	0.512	-0.035	-0.083	0.137	0.180	0.673
16	0.492	0.248	-0.007	0.137	0.635	0.089
17	0.414	-0.017	0.120	0.123	0.300	0.542
18	0.308	0.258	0.355	0.236	0.214	0.117
19	0.276	0.204	0.182	0.347	0.270	0.091
20	0.442	0.399	0.059	0.519	0.031	0.093
21	0.279	0.319	0.322	0.168	0.211	-0.032
22	0.411	0.215	0.556	0.041	0.095	0.210
23	0.420	0.605	0.189	-0.053	0.044	0.117
24	0.381	0.522	0.132	0.262	0.146	0.030
25	0.342	0.419	0.107	0.295	0.085	0.246
26	0.226	0.241	0.148	0.289	0.052	0.245
27	0.268	0.391	0.224	0.159	0.189	-0.060
28	0.397	0.519	0.321	-0.100	0.053	0.106
29	0.508	0.315	-0.095	0.152	-0.001	0.614
30	0.387	0.411	0.460	-0.016	0.023	0.075
31	0.386	0.512	0.015	0.294	0.146	0.128
32	0.389	0.394	0.059	-0.023	0.453	0.157
33	0.490	0.257	0.624	0.138	0.119	-0.040
34	0.506	0.669	0.180	0.135	0.086	-0.024
35	0.476	0.585	0.093	0.320	0.149	-0.012
	13.204	3.588	3.313	2.420	2.037	1.847

TABLE XVIII  
 FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE ACTUAL PARTICIPATION SCALE  
 (5 factors)  
 ROTATED FACTORS (VARIMAX)

Communalities		1	2	3	4	5
1	0.549	0.358	0.091	0.130	0.626	0.068
2	0.607	0.257	0.076	-0.002	0.691	0.240
3	0.483	-0.002	0.209	0.131	0.635	-0.136
4	0.359	0.422	0.278	0.216	0.212	-0.109
5	0.448	0.088	0.156	0.638	0.064	-0.066
6	0.289	0.288	0.046	0.414	-0.064	-0.169
7	0.334	0.049	0.393	0.255	0.252	0.221
8	0.411	0.032	0.555	0.191	0.154	0.206
9	0.332	0.091	0.494	0.066	0.195	0.193
10	0.406	0.147	0.354	0.485	0.110	-0.104
11	0.327	0.154	0.499	0.182	0.146	0.014
12	0.411	0.219	0.115	0.580	0.066	0.099
13	0.366	0.121	0.089	0.482	0.142	0.302
14	0.459	0.044	0.410	0.373	0.370	-0.115
15	0.411	-0.128	0.361	0.031	0.314	0.406
16	0.523	0.041	0.716	0.048	-0.053	0.051
17	0.503	-0.067	0.214	0.094	0.045	0.665
18	0.349	0.353	0.430	0.158	0.113	-0.047
19	0.424	0.290	0.110	0.041	-0.113	0.560
20	0.375	0.334	0.210	0.197	0.399	0.146
21	0.369	0.293	0.079	0.469	0.069	0.228
22	0.525	0.145	0.012	0.547	0.119	0.437
23	0.348	0.490	0.008	0.294	0.120	0.079
24	0.486	0.547	0.262	0.179	0.278	0.090
25	0.407	0.384	0.479	-0.012	0.065	0.158
26	0.370	0.187	0.418	0.001	0.256	0.308
27	0.376	0.469	0.270	-0.039	-0.174	0.227
28	0.313	0.484	0.259	0.031	0.061	0.081
29	0.252	0.152	0.275	-0.048	0.233	0.311
30	0.400	0.514	0.097	0.248	0.254	-0.005
31	0.341	0.332	0.346	0.157	0.273	0.106
32	0.503	0.184	0.663	0.109	0.020	0.133
33	0.439	0.594	-0.045	0.283	0.039	0.048
34	0.600	0.752	0.029	0.116	0.105	0.097
35	0.491	0.640	0.172	0.167	0.153	-0.026
	14.585	3.970	3.657	2.681	2.378	1.899

APPENDIX D

TABLE XIX

## COMPARISON OF STUDY SAMPLE TO QUÉBEC'S TEACHER POPULATION BY PERCENTAGES

Variable	Classification	Sample	Québec's Teacher Population	p***
* Sex	Male	38%	27%	.05
	Female	62%	73%	
* Civil Status	Lay	87%	86%	n.s.
	Religious	13%	13%	
* Teaching Level	Kindergarten	3%	3%	n.s.
	Elementary	52%	57%	
	Secondary	45%	40%	
** Age	0 - 19	1%	2%	n.s.
	20 - 29	54%	58%	
	30 - 39	24%	18%	
	40 - 49	12%	11%	
	50 - 59	8%	10%	
	60 or more	2%	1%	
** Years of Education	14 or less	54%	70%	.001
	15 or more	46%	30%	
** Years of Teaching Experience	1 or less	4%	11%	n.s.
	2 - 4	22%	29%	
	5 - 7	25%	20%	
	8 - 10	12%	12%	
	11 - 13	11%	)	
	14 - 16	6%	) 28%	
	17 or more	21%	)	

\* It was possible to obtain statistics from the French sector only.

\*\* The comparison had to be made with the French and English sectors together.

\*\*\* The levels of significance were arrived at using the chi-square test.

APPENDIX E

TABLE XX

INFLUENCE OF SEX, AGE, CIVIL STATUS, YEARS OF EDUCATION, EXPERIENCE, TEACHING LEVEL, YEARS IN THE SCHOOL, NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOL, STATUS IN TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION AND GEOGRAPHICAL POPULATION ON THE PROFESSIONALISM SCALE, THE PROFESSIONAL AUTHORITY SCALE, THE ACTUAL AND PREFERRED PARTICIPATION SCALES\*

Variable	P.S.	P.A.S.	A.T.P.	P.T.P.
Sex	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.006
Age	.000	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Civil Status	.000	.000	n.s.	.03
Education	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Experience	.000	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Teaching Level	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Years in the School	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Number of Teachers	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Status in Teach. Org.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Population	.04	n.s.	.002	n.s.

\* The levels of significance were arrived at using the chi-square test.