

21791

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA



BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR..... C. GRAHAM COOKE.....
TITLE OF THESIS..... THE PARTICIPATION OF
QUEBEC ENGLISH PROTESTANT
TEACHERS IN DECISION-MAKING
UNIVERSITY..... UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED..... M. Ed.
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED..... FALL 1974

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).....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

10527 - 129 ST.
EDMONTON, ALTA.
T5N 1W9

DATED..... OCT. 4..... 19 74

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE PARTICIPATION OF QUEBEC ENGLISH PROTESTANT TEACHERS
IN DECISION-MAKING

by

C. GRAHAM COOKE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and
recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research,
for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Participation of Quebec
English Protestant Teachers in Decision-Making" submitted by
C. Graham Cooke in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Education.

G. Monard

.....
Supervisor

H. J. Jensen

K. A. Neufeld

Date October 2, 1974.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degree of participation in a number of decisions pertaining to school organization, the teaching profession, pupil personnel, teacher personnel and elementary and secondary curriculum.

The study also attempted to examine the relationships between teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degree of participation in decision-making and such personal and school variables as sex, age, marital status, years of training, teaching experience, teaching level, years of teaching in their present school; size of school and size of the community in which the school was situated.

The two instruments used in the study were English translations of Massé's Teacher Participation Questionnaire and Teacher Background Questionnaire. The first questionnaire provided information regarding the teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degrees of participation on thirty-five decision items. The Teacher Background Questionnaire elicited the personal and school characteristics of the respondents.

The study was conducted in the Province of Quebec and involved a random sample of 200 classroom teachers who were members of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers. Usable returns were obtained from 72 percent of the teachers. The statistical treatment of the data included the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test.

The findings of the study revealed that the degree of participation teachers perceived they had on a number of professional decisions was significantly different from the degree of participation they preferred to have. Over 74 percent of the teachers felt that at the present time there was no teacher participation on seventeen of the thirty-five decision items. The most preferred style of participation was co-operative, involving the teachers with the administrative authorities in making decisions. The second preferred style was decision-making by the teachers themselves, independent of the administrative authorities.

The three variables that had significant relationships with teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making on a few items were school size, years of training and teaching level. Only slight relationships were observed between teachers' perceptions and their sex, age, teaching experience, and size of the community. No relationships were observed between teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making and marital status and number of years they had taught in their present school.

Significant relationships were observed between the teachers' perceptions of preferred decision-making on a few items and the variables school size and years of training. Age, marital status, teaching experience, teaching level, number of years in the present school and size of the community appeared to have only a slight relationship with teachers' perceptions. No significant relationships were observed between teachers' perceptions of their preferred decision-making and sex.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the executive of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers in Quebec for their support and assistance in conducting this study. Thanks are also extended to the teachers throughout the Province of Quebec who gave of their valuable time in order to respond to the questionnaires used in the study.

Special appreciation is gratefully expressed to the writer's thesis supervisor, Dr. A. Konrad, for his continued encouragement and assistance. His many suggestions and perceptive criticism have added appreciably to the quality of this thesis. The comments and suggestions of the other committee members, Dr. D. Friesen and Dr. A. K. Neufeld, are also acknowledged with gratitude. A special debt is acknowledged to Dr. E. Ratsoy, whose interest in decision-making gave rise to the identification of the problem, and who gave much assistance in the early stages of the project.

Thanks are extended to Mrs. C. Prokop and Mr. D. Precht for their assistance with regard to computer programming.

A word of appreciation is also given to the writer's children, Douglas and Darren, who have borne the inconvenience of living with a part-time father for so long without a word of complaint.

Finally, the writer has pleasure in acknowledging the great debt he owes his wife, Joann, not only for her typing, but also for her unfailing love and unselfish support of a project that at times was a most unfair rival.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM	1
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	5
THE PROBLEM	6
ASSUMPTIONS	8
LIMITATIONS	8
DELIMITATIONS	9
DEFINITION OF TERMS	9
Decision-making	9
Degree of Participation	9
Teachers	10
The Administrative Authority	10
OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	12
RELATED LITERATURE ON PARTICIPATION	12
The Concept of Participation	12
Psychological Perspective on Participation	14
Participation in Industry	16
Advantages of Group Decision-Making	17
RELATED RESEARCH ON PARTICIPATION	18
Research Studies in Education	18

Chapter	Page
Personal and Professional Characteristics	22
Sex	22
Age	23
Years of training	24
Teaching experience	24
Teaching level	26
Size of the school	26
Size of the community	27
SUMMARY	27
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	29
THE SUB-PROBLEMS	29
Sub-Problem 1.1	29
Sub-Problem 1.2	29
Sub-Problem 1.3	30
Sub-Problem 2.1	30
Sub-Problem 2.2	30
INSTRUMENTATION	30
Teacher Participation Questionnaire	31
Teacher Information Questionnaire	32
THE SAMPLE	37
DATA COLLECTION	37
DATA ANALYSIS	40
Personal and School Characteristics	40
Actual and Preferred Degrees of Participation	41
Personal and School Characteristics and Degrees of Participation	42

Chapter	Page
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	45
ACTUAL AND PREFERRED DEGREES OF PARTICIPATION .	45
Sub-Problem 1.1	45
Sub-Problem 1.2	58
Sub-Problem 1.3	62
ACTUAL DECISION-MAKING AND PERSONAL AND SCHOOL VARIABLES	66
Sex	66
Age	72
Marital Status	73
Years of Training	73
Teaching Experience	74
Teaching Level	75
Years in Present School	81
Size of the School	81
Size of the Community	87
PREFERRED DECISION-MAKING AND PERSONAL AND SCHOOL VARIABLES	88
Sex	88
Age	89
Marital Status	89
Years of Training	95
Teaching Experience	96
Teaching Level	96
Years in Present School	102
Size of the School	103

Chapter	Page
Size of the Community	109
SUMMARY	109
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	113
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	113
The Problem	113
Instrumentation	114
The Sample	114
Treatment of the Data	114
Findings	115
CONCLUSIONS	116
IMPLICATIONS	119
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY	124
APPENDIX A (Questionnaire)	135
APPENDIX B (Correspondence)	142

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Decision Items Pertaining to School Organization	33
2.	Decision Items Pertaining to the Teaching Profession	34
3.	Decision Items Pertaining to Pupil Personnel	34
4.	Decision Items Pertaining to Elementary and Secondary School Curriculum	35
5.	Decision Items Pertaining to the Teacher Personnel	36
6.	Personal-Professional Characteristics of Population by Percentages	38
7.	Frequency and Percentage Distributions for Each Item of the Actual and Preferred Scales of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire	46
8.	Modal Levels of Teachers' Actual Decision-Making	56
9.	Modal Levels of Teachers' Preferred Decision-Making	60
10.	Probabilities Associated With Z Scores on the Wilcoxon Test	64
11.	Teachers' Perceptions of Their Actual Degree of Participation in the Decision Items by Sex, Age, Marital Status and Years of Training	67
12.	Teachers' Perceptions of Their Actual Degree of Participation in the Decision Items by Teaching Experience, Teaching Level, and Years Taught in Present School	76
13.	Teachers' Perceptions of Their Actual Degree of Participation in the Decision Items by Teachers in School and Size of Community	82
14.	Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preferred Degree of Participation in the Decision Items by Sex, Age, Marital Status and Years of Training	90

Table

Page

15. Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preferred Degree of Participation in the Decision Items by Teaching Experience, Teaching Level, and Years Taught in Present School 97
16. Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preferred Degree of Participation in the Decision Items by Teachers in School and Size of Community 104

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

The purposes of this chapter are to introduce the problem under study, state the purposes and significance of the study, and delineate the main problem and its related sub-problems. The limitations and delimitations of the study are stated, and the major terms used in the study are defined. The chapter concludes with an overview of the complete thesis.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most prominent issues in the general field of organizational theory and analysis during this last decade has been the desire of individuals and groups to be involved in or at least to influence the decision-making which affects their conditions of work and their general welfare. This phenomenon, which appeared to be one aspect of wide spread societal unrest in the late 1960's, was evidenced in the strident rhetoric of dissent, the "body rhetoric" of sit-ins, lie-ins, marches and strikes, all inexorably creating the tensions, turmoil, and conflict which seemed to be endemic to many of the large monolithic organizations.

Recent organizational analysts have deemed it advisable and

feasible to shift the focus of decision-making by individual hierarchical authorities to decision-making by individuals, groups, or committees who will be the very persons who are to execute those decisions (Argyris, 1966; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Griffiths, 1962). Schein (1965:65) has concluded that:

. . . both for productivity and for the satisfaction and psychological growth of employees, the superiority of supervisory strategies which involve employee participation in decision making are now sufficient to suggest strongly that more shared decision making, greater influence for employees, and power-equalization should be seriously considered for many kinds of organizations.

In the educational organization context, classroom teachers have also been very militant in their desire for a more active role in the decision-making process (Anderson, 1966; Belasco and Alutto, 1969; Findley, 1968; Miklos, 1970). Many school systems that have been cognizant of these professional aspirations of teachers have expeditiously decentralized their decision-making procedures to the school and classroom level, allowing teachers to participate in decisions that are of central concern to them. However, there is some evidence that teachers want the extent and type of participation to vary considerably with the different decision tasks (Simpkins and Friesen, 1969). Also, some teachers desire more involvement, others desire less, and still others desire neither more nor less (Alutto and Belasco, 1972).

II. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions that classroom teachers had of their actual and preferred degrees of participation in a number of professional decisions. Whether teachers have heeded the exhortations of their professional associations to drop their passivity and engage in significant decision-making was a point to be determined by this study. As Katz and Kahn (1966:380) point out:

Participation has become something of a shibboleth in our society and everything from consultative management to group decision is therefore seen through rosy glasses. There are, of course, degrees and types of participation.

A second purpose of this study was to determine what relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degrees of involvement in decision-making, and their personal and school characteristics. In other words, this study would "identify the decisional participation needs of the various substrata within a teaching population" (Alutto and Belasco, 1972:28). This is an area of educational research where there appeared to be a dearth of empirical information.

A third purpose of this study was to determine whether the democratization of education as proposed by the Parent Report and as legislated by Regulation Number 1 of the Department of Education has become evident in participatory decision-making at the school and classroom levels in the Province of Quebec. The Parent Report, the Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec, represented a promising blueprint

for genuine reform in public education (Lavery, 1972:166). In response to a recommendation of the Report, the Quebec Government created a Department of Education in 1964 which was structured so as to balance central leadership with widespread participation. This philosophy was apparent in the First Report of the Minister of Education (1965:21):

The structure of the Department provides for organic collaboration in the development of educational policy on the part of teachers, administrators, and groups representing every sphere of social and economic activity.

Regulation 1 of the Department of Education granted further autonomy to the teaching force. As Education Weekly, the official bulletin of the Quebec Department of Education, reported (1965:144):

. . . by means of Regulation Number 1, the Department of Education aims at promoting, within the elementary and secondary schools of Quebec, a form of self-government, that is to say, (sic) at placing the responsibility for pedagogical decisions in the hands of those who will actually carry them out in the classroom with their pupils.

In the 1968 Collective Agreement signed with the Government, teachers were also given a voice in the administration of schools by virtue of the school councils which were to be instituted for every school. The councils were to be comprised of representatives of the community, three to nine staff members, and the principal of the school. The broad mandate given the councils was that they were to be a consultative body "on the ways and means of applying in the school, decisions of a pedagogical or disciplinary nature emanating from the school board (Little, 1968:14).

In conclusion, then, this study could provide empirical evidence on which to base an evaluation of the Quebec Department of

Education's attempt at participatory democracy in the increased involvement of teachers in decision-making.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

After reviewing the literature and research relating to teacher participation in decision-making it was apparent to this researcher that there was a paucity of data on the discrepancy between teachers' actual and preferred degrees of participation in specific decision items. On the other hand, there appeared to be a substantial amount of research on the absolute rates of participation on global decisions grouped under curriculum teaching personnel, school organization, pupil discipline and control, and the teaching profession (Corriveau, 1968; Clarke, 1970). Some researchers feel that the former method yields a clearer indication of the decisional participation needs of teachers (Alutto and Belasco, 1972), so it is hoped that the results of this study will explicitly augment the previous research findings on teacher participation in decision-making.

The findings of the study could be applicable to the administrative authorities at both the system level and the school level, for the teachers in the sample should clearly indicate on the various decision items whether they prefer more participation, less participation, or no change in the current degree of participation. This would undoubtedly assist school principals in deciding under what conditions the staff should be asked to participate and who

should constitute the decision-making groups. As a consequence, then, the principals would be able to determine the staff's "zone of indifference" which Bridges (1967) defines as those areas in which staff members do not wish to participate and will accept administrative decisions without question.

Finally, this study is a continuation of the research on the participatory decision-making of Quebec teachers which was conducted by Massé (1969) and Corriveau (1969). These two researchers carried out their studies with French Catholic teachers and principals who were members of the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec (C.E.Q.), while this researcher was concerned with the English Protestant segment who belong to the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers (P.A.P.T.).

IV. THE PROBLEM

The problem investigated by this study was to determine what perceptions classroom teachers had of their actual and preferred degrees of participation in a number of decisions that pertained to pupil personnel, teacher personnel, the teaching profession, the curriculum in elementary and secondary schools, and school organization.

More specifically, the problem was broken down into four researchable sub-problems.

Sub-Problem 1.1

What are the teachers' perceptions as to how decisions are actually made on each of the thirty-five decision items specified by

the study?

Sub-Problem 1.2

What are the teachers' perceptions as to how they would prefer the decisions to be made on each of the thirty-five decision items specified by the study?

Sub-Problem 1.3

Is there a significant difference between the actual degree of participation teachers perceive they have on each of these thirty-five decision items, and the degree of participation they would prefer to have?

Sub-Problem 2.1

What relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of their actual degrees of participation on each of these decision items and such variables as sex, age, marital status, academic and professional training, teaching experience, grade level taught, length of time in the present school, number of teachers in the school, size of the town or city in which the school is situated?

Sub-Problem 2.2

What relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of their preferred degrees of participation on each of these decision items and such variables as sex, age, marital status, academic and professional training, teaching experience, grade level taught, length of time in the present school, number of teachers in the school, and size of the town or city in which the school is situated?

V. ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this study, the methodological assumptions were:

1. The two instruments used yielded reliable and valid results.
2. The respondents had the knowledge necessary to complete the questionnaires and their perceptions of the locus of decision-making were indicative of the current situation.
3. The four degrees of teacher involvement in decision-making on the Teacher Participation Questionnaire were continuous in nature from "No Teacher Participation" to "Teacher (s) Decision."

VI. LIMITATIONS

This study had the following limitations:

1. The findings of this study and their subsequent generalizations were limited to the population sampled.
2. The number of decision items on the Teacher Participation Questionnaire was limited to thirty-five, so the scope of the decision-making of teachers was somewhat constrained.
3. The four degrees of teacher participation in decision-making on the Teacher Participation Questionnaire limited the choice of response of the teachers.

VII. DELIMITATIONS

This study had the following delimitations:

1. It was limited to a random sample of teachers belonging to the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers in Quebec. Principals, vice-principals, librarians, guidance counsellors, or any other members of a school staff who taught in a classroom less than fifty percent of their time were not included in this study.

2. The data for this study were compiled in June, 1969, when the questionnaires were completed. Therefore, the findings do not necessarily apply to other situations or to other periods of time.

VIII. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study, the following terms were defined in this manner:

Decision-making

It is basically a process involving a sequence of steps whereby one selects the most promising of the available alternatives in order to prepare the way for effective action (Ratsoy, 1968:9).

Degree of Participation

This is the extent of teacher involvement in the decision-making process in regards to the thirty-five decision items on the Actual Participation Scale and the Preferred Participation Scale.

