THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF SHARED DECISION MAKING

IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN ÇANKAYA DISTRICT OF ANKARA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ZAFER GÜNAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

SEPTEMBER 2005

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

_____

Prof. Dr. Ali Yıldırım

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek   (METU, EDS)   _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ercan Kiraz   (METU, EDS)   _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu (METU, FLE)   _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Surname   :

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED LEVELS OF SHARED DECISION MAKING

IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

IN ÇANKAYA DISTRICT OF ANKARA

Günal, Zafer

M.S., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek

September 2005, 96 pages

The purpose of the study is to investigate the actual and desired levels of shared decision making in public schools in Çankaya district of Ankara, Turkey.

The sample of this study consisted of 372 teachers from 10 public basic schools and secondary schools in Çankaya district of Ankara. Shared Education Decisions Survey- Revised by Prof. Dr. Donna Ferrara was used to collect data.

The results of the study showed that the teachers working in public schools of Çankaya district sometimes participate in the decision making process. The level of participation increases about the parental involvement, pupil personnel and student achievement issues. However, it is understood that teachers rarely participate in the decisions relating to budget, school/community relations, staff development and policy issues.

On the other hand, when the results of the study are considered, it is apparent that teachers in public schools in Çankaya district always desire to participate in the decision making processes in their schools. The parental involvement, student achievement, pupil personnel and curriculum/ instruction areas, which are directly related to teaching, are the areas teachers most desire to participate in.

Keywords: Shared decision making, participation, participative decision making, public education institutions, teacher participation.

ÖZ

ANKARA'NIN ÇANKAYA İLÇESİNDEKİ DEVLET OKULLARINDA
EĞİTİMDE ORTAK VERİLEN KARARLARDA
MEVCUT VE İSTENDİK DURUMLAR

Günal, Zafer

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek

Eylül 2005, 96 sayfa.

Bu araştırmanın amacı, Ankara'nın Çankaya ilçesindeki devlete bağlı ilk ve orta öğretim kurumlarında verilen eğitim kararlarına öğretmenlerin mevcut durumda ne kadar katıldıkları ve ne kadar katılmak istediklerini incelemektir.

Araştırmanın örneklemi, Ankara'nın Çankaya ilçesindeki 10 ilk ve orta dereceli okulda görev yapan 372 öğretmenden oluşmuştur. Prof. Dr. Donna Ferrara tarafından geliştirilmiş olan "Eğitimde Ortak Alınan Karalar Anketi- Yenilenmiş", bu araştırmada veri toplamak için kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın sonuçları göstermiştir ki, Çankaya ilçesinde görev yapan öğretmenler okul kararlarına bazen katılmaktadırlar. Katılım oranının şu alanlarda arttığı gözlemlenmiştir: Veli katılımı, öğrenciler, öğrenci başarısı. Fakat, kararlara katılım oranının bazı alanlarda ise düştüğü belirlenmiştir. Katılım oranının azaldığı alanlar ise şunlardır: bütçe, okul/toplum ilişkileri, personel gelişimi ve politika.

Diğer yandan, sonuçlar göz önüne alındığında, Çankaya ilçesinde görev yapan öğretmenler büyük bir çoğunlukla kararlara her zaman katılmak istediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Öğretmenler öğretimle doğrudan ilgili olan veli katılımı, öğrenci başarısı, öğrenci ve müfredat/öğretim alanlarıyla ilgili kararlara her zaman katılmak istemektedirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ortak karar alma, katılım, öğretmen katılımı, katılımcı karar alma, devlete bağlı eğitim kurumları

To my dear father and mother

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the support of many people.

Special thanks to my adviser, Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek, who read my numerous revisions and helped to clear up my confusion. His suggestions, recommendations, guidance, supervision and direction have been invaluable.

I also wish to thank Dr. Bünyamin Yurdakul for his support in the analysis stage.

I am also grateful to my family, who endured this long process with me, always offering support and love.

And finally, words cannot alone express the thanks I owe to Hatice Günal, my dear wife, for her encouragement and assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes information about the background of shared decision making, significance of the study and the definitions of terms which are used in this study.

1.1. Background to the Study

The importance of education has risen especially since the beginning of the 20th century. The countries educating their citizen in accordance with the developing technology and the new findings have got their benefit in time. Their economy has become powerful; moreover, they have started to produce information and had the advantage of directing information technology. This technology has been developing so fast for some countries that they have not been able to adopt their education system in parallel to this development. Therefore, in order to overcome this problem new techniques and methods should be used, so educational management has increased its importance in many countries and the term "quality education" has started to be heard. Governments have tried to find ways to improve the quality of their education systems. However, when a school setting is taken into

consideration, there are many things to be considered for improvement. One and the most important of them is, of course, the management type. In the past, schools were governed according to the classical management style, which refers to the top-down management style. Decisions were made by the upper authority and the staff at the lower levels of the hierarchy applied them without questioning. The decisions or the ideas of the other stakeholders were not taken into consideration. Its size increased a lot and it became an organization which had limited flexibility and very centralized and hierarchical structure (Şimşek and Yıldırım, 2004).

Since 1980's, shared decision making (SDM) has started to be applied in many educational institutions as a new strategy in the field of educational management. "This strategy for improving schools focuses on empowering teachers and administrators at the school level. The rationale is that the people who know students best should have the autonomy to create and implement educational programs" say Coffey and Lashway (2002). They add that throughout the history the names of this strategy varied from site-based management to shared decision making or to distributed leadership, aiming to increase involvement of all stakeholders like parents and community and empower teachers. However, they believe that the aim of SDM has changed in the recent years from democratizing the school environment to increasing the schools' capacity to learn.

There are many reasons why shared decision making is seen as a rescuer. First of all, it is believed that forming coalitions among stakeholders are important while a decision is made. To put it in a different way, each school has a site-based

2

management committee of parents, teachers, and administrators to engage in shared decision-making to improve student achievement (Vann, 2000).

It is obvious that to increase the quality of education, the support of all stakeholders is needed. Therefore, their ideas should be taken into consideration. Wise (1997) claims that shared decision making provide all participants an opportunity to share their ideas and experience. If roles and responsibilities are clearly understood through effective communication, shared decision making increases collaborative efforts, sense of ownership and commitment.

According to Meyers (1997), shared decision making is supported in school reforms because shared decision making involves theory concerning facilitative power and participative decision making. The emphasis of shared decision making on facilitative power and shared leadership suggest that principals, team leaders, educators, parents and other stakeholders must learn new roles.

Distribution of power is one of the most important aspects of shared decision making. It is, in fact, based on the concept of "empowerment" as Goyne, Pedgett, Rowicki and Triplitt (1999) stated. They claim that in order to give teachers a sense of ownership and connectedness to their job and to increase their job satisfaction, commitment and motivation and to improve communication and quality, this concept is excellent. Besides these advantages they put forward that in the traditional organizational hierarchical structure, people spent their power to protect themselves which means they do nothing for personal and organizational growth.

Shared decision making is defined by Joyce (1986) as "a process in which variety of members of a school community collaborate in identifying problems, formulating policy, shaping solutions and implementing decisions". Another definition of shared decision making is "Shared decision making is creating ownership for those responsible for carrying out decisions by involving them directly in the decision making process and trusting their abilities and judgments" (Harrison, Killion and Mitchell, 1989, p. 55).

As it has been stated before, shared decision making aims that the people who know students best should have the autonomy to create and implement educational programs. However, currently, in Turkish Education system, the situation is a little bit different. Because of the highly centralized structure of the Ministry of National Education, teachers have almost no autonomy. From the area of curriculum to budget or from staff development to policy, everything is decided by the Ministry of National Education. To put it in a different way, decisions are taken at the top and sent to the bottom to be applied, which shows how centralized the Ministry of Turkish National Education is. As Erten's study (2004) shows, even private schools teachers say that they sometimes or sometimes participate in the decisions. Therefore, it is important to learn how often public school teachers participate in the decisions at their schools.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the actual and desired levels of shared decision making in some public primary and secondary schools in Ankara, Turkey. The specific aims of the study are:

1. To what extent do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making in their schools?
2. In what categories do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making?
3. To what extent do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?
4. In what categories do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?

1.3. Significance of the Study

Public schools are the most important part of the Turkish Education System because most of the students attend public schools. As I am an English teacher, working for the Ministry of Turkish National Education, at a public school, I must, unfortunately, admit that public schools have many drawbacks in terms of quality education. I believe every citizen is responsible for the quality of schools and education, which determines our future. One of the most important roles in the quality of education, educational development and educational reforms belongs to

the teachers. Therefore, it is proposed that this study will enlighten the actual and the desired levels in the school system. As a result, it will provide an opportunity for teachers to express their ideas and expectations. Moreover, it will also provide an opportunity for administrators to see what is done and what is expected. It is believed that this study is a unique opportunity for all stakeholders of the education system to consider once more what the actual condition is and what the desired condition is by the data gathered from the people who are in the kitchen, the teachers.

1.4. Definitions of Terms

Some brief definition of terms to be used in this study is as follows:

Decision Making

Decision making is the process of choosing from among alternatives (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 1996). Simon (1997) divides decision-making process into three parts: 1) Intelligence activity; 2) Design activity; 3) Choice Activity.

Shared Decision Making

There are many different definitions for shared decision making. Berry (1993) defines it as; a form of school governance that will impact how school districts

move their schools to higher levels of achievement (Berry, 1993). Bauer (1992) also makes a clear definition:

> Shared decision making is a process designed to push education decisions to the school level, where those closest to children may apply their expertise in making decisions that will promote school effectiveness and ensure that the most appropriate services are provided to students and the school community.

In brief, shared decision making suggests that decisions should be made by administrators, teachers, parents, students and other stakeholders. However, in the Method and Results Chapters of the study, because the study covers only the teachers, the term shared decision making refers to only decisions made by the contribution of the teachers.

Participative Decision Making

Bolman and Deal (1997) define participative decision making as giving workers more opportunity to influence decision about their work and working conditions.

Teacher

The term teacher in this study is used to refer to the teachers who participate to this study from 10 public schools.

Teacher Participation

Teacher participation is a term to explain how much a teacher participate in the decision making process or activities in his/her institution.

Organizational Democracy

Bolman and Deal (1997) define organizational democracy as an idea of building worker participation into the formal structure in order to protect it from managerial discretion.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review consists of five sections: (1) the positive effects of shared decision making (2) the drawbacks of shared decision making (3) leadership in shared decision making (4) teachers' efficacy in shared decision making and (5) practices in Turkey.

2.1. The Positive Effects of Shared Decision Making

Shared decision making has many positive effects not only on institutions but also on people. Almost all shared decision making processes have many common points, as Bauer (1992) states, which are as follows:

1. Teachers can make the best decisions about student's education because they are closest to the students and in the place where the action takes place will.

2. Because policies and programs affect their schools and children, teachers, parents, and school staff should have more say about decisions made in schools.

3. If people are responsible for the decisions carried out, they have to have a voice determining those decisions.

4. If people who implement the decisions feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for the process, change is most likely to be affective and lasting.

Shared decision making gives the opportunity to improve the quality of decisions, increase the acceptance and implementation of a decision, make staff morale, commitment, and teamwork strong; increase trust among staff, help stakeholders create new skills and increase school effectiveness (Liontos, 1994). Liontos also adds that when the number of people who are involved in shared decision making increases, more alternatives can be created for a work to be done. According to his study in the schools which had implemented shared decision making, Lange (1993) found that the grater the autonomy in the school was, the better the decisions were made. Trust among the staff increased as they understood the process and their ideas and they respected each other.

One of the most important aspects of shared decision making is that it sees teachers as a key factor in the school development. According to Lashway (1996), shared decision making improves student learning, creates teacher satisfaction and develops new forms of leadership. He proposes that one of the advantages of shared

decision making is because teachers have the real understanding of classroom complexities, they can help for the necessary changes in the programs and curriculum, which increases the achievement.

Another advantage of shared decision making is that it increases job satisfaction. Teachers are pleased when their ideas affect school decisions, which lead them to feel both empowered and respected. So that the decisions are most probably to be supported (Weiss, 1993). This idea is also supported by Lashway (1996) arguing that when stakeholders involve in decision making, the feeling of ownership, commitment and empowerment is created, which will result in collaboration and success. The thoughts of Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992) also support this idea. They argue that because teachers actively participate in the decision making processes in the school, they feel empowered and their professionalism improves. Also, Flannery (1980), who examined job satisfaction in 22 Wisconsin high schools, found that those teachers who had the highest levels of expertise were particularly interested in working in schools where they could participate in school level decision making. She also found that teachers did not want to participate in issues that they regarded as either insignificant or outside their areas of expertise. Shared decision making is favored by most of the recent literature. Some of the benefits it includes: facilitates making decisions; encourages teachers to assume greater responsibility for what happens in a school (Keith and Girling, 1991); increases teacher job satisfaction (Flannery, 1980); minimizes sabotage of selected decisions (Keith and Girling, 1991); increases efficacy of those involved (March

and Simon, 1985); and contributes to improved student achievement (Dismuke, 1993).

It is clear that one of the greatest advantages of shared decision making is the groups which are set up to make shared decisions. As Malcolm (1981) says, "groups usually produce more and better solution than do individuals working alone." According to Andrew (1994), the benefits of groups in shared decision making include:

1- <u>Decision Quality:</u> The total amount of knowledge and information is greater in a   group than its each member. Therefore, each member from different areas increases the amount of knowledge so that the quality of decisions increases.

