

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING PROCESS IN SENIOR
HIGH AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS IN THE KWAEBIBIREM DISTRICT IN
THE EASTERN REGION OF GHANA

SAMUEL TETTEH DRAH

2011

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING PROCESS IN SENIOR
HIGH AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS IN THE KWAEBIBIREM DISTRICT IN
THE EASTERN REGION OF GHANA

BY

SAMUEL TETTEH DRAH

Dissertation submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and
Administration of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape Coast, in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for award of Master of Education Degree in
Educational Administration

JANUARY 2011

DECLARATION

Student's Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own original research and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Student's Signature Date

Name: Samuel Tetteh Drah

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the dissertation were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of dissertation laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Supervisor's Signature Date

Name: Professor Andrew Amuzu-Kpeglo

ABSTRACT

Teachers perceived that they were not engaged in the school decision making process. Some perceived, they were deliberately neglected and sidelined in school decision making. They openly display apathy and non-commitment to teaching and learning in the schools.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the opportunities that exist for decision making and the categories of teachers engaged in the decision making process in the second cycle institutions in the Kwaebibirem district in the Eastern Region of Ghana. The descriptive survey design was used. The five public senior high and technical institutions in the district were covered involving 105 respondents made up of 100 teachers and the 5 heads of institutions.

Questionnaire was the main instruments used for the study. The items of the questionnaire were adopted from research instrument designed by Wiredu-Kusi (1990) who conducted similar study in the Cape Coast Municipality. Data collected were analysed using frequencies and percentages.

The study revealed that, there were frequent staff meetings and structures or opportunities for all teachers to participate but teachers were not engaged in planning and budgeting decisions of the schools. There were both positive and negative perceptions held by the respondents about school decision making. However, teachers indicated that participation in school decision making gave them job satisfaction and a sense of we-feeling. It is recommended that heads of the schools investigated must properly and adequately involve teachers in school decision making, especially in planning and budgeting for the school to erase the negative perceptions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I appreciate the enormous contribution put into this work by my supervisor, Professor Andrew Amuzu-Kpeglo of the Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA) of the University of Cape Coast (UCC). I am grateful to him for his direction, criticism and corrections that enabled me to design the questionnaire to collect data and the subsequent write up.

My sincere gratitude goes to Mr. Yaw Mensah Anhwere of IEPA, UCC for his assistance in sharing some ideas with me on the study and providing some relevant materials. Mr. Sherif N. Adeyemi of Kade Senior High/Technical School was of great help to me in typing all the reports and other relevant documents related to the study. I am thankful to him. All tutors of the institutions where the study was conducted are recognized for their various roles during the data collection.

Finally, I thank my headmaster, Mr. Rexford Boadi-Danquah of Kade Senior High/Technical School for granting me the permission to pursue the programme.

DEDICATION

To my parents, Joseph Djabaku Drah and Agnes Adinorkie Klokpah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of Study	3
Research Questions	3
Significance of the Study	4
Delimitations	4
Limitations	5
Organisation of Study	5
TWO REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
Administration and Decision Making in Schools	6
The Decision Making Process	10
Some Theoretical Framework on Decision Making Process	11
Structures, Mode, Opportunities for Decision Making in Educational Institutions.	18
Teacher Participation in the Decision Making Process in Schools:	22
Perception of Heads and Teachers about Teacher Participation	

in the Decision Making Process	23
Categories of Teachers Involved and Extent of Teacher	
Participation in School Decision Making	29
Teacher Participation in School Decision Making and Job	
Satisfaction	32
Summary of Related Literature Review	40
THREE METHODOLOGY	42
Research Design	42
Population	43
Sample and Sampling Procedure	44
Research Instrument	44
Data Collection Procedures	45
Data Analysis	46
FOUR RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	47
Structures of Decision Making in the Schools	47
Perceptions of Heads of Institutions and Teachers about	
Participation in School Decision Making Process	52
Categories of Teacher Involved in Decision Making in the	
Schools	58
Extent/Level of Teacher Participation in School Decision Making	61
Teacher Participation in School Decision Making and Job	
Satisfaction	68

FIVE SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	74
Summary	74
Key Findings	76
Conclusions	77
Recommendations	78
Suggestions for Further Research	79
REFERENCES	80
APPENDICES	89
A. Questionnaire for Heads of Institutions and Teachers	90
B. Letter of Introduction	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table	page
1. Structures of Decision Making in the Schools	48
2. Perceptions of Heads of Institutions and Teachers about Teacher Participation in Decision Making Process	53
3. Category of Teachers Involved in Decision Making in the Schools	59
4. Extent/Level of Teacher Participation in Technical or Instructional Decisions	62
5. Extent/Level of Teacher Participation in Operational Decisions	64
6. Extent of Teacher Participation in Executive or Managerial Decisions.	66
7. Teacher Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction	69

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

For organisations including institutions of learning (schools and colleges) to attain their organisational objectives, it is important that the best administrative practices must be functional. One of such practices is democratic governance with participatory decision making. This means that all stakeholders (teachers inclusive) must be given the opportunity to play their defined and legitimate roles. Therefore teachers, important human resources in schools, must be part of the decision making process. According to (Denys 1980), some teachers will like a greater participation while others do not want to be involved. It is therefore the responsibility of the educational administrator to identify the capabilities and interest of individuals and assign each member of staff according to the desired level of participation. Asiedu – Akrofi (1978) recognized the school as a democratic society in which individual and group views should be respected.

According to Adamelokun (1989) cited in Okae –Anti (1999), administration is a human process and a means by which the aim or purpose of an organisation is effected. Administration is defined by Agyenim-Boateng et al. (2009) as the means by which formal goals are achieved through co-operative human effort; the careful and systematic arrangement and use of resources (human and material), situations and opportunities for the

achievement of the specific objectives of a given organisation. Educational administration is defined by Agyenim-Boateng et al. (2009) as the systematic arrangement of human and material resources and programmes that are available for education and carefully using them systematically within defined guidelines or policies to achieve educational goals.

Educational institutions in Ghana have become as complex as society in taste, needs and expectations. Administering and managing such institutions in contemporary times require a level of competence and professionalism as in other organizations like factories, companies, banks etc, due to their complexities. Maximum participation of all who matter in education is required to promote growth and development of students in our schools.

Statement of Problem

There is the general perception that, some second cycle school administrators govern the schools alone and hardly involve teachers in school governance. Some teachers perceive that they are neglected and sidelined in the decision making process in their schools so they openly display apathy and non-commitment to the teaching and learning process and worst of all indiscipline, which is impacting adversely on the quality of education in the district. The study is to investigate teacher participation in the decision making process in senior high and technical schools in the Kwaebibirem District in the Eastern Region of Ghana.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study focused on finding out the opportunities that exist for decision-making and the categories of teachers involved in the decision making process in the second cycle institutions in the Kwaebibirem district in the Eastern Region of Ghana. Secondly, the study is designed to explore teachers and heads of institutions perception of teacher involvement in school decision making and the level or extent of teacher involvement in the school decision making process. Finally, it is to find out teacher participation in the decision making and job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The study sought answers to the following questions;

1. What decision making structures or opportunities are there in the institutions?
2. How do teachers and heads of institutions perceive teacher participation in school decision making?
3. What categories of teachers participate in school decision making?
4. To what extent are teachers actually involved in decision making in the schools?
5. To what extent does teacher participation in school decision making affect teacher job satisfaction?

Significance of the Study

The central issue in educational administration is decision making (Mankoe 2007). Some teachers would like greater participation while others do not want to be involved in the decision making process (Denys, 1980). Some teachers and educational administrators are sceptical about the need for teacher participation in the decision making process in our schools. They think it is the prerogative of the heads of institutions to choose some teachers to be involved in the decision making process in their various schools.

The study would clear the doubts and convince teachers and heads of second cycle institutions in the district to embrace the participatory decision making process in the schools as an effective tool for managing the schools. It would also add to the knowledge base on the decision making process in educational administration in the district. Importantly, the study would provide guidelines and literature for heads of institutions who want to adopt effective decision making process in their schools.

Finally, it is hoped that this study will complement studies already done in this subject matter and be the basis for future research work.

Delimitations of the Study

The researcher focused on the four senior high schools and the only technical institute in the Kwaebibirem district of the Eastern region of Ghana. It is to evaluate only teacher participation in decision making and not other administrative or management processes in the schools.

Limitations of the Study

The fear of victimization was a perception on the part of some teachers, so some of the responses were not provided confidently by such teachers. The use of close ended questions restricted full expression of opinion of some teachers on some of the issues on the topic. The population of the study was too small to overturn earlier findings.

Organization of the Study

The first chapter is the introduction which gives an outline of the background to the study, research problem, the statement of the problem and the research questions. It also considers the purpose of the study, significance of study, delimitation and limitation. The second chapter reviews the related literature of the study. This considers the framework of decision making; structures or opportunities or mode of decision making; perceptions of teacher participation in school decision making; extent or level of teacher participation in decision making and teacher participation in decision making and job satisfaction.

The third chapter is concerned with the methodology that describes the method used in the study. These include: research design, population, sample and sampling procedure, research instrument, data collection and data analysis plan. In chapter four the findings, results and discussions of the study are presented. The last chapter is the summary of the research findings, conclusions and recommendations related to the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of literature on the study was considered in the main areas as follows;

1. Administration and decision making in schools
2. The decision making process and
3. Teacher participation in the decision making process in schools.

Administration and Decision Making in Schools

Campbell et al (1977) have stated that, those in charge of educational institutions have the major task of; supervising, curriculum instruction and appraisal, staff personnel, pupils/students personnel, physical facilities and educational materials and financial management among others. Rebores (2007) outlined that there is the need for formal study of administration in public education which grew out of increased complexity of urban schools. He stated further that, the illusion that anyone with a good general education could become an effective administrator was quickly shattered during the urbanization period. He again stated that administration is a social process of managing human, financial and material resources towards the fulfilment of a mission. The administrator fulfils these requisites by developing and establishing administrative processes, procedures and techniques to harness human financial and material energies. The importance of administrative leadership stems from its potential for converting these energies within an

organisation (schools and colleges), into the fulfilment of educational objectives.

Mankoe (2007) contended that administration means decision making in a social organisation and those who are appointed to head educational institutions have not undergone any lengthy period of formal training, specifically in educational administration or organisational management. Again he stated that the central issue in educational administration is decision making.