Four degrees of personal participation were defined as:

1. No teacher participation. Teachers do not participate in the decision-making process, and the decision is made entirely by the administrative authorities.

2. Advice of teachers. The administrative authorities make the decision after consultation with an individual teacher or group of teachers.

3. Co-operative decision. Teachers and the administrative authority together make the decision.

4. Teacher(s') decision. A teacher or group of teachers make the decision independently.

Teachers

This term refers to members of a school staff who are engaged in classroom teaching either at the Kindergarten, Elementary, or Secondary levels for at least fifty percent of their time.

The Administrative Authority

This is a very broad term used by Massé (1969) to include the principal and assistant principals of schools, the central office administrative staffs of school boards, school board members, the Department of Education's staff, or the Minister of Education.

IX. OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

Chapter I has introduced the study, presented the purpose and significance of the study, and stated the problem, sub-problems, assumptions, limitations and delimitations of the study. Definitions of selected terms used in the study were also put forward.

The remainder of the thesis is organized in the following manner. Chapter II presents a review of the literature and research pertinent to the topic under investigation. Chapter III describes the research methodology used in the study. Chapter IV contains the analyses and discussions of the results of the study, and Chapter V concludes with a summary of the study, a statement of the main conclusions and implications arising from the study, and some suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of recent literature and research findings that are pertinent to the problem under study. Significant articles and research studies are summarized under the following headings: Related Literature on Participation, Psychological Perspectives of Participation, Related Research on Participation in Industry and in Education, and finally, the Relationship of Personal and Professional Characteristics to Decision-making.

I. RELATED LITERATURE ON PARTICIPATION

The Concept of Participation

The topic of teacher participation in decision-making and increased autonomy for teachers has received considerable attention in the literature of industrial psychologists, and of leaders in the various teachers' organizations. Wilhelms (1967:68), writing about participation as it pertains to professional teachers, states:

They've had enough of being little cogs in a big machine, and they don't intend to be driven in circles by anybody. More important, they respect themselves as professional experts and intend to speak as professionals in all the important decisions of the school.

A prominent writer on teacher professionalism in Alberta, Clarke (1968:15), writes that "professionalism requires and demands that the professional have a voice in all decisions which determine the practice of the profession. This is what teachers are demanding."

Griffiths et al (1962) have encouraged practicing administrators to have decisions made as close to the source of effective action as possible, and Griffiths (1966:108), himself has made the following contention:

. . . 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.

In contrast to such writers as Wallett (1966), Stinnett et al (1966) and Corwin (1965), who have vaguely indicated that teachers should decide on matters that generally affect their work or their pupils, Lieberman (1956:91) has been most explicit in delineating what he feels should be the scope of teacher decision-making:

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.

However, in spite of the promulgations of organizational theorists to decentralize the decision-making processes in addition

to the exhortations of educational leaders to the teachers to become involved, Miklos (1970) claims that the degree of teacher participation has not yet reached the feasible or desirable level.

Psychological Perspective on Participation

Owens (1970:88) contends that such social and industrial psychologists as Argyris, McGregor, Maslow and Herzberg have been most influential in developing a concept that "organizational behavior is strongly affected by social influences and the need for the individual to control himself."

The higher psychological needs of Maslow's (1954) motivational hierarchy are critical in an analysis of participation and psychological growth. The two social-emotional needs of esteem and self-actualization are the prepotent ones, once the physiological, safety and social needs of an individual are fairly well satisfied. Maslow (1954:90) states that the self-esteem need includes " . . . the need for independence and freedom" and also " . . . a desire for strength, for achievement, for mastery and competence, for confidence in the face of the world."

Self-actualization is the need to maximize one's potential, whatever it may be. According to Maslow (1954: 91-92), self-actualization refers to

. . . a man's desire for self-fulfillment, namely to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially. This tendency might be phrased as the desire to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming.

This need is so critical, that Maslow feels that it must be met before an individual can attain psychological health (Maslow, 1966:308).

Porter (1963) slightly alters Maslow's needs hierarchy by adding a need for autonomy between the self-esteem and self-actualization needs. As Sergiovanni et al (1973:57) claim, " . . . the need for autonomy - the desire for control over one's environment or destiny - seems particularly important for school professionals."

Herzberg (1960) stresses the importance of these higher needs to the extent that he feels the attainment of them enhances an individual's self-concept, thus leading to feelings of self-confidence and personal worth. Conversely, Herzberg believes that the repression of the needs leads to feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, and alienation.

In a somewhat similar manner, Argyris (1960) believes that there is a lack of congruency between the needs of healthy individuals and the demands of formal organizations. A formal organization creates an environment where employees have no control over their workaday world: they are expected to be passive, dependent, subordinate; they are expected to have a short-time perspective, and they are expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure (Argyris, 1960). Argyris feels that these characteristics are incongruent to the ones healthy human beings desire and, instead, are much more congruent with the needs of infants in our culture. Consequently, adults tend to experience frustration, failure, and conflict because their self-actualization is blocked. Argyris believes that a style of employee-centered or participative leadership where the workers are

meaningfully involved in decision-making, " . . . can go a long way toward ameliorating the situation" (Argyris, 1960:331).

A statement by Archambault (1967:37) appears to bring together the various points on the psychology of participation.

Where teachers have identified with the institution and have internalized the institution's goals as their own, the probability of the institution reaching its goals is enhanced. Participation in institutional decision-making seems to promote this identification.

Participation in Industry

One of the earliest documented studies on member participation was conducted by Coch and French (1948) in a textile factory that was experiencing serious and chronic employee resistance to method and job changes. Four groups of employees were established. The first was a control group that underwent modifications of their jobs in the usual way. The second group used a system of participation through representation, while the third and fourth groups had a smaller number of members who all participated in making the decisions concerning the design of their new jobs. Thirty-two days after the changes, the production of the participatory groups had more than doubled, while there was an absolute decline in the production of the control group. Some other positive consequences of this participative approach were reported by Tannenbaum (1966:89) who claimed that " . . . aggression toward management decreased markedly, turnover dropped to a minimum level, and a sense of identification with the work and with the company increased."

In a Norwegian replication of the Coch and French study,

French, Israel and As (1960) found that the experimental groups that participated in the decision-making at a particular factory did not exceed the productivity of the control group, but they did become faster learners. The researchers also discovered that employees who were more favorably influenced by participation firmly believed that their involvement was legitimate and not simply tokenism on the part of management.

Morse and Reimer (1956) reported data that they had collected over a one-year period on the relationship between employee participation in organizational decision-making and their individual satisfaction and productivity in a large industrial firm. Two experimental groups of office workers were given increased decision-making in the organization of the company. In two control groups which were hierarchically controlled, upper management was given an increased role in the decision-making processes. The results showed that all groups increased productivity, and the greater increases were in the autocratically controlled group. However, it was evident that employee satisfaction increased significantly in the participative group, and decreased significantly in the group that was hierarchically controlled.

Advantages of Group Decision-Making

The writings of several authorities in organizational and industrial psychology attest to the fact that group participation in decision-making is much superior to individual decision-making.

Massarik and Tannenbaum (1961:343) suggest the following advantages:

1. A higher rate of output and increased quality of product . . . as a result of greater personal effort and attention on the part of subordinates.
2. A reduction in turnover, absenteeism, and tardiness.
3. A reduction in the number of grievances and more peaceful manager-subordinate and manager-union relations.
4. Greater ease in the management of subordinates. Fewer managers may be necessary, the need for close supervision may be reduced, and less disciplinary action may be called for.
5. The improved quality of managerial decision. It is seldom, if ever, possible for managers to have knowledge of all alternatives and all consequences related to the decisions which they must make. Because of the existence of barriers to the upward flow of information in most enterprises, much valuable information possessed by subordinates never reaches their managers.

According to Collins and Guetzkow (1964:52), two facts that contribute to the superiority of group decision-making are: (1) the group will have access to more extensive resources than an individual member, and (2) group products will frequently be superior because the pooling of individual judgments eliminates random error. This error correcting mechanism and its contribution to the efficacy of group decision-making is elaborated on by Bridges, et al (1968:318):

It is not easy for an individual to detect mistakes in his thinking: He brings a set perspective to the problem-solving situation, which militates against his seeing the problem from another perspective. When a number of individuals are working on a common task, the chances that an error in thinking will be detected are increased, because the other people bring different assumptions, frames of reference, experiences, and knowledge to bear on the problem.

II. RELATED RESEARCH ON PARTICIPATION

Research Studies in Education

One of the earliest studies conducted on the realities of teacher participation in decision-making was undertaken by Sharma

(1954) in twenty school districts distributed in eighteen states of the United States. His sample of 568 teachers clearly indicated that the teachers desired more extensive involvement in decision-making than they had at the time of the study. The teachers wanted more autonomy for individual schools and felt that they should assume professional responsibility for all activities concerned with instruction and curriculum. The respondents felt that such decisions as determining the objectives for both the total instructional program and particular subject matter fields as well as determining what materials should be used for a subject or class, should be almost the exclusive domain of the teachers.

In a study of the extent of teacher participation in the administration of the public schools of Mississippi, Walters (1967) found that their involvement was quite limited. The largest percentage (87.2%) of teachers believed that on instructional and curriculum development practices, the administrative staffs should share the decision-making roles with teachers more frequently than they did at the time of the study. Few teachers wished to share in decisions pertaining to the administration of the school plant, school transportation, and to the general administration of the school.

Three Oregon communities were the loci for a comprehensive research project by Carson et al (1967) on teacher decision-making in educational affairs as well as in the economy, local government and public recreation areas of the communities. The results that are pertinent to this present study indicated that the teachers in

the three communities did not participate extensively in educational matters and furthermore, they did not " . . . aspire toward a powerful role in decision-making in most educational questions." The researchers astutely concluded that the low levels of participation of the respondents and their low aspirations for involvement were most disturbing to the educational leaders in universities and professional associations who have continuously exhorted teachers to become more actively involved in educational decision-making.

In recent years in Western Canada, there have been several research studies investigating teachers' perceptions of their actual degree of decision-making and comparing this with their preferred degree of involvement. In a speech at an Educational Administrators' Conference, McBeath (1970) reported on his study of teachers' perceptions of the levels at which decisions were made concerning the educational program in the elementary and secondary schools of Saskatchewan. His findings indicated that most educational program decisions were at that time being made at the Department of Education level. However, there was overwhelming agreement amongst his respondents that fewer decisions should be made at that point in the hierarchy, and instead more decisions should be made at the school and classroom levels.

Hawley (1969) carried out a similar study with teachers in a southern Alberta county school system, and obtained results consistent with those of McBeath. On each of the fifteen curriculum decision items considered in the study, there were

significant differences between actual and preferred levels of decision-making. The teachers in his study clearly indicated that they wanted the decision-making levels to shift from the provincial, system, or school level to either the school or classroom levels.

In his doctoral study at the University of Alberta, Simpkins (1968) analysed the perceived and preferred degrees of participation in decision-making of 343 teachers in fourteen urban schools of Alberta. The three decision-making sources considered were the individual teachers, the formal staff group, and the higher official administrative authority, from the principal upward. There were remarkable differences between the perceived and preferred degrees of participation on school matters external to the classroom. Also, the teachers appeared to want their involvement to vary according to type of task activity on which they had to make a decision. On matters like classroom management, determining the detailed content of the curriculum, or making arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling, the respondents felt the individual teacher should be the one involved. On the other hand, the respondents felt that the formal staff group should be primarily involved in deciding on school rules and regulations for the general student body, on the teaching load and other duties for teachers, and on the allocation of money to the teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.

Massé (1969) also conducted an investigation into the actual and preferred degrees of teacher participation in decision-making. His sample consisted of 655 French Catholic teachers in Quebec who were members of the Corporation des Enseignants de Quebec. His

findings were similar to those of Simpkins (1968) in that his sample of teachers also were most desirous of a greater degree of participation than they had at the time of the study. Over 50 percent of the teachers sampled indicated that they had no participation in twenty-seven of the thirty-five decision items. The preferred style of participation appeared to be collegial involvement, where teachers and the administrative authorities made the decisions together. Complete autonomy in decision-making was not a prime requisite for the teachers either, for on only seven decision items out of thirty-five did 25 percent or more of the teachers ask for teacher autonomy in arriving at a decision.

Personal and Professional Characteristics

Sex. The individual's sex has been shown to be a significant variable in decision-making in a number of educational research studies. Corriveau (1969) found that the male respondents desired much more involvement than females in decision-making. Sex made significant differences on seven decision items, four of them dealing with the teaching profession. This supports the contention of Ingram (1965) that males were more highly committed to the teachers' professional organization than females.

Hawley (1969) reported that sex was a significant variable in the preferred degree of decision-making of teachers on curriculum items, with the males desiring much more involvement than the females in decisions at the classroom level. Francoeur (1963) also found that male teachers were consistently more dissatisfied with

A

their lack of involvement in decision-making than were the female teachers. A qualification was added to this dimension by Duncan (1959) and Wallach and Kogan (1959), who claimed that sex was an important variable in decision-making only when the task had a particular masculine or feminine connotation associated with it.

Age. Research findings concerning age and its relationship with decision-making preferences are somewhat contradictory. Both Corriveau (1969) and Hawley (1969) reported that age had a significant relationship with the perceptions of the preferred decision-making of their respondents. There were significant differences on eight decision items on Corriveau's questionnaire and on six items on Hawley's, which both researchers felt were due to the varieties in age of the respondents. However, neither researcher could detect a consistent pattern in the differences; that is, younger teachers did not always seem to prefer more involvement in decision-making than did the older teachers. In contrast to these findings, a study conducted in two school districts located in Western New York State (Alutto and Belasco, 1972) found that the younger males in the teaching force had the highest levels of decisional deprivation; that is, they desired more participation in decision-making than they currently possessed. These same males also indicated that they had the highest levels of role conflict and possessed the most favorable attitudes toward more militant activities such as collective bargaining, strikes and membership in a union rather than a professional association.

At variance with these findings, were those of both Blacker (1971) and Clarke (1970). In studies of two varied Alberta populations, they concluded that sex had no significant relationship with the preferences of decision-making patterns of their respondents.

Years of academic and professional education research evidence on the relationship between the number of years of education of teachers and their preferences for involvement in decision making indicates that this variable has only a moderate effect on their preferences. In Hawley's (1969) study, differences attributed to years of training were noted on only three decision items while Corriveau (1969) noted only four items that were affected in his study. However, Blacker (1971) noted stronger differences in his research, and he concluded that years of training had a very significant relationship with perceptions of preferred decision-making.

Teaching experience. The demographic background characteristic, teaching experience, has been used in a variety of recent educational studies to determine whether there was any relationship between it and teachers' drive for more professional autonomy or more participation in decision-making that affects their work. Unfortunately, the findings of the various studies are at variance with each other.

Two prominent Albertan educators, who have been most prolific in their writings concerning the teaching profession, claim that the teachers with fewer years of experience are the most dissatisfied

with the state of the teaching profession. This dissatisfaction they attribute to the lack of opportunities for meaningful involvement in decision-making and its concomitant lack of autonomy in the classroom. Clarke (1968) claims that these militant professionals or "Young Turks" usually have only five years of experience or less. In a similar vein, Keeler (1970:24) states that "there seems to be more dissatisfaction among teachers new to the profession than teachers who have been in the field for over seven years."

On the basis of empirical evidence, however, Francoeur (1963) reported that the teachers with more experience were the ones most dissatisfied with their degree of involvement in curriculum decisions. Corriveau (1969), Hawley (1969) and Blacker (1971) all found that there were significant relationships between years of teaching and their preferred degree of involvement in decision-making. However, none of the above researchers was able to identify a consistent pattern among the differences in decision-making as a result of the varieties in the teaching experiences of the respondents. Similar results were reported by Moir (1971) concerning a study on teacher militancy conducted by Gamble in a Calgary school system. The latter researcher concluded that teachers with less than one year of experience were not more militantly oriented in their demands for more involvement in decision-making than were teachers with two or three years of experience. The findings of an Oregon study on teacher participation led the researchers, Carson et al (1967:56) to conclude that:

. . . the neophyte teacher has low aspirations for participation. During the next few years of teaching his aspirations rise, reaching a peak between his fourth and ninth year of experience. As his occupational socialization continues, he sees less participation at decision-making levels as appropriate.