2- <u>Decision Creativity:</u> The more the number of member is, the more different ideas appear, which leads to logical solutions to problems. Because each member has unique character and has individual ideas different from others.

3- <u>Decision Acceptance:</u> If the participation increases, similarly, the possibility of the acceptance of the decisions increases, too.

4- <u>Decision Understanding:</u> The greater the participation is, the more likely the decisions are understood. Because the members are involved in the process, there is no need to explain the necessities of the decisions.

5- <u>Decision result:</u> Establishing the objectives, identifying alternatives, and evaluating the alternatives, groups are more effective.

6- <u>Decision Accuracy:</u> Because all ideas are evaluated deeply in the group, it is unlikely to make major errors.

Besides the advantages which are mentioned above, new type of leadership can be created by the help of shared decision making. Allen and Glickman (1992) say that administrators must learn to lead a group not consisting of individuals as it is before but a collaborative decision making unit. To put it in a different way, they must develop themselves in team work and group decision making skills. Because they have to act as instructional leaders more than as managers.

Shared decision making takes teachers', students' and community's ideas into account in a school setting when decisions are made in the school. Allen and Glickman (1992) argue that it involves important changes in school management style, in the roles and relationships of everyone in the school community. They also add that the purpose of shared decision making is to increase school effectiveness and student learning by increasing staff commitment and ensuring that schools are more responsive to the needs of their students and community.

2.2. The Drawbacks of Shared Decision Making

Shared decision making has also some drawbacks. One of them is that it increases teachers' and administrators' work. Shared decision making creates new demands on teachers and administrators. Liontos (1994) thinks that increased demands on

participants' time are the greatest barrier to implementing and maintaining shared decision making.

One of the most important drawbacks of shared decision making is, as Weiss, Cambone and Wyeth (1992) state, shared decision making often creates conflicts among teachers. Disagreements that could be politely ignored before, have to be resolved after the shared decision making is implemented; the balance of power sometimes shifts, and time and energy were used up by the need to learn a new way of doing things. Another point related to this issue is that there can also be some disagreements between teachers and administrators. Sometimes teachers are the ones who do not want any change and resist any kind of such attempts. The study by Weiss (1995) shows that shared decision making schools sometimes try to make significant reforms but that the push for innovation usually comes from the principal against the opposition of many teachers. Teacher participation "acted as a brake on the pace of school reform" says Weiss (1995).

After the implementation of shared decision making, there can also be another type of disagreement between teachers and administrators. In this type, administrators struggle with teachers not to lose the control of the school. They resist to the change and try to dominate the shared decision making committee, of which he is just one of the ordinary members and has one vote as everybody in the committee. It is not a principal's advisory committee, so the principal's agenda for change may, or may not be, in tune with the notions of other committee members, says Vann (2000).

This argument leads us to another issue, that is, role conflicts of the stakeholders. As Vann (2000) states some teachers worry about their reputations if they express their view too forcefully. Some parents also have similar role conflicts and think about their reputations among staff and worry about if staff mistreat their children, if they hear about the parents' forceful disagreements with teachers. Moreover, principals have similar role conflicts. They think that if they speak up too much or too forcefully for or against a proposal, they risk being perceived as trying to influence committee members' decisions. If they hold back, they risk being perceived as showing lack of leadership.

As it has been argued before, besides its many advantages, one of the most important reasons why shared decision making has become so popular is that it is taught to increase student achievement. However, so far there is little consistent evidence that shared decision making increases student achievement (Miller, 1995). Beadi (1996) supports this idea and says that the teachers interviewed had all participated to some extent in school restructuring efforts and teacher decision making councils. Like teachers in a number of other studies, they expressed frustration with such efforts, citing the triviality on which so much shared decision making often focused, the short life of many reforms, and the limited evidence that such reforms really make a difference for students. Although it is too early to expect good results, some researchers believe that shared decision making efforts sometimes interested in the real issues of teaching and learning. Studies of shared decision making generally show that committees almost always deal with unimportant issues such as parking, or smoking in schools (Liontos, 1994). Griffin

(1995) found that while teachers willingly worked on school wide issues such as curriculum frameworks, they sometimes questioned daily classroom activities.

The result of shared decision making implementation does not always bring the expected outcome. The evidence gathered by Weiss (1995) in a longitudinal study of 12 high schools in 11 states across the U.S. does not support the claims that decision making in which teachers share focuses attention on issues of student performance or that the decisions are innovative and progressive. However, when they involved, teachers share in and take responsibility for the processes of decision and implementation themselves. According to her research, 23 percent of these teachers reported being involved with governance of the school, while 5 percent among teachers from traditionally managed schools. While participating in decision making seems to improve teacher's morale and sense of ownership of school decisions, over a period of two and a half years (the period of the field work). Tice (1994) states that, without appropriate direction, the process itself is not enough to create respected innovation and reform.

After these negative findings, researchers argue that traditional school culture can be better than shared decision making. New roles and relationships that shared decision making brings are ambiguous, time-consuming, and often uncomfortable. Shared decision making can be considered as just another educational trend, without changing much and giving teachers any reason to transfer their time and energy to the new way of doing things (Weiss, 1995).

Another key concept of shared decision making is empowerment. All stakeholders are empowered and they are equally represented in committees. However, in many institutions, shared decision making committees are set up, but the power of funding is not given. They take decisions but they do not have money to implement these decisions. As Vann (2000) mentions, most boards have not allocated funding or authority, so the shared decision making committees function like an advisory council. The shared decision making committee can make and try to implement recommendations for change, but if it costs money, the committee has to ask for money from the board of education or superintendent. Without money for additional staff or programs, improving student achievement cannot be achieved. Teams can spend a great deal of time such as months or years debating an issue, make a recommendation, and then there can be no result just because the lack of the necessary funding.

One of the drawbacks of shared decision making is that many administrators think applying shared decision making is easy. Enderlin-Lampe (1997) says that schools generally attempt to function as if using the words of shared management will bring it about. Many districts identify themselves as shared decision making districts, limited in-service is provided, and it is assumed that everything will be all right. What is forgotten by them is that shared decision making is not so easy. There is a great difference between 'wanting' and 'having' participatory management.

Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992) examine some of the problems of shared decision making at the school level in their work "Trouble in Paradise". They state that all the issues they have identified generally related to school culture that

supports or inhibits effective participation in shared decision making. Some of the issues were matters of formal school structure, however, while others were matters of informal relations among teachers. They argue that the most important problem with formal structures of shared governance is simply confusion over who will say the final word when accepting or implementing a decision. When administrators say the final word, teachers think that their ideas are not taken into consideration. On the other hand, when teachers say the final word, administrators think that they lose control and loss respect. The most successful shared governance structure observed by the researchers is a management team in which the principal is simply a member.

Another problematic issue about shared decision making considered by Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992) is that there are also some informal sense of power and responsibility among teachers. The teachers who are in shared decision making committees are somehow regarded as a favored group just because they are in the committees, which creates a kind of competence among teachers. Weiss and colleagues think that respect and trust are the key concepts for shared decision making because people have to negotiate and communicate in this culture. If they do not trust and respect each other, a real set of shared decision making atmosphere cannot be set up.

2.3. Leadership in Shared Decision Making

The leadership in shared decision making is very important. Because the role of the principal in shared decision making process determines the success of the implementation. New models of leadership are required by shared decision making: teachers lend their expertise, and principals become facilitators rather than directors. In practice, the new behaviors can be vague (Liontos, 1994).

Shared decision making does not replace the principal as a decision-maker on all issues, Bauer (1992) emphasizes. Instead, the principal becomes one of the members of shared decision making committees and will likely make decisions on issues outside the scope of these committees. The principal plays a critical role in establishing and maintaining shared decision making.

According to Stine (1993), the principal's new role is being an organizer, adviser, and consensus builder, who takes advantage of the group's thinking. The principal helps a school become ready for shared decision making by promoting a noncompetitive, trusting climate, creating opportunities for staff to express ideas, and placing a priority on professional development (Liontos 1994). In short, shared decision making seems to be a complex process that does not lead to simple leadership strategies.

In order to successfully implement the shared decision making, flexible leadership, collaborative and empowering, different from the country-wide, top-down, controlled programming activities that occur in many districts, is necessary. Green and Etheridge (2001) argue that the first phase of the restructuring process is the

selection of new leaders. Moreover, the new leadership should not just depend on central administration; rather leadership must be collaborative and shared across the district among individuals who can actively participate in the process.

Participants often tend to shape their new roles with old assumptions. For example, Spaulding (1994) studied one principal who was consciously manipulating the process to move it in the direction he wanted by planting ideas, pressuring opponents, and showing favoritism to supporters.

Prestine (1993) uncovered another leadership dilemma. If principals don't play an active, visible role in shared decision making, teachers may fail to take it seriously; on the other hand, participation that is too strong may convince teachers that the principal is in charge.

2.4. Teachers' Efficacy in Shared Decision Making

Shared decision making has started to become popular as part of a democratization process throughout the world. Teacher satisfaction is the key factor in the success of shared decision making. Therefore, a lot of research has been conducted to measure teacher satisfaction.

As this study takes the teachers' point of view about shared decision making, it is important to know if shared decision making increases their efficacy or not. Bandura (1977) argues that self-efficacy consists of two components, outcome expectancy and self efficacy. Outcome expectancy involved the belief that an

individual holds regarding the specific results caused by a particular action. Whereas, the latter is related to the beliefs regarding personal competency to affect or do a given task.

In order to increase teacher efficacy, teachers must believe that their behavior can affect the education of their students. They must realize that they have the necessary capacity and power to make important decisions which will affect the system. They must spend their energy on determining how to bring about and increase their sense of efficacy. Teachers need to feel competent to do the job and be assured that the system is suitable to support them (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997).

Research conducted by Ashton and Webb (1986) indicates that the motivation of teachers can be greatly increased by emotional rewards that teachers indicate are so satisfying yet so rare in the current system. At the center of these rewards is shared decision making and the opportunity for real voice in schooling (Andrew, 1994).

Many articles provide evidence of positive outcomes (Weiss, 1995). In schools which had implemented shared decision making, a comparative analysis of teacher perceptions of empowerment was conducted (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997). He found that teachers think school climate, staff development, competency requirements, program content and implementation patterns are the areas to which shared decision making can contribute. He argues that teacher efficacy with the use of shared decision making increased. His findings indicate that many crucial decisions regarding curriculum, teaching strategies and personnel should be made by school staff at the site level.

It can not be said that all research conducted in this area supports this decision making model. There are studies citing the negative effects on and attitude of teachers after the implementation of shared decision making (Weiss, 1995). In an examination of the relationship between teacher decision making and sense of efficacy, Taylor and Bogotah (1994) found that teachers' self efficacy changed very little after the application of shared decision making.

It is argued that shared decision making is not a reform, but rather a methodology for management. However, teacher participation in decision making is viewed as a school reform change initiative centering on an alternative strategy for school management (Conley, Bacharach, and Bauer, 1989). This is an essential point in the discussion of shared decision making. If it is a matter of determining where power and authority for various types of decisions rest, than it would certainly mean the need for knowledge and expertise in the decision making process. Certainly, a knowledge base in decision making, training, willingness, ability to take risks, and experience are all necessary to guarantee logical decision making. Conley, Bacharach, and Bauer (1989) point out that teachers may not even want to be involved in shared decision making to the degree and type that the literature and laws suggest.

One of the critical components in shared decision making is teacher self-efficacy. There is a lack of clarity regarding role expectations and aspirations of teachers regarding decision making, which results in a lack of general and personal self efficacy in the workplace. Sachs (1990) supports this focus on teacher attributes of

self-efficacy, as a major element in productive schooling. The teacher's competency and self-efficacy greatly affect the teacher-student relationship.

Although there are positive results of shared decision making, there is also a great deal of frustration and confusion which results in increased teacher alienation. Therefore, it is critical that on-going studies be conducted to assess what teachers perceive to be occurring, their aspirations in the area of shared decision making, and these effects on overall work efficacy (Enderlin-Lampe, 1997).

2.5. The Situation in the Turkish Education System

There have been some important changes in the Turkish Education System in the last twenty years. Decentralization becomes the key word for the changing efforts. As Şimşek and Yıldırım (2004) state, the Ministry of National Education is one of the institutions which a centralized bureaucracy controlled since the founding of the Turkish Republic in 1923. Moreover, the Ministry has grown in size during these years, which leads to loss of the quality of education. In order to increase the quality again, many new trends have been adopted. The most popular of these them is Total Quality Management (TQM). TQM has been tried to be applied all the schools (Şişman and Turan, 2002). However, as TQM does not work properly in highly centralized organizations, it failed. The expected results have not been achieved since than. Participation of the staff to decisions has not been achieved because of the centralized hierarchy of the Turkish Ministry of National Education, which

controls decisions about all areas of education policy, from curriculum to personnel (Şimşek and Yıldırım, 2004).

According to the present hierarchy of the Turkish Ministry of National Education, it looks impossible to achieve both TQM and shared decision making. Although the situation looks almost impossible in theory, in fact, in practice it changes from district to district or even from school to school. Because principals have the power to change the applications of the top orders.

Some studies have been conducted so far about participations of teachers and administrators to decision making process. One of them is the study of Gökbaş and Kocabaş (2002). They conducted their study in Elazığ, Turkey. Their sample was made up of 450 teachers and 75 administrators. They tried to find out to what extent administrators believe in the importance of participation in the decision and to what extent administrators give their employees chance to participate in the decision making process. The study shows that both administrators and the teachers believe that decisions should be made together. All the participants thought that they could easily express their ideas for the points on discussion. They were happy that the decisions which had been made at the committee meetings are implemented. Therefore, they felt themselves powerful and they believed that they could change something. According to Gökbaş and Kocabaş (2002), there is a need for in-service training for teachers and administrators about shared decision making to increase the success of the implementation.