According to Agyenim-Boateng et al (2009), the administrator engages in decision making perhaps more than in other processes. During the process of reaching a decision, an administrator should involve teachers, parents, students, central office supervisors or others appropriate in order to capitalize on any special insight and expertise, which they may be able to contribute. Once a decision has been made, the administrator will need to concentrate on such other administrative processes as planning, organizing and co-ordinating the implementation of the decision made. Also Shaw (1978) has stated that educational administrators are decision makers but the process of decision making is not limited to them alone.

These assertions clearly point to the fact that decision making is central to any administrative system and does not rest on the administrator alone. The educational administrator and other human resource available (staff), who are in the process of implementing educational policies, are also engaged in decision making among others. Decision is a choice made from among alternative courses of actions that are available and decision analysis is the process of evaluating information leading to the choice (Marfo–Yiadom 2005). He also defined decision making as a process involving informed choice of

alternative actions, implementation and evaluation that is directed to the achievement of certain stated goals.

The relevant publics that are affected by a decision according to Hanson (1996), must be involved in making such a decision, so that there might not be seen any traces of dysfunction in the decision making process.

Gorton (1980) contended that decision making is a complex exercise that requires time and effort, use of analytical thought process and utilizes relevant sources of information and assistance. Decision making therefore involves selecting alternative solutions. He identified some benefits when others who matter are involved in the decision making process as follows:

1. Increases the number of different view-points and ideas (input) relevant to the decisions to be made.
2. Enhances the full use of expertise and problem solving skills which are available in the institutions.
3. Raises the morale of the school when individuals involved in the decision making realize that the administrator recognizes their opinions. This translates into the individuals feeling satisfied.
4. Promotes the acceptance and implementation of decision because those involved are more likely to understand and show more commitment to the success of such decisions.
5. Practice is consistent with democratic principles of our society, that those who are affected by a particular decision in an organisation or public institutions like schools should have some say in how they are run.

Campbell et al (1977) observed that teachers do not consider themselves as being part of administration in their various schools, because they think they

do not have the requisite knowledge about school administration. Further they are in doubt as to whether their contributions to the decision making process would be accepted or not by heads or principals. Boyan (1988) refers to schools as impoverished intellectual climates for adults where the norm in most schools is that teachers are not expected to contribute experience, knowledge and wisdom to decision about the common good of educating students.

Goodlad's study of schooling in 1984 found the involvement of teachers in decisions about the curriculum and instruction virtually nil. Oduro (1998) stated that in the Ghana Education Service, superiors impose predetermined standards concerning desirable teaching outcomes on teachers. This reflects what Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) cited in Oduro (1998), classified as a traditional teacher evaluation which does not fit too well with the ideas of staff development. This is because; basic assumptions of staff development models require an emphasis on co-operation, collegiality and decisions from the bottom up rather than from top down. Gitlin and Smyth (1989) in Oduro (1998), also have it that leaving the teacher out of the process, amounts to regarding the teacher as commodity to be shaped and manipulated. It is through involvement that teachers come to consider and challenge taken- for- granted views about their pedagogy. Richardson (1979) affirmed that some heads of educational institutions such as, schools and colleges are still of the view that administrators should administer while teachers teach, because teachers are inexperienced in administrative techniques and skills, so must be confined to classroom teaching.

The dawn of the nineteenth (19th) century, came with the rapid growth and pragmatic development of the school system, and increased

professionalism in the teaching field. Teachers became aware that, the subordinate role they have been playing in the educational system, was no longer consistent with the then emerging teacher professionalism. The total submissive attitude and conduct of school teachers to powers that were gradually diminished. They were no longer prepared to be the docile “handmaiden” of education (Campbell 1977). It was clear that the teacher wished he could contribute to administrative decision making process in his or her school.

Wilson (1966) also observed that, the dissatisfaction among teachers and their desire to be involved in the decision making process made the authoritarian leadership style ineffective. Peters (1976) corroborated by stating that, it is no longer practicable or advisable for school administrators to exercise authority in the traditional way. He says that administrators are now working in complex environments, so if they want to be successful, they must be prepared to share their time honoured administrative prerogative of decision making. This situation calls for increased staff participation in the day to day running of the schools.

The Decision Making Process

This aspect of the literature focused on:

1. Theoretical frameworks on decision making process
2. Structures or modes or opportunities for decision making process in Educational institutions.

Theoretical Frameworks on Decision Making Process

Theory is the bedrock of practice. It provides knowledge and enhances performance if efficiently applied. It is important to review related theories before practice.

Many researchers and theorist have carefully studied decision making process as a function of management and administration in organisations.

According to Harding (1987), there are two main approaches to the study of organisational decision making. These are the descriptive approach and the prescriptive approach. Linblom's theories of muddling and classical decision making theory models are examples of the descriptive and prescriptive approaches respectively.

Linblom's Theory of Muddling through Model

The descriptive approach depicts how leadership makes decisions. It is a non-rational approach to decision making. Harding (1987) views the decision maker as an administrative "man" rather than a rational economic "man" who makes the most logical decisions rather than the best or ideal decisions. He can be limited by his inadequate information and his ability to utilize the information. Managers and school administrators more realistically settle for a decision that will adequately serve their purpose or appear reasonable based on their past experiences and knowledge. In general terms, at best, they only follow a course of action that satisfies, that is, they look for a "satisfactory decision" or a course of action that is "satisfactory" or "good enough" rather than maximize or reach the optimal decision.

The Classical Decision Making Theory Model

This is prescriptive approach which tries to show how decision might to be made. Again Harding (1987) sees the classical Decision making model as one which calls for a rational, deliberate and systematic approach in the decision is making process. This is based on the assumption that people are economically rational and attempt to maximize output in an orderly and sequential manner. Each step in this model is considered indispensable and one must proceed through the specific order. There are varied numbers of steps in the process in this model. Marfo-Yiadom (2001) identifies the following steps:

1. Recognition and identification of the problem.
2. Development and evaluation of alternatives
3. Choice among the alternatives
4. Implementation; and
5. Evaluation of results

Harding (1987) also outlines five steps in the process, these are:

1. Identification and definition of the problem,
2. Statement of the desired state of affairs
3. Generation of alternative course of action
4. Formulation and selection of the preferred course of action and
5. Implementation

Daft (2003) also outlines three (3) approaches managers use to make decisions. The types are: the classical model, the administrative model or political model. The choice of model depends on the manager's personal preference, whether the decision is programmed or non-programmed, and the extent to which the decision is characterized by risk, uncertainty or ambiguity.

This corroborates the findings of Bennet (1987) which states that the mode of decision making at school depends on the style of leadership at the central office.

Classical Model

According to Daft (2003) this model is based on the assumption that managers should make logical decisions that will be in the organisation's best economic interests. It is considered to be normative, meaning it defines how a decision maker should make decision. The assumptions underlying this model are as follows:

1. The decision maker operates to accomplish goals that are known and agreed upon. Problems are precisely formulated and defined
2. The decision maker strives for condition of certainty, gathering complete information. All alternatives and the potential results of each are calculated.
3. Criteria for evaluating alternatives are known. The decision maker then will maximize the economic return to the organisation.
4. The decision maker is rational and uses logic to assign values, order preferences, evaluate alternatives, and makes the decisions that will maximise the attainment of organisational goals.

Administrative Model

The model describes how managers actually make decisions in difficult situations such as those characterized by non programmed decisions, uncertainty and ambiguity. It is considered to be descriptive meaning it describes how managers actually make decisions in complex situations rather

than dictating how they should make decisions according to a theoretical ideal. It also recognizes the human and environmental limitations that affect the degree to which managers can pursue a rational decision making process. According to the administrative model;

1. Decision goals often are vague, conflicting and lack consensus among managers. Managers often are unaware of problems or opportunities that exist in the organisation.
2. Rational procedures are not always used, and when they are, they are confined to a simplistic view of the problem that does not capture the complexity of real organisational events.
3. Managers' search for alternatives is limited because of human information and resource constraints.
4. Most managers settle for a satisfying rather than a maximizing solution. This is partly because they have only agreed criteria for what constitutes a maximizing solution (Daft 2003).

Political Model

This model of decision making is useful for making non programmed decisions when conditions are uncertain, information is limited and there is disagreement among managers about what goals to pursue or what course of action to take. The political model closely resembles the real environment in which most managers and decision makers operate. Decisions are complex and involve many people, information is often ambiguous, disagreement and conflict over problems and solution are normal. The basic assumptions of the political model are:

1. Organisations are made up of groups with diverse interests, goals and values. Managers disagree about problem priorities and may not understand or share the goals and interests of other managers.
2. Information is ambiguous and incomplete. The attempt to be rational is limited by the complexity of many problems as well as personal and organisational constraints.
3. Managers do not have time, resources, or mental capacity to identify all dimensions of the problem and process all relevant information. Managers talk to each other and exchange view points to gather information and reduce ambiguity.
4. Managers engage in the push and pull of debate to decide goals and discuss alternatives. Decisions are the result of bargaining and discussion among coalition members (Daft 2003). He again identified six steps in the decision making process.
 1. recognition of decision requirement
 2. diagnosis and analysis of causes
 3. development of alternatives
 4. selection of desired alternative
 5. implementation of chosen alternative
 6. evaluation and feedback

Shared Decision Making (SDM) Model

This came into being when a school of thought initially proposed that schools are to be run by committees of teachers without administrators in sight.

It was agreed that teachers deserved to play a greater role in school governance.

In the SDM model, teachers are key players in determining school policies and practices. The rationale is that, those who are closest to students learning are best equipped to make educational decisions. Advocates say shared decision making will improve student learning, create teacher satisfaction and develop new forms of leadership (Liontos, 1994). He also stated that, the SDM is to improve teaching and learning. Since students mostly learn in the classroom, teachers should be deeply involved in the decision making process. Again, he predicted shared decision making (SDM) that will create new forms of leadership. Not only will teachers be brought into the process but principals will devise new strategies based on facilitation and trust rather than hierarchical authority.