Teaching level. According to the results of recent research on participative decision-making by teachers, there is a definite relationship between teaching level and the teachers' perceptions of their preferred degree of involvement in decision-making. Corriveau (1969), Hawley (1969), and Blacker (1971) all reported significant differences related to this variable, with Corriveau and Hawley reporting that secondary school teachers wanted decidedly more involvement than elementary school teachers. Similarly, Francoeur (1963) found that secondary teachers were more dissatisfied with their current status of involvement in curriculum decisions than were elementary teachers. Alutto and Belasco (1972) were also in accord with the above findings. They concluded that, in their sample of New York State teachers, the secondary school teachers had the highest levels of decisional deprivation, while elementary teachers experienced decisional saturation.

Size of the school. One situational variable which has been reported to influence the preferences of teachers for greater involvement in decision-making is the size of the school in which the teachers are situated. Corriveau (1969) noted marked differences on eight decision items due to size of the school, while Hawley (1969) noted differences on three decision items. Both researchers indicated that teachers in the larger schools wished to

be involved in decision-making to a greater extent than did those in the smaller schools. Blacker (1971) reported that significant relationships were observed between teachers' perceptions of preferred decision-making and school size, but could not detect any systematic occurrences of the differences.

Size of the community. The final situational factor to be considered in this review of research is the size of the community in which the school is situated. Only four researchers have reported that it has some relationship to differences in decision-making preferences. Corriveau (1969) reported that only one decision item was affected by the size of the school while in Hawley's (1969) study, five decision items were affected. Alutto and Belasco (1972) claimed that there were decided differences in their teachers' preferences for decision-making with the rural teachers having the highest levels of decisional deprivation and, consequently, desiring widely increased participation. On the other hand, teachers in the urban school districts indicated they were experiencing decisional saturation, and were thus seeking less involvement.

III. SUMMARY

The literature and research studies that were cited in this chapter indicate that the normative role of teachers should be to participate in decisions of a professional nature. Two basic reasons were: it is psychologically healthy for mature individuals

to participate in order to satisfy their needs for esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization, and, secondly, the professional teacher now has the expertise to be involved in decisions that affect the very nature of his work.

Studies indicated that the degree of participation teachers would like to have in decision-making is significantly different from the amount of participation they presently have.

There appeared to be a need for a further study to examine the relationships between personal and professional characteristics of teachers and their actual and preferred degrees of participation. Some of the research findings on this point were at variance with each other, so a further study is needed to arrive at a clearer understanding of these intervening variables.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter indicates the sub-problems of the study, and describes both the instruments used and the sample of the study. The chapter concludes with a description of how the data were collected and what statistical treatments were used in the analysis of the data.

I. THE SUB-PROBLEMS

The five sub-problems identified in Chapter 1 are restated below.

Sub-Problem 1.1

What are the teachers' perceptions as to how decisions are actually made on each of the thirty-five decision items specified by the study?

Sub-Problem 1.2

What are the teachers' perceptions as to how they would prefer the decisions to be made on each of the thirty-five decision items?

Sub-Problem 1.3

Is there a significant difference between the actual degree of participation teachers perceive they have on each of the thirty-five decision items, and the degree of participation they would prefer to have?

Sub-Problem 2.1

What relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of their actual degrees of participation on each of these decision items and such variables as sex, age, marital status, academic and professional training, teaching experience, grade level taught, length of time in the present school, number of teachers in the school, size of the town or city in which the school is situated?

Sub-Problem 2.2

What relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of their preferred degrees of participation on each of these decision items and such variables as sex, age, marital status, academic and professional training, teaching experience, grade level taught, length of time in the present school, number of teachers in the school, and size of the town or city in which the school is situated?

II. INSTRUMENTATION

Two instruments were used to collect the data: a Teacher Participation Questionnaire and a Teacher Information

Questionnaire. Both instruments were developed by Massé and used in his doctoral study of the decision-making characteristics of a sample of French speaking teachers in the Province of Quebec (Massé, 1969). Massé's French version was translated into English by this researcher. The accuracy of the translation was verified by three bilingual graduate students from Quebec who were in the Educational Administration Department during the winter of 1969. Copies of the two questionnaires may be found in Appendix A.

Teacher Participation Questionnaire

This questionnaire consisted of thirty-five decision items, each item accompanied by two subscales, an Actual Teacher Participation subscale and a Preferred Teacher Participation subscale. On each of these two subscales, respondents were asked to indicate one of four degrees of teacher-participation in the decision-making process for that particular decision item. The four degrees of teacher participation were:

1. No Teacher Participation. Teachers could not participate or should not participate, and the decision was made entirely by the administrative authorities.
2. Advice of Teachers. The administrative authorities made or should have made the decision after consultation with an individual teacher or with a group of teachers.
3. Co-operative Decision. Teachers and the administrative authority together made or should have made the

decision.

4. Teacher(s)'-Decision. A teacher or group of teachers made or should have made the decision independently.

The thirty-five items on the Teacher Participation Questionnaire were selected by Massé from related research findings and from proposals put forward to the Quebec government by the various teaching associations during contract negotiations (Massé, 1969). The various decisions pertained either to school organization, the teaching profession, pupil personnel, teacher personnel, or elementary and secondary curriculum. Their allocations to these various categories are shown in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Teacher Information Questionnaire

This questionnaire was a modified version of Masse's (1969), so that it was suitable to members of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers (P.A.P.T.) in the Province of Quebec, rather than members of the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec. Seven of the nine items on the questionnaire remained the same as on Massé's so that a comparison between the two teachers' associations as regards their responses on the Teacher Participation Questionnaire could be made at a later date. The nine items requested the respondents to indicate their sex, age, marital status, teaching experience, teaching level, type of academic and professional training, length of time in the present school, number of

TABLE 1

DECISION ITEMS PERTAINING TO SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

Item No.	Decision Items
10.	Determining the length of teaching periods.
13.	Establishing educational specifications for new school buildings.
16.	Drawing up timetables for the school.
17.	Deciding which teachers will be members of the school council.
21.	Determining the number of periods one should teach per week.
23.	Determining the need for specialist-consultants or coordinators in a school system.
27.	Determining the amount of the school budget which should be spent for instructional purposes.
28.	Determining the priorities in relation to educational research.
32.	Determining the formal structures to be established in the school; i.e. the distribution of workload, the formation of departments, the establishment of committees or councils in the school.

TABLE 2

DECISION ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Item No.	Decision Items
3.	Determining which individual teachers require further professional education.
5.	Evaluating teachers' professional qualifications.
6.	Suspending a teacher's diploma.
14.	Determining priorities in the retraining of teachers.
19.	Determining program content for teacher workshops.
22.	Drawing up a code of ethics to which teachers must adhere.
30.	Determining the content of teacher training programs.
33.	Determining the minimum requirements for entry to the teaching profession.

TABLE 3

DECISION ITEMS PERTAINING TO PUPIL PERSONNEL

Item No.	Decision Items
8.	Establishing regulations concerning student behavior in school.
25.	Deciding on the methods to be used in grouping students.

TABLE 4
DECISION ITEMS PERTAINING TO ELEMENTARY AND
SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Item No.	Decision Items
1.	Introduction of new teaching methods.
2.	Deciding on instructional methods which teachers should use.
4.	Establishing the broad outlines for instructional programs at the secondary or elementary levels.
7.	Organizing extra-curricular activities.
11.	Establishing methods to be used in evaluating students.
15.	Determining the types of assignments to be given to students.
20.	Selecting textbooks.
24.	Introducing new courses of study.
29.	Developing tests and examinations to evaluate student progress.
31.	Selecting teaching materials, audio-visual materials, etc.
34.	Selecting the subjects to be included in the school program.
35.	Determining the subject matter to be taught.

TABLE 5

DECISION ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE TEACHER PERSONNEL

Item No.	Decision Items
9.	Assigning the subject or subjects which a teacher will teach.
12.	Establishing criteria for the evaluation of teacher competency.
18.	Defining objectives for the supervision of teachers.
26.	Deciding the grade level at which individual teachers will teach.

teachers in the school, and the size of the city or town in which the school was located.

III. THE SAMPLE

Permission was requested from the executive of the P.A.P.T. to conduct this research with a sample of their membership, and a request was made for assistance in sampling the population. Permission was granted by the executive to carry out the research project, and Dr. Allana Reid-Smith, the President of the P.A.P.T., took the responsibility of having the questionnaires mailed from the Association's office in Montreal.

The sample of teachers selected for this study consisted of 200 teachers obtained by using a table of random numbers from a total population of 7,200 members of the P.A.P.T. Assistant-principals, principals, librarians, guidance counsellors or any school personnel whose sole responsibility was not teaching either in elementary or secondary schools were not included in the study.

The personal-professional characteristics of the sample are indicated in Table 6.

IV. DATA COLLECTION

The questionnaires were mailed from the Montreal office of the P.A.P.T. with a postage-paid return envelope. One

TABLE 6

PERSONAL-PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
POPULATION BY PERCENTAGES

Variables	Variable Categories	N	%
Sex	Male	70	48.6
	Female	74	51.4
Age	Under 20 years	1	0.7
	20 to 29 years	73	50.7
	30 to 39 years	35	24.3
	40 to 49 years	19	13.2
	50 to 59 years	14	
	60 years or more	2	
Marital Status	Single	47	32.6
	Married	91	63.2
	Other	6	4.2
Academic and Professional Training	Less than 12 years	6	4.2
	12 to 14 years	43	29.9
	15 to 17 years	70	48.6
	18 or more years	25	17.4
Teaching Experience	Less than 2 years	2	1.4
	2 to 4 years	40	27.8
	5 to 7 years	32	22.2
	8 to 10 years	25	17.4
	11 to 13 years	11	7.6
	14 to 16 years	12	8.3
	17 or more years	22	15.3
Teaching Level	Kindergarten	3	2.1
	Elementary	70	48.6
	Secondary	71	49.3

TABLE 6 (continued)

Variables	Variable Categories	N	%
Number of Years in Present School	Less than 1 year	19	13.2
	1 to 3 years	61	42.4
	4 to 6 years	29	20.1
	7 to 9 years	17	11.8
Number of Teachers in School	Less than 10	7	4.9
	10 to 19	24	16.7
	20 to 29	56	38.9
	30 to 39	11	7.6
	40 to 49	9	6.2
	50 or more	37	25.7
Population of Community	1 to 19,999	48	33.3
	20,000 to 39,999	39	27.1
	40,000 and over	57	39.6

reminder was sent to those teachers who had failed to return the questionnaire within one week. The questionnaires were collected by the central office of the P.A.P.T., and forwarded to this researcher. Of the 200 teachers sampled, 144 (72%) returned useable questionnaires.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

The data obtained with the Teacher Participation and Teacher Information Questionnaires were transferred to IBM coding sheets by this researcher. From the answer sheets, the data were transferred to IBM punch cards, each respondent having his data on two cards. Then the following analyses of the data were carried out.

Personal and School Characteristics

In order to determine the characteristics of the individuals who completed the questionnaires, an analysis of the independent variables stipulated in the Teacher Information Questionnaire was carried out by using the Division of Educational Research Services' program NON P1Ø. This statistical program generated the frequency and percentage frequency of responses for each category of the nine variables. Table 6 illustrates the variables analysed, the various categories within those variables, and the frequencies and percentage frequencies corresponding to each category.

Actual and Preferred Degrees of Participation

Sub-problems 1.1 and 1.2 were analysed by the Division of Educational Research's statistical program NON P09. This statistical program determined the frequencies and percentage frequencies of responses on each of the four levels of participation for each decision-making item on the Actual scale and on the Preferred scale.

Sub-problem 1.3 was tested using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test on an item by item basis.

Siegel (1956:75) describes the Wilcoxon as a non-parametric test appropriate for a study involving two related samples. It is a powerful test in that it takes into account the relative magnitude as well as the direction of the differences between two samples. In this study, the two related samples were the teachers' perceptions of their actual degree of participation and the teachers' perceptions of their preferred degree of participation. The samples were considered related in that each individual teacher in the sample signified his or her perceptions on both the actual and preferred participation scales.

A second criterion of the Wilcoxon test was that there must be at least ordinal measurement not only with the pairs of samples but also between the pairs. The four degrees of participation on the Teacher Participation scale were considered to be continuous in nature from "No Teacher Participation" to "Teacher(s') Decision," thus signifying a "greater than" relationship between pairs of degrees of teacher participation.

This relationship gives rise to a rank ordering of degrees of participation, so consequently the participation scale may be considered ordinal.

Since the number of respondents, N, in the sample was larger than 25, the statistic generated by the Wilcoxon test is equivalent to a Z score (Siegel, 1956:79). This deviation from the mean is a Z score, where

$$Z = \frac{T - \mu_T}{\sigma_T} = \frac{T - \frac{N(N+1)}{4}}{\frac{N(N+1)(2N+1)}{24}}$$

and T = sum of the ranks

μ_T = the mean

σ_T = the standard deviation

The Z score is approximately normally distributed with zero mean and unit variance. Its value obtained from the above formula was then used in Table A of Siegel (1956:247) to determine what were the probabilities associated with values as extreme as observed values of Z in the normal distribution.

The Division of Educational Research Services' program NON P05 modified for a large sample, was used to determine the Wilcoxon statistic for each of the thirty-five items on both the Actual and Preferred scales. The level of significance for the Wilcoxon test was set at the .05 level.

Personal and School Characteristics and Degrees of Participation

Sub-problem 2.1 and 2.2 were tested for each item on the two participation scales by means of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-

sample test. This is a test of goodness of fit, and is concerned with cumulative frequencies and the agreement between two sets of sample values (Siegel, 1956:127). In this study the two samples for the test are the responses on the actual participation scale and those on the preferred participation scale.

As mentioned earlier in the text, the data from the two participation scales were ordinal in nature, so this met the requirement of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

This test basically computed the maximum deviation, D_{\max} , between the cumulative frequencies of teachers' responses on the same item where there were two sets of ordinal scores. The significance of this D_{\max} was then determined by calculating a chi square, χ^2 , where

$$\chi^2 = 4 D_{\max}^2 \frac{n_1 n_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

and n_1 = frequency of response in sample one

n_2 = frequency of response in sample two

Table C of Siegel (1956:249) was used to determine the levels of significance of the observed chi square values.

Program NON P01, obtained from the Division of Educational Research Services, was used for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical test. For this test, the level of significance was set at the .05 level.

VI. SUMMARY

In this chapter a description of the instruments used in the study was provided, the sample and method of data collection were described, and the two statistical techniques used in the data analyses were discussed.

English translations of Massé's (1969) Teacher Participation Questionnaire and Teacher Background Questionnaire were the instruments used in the study. The former consisted of thirty-five decision items and two scales, Actual Participation and Preferred Participation. The Teacher Background Questionnaire elicited the personal and professional characteristics of the respondents.

The study was conducted in the Province of Quebec and involved a random sample of 200 classroom teachers in the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers. The questionnaires were distributed and collected by the office staff at the P.A.P.T. head office in Pointe Claire. All responses were coded on IBM computer data cards.

The two statistical techniques that were used in the data analysis were the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

In this chapter the findings of the study are summarized under the headings of the various sub-problems stated in Chapter I.

I. ACTUAL AND PREFERRED DEGREES OF PARTICIPATION

Sub-Problem 1.1

The first sub-problem was to determine what were the teachers' perceptions as to how decisions were being made on each of the thirty-five decision items specified by the study.