The latest survey about shared decision making was done by Erten (2004). She studied the actual and desired levels of shared decision making for private school teachers. She distributed a questionnaire to 253 teachers working for 10 of the private schools in Ankara and tried to gather data about to what extent do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making, in what categories do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making, and to what extent do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making, in what categories do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making. Her study revealed that there was a moderate participation in the decisions. According to her results, teachers are mostly consulted in the student and classroom related issues, and similarly, they desire to be consulted more in those issues compared to the other areas of decision making. Her findings also indicate that the private schools are mostly successful in applying shared decision making in most of the organization areas and the teachers who work in private schools perceive that they participate in all decisions to a lesser extent than they desire to participate.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter includes the overall design of the study, the sample, the data collection instrument, definitions of variables, the data analysis procedure and limitations of the study.

3.1. The Overall Design of the Study

In terms of methodological approach, when the participants, instrument and the procedure is considered, purpose statement, sampling strategies, data collection instrument, data collection technique and the analysis of results were on the base of quantitative approaches and the research design was based on survey method. Survey method was used because surveys are particularly useful in determining the actual values of variables under study, and the strengths of relationships among them. Moreover, survey method was preferred because of the following strengths it has: surveys are easy to administer; they are simple to score and code; they determine the values and relations of variables and constructs; responses can be generalized to other members of the population studied and often to other similar

populations; surveys can be reused easily, and provide an objective way of comparing responses over different groups, times, and places; surveys can be used to predict behavior and specific theoretical propositions can be tested in an objective fashion.

This study is designed to investigate the actual and desired levels of shared decision making in some public primary and secondary schools in Çankaya district of Ankara, Turkey and to investigate the following specific aims:

1. To what extent do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making in their schools?

2. In what categories do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making?

3. To what extent do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?

4. In what categories do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?

3.2 The Sample

The population of the study consists of 372 teachers who were teaching in 10 public primary and general secondary schools in Çankaya district of Ankara during 2004-2005 Spring Semester. By using random sampling procedure, a sample of 12 public schools, 6 of which are general secondary schools and the other 6 are basic

education schools, was selected from 121 public general secondary and primary schools in Çankaya district of Ankara during 2004-2005 Spring Semester. The selected sample represents 10% of the population of schools consisting of 103 public primary school and 18 public general secondary schools. Only 10 of the selected sample of schools accepted to join the study. Among these 10 schools, 6 of them are general secondary schools. These schools represent 33,3 % of the all general secondary schools in the district, which shows that this study covers very high percentage of the all population. Among these 10 schools, 4 of them are basic education because two primary schools did not accept to join the study due to the lack of time of their teachers.

The total number of teachers in the schools where the study was done is 733. Moreover, 478 of these teachers work in general secondary schools and 255 of them work in primary schools. The number of teachers who surveyed is 372, 267 of whom work in general secondary schools and 105 of whom work in primary schools. This means that the return rate is 50.8%, which is considerably high for a survey research.

Table 3.2.1 The Sample Distribution of the Subjects by Gender

Variable	Teacher	frequency	Percentage
Gender	Women	252	67,7
	Men	120	32,3
	Total	372	100

Table 3.2.2 The Sample Distribution of the Subjects by Age

Variable	Teacher	frequency	Percentage
Age	22-32	7	1,9
	33-43	141	37,9
	44-54	219	58,9
	55 and over	5	1,3
	Total	372	100

Table 3.2.3 The Sample Distribution of the Subjects by School Type They Work

Variable	Teacher	frequency	Percentage
School Type	Pre-school	11	3,0
	Basic Education	134	36,0
	Secondary Education	227	61,0
	Total	372	100

3.3. The Data Collection Instrument

The "Shared Education Decisions Survey-Revised" was used as a data collection instrument. Prof. Dr. Donna Ferrara, who lives in the USA, developed the original instrument, which was in English. The instrument was later translated into Turkish and used by Erten (2004).

The questionnaire had been developed according to a six-point likert scale from "never" to "always" (see Appendix B).

The validity and the reliability of the instrument were provided using the following steps (Ferrara, 1996):

1- Questionnaire was checked by the experts.
2- Questionnaire was pilot tested.
3- Questionnaire's internal consistency was measured with Cronbach Alpha test.

Table 3.3.1 Cronbach Alpha Reliabilities of the study (Ferrara, 1996)

Category	# Items/*Category	Actual Scores	Desired Scores
Planning	5	,88	,85
Policy	8	,91	,91
Curriculum/Instruction	8	,90	,94
Student Achievement	7	,81	,89
Pupil Personnel	5	,87	,87
Staff Personnel	12	,94	,92
School/Community	6	,91	,88
Parental Involvement	5	,91	,88
Staff Development	5	,95	,95
Budget	7	,96	,93
Plant Management	9	,94	,94
Total Scale	77	,98	,98

Table 3.3.2 Cronbach Alpha Reliabilities of the current study

Category	# Items/*Category	Actual Scores	Desired Scores
Planning	5	,88	,85
Policy	8	,91	,91
Curriculum/Instruction	8	,90	,94
Student Achievement	7	,81	,89
Pupil Personnel	5	,87	,87
Staff Personnel	12	,94	,92
School/Community	6	,91	,88
Parental Involvement	5	,91	,88
Staff Development	5	,95	,95
Budget	7	,96	,93
Plant Management	9	,94	,94
Total Scale	77	,98	,98

When the results of Cronbach Alpha Reliabilities of the current study, given in Table 3.3.2., and the Ferrara's studies, given in Table 3.3.1., are compared, it is seen that the internal consistency of the current study is higher than the Ferrara's studies. It can also be interpreted as this scale can measure the variables in this study done in Çankaya district more correctly than the Ferrara's studies.

3.4. Definitions of Variables

There are 154 observed variables in the questionnaire, 77 of which represents the actual level and 77 of which represents the desired level, under 11 categories. The categories are planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, student achievement, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community relations, parental involvement, staff development, budget and plant management.

There are also 5 questions about the participants' position in the school, school type, gender, age and education level.

3.5. The Data Analysis Procedure

To analyze the data of the survey descriptive statistics were used and the data collected through the survey were analyzed by using the SPSS program. In order to present the data, means, standard deviations and percentages are used.

3.6. Limitations of the Study

Although the permission from the Ministry of National Education for this study is given for 12 public schools, two of the schools did not permit the questionnaire to be applied in their schools. As a result of this, the proposed number of participants decreased.

On the other hand, the limitation on generalization is restricted to only 10 schools of the Çankaya district of Ankara.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings regarding the actual and desired levels of shared decision making in 10 public schools are presented. For the data analysis, descriptive statistics were used. The following research questions are answered:

1. To what extent do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making in their schools?

2. In what categories do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making?

3. To what extent do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?

4. In what categories do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?

While answering these questions, to present the solutions more clearly question 1, *to what extent do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making in their schools?*, and question 3, *to what extent do teachers perceive they*

desire to participate in shared decision making?, are answered together. Because seeing the actual and desired level together allows recognizing differences easily and makes comparisons easier.

Each category is analyzed from the beginning and question by question. Therefore, the answers of the question 2, *in what categories do teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making?* and question 4, *in what categories do teachers perceive they desire to participate in shared decision making?*, can be found either at the end of each category, in order to show categorical differences, or at the table 4.12.2., for the rank order of scores of categories of actual decision making, which allows seeing in what categories teachers perceive they actually participate in shared decision making in the rank order, or at the table 4.12.3.,for the rank order of scores of categories of desired decision making, which permits seeing in what categories teachers perceive they desired participate in shared decision making in the rank order.

4.1. The Actual and Desired Levels of Planning Decisions

Table 4.1.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Planning Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 1	A	2,74	,067	3	1,295
	D	5,17	,053	6	1,024
Question 2	A	3,07	,072	3	1,380
	D	5,20	,056	6	1,071

Table 4.1.1 (continued)

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 3	A	2,85	,072	3	1,384
	D	5,08	,059	6	1,141
Question 4	A	3,00	,065	2	1,249
	D	5,02	,066	6	1,262
Question 5	A	2,79	,068	3	1,319
	D	5,22	,054	6	1,038

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

A=Actual, D=Desired

In planning issue, teachers said that they sometimes participate in the decision making process at the school. Also the results show that they would like to participate in the process. In question 2, which is *setting building-level goals,* teachers are more positive about the actual situation than the other questions. On the other hand, in the question 1, which is *designing change initiatives at the building level*, question 2, *setting building-level goals* and question 5, which is *determining who will be involved in school-wide change initiatives*, almost all participants want to participate more in the decision making process. This shows that the willingness of teachers for change initiatives is higher than the other issues. The reason for this may be explained as the participants work for a very centralized organization, Ministry of National Education, and because change initiatives are limited and in the hands of Ministry, this result may reflect the current situation.

Table 4.1.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Planning Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Q 1	A	72	19,4	85	22,8	135	36,3	38	10,2	27	7,3	14	3,8
	D	0	0	0	0	26	7,0	89	23,9	51	13,7	202	54,3
Q 2	A	60	16,1	71	19,1	102	27,4	73	19,6	54	14,6	12	3,2
	D	0	0	10	2,7	18	4,8	69	18,5	65	17,5	210	56,5
Q 3	A	74	19,9	81	21,8	111	29,8	54	14,5	36	9,7	16	4,3
	D	1	,3	21	5,6	11	3,0	59	15,9	103	27,7	177	47,6
Q 4	A	39	10,5	105	28,2	102	27,4	82	22,0	32	8,6	12	3,2
	D	11	3,0	11	3,0	14	3,8	72	19,4	77	20,7	185	49,7
Q 5	A	70	18,8	92	24,7	110	29,6	60	16,1	26	7,0	14	3,8
	D	7	1,9	0	0	13	3,5	59	15,9	99	26,6	194	52,2

A=Actual, D=Desired

135 of 372 of the participants in question 1, which is, *designing change initiatives at the building level*, chose sometimes level which is the highest in this category. The frequencies show that almost 80% of the participants say never, rarely and sometimes. It can be concluded that because of the centralized structure of the Ministry of National Education, teachers are most disturbed from not participating in changing. Parallel to this, for desired level, question 1 *designing change initiatives at the building level*, is one of the questions which they want to

participate in more than the other questions. In this question no participants chose never or rarely.

4.2. The Actual and Desired Levels of Policy Decisions

Table 4.2.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Policy Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 6	A	2,71	,067	3	1,289
	D	4,96	,062	6	1,190
Question 7	A	2,79	,072	3	1,398
	D	5,40	,054	6	1,048
Question 8	A	2,69	,061	3	1,176
	D	5,08	,066	6	1,275
Question 9	A	2,98	,072	3	1,379
	D	5,17	,062	6	1,188
Question 10	A	2,75	,066	3	1,278
	D	5,08	,058	6	1,118
Question 11	A	2,30	,065	1	1,255
	D	5,04	,063	6	1,215
Question 12	A	2,74	,074	3	1,421
	D	5,22	,055	6	1,060
Question 13	A	2,41	,072	1	1,393
	D	5,20	,053	6	1,031

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation
A=Actual, D=Desired

According to the results of the Table 4.2.1 (The Actual and Desired Levels of Policy Decisions), teachers, in general, often participate in the policy decisions in the school. They participate more in the question 9, which is *establishing student*

38

attendance policies, than the others. Teachers are consulted more about this issue most probably because this is real part of the classroom activity, not a very critical decision, which means this may not be such an important decision to be given by the Ministry. Furthermore, they think that they less participate in the question 11, which is *setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators*. This result may also indicate that the centralized organizational structures, like Ministry of National Education, are generally closed to criticisms. On the other hand, participants want to take part in the decision revealed in question 7, which is *setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators*. This may indicate that teachers are not given power in the current situation; therefore, they would like to participate in this kind of decisions.

When the results of Table 4.2.2 (The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Policy Decisions) are considered, for the question 11, which is *setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators*, and question 12, which is *setting guidelines for evaluation of teachers*, the percentage of teachers who think that they never participate in the policy decisions is very high. On the other hand, in the question 7, which is *setting guidelines for student conduct, discipline*, 65,9 % of teachers, which is the highest percentage in policy decision questions, believe that they should always participate in the policy decisions. In question 6, which is, question 10, *establishing academic eligibility policies for students participation in extracurricular activities*, and question 11, *setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators*, the percentage of these teachers get lower, until 41,9%. For policy decisions, teachers think that they should often, usually or always participate more

in the decisions. The ones who think they should participate never, sometimes or sometimes is very low.