Also, SDM creates ownership, commitment, a sense of empowerment and increased job satisfaction as teachers participation in decision making is recognized. Furthermore, according to Blasé et al (1995) SDM promotes equality and makes the school a more democratic work place. However research and observations indicate, there is little consistent evidence that SDM increases students' achievement (Miller, 1995). According to Liontos (1994), some researchers contended that SDM approach seldom addresses the “core issues” of teaching and learning. Studies of SDM frequently mention a tendency to focus on trivial issues as parking, bus supervision, and smoking in faculty lounges. The findings of Griffin (1995) corroborates Liontos (1994), that while teachers willingly tackled school wide issues such as curriculum frameworks, they seldom examined daily classroom practices.

Also Weiss (1993) discovered that SDM schools sometimes launched significant reform but that the push for innovation usually came from the principal against the opposition of many teachers. He stated further that teacher participation “acted as a brake on the pace of school reform”. Faced with these negative findings, researchers speculate that traditional school culture may simply overpower SDM. He again stated that, new roles and relationships are ambiguous, time consuming and often uncomfortable.

Finally he mentioned that SDM may be regarded sceptically as just another passing fad, giving teachers little reason to transfer their allegiance to the new ways of doing things. Spaulding (1994) studied one principal who was consciously manipulating the process to move it in the direction he wanted by planning ideas, pressuring opponents and showing favouritism to supporters. This principal characterized by his approach as “going through the motions” of SDM but he still saw himself as the source of decisions. Before the study of Spaulding (1994), it was stated by Prestine (1993) that if principals do not play active and visible role in SDM teachers may fail to take it seriously; yet participation that is too vigorous may convince teachers that the principal is still in charge.

Shared decision making according to Smylie (1996), is a means for teachers to lead in the school and beyond the classroom. Such extended influence and involvement enhanced commitment to systematic change as it enabled a more empowered and efficient teachers. Thus, sharing or participation in decision making in its historical context shifted its focus to empowering teachers to lead, not simply co-opting them into becoming better followers. For school administrators and teachers, this had implications. As

Schechty (1990) pointed out school administrators in the future must see themselves as “leaders of leaders”.

Theoretically, SDM requires new modes of leadership which allows teachers to lend their expertise, while principals become facilitators rather than directors but in reality such behaviours are difficult to achieve. Taylor and Tashakkori (1997) observe that more recent observed assertions in the shared decision making literature suggests that teachers must do more than simply participate. Teachers provide leadership and it is important that they should be seen performing such role.

Structures, Modes or Opportunities for Decision Making Process in Educational Institutions

Smylie (1996) stated that decision making structure could be defined as the method an organisation adopts in arriving at decision. Effective participation in decision pre-supposes the existence of decision making structures. Structure of decision making basically implies the means employed by organisations, especially educational institutions to arrive at decisions to run them. There are the opportunities available for collaborative decision making. Some structures of decision making in schools according to Asare-Bediako (1990) are as follows: decision by Authority, decision by majority, decision by minority, Decision by unanimity and Consensus Decision Making. He further explained each as:

1. Decision by Authority is a situation where someone in authority makes decisions for the group.

2. Decision by majority is a mode where the members of a group freely express their views on an issue at stake with the majority views taken as the decision.
3. Decision by minority is the means whereby a small group of people takes a decision for a larger group.
4. Decision by unanimity is another mode in which every member of the group really agrees on the decision to be taken.
5. Consensus decision making is an opportunity provided in which there is lot of discussions, so that group members who do not favour the majority point of view nevertheless understand it and are ready to support it.

Daft (2003) also mention the three major components of the Vroom-Jago Model designed to help gauge the appropriate amount of participation by subordinates in making a specific decisions. These are: leadership participation style, a set of diagnostic questions with which to analyze a decision situation, and series of decision rules. He stated further that the leadership participation style employs five levels of subordinate participation in decision making ranging from highly autocratic to highly democratic. They are:

- i. Leader decides alone, this highly autocratic. Decision is made by the leader alone and either announces or 'sells' it to the group.
- ii. The second mode is consult individually: problem is presented to group members individually, get their suggestions and make the decision.
- iii. The third is consult group: problem is presented to the group members in a meeting to get their suggestions and then decision is made.
- iv. The next is facilitate: sharing the problem with subordinates as a group and acting as a facilitator to help the group arrive at a decision, to further

v. The fifth is delegate: - the group is permitted to make decision within prescribed limits. The group goes through the decision making process while he plays no direct role in the group's deliberations unless he is explicitly asked, The leaders' role is an important one behind the scenes, providing needed resources and encouragement (Daft 2003). It should be noted that the five leader participation styles do not only show modes of leaders involvement but also structures or opportunities for group members participation in decision making.

Earlier than the two writers quoted above, Owen (1973) had mentioned seven different modes of involving teachers in decision making. These are; discussion in which the administrator could organise the teachers formally or informally to discuss educational problems or issues. This method is especially used to make teachers aware of problems which require the making of decision by the administrator. The second mode is information seeking; the administrator's aim is just to find information from teachers so that he could make a more rational and logical decision. The next is democratic centralist; the administrator presents the problem to the staff and asking for suggestions, reactions and ideas. The administrator then tries to reflect the staffs' participation in this decision. The forth is the parliamentarian mode, teachers

actually make a decision through voting to determine which way the decision has to go. It is useful when the administrator senses that a decision concerning teachers may not be unanimous, that is may not be taken through consensus. Parliamentary procedure offers the advantage of specially providing for minority opinion, conflicts of ideas and values. The Participant-determining mode; it is useful when consensus is required of the group. The sixth is the delegation mode; the administrator could delegate his decision making authority to his staff. The members of staff will then be in charge of routine decisions that only require the application of general rules and regulations to deal with.

Lastly, Brainstorming, this is the name given to the activity of a group of individuals who are charged with solving a problem, get together and invent as many solutions as they can. The average person could think twice as many ideas when working in a group than when working alone. Unfortunately, this is not always the case.

Peretomode (1992) outlines five (5) decision making skills that contribute to the effectiveness of the school administration's work. They are as follows:

1. Skill in differentiating among types of decision
2. skill in determining the amount and type of information needed to reach a decision
3. Skill in determining the appropriate involvement of other people in reaching decision
4. Skills in establishing priorities for action and

5. Skills in anticipating both intended and unintended consequences of decisions.

Arnold (1966) and later, Shanahan (1987) both identified three distinct decision making structures in schools in their various studies. These were: collective decision making, consultative decision making and “one-man” decision making. This is indicative of some level of teacher participation. The data collected was compared with existing professional literature on participation and decision making and this revealed that teachers were found not very much involved in the decision making process. Based on this finding, moves were made to improve teachers’ participation in decision making in Ohio State Schools. Several structures exist from which some could be employed by administrators for participative management or democratic administration in educational institutions.

As stated earlier the choice of a particular structure for decision making depends on the administrator. A proper blend promotes a democratic administration in schools which Wiredu-Kusi (1990) referred to as, the use of free discussions on the part of all concerned in determining the ends or purpose to be attained and the acceptance of full responsibility for their action.

Teacher Participation in the Decision Making Process in Schools

This part considered the following;

1. Perceptions of heads and teachers about teacher participation
2. Category of teachers involved and extent of teacher participation in school decision making and
3. Teacher participation in school decision making and job satisfaction

Perceptions of Heads and Teachers about Teacher Participation in the Decision Making Process

Teaching is a “culture of isolation” in which practitioners use their own professional judgment to make key instructional decisions in the privacy of their classrooms (Griffin 1995). The teachers he interviewed believed their own methods were effective and took a “live and let live” attitude towards the practices.

Bennet (1987) investigated the way principals’ perceptions of certain conditions, practices at the central office level were related to the methods the principals used to involve teachers on their staff in the decision making process.

One hundred and twenty (120) primary and secondary school principals in the United States of America were asked to describe the decisions that best characterized the way instructional decisions were made in their schools, on a continuum which ranged from “boss centred” to “subordinate centred”. It was found that a positive relationship existed between the principals’ allocation of decisional power and the principals’ perception of leadership at the central office. The powers to make day-to-day educational decisions were concentrated at the central office. In view of this, staff participation in certain decisions involving managerial and operational matters is reduced to the minimum level in some schools and does not affect the principals’ authority.

For the past decades, the headmasters or principals were those seen as the most important personnel in the school set up. Without them, no decision was taken. Teachers are nowhere near the school administrator. This is confirmed by Siddle (1978) who observed that a close look at hierarchy of

authority, the teacher with all his training, qualification and experience was always at the base not competent enough to take decisions. Merrit (1987) carried out a study to look carefully at the differences in perception of parents, teachers and clerical staff of their concept of shared governance in selected urban school districts of southern Mississippi. A fifty item shared governance questionnaire was used to collect data from five hundred and seventy teachers, clerical staff and parents. He found out that:

1. There was a significant difference in the perception of shared governance among teachers, school principals, the clerical staff and parents.
2. There was no distinct difference in perceptions when teachers and principals were grouped into primary or secondary schools
3. There was a significant difference in perception of principals when categorized by gender and age.

Ethling and Jago (1988) mentioned that collective thinking resulted in higher quality decisions. They again asserted that increased staff participation generated greater acceptance of decision with the understanding that the decision is sound. Earlier, a study among some Francisco principals by Johnson (1975) confirmed the existence of collective decision making structures in schools. It was observed that school principals did not need to fear that expanded teacher influence would undermine their work. It was further explained that they showed interest in collective work structures in schools because it helped them develop professionally.

It could be concluded from their studies that persons of the relevant publics and general public differ in their attitude and perceptions of teacher participation in school decision making. Later, Keef (1976) studied the role of teachers in

school decision making in Montana District Schools. His findings confirmed that significant differences existed among teachers, principals and board members' perception of teachers' involvement in school decision making. Teachers perceived that they should be given the opportunity to get involved in all types of school decisions while administrators perceived that teachers should be involved fully in only instructional decisions. The Board of Governors would like teachers to be involved in neither operational nor managerial decisions. These points to the fact that some stakeholders in education delivery, especially Board members are of the mind that teachers should not be partners in decision making in schools.

Another important study conducted by Witherspoon (as cited in Wiredu-Kusi, 1990) on the attitude and perceptions of principals and teachers, towards the implementation of school based shared decision making in an urban school setting at Purdue. He reported that the attitude of principals and teachers regarding the process of shared governance and their perceptions of areas for teacher involvement did not differ significantly. He further observed that teachers indicated significantly less agreement than principals as to how the shared decision making process was functioning in their schools. Principals were found to be more in favour of the following:

1. Teachers having input in decisions
2. Teachers having input in getting goals and priorities
3. The principals supporting the process, and
4. Teachers being provided with enough information to make decisions.