Findings. A summary of the response frequencies and percentage frequencies for each of the decision items may be found in Table 7. On eighteen of the thirty-five items, over 50 percent of the teachers felt that there was no teacher participation. Among these eighteen, there were eight decision items in which 83 percent or more of the teachers felt they had no involvement whatsoever. Four of the items, numbers 5, 6, 12 and 33, appear to be concerned with the teaching profession; namely, evaluating teachers' professional qualifications, suspending a teaching diploma, establishing criteria for the evaluation of teaching

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR
EACH ITEM OF THE ACTUAL (A) AND PREFERRED (P) SCALES
OF THE TEACHER PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING											
	No Teacher Participation			Advice of Teachers			Co-operative Decision			Teacher(s') Decision		
	N	%		N	%		N	%		N	%	
1. Introduction of new teaching methods												
A	44	30.6		42	29.2		43	29.9		15	10.4	
P	-	-		8	5.6		111	77.1		25	17.4	
2. Instructional methods for teachers												
A	27	18.8		37	25.7		28	19.4		52	36.1	
P	-	-		5	3.5		61	42.4		78	54.2	
3. Further professional education												
A	95	66.0		6	4.2		8	5.6		35	24.3	
P	7	4.9		12	8.3		74	51.4		51	35.4	
4. Broad outlines for instructional programs												
A	78	54.2		46	31.9		19	13.1		1	.7	
P	0	0		25	17.4		111	77.1		8	5.6	

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING							
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s)' Decision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Evaluating teachers' qualifications	A 124	86.1	8	5.6	12	8.3	0	0
	P 14	9.7	19	13.2	91	63.2	20	13.9
6. Suspending a teacher's diploma	A 136	94.4	5	3.5	2	1.4	1	.7
	P 9	6.3	25	17.4	87	60.4	23	16.0
7. Extra-curricular activities	A	6.3	32	22.2	71	49.3	32	22.2
	P 2	1.4	5	3.5	98	68.1	39	27.1
8. Student behavior in school	A 27	18.8	49	34.0	61	42.4	7	4.9
	P 0	0	12	8.3	125	86.8	7	4.9
9. Subjects which a teacher will teach	A 44	30.6	61	42.4	35	24.3	4	2.8
	P 0	0	7	4.9	116	80.6	21	14.6

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING							
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s') Decision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10. Length of teaching periods								
A	107	74.3	13	9.0	13	9.0	11	7.6
P	4	2.8	18	12.5	100	69.4	22	15.3
11. Evaluating students								
A	36	25.0	55	38.2	35	24.3	18	12.5
P	0	0	12	8.3	93	64.6	39	27.1
12. Evaluation of teacher								
A	128	88.9	11	7.6	5	3.5	0	0
P	10	6.9	13	9.0	94	65.3	27	18.8
13. Specifications for new school buildings								
A	117	81.3	25	17.4	2	1.4	0	0
P	6	4.2	52	36.1	84	58.3	2	1.4

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING								
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s') Decision		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
14. Retraining of teachers	A	115	79.9	19	13.2	8	5.6	2	1.4
	P	5	3.5	30	20.8	96	66.7	13	9.0
15. Student assignments	A	4	2.8	19	13.2	18	12.5	103	71.5
	P	0	0	3	2.1	31	21.5	110	76.4
16. School timetables	A	64	44.4	40	27.8	34	23.6	6	4.2
	P	9	6.3	21	14.6	101	70.1	13	9.0
17. Teachers on school council	A	7	4.9	13	9.0	38	26.4	86	59.7
	P	0	0	6	4.2	37	25.7	101	70.1

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING							
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s') Decision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18. Supervision of teachers								
A	116	80.6	14	9.7	11	7.6	3	2.1
P	7	4.9	22	15.3	95	66.0	20	13.9
19. Content of teacher workshops								
A	29	20.1	44	30.6	36	25.0	35	24.3
P	0	0	12	8.3	77	53.5	55	38.2
20. Selecting textbooks								
A	68	47.2	57	39.6	15	10.4	4	2.8
P	0	0	17	11.8	80	55.6	47	32.6
21. Teacher workload								
A	120	83.3	15	10.4	7	4.9	2	1.4
P	5	3.5	17	11.8	110	76.4	12	8.3

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING								
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s') Decision		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
22. Code of ethics for teachers	A	48	93.3	18	12.5	20	13.9	58	40.3
	P	2	1.4	11	7.6	51	35.4	80	55.6
23. Need for consultants	A	121	84.0	18	12.5	5	3.5	0	0
	P	5	3.5	32	22.2	95	66.0	12	8.3
24. New courses of study	A	81	56.3	50	34.7	12	8.3	1	0.7
	P	0	0	20	13.9	115	79.9	9	6.3
25. Methods of grouping students	A	22	15.3	51	35.4	44	30.6	27	18.8
	P	0	0	8	5.6	93	64.6	43	29.9

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING							
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s') Decision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
26. Teacher assignment								
A	57	39.6	49	34.0	35	24.5	3	2.1
P	2	1.4	17	11.8	104	72.2	21	14.6
27. Budget for instructional purposes								
A	130	90.3	13	9.0	1	0.7	0	0
P	18	12.5	52	36.1	69	47.9	5	3.5
28. Priorities in educational research								
A	119	82.6	20	13.9	3	2.1	2	1.4
P	6	4.2	44	30.6	85	59.0	9	6.3
29. Tests and examinations for students								
A	20	13.9	30	20.8	27	18.8	67	46.5
P	0	0	9	6.3	59	41.0	76	52.8

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING							
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operative Decision		Teacher(s') Decision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Teacher training programs	109	75.7	30	20.8	4	2.8	1	0.7
	3	2.1	34	23.6	86	59.7	21	14.6
31. Selecting materials, audio visual materials, etc.	14	9.7	61	42.4	42	29.2	27	18.8
	0	0	11	7.6	81	56.3	52	36.1
32. Formal structures in the school	88	61.1	39	27.1	17	11.8	0	0
	6	4.2	19	13.2	107	74.3	12	8.3
33. Entry into the teaching profession	122	84.7	22	15.3	0	0	0	0
	7	4.9	36	25.0	67	46.5	34	23.6

TABLE 7 (continued)

DECISION ITEM	LEVELS OF DECISION-MAKING					
	No Teacher Participation		Advice of Teachers		Co-operational Decision Teacher(s)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
34. School program						
A	107	74.3	31	21.5	6	4.2
P	3	2.1	27	18.8	102	75.8
					12	8.3
35. Subject matter to be taught						
A	61	42.4	52	36.1	16	11.1
P	0	0	14	9.7	89	61.8
					41	28.5

competency, and determining the minimum requirements for entry into the teaching profession. The other four items, numbers 21, 23, 27 and 28, appear to be concerned with organizational matters such as determining the number of periods teachers should teach per week, determining the need for consultants, allocating funds to be spent in school budget, and deciding upon the priorities in educational research.

On the other end of the continuum dealing with the degree of teaching participation in decisions, there were five decision items on which the largest percentage of respondents perceived that teachers actually made those decisions by themselves independent of the administrative authorities. Three of these decision items, numbers 2, 15, and 29, were concerned with curriculum matters such as instructional methods teachers should use, student assignments, and test development. One other item, number 17, was an organizational matter concerning the teacher representation on the school council, and the fifth item, number 22, was concerned with the teaching profession, in the drawing up of a code of ethics for teachers.

Table 8 indicates the modal decision-making levels, or the levels at which the greatest number of teachers perceived the decisions being actually made, for each of the thirty-five decision items.

On twenty-two decision items the mode fell at No Teacher Participation, on six items it fell at Advice of Teachers and on two items it fell at Co-operative Decision, where teachers and the

TABLE 8

MODAL LEVELS OF TEACHERS' ACTUAL DECISION-MAKING

Decision Item	Perceived Degree of Participation in Decision-Making
1. New methods	No teachers
2. Methods to use	Teachers
3. Professional education	No teachers
4. Program outlines	No teachers
5. Professional qualifications	No teachers
6. Diploma suspension	No teachers
7. Extra-curricular	Co-operative
8. Student behavior	Co-operative
9. Teacher load	Advice
10. Teaching periods	No teachers
11. Student evaluation	Advice
12. Teacher evaluation	No teachers
13. Building specifications	No teachers
14. Teacher retraining	No teachers
15. Student assignments	Teachers
16. School timetables	No teachers
17. School council	Teachers
18. Teacher supervision	No teachers
19. Teacher workshops	Advice
20. Selecting textbooks	No teachers

TABLE 8 (continued)

Decision Item	Perceived Degree of Participation in Decision-Making
21. Periods taught	No teachers
22. Code of ethics	Teachers
23. Consultants	No teachers
24. New courses of study	No teachers
25. Grouping students	Advice
26. Teacher assignment	Advice
27. School budget	No teachers
28. Research	No teachers
29. Test development	Teachers
30. Training programs	No teachers
31. Selection of material	Advice
32. School organization	No teachers
33. Teaching profession	No teachers
34. Subjects in program	No teachers
35. Subject matter	No teachers

administrative authorities made the decisions together. There were only five items on which the mode fell at Teachers(s') Decision, where the teachers had complete autonomy in making the decisions.

The magnitudes of the modes that fell in the category Advice of Teachers were all less than 50 percent. On the two items that were concerned with teaching personnel, numbers 9 and 26, the modes were 42.4 percent and 34.0 percent. On two items concerned with curriculum, numbers 11 and 31, the modes were 38.2 percent and 42.4 percent. The fifth and sixth decision items that had the mode fall in the category Advice of Teachers were item number 19, a teaching process item, and item number 25, a pupil personnel matter. The magnitudes of the modes were 30.6 percent on item number 19 and 35.4 percent on number 25.

Items 7 and 8 were the two decision items that had the mode fall in the response category Co-operative Decision. The mode on number 7, a curriculum matter dealing with extra-curricular activities, was 49.3 percent, while on item number 8, a pupil personnel matter; it was 42.4 percent.

For the five items that had the mode fall at Teacher(s') Decision, the magnitudes of the modes ranged from 36.1 percent on item number 2, 40.3 percent on item number 22, 46.5 percent on item number 29, 59.7 percent on item number 17, to 71.5 percent on item number 15, a curriculum decision matter.

Sub-Problem 1.2

Sub-problem 1.2 was to determine what were the teachers'

perceptions as to their preferred degree of participation on each of the thirty-five decision items specified by the study.

Findings. A summary of the response frequencies and percentage frequencies at the preferred level for each of the decision items may be found in Table 7. On thirty-five decision items, the largest percentage of teachers for each item preferred the Co-operative style of decision-making with the administrative authorities.

On the remaining five items of the questionnaire, the majority of the teachers preferred complete autonomy in making decisions. On item 2, deciding which instructional methods teachers should use, 54.2 percent of the sample felt that it should be a teacher's decision. On two other items also concerned with curriculum, items 15 and 29, 76.4 percent of the teachers preferred autonomy on item 15 and 52.8 percent preferred autonomy on item number 29. On item number 17, an organizational decision, 70.0 percent of the respondents preferred that teachers by themselves should decide what members of the school staff should be on the school council. The fifth decision item that had the majority of the respondents preferring a teachers' autonomous decision was number 22, a matter concerning the teaching profession. On this item, 55.6 percent of the teachers felt that only teachers should be concerned with drawing up a code of ethics to which they must adhere. The modal levels of the teachers' preferred degrees of decision-making are shown in Table 9. The magnitude of the modes that fell in the Co-operative Decision category on thirty decision

TABLE 9

MODAL LEVELS OF TEACHERS' PREFERRED DECISION-MAKING

Decision Item	Perceived Degree of Participation in Decision-Making
1. New methods	Co-operative
2. Methods to use	Teachers
3. Professional education	Co-operative
4. Program outlines	Co-operative
5. Professional qualifications	Co-operative
6. Diploma suspension	Co-operative
7. Extra-curricular	Co-operative
8. Student behavior	Co-operative
9. Teacher load	Co-operative
10. Teaching periods	Co-operative
11. Student evaluation	Co-operative
12. Teacher evaluation	Co-operative
13. Building specifications	Co-operative
14. Teacher retraining	Co-operative
15. Student assignments	Teachers
16. School timetables	Co-operative
17. School council	Teachers
18. Teacher supervision	Co-operative
19. Teacher workshops	Co-operative
20. Selecting textbooks	Co-operative

TABLE 9 (continued)

Decision Item	Perceived Degree of Participation in Decision-Making
21. Periods taught	Co-operative
22. Code of ethics	Teachers
23. Consultants	Co-operative
24. New courses of study	Co-operative
25. Grouping students	Co-operative
26. Teacher assignment	Co-operative
27. School budget	Co-operative
28. Research	Co-operative
29. Test development	Teachers
30. Training programs	Co-operative
31. Selection of material	Co-operative
32. School organization	Co-operative
33. Teaching profession	Co-operative
34. Subjects in program	Co-operative
35. Subject matter	Co-operative

items ranged from 46.5 percent on item 33 which dealt with entry into the teaching profession to 86.8 percent on item 8, concerned with regulations for student behavior in the schools.

On sixteen of the decision items which had the mode falling at the co-operative level, the percentage of teachers preferring that level was greater than 65 percent. Five of these items appear to be concerned with organizational decisions (numbers 10, 16, 21, 23 and 32). Five seem to be related to curriculum decisions (numbers 1, 4, 7, 24 and 34) and another four to decisions dealing with the teaching personnel (numbers 9, 12, 18 and 26). One other, item 8, related to pupil personnel, and the last one, item 14, was concerned with the teaching profession.

When Table 8 is compared to Table 9, it is apparent that the modal level on twenty-two decision items moved from No Teacher Participation on the actual scale to Co-operative Decision on the Preferred scale. On six other items, the modal level moved from Advice of Teachers to Co-operative Decision.

It is also noteworthy that the teachers in this study rejected the consultation style of decision-making, where advice is sought from the teachers but the final decision is made by the administrative authorities. The respondents perceived consultation as being the style of decision-making actually being used on six items but they indicated that they would much prefer a co-operative style instead.

Sub-Problem 1.3

Sub-problem 1.3 was to determine whether there were

significant differences between the actual degree of participation teachers perceive they have in each of the thirty-five decision items and the degree of participation they would prefer to have.

The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used to assess the significance of the difference between the actual and preferred decision-making levels.

Findings. The Z scores obtained with the Wilcoxon test and their probabilities are presented in Table 10. The results indicated a highly significant difference between the actual and preferred decision-making levels of the teachers on each one of the thirty-five items. In all cases, the probability of the differences occurring by chance was less than 0.001.

Consequently, from the data that were obtained in the study of the first three sub-problems, there was ample evidence to indicate that teachers desired much more involvement in decision-making on matters pertaining to education at the classroom, school, system, and provincial levels. The findings were very consistent with those of Simpkins (1968), Hawley (1969), Clarke (1970), Blacker (1971), and Massé (1969), in that all the above researchers also discovered that teachers desired more participation in decision-making, but they wanted the extent and style of participation to vary with each specific decision.