Table 4.2.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Policy Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q6	A	82	22,0	76	20,4	127	34,1	50	13,4	28	7,5	9	2,4
	D	10	2,7	4	1,1	28	7,5	62	16,7	112	30,1	156	41,9
Q7	A	86	23,1	73	19,6	112	30,1	45	12,1	45	12,1	11	3,0
	D	7	1,9	3	,8	11	3,0	38	10,2	68	18,3	245	65,9
Q8	A	73	19,6	77	20,7	142	38,2	49	13,2	25	6,7	3	,8
	D	12	3,2	10	2,7	17	4,6	54	14,5	79	21,2	197	53,0
Q9	A	69	18,5	71	19,1	92	24,7	92	24,7	33	8,9	15	4,0
	D	7	1,9	16	4,3	7	1,9	49	13,2	92	24,7	201	54,0
Q10	A	79	21,2	76	20,4	117	31,5	66	17,7	27	7,3	7	1,9
	D	10	2,7	0	0	20	5,4	59	15,9	116	31,2	167	44,9
Q11	A	132	35,5	82	22,0	102	27,4	28	7,5	25	6,7	3	,8
	D	12	3,2	11	3,0	9	2,4	53	14,2	119	32,0	168	45,2
Q12	A	89	23,9	82	22,0	110	29,6	31	8,3	47	12,6	13	3,5
	D	2	,5	13	3,5	10	2,7	48	12,9	101	27,2	198	53,2
Q13	A	127	34,1	89	23,9	80	21,5	41	11,0	21	5,6	14	3,8
	D	1	,3	12	3,2	9	2,4	58	15,6	100	26,9	192	51,6

A=Actual, D=Desired

4.3 The Actual and Desired Levels of Curriculum/Instruction Decisions

Table 4.3.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Curriculum/Instruction Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 14	A	2,70	,075	1	1,446
	D	5,19	,064	6	1,226
Question 15	A	2,66	,070	3	1,354
	D	5,14	,057	6	1,093
Question 16	A	3,50	,083	3	1,600
	D	5,37	,059	6	1,122
Question 17	A	3,37	,082	3	1,574
	D	5,36	,054	6	1,034
Question 18	A	3,38	,077	3	1,479
	D	5,23	,060	6	1,147
Question 19	A	3,39	,079	3	1,527
	D	5,35	,053	6	1,012
Question 20	A	3,16	,075	3	1,453
	D	5,35	,051	6	,981
Question 21	A	2,62	,072	3	1,388
	D	5,26	,060	6	1,146

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

A=Actual, D=Desired

Table 4.3.1 reveals that teachers think they most participate in this category is question 16, which is *selecting textbooks*. Moreover, it is the same question that teachers would like to participate in most. This may be explained as teachers give importance to the textbooks used in the classroom. Moreover, teachers think they less participate in the question 21, *designing new academic programs.* This may be the result from the centralized structure of the Ministry. Because, currently, programs are decided by the Ministry.

41

Table 4.3.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Curriculum/Instruction Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q14	A	103	27,7	68	18,3	99	26,6	52	14,0	32	8,6	16	4,3
	D	11	3,0	4	1,1	24	6,5	43	11,6	71	19,1	217	58,3
Q15	A	90	24,2	84	22,6	107	28,8	50	13,4	24	6,5	14	3,8
	D	7	1,9	2	,5	23	6,2	46	12,4	112	30,1	179	48,1
Q16	A	47	12,6	58	15,6	92	24,7	64	17,2	48	12,9	59	15,9
	D	10	2,7	2	,5	15	4,0	30	8,1	68	18,3	241	64,8
Q17	A	47	12,6	76	20,4	92	24,7	46	12,4	65	17,5	44	11,8
	D	7	1,9	2	,5	9	2,4	45	12,1	75	20,2	231	62,1
Q18	A	52	14,0	46	12,4	103	27,7	81	21,8	51	13,7	35	9,4
	D	12	3,2	2	,5	11	3,0	44	11,8	95	25,5	204	54,8
Q19	A	53	14,2	57	15,3	87	23,4	75	20,2	63	16,9	36	9,7
	D	7	1,9	2	,5	5	1,3	50	13,4	82	22,0	225	60,5
Q20	A	72	19,4	27	7,3	138	37,1	65	17,5	42	11,3	27	7,3
	D	7	1,9	0	0	8	2,2	42	11,3	99	26,6	215	57,8
Q21	A	106	28,5	66	17,7	113	30,4	51	13,7	18	4,8	17	4,6
	D	12	3,2	1	,3	14	3,8	39	10,5	89	23,9	216	58,1

A=Actual, D=Desired

For curriculum/instruction issues, participants think that they are sometimes consulted. This thought reaches its peak in question 20, *determining new programs for inclusion in the curriculum*, with the percentage of 37,1%. Although the higher percentages show that they are sometimes consulted, in question 14, *choosing content/program areas for curriculum development*, question 15, *choosing content for inclusion in curriculum documents*, question 20, *determining new programs for inclusion in the curriculum* and question 21, *designing new academic programs*, most teachers think that they are never or sometimes consulted for curriculum/instruction issues. On the other hand, in question 17, *selecting instructional materials*, question 18, *determining changes in course offerings*, and question 19, *determining teaching methodologies*, most of the teachers say that they often or usually would like to participate in this decisions. This may indicate that teachers would like to have more power related to classroom issues. In contrast, in question 16, *selecting textbooks*, 15,9 % of teachers and in question 17, *selecting instructional materials,*11,8 % of teachers think that they always participate in the decisions, which are the highest scores in this group. However, in questions 14, *choosing content/program areas for curriculum development,* and question 15, *choosing content for inclusion in curriculum documents*, almost none of the teachers, 4,3% for the former and 3,8% for the latter, think that they always participate in the decisions.

4.4. The Actual and Desired Levels of Student Achievement Decisions

In the student achievement decision group, referring to the Table 4.4.1 (The Actual and Desired Levels of Student Achievement Decisions), teachers feel that they often participate in the decisions. While in question 22, *specifying grade-level or course-level student outcomes*, question 23, *determining student grading practices*, and question 24, *determining strategies for optimizing time on task* participants think that they participate in the process sometimes or more, in question 25, *setting guidelines for student testing and assessment*, question 26, *determining specific standardized tests and other forms of student assessments*, question 27, *evaluating the alignment between textbooks, curriculum, and testing programs*, and question 28, *evaluating the alignment between teaching, testing, and staff development*, they think that they participate sometimes or less. On the other hand, when the desired level is considered, almost all teachers want to participate in the decision making process. In questions 22, *specifying grade-level or course-level student outcomes*, and question 23, *determining student grading practices* no teacher says never or sometimes to participate. Question 23, *determining student grading practices*, shows the highest actual participation. Probably because in the current system, grading is determined mostly by teachers. Moreover, teachers almost always would like to participate in this decision making process.

Table 4.4.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Student Achievement Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 22	A	3,36	,077	3	1,481
	D	5,38	,047	6	,909
Question 23	A	3,40	,074	3	1,422
	D	5,44	,046	6	,886
Question 24	A	3,31	,069	3	1,337
	D	5,43	,040	6	,769
Question 25	A	3,00	,072	3	1,385
	D	5,45	,045	6	,867
Question 26	A	3,15	,161	3	3,101
	D	5,28	,056	6	1,072
Question 27	A	2,86	,071	3	1,357
	D	5,38	,051	6	,977
Question 28	A	2,76	,070	3	1,345
	D	5,19	,056	6	1,075

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

A=Actual, D=Desired

Furthermore, for Table 4.4.2 (The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Student Achievement Decisions), in question 28, *evaluating the alignment between teaching, testing, and staff development,* only 51,3% of the participants say they always want to participate while in other question this percentage rises until 62,6. Besides, the question 28 is about the issue of which teachers are not happy with the present condition. The reason for this may be because participants might not think this is part of their job.

Table 4.4.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Student Achievement Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 2 2	A	46	12,4	45	12,1	142	38,2	52	14,0	39	10,5	47	12,6
	D	0	0	0	0	22	5,9	43	11,6	77	20,7	229	61,6
Q 2 3	A	46	12,4	43	11,6	118	31,7	67	18,0	69	18,5	26	7,0
	D	0	0	6	1,6	11	3,0	30	8,1	89	23,9	233	62,6
Q 2 4	A	41	11,0	51	13,7	132	35,5	62	16,7	69	18,5	16	4,3
	D	0	0	0	0	9	2,4	37	9,9	112	30,1	213	57,3
Q 2 5	A	65	17,5	69	18,5	113	30,4	65	17,5	43	11,6	16	4,3
	D	0	0	9	2.4	2	,5	33	8,9	95	25,5	232	62,4
Q 2 6	A	68	18,3	64	17,2	110	29,6	69	18,5	36	9,7	21	5,6
	D	5	1,3	7	1,9	11	3,0	49	13,2	81	21,8	216	58,1
Q 2 7	A	78	21,0	57	15,3	135	36,3	55	14,8	27	7,3	17	4,6
	D	0	0	9	2,4	14	3,8	36	9,7	77	20,7	233	62,6
Q 2 8	A	82	22,0	77	20,7	99	26,6	73	19,6	21	5,6	13	3,5
	D	5	1,3	7	1,9	13	3,5	53	14,2	100	26,9	191	51,3

A=Actual, D=Desired

4.5. The Actual and Desired Levels of Pupil Personnel Decisions

Table 4.5.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Pupil Personnel Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 29	A	2,89	,082	1	1,572
	D	5,17	,065	6	1,256
Question 30	A	3,07	,078	3	1,497
	D	5,28	,056	6	1,085
Question 31	A	3,31	,071	3	1,371
	D	5,45	,052	6	,997
Question 32	A	3,39	,075	3	1,439
	D	5,36	,047	6	,896
Question 33	A	3,55	,078	3	1,494
	D	5,31	,052	6	,999

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

A=Actual, D=Desired

It is the question 29, *determining student placement for instructional programs*, teachers say that they less participate in the decisions than the others; moreover, they would like to participate less than the other questions in this category. The reason for this result may be explained as, according to the current educational system, placement are made considering either the general exam results or the schools' capacity free from teachers participation. Teachers' less desire for this issue can be explained as they may think this issue is not related to them.

Table 4.5.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Pupil Personnel Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 2 9	A	101	27,2	66	17,7	70	18,8	53	14,2	64	17,2	15	4,0
	D	12	3,2	13	3,5	5	1,3	52	14,0	77	20,7	210	56,5
Q 3 0	A	78	21,0	54	14,5	104	28,0	46	12,4	75	20,2	13	3,5
	D	12	3,2	0	0	3	,8	51	13,7	95	25,5	209	56,2
Q 3 1	A	32	8,6	66	17,7	141	37,9	48	12,9	52	14,0	31	8,3
	D	7	1,9	0	0	7	1,9	46	12,4	54	14,5	254	68,3
Q 3 2	A	50	13,4	35	9,4	120	32,3	80	21,5	49	13,2	34	9,1
	D	0	0	0	0	17	4,6	54	14,5	77	20,7	220	59,1
Q 3 3	A	39	10,5	48	12,9	110	29,6	60	16,1	68	18,3	44	11,8
	D	0	0	11	3,0	9	2,4	51	13,7	81	21,8	217	58,3

A=Actual, D=Desired

In this category, for each question, the highest percentage of the teachers think they sometimes join the decisions, except question 29, *determining student placement for instructional programs*, in which the highest percentage belongs to the teachers who think they never join the process. In question 31, which is, *helping to solve a student's academic problem*, 68,3% and in question 32, which is, *choosing student support services administered by guidance*, 59,1% of the teachers think that they

should always participate the decisions, which are the highest percentages in this category. In general, most of the teachers think that they should always or usually participate in the decisions.

4.6. The Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Personnel Decisions

Table 4.6.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Personnel Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 34	A	2,26	,063	1	1,203
	D	4,98	,075	6	1,424
Question 35	A	2,37	,067	1	1,273
	D	4,91	,073	6	1,376
Question 36	A	2,39	,074	1	1,417
	D	5,03	,069	6	1,323
Question 37	A	3,52	,086	3	1,662
	D	5,22	,066	6	1,280
Question 38	A	2,83	,081	1	1,553
	D	5,34	,054	6	1,034
Question 39	A	3,13	,081	3	1,570
	D	5,34	,050	6	,962
Question 40	A	2,97	,085	1	1,627
	D	5,26	,060	6	1,151
Question 41	A	3,04	,090	1	1,713
	D	5,15	,068	6	1,293
Question 42	A	2,86	,080	3	1,540
	D	5,07	,072	6	1,382
Question 43	A	3,17	,084	3	1,622
	D	5,22	,062	6	1,187
Question 44	A	3,28	,091	1	1,747
	D	5,27	,054	6	1,038
Question 45	A	2,91	,089	1	1,709
	D	5,53	,040	6	,775

Table 4.6.1 (continued)
M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation
 A=Actual, D=Desired

Staff personnel group consists of questions which are directly related to teachers. According to this table, the lowest level that teacher actually participate is 2,26 in question 34, which is *hiring building administrators*. It reflects that administers are appointed by the Ministry, which also refers to the centralized structure. The issue which teachers think they participate in more than the other issues in this category is question 37, which is, *selecting department heads*. Because department heads are either elected or selected at the schools, not determined by the Ministry, teachers have more opportunity to contribute the decisions. The data about the question 45, which is *resolving employee grievances*, enlightens an important point. The data shows that teachers are not given enough opportunity to solve their problems or to realize their wishes. This is most probably because of not determining teachers' satisfaction level. Moreover, it reveals that teachers would like to participate more in this issue.

About the Table 4.6.2 (The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Personnel Decisions), the results show that most of the teachers are not happy with their participation to the decisions. In question 34, *hiring building administrators*, question 35, *hiring instructional personnel*, question 45, *resolving employee grievances*, and especially in question 36, *hiring educational support personnel*, which have the highest percentage, 39 %, participants think that they never

participate in the decisions. On the other hand, more participants think they always or usually participate in the decisions in question 37, *selecting department heads*, with the percentage of 14,8 and 19,4; question 40, *determining duty assignments*; question 41, *granting tenure to teachers*; question 43, *assigning staff to committees*; and question 44, *planning agendas for staff meetings*.