He concluded from the study that teachers and principals do not have the same perception, concerning teacher participation in school decision

making, and therefore attitudes differ with regard to the involvement of teachers in school decision making process.

Campbell et al, (1977) realized that administrators fear that teachers' participation in school based decision making, jeopardizes the exercise of their authority. Teachers on the other hand accuse principals of being too authoritarian. The administrator who attempts to be democratic by including his teachers in decision making of the school often becomes discouraged when he finds that he must accept responsibility for decision to which he does not agree. To them, the administrator therefore will lose faith in broad participation in decision making; hence will adopt a more self-centered style, which is autocratic leadership he wants to do away with. Also according to them administrators are cautious in allowing teachers' participation in school decision making for what they perceive, teachers may spend too much time in perceiving the total problem, therefore negatively affecting their effectiveness in the classroom.

It is also argued by Campbell et al, (1977) that the administrator has to ensure that decision made enhance the general purpose of the school. The administrator perceives that the relevant publics of the school may not be in the position to see the general purpose of the school. Hence their participation in decision making will portray some bias due to their limited view of the problem and purpose of the school.

They mentioned further that policy and legislation in South Africa which specify that the major stake-holders should participate in school management and governance. This policy direction places special demand on the shoulders of principals and teachers who grapple daily with the running of

the school. Consequently, a research was carried out to investigate the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding the extent of teacher participation in school management. The major findings of this research were that teachers and principals differ in their perceptions on what is and ought to be the extent of teacher participation. However, both groups agreed that teachers experienced deprivation in all management activities. Denys (1980) also states that some teachers would like greater participation while others do not want to be involved. It is therefore the responsibility of the educational administrator to identify the capabilities and interest of individuals and assign each member of staff according to the desired level of participation. This step is very important because according to Styles and Gernunario (1985) both over- utilization and under-utilization of teachers in the decision making process can affect teachers' attitude to work and performance in diverse ways.

Campbell et al (1977) again stated "teachers' organisations whether unions or association are no longer willing to be treated paternalistically by the superintendents or the boards of education, no matter how benevolent such action might be" (p. 386). They therefore seriously challenge the school administrators. Teachers have the burning desire to contribute to school administration and management. Formal education in Ghana and its administration is a legacy from the British colonial government and the early missionaries; hence there exists serious traces of autocratic administration. As observed by Graham (1976), schools in British West Africa are the exact copies of the English system of education. Similar to the British educational system, the administrators of such schools are state employees at the top and dictate to teachers.

In the face of complexity of school administration, which calls for participatory governance of schools, the burning desire of teachers is recognized as part of school governance system. In spite of the persistent call on school heads and principals to demonstrate democratic leadership style in schools and colleges among others, most heads of institutions:

1. Still see teachers as human resource only well enough in the classroom who can not contribute to any good administrative decision because they are not administrators.
2. Consider teachers as inexperienced personnel who have nothing to share in the decision making process.
3. Perceive some teachers as not willing to be part of the decision making process because it goes with added responsibilities. These heads of institutions are not willing to involve teachers in the decision making process in their various schools due to the few reasons outlined above.

Some effects on education delivery are as follows:

- i. Total lack or limited co-operation from teachers to formulate school policies and assist in their implementation.
- ii. Some teachers feel not recognized hence display apathy. They only go into the classroom to teach and would not do anything outside their academic duties to the detriment of co-curricular activities
- iii. Rules and regulations pertaining to discipline in the schools are not enforced. Teachers feel they are not part of school administration
- iv. Apathy and false perceptions on the part of teachers breed indiscipline and factionalism which may lead to staff confrontation, unrest and the absence of job satisfaction in most schools.

Category of Teachers Involved and the Extent/Level of Their Involvement in School Decision Making

In 1987, Burke carried out a study on teachers' view of their involvement in decision making in a school district. One hundred and two (102) teachers were randomly selected to respond to questionnaire, showing their "desired" and "actual" levels of participation in fifteen decision making areas. In addition to this, fifteen teachers were interviewed on their perception and participation opportunities that were available in the school district. Analysis of data indicated that participation level for both desired and actual were greatest for technical decision, and least for executive or managerial decisions. With instructional decisions, "actual" and "desired" were not found to relate to any demographical factors like sex, age and experience. It was found out that teachers who had stayed in the schools for longer period, those who were regular at staff meetings and those who lived in close proximity to the school participated more in operational and managerial decisions. Also, it was observed that the desire for participation in operational decisions was higher for teachers with greater experience.

The study also showed that male teachers participated more in executive or managerial decisions than female teachers. In the same year, Tamburo (1987) studied one hundred and fifty-three (153) primary school teachers in the school area of New York, and explored their views on the "actual" and "preferred" participation in twelve school level decisional situations. The finding showed that teachers desired more participation than they actually had the opportunity for all the twelve decisional situations.

Moreover, teachers rated instructional (technical) decisions as more important than operational or managerial decisions.

Their findings were similar to Thierbach (1980) and Rice and Schneider (1994) who also stated that teachers reported higher levels of decision deprivation in managerial issues than in technical issues.

Tamburo (1987) again observed that differences occurred between gender and levels of experience, for decisions considered to be operational and executive or managerial. For example, male teachers participated more than female teachers did in operational and managerial decisions. Both Burke (1987) and Tamburo (1987) found out that teachers saw participation in instructional decision to be relatively more important to them than operational or managerial decisions. He again observed that differences occurred between gender and level of experience, for decisions considered to be operational and executive or managerial. For example, male teachers participated more than female teachers did in operational and managerial decisions. Both Burke (1987) and Tamburo (1987) found out that teachers saw participation in instructional decision to be relatively more important to them than operational or managerial decisions.

Shanahan (1987) investigated the extent to which school principals used participative management and their success in schools. Findings showed that participative decision making were in some areas of teacher responsibility as; establishing classroom disciplinary policies, determining appropriate teaching methods which also increased commitment and greater co-operation. Alluto and Belasco (1976) cited factors like age sex, level of teaching, length

of service and perceptions held by teachers, as being related to teachers desire to be involved in the executive and managerial decisions.

It may be useful to increase teacher participation in those areas where teachers desire greater participation than in fact occurs. Teachers appear to desire greater influence in those areas directly related to the teaching situations (Glickman 1993). “Empowerment should focus on decisions that affect middle level policies regarding school functioning, those that are broader than a single classroom, but still clearly related to the improvement of learning environment” (Marks and Louis 1997 p. 265).

Ettling and Jago (1988) studied and found out that when disagreement among members was likely and acceptance was necessary, decision making method that allowed group interaction generated greater acceptance than when such method was absent. The subjects used for the study felt that collective thinking resulted in higher decision quality. This study was similar to that of Piper (1974) who found out that, the subjects using either consensus process model or the participative decision making model had more correct decisions on the assigned task, than the same individuals deciding alone. These findings of Piper (1974) and Ethling and Jago (1988) confirmed earlier pieces of research evidence that increased staff participation, generated greater acceptance of a decision with the understanding that the decision is found.

Van de van and Delbeca (1974) emphasized that interaction in groups gave encouragement or the consideration of a wider variety of alternatives and results. Rose, Menasco and Curry (1982) expressed similar views stating that quality decision would evolve from group participation when all alternatives were put together for the best to be selected.

Taylor and Tashakkori (1997) tried to better understand teachers' desire to participate in decision making by using four categories of teacher involvement in decision making:

1. Empowered (those that were involved and desired to be involved)
2. Disenfranchised (those that were not involved but desired involvement)
3. Involved (those that were involved but did not desire it) and
4. Disengaged (those that were neither involved nor desire to be)

The study attempted to resolve what was seen as a lack of understanding of the teacher participation dimensions. They claimed "several studies" showed that teachers preferred involvement in some areas over others". Taylor and Tashakkori (1997) found that the best discriminator between high participation and low participation groups was principal leadership followed by job satisfaction. In addition, they found, that variable most likely to discriminate among teachers as to their desire to participate in decision making was a teachers' sense of efficacy (as confident as they can teach effectively) Earlier in Price and Raid had agreed generally from their findings that:

1. Teachers differed in their desire to be involved in school based decision making
2. Many factors affect teachers' desire for participation in school decision making.

Teacher Participation in School Decision Making and Job Satisfaction

Participation in decision making can be explained as a process in which an individual or group takes part in specific decision making and action and

over which he may exercise specific controls. It is often used to refer specifically to processes in which primary stakeholders take an active part in planning and decision making, implementation, learning and evaluation.

Afful-Broni (2004) also defined participation as an individual or a group's involvement in a process which may not have originally been their own. It is a process of engaging some one because of what he may be believed to possess as important contribution to a particular process or a series of processes that might bring the various agents to a different level of relatedness. Decision making is defined as the selection of a course of action from available alternatives (Richman and Farmer 1975) cited in Afful-Broni (2004). Teacher participation in decision making therefore is the process in which the teacher takes part in the selection of course of actions from available alternatives.

Job satisfaction is a critical factor influencing the processes and achievement of a school as of any organisation. It has to do with the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it is offering. It also concerns what an organisation requires of its employees and what the employees are seeking from the organisation (Ankomah and Amoako-Essien, 2002). Amuzu-Kpeglo (1991) contended that most members of an organisation desire opportunities to participate in the process of decision making. They believe that increase decision participation increases commitment to the organisation, job satisfaction, personal growth and development and acceptance of change. Bame (1991) cited in Ankomah and Amoako-Essien (2002) perceived job satisfaction to be multi-dimensional phenomenon which works together to influence one's attitude towards work and consequently one's performance.

Job satisfaction refers to an individual's general attitude towards the job he/she performs (Rue and Byars, 1986). According to Hoy and Miskel (1991), job satisfaction may be the relationship between motivational concepts and occupational performance of an individual in an organisation. These definitions of job satisfaction imply that the concept refers to favourable feelings with which employees view their work. Job satisfaction therefore emanates from the perception of employees on how well the jobs they do give them those things that are seen as vital to both themselves and the organisation. Okumbe (1998) identifies three (3) important dimensions in job satisfaction:

1. The first, dimension is the emotional response to a job situation, this means that job satisfaction can only be informed and not seen;
2. The second, is that it is usually determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectations, and
3. The third is that job satisfaction represents several related attitudes; these attitudes are essential characteristics of the job such as the work itself, pay, promotion, opportunities, supervision, recognition and participation in decision making process.