This present study was involved with English Protestant teachers in Quebec using the identical questionnaire with which Massé sampled French Catholic teachers in the same province. It is interesting to note that more than 25 percent of the English

TABLE 10
PROBABILITIES ASSOCIATED WITH
Z SCORES ON THE WILCOXON TEST

Decision Item	Z Score	Probability
1. New methods	-7.68	0.00
2. Methods to use	-6.72	0.00
3. Professional education	-8.06	0.00
4. Program outlines	-9.21	0.00
5. Professional qualifications	-9.43	0.00
6. Diploma suspension	-10.04	0.00
7. Extra-curricular	-4.28	0.00
8. Student behavior	-7.00	0.00
9. Teacher load	-8.68	0.00
10. Teaching periods	-9.42	0.00
11. Student evaluation	-7.75	0.00
12. Teacher evaluation	-9.86	0.00
13. Building specifications	-9.93	0.00
14. Teacher retraining	-9.77	0.00
15. Student assignments	-3.45	0.00
16. School timetables	-8.15	0.00
17. School council	-3.93	0.00
18. Teacher supervision	-9.47	0.00
19. Teacher workshops	-6.98	0.00
20. Selecting textbooks	-9.44	0.00

TABLE 10 (continued)

Decision Item	Z Score	Probability
21. Periods taught	-9.93	0.00
22. Code of ethics	-6.65	0.00
23. Consultants	-9.93	0.00
24. New courses of study	-9.93	0.00
25. Grouping students	-7.13	0.00
26. Teacher assignment	-8.60	0.00
27. School budget	-9.55	0.00
28. Research	-9.90	0.00
29. Test development	-5.58	0.00
30. Training programs	-9.97	0.00
31. Selection of material	-7.24	0.00
32. School organization	-9.27	0.00
33. Teaching profession	-10.08	0.00
34. Subjects in program	-9.93	0.00
35. Subject matter	-8.97	0.00

teachers desired autonomy in making decisions on the same items as 25 percent of Masse's sample did; namely, items 2, 3, 17, 22 and 29. However, in addition, more than 25 percent of the English Protestant teachers desired autonomy on eight other items as well.

II. ACTUAL DECISION-MAKING AND PERSONAL AND SCHOOL VARIABLES

Sub-problem 2.1 was to determine what relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of their actual degrees of participation on each of thirty-five decision items and such personal and school variables as sex, age, marital status, academic and professional training, teaching experience, grade level taught, length of time in the present school, number of teachers in the school and size of the town or city in which the school is situated.

An item by item analysis was carried out on each of the thirty-five decision items on the Actual Participation Scale using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test. The findings are reported below under each of the nine personal and school variables.

Sex

Significant differences in the Actual Participation Scale were found on only two decision items when the respondents were categorized according to sex. As shown in Table 11, the

TABLE 11

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ACTUAL DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION ITEMS BY
SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS AND YEARS OF TRAINING

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.150	0.036	0.981	0.081	0.051	0.041	0.099
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.161	0.169	0.071	0.036	0.146	0.039	0.116
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.061	0.226	0.169	0.115	0.203	0.015	0.054
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.143	0.057	0.171	0.143	0.057	0.029	0.086
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married (2)	91	1 & 2	0.054	0.136	0.116	0.039	0.070	0.032	0.069
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.063	0.018	0.112	0.180	0.043	0.027	0.171
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.089	0.031	0.167	0.225	0.097	0.041	0.074
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.060	0.146	0.086	0.074	0.140	0.017	0.194

TABLE 11 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.141	0.054	0.093	0.077	0.040	0.163	0.052
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.060	0.067	0.102	0.162	0.075	0.179	0.068
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.181	0.142	0.210	0.037	0.104	0.036	0.124
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.143	0.114	0.143	0.171	0.029	0.143	0.143
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.119	0.036	0.088	0.097	0.027	0.118	0.110
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.157	0.055	0.186	0.231 ^a	0.033	0.286 ^b	0.057
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.131	0.175	0.166	0.291	0.061	0.280	0.177
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.066	0.154	0.094	0.060	0.060	0.029	0.120

^a Significant at the .05 level.^b Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 11 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.054	0.290 ^b	0.200	0.122	0.070	0.057	0.038
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.024	0.247	0.047	0.051	0.060	0.083	0.066
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.090	0.247	0.039	0.086	0.141	0.031	0.048
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.114	0.086	0.029	0.086	0.143	0.114	0.114
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.074	0.128	0.070	0.000	0.056	0.046	0.095
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.049	0.131	0.333 ^b	0.227	0.024	0.045	0.078
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.215	0.268	0.393 ^b	0.380	0.156	0.211	0.041
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.251	0.137	0.060	0.060	0.000	0.166	0.040

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 11 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items					
			22	23	24	25	26	27 28
Sex (1) Male	70							
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.065	0.044	0.177	0.348 ^c	0.097	0.033 0.135
Age (in years)								
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.169	0.088	0.110	0.196	0.028	0.093 0.058
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.174	0.088	0.090	0.206	0.058	0.014 0.173
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.343 ^a	0.000	0.200	0.229	0.086	0.086 0.114
Marital Status								
(1) Single	53							
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.160	0.076	0.019	0.205	0.089	0.055 0.064
Years of Training								
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.149	0.076	0.214	0.212	0.078	0.020 0.12
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.249	0.044	0.274	0.233	0.089	0.022 0.040
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.100	0.043	0.060	0.029	0.026	0.020 0.123

^a Significant at the .05 level.^b Significant at the .01 level.^c Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE II (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.064	0.083	0.126	0.063	0.092	0.139	0.141
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.195	0.056	0.110	0.117	0.122	0.068	0.115
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.133	0.025	0.082	0.174	0.049	0.112	0.056
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.143	0.057	0.171	0.114	0.171	0.114	0.171
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.100	0.123	0.137	0.101	0.027	0.041	0.016
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.059	0.143	0.082	0.098	0.104	0.053	0.224
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.104	0.177	0.070	0.104	0.118	0.156	0.247
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.049	0.043	0.109	0.040	0.014	0.103	0.094

differences on item 16 which dealt with the drawing up of school timetables were significant at the .01 level, and differences on item 25 on the methods of grouping students were significant at the .001 level.

In Corriveau's (1969) study with French-speaking teachers in North-western Quebec, the sex of the respondents also was significant for item number 16 as well as for nine other decision items that were mainly concerned with school organization and curriculum. Hawley (1969) also found that sex was significantly related to teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making on curriculum items, and Blacker's (1971) study found consistent results on budgeting decisions. Thus, the findings of the present study are not in agreement with those of Corriveau (1969), Hawley (1969) and Blacker (1971). The present data indicate that the sex of the respondents is not significantly related to their perceptions of their actual decision-making level.

Age

For facility in analysing the data, the respondents were placed into one of three age categories; under thirty years of age, thirty to thirty-nine, and forty or over. As shown in Table 11, age was found to produce significant differences in actual decision-making on only one of the thirty-five decision items. That item was number 22, which was concerned with the drawing up of a code of ethics to which teachers should adhere. Participation in decision-making on this item appeared to be a matter of importance to only the middle-aged and older groups of teachers.

for the variable age was significant only when the responses of these two groups were analysed together.

Corriveau (1969), Blacker (1971), and Clarke (1970) also found that age was not significantly related to the actual decision-making of teachers. Hawley's (1969) findings were at variance with these results, however, for he found that age accounted for significant differences on eight out of fifteen curriculum decisions.

Marital Status

The findings of this study indicated that whether a respondent was single or married seemed to have no relationship to how he perceived his actual decision-making role. Similar findings were reported by Corriveau (1969), Blacker (1971), and Clarke (1970), but Hawley (1969) found that on five out of fifteen decision items, marital status was related to teachers' decision-making levels.

Academic and Professional Training

Three categories of the variable Academic and Professional Training were used in this analysis to indicate teachers with less than fifteen years of training, teachers with fifteen to seventeen years of training, and teachers with more than seventeen years of training. The first category included all teachers with a Class II Teaching Diploma in Quebec. The second one was made up of teachers with a Bachelors degree or a Bachelors degree and one year of teacher training. The last category

included teachers with Masters degrees or Doctorates.

The number of years of academic and professional education that the respondents had did not appear to be significantly related to the perceptions of their actual degree of decision-making. A significant relationship was apparent on only three items as indicated in Table 11. Item number 11 dealt with establishing methods to be used in evaluating students. Item number 13 was concerned with establishing educational specifications for new school buildings. The third decision item on which years of training had a bearing was number 17, deciding which teachers will be members of the school council.

Item 11 appeared to be a decision related to pupil personnel while the other two items were concerned with school organization. Corriveau (1969) also found that years of training were related to teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making on three organizational decision items. Furthermore, his study also indicated differences according to years of training on six other decision items.

Hawley (1969) also found that this variable was significant, for nine out of fifteen decision items produced responses which indicated differences according to years of academic and professional education.

Teaching Experience

To carry out the analysis of this variable, the respondents were placed into three categories. Category one included those

respondents who had taught less than five years. Category two included those who had five to ten years of teaching experience, and the third category was made up of teachers with eleven or more years of teaching experience.

As indicated in Table 12, teaching experience was significantly related to teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making on item 16, dealing with the formulation of school timetables, and on item 34 which was concerned with the selection of subjects in the school program.

These findings were not consistent with those of Hawley (1969). He found that teaching experience was related to teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making on nine out of fifteen items dealing with curriculum.

Teaching Level

The two categories of teaching level used in the analysis were elementary, which included Kindergarten to Grade Seven, and secondary, which comprised Grades Eight to Twelve inclusive.

Teaching level was found to produce significant differences on the perceptions of actual decision-making on three items: numbers 16, 24 and 25. Item 16 had to do with drawing up school timetables; item 24 was concerned with introducing new courses of study; and number 25 dealt with deciding on what methods were to be used in grouping students.

These findings tended to support those of Corriveau (1969), Hawley (1969), and Blacker (1971) in their analyses of the

TABLE 12

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ACTUAL DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION ITEMS BY
TEACHING EXPERIENCE, TEACHING LEVEL, AND YEARS TAUGHT IN PRESENT SCHOOL

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.113	0.100	0.063	0.098	0.016	0.119	0.095
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.130	0.119	0.135	0.105	0.195	0.052	0.065
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.178	0.193	0.164	0.126	0.179	0.067	0.067
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.156	0.154	0.051	0.041	0.059	0.014	0.062
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.095	0.102	0.157	0.067	0.031	0.041	0.098
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.150	0.107	0.098	0.059	0.186	0.046	0.084
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.055	0.209	0.059	0.089	0.217	0.034	0.139

TABLE 12 (continued)

Variable	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.080	0.071	0.024	0.123	0.099	0.026	0.036
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.149	0.049	0.198	0.111	0.154	0.033	0.100
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.15	0.065	0.222	0.028	0.055	0.007	0.091
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	0.070	0.062	0.190	0.163	0.086	0.186	0.186	0.131
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.088	0.091	0.160	0.076	0.063	0.028	0.022
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.163	0.113	0.173	0.075	0.096	0.029	0.064
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.186	0.159	0.231	0.041	0.040	0.029	0.045

TABLE 12 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.115	0.159 ^c	0.123	0.063	0.098	0.035	0.040
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.060	0.290 ^a	0.067	0.060	0.192	0.083	0.035
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.055	0.179	0.056	0.027	0.241	0.055	0.043
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.117	0.457 ^c	0.183	0.089	0.194	0.073	0.040
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.025	0.068	0.140	0.044	0.227	0.034	0.084
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.061	0.188	0.079	0.086	0.098	0.023	0.016
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.058	0.255	0.075	0.086	0.233	0.039	0.068

^a Significant at the .05 level.^b Significant at the .01 level.^c Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 12 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items					
			22	23	24	25	26	27 28
Teaching Experience (in years)								
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.085	0.119	0.074	0.073	0.034	0.114 0.006
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.205	0.119	0.167	0.124	0.049	0.078 0.125
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.250 ^a	0.011	0.140	0.196	0.083	0.036 0.122
Teaching Level								
(1) Elementary	73							
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.102	0.043	0.221 ^a	0.389 ^c	0.104	0.014 0.130
Years Taught in Present School								
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.146	0.156	0.097	0.124	0.021	0.016 0.013
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.182	0.139	0.079	0.161	0.041	0.027 0.114
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.071	0.017	0.115	0.217	0.049	0.011 0.121

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.^cSignificant at the .001 level.

TABLE 12 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.091	0.090	0.021	0.028	0.109	0.172	0.178
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.125	0.054	0.059	0.095	0.059	0.081	0.035
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.057	0.036	0.037	0.070	0.050	0.253 ^a	0.213
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.135	0.187	0.075	0.128	0.060	0.132	0.045
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.114	0.018	0.110	0.038	0.131	0.091	0.138
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.089	0.089	0.080	0.057	0.086	0.045	0.205
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.095	0.107	0.095	0.071	0.045	0.050	0.067

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

relationship of teaching level to teachers' perceptions of their actual involvement in decision-making.

Corriveau (1969) found that nine decision items produced responses which indicated differences according to the grade level taught by the respondents. Two of those nine items were the same items sixteen and twenty-five mentioned as significant in the analysis for this study. In the same manner, Hawley (1969) found that teaching level produced significant differences in decision-making on eleven out of fifteen items on his questionnaire.

Years in Present School

The findings indicated that the length of time teachers had taught in their present schools had no relationship to how they perceived their actual decision-making on the various items.

Size of the School

Schools were categorized as either small, medium, or large in size depending on the number of teachers on their staffs. Schools with fewer than ten teachers were deemed small, those with ten to twenty-nine teachers were medium size, and schools with thirty or more teachers were classified as large schools.

As may be seen from Table 13, school size was significantly related to teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making on seven items of the questionnaire. Items 16 and 25 were again amongst the list of decisions on which differences according to school size were apparent.

Significant differences were apparent on decision items

TABLE 13

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ACTUAL DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION ITEMS BY
TEACHERS IN SCHOOL AND SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Teachers in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.309	0.175	0.084	0.164	0.100	0.118	0.359
(2) 10 - 29	80	1, & 3	0.238	0.228	0.075	0.206	0.070	0.143	0.221
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.071	0.053	0.052	0.045	0.033	0.027	0.138
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.141	0.016	0.098	0.210	0.127	0.021	0.022
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.149	0.186	0.120	0.138	0.141	0.042	0.027
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.076	0.202	0.038	0.090	0.016	0.026	0.024

TABLE 13 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Teachers in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.434	0.402	0.350	0.216	0.100	0.125	0.163
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.361	0.556 ^a	0.158	0.148	0.140	0.298	0.281
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.121	0.184	0.192	0.247 ^a	0.040	0.173	0.118
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.043	0.114	0.037	0.197	0.056	0.157	0.069
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.079	0.251 ^a	0.120	0.146	0.019	0.050	0.048
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.092	0.182	0.097	0.063	0.059	0.107	0.081

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

TABLE 13 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items							
			15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Teachers in School										
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.157	0.314 ^b	0.575 ^a	0.188	0.202	0.357	0.130	
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.138	0.662 ^b	0.702 ^b	0.228	0.276	0.471	0.143	
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.055	0.367 ^c	0.127	0.041	0.112	0.114	0.107	
Size of Community										
(1) 1-19,999	48	1 & 2	0.018	0.061	0.096	0.050	0.216	0.059	0.035	
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.082	0.093	0.101	0.145	0.372 ^c	0.082	0.030	
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.100	0.101	0.197	0.151	0.248	0.023	0.026	

^a Significant at the .05 level.^b Significant at the .01 level.^c Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 13 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			22	23	24	25	27	28	
Teachers in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.270	0.118	0.388	0.139	0.389	0.143	0.125
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.278	0.180	0.561 ^a	0.363	0.258	0.143	0.263
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.084	0.082	0.174	0.224 ^a	0.131	0.018	0.138
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.117	0.077	0.066	0.152	0.072	0.040	0.021
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.078	0.047	0.060	0.036	0.196	0.060	0.024
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.148	0.042	0.072	0.116	0.227	0.026	0.034

^a Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 13 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Teachers in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.304	0.143	0.357	0.016	0.020	0.050	0.502 ^a
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.306	0.226	0.454	0.078	0.003	0.035	0.556 ^a
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.071	0.206	0.096	0.080	0.022	0.043	0.154
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.066	0.085	0.117	0.077	0.013	0.146	0.192
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.130	0.188	0.236	0.096	0.044	0.076	0.169
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.065	0.103	0.126	0.058	0.057	0.070	0.134

^a Significant at the .05 level.

concerned with either curriculum or school organization. Items 24 and 35 were decisions of a curriculum nature which dealt with introducing new courses of study and determining the subject matter to be taught. Items 16 and 17 dealt with organizational decisions: drawing up school timetables and deciding which teachers would be members of the school council.