Table 4.6.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Personnel Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 3 4	A	134	36,0	67	18,0	107	28,8	40	10,8	7	1,9	5	1,3
	D	19	5,1	11	3,0	28	7,5	28	7,5	89	23,9	185	49,7
Q 3 5	A	132	35,5	54	14,5	108	29,0	49	13,2	15	4,0	4	1,1
	D	19	5,1	5	1,3	33	8,9	39	10,5	101	27,2	163	43,8
Q 3 6	A	145	39,0	50	13,4	97	26,1	36	9,4	27	7,3	10	2,7
	D	18	4,8	5	1,3	15	4,0	58	15,6	83	22,3	185	49,7
Q 3 7	A	65	17,5	33	8,9	99	26,6	47	12,6	72	19,4	55	14,8
	D	18	4,8	0	0	17	4,6	40	10,8	68	18,3	228	61,3
Q 3 8	A	102	27,4	69	18,5	70	18,8	74	19,9	29	7,8	26	7,0
	D	7	1,9	2	,5	8	2,2	50	13,4	79	21,2	224	60,2
Q 3 9	A	79	21,2	49	13,2	110	29,6	52	14,0	47	12,6	35	9,4
	D	5	1,3	2	,5	12	3,2	32	8,6	112	30,1	209	56,2
Q 4 0	A	93	25,0	62	16,7	89	23,9	38	10,2	51	13,7	32	8,6
	D	10	2,7	2	,5	21	5,6	31	8,3	87	23,4	214	57,5

Table 4.6.2 (continued)

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q41	A	94	25,3	68	18,3	71	19,1	36	9,7	55	14,8	41	11,0
	D	12	3,2	10	2,7	21	5,6	34	9,1	74	19,9	209	56,2
Q42	A	101	27,2	48	12,9	107	28,8	54	14,5	30	8,1	28	7,5
	D	21	5,6	6	1,6	19	5,1	36	9,7	85	22,8	201	54,0
Q43	A	83	22,3	45	12,1	95	25,5	58	15,6	51	13,7	38	10,2
	D	3	,8	16	4,3	23	6,2	33	8,9	74	19,9	221	59,4
Q44	A	88	23,7	53	14,2	60	16,1	59	15,9	62	12,7	50	13,4
	D	0	0	12	3,2	14	3,8	49	13,2	82	22,0	215	57,8
Q45	A	117	31,5	52	14,0	76	20,4	37	9,9	56	15,1	34	9,1
	D	0	0	0	0	17	4,6	14	3,8	94	25,3	247	66,4

A=Actual, D=Desired

4.7. The Actual and Desired Levels of School/Community Relations Decisions

Table 4.7.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of School/Community Relations Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 46	A	2,65	,066	2	1,271
	D	5,19	,053	6	1,014
Question 47	A	2,67	,066	3	1,272
	D	5,07	,061	6	1,172

Table 4.7.1 (continued)

		M	S.E.M	Md.	S.D.
Question 48	A	2,39	,067	1	1,290
	D	4,85	,072	6	1,383
Question 49	A	2,47	,070	1	1,344
	D	4,87	,065	6	1,259
Question 50	A	2,82	,079	1	1,530
	D	5,22	,060	6	1,161
Question 51	A	2,54	,076	1	1,439
	D	5,23	,053	6	1,017

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

A=Actual, D=Desired

In terms of school/community relations decisions, teachers, in general, participate in the decisions less than "sometimes". In question 48, *selecting community or business representatives for involvement in school committees*, teachers think they participate the least in this category. Not having active school-community relationship in Turkish education system may be the reason for this. Moreover, it is the same subject which teachers would like to participate in the least.

Table 4.7.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of School/Community Relations Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 46	A	67	18,0	117	31,5	115	30,9	37	9,9	19	5,1	16	4,3
	D	0	0	0	0	38	10,2	48	12,9	91	24,5	194	52,2

A=Actual, D=Desired

Table 4.7.2 (continued)

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q47	A	71	19,1	102	27,4	134	36,0	19	5,1	34	9,1	11	3,0
	D	2	,5	5	1,3	47	12,6	51	13,7	72	19,4	194	52,2
Q48	A	115	30,9	106	28,5	72	19,4	43	11,6	33	8,9	1	,3
	D	16	4,3	10	2,7	38	10,2	51	13,7	90	24,2	165	44,4
Q49	A	114	30,6	89	23,9	89	23,9	45	12,1	25	6,7	9	2,4
	D	5	1,3	11	3,0	54	14,5	43	11,6	103	27,7	155	41,7
Q50	A	97	26,1	77	20,7	77	20,7	51	13,7	52	14,0	17	4,6
	D	10	2,7	3	,8	20	5,4	39	10,5	88	23,7	211	56,7
Q51	A	117	31,5	77	20,7	79	21,2	41	11,0	39	10,5	9	2,4
	D	0	0	7	1,9	23	6,2	44	11,8	95	25,5	193	51,9

A=Actual, D=Desired

In this part, school/community relations, the participants do not have a general common point. The results show differences in each question. For example, in question 46, *involving community/civic groups in school activities*, and question 47, which is, *involving business groups in school activities*, the participants think that they sometimes or less participate in the decisions. However, from question 48 to 51, they think that they never or sometimes participate in the decisions. Moreover, in question 51, *resolving difficulties with community/business groups*, the percentage of these participants reaches its peak, 31,5. In question 50, which is, *distributing outside resources within the school*, on the other hand, the distribution

of actual level answers are almost equal, except the ones who say always. In terms of desired level almost all participants wish to participate the decision. The percentage of these participants in question 50, which is 51,9 %, is higher than the others.

4.8. The Actual and Desired Levels of Parental Involvement Decisions

Table 4.8.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Parental Involvement Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 52	A	3,03	,079	3	1,530
	D	5,24	,056	6	1,070
Question 53	A	3,07	,078	2	1,495
	D	5,28	,053	6	1,011
Question 54	A	3,01	,066	3	1,280
	D	5,28	,052	6	1,000
Question 55	A	3,66	,085	3	1,644
	D	5,52	,041	6	,792
Question 56	A	3,70	,078	5	1,495
	D	5,55	,043	6	,837

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation
A=Actual, D=Desired

Parental involvement is one of the categories which teachers show more participation than the other categories. Question 56, which is *resolving parental complaints*, revealed higher participation both in the actual level and desired level than the other questions in this category. This result may show that when parents have a problem, if it is about their child, they prefer to solve it with the child's teacher not the administration.

Table 4.8.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Parental Involvement Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q52	A	80	21,5	68	18,3	82	22,0	65	17,5	54	14,5	22	5,9
	D	5	1,3	5	1,3	16	4,3	50	13,4	89	23,9	206	55,4
Q53	A	53	14,2	110	29,6	75	20,2	50	13,4	58	15,6	25	6,7
	D	5	1,3	5	1,3	13	3,5	33	8,9	118	31,7	197	53,0
Q54	A	47	12,6	90	24,2	110	29,6	75	20,2	39	10,5	11	3,0
	D	5	1,3	2	,5	14	3,8	44	11,8	104	28,0	203	54,6
Q55	A	45	12,1	56	15,1	81	21,8	55	14,8	68	18,3	67	18,0
	D	0	0	0	0	9	2,4	43	11,6	67	18,0	253	68,0
Q56	A	22	5,9	83	22,3	58	15,6	76	20,4	86	23,1	47	12,6
	D	0	0	7	1,9	8	2,2	18	4,8	79	21,2	260	69,9

A=Actual, D=Desired

In parental involvement category, the results show differences in each question. In question 52, which is, *selecting parents for involvement in school committees*, 22% of the teachers think that they are sometimes consulted, and 21,5% think that they are never consulted. In question 53, *selecting parents for involvement in shared decision making committees or councils*; question 54, *determining the amount of influence the pta will have on school functioning*; and 55, *setting agenda items for parental meetings*, teachers feel that they are sometimes or sometimes consulted.

However, in question 56, *resolving parental complaints*, most of the teachers think that they usually participated in the decisions. In terms of desired level, most of the teachers want to contribute the decision making processes in the school. Especially, in question 55 and 56, the percentage of the teachers who thinks they should always participate the decisions is very high, 68% in question 55, and 69,9% in question 56.

4.9. The Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Development Decisions

Table 4.9.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Development Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 57	A	2,54	,073	1	1,394
	D	5,05	,062	6	1,188
Question 58	A	2,61	,075	1	1,444
	D	5,21	,052	6	1,001
Question 59	A	2,57	,070	1	1,343
	D	5,21	,050	6	,954
Question 60	A	2,66	,069	1	1,325
	D	5,20	,054	6	1,044
Question 61	A	2,60	,071	1	1,360
	D	5,19	,054	6	1,034

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation
A=Actual, D=Desired

Staff development is among the categories which teachers mention less participation than the other categories. Least participation among them is question 57, which is assigning staff to staff development committees, this is also the same question which teachers would like to participate less than the other questions in

this category. Teachers may just want to deal with teaching not other the issues administration can do.

Table 4.9.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Staff Development Decisions

Item s		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 5 7	A	110	29,6	83	22,3	93	25,0	42	11,3	27	7,3	13	3,5
	D	5	1,3	14	3,8	25	6,7	42	11,3	111	29,8	171	46,0
Q 5 8	A	107	28,8	81	21,8	92	24,7	43	11,6	27	7,3	18	4,8
	D	0	0	12	3,2	5	1,3	66	17,7	95	25,5	190	51,1
Q 5 9	A	109	29,3	68	18,3	109	29,3	42	11,3	35	9,4	5	1,3
	D	0	0	12	3,2	10	2,7	34	9,1	143	38,4	169	45,4
Q 6 0	A	92	24,7	85	22,8	90	24,2	60	16,1	39	10,5	2	,5
	D	0	0	12	3,2	15	4,0	54	14,5	95	25,5	192	51,6
Q 6 1	A	100	26,9	91	24,5	83	22,3	51	13,7	38	10,2	5	1,3
	D	0	0	9	2,4	13	3,5	75	20,2	74	19,9	197	53,0

A=Actual, D=Desired

In staff development part, the participants generally think that they never participate in the decisions. Especially, in question 57, *assigning staff to staff development committees*, the percentage reaches 29,6. In question 60, *implementing staff development activities*, only 0,5% of the teachers say that they are always consulted.

In desired level, most of the teachers want to participate in the decisions. In question 58, *carrying out staff development needs assessments*, question 59, *designing staff development activities*, question 60, *implementing staff development activities* and question 61, nobody thinks that they should never be consulted.

4.10. The Actual and Desired Levels of Budget Decisions

Table 4.10.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Budget Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 62	A	2,56	,077	1	1,452
	D	5,33	,059	6	1,128
Question 63	A	2,45	,075	1	1,438
	D	5,11	,065	6	1,238
Question 64	A	2,38	,073	1	1,395
	D	5,09	,066	6	1,255
Question 65	A	2,45	,073	1	1,385
	D	5,15	,065	6	1,242
Question 66	A	2,56	,084	1	1,597
	D	5,15	,064	6	1,216
Question 67	A	2,62	,085	1	1,616
	D	5,18	,060	6	1,140
Question 68	A	2,67	,083	1	1,590
	D	4,79	,080	6	1,515

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation
A=Actual, D=Desired

The significant result in this category is that in question 68, which is cutting monies from department /grade-level budgets, teachers mention that this is the issue they are consulted most among the other issues in this category; however, the data also show that this is the same issue which teachers would like to participate the least.

The reason for this may be that teachers might want to control the money of their department because the authority to decide to cut the monies is given to the principal.

Table 4.10.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Budget Decisions

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 6 2	A	117	31,5	66	17,7	97	26,1	37	9,9	26	7,0	17	4,6
	D	11	3,0	5	1,3	8	2,2	25	6,7	94	25,3	217	58,3
Q 6 3	A	127	34,1	79	21,2	86	23,1	30	8,1	28	7,5	15	4,0
	D	11	3,0	8	2,2	23	6,2	34	9,1	101	27,2	188	50,5
Q 6 4	A	126	33,9	86	23,1	95	25,5	23	6,2	16	4,3	19	5,1
	D	11	3,0	10	2,7	15	4,0	57	15,3	79	21,2	193	51,9
Q 6 5	A	115	30,9	86	23,1	103	27,7	24	6,5	19	5,1	18	4,8
	D	14	3,8	4	1,1	19	5,1	37	9,9	95	25,5	196	52,7
Q 6 6	A	137	36,8	63	16,9	67	18,0	31	8,3	47	12,6	18	4,8
	D	12	3,2	2	,5	26	7,0	35	9,4	94	25,3	194	52,2
Q 6 7	A	134	36,0	53	14,2	84	22,6	26	7,0	42	11,3	24	6,5
	D	10	2,7	2	,5	11	3,0	63	16,9	79	21,2	198	53,2

A=Actual, D=Desired

Table 4.10.2 (continued)

Items		Never		Sometimes		Sometimes		Often		Usually		Always	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Q 6 8	A	122	32,8	59	15,9	85	22,8	32	8,6	42	11,3	23	6,2
	D	25	6,7	9	2,4	40	10,8	39	10,5	82	22,0	168	45,2

A=Actual, D=Desired

In budget part, in all questions participants mostly state that they are never consulted. In question 66, *managing the building-level budget*, its reaches the highest percentage, 36,8%. However, participants state that they want to participate the decision making process.