Motivation is at the very heart of the study and the practice of management (Peretomode, 1992). He stated further that it is difficult to define and apply motivation in organisations and institutions. However, Okumbe (1998) observed that thorough knowledge and application of motivation such as teachers' participation in the decision making process is very essential in any strong educational management which has widely proved to be applicable in an educational setting.

Munford (1972) outlines a number of approaches used in seeking to explain and enhance job satisfaction. These include the following:

1. The psychological needs approach - it stresses that, the central factor in job satisfaction is the extent to which the job satisfies personal needs for security, recognition, affiliation and self-esteem.
2. The approach emphasizing - the leadership skills, management in creating circumstances of job satisfaction
3. The effort - reward bargaining approach that, emphasizes the importance of incentive such as salary and job conditions and
4. The approach that - emphasizes the intrinsic nature of the work itself in providing job satisfaction.

Young (1988) conducted a research on the overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction with jobs of diverse degrees as well as workplace traits of teachers in a public school district in central California in the United States of America. He found out that satisfying factors of teaching have correlation with interactions and success with learners. Dissatisfiers were detected to emanate from conditions that diminished teacher performance. Young concluded that opportunity for creativity, resourcefulness; challenge and salary earned from teaching and its adequacy are the greatest causal factors in job satisfaction. Even though job satisfaction has been found to bring about good performance, Smith (1987) observed from his study that satisfaction does not necessarily lead to high performance. It could also lead to low performance due to complacency. However, he admits that the job satisfaction outlook is a guarantee to high degree of performance especially in an environment where job dissatisfiers are present.

According to Agyeman (1986), the social prestige attached to the job rather than how the individual performs, acts as a strong variable in determining the individual's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job. When teachers are recognized as mature in the decision making process of the school and are involved, it gives them job satisfaction which generally means the fulfilment acquired by experience in various job activities apart from only teaching in the classroom (Bame 1991).

He stated further that empowering employees in the management of organization motivates such employees to stay on the job and give of their best. Terry and Appelbaum (1988) confirmed Bame (1991) by stating that "when teachers are involved in those decisions that affect them, they are more likely to be more satisfied with their job situation and their principal". Similarly, Patchen (1970) argued that increased participation in decision making was associated with greater job satisfaction, work achievement and personal integration in the organisation. However, Alluto and Acito (1974) stated that pseudo-democratic leadership will bring about many disadvantages ranging from apathy to open hostility.

A survey conducted in the United States of America by Lischerson and Wall (1975) showed that perceived distant participation in decision making was positively associated with job performance.. This is the more reason why Havelock (1975) proposed that administrators who want innovation in their institutions should as a matter of urgency, encourage what he calls "genuine participation". Similarly, Herzberg (1987) argued that participation in the management of organisations' motives and objectives make employees stay on the job and give their best. He stated further that, extrinsic motivator were not

enduring so he advocated for job enrichment programmes such as genuine participation of staff in the decision making process. According to Herzberg (1987), group participation of staff in decision making has become popular because it gives members the chance to voice their opinion concerning matters that affect their work, help promote esprit de corps, boost morale and help increase productivity. They went on to say that in the school situation, when teachers are made to participate in decision making, it fosters friendly informal discussion and they become committed to the decisions they helped to formulate. This encourages them to work hard to help achieve institutional goals.

Campbell et al (1977), contended, that the modern school system is an intricate network of varied activities and services carried on by personnel who assume a variety of responsibilities for the teaching and learning process. Teachers are aware that the organizational achievement is more than the sum of their individual and collective efforts have contributed both to the formulation and to the achievement of the schools' goals. Teachers, who gain these satisfactions, feel identify with the organisation, its purpose and its method of achieving these purposes.

Earlier, Handerson (1976) carried out a research with the aim of finding out whether primary school teachers, who perceived they had high participation in school decision making as a group showed high job satisfaction, than those who perceived they had low participation. The result of the study was that teachers who perceived they had high participation in school decision making were more satisfied with their job. He concluded on the basis of the finding that there was positive relationship between participation in

school decision making and job satisfaction and also there existed more positive relationship towards their principals. On the basis of this finding, Wiredu-Kusi (1990), confirmed that in our educational institutions, when teachers are actively involved in the decision making process, they develop positive relationship with the head of institution and therefore become satisfied with their jobs, as against others not being involved in the decision making process who feel they have been relegated to the background by their head of institution. They either wish to go on transfer or leave the service. Pastor and Erlandson (1982) conducted a survey which found that teachers perceive their needs and measure their job satisfaction by factors such as participation in decision making, use of value, skills, freedom and independence, challenge, expression of creativity and opportunity for learning. They concluded that high internal motivation, work satisfaction and high-quality performance depend on three critical psychological states: personnel involvement in decision, responsibility for outcomes of the decision and knowledge of results of decision. A study conducted by Rockter (1987) at Michigan University had the finding that a teacher will be more committed to his work when he is actively involved in the decision making process. He further explained that a teacher feels recognised by his principal which is also a motivating factor for job satisfaction.

Ejiogu (1983) conducted a survey of workers orientation in the industrial sector in Nigeria, and found out that there was overwhelming preference for economic returns rather than intrinsic factors. In a similar study by Clegg (1971), in Algeria to find out workers orientation in the industrial sector, it was found that there was greater preference for economic than

intrinsic rewards. The two researchers concluded that participation in management does not feature prominently in the African workplace.

Wood (1986) attributed the steady indifference to participation in decision making in Ghana to what he terms “Paternalism” in Ghanaian society. He explains that persons in position of authority behave and are encouraged to behave like uncles, fathers, elders, mothers and old men. Ghanaian customary practice clearly forbids one to argue or dispute with one’s elder or leaders in public irrespective of the nature of what happens. This being the state of affairs, sub-ordinates do not freely and openly challenge people of authority, not even when they show their ignorance in areas clearly beyond them. This being so, the African worker, and for that matter the Ghanaian in particular, display a feeling of inferiority to a large extent when it comes to sitting in conference with their super-ordinates. Wood (1986), maintains that this situation accounts for the existence of dictators in several organisations in Ghana. Brondinsky and Neill (1988) studied and found out that majority of school administrators and teachers cited three policies that effectively improved morale and motivate their staff: shared governance, in-service education and systematic supportive evaluation. Shared governance or participatory management enhances teachers’ professional status and their ownership in the planning and operation of the school. Thus shared governance gives teachers a vested interest in school performance and also promoted harmony and trust among teachers and administrators.

Wiredu-Kusi (1990) in a related study of teacher participation in decision making in some selected senior secondary schools in the Cape Coast Municipality came out to support the stand that involvement in the decision

making process is the key to developing worthwhile attitude in teachers in the educational system. The study showed clearly that the participation of teachers in decision making lead to greater job satisfaction, commitment to decision and more qualitative decisions. Non participation on the other hand leads to frustration, low morale and apathy. Also he observed that teachers' involvement in certain aspects of school decision making process was not encouraging. Apathy on the part of teachers and constraints from administrators were the causes.

Summary of Related Literature Review

Review of literature on the study has shown that decision making is an important function in management of educational institutions. Decision making as a process is going on in school administration and instructional programmes. It is realized from the literature that many studies on decision making in school management and administration recommend participatory management or shared decision making (SDM) to those in charge of educational institutions. The literature also points to involvement of teachers in school decision making process as one of the important characteristics of effective schools. Better effects were seen in schools where teachers were involved in curriculum planning, guideline development and various aspects of decision making. There are various decision making models, processes and structures for making decisions in institutions which administrators adopt based on the leadership style in place. In few cases opportunities for decision making do not exist or are hardly used.

In connection with the heads of institutions perception towards teacher participation in decision making, teachers are perceived to be important stakeholders who should be given opportunity to contribute in decision making in all matters affecting them in the schools. Other heads of institutions opine that since teachers teach, their decision making must be limited to instructional decisions only. Some teachers perceive that they are major players in the educational process and should be allowed to participate in all types of school decisions. The Board of governors perceive that teachers should not be partners in the decision making process. Many research findings have stated relationship between teachers in participatory management and heads of educational institutions. When teachers are allowed to make inputs in schools, it fosters a positive relationship with the heads of institutions and therefore are satisfied with their jobs. However teachers who do not have such opportunities perceive they are relegated and have no job satisfaction. There are varied perceptions among heads of institutions, board members and teachers themselves.

It is important to note that many studies cited in the literature attest to the fact that adoption of participatory decision making governance in educational institutions promotes in most cases healthy school climate, commitment on part of teachers, staff professional development which will translate into effective and efficient use of human capital and materials to achieve desired educational outcomes in the schools.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The methodology describes the research design, population, sample and sampling procedure, data collection (instrument and administration) and data analysis procedure. The study was to investigate teacher participation in decision making process in the second cycle institutions in the Kwaebibirem district of Eastern Region.

Research Design

Research design is the overall plan or procedure for obtaining answers to the research questions for this study. The descriptive survey was used data for this study, so that inferences could be made about some behaviour, characteristics of population.

The descriptive design is concerned with the circumstances that exist, such as determining the nature of prevailing conditions, practices and attitudes. It also provides answers to questions raised in the study as research questions.

Osuala (1991) noted that descriptive surveys are versatile and practical, especially to the researcher in that they identify present needs. Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) have stated that the purpose of descriptive research is to observe, describe and document aspects of a phenomenon as it naturally occurs. They go on to say that in descriptive research, the events or conditions

either already exist or have occurred and the researcher merely selects relevant variables for analysis of their relationship.

Further, Frankel and Wallen (2000). contended that it allows for obtaining answers from a large group of people to a set of carefully designed and administered questionnaire. Nevertheless, there are problems involved in a descriptive survey. These include ensuring that the questions to be answered are clear and not misleading, getting respondents to answer thoughtfully and honestly and getting sufficient number of questionnaires completed and returned so that meaningful analysis can be made (Fraenkel&Wallen, 2000).