Two other decision items which were significantly related to school size were numbers 11 and 25 dealing with pupil personnel problems. The final decision item, 9, was of a teacher personnel nature.

The above findings were consistent with those of Corriveau (1969) and Hawley (1969) concerning the effect of school size on actual decision-making. Corriveau found that this variable was significantly related to ten decision items, while Hawley found it caused differences on six decision items.

Size of the Community

The size of the community in which the respondents taught was significantly related to their perceptions of actual decision-making on two items, number 9 and number 19, as indicated in Table 13. Item number 9 was concerned with assigning the subjects which a teacher would teach, and item 19 was of a teaching profession nature, deciding on the program content for teacher workshops.

Corriveau (1969) also found that item number 19 produced significantly different responses according to the size of the community in addition to six other decision items. However,

Hawley (1969) discovered that eight out of fifteen items dealing with curriculum were found to differentiate according to the size of the community in which the respondents taught.

III. PREFERRED DECISION-MAKING AND PERSONAL AND SCHOOL VARIABLES

Sub-problem 2.2 was to determine what relationships exist between teachers' perceptions of their preferred degree of participation on each of the thirty-five decision items and such variables as sex, age, marital status, academic and professional training, teaching experience, grade level taught, length of time in the present school, number of teachers in the school, and size of the town or city in which the school was situated.

An item by item analysis was carried out on each of the thirty-five decision items on the Preferred Participation Scale using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test. The findings are reported below under each of the nine personal and school variables.

Sex

The findings of this study indicated that the sex of the respondents was not related to the perceptions of their preferred degrees of decision-making.

Similar findings were obtained by Clarke (1970) and Blacker (1971), but Corriveau (1969) found that the sex of the respondents had significant relationships with their preferred decision-making

on seven items. Hawley (1969) found a similar relationship on four items.

Age

Significant differences in the preferred degree of decision-making when the respondents were categorized by age, were found on only two items as shown in Table 14. Both items were concerned with the teaching profession: number 5 dealt with evaluating teachers' professional qualifications and number 33 was concerned with determining the minimum requirements for entry into the teaching profession.

On both decision items the older teachers were found to prefer more teacher involvement in making the decisions than did the younger teachers under thirty years of age.

Hawley (1969) found that age was significant on six out of fifteen curriculum items, while Corriveau (1969) determined that this variable made a difference on six curriculum decision items, one organizational item, and the identical professional item mentioned above, number 33.

Marital Status

As may be seen in Table 14, marital status produced significant differences regarding the preferred degree of decision-making of teachers on only one item, number 22. That decision item was concerned with drawing up a code of ethics to which teachers must adhere, and would therefore be termed a decision relating to the teaching profession. The findings for this item

TABLE 14

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PREFERRED DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION ITEMS BY
SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS AND YEARS OF TRAINING

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.079	0.114	0.145	0.088	0.078	0.181	0.054
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.103	0.082	0.059	0.201	0.138	0.070	0.111
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.066	0.101	0.163	0.059	0.309 ^a	0.095	0.054
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.143	0.114	0.171	0.171	0.171	0.057	0.057
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.036	0.128	0.083	0.084	0.115	0.164	0.109
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.053	0.145	0.076	0.143	0.057	0.057	0.180
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.057	0.021	0.078	0.246	0.166	0.126	0.117
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.051	0.134	0.066	0.103	0.109	0.086	0.066

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

TABLE 14 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.017	0.067	0.158	0.107	0.088	0.025	0.084
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.036	0.076	0.117	0.053	0.046	0.120	0.239
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.122	0.010	0.114	0.062	0.075	0.109	0.096
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.086	0.086	0.114	0.114	0.057	0.229	0.143
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.017	0.028	0.092	0.040	0.118	0.024	0.093
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.086	0.031	0.145	0.086	0.155	0.329 ^b	0.300 ^b
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.103	0.063	0.125	0.103	0.058	0.122	0.229
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.017	0.091	0.040	0.060	0.097	0.277	0.071

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 14 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.126	0.148	0.136	0.067	0.079	0.119	0.079
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.027	0.054	0.166	0.099	0.093	0.109	0.159
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.015	0.152	0.045	0.185	0.106	0.062	0.102
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.029	0.143	0.171	0.086	0.086	0.171	0.086
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.015	0.096	0.065	0.070	0.186	0.038	0.072
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.073	0.137	0.269 ^a	0.102	0.108	0.210	0.098
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.155	0.062	0.229	0.039	0.134	0.116	0.122
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.229	0.191	0.040	0.137	0.026	0.103	0.194

^a Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 14 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items					
			22	23	24	25	26	27 28
Sex (1) Male	70							
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.142	0.068	0.131	0.164	0.034	0.112 0.092
Age (in years)								
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.017	0.043	0.045	0.039	0.063	0.044 0.079
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.033	0.101	0.078	0.067	0.057	0.098 0.116
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.029	0.143	0.086	0.029	0.114	0.143 0.086
Marital Status								
(1) Single	53							
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.222 ^a	0.131	0.109	0.095	0.068	0.067 0.078
Years of Training								
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.165	0.057	0.153	0.131	0.161	0.165 0.206
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.151	0.021	0.064	0.148	0.041	0.089 0.079
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.117	0.051	0.089	0.051	0.197	0.254 0.197

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

TABLE 14(continued)

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Sex (1) Male	70								
(2) Female	74	1 & 2	0.029	0.111	0.076	0.060	0.192	0.072	0.085
Age (in years)									
(1) 0 - 29	74	1 & 2	0.086	0.027	0.163	0.159	0.291 ^a	0.066	0.140
(2) 30 - 39	35	1 & 3	0.032	0.107	0.123	0.059	0.148	0.100	0.197
(3) 40 and over	35	2 & 3	0.114	0.114	0.286	0.143	0.143	0.086	0.057
Marital Status									
(1) Single	53								
(2) Married	91	1 & 2	0.090	0.041	0.085	0.143	0.184	0.118	0.092
Years of Training									
(1) 1 - 14	49	1 & 2	0.184	0.112	0.120	0.110	0.282 ^a	0.129	0.127
(2) 15 - 17	70	1 & 3	0.292	0.087	0.215	0.140	0.430 ^b	0.086	0.256
(3) 18 and over	25	2 & 3	0.109	0.120	0.094	0.146	0.149	0.066	0.140

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

also indicated that those respondents who were married preferred a greater degree of teacher involvement in making this decision than did the single respondents.

That the variable marital status is relatively unimportant in affecting teachers' perceptions of their preferred decision-making was substantiated by Hawley (1969), Corriveau (1969) and Clarke (1970). Hawley found that it had a bearing on only two out of fifteen decision items, while Clarke and Corriveau determined that it had no effect whatever on any of their questionnaire items.

Academic and Professional Training

The number of years of academic and professional education that the respondents had appeared to be significantly related to the perceptions of their preferred degree of decision-making on four decision items: numbers 13, 14, 17 and 33 as indicated in Table 14. Items 13 and 17 were decisions of an organizational nature, dealing with specifications for new buildings and with the makeup of school councils, while 14 and 33 were concerned with the teaching profession. Item 14 was a decision on determining the priorities in retraining teachers and number 33 was one of determining the minimum requirements for entry into the teaching profession.

On all of the four specific decision items mentioned above, those respondents with fifteen or more years of training wanted significantly more participation than did those with fourteen

years and less of training.

Corriveau (1969) also found significant differences, when the respondents were categorized according to years of training, on two decision items identical to numbers 13 and 33 mentioned previously, in addition to six other items. The findings were also consistent with those of Hawley (1969).

Teaching Experience

Responses to two decision items, numbers 2 and 5, were significantly different according to the years of teaching experience the respondents had (Table 15). Item 2 was concerned with deciding what instructional methods teachers should use, and item 5 with the evaluation of teachers' professional qualifications. There also was evidence to indicate that on both items, teachers with five or more years of experience preferred much more involvement in decision-making than those teachers with less than five years of experience.

These findings were consistent with those of Corriveau (1969) and Hawley (1969). The former researcher found that two organizational items and two curriculum items produced responses which indicated differences according to teaching experience, and the latter found four curriculum items out of fifteen that were significant.

Teaching Level

The two categories of teaching level used in the analysis were elementary and secondary. As may be seen in Table 15, only

TABLE 15

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PREFERRED DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION ITEMS BY
TEACHING EXPERIENCE, TEACHING LEVEL, AND YEARS TAUGHT IN PRESENT SCHOOL

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.157	0.352 ^b	0.137	0.139	0.194	0.058	0.170
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.084	0.183	0.141	0.106	0.316 ^a	0.062	0.137
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.083	0.170	0.087	0.036	0.122	0.083	0.034
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.046	0.182	0.094	0.092	0.146	0.093	0.117
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.126	0.092	0.116	0.097	0.094	0.138	0.147
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.018	0.061	0.102	0.029	0.284	0.059	0.030
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.133	0.032	0.184	0.068	0.213	0.162	0.172

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 15 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax. of Decision Items						
			8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.036	0.068	0.120	0.070	0.085	0.153	0.043
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.097	0.057	0.124	0.111	0.103	0.181	0.130
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.083	0.026	0.152	0.058	0.083	0.032	0.125
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.053	0.065	0.162	0.081	0.121	0.028	0.118
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.091	0.066	0.104	0.082	0.050	0.034	0.056
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.096	0.036	0.073	0.034	0.073	0.152	0.073
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.023	0.075	0.127	0.116	0.040	0.135	0.051

TABLE 15 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items							
			15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Teaching Experience (in years)										
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.028	0.074	0.095	0.051	0.100	0.083	0.050	
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.029	0.192	0.073	0.129	0.130	0.084	0.043	
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.056	0.118	0.022	0.077	0.230	0.033	0.082	
Teaching Level										
(1) Elementary	73									
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.077	0.172	0.089	0.087	0.191	0.106	0.081	
Years Taught in Present School										
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.125	0.031	0.153	0.163	0.063	0.025	0.044	
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.025	0.070	0.020	0.152	0.218	0.059	0.118	
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.119	0.051	0.170	0.200	0.198	0.061	0.150	

TABLE 15(continued)

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.043	0.110	0.031	0.024	0.045	0.014	0.041
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.038	0.065	0.103	0.087	0.060	0.171	0.087
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.081	0.158	0.135	0.089	0.055	0.161	0.058
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.127	0.118	0.135	0.172	0.073	0.042	0.157
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.108	0.137	0.116	0.139	0.025	0.049	0.100
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.087	0.102	0.050	0.036	0.059	0.137	0.032
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.080	0.176	0.166	0.157	0.057	0.186	0.081

TABLE 15 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Teaching Experience (in years)									
(1) 0 - 4	42	1 & 2	0.039	0.090	0.095	0.139	0.096	0.055	0.025
(2) 5 - 10	57	1 & 3	0.017	0.098	0.095	0.106	0.159	0.013	0.117
(3) 11 and over	45	2 & 3	0.054	0.015	0.041	0.063	0.076	0.068	0.092
Teaching Level									
(1) Elementary	73								
(2) Secondary	71	1 & 2	0.181	0.074	0.149	0.120	0.256 ^b	0.105	0.216 ^a
Years Taught in Present School									
(1) 1 - 3	80	1 & 2	0.061	0.094	0.053	0.031	0.157	0.065	0.236
(2) 4 - 6	29	1 & 3	0.039	0.118	0.102	0.045	0.080	0.066	0.102
(3) 7 and over	35	2 & 3	0.100	0.101	0.094	0.040	0.088	0.080	0.134

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

items 33 and 35 indicated significant relationships between the teaching level of the respondents and their preferred degree of involvement in decision-making. Item 33 was related to teaching profession matters, but item 35 was oriented towards curriculum, for it involved the decision of what subject matter was to be taught. Furthermore, those respondents who were categorized as secondary school teachers also indicated a strong preference for greater teacher involvement in the decision-making on these two items, more so than did the elementary teachers.

Corriveau (1969) also found that item 33 produced significant differences with respect to teaching level, in addition to six other decision items on his questionnaire. Hawley (1969) found that five curriculum items produced differences according to teaching level.

Years in Present School

The findings indicated that the responses for only one item, number 5, were significantly different with respect to the length of time the teachers had taught in their present school. The specific item, as indicated in Table 15 was concerned with the teaching profession, involving a decision on the evaluation of teachers' professional qualifications. On this item, it appeared that those teachers who had been on the school's staff for a longer period of time, preferred a much greater degree of involvement in decision-making than did the newcomers to the staff.

These findings substantiated those of Corriveau (1969) who

reported that, with his sample of French Catholic teachers in Quebec, only two decision items indicated differences with respect to the number of years taught in the present school of the respondents.

Size of the School

As may be seen in Table 16, the variable school size was found to produce significant differences regarding the preferred degree of involvement in decision-making of the respondents on eight decision items. Of these eight items, six pertained to the teaching profession while two dealt with school organization, determining the length of teaching periods, and deciding which teachers should be members of the school council. The particular items dealing with the teaching profession involved evaluating teachers' professional qualifications, suspending a teacher's diploma, determining priorities in the retraining of teachers, drawing up a code of ethics for teachers, determining the content of teacher training programs and determining the requirements for entry into the teaching profession.

The findings indicated that the teachers in the larger schools, with staffs of thirty or more, preferred more teacher involvement in the decision-making on all of the eight significant items mentioned above. A much greater percentage preferred the decisions to be made co-operatively with the administrative authorities or by the teachers themselves than did the teachers in schools where staffs were nine or less.

TABLE 16

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PREFERRED DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION ITEMS BY
TEACHERS IN SCHOOL AND SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Teachers in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.304	0.109	0.116	0.396	0.271	0.198	0.325
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.218	0.078	0.143	0.449	0.484	0.198	0.228
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.086	0.187	0.091	0.080	0.212 ^a	0.250 ^a	0.097
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.032	0.178	0.232	0.043	0.096	0.226	0.038
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.065	0.141	0.186	0.065	0.075	0.144	0.237
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.057	0.036	0.126	0.108	0.132	0.082	0.198

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

TABLE 16 (continued)

Variables	Group Comparison		Dmax of Decision Items						
			8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Teachers and School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.186	0.075	0.564 ^a	0.275	0.125	0.236	0.093
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.251	0.050	0.627 ^b	0.298	0.298	0.286	0.180
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.065	0.080	0.112	0.047	0.202	0.087	0.232 ^a
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.077	0.042	0.069	0.091	0.111	0.234	0.163
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.070	0.046	0.079	0.063	0.141	0.191	0.066
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.054	0.088	0.143	0.154	0.116	0.051	0.152

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 16 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items							
			15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Teachers in School										
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.216	0.150	0.545 ^a	0.166	0.055	0.191	0.186	
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.183	0.103	0.647 ^b	0.341	0.170	0.070	0.251	
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.033	0.132	0.102	0.175	0.119	0.201	0.065	
Size of Community										
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.099	0.133	0.058	0.143	0.171	0.136	0.019	
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.003	0.172	0.123	0.078	0.128	0.192	0.032	
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.097	0.115	0.174	0.065	0.097	0.113	0.032	

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 16 (continued)

Variables	N	Group Comparison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Teaching in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.357	0.141	0.291	0.207	0.188	0.123	0.139
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.541 ^a	0.236	0.323	0.103	0.145	0.233	0.123
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.184	0.095	0.038	0.104	0.117	0.194	0.179
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.038	0.107	0.131	0.053	0.091	0.333 ^b	0.032
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	29	1 & 3	0.114	0.137	0.086	0.192	0.148	0.228	0.091
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.076	0.107	0.046	0.216	0.057	0.105	0.096

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 16 (continued)

Variables	N	Group. Compar- ison	Dmax of Decision Items						
			29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Teachers in School									
(1) 1 - 9	7	1 & 2	0.227	0.325	0.112	0.063	0.164	0.191	0.225
(2) 10 - 29	80	1 & 3	0.293	0.193	0.035	0.233	0.278	0.288	0.404
(3) 30 and over	57	2 & 3	0.070	0.231 ^a	0.079	0.197	0.362 ^c	0.133	0.179
Size of Community									
(1) 1 - 19,999	48	1 & 2	0.122	0.210	0.011	0.061	0.082	0.104	0.117
(2) 20,000 - 39,999	39	1 & 3	0.197	0.033	0.043	0.065	0.084	0.151	0.115
(3) 40,000 and over	57	2 & 3	0.076	0.213	0.054	0.057	0.105	0.123	0.232

^aSignificant at the .05 level.^bSignificant at the .01 level.^cSignificant at the .001 level.