4.11. The Actual and Desired Levels of Plant Management Decisions

Table 4.11.1 The Actual and Desired Levels of Plant Management Decisions

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 69	A	2,72	,077	3	1,466
	D	5,25	,055	6	1,052
Question 70	A	2,40	,070	1	1,334
	D	5,05	,064	6	1,229
Question 71	A	2,31	,068	1	1,299
	D	5,03	,065	6	1,238
Question 72	A	2,43	,072	1	1,378
	D	5,11	,064	6	1,235
Question 73	A	2,67	,075	1	1,444
	D	5,17	,063	6	1,217

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

61

Table 4.11.1 (continued)

Items		M	S.E.M	M.d	S.D.
Question 74	A	3,39	,091	1	1,746
	D	5,26	,058	6	1,117
Question 75	A	3,34	,094	1	1,809
	D	5,24	,061	6	1,184
Question 76	A	3,40	,095	1	1,823
	D	5,10	,069	6	1,322
Question 77	A	3,80	,106	6	2,043
	D	5,39	,052	6	1,008

M=Mean, S.E.M=Standart Error of Mean, Md.=Mode, S.D.=Standart Deviation

The last category is the Plant management. Among the issues taking place in this category, in question 71, *determining the scheduling of capital projects*, teachers mention that they participate the least; similarly, they would like to participate the least. On the other hand, in question 77, *determining the hours of the school schedule*, teachers think that they participate in more than the other issues and ;likewise, teachers almost always would like to participate in the decision making process of this issue. Because this is one of the most important issues, which affects teachers' lives, they have a desire to always participate the decisions.

Table 4.11.2 The Statistics for the Actual and Desired Levels of Plant Management Decisions

Items		Never f	%	Sometimes f	%	Sometimes f	%	Often f	%	Usually f	%	Always f	%
Q69	A	104	28,0	54	14,5	121	32,5	38	10,2	27	7,3	22	5,9
	D	5	1,3	7	1,9	9	2,4	49	13,2	98	26,3	198	53,2
Q70	A	130	34,9	70	18,8	92	24,7	46	12,4	21	5,6	7	1,9
	D	15	4,0	0	0	17	4,6	65	17,5	90	24,2	179	48,1
Q71	A	128	34,4	109	27,2	63	16,9	51	13,7	16	4,3	7	1,9
	D	15	4,0	0	0	17	4,6	73	19,6	82	22,0	179	48,1
Q72	A	122	32,8	83	22,3	103	27,7	18	4,8	33	8,9	11	3,0
	D	15	4,0	0	0	20	5,4	54	14,5	88	23,7	193	51,9
Q73	A	104	28,0	72	19,4	94	25,3	54	14,5	25	6,7	18	4,8
	D	7	1,9	15	4,0	18	4,8	33	8,9	92	24,7	205	55,1
Q74	A	79	21,2	47	12,6	78	21,0	39	10,5	75	20,2	54	14,5
	D	6	1,6	7	1,9	26	7,0	16	4,3	109	29,3	208	55,9
Q75	A	87	23,4	48	12,9	82	22,0	23	6,2	69	18,5	62	16,7
	D	9	2,4	8	2,2	21	5,6	25	6,7	93	25,0	216	58,1
Q76	A	93	25,0	42	11,3	53	14,2	49	13,2	77	20,7	58	15,6
	D	13	3,5	11	3,0	27	7,3	30	8,1	82	22,6	207	55,6
Q77	A	86	23,1	43	11,6	45	12,1	15	4,0	53	14,2	130	34,9
	D	5	1,3	7	1,9	13	3,5	13	3,5	108	29,0	226	60,8

A=Actual, D=Desired

63

For this final category, plant management decisions, participants mostly state that they never participate in the decisions, except question 69, *determining priority use of school facilities*, in this question, teachers generally think that they are sometimes consulted about the decision. From question 74 to question 77, the number of teachers who are happy with the actual situation increases. Especially in question 77, which is, *determining the hours of the school schedule*, this number increases to its peak. The percentage of participants who says they are always consulted is 34,9. For the desired level, most of the teachers want to participate in the decisions.

4.12.General Results

Table 4.12.1 The Actual and Desired Scores of Decision Making of the Sample

Area of Decision Making	Actual Score (Means)	Desired Score (Means)
1- Planning	2.99	5.12
2- Policy	2.67	5.14
3- Curriculum/Instruction	3.08	5.24
4- Student Achievement	3.10	5.34
5- Pupil Personnel	3.22	5.27
6- Staff Personnel	2.86	5.13

Table 4.12.1 (continued)

Area of Decision Making	Actual Score (Means)	Desired Score (Means)
7- School/Community Relations	2.57	5.03
8- Parental Involvement	3.29	5.37
9- Staff Development	2.57	5.12
10- Budget	2.47	4.99
11- Plant Management	2.92	5.14

Shared Education Decisions Survey shows that teachers are sometimes consulted in most of the decisions, but some areas show moderate rate of participation compared to the other areas.

The areas which teachers participate in more than the others are: Parental involvement, Pupil personnel, Student achievement and Curriculum/Instruction. In these areas, teachers think that they sometimes participate in the decisions.

The highest difference (2.55) between actual scores and desired scores belong to the *Staff Development* category, which can be comprehended as teachers may want to see the considerable development in this area.

The smallest difference (2.05) between actual scores and desired scores belong to the *Pupil Personnel* category, which may mean that teachers are happier about the current situation when compared with the other categories.

Table 4.12.2 Rank Order of Scores of Categories of Actual Decision Making

Ranking	Area of Decision Making	Actual Score
1	Parental Involvement	3.29
2	Pupil Personnel	3.22
3	Student Achievement	3.10
4	Curriculum/Instruction	3.08
5	Planning	2.99
6	Plant Management	2.92
7	Staff Personnel	2.86
8	Policy	2.67
9	Staff Development	2.57

Table 4.12.2 (continued)

Ranking	Area of Decision Making	Actual Score
9	School/Community Relations	2.57
11	Budget	2.47

In *parental involvement*, *pupil personnel*, *student achievement* and *curriculum and instruction* areas, teachers sometimes participate the decision making process. Among these areas, *parental involvement* shows the highest level of participation. Most probably, because there is no information center which the scores and development of the students are kept, administrators need to consult the teachers; in this sense, teachers are seen as the only source to give information about the students. This may be the reason why *parental involvement* score is higher than the others.

On the other hand, in planning, plant management, staff personnel, policy, staff development, school/community relations and budget areas, teachers sometimes participate in the decision. Moreover, budget shows the least participation compared to the other areas. Because of the centralized structure of the Ministry, most of the decisions about these areas are taken in the Ministry. Therefore, teachers have little chance to participate in these decisions.

Table 4.12.3 Rank Order of Scores of Categories of Desired Decision Making

Ranking	Area of Decision Making	Desired Score
1	Parental Involvement	5.37
2	Student Achievement	5.34
3	Pupil Personnel	5.27
4	Curriculum/Instruction	5.24
5	Policy	5.14
5	Plant Management	5.14
7	Staff Personnel	5.13
8	Staff Development	5.12
8	Planning	5.12
10	School/Community Relations	5.03
11	Budget	4.99

It can be said that, in all areas, teachers always want to participate the decision making. The area which most of the teachers want to participate is parental involvement. However, the area which teachers least want to participate compared to the other areas is budget.

It can also be seen that some items of the questionnaire reveal more participation than the other items. These items are question 77, which is, *determining the hours of the school schedule*, (M=3.80), question 56, which is, *resolving parental conflicts*, (M=3.70), question 33, *determining pupils who are given commendations, awards, and scholarships*, (M=3.55), question 37, *selecting department heads*, (M=3.52), and question 16, *selecting textbooks*, (M=3.50). These results show that teachers are mostly consulted about the issues affecting their lives directly.

There are also some items which reveal lower participation compared to the other ones. These are question 34, *hiring building administrators* (M=2.26); question 11, *setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators* (M=2.30); question 71, *determining the scheduling of capital projects* (M=2.31); and question 64, *allocating monies for curriculum development* (M=2.38). These results clearly show that teachers do not want to spent their time on the issues which are not related to education, especially about the issues related to money.

According to the results of the study, in some questions, teachers have high desires to participate these decisions. These questions are question 56, *resolving parental complaints* (M=5.55); question 45, *resolving employee grievance* (M=5.53); question 25, *setting guidelines for student testing and assessment* (M=5.45); and

question 31, *helping to solve a student's academic problem* (M=5.45); question 7, *setting guidelines for student conduct, discipline* (M=5.40). The results show that teachers want to participate highly to decisions related to themselves, which is very humanistic and teachers would like to participate in the decisions about students and parents, which means teachers want to solve students' and parents' problems so that they can do their job, teaching, easily.

On the other hand, teachers have less wish to participate in some decisions. These decisions are related to question 68, *cutting monies from department/grade-level budgets* (M=4.79); question 48, *selecting community or business representatives for involvement in school committees* (M=4.85); question 6, *setting guidelines for homework* (M=4.96); question 34, *hiring building administrators* (M=4.98); and question 4, *planning short-term educational improvements* (M=5.02). As it is seen from the results, teachers do not think that they should participate in these decisions as much as the others. Most of these items are not related to education. Therefore, it is quite normal for teachers not to wish to participate in these decisions.

To sum up, the analyses show that the teachers sometimes participate in the decision making processes in their schools and they have a great desire to participate.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter deals with the discussion and interpretation of the results, implications of the findings, and recommendations for further research.

5.1. Conclusions

The result of the study shows that there is low participation in the decisions. It is understood that teachers sometimes participate in *parental involvement* (M=3.29), *pupil personnel* (M=3.22), *student achievement* (M=3.10), and *curriculum/instruction* (M=3.08). The results support that teachers mainly deal with teaching and classroom issues more than the other areas. Moreover, *parental involvement* is the area which teachers think that they most participate. This may be because teachers want parents to actively contribute the schools' decisions processes. As a result, teachers can have more time for quality teaching. On the other hand, teachers think that they sometimes participate in the following areas: *planning* (M=2,99), *plant management* (M=2,92), *staff personnel* (M=2,86), *policy* (M=2,67), *staff development* (M=2,57), *school/community relations* (M=2,57),

budget (M=2,47). This result means that teachers are not consulted, except teaching and classroom issues, even about themselves, like *staff personnel* or *staff development.* In terms of *budget*, teachers are sometimes consulted.

When their desire for participation is considered, it can be said that teachers have great desire to participate almost all decisions. The areas *parental involvement* (M=5,37), *student achievement* (M=5,34), *pupil personnel* (M=5,27) and *curriculum/instruction* (M=5,24) show that teachers have higher desire to participate decisions in these areas more that the others. Similar to the actual situation, teachers want to be consulted more in *parental involvement* compared to the other issues. On the other hand, the areas *policy* (M=5,14), *plant management* (M=5,14), *staff personnel* (M=5,13), *staff development* (M=5,12), *planning* (M=5,12), *school/community relations* (M=5,03) and *budget* (M=4,99) show that teachers have less desire to participate in these decision making processes. Again, similar to the actual situation, teachers less willingly to participate in the issues not directly relating to teaching, like *budget*, *planning* and *plant management*. *Budget* is the area which teachers show the least desire to participate.

In conclusion, overall total mean score of actual participation is 2.87, and total mean score of desired participation is 5.17. These results show that teachers want to participate in the decisions more than the actual situation. To put it in a different way, teachers participate in the decisions less than they desire to participate.

Perry and Brown (1994) conducted a study on teacher participation to decision making in schools. The number of participants was 160 teachers from fifteen

schools. The sample represents approximately 85% of the teachers in the schools. This study looked at actual teacher involvement in shared decision-making and their desired level of involvement regarding four educational issues (Table 5.1.1.). They determined four educational areas for their questionnaire to assess teacher satisfaction and desired level. These areas are:

- mission, goals and objectives

- curriculum

- communication procedures

- student assessment and requirements

Their findings show that almost 90% of teachers desire more involvement than they perceive themselves as presently have and want full involvement in decisions in all four educational issue areas. These teachers desire more involvement in decision-making than they currently have. Fewer than half of the respondents believed that presently they were involved in decision-making about mission and goals or communication procedures. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers believed that they were involved in decisions related to curriculum (66%) and involved in decisions related to student assessment and requirements (64%). In contrast, almost ninety percent of the teachers said that they wish they would have full involvement in decisions in all four educational areas. The findings of this study show that the teachers did not view themselves involved in decision-making as much as they desired to be (Perry and Brown, 1994).

Table 5.1.1 The Actual and Desired Level of the Teachers (Perry and Brown, 1994)

Subjects	Actual	Desired
Mission, goals and objectives	49	91
Curriculum	66	93
Communication procedures	47	89
Student assessment and requirements	64	93

There is another study which is conducted by Müge Erten (2004) in Ankara. She studied the actual and desired levels of shared decision making in 12 private primary and secondary schools in Çankaya district in Ankara. She used "Shared Education Decisions Survey-Revised" to collect the necessary data. She questioned 11 areas which were planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, student achievement, pupil personnel, staff personnel, school/community relations, parental involvement, staff development, budget and plant management. She found that teachers are consulted in most of the decisions, but some areas reflected moderate rate of participation compared to the other areas. According to her research, teachers are mostly consulted in planning curriculum/instruction, student achievement, pupil personnel, and parental involvement. Among them parental involvement is the area which teachers participate at the highest level. On the other hand, the areas which teachers participates in less are policy, staff personnel, staff development, school/community relations, budget and plant management. School/community relations showed the least participation compared to the other areas. She also collected information about the desired levels of teachers. She found that the participants mostly desire to be consulted in most of the areas. Student

achievement, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel and planning were the areas which teachers would like to participate in most. While, staff development, school/community relations, plant management and budget were the areas teachers would like to participate less than the others. Among these areas budget decisions revealed the lowest desire for participation. It can be said that the level of desire for participation (m= 4.31) was higher than the level of actual participation (m=3.41).