Population

All teachers and heads of second cycle institutions in the Kwaebibirem District constituted the target population made up of two hundred and thirty teachers and five heads of institutions for the study. The four senior high schools and the only technical institute in the district were:

1. St. Roses' Senior High School – Akwatia
2. Kade Senior High / Technical School – Kade
3. Asuom Senior High School – Asuom
4. Salvation Army Senior High School – AkimWenchi
5. Akwatia Technical Institute – Akwatia

The accessible population was made up of two hundred respondents including the heads of the institutions.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

In all, one hundred and twenty-five (125) respondents were sampled. Twenty-five (25) respondents were selected from each senior high school and the only technical institute in the district. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the respondents of the study. The criterion was all teachers (both males and females) who had been at post for at least three continuous academic years in each institution in the district. This period of stay in the institution would have given them fair insight into decision making process in their schools. According to Nwadinigwe (2002), purposive sampling is used in a condition whereby the researcher selects or includes aspects of a population on purpose.

Research Instrument

The researcher used questionnaire (Appendix A) made up of close-ended questions for the study. The questionnaire was presented to the supervisor who carefully studied, evaluated it, and made recommendations. Items of the questionnaire were adapted from the research instrument designed by Wire-Kusi (1990) who conducted similar research in the Cape Coast municipality. The first part of the questionnaire was to indicate the status of respondents in the school such as head of institution or teacher. Besides, there were five (5) other main sections. Section A had five items that sought to find out the structures, mode or opportunities for decision making that existed in the schools. Respondents were to indicate frequency of staff meetings and other opportunities for teacher to make inputs in relation to decision making. Section B had eight items on the head of institution and teacher perception of teacher

participation in school decision making process. This was to elicit information on the views of both heads of institutions and teachers in relation to teacher participation in school decision making process.

Section C made up of four items sought to investigate, the categories of teachers often involved in the decision making process. Section D had ten items that sought to find out the actual level or extent of teacher participation in decision making in the schools. The decision areas considered under this section were: technical or instructional decision that is choosing appropriate textbooks, solving learning problems in class, selecting their own teaching procedures and discussion of instructional policies. There was operational decision for example, class disciplinary policies, planning new structural facilities for the school, planning new project or programmes for the school.

Lastly, executive decision that is, planning and budgeting for the school, determining specific departmental routines and resolving departmental grievances of staff. Section E was made up of seven items which enabled the researcher to investigate teacher participation in decision making and job satisfaction. Respondents were to indicate their feeling of belongingness to their present schools, the level of autonomy in the job and desire to stay long in their schools.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher visited each of the schools in the district targeted for the study and interacted first with the head of institution and later with the teachers. It was explained to them the objective of the study and what they

were expected to do in order to provide their own responses individually without external influence or sceptism.

The researcher personally gave out the questionnaires to the respondents and collected them after three days. One hundred and twenty-five (125) questionnaires were given out and one hundred and five (105) were collected, representing eighty-four percent (84%) return rate.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were checked, edited, cleaned, coded and statistically analysed with descriptive statistics based on the research questions. The scores or responses of the items in each section were tallied and frequency distribution tables drawn for the responses from the five institutions.

Some of the columns under the four-point Likert-type scale in the questionnaire were combined for convenience in following the trend of views as expressed by respondents. For example, “strongly agree” and “agree” were put together to mean agreement, and compared with “strongly disagree” and “disagree” put together to mean disagreement. That is data on responses was collapsed to “agree” and “disagree” to allow for easier interpretation. Mean frequencies of responses to various items in each section of the questionnaire were computed into percentages for analysis. All the five research questions were addressed based on data obtained by using frequency and percentage distribution.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter focused on analyses of data and discussing the results of the study. Frequency and percentages were the statistical tools used. The study sought responses to the five (5) main research questions on the following;

1. Structures of decision making that are in the schools.
2. Perceptions of teacher participation in decision making in schools
3. Category of teachers often engaged in decision making in the schools
4. Extent of teacher participation in decision making in the schools
5. Participation in decision making and teacher job satisfaction

Structures of Decision Making in the Schools

Section A discusses available structures or opportunities for decision making which are likely to encourage teachers to participate in school decision making. The two columns of “agree” and strongly agree were all put together to mean agreement on the part of respondents. Again, disagree and strongly disagree were also put together to mean disagreement. This was adapted to distinguish respondents who were of the view that there are structures and those who do not agree that such structures exist. Respondents were to indicate their views on the existence of opportunities or structures for teachers in the school. This was done by showing their agreement or disagreement.

Research Question One: What decision making structures or opportunities are there in the institutions?

The first research question relating to the existence of structures, sought to find out views of respondents on the opportunities available to them in the schools to participate in decision making. Table 1 shows the responses of the heads of institutions and teachers on structures that allow teachers to be involved in school decision making. Structures or opportunities available in the school as indicated in Table 1 below are; staff meetings are held frequently, teachers suggestions are well taking by heads of institutions and the schools adopt consensus in decision making. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyse data collected.

Table 1: Structures of Decision Making in the Schools

Statements	Heads of Institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Staff meetings are held frequently in the school.	3	60	2	40	57	54.3	48	45.7
Many school matters are brought to staff meeting.	4	80	1	20	81	77.1	24	22.9
Head of institution Often has the final word.	3	60	2	40	63	60.0	42	40.0
Teachers' suggestions are well taken by head of institution.	4	80	1	20	58	55.2	47	44.8
Our school always adopt consensus in decision making.	5	100	0	0	47	44.8	58	55.2

Table 1 is a summary of respondents' views on the structures or mode of decision making in the schools. Majority of both heads of institutions i.e. 3 out of 5 representing 60% and 57 out of 105 teachers representing 54.3% accepted that staff meetings were frequently held in the schools. A number of the respondents, 2(40%) of heads of institutions and 48(45.7%) of teachers disagreed that there were frequent staff meetings in the schools. Judging from the analysis of data, there were acceptable frequencies of staff meetings in the schools as indicated by the majority of the respondents. This finding agrees with Richardson (1979) who asserted that frequent staff meetings are important in order to bring staff into a relationship that is harmonious. Also, Asare-Bediako (1990) sees staff meetings as a forum where every member of staff timely agrees on decision to be taken. He called this mode of decision making "decision by unanimity." This decision making structure is consistent with Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) who asserted that the school is a democratic society where individuals as well as group views are respected through regular staff meetings.

Four (80%) of heads of institutions and 81(77.1%) of teachers agreed that school matters are discussed at staff meetings. This indicates the sharing of ideas among teachers and heads of institutions (both parties make input to school governance). On the other hand, (20%) of heads of institutions and (24%) of teachers disagreed that school matters were brought to staff meetings for discussion. One could infer that these percentages represented heads of institutions who exhibit dictatorial tendency by not calling for staff meeting to

discuss or debate issues and that of teachers showed those who do not attend staff meetings or are not punctual.

Majority responded in the affirmative that school matters are brought to staff meeting. This agrees with Daff (2003) who mentioned that problems or issues are represented to the group members at a meeting to get their suggestions and then decision is made. This is known as 'consult group'. This will promote participation and responsibility.

On heads of institutions often having the final word, 3 (60%) of the heads of institutions and 63 (60.0%) of the teachers, all responded in the positive, i.e. agreed to the statement. This implies that heads of institutions influence final decisions made at staff meetings by exercising the power vested in them as the administrative head of the institution. This action undermines democratic governance in the school and is contrary to AsareBediako's (1990) "Decision by Majority" which stated that members of a group freely express their views on a given issue with the majority feelings taken as the decision. One may justify the heads of institutions' personal influence on the decisions arrived at during staff meetings on the grounds that the teachers are accountable to the heads of institutions who are also accountable to the community and superiors for any development in the schools. This, according to Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1997) is the unwillingness of administrators or heads of institutions to relinquish part of their absolute authority to teachers. This is perhaps due to the fact that they are still accountable to the community for whatever goes on in their schools. Jennings (1975) also argued and questioned the rationale of holding heads of institutions responsible for decisions arrived at collectively. The implication of his

argument is that once heads of institutions are the first to be held accountable for anything which goes on in the institutions, then there is high tendency of them using veto on sensitive issues or areas where teachers have difficulty in deciding, (This should not be often as indicated in Table 1) or collective decisions arrived at involving staff, required entire staff being held responsible.

Four (80%) of heads of institutions and 58 (55.2%) of teachers agreed to the statement that teachers' suggestions are well taken by heads of institutions. This is in line with the mode of involving teachers in decision making described by Owens (1973) as "democratic centralist" where the administrator presents issues or problems to the staff and accepts suggestions, reactions and ideas from them.

Consensus in decision making in the schools prevails highly as 5 (100%) of the heads of institutions agreed. However, majority 58(55.2%) of the teachers disagreed. All of the heads of institutions viewed consensus in decision making as a common practice whilst the majority of the teachers saw it as not existing in the schools. Forty-seven (48.8%) of the teachers accepted that consensus in decision making exists in the schools hence they are in agreement with the heads of institutions. The differences in the opinions of the heads of institutions and the minority of teachers on one hand, and the majority of the teachers on the other hand can be attributed to their understanding and application of the concept of the consensus in decision making in the schools.

**Perceptions of Heads of Institutions and Teachers about Teacher
Participation in School Decision Making Process**

This section discusses the perception held by both heads of institutions and teachers in the context of teacher participation in school decision making process. Respondents were made to confirm or reject the eight (8) core perceptions stated by indicating their agreement or disagreement respectively. Results presented in Table 2 show the perceptions of heads of institutions and teachers.

**Research Question Two: How do teachers and heads of institutions
perceive teacher participation in school decision making?**

This question sought to elicit responses showing the perceptions of respondents which affect teacher participation in school decision making. Table 2 indicates the results on the perceptions held by respondents. The core perceptions are: teacher participation enhances quality decisions, delays prompt action and enhances sabotage by teachers. Results presented in Table 2 were analysed using frequencies and percentages.