Corriveau (1969), Hawley (1969) and Blacker (1971) had consistent findings with the present study. In addition, out of the seven items on Corriveau's questionnaire that appeared to be affected by school size, three of the teaching profession items were identical to items 5, 22 and 33 mentioned above.

Size of the Community

On only one item of the Preferred Participation Scale did the responses of the teachers appear to be significantly different when categorized according to the size of the community in which their school was situated. The decision item in question was number 27, which dealt with determining the amount of the school budget which should be spent for instructional purposes. This finding indicated that the teachers who taught in the larger urban centers with populations of 20,000 or more did have a greater preference for more teacher involvement in decision-making than did the teachers located in the smaller communities.

Corriveau (1969) and Hawley (1969) similarly found that this variable only slightly affected the responses of the teachers involved in their studies. Only one item on Corriveau's questionnaire showed significant differences, while five on Hawley's indicated differences that were related to the size of the community of the respondents.

IV. SUMMARY

From the analysis of the data for the first three sub-problems concerning the teachers' perceptions of their actual and

preferred degrees of decision-making, it was clearly evident that the teachers' perceptions differed significantly. The respondents desired more extensive teacher involvement in decision-making processes throughout the public education scene than they had at the time of the study. The predominantly favoured style of teacher participation was co-operative, involving the teachers with the administrative authorities. The next preferred style was decision-making by the teachers themselves, independent of the administrative authorities.

The findings relating to sub-problems 2.1 and 2.2 indicated that there were significant relationships between teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degrees of participation on some of the decision items and certain personal and school variables.

The variables that indicated significant relationships with teachers' perceptions of their actual decision-making on three or seven decision items were years of training, teaching level, and size of the school. The sex and age of the respondents, their teaching experience, and the size of the community in which they taught appeared to cause few differences in the perceptions of the actual degree of decision-making. Those variables which were found to have no association with differences in the perceptions of actual decision-making were marital status and number of years teachers were in their present school.

The seven variables: sex, age, years of training, teaching experience, teaching level, size of school and size of community,

produced differences in perceptions on eleven various decision items on the Actual Participation Scale, with some items affected by two, three, or four variables. Decision items relating to curriculum were affected to the greatest extent, followed by two organizational items, and one item from each of the teaching profession, teacher personnel, and pupil personnel areas.

Of the nine personal and school variables tested with the Preferred Participation Scale, school size, and years of academic and professional education were the variables most often associated with differences in the teachers' perceptions. It appeared that teachers in larger schools with more years of training preferred greater teacher involvement in decision-making. Age, marital status, teaching experience, teaching level, years in the present school and size of the community appeared to cause only slight differences in the teachers' preferred degree of decision-making. No significant relationships were found between teachers' perceptions of their preferred degree of participation and the sex of the respondents.

The eight variables: age, marital status, years of training, teaching experience, teaching level, years in present school, size of school and size of community, produced differences in perceptions on twelve items of the Preferred Participation Scale. Several items were affected by two or four of the personal and school characteristics. Six of these decision items related to the teaching profession, four related to organizational decisions, and two were concerned with curriculum matters.

Years of training and school size were two variables that had significant relationships with the teachers' perceptions on the same two decision items on both the Actual and Preferred Scales. The two decision items were number 17, deciding which teachers should be members of the school council, and number 13, deciding on the educational specifications for new school buildings. Both these decisions were of an organizational nature.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter presents a review and summary of the study. Conclusions that followed from the findings are set forth, and their implications are described. Finally, some suggestions are given for further research that might follow from this study.

I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The Problem

The problem investigated by this study was to determine what perceptions classroom teachers had of their actual and preferred degrees of participation in a number of decisions that pertained to pupil personnel, teacher personnel, the teaching profession, the curriculum in elementary and secondary schools, and school organization. These perceptions of actual and preferred degrees of decision-making were then analysed to determine whether there were any significant relationships between them and such personal and school variables as sex, age, marital status, years of training, teaching experience, teaching level, years in present school, size of school, and size of community in which the school is located.

Instrumentation

The two instruments used to collect the data were English translations of Massé's (1969) Teacher Participation Questionnaire and Teacher Background Questionnaire. The Teacher Participation Questionnaire consisted of thirty-five decision items and two scales, an Actual Participation Scale and a Preferred Participation Scale. The respondents indicated the perceptions of their actual and preferred degree of involvement in decision-making by signifying whether there was No Teacher Participation, Advice of Teachers, Co-operative Decision, or Teacher Autonomous Decision. The Teacher Background Questionnaire elicited the personal, professional, and school characteristics of the respondents.

The Sample

The sample of teachers selected for this study consisted of 200 members of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers in Quebec. The sample was randomly selected by the executive of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers, and 72 percent of the questionnaires were returned to be used in the study.

Treatment of the Data

The data from the questionnaires were punched on data cards for computer analysis. Frequencies and percentage frequencies of responses were determined for each category of the nine personal and school variables, and for each of the decision items on the Actual and Preferred Participation scales. The Wilcoxon matched-

pairs signed-ranks test was used to test for differences between the respondents' perceptions of their actual and preferred degrees of decision-making. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test was used to test for any relationships between teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degrees of participation and the personal and school variables specified by the study. The level of significance for both of these tests was set at the .05 level.

Findings

Over 74 percent of the teachers felt that at the present time there was no teacher participation whatsoever on seventeen of the thirty-five decision items. However, the results indicated that teachers desired more involvement than they perceived they had at the present time. The predominantly favoured style of participation was co-operative, involving the teachers with the administrative authorities in making decisions. The second preferred style was decision-making by the teachers themselves, independent of the administrative authorities.

Significant relationships were indicated on some items between the teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making and school size, years of academic and professional education, and teaching level. The sex and age of the respondents, their teaching experience and the size of the community in which they taught appeared to cause slight differences in the response patterns. The variables which were found to have no association with differences in perceptions of actual decision-making were marital status and number of years teachers had been in their

present school.

For perceptions of preferred decision-making, school size and years of academic and professional education were the variables most important in determining response patterns. Age, marital status, teaching experience, teaching level, number of years in the present school and size of the community appeared to cause only slight differences. The sex of the respondents had no significant relationship with their preferred degree of decision-making.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions which are drawn from this study must be viewed in the light of the limitations imposed on the respondents and of the assumptions with respect to the instruments used, as outlined in Chapter I.

One of the major purposes of this study was to determine whether the traditional styles of decision-making at the various levels of public education in Quebec had been modified to allow teachers to make decisions that they considered within their professional domain. The findings suggest that the participatory democracy advocated by the Quebec Department of Education has not yet had an impact on the English Protestant teaching force. A large majority of the respondents indicated that on seventeen of the thirty-five decision items on the questionnaire there was no teacher participation in the decision-making process whatsoever.

When the teachers' perceptions of their actual degree of decision-making were compared with their preferred degree, very strong significant differences were apparent on each of the thirty-five decision items. The modal preferred decision-making style was Teachers Autonomous on five items, and Co-operative on the remaining thirty items.

It can be concluded, then, that the teachers in this sample were desirous of more involvement in decision-making processes and, depending on the nature of the task, they wanted to make the decision themselves or make it together with the administrative authorities. These findings were most consistent with those of the Alberta studies completed by Simpkins (1968), Hawley (1969), Clarke (1970) and Blacker (1971) and a similar Quebec study conducted by Massé (1969).

In making a global comparison of the English Protestant teachers' preferred involvement with the French Catholic teachers' preferences in Massé's study, the English Protestant teachers appeared to desire more autonomy on more decision items than did their French counterparts. This is somewhat of an anomaly in that the Francophone teachers and their association, the C.E.Q., have been most militant in their negotiations with the Quebec government.

It can be concluded from the findings that the teachers in the sample have not heeded the exhortations of their leaders in their professional associations to become more active in educational matters. The data have shown that the teachers were

mainly desirous of only a co-operative style of decision-making, and wanted autonomous decisions at rather a low level, in the classroom dealing with methods, tests, and so on. One might have expected that professional teachers would actively seek autonomy in such items as evaluating professional qualifications of teachers, evaluating teacher competency, determining teacher load, and evaluating students, to name a few. This situation is not without poignancy, for as Carson et al (1967:54) have suggested, to better prepare present day students to survive in a pluralistic society, "one of the main goals of teachers is to emphasize the active participation of citizens as a necessary condition for the maintenance of democracy."

It is possible that teachers were simply bound by excessive duties and constraints at the classroom and school levels, so that the time element prohibited them from becoming more involved in educational decision matters.

A third conclusion of this study was that there was a slight relationship between the teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred degrees of participation in decision-making and only two personal and school variables.

School size and the years of training that teachers had were the only two variables that appeared to have significant relationships with teachers' perceptions of their actual and preferred decision-making. Marital status and years in the present school had no relationship with teachers' perceptions of actual decision-making, while the sex of the respondents had no

relationship with their perceptions of preferred decision-making.

In similar studies, Corriveau (1969) and Blacker (1971) also found that school size and years of training were two of the personal and school variables most associated with the perceptions of preferred decision-making of teachers. The sex and teaching levels of the respondents also caused significant differences, but in this present study teaching level had only a slight effect on the decision-making.

Corwin (1970) describes the militant teacher as a middle-aged male teaching in the social sciences. However, from the results of this study, it would be too facile a conclusion to describe the stereotype of a militant educator as a middle-aged married person with more than seventeen years of training, teaching in a large school.

III. IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions of this study are applicable to educational organizations and therefore have important implications for the field of educational administration. One of the most serious implications has to do with what Cunningham (1971:19) has aptly called "the magnificent Pandora of decentralization." If the teachers' legitimate demands for increased involvement in the decision-making processes are to be met, Provincial Departments of Education and school board officials will have to determine how individual schools and teachers can be granted the responsibilities

to make certain classes of decisions without the addition of another administrative level (Miklos, 1974). New authority structures will have to be designed in order that a collegial decision-making structure could be utilized at the school level. School councils at the building level and Committees on Educational Policies at the system levels, as instituted by the Quebec Department of Education in 1968, (Education Weekly, 1968) will have to become decision-making bodies and not simply consultative units acting at the whims of paternalistic administrative authorities.

A second implication of this study is pertinent to Departments of Educational Administration in Faculties of Education and their programs for the preparation of school administrators. Courses that include a substantial amount of work in superior-subordinate relationships in complex social organizations will be of the utmost importance. With a participatory style of decision-making in his school, a principal will have to be skilled in the realm of human relations and most knowledgeable in interpersonal and group processes that facilitate both the school's productivity and the maintenance of positive social-emotional climate (Schmuck, 1968). The leadership role of the school administrators will now be staggering. Not only will they have to be procedural task masters assisting their staffs in arriving at consensus on problems and decisions, but they will also have the primary responsibility for educational quality placed on their shoulders as well as those of the teachers.

A third implication follows from the above in that teachers must now become competent decision-makers, knowledgeable in the skills of decision-making and group processes. School boards will have to provide instructional workshops and visitation schedules to enable teachers to keep abreast of new developments in education. Such action should ensure that decisions made in the schools are derived from the best available knowledge and are not simply dictated by habit or convention. A consequence of involving more teachers in workshops or inter-school visitations or ultimately in decision-making bodies would be an increased staff requirement for each school board. Faculties of Education in universities would also have to take a new position in preparing teachers to assume more mature, responsible roles in the authority structures of the schools. "In-basket" techniques or case studies of school incidents as suggested by Dettre (1970) would be a prime requisite for prospective teachers.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following suggestions are made for further appropriate research studies.

1. Another approach in a study of the patterns of teacher decision-making might be to utilize a distinctly new variable, decisional participation, rather than using absolute rates of decision-making such as No Teacher Participation or Advice of Teachers. This variable would be determined algebraically

by finding the difference between the number of decisions in which an individual teacher currently participates and the number in which he desires to participate. Three decisional states could then be identified. One would be decisional deprivation where current participation is less than preferred. The second is called decisional equilibrium where current participation is equal to desired participation, and the third is decisional saturation, where current participation is greater than desired. Alutto and Belasco (1972) found that such a conceptualization was a most viable and effective method of identifying the decisional participation needs of various groups in a teacher population categorized by personal and school variables.

2. A second suggestion for further research would be to study the decision-making patterns of teachers in a random sample of various school units. Using a refined version of the Teacher Participation Questionnaire and another instrument similar to the O.C.D.Q., one could determine what relationships there are between the school climate and the decision-making preferences of the teachers.

3. A longitudinal study of particular school units that have utilized various styles of participatory decision-making could be carried out to determine whether an adherence to a particular decision-making model does in fact result in better education. This would require the development of highly sophisticated performance criteria and assessment instruments.

4. A final suggestion for further research would be to

sample parents and individuals in the wider community as to their preferences for involvement in educational decision-making. The present day proposals of community control of schools could thus be examined on its merits with empirical research, and not in the context of nostalgic rhetoric.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alutto, Joseph A., and James A. Belasco.
 1972 "Patterns of Teacher Participation in School System Decision Making." Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Winter), 27-41.
- Anderson, James G.
 1966 "Bureaucratic Rules: Bearers of Organizational Authority." Educational Administration Quarterly, 2 (Winter), 7-33.
- _____.
 1968 Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Archambault, Eldon D.
 1967 "Teacher Role in School Policy Development." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Iowa.
- Argyris, Chris.
 1957 "The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (June) 1-24.
- _____.
 1964 Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- _____.
 1966 "Interpersonal Barriers to Decision-Making." Harvard Business Review, 44 (March-April) 84-97.
- _____.
 1971 Management and Organizational Development: The Path From XA to YB. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Belasco, James A. and Joseph A. Alutto.
 1969 "Organizational Impacts of Teacher Negotiations." Industrial Relations, 9 (January-February), 67-69.
- _____, and Joseph A. Alutto.
 1972 "Decisional Participation and Teacher Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (Winter), 44-58.
- Blacker, David A.
 1971 "Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of School Budget Decentralization." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta.

- Blumberg, Arthur, William Wayson, and Wilford Weber.
1969 "The Elementary School Cabinet: Report of an Experience in Participative Decision-Making." Educational Administration Quarterly, 5 (Autumn), 39-52.
- Bolla, R. P., and J. J. Keith
1967 "Towards a Quebec Teachers' Federation." The Teachers' Magazine, 47 (May), 56-57.
- Boyan, Norman J.
1969 "The Emergent Role of the Teacher in the Authority Structure of the School." In Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (eds.), Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Breau, Francis H.
1969 "A Study of Participation for Educational Change in Quebec." Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta.
- Bridges, Edwin M.
1964 "Teacher Participation in Decision-Making." Administrator's Notebook, 12 (May).
- _____.
1967 "A Model for Shared Decision-making in the School Principalship." Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (Winter), 49-61.
- _____, W. F. Doyle and D. J. Mahan.
1968 "Effects of Hierarchical Differentiation on Group Productivity, Efficiency, and Risk-taking." Administrative Science Quarterly, 13 (September), 305-319.
- Carson, Robert B., Keith Goldhammer, and Roland J. Pellegrin.
1967 Teacher Participation in the Community. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press.
- Clarke, Gerald A.
1970 "Teachers' Perceptions of School Decision-making Roles." Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta.
- Clarke, Stanley C. T.
1968 "The Role of Teachers in Decision-making." ATA Magazine, 48 (February), 11-15.
- Coch, Lester, and John R. P. French, Jr.
1948 "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations, 1 (August), 512-532.