When the results of the Erten's study (2004) are compared with the current study, it is understood that the teachers who work at public schools less participate the decisions in their schools. The mean score of actual participation of Erten's study (2004) is 3.41 while the mean score in this study is 2.87, which shows a considerable difference. This difference might depend on many factors. The first and the most important factor may be the structural difference. The organizational structures of private and public schools are quite different. In private schools, for example, the schools are generally administered by the schools themselves unlike public schools which are administered from Ankara by the Ministry of National Education. Although the curriculum and plans, which are only 2 of the 11 areas under our investigation, of the private schools are controlled by the Ministry, in the other areas, schools themselves decide what to do. Therefore, they are freer than public schools. Because private schools can be considered as private companies, they not only have to satisfy their students but also satisfy their staff. In this sense, it is understandable that private school teachers participate in decisions more than the public school teachers. On the other hand, there is a highly centralized organization, the Ministry of National Education. The most important decisions are

not taken by the schools themselves but taken by the Ministry. It is clear that the Ministry can not know all the problems of all the schools throughout the nation, and it is also clear that even if it knows all the problems, it can not solve them easily and quickly. The hierarchy in the public school system does not allow teachers to participate in the decision making system much. Therefore, it is normal for public school teachers to participate in the decisions less than their colleagues working at private schools.

Another factor may be the principals in public schools. There is no doubt that in this school system principals have a lot of power. As a result, however, unless they administer in a democratic way, teacher satisfaction may not improve. This may show the democratic difference between public and private schools, which also directly affects the participation of the teachers. This may indicate that either private school principals do have less power over the decision making process because of an owner and existence of governing board in these schools.

Erten (2004) also found in her study that, according to the actual decision making scores, parental involvement area revealed the highest participation among private school teachers. Similarly, among public school teachers the same area revealed the highest participation. In fact, the first five rank of actual participation between public and private school teachers do not show much difference. This similarity can be interpreted as teachers all have similar perceptions regardless of school differences, which can also be a subject of further study. However, public school teachers think that they participate the least in school/community area whereas

public school teachers think that they participate the least in budget area. It is obvious that because, in public schools, budget is prepared by the Ministry, there is no room for teachers' opinions. On the other hand, in private schools, budget is organized according to the needs of the departments so that teachers are more or less consulted.

When Erten's study (2004) is taken into account in terms of desired level of shared decision making scores, it is seen that private school teachers wish to be consulted most in student achievement area while public school teachers wish to be consulted most in parental involvement. Parental involvement takes the fifth rank for private school teachers. This difference may be explained as, for private schools; success is the most important thing because they are private companies and they have to be successful to survive whereas there is not such a pressure for public school teachers, for them parental involvement may be the easiest way to increase success.

After the overall comparison of these two studies, it can be concluded that public school teachers can have less opportunity to participate in decision making processes in their schools than private school teachers. However, they would like to participate in the decisions more than the private school teachers. The mean score of the desired level of private school teachers are 4.31 in Erten's study (2004) while this score is 5.17 for public school teachers. These scores show that public school teachers have much more desire to participate in the decisions. This can be interpreted as public schools teachers' willingness to have more democratic schools. It is also a good sign for the future of public schools. It is understood that teachers are ready for democratic improvements that Ministry of National Education would

make in the schools and teachers see the mistakes and they have the desire to change the things to good by joining the decision making process.

Table 5.1.2 Studies on Shared Decision Making (Erten, 2004)

Study	Year of Study	Actual Participation	Desired Participation
Teacher perception of participation in shared decision making in New York State (n=230) (Ferrara, 1996)	1992	2.57	4.22
Time 1 and Time 2 Data in South Huntington Schools in New York State (n=81) (Ferrara, 1996)	1992	1.86	3.92
Time 1 and Time 2 Data in South Huntington Schools in New York State (n=80) (Ferrara, 1996)	1993	1.99	3.63
A Study of Shared Decision Making, School Improvement Needs, School Improvement Practices, and Student Outcomes in New York State (n=202) (Ferrara, 1996)	1996	2.33	3.57
Shared Decision Making and School Autonomy in Belarussian Schools in Belarus (n=81) (Ferrara, 2002)	2002	2.33	3.06
The actual and desired levels of shared decision making in private school teachers in Ankara (n=253) (Erten, 2004)	2003	3.41	4.31

Table 5.1.2 (continued)

Study	Year of Study	Actual Participation	Desired Participation
The actual and desired levels of shared decision making in private school teachers in Ankara (n=372)	2005	2.87	5.17

When all the studies presented in the Table 5.1.2 are considered, it is seen that the level of actual participation in decision making of Turkish public school teachers is higher than all the other studies, except Erten's study (2004) which was done in private schools in Ankara. There may be several reasons for this. One of them can be the time difference. Most of these studies were done in 1990's, and Turkey has been undergoing a fast democratic movement within the last decade. The effect of this movement has caused changes on many things in every part of life, including schools. Because of this Turkish public school teachers may have higher actual scores than other studies. Another thing to mention is that the desired level of participation in shared decision making of Turkish public school teachers is the highest. The reason why they desire to participate more can be explained as teachers have good ideas worth telling in committees. They may think that if they are in the committees they can affect the decision according to their interests.

Finally, the findings of this study suggest that Turkish public schools are not successful in terms of shared decision making, especially in budget, school/community relations, and staff development areas. However, public school teachers have a great desire, more than their colleagues in the comparable studies

given in table 5.1.2., for the participation in shared decision making processes in their institutions.

5.2. Implications for Research

This study was conducted in public schools, belonging to the Ministry of National Education, considered to be one of the highly centralized organizations in Turkey. However, Turkey has been undergoing a democratic movement and tries to be a member of the European Union, which makes it is possible for Turkey, in this process, to change rules, regulations and laws in a very short time. Therefore, such studies should be repeated at certain intervals to see the difference in perceptions and desires, and to ensure that reforms are applied. As Enderlin-Lampe (1997) says although there are positive results of shared decision making, there can also be a great deal of frustration and confusion which results in increased teacher alienation. Therefore, it is critical that on-going studies be conducted to assess what teachers perceive to be occurring, their aspirations in the area of shared decision making, and these effects on overall work efficacy.

The scope of this study might be expanded to other educational institutions in other cities or entire Turkey. This study can be done in different districts and the differences can be searched. Public schools and private schools can be compared in the same study. The impact of shared decision making on principals, or student achievement can also be a further study in this area. Same study can be conducted among two or more cities' public schools' teachers and whether the place makes any difference or not can be assessed.

5.3. Implications for Practice

When the results of this study are considered, a few suggestions are to be made. First of all, decentralization is needed especially in parental involvement, student achievement, pupil personnel and curriculum/instruction areas as teacher demand more participation in these areas. Almost 600.000 personnel work for the Ministry. Therefore, it is difficult to control and give correct decisions from one place. Decentralization provides more democracy and autonomy for the teachers. If more democracy and autonomy can not be provided for teachers, participative decision making can not be achieved. As it is understood from the results, teachers want to participate most of the decisions; therefore, the organizational structure of the Ministry should be bottom-up not top-down.

Another suggestion can be setting up shared decision making committees in the Ministry, at each city, at each district and at each school. Each school in the district should have a member in the committee. Each school should have a shared decision making committee. The members of this committee should be teachers from each department. By this way, each school can discuss and determine its problems. Therefore, by the members of the schools in the district committee, districts also realize the exact situation of the school. Then, each district should have a member in the city's shared decision making committee so that cities can determine the districts problems correctly. Finally, in the Ministry a shared decision making committee consisting of each city's members should be set up. However, the

important issue is that setting up committees does not mean that shared decision making is applied. Unless each committee has the power to implement its decisions, nothing will be different from the current situation, only it means more committees and more work load for teachers. Therefore, power distribution is the most essential part of shared decision making to be achieved.

On the other hand, supervision has to be provided regularly so that teachers' problems are recognized immediately and can be solved without delay. This is also important to increase the quality of the education.

REFERENCES

Andrew, J. D., (1994). *Essentials of management*. (3rd ed.). Cincinnati: South-Western.

Allen, L., & Glickman, D.C., (1992). School improvement: The elusive faces of shared governance. *Nassp Bulletin, 76*, 80-87. ej 441161.

Ashton, P. & Webb, K.B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York, NY: Longman.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychology Review, 84*, 191-215.

Bauer, S. C. (1992). Myth, consensus, and change. *Executive Educator, 14,* 7, 26-28.

Beadi, N., (1996). From 'Teacher as decision maker' to teacher as participant in 'shared decision making': Reframing the purpose of social foundations in teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 98*, 20-48.

Berry, J. E. (1993). Redefining roles for shared decision-making: Organizational leadership for school systems. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management, ed 360712

Bolman, L.G., and Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations*: *artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Press.

Coffey, E., and Lashway, L., (2002). School reform trends and issues. Retrieved July 18, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management, ed 472992.

Conley, S.C., Bacharach, S.B., and Bauer, S.C. (1989). The school and work environment and teacher career dissatisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25*, 58-81.

Dismuke, D. (1993). Renaissance school. *NEA Today, 11*, 9,15.

Enderlin-Lampe, S., (1997). Shared decision making in schools: Effect on teacher efficacy. Retrived June 10, 2005, from academic search premier, education 00131172.

Erten, M. (2004). *The actual and desired levels of shared decision making.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

Ferrara, D.L. (1996). *Results of the three studies of shared decision making in New York State: 1991-1996.* Paper presented to the New York state education department, New York.

Flannery, D. (1980). *Teacher decision involvement and job satisfaction in Wisconsin high schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Goyne, J., Pedgett, D., Rowicki, M. A., and Triplitt, T. (1999). The journey to teacher empowerment. Retrieved July 16, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on Educational Management, ed 434384

Gökbaş, M., Kocabaş, I. (2002). Eğitimde karara katılma. Retrived June 12, 2005, from *http:// yayim.meb.gov.tr/yayımlar/155-156/kocabas.htm.*

Green, R. L., and Etheridge, C. P. (2001). Collaboration to establish standards and accountability: Lessons learned about systemic change. Retrieved May 24, 2005, from academic search premier, education 00131172

Harrison, C., Killion, J., and Mitchell, J. (1989). Site-base management: The realities of implementation. *Educational Leadership, 48,* 55-58.

Joyce, B. (1986). *Improving America's schools.* New York: Longman, Inc.

Keith, S., and Girling, R. (1991). *Education management and participation*: *New directions in educational administration.* New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Lange, J. T. (1993). Site-based, shared decision making: A resource for restructuring. *Nassp Bulletin 76*, 98-107.

Lashway, L. (1996). The limits of shared decision-making. Retrieved May 12, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management, ed 397467.

Liontos, L. B. (1994). Shared decision-making. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management, ed 368034.

Lunenburg, F.C., and Ornstein, A.C. (1996). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices.* California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Malcolm, E. S. (1991). *Group dynamics.* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

March, J. and Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Meyers, B. (1997). Getting better with practice? A longitudinal study of shared leadership. Retrieved July 10, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management, ed 408705.

Miller, E. (1995). Shared decision-making by itself doesn't make for decisions. *The Harvard Education Letter, 11*, 6, 1-4.

Perry, C.M., and Brown, D.W. (1994). Teachers' respond to the shared decision-making opportunity. Retrieved June 8, 2005, from academic search premier, 131172

Prestine, N. (1993). Extending the essential schools metaphor: Principal as enabler. *Journal of School Leadership, 3*, 4, 356-79.

Sachs, J.J. (1990). The self-efficacy interaction between regular educators and special education students: 'A model for understanding the mainstreaming dilemma. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 13,* 3, 235-239.

Simon, Herbert A. (1995) *The new science of management decisions*. Englewood Cliffs Nj: Prentice- Hall.

Spaulding, A. M. (1994). The politics of the principal: Influencing teachers' school based decision making. Retrieved June 17, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management. ed 374 542.

Stine, D. O. (1993). How to build a leadership team for effective decision making. *Tips For Principals, 9*, 5, 1-15.

Şimşek, H., and Yıldırım, A. (2004).Turkey: Innovation and tradition. In I.C. Rotberg, (2004). *Balancing change and tradition in global education reform* (pp. 153-185). Maryland: Scarecrow Education Press.

Şişman,, M., and Turan, S. (2002). *Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi*. Ankara: Pagem Yayınları.

Taylor, D.L., and Bogotoh, I.E. (1994). School-level effects of teachers' participation in decision making. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 16,* 3, 302-319.

Tice, T. N. (1994). Shared decision making. Retrieved July 7, 2005, from academic search premier, education digest, 0013127X

Vann, A. S. (2000). Shared decision-making committees: Power without power. Retrieved June 15, 2005, from eric clearinghouse on educational management, 0013127X

Wise, B. J. (1997). Shared decision making. Education policy brief, delaware education research and development center.

Weiss, C. H. (1995). Shared decision making about what? A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation. *Teachers College Record 95*, 1, 69-92.

Weiss, C.H., Cambone, J., and Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared decision making. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*, 3, 350-367.

EĞİTİMDE ORTAK ALINAN KARARLAR ANKETİ- Yenilenmiş©

Bu anket ortak karar verme ile ilgili düşünceleri elde etmek için tasarlanmıştır. Aşağıdaki maddelerde okul ortamına özgü kararlar 11 örgütsel alan altında verilmiştir. Aşağıdaki anahtarı kullanarak her bir sütunda size en uygun gelen cevabı lütfen YUVARLAK içine alarak belirtiniz:

1. Her bir karara ne sıklıkta katıldığınızı düşünüyorsunuz (**Mevcut Durum** sütunu) ve

2. Her bir karara ne sıklıkta katılmanız gerektiğini düşünüyorsunuz (**İstenilen** sütunu)

Her madde için **her iki sütunda da** cevap vermeniz analiz yapılabilmesi için önemlidir. Maddede aksi belirtilmedikçe, her maddeye sadece okulunuzdaki kararları göz önüne alarak cevap verin.