Table 2: Perceptions of Heads of Institutions and Teachers about Teacher Participation in Decision Making Process

Statements	Heads of institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teacher participation in decision making:								
Enhances quality decision	5	100	0	0	61	58.1	44	41.9
Delays prompt action.	3	60	2	40	58	55.2	47	44.8
Develops the professional competence of the teacher.	4	80	1	20	45	42.9	60	57.1
Makes teacher's work too loaded	3	60	2	40	55	52.4	50	47.6
Ensures collective responsibility of decision	2	40	3	60	46	43.8	59	56.2
Reduces head of institution's authority.	4	80	1	20	48	45.7	57	54.3
Promotes commitment to decision.	3	60	2	40	54	51.4	51	48.6
Enhances sabotage by teachers.	3	60	2	40	54	51.4	51	48.6

The analysis of data in Table 2 shows how heads of institutions and teachers perceive teacher participation in school decision making.

All the 5(100%) heads of institutions and 61(58.1%) of the teachers confirmed that teacher participation in decision making in schools promote quality decision making in schools. This implies that all the heads of institutions are more likely to encourage teachers to be involved in school decision making, because they believe it promotes quality decision. And for majority of the teachers, they will readily participate in the school decision making process. This finding is not consistent with the argument by Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1977) that the administrator perceives that the relevant publics of the school may not be in the position to see the general purpose of the school, hence their participation in decision making will portray some bias due to their limited view of the problem and purpose of the school.

Majority of the heads of institutions 3(60%) and 58(55.2%) of teachers did agreed that teacher participation in decision making delays prompt actions. This majority view is in contrast to Johnson's (1975) study which encouraged school principals not to fear that expanded teacher influence would undermine their work. The findings suggest that greater percentage of headmasters, principals and teachers are of the view that teacher participation in decision making is not favorable to decision that requires quick actions for immediate outcomes, hence a setback to efficient and effective administration. However, a number of heads of institution; 40% and 44.8% teachers were of the view that teacher participation does not delay prompt action.

While four (80%) of heads of institution agreed that teacher participation promotes professional growth, only 45(42.9%) of the teachers agreed. This perception of the majority of headmasters and principals and the minority of teachers confirms the assertion by Brodinsky and Neill (1988) that shared governance or participatory management enhances the teachers' professional status and their ownership in the planning and operation of school. Respondents in agreement hold the view that teachers can grow professionally if given the opportunity to participate in school decision making. Practice brings about competence over a period of time. Avenues will be created and teachers will participate willingly.

In contrast, one (20%) of the heads of institution and 60(57.1%) of the teachers disagreed that teacher participation develops the professional competence of the teacher. This means that engaging teachers in decision making does not develop the professional competence of the teacher. Such respondents do not appreciate the impact of full participation in school decision making on their work in the school as professionally competent teachers.

On the perception that teacher participation in decision making makes teacher's work too much loaded, majority of the respondents i.e. heads of institutions 3(60%) and 55(52.4%) teachers agreed that it holds. This is based on the fact that the teacher is already saddled with his main work of teaching both in and outside the classroom. Therefore, engaging him in other decision areas is added responsibility which is too much. This finding affirms Graham's (1976) observation that most heads of institution perceive teachers not willing to be part of the decision making process because it goes with added responsibilities. However, 2(40%) of the heads of institution and 50(47.6%) of

the teachers disagreed, which implies that such heads of institutions and teachers were prepared to engage and be engaged respectively in decision making because they do not perceive it as making the teachers' work difficult. This significant minority view is at the variance with Chapman's (1988) observation that teachers' participation in school-based decisions is additional work which impedes their classroom teaching.

Majority of the respondents 3(60%) of heads of institutions and 59(56.2%) teachers disagreed to the perception that teacher participation in decision making ensures collective responsibility for decision. This means that they were of the view that teacher participation in decision making does not ensure collective responsibility, which implies teachers participate but will not ensure acceptance and full involvement in implementing such decisions taken. This finding does not confirm Ettlign and Jago(1988) assertion that, increase in staff participation generated greater acceptance of decision with the understanding that the decision is sound. Significantly, 2(40%) of heads of institutions and 46(43.8%) of teachers indicated agreement.

It is indicated in the table that 4(80%) of the heads of institutions and 48(45.7%) of the teachers agreed that teacher participation in decision making reduces headmasters' and principals' authority to administer the schools. On the other hand, 1(20%) head of institutions and 57(54.3%) of the teachers disagreed, which implies that the influence of heads of institutions is reduced as teachers participate in school decision making, others perceive otherwise. The finding shows clearly that almost all (80%) of the heads of institutions supported by minority (45.7%) teachers perceive their authority is reduced because the process of teacher participation in decision will not always allow

them to use their discretionary power fully to govern the schools. This outcome negates the findings of Bennet (1987) that teacher in school decision making will actually enhance the principal's authority. Contrarily, the perception of majority of the teachers (54.3%) and only 20% of the heads of institution confirm the finding of Bennet (1987).

58(55.2%) of the teachers and 2(40%) of the heads of institutions agreed that teacher participation in school based decision promotes their commitment to decisions. This outcome confirms the findings of Shanhan (1987) that the use of participative decision making structure increased commitment and greater co-operation in the implementation of decision taken. The opposite view held by 47(44.8%) of the teachers and 3(60%) the heads of institutions is explicitly shown in the table that even where teachers are involved in decisions made, it does not increase their commitment to such decisions. This is completely at variance with Shanahan's (1987) findings above and that of Field's (1982) assertion that leadership behaviour which conformed to group involvement in decision making was likely to be more effective than one which rejected it. Herzberg (1987) also stated that when teachers are made to participate in decision making, it fosters friendly informal discussion and they become committed to the decision they have helped to formulate.

Majority of the respondents, i.e., 3(60%) of heads of institutions and 54(51.4%) of teachers perceive that, engaging teachers in school-based decision process promotes sabotage by teachers that creates opportunities to undermine the heads of institutions' work and influence in the schools. These finding is contrary to that of Johnson (1975) which confirmed the existence of

collective decision making structure in the schools, and principals need not fear that teacher influence would undermine their work. A number of respondents, 2(40%) of heads of institutions and 51(48.6%) of teachers did not perceive that teacher participation in school decision process is a source of sabotage to heads of institutions' work by teachers.

Category of Teachers Involved in Decision Making in the Schools.

There are varying groups of teachers both formal and informal in the schools. This section sought to elicit responses to show the group of teachers, who are often involved in decision making by heads of institutions. Respondents were made to indicate their confirmation / agreement or rejection/disagreement of the statements in the questionnaire.

Research Question Three: What Categories of Teachers Participate in School Decision Making?

This research question was used to find out whether teacher participation in decision making was open to all or a particular group of teachers in the school. Table 3 shows the result on the main categories of teachers engaged in school decision making: heads of institutions involving only his assistants in school decision, those who are next in rank to the head of institution and his assistants and have stayed in the school for over three years (senior teachers), teachers liked by the head of institutions (favoured teachers) and teachers who show willingness to be involved in school decision making. Responses were analysed using frequencies and percentages as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Category of Teachers Involved in Decision Making in the Schools

Statements	Heads of institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Heads of institution and assistants only.	1	20	4	80	43	41	62	59.0
Only senior members are involved.	2	40	3	60	45	42.8	60	57.2
Only favoured teachers are engaged.	3	60	2	40	36	34.3	69	65.7
Any teacher willing to take part in the process.	1	20	4	80	53	50.5	52	49.5

Table 3 shows that 4(80%) of the heads of institutions and 62(59%) of the teachers disagreed that heads of institutions and their assistants only are involved in decision making in the schools. This implies that there were some opportunities for teachers outside the top hierarchy of the schools to be engaged in school-based decisions.

This finding does not agree with the affirmation of Richardson (1979) that some heads of educational institutions such as schools and colleges are of the views that administrator should administer while teachers teach because teachers are inexperienced in administrative techniques and skills so must be

confined to classroom teaching. On the contrary, 1(20%) head of an institution and 43(41%) of the teachers agreed to the statement.

Three (60%) of the heads of institutions and 60 (57.2%) of the teachers indicated their disagreement to the issue of only senior teachers are involved in decision making in schools. Both senior and junior teachers have the opportunity to be part of school decision making. This corroborates Hanson (1996) that the relevant publics that are affected by a decision must be involved in making such a decision so that there might not be any traces of malfunctioning in the decision making process. Two (40%) of the heads of institutions and 45(42.8%) of the teachers agreed that only senior teachers are involved in school decision making. In their view, there were no opportunities for respondents who were not senior teachers.

On only favoured teachers are engaged in decision making, 3(60%) of heads of institutions and 36(34.3%) of the teachers agreed. Contrarily, 2(40%) of heads of institutions and 69(65.7%) of the teachers disagreed. This clearly shows that majority of the teachers do not see favouritism in the choice of teachers engaged in decision making in the schools. This affirms the contention of Gorton (1980) that the practice of involving all who matter in decision making is consistent with democratic principles of our society and that those who are affected by such decision in schools should have some say in how they are ran.

Also, on any teacher willing to take part in the decision making process being engaged, majority i.e., 4(80%) of the heads of institutions and many 52(49.5%) of the teachers disagreed, this implies they are of the view that not any teacher willing to participate in the school decision making process is

engaged. Their view is that one's willingness is not the criterion for engaging a teacher in the process. Hence the findings disagree with Campbell et al (1977) that the teacher wished he could contribute to administrative decision making in his/her school. On the other hand, only 1(20%) of the heads of institutions and an average number of 53(50.5%) of the teachers agreed that any teacher willing to take part in the decision making process could be engaged.

Extent/Level of Teacher Participation in School Decision Making

Section D of the questionnaire sought to investigate the extent/levels at which teachers are engaged in school decision making, i.e., the kind of decision situations in which teachers participate. The section was made up of three (3) subsections, indicating the levels or extent of school decision situations. They are:

- (i) Technical or Instructional decisions,
- (ii) Operational decisions and
- (iii) Executive or Managerial decisions.

Teachers were asked to show the extent to which they agreement or disagreement to the various levels of decision making in the schools. In order to accomplish this task, three different tables were presented to discuss research four. The results were indicated in Tables 4, 5, and 6.

Research Question 4: To what extent are teachers actually involved in decision making in the schools?

This research question demanded responses from the heads of institutions and teachers' to find the level at which teachers participate in the school decision

making. The decision levels are: technical, operational and executive decisions.

Tables 4, 5 and 6 all show results related to research question four above.