Collins, Barry E., and Harold Guetzkow.

- 1964 A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Corriveau, Rodolphe L.

- 1969 "A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual and Preferred Degree of Teacher Participation in a Number of Decisions." Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta.

Corwin, Ronald G.

- 1965 A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

-
- 1970 Militant Professionalism - A Study of Organizational Conflict in High Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Cunningham, Luvern L.

- 1968 "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship." Theory Into Practice, 7 (April), 62-70.

-
- 1971 Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Dettre, John R.

- 1970 Decision Making in the Secondary School Classroom. Scranton, Ohio: Intext Educational Publishers.

Dubin, Robert.

- 1965 "Supervision and Productivity: Empirical Findings and Theoretical Considerations." In Robert Dubin, George C. Homans, Floyd C. Mann, and Delbert C. Miller (eds.), Leadership and Productivity. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Duncan, C.

- 1959 "Recent Research on Human Problem Solving." Psychological Bulletin, 56, 397-429.

Education Weekly.

- 1965 Vol. 2, No. 16, August 27. Quebec: Queen's Printer.

Emory, William, and Powell Niland.

- 1969 Making Management Decisions. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Enns, Frederick.

- 1967 "The Principal: Administrator." In Erwin Miklos and A. N. Stewart (eds.), Developing a Concept of the Principalship. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Fein, Leonard J.

- 1971 The Ecology of the Public Schools - An Inquiry Into Community Control. New York: Pegasus.

Findley, D.

- 1968 "The Secondary Principal: Evaluator and Supervisor." Contemporary Education, 39 (May), 276-277.

First Report of the Minister of Education.

- 1965 Quebec: Queen's Printer.

Flippo, Edwin B.

- 1970 Management: A Behavioral Approach. (2nd. ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Francoeur, Kathleen.

- 1963 "Factors of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in the Teaching Profession." Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta.

French, John R. P., Jr., Joachim Israel and Dagfinn As.

- 1960 "An Experiment on Participation in a Norwegian Factory." Human Relations, 13 (February), 3-19.

Frey, Sherman H.

- 1973 "Policy Formulation - A Plan Involving Teachers." In Louis G. Romano, Alexander J. Kloster, Richard L. Featherstone, and Nicholas P. Georgiady (eds.), The Management of Educational Personnel. New York: MSS Information Corporation.

Gallagher, Paul.

- 1972 "Power and Participation in Educational Reform." McGill Journal of Education, 7 (Fall), 149-165.

Griffiths, Daniel E.

- 1959 Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

_____, David L. Clark, D. Richard Wynn, and Laurence Iannaccone.
1962 Organizing Schools For Effective Education. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Griffiths, Daniel E.

- 1966 "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternatives to the Status Quo." In Frank W. Lutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli, (eds.), Struggle For Power in Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Guy, Alexander J. Y.

- 1970 "Group Decision-Making." The CSA Bulletin, 9 (June), 29-51.

Hall, Oswald.

- 1966 "The Social Structure of the Teaching Profession." In Frank W. Lutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli, (eds.), Struggle For Power in Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Hawley, Gerald B.

- 1969 "Actual and Preferred Levels of Curriculum Decision-Making as Perceived by Selected Groups." Unpublished M. Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta.

Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard (eds.).

- 1972 Management of Organizational Behavior - Utilizing Human Resources, (2nd ed.), Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Herzberg, Frederick.

- 1966 Work and The Nature of Man. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company.

- 1972 "The Motivation - Hygiene Concept and Problems of Manpower." In Herbert G. Hicks (ed.), Management, Organizations, and Human Resources: Selected Readings. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Housego, Ian E.

- 1972 "Pluralist Politics and Educational Decision-Making." In Peter J. Cistone (ed.), School Boards and the Political Fact. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Ingram, Ernest J.

- 1965 "Member Involvement in the Alberta Teachers' Association." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta.

- 1966 "Teacher Involvement in Professional Organizations." The Canadian Administrator, 5 (February), 19-22.

- Katz, Daniel, and Robert L. Kahn.
1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Keeler, Bernard T.
1969 "The New Teacher." The Teachers' Magazine, 50 (January), 20-26.
- Kirst, Michael, W. (Ed.).
1972 State, School and Politics - Research Directions. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co.
- Kogan, Nathan, and Michael A. Wallach.
1967 "Risk Taking as a Function of the Situation, the Person, and the Group." In George Mandler, Paul Mussen, Nathan Kogan, and Michael A. Wallach, (eds.), New Directions in Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Laliberté, Raymond.
1967 La Presse, Friday, April 14.
- La Noue, George R., and Bruce L. R. Smith.
1973 The Politics of School Decentralization. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Larson, O. P.
1972 "Increasing Accountability Through Involvement of Professional and Lay Groups." In T. E. Giles (ed.), Educational Accountability. Calgary: John D. McAra Limited.
- Lavery, Robert E.
1972 "Changes in the Teaching Profession." McGill Journal of Education. 7 (Fall), 166-174.
- LeBlanc, Jules.
1972 "Becoming Political - The Growth of the Quebec Teachers' Union - C.E.O." This Magazine Is About Schools, 6 (Summer), 8-23.
- Lieberman, Myron.
1956 Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Little, Robert J.
1968 "The Emerging Role of the Principal." The Teachers' Magazine, 49 (October), 13-18.

- MacLeod, Alan R.
1970 "An Analysis of Power in School Systems." The CSA Bulletin, 9 (September), 59-83.
- Maslow, Abraham H.
1954 Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row.
- _____
"Some Basic Propositions of a Growth and Self-Actualization Psychology." In G. Lindzey and C. S. Hall (eds.), Theories of Personality: Primary Sources and Research. (2nd. ed.). New York.
- Massarik, Fred, and Robert Tannenbaum.
1961 "Sharing Decision-Making With Subordinates." In Robert Dubin (ed.), Human Relations in Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Masse, Denis.
1969 "Teacher Participation and Professional Attitudes." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Alberta.
- McBeath, Art.
1971 "Decentralization of Program Decision-Making." In Ted Sawchuk and Gordon McIntosh (eds.), Revolution to Resolution - New Directions for the Seventies. Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association.
- McKean, Robert C.
1967 "Decision-Making, The Administrator Needs a New Outlook." Clearing House, 41 (January), 285-287.
- Miklos, Erwin.
1970 "Increasing Participation in Decision Making." The Canadian Administrator, 9 (March), 25-29.
- _____
1974 "Forces Affecting The Decentralization of Decisions." In Eugene W. Ratsoy and Donald M. Richards (eds.), Decentralizing Decision-Making Within School Systems. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Moir, Carmen F.
1971 "Teacher Militancy." Paper read at the 1971 CEA Short Course, Banff, Alberta.
- Morse, Nancy C. and Everett Reimer.
1956 "The Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (January), 120-129.

- Myers, Donald A.
1970 Decision Making in Curriculum and Instruction. Dayton, Ohio: Institute for Development of Educational Activities.
- Oliva, Frank D.
1968 "Member Participation in Decision-Making." The CSA Bulletin, 7 (February), 21-56.
- Owens, Robert G.
1970 Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Porter, Lyman.
1963 "Job Attitudes in Management: I. Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfillment as a Function of Job Level." Journal of Applied Psychology, 47 (December), 386-397.
- Ratsoy, Eugene W.
1968 "Decision-Making: Must It Be A Co-operative Activity?" In John J. Bergen (ed.), The Principal As Administrator. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Rogers, Carl R.
1962 "Toward Becoming a Fully Functioning Person." In Arthur W. Combs (ed.), Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming - A New Focus for Education. Washington: National Education Association.
- Rosenthal, Alan.
1969 Pedagogues and Power - Teacher Groups in School Politics. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Savage, William W.
1968 Interpersonal and Group Relations in Educational Administration. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Schein, Edgar H.
1965 Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Schmuck, Richard A.
1968 "Using Knowledge of Group Processes to Improve Administrative Performance." In Robert B. Carson (ed.), Leadership, Volume 1, Seminar Series for School Administrators, Calgary: John D. McAra Limited.
- Selinger, Alphonse D., and Keith Goldhammer.
1972 "The Roots of Teacher Militancy." In Peter J. Cistone (ed.), School Boards and the Political Fact. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Fred D. Carver.
 1973 The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration.
 New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Sharma, Chiranji L.
 1954 "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook, 3 (April).
- Siegel, Sidney.
 1956 Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences.
 New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Simpkins, William L.
 1968 "The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in the School." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Alberta.
- _____, and David Friesen.
 1969 "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making." The Canadian Administrator, 8 (January), 13-16.
- Stinnett, R. M., Jack H. Kleinmann, Martha L. Ware.
 1966 Professional Negotiations In Public Education. London: Collier-MacMillan.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel L., Walter J. Roley, William J. Gephart, Egon
 1971 G. Guba, Robert L. Hammond, Howard O. Merriman, and Malcolm M. Provus.
Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold L.
 1966 Social Psychology of the Work Organization. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Ullrich, Robert.
 1972 A Theoretical Model of Human Behavior in Organizations - An Eclectic Approach. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Wallach, M., and N. Kogan.
 1959 "Sex Differences and Judgement Processes." Journal of Personality, 27, 559-564.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

TEACHER PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS MADE UP OF TWO SECTIONS:

SECTION A - Teacher participation questionnaire

SECTION B - General information

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.¹
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 administrators¹ who make (or should make) the decisions.
3. "Cooperative Decision" Teachers and administrators¹, 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"/>

¹By "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"/>
x 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; i.e., 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"/>

SECTION B

141

GENERAL INFORMATION

1) SEX

1 ☐ Male2 ☐ Female

2) AGE

1 ☐ under 20 years4 ☐ 40 to 49 years2 ☐ 20 to 29 years5 ☐ 50 to 59 years3 ☐ 30 to 39 years6 ☐ 60 years and over

3) MARITAL STATUS

1 ☐ Single2 ☐ Married3 ☐ Widowed, divorced, or separated

4) YEARS OF ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (according to the provincial salary schedule)

1 ☐ less than 12 years3 ☐ 15 - 17 years2 ☐ 12 - 14 years4 ☐ more than 17 years

5) YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE (including the present year)

1 ☐ less than 2 years5 ☐ from 11 to 13 years2 ☐ from 2 to 4 years6 ☐ from 14 to 16 years3 ☐ from 5 to 7 years7 ☐ more than 16 years4 ☐ from 8 to 10 years

6) TEACHING LEVEL

1 ☐ Kindergarten2 ☐ Elementary3 ☐ Secondary

7) NUMBER OF YEARS TAUGHT IN PRESENT SCHOOL

1 ☐ less than 1 year4 ☐ 7 to 9 years2 ☐ 1 to 3 years5 ☐ 10 years and over3 ☐ 4 to 6 years

8) NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN YOUR SCHOOL

1 ☐ 9 or fewer4 ☐ 30 to 392 ☐ 10 to 195 ☐ 40 to 493 ☐ 20 to 296 ☐ 50 or more

9) YOUR STATUS IN THE PAST OR IN THE LOCAL OR REGIONAL ASSOCIATION

1 ☐ ordinary member3 ☐ member of the local executive2 ☐ school representative in the local association (e.g., MTA)4 ☐ member of the provincial executive

10) POPULATION OF THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH YOU TEACH

1 ☐ 1 - 19,9992 ☐ 20,000 - 39,9993 ☐ 40,000 and over

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Name Address

APPENDIX B
Correspondence

Department of Educational Administration,
General Services Building, Rm. 815-G,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton 7, Alberta.

21st March 1969.

Dr. A. Reid-Smith,
President, Provincial Association of
Protestant Teachers,
2100 St. Mark Street,
Montreal, Quebec.

Dear Dr. Reid-Smith,

I am a teacher and staff-assistant on Leave of Absence from the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, to study at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, for a Masters of Education degree in Educational Administration.

As a research study for my thesis I would like to sample 200 teachers of the PAPT to determine their actual and preferred degrees of participation in a number of decision items. Since it appears that teachers in Quebec have been given greater participation in decision-making, I feel this study would be of interest to the PAPT as well, learning how much participation teachers have now and how much they would like to have.

The questionnaire consists of thirty-five items and should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete. The results would be made available to the teachers' association, along with a copy of the completed thesis. Thus, I would like to ask if the PAPT would kindly supply me with the names and addresses of a stratified random sample of 200 members of the Association; or, could the central office of the PAPT distribute the questionnaire to a stratified random sample for me, if I sent them sufficient copies, and envelopes, and paid for the work of the personnel involved.

As I would like to distribute the questionnaires immediately after the Easter holidays, an early reply stating the PAPT's co-operation with this study would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Yours very truly,


C. Graham Cooke



Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers of Quebec 144
245 Hymus Blvd., Pointe Claire, Que.

Telephone 695-7791

President
Allana Reid-Smith, Ph.D.

First Vice-President
Wendell J. Sparkes, B.Sc.

Second Vice-President
Margery Langshur, B.A.

Past President
K. Ian Trasler, B.Sc.

Hon. Secretary-Treasurer
Phyllis M. McGlashan, B.A.

Asst. Hon. Secretary-Treasurer
Ronald T. Boyd, B.A.

Business Manager
Duncan C. Cumming

April 3, 1969

Mr. C. Graham Cooke,
Department of Educational Administration,
General Services Building, Room 815-G,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton 7, Alberta

Dear Mr. Cooke:

Your letter of March 21st was received by me and presented to the officers of the PAPT for their information and discussion.

It is contrary to our policy to release the names and addresses of our members to anyone, but we would be pleased to assist you in your survey of the teachers of the PAPT by sending out your questionnaire to two hundred of our members. If you would send me your questionnaire, I will see that they are distributed.

I am interested in your comment that teachers in Quebec have been given greater participation in decision making". As you know, we are at present in the throes of negotiating a provincial contract in which one of the bones of contention is the teachers' demand for comanagement. Possibly it is a case of "the more you have, the more you want".

With best wishes for the success of your project,

Yours sincerely,

Allana Reid-Smith
President

ARS/ac



General Services Building,
Room 815-G,
April 10, 1969.

Dear Colleague,

I am a teacher on leave of absence from the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal, presently studying at the University of Alberta in Edmonton for a Master of Education degree in Educational Administration..

The executive of the P.A.P.T. has kindly granted me permission to sample 200 teachers in the Association as part of my research for a thesis concerned with the participation of Quebec teachers in decision-making. Your name has been selected in the random sample of teachers, and I therefore request your co-operation in answering the attached questionnaire.

The questionnaire should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete, and may I assure you that all information obtained will remain confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Your name and address is requested ONLY if you would like to have a summary of the findings of the study mailed to you at a later date.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed so that you may return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible to the P.A.P.T. offices in Pointe Claire.

I do realize that this time of the year is a very busy time for classroom teachers, so I appreciate very much your co-operation in answering the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

C. Graham Cooke

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION



146
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, CANADA

General Services Building,
Room 815-G,
April 17, 1969.

Dear Colleague,

A few days ago you received a questionnaire in the mail entitled Teacher Participation Questionnaire, which I asked you to answer and return to the P.A.P.T. offices in Pointe Claire.

This letter is simply a reminder to please complete the questionnaire and mail it as soon as possible, for the data is urgently needed. If you have already completed the questionnaire, may I thank you very much for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

C. Graham Cooke