ANAHTAR: 1= Asla, 2= Nadiren, 3= Bazen, 4= Sık sık, 5= Genellikle, 6= Her zaman

	MEVCUT DURUM						İSTENİLEN					
	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKLIKLA	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIK SIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN
1. Okul düzeyinde değişim girişimlerin tasarlanması...	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Okul amaçlarının belirlenmesi.........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Okulla ilgili uzun vadeli eğitim iyileştirmelerinin planlanması..........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Okulla ilgili kısa vadeli eğitim iyileştirmelerinin planlanması........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Okulla ilgili değişim girişimlerine kimin dahil olacağının belirlenmesi........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Politika

	MEVCUT DURUM						İSTENİLEN					
6. Ev ödevleri için yönergelerin geliştirilmesi........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Öğrenci davranışı ve disiplinle ilgili yönergelerin geliştirilmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Öğrencilerin öğrenimlerine ara vermemeleri için gerekli yönergelerin hazırlanması.........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Öğrencilerin okula devamı ile ilgili politikaların belirlenmesi.........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

	MEVCUT DURUM						İSTENİLEN					
	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN

10. Öğrencilerin müfredat dışı etkinliklere katılımları ile ilgili akademik yeterlik ölçütlerinin belirlenmesi... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Yöneticilerin değerlendirilmesi ile ilgili yönergelerin geliştirilmesi........................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. Öğretmenlerin değerlendirilmesi ile ilgili yönergelerin geliştirilmesi........................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. İdari / yardımcı personelin değerlendirilmesi ile ilgili yönergelerin geliştirilmesi................ 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

Müfredat/ Öğretim

14. Müfredat (program) geliştirme ile ilgili program/içerik alanlarının seçilmesi........................ 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. Müfredat (program) dökümanlarına dahil edilebilecek (yeni) içeriklerin seçimi...................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. Ders kitaplarının seçimi.......................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

17. Öğretim materyallerinin seçimi................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. Verilecek derslerlerle ilgili değişikliklerin belirlenmesi... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. Öğretim yöntemlerini belirlenmesi............... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

20. Müfredata (programa) dahil edilecek yeniliklerin belirlenmesi.................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

21. Yeni (akademik) programların tasarlanması..................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

Öğrenci Başarısı

22. Seviye veya ders bazında öğrenciden beklenenlerin saptanması..................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

23. Öğrenci başarısının nasıl notlandırılacağının belirlenmesi 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

24. Öğrencilerin zamanı en verimli şekilde kullanmaları için gerekli stratejilerin belirlenmesi..... 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

25. Öğrenci başarısının ölçülmesi konusunda yönergelerin hazırlanması............................ 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

26. Öğrenci başarısını ölçmek için standart testlerin ve diğer ölçme araçlarının belirlenmesi............ 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 6

	MEVCUT DURUM						İSTENİLEN					
	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN
27. Ders kitabı, müfredat ve test programı arasındaki uyumu değerlendirmek	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Öğretim, ölçme ve personel gelişimi arasındaki uyumun değerlendirilmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Öğrenciler

	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN
29. Öğrencilerin okula kabul edilebilmeleri için gerekli koşulların belirlenmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Öğrenci gelişimini ve ilerlemesi konusunda velileri bilgilendirmenin yöntemlerinin belirlenmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Öğrencinin akademik problemlerini çözmeye yardım etmek	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Rehberlik servisi tarafından yönetilen öğrenci destek hizmetlerinin seçimi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Takdir, ödül ve bursa layık öğrencilerin belirlenmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Çalışan Personeli

	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN
34. Yöneticilerin işe alınması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Eğitim-öğretim personelinin işe alınması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Eğitim destek personelinin (idari/yardımcı) işe alınması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. Bölüm (zümre) başkanlarının seçimi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Yeni personelin işe uyumunun (oryantasyon) sağlanması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. Eğitim-öğretim görevlerinin dağıtılması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. Görev atamalarının belirlenmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. Yöneticilerin asaleten atanmalarının onaylanması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. Öğretmenlerin asaleten atanmalarının onaylanması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. Personelin çalışma grupları, komisyonlarda görevlendirilmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. Toplantılar için gündemin planlanması	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. Çalışanların şikayet ve isteklerinden kaynaklanan sorunların çözülmesi	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

| | MEVCUT DURUM | | | | | | | İSTENİLEN | | | | | |
	A S L A	N A D İ R E N	B A Z E N	S I K S I K	G E N E L L İ K L E	H E R Z A M A N		A S L A	N A D İ R E N	B A Z E N	S I K S I K	G E N E L L İ K L E	H E R Z A M A N

Okul/ Toplum İlişkileri

46. Okul etkinliklerine toplum/ sivil grupların dahil edilmesi................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

47. Okul etkinliklerine iş çevresi ve gruplarının dahil edilmesi................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

48. Toplum ya da iş dünyası temsilcilerinin okulla ilgili komitelere dahil edilmesi amacıyla seçilmesi.............. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

49. Medyaya verilecek okul ile ilgili haberlerin içeriğinin belirlenmesi................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

50. Okul dışından sağlanan kaynakların okul içinde dağıtımı................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

51. Toplum/ iş grupları ile olan sorunların çözülmesi......... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

Veli Katılımı

52. Okul komitelerine dahil edilecek velilerin seçilmesi.... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

53. Kararların ortak alındığı komite veya konseylere katılacak velilerin seçimi................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

54. Okul aile birliğinin okulla ilgili işleyiş ve süreçlerde ne derece etkisi olması gerektiğinin saptanması............ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

55. Veli toplantıları için gündem maddelerinin belirlenmesi 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

56. Veli şikayetlerinin giderilmesi/çözülmesi...................... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

Personel Gelişimi

57. Personel gelişimi ile ilgili komitelere personel atanması 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

58. Personel gelişimi ile ilgili ihtiyaçların saptanması çalışmalarının yapılması................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

59. Personel gelişimi ile ilgili etkinliklerin tasarlanması...... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

60. Personel gelişimi ile ilgili etkinliklerin uygulanması 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

61. Personel gelişimi ile ilgili değerlendirme etkinliklerinin belirlenmesi........................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

	MEVCUT DURUM							İSTENİLEN					
	ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN		ASLA	NADİREN	BAZEN	SIKSIK	GENELLİKLE	HER ZAMAN

Bütçe

62. Okul bütçesinin hazırlanması........................... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

63. Ders kitapları için kaynak ayrılması................. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

64. Müfredat (program) geliştirme için kaynak ayrılması... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

65. Altyapı ve işleyişle ilgili kaynakların ayrılması............. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

66. Okul bütçesinin yönetilmesi.......................... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

67. Kısım / bölüm / ünite bütçelerinin yönetilmesi............. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

68. Kısım / bölüm / ünite bütçelerinden kesintiler

    yapılması.. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

Tesis Yönetimi

69. Okul tesislerinin / binalarının kullanımında

    önceliklerin saptanması........................... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

70. Büyük ölçekli altyapı geliştirme proje seçeneklerinin

    belirlenmesi.. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

71. Büyük ölçekli altyapı geliştirme projelerinin

    takviminin belirlenmesi............................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

72. Tesis planlaması için önceliklerin belirlenmesi........... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

73. Tesislerin bakımı için önceliklerin belirlenmesi.......... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

74. Öğrenci servis saatlerinin belirlenmesi.................... 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

75. Öğrenci servis güzergahlarının belirlenmesi................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

76. Öğrenci taşınması için kullanılacak araçların

    sayısının belirlenmesi............................. 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

77. Okul eğitim-öğretim saatlerinin belirlenmesi................ 1 2 3 4 5 6   1 2 3 4 5 6

78. Bu okulla ilişkiniz aşağıdakilerden hangisidir?

    a.   Yönetici
    b.   Öğretmen
    c.   Destek personeli
    d.   Veli
    e.   Toplum üyesi
    f.   Okul yönetim kurulu üyesi
    g.   İş dünyası temsilcisi
    h.   Öğrenci
    i.   Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz):_____

79. Bu ankcti bulunduğunuz okulun hangi eğitim seviyesi için cevaplıyorsunuz?

    a. Anaokulu
    b. İlkokul
    c. Ortaokul Hazırlık
    d. Ortaokul
    e. Lise Hazırlık
    f. Lise
    g. Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz): _____

80. Cinsiyetiniz   O Kadın O Erkek

81. Yaşınız :.....................................

82. Eğitim Durumunuz: O Lisans O Yüksek Lisans O Doktora

Zaman ayırdığınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Zafer GÜNAL
MEB. İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENİ
ODTÜ YÜKSEK LİSANS ÖĞRENCİSİ

zafergunal@hotmail.com

92

APPENDIX B

SHARED EDUCATION DECISIONS SURVEY - Revised ©

This survey is designed to obtain perceptions concerning involvement in shared decision making. For the following items, decisions common to the school setting are divided into 11 organizational areas. Using the key below, for each item please indicate by **CIRCLING** the appropriate response in each column:

1. how frequently you perceive you are involved in making each decision (**Actual** column) and
2. how frequently you would like to be involved in making each decision (**Desired** column).

For analysis purposes, it is important that you provide a response in <u>both</u> columns for <u>every</u> item. Except where indicated by the wording of a particular item, respond to each item as it applies only to a <u>building-level decision</u>.

KEY: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Usually, 6=Always

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS
1. Designing change initiatives at the building level..............	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Setting building-level goals...	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Planning long-term building-level educational improvements..1		2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Planning short-term building-level educational improvements..1		2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Determining who will be involved in school-wide change initiatives..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Policy

6. Setting guidelines for homework....................................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Setting guidelines for student conduct, discipline................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Determining guidelines for student retention......................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Establishing student attendance policies...........................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Establishing academic eligibility policies for student participation in extracurricular activities...........................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Setting guidelines for evaluation of administrators..............	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Setting guidelines for evaluation of teachers......................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Setting guidelines for evaluation of educational support personnel...	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Curriculum/Instruction

14. Choosing content/program areas for curriculum development..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Choosing content for inclusion in curriculum documents......	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Selecting textbooks...	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Selecting instructional materials....................................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Determining changes in course offerings...........................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Determining teaching methodologies...............................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS
20. Determining new programs for inclusion in the curriculum...	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Designing new academic programs.................................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Student Achievement

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
22. Specifying grade-level or course-level student outcomes........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Determining student grading practices...............................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Determining strategies for optimizing time on task..............	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Setting guidelines for student testing and assessment...........	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Determining specific standardized tests and other forms of student assessments..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Evaluating the alignment between textbooks, curriculum, and testing programs..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Evaluating the alignment between teaching, testing, and staff development..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Pupil Personnel

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
29. Determining student placement for instructional programs....	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Determining methods of reporting student progress to parents..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Helping to solve a student's academic problems..................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Choosing student support services administered by guidance..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Determining pupils who are given commendations, awards, and scholarships..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Staff Personnel

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
34. Hiring building administrators..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Hiring instructional personnel..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Hiring educational support personnel...............................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. Selecting department heads..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Orientating new personnel...	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. Assigning teaching duties..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. Determining duty assignments..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. Granting tenure to administrators....................................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. Granting tenure to teachers..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. Assigning staff to committees..	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. Planning agendas for staff meetings................................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. Resolving employee grievances......................................	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

	ACTUAL						DESIRED					
	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS

School/Community Relations

46. Involving community/civic groups in school activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. Involving business groups in school activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. Selecting community or business representatives for involvement in school committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. Determining content of school news released to the media	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. Distributing outside resources within the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
51. Resolving difficulties with community/business groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Parental Involvement

52. Selecting parents for involvement in school committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
53. Selecting parents for involvement in shared decision making committees or councils	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
54. Determining the amount of influence the PTA will have on school functioning	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
55. Setting agenda items for parent meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. Resolving parental complaints	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Staff Development

57. Assigning staff to staff development committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. Carrying out staff development needs assessments	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. Designing staff development activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. Implementing staff development activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
61. Specifying staff development evaluation activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Budget

62. Formulating building-level budgets	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
63. Allocating monies for textbooks	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. Allocating monies for curriculum development	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
65. Allocating monies for plant decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. Managing the building-level budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. Managing department/grade-level budgets	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. Cutting monies from department/grade-level budgets	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

Plant Management

69. Determining priority use of school facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. Determining the choice of capital projects	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
71. Determining the scheduling of capital projects	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6

	ACTUAL							DESIRED					
	NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS		NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS
72. Determining priorities for facilities planning.....................	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
73. Determining priorities for facilities maintenance................	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
74. Determining busing schedules..….	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
75. Determining bus routes..….	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
76. Determining the number of buses utilized for student transportation ....……….	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6
77. Determining the hours of the school schedule....................	1	2	3	4	5	6		1	2	3	4	5	6

78. What is your role in relation to the school?

    1   Administrator

    2   Teacher

    3   Support staff

    4   Parent

    5   Community member

    6   School board member

    7   Business representative

    8   Student

    9   Other (please specify):_____

79. For which level of the school are you completing this survey?

    1   Pre-K

    2   Elementary

    3   Intermediate school

    4   Middle school

    5   Junior high school

    6   High school

    7   Junior-senior high school

    8   K-12

    9   Other (please specify):_____