Table 4 deals specifically with technical or instructional decisions. Such decisions are: teachers are free to select appropriate books, teachers are free to solve learning problems, teachers are free to choose their own teaching methods and teachers are included in the discussion of instructional policies. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyse data collected.

Table 4: Extent/Level of Teacher Participation in Technical or Instructional Decisions

Statements	Heads of institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teachers are free to select appropriate textbooks.	2	40	3	60	70	66.7	35	33.3
Teachers are free to solve learning problems.	4	80	1	20	44	41.9	61	58.1
Teachers are free to choose their own teaching methods.	3	60	2	40	48	45.8	57	54.2
Teachers are included in the discussion of instructional policies.	3	60	2	40	52	49.5	53	50.5

Freedom to select appropriate text books exists in the schools as 70(66.7%) of the teachers and 2(40%) of the heads of institutions agreed. This means teachers do recommend appropriate textbooks to the students. This

affirms Lianto's (1994) prediction that shared decision making (SDM) will create new forms of leadership. Not only will teachers be brought into the process but principals will devise new strategies based on facilitation and trust rather than hierarchical authority. As to whether teachers have free hand in solving learning problems, 4(80%) of heads of institutions and 44(41.9%) of teachers did agree that teachers are free to solve learning problems they meet in class.

Conversely, 61(58.1%) of the teachers and only 1(20%) of the heads of institutions were of the view that teachers do not have free hand in solving learning problems they encounter in class. This finding confirms the castle school era, where heads become the gods of their schools and teachers' liberty was out of place even in their own classrooms. Three (60%) of the heads of institutions and 48(45.8%) of the teachers agreed that teachers were free to choose their own teaching methods. On the other hand, 2(40%) of the heads of institution and 57(54.2%) of the teachers disagreed. This finding contradicts Lutterodt's (1989) assertion that employee participation in decision making is among the range of key success for productive improvement and the findings of Shanahan(1987) which showed that participative decision making were areas of teachers responsibility as; establishing classroom disciplinary policies, determining appropriate teaching methods which also increases commitment and greater efforts.

From Table 4, 3(60%) of the heads of institutions and 52(49.5%) of the teachers agreed that teachers were involved in the discussion of instructional policies, where as 2(40%) of the heads of institutions and 53(50.5%) of the teachers disagreed, that teachers were involved in the discussion on

instructional policies in their schools. This affirms Graham's (1976) observation that schools in West Africa are exact copies of the English system of education. Similar to the British educational system, the administrators of such schools were state employees at the top and dictated to teachers.

As stated earlier, Table 5 relates to research question four (4). It sought information from respondents about participation in operational decisions in the schools. Data collected were analysed using frequencies and percentages.

Table 5: Extent/Level of Teacher Participation in Operational Decisions

Statements	Heads of institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teachers are allowed to make classroom disciplinary policies.	2	40	3	60	62	59.0	43	41.0
Teachers participate in planning new structural facilities of the school.	2	40	3	60	53	50.5	52	49.5
Teacher participate in planning new projects or programmes for the school.	4	80	1	20	54	51.4	51	48.6

Table (5), shows majority 62(59.0%) of the teachers and 2(40%) of the head of institution accepted that teachers were allowed to make classroom disciplinary policies. Classroom discipline is important for effective teaching

and learning and formulating such policies are in the professional jurisdiction of the teacher. Again, this finding affirms Shanahan's (1987) finding which showed that participative decision making were in some areas of teachers responsibility as; establishing classroom disciplinary policies, determining appropriate teaching methods which also increased commitment and greater co-operation. However 43(41.0%) of the teachers and 3(60%) of the heads of institutions disagreed.

In the view of 53(50.5%) of the teachers and 2(40%) of the heads of institutions, teachers were involved in planning new structural facilities of the school. This allowed teachers to contribute to the process of infrastructural development of their schools. There was a divided opinion as 52(49.5%) of the teachers and 3(60%) heads of institutions disagreed that teachers were involved in planning new structural facilities for the school. This slightly divided opinion of the teachers may be due to the reason that, some teachers in some schools were engaged in the process while some teachers in other schools were not involved. This finding is in line with the research findings of Burke (1987) that teacher participation level for both desired and actual was greatest for technical decisions and least for operational and executive decisions.

On teachers participating in planning new projects and programmes for the school, majority of the teachers 54(51.4%) and 4(80%) of the heads of institutions were of the opinion that teachers were engaged in planning new projects and programmes for their schools. This finding supports Burke's (1987) finding that teachers who had stayed for longer period, those who were regular at staff meetings and those who lived in close proximity to the school participated in operational and managerial decisions.

The results in Table 6 show the extent to which teacher were involved in executive or managerial decision making in the school Table 6 also provides results pertaining to research question four (4) and it deals specifically with the participation of teachers in executive or managerial decisions in the schools. Such decisions found in Table 6 are: teachers are involved in planning and budgeting for the schools, teachers are engaged in determining specific departmental assignments, teachers are involved in resolving departmental grievances of staff. Data collected were analysed using frequencies and percentages.

Table 6: Extent of Teacher Participation in Executive or Managerial Decisions

Statements	Heads of institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teachers are involved in planning and budgeting for the school.	4	80	1	20	47	44.8	58	55.2
Teachers are engaged in determining specific departmental assignments.	2	40	3	60	56	53.3	49	46.7
Teachers are involved in resolving departmental grievances of staff.	5	100	0	0	45	43.9	60	56.1

Majority of the teachers 58(55.2%) and 1(20%) of the heads of institutions disagreed, i.e., in their view, teachers are not involved in planning

and budgeting for the school. Majority of the teachers feel they are left out in planning and budgeting for various school activities in the school. The majority view of the teachers shows that the heads of institutions and few teachers, assistant headmasters and senior teachers plan and budget for the school. Teachers were expected to accept work within the planned activities and the financial resource made available. This finding supports Oduro's (1998) research findings which stated that in Ghana Education Service, supervisors impose predetermined standards concerning desirable teaching outcome on teachers.

As to whether teachers were engaged in determining specific departmental assignments or not, majority of the teachers 56(53.3%) and 2(40%) of the heads of institutions indicated their agreement. Teachers were involved in determining such issues. On the other hand, 49(46.7%) of the teachers and 3(60%) of the heads of institutions were of the view that teachers were not engaged in determining specific departmental assignments. Despite the slight differences in opinion of the respondents, one may deduce a form of collaboration in the various departments in determining work load and specific classes each teacher is to teach. The finding according to majority of teachers was at variance with Boyan (1988) who referred to schools as impoverished intellectual climate for adults where the norm in most schools is that teachers are not expected to contribute experience knowledge and wisdom to decision about the common good of educating students.

All the 5(100%) heads of institutions and 45(43.9%) of the teachers agreed that teachers were engaged in resolving departmental grievances of

staff. Majority of the teachers 60(56.1%) disagreed. The view of this majority of teachers shows that such issues are regarded as serious concern for administration; therefore junior teachers may stay out of handling grievances of staff. This finding corroborates Rice and Schneider's (1994) finding that stated that teachers reported higher levels of decision deprivation in managerial issues than technical issues.

Teacher Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction

Section E sought to find out whether there exist any relationships between teacher job satisfaction and teacher participation in school-based decision making process or not. Respondents were to express their views on each of the statements positively as agreement and negatively as disagreement. Seven statements were adopted to elicit information from respondents.

Research Question 5: To what extent does teacher participation in school decision making affect teacher job satisfaction?

This research question sought to elicit information about teachers' job satisfaction as they are involved in school decision making process. Table 7 shows the results on teacher participation in decision making and teacher job satisfaction. Responses to items such as teacher participation in decision making generates: high level of autonomy, high sense of we-feeling, desire for long stay in school, provided data which were analysed by using frequencies and percentages.

Table 7: Teacher Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction

Statements	Heads of institutions				Teachers			
	Agree		Disagree		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Teacher participation in decision making generates:								
High level of autonomy.	4	80	1	20	55	52.4	50	47.6
High sense of we-feeling.	3	60	2	40	58	55.2	47	44.8
Feeling of inclusiveness.	3	60	2	40	58	55.2	47	44.8
Job recognition outside school.	2	40	3	60	37	35.3	68	64.7
Social recognition outside school.	3	60	2	40	59	56.2	46	43.8
Desire for long stay in school.	4	80	1	20	64	61.0	41	39.0
Desire for increased and sustained academic output for school.	4	80	1	20	59	56.2	46	43.8

Fifty-five (52.4%) of the teachers and 4(80%) of the heads of institutions were of the view that teachers enjoy a high level of autonomy in the teaching profession. On the contrary, 50(47.6%) of the teachers and 1(20%) head of institution felt that high level of autonomy was lacking in the schools. The slightly divided opinions depict these two groups with regards to the statement. However, the responses of the majority 55(52.4%) is an indication that an appreciably high level of autonomy exists in the job of teachers as they are professionally trained to participate in decision making process in their schools. This finding confirms the findings of a study conducted earlier by

Wierdu-Kusi (1990) showed clearly that, the participation of teachers in decision making leads to greater job satisfaction, commitment to decision and more qualitative decisions.

On participation in school decision resulting into high sense of well-being (togetherness), majority of the teachers 58(55.2%) and 3(60%) of the heads of institutions indicated that their participation in school based decision making has generated a high sense of togetherness (well-feeling) among the teachers in the schools. This is so, for the reason that they decide and implement such decisions together. This is in support of Brodinsky (1983) who stated that share governance gives teachers a vested interest in school performance and also promotes harmony and trust among teachers and administrators.

Feeling of inclusiveness (being part of the decision making process in the school) by teachers as partners in school decision making was indicated by 58(55.2%) of the teachers and 3(60%) of the heads of institutions as being positive. They agreed to the statement. This implies that they felt they were free to express their views as they are seen to be part of the decision making process in the school, hence the feeling that they are part of the school. This finding is confirmed by the early argument of Patchen (1970) that increased participation in decision making is associated with greater job satisfaction, work achievement and personal integration in the organisation or institution. This argument was later corroborated by Herzberg (1987) that in school situation, when teachers are made to participate in decision making, it fosters friendly informal discussion and they become more committed to the decisions

they help to formulate. This encourages them to work harder to help achieve institutional goals.

The table above shows that majority of the teachers 68(64.7%) and heads of institutions 3(60%) indicated that participatory governance did not give them the advantage of enjoying job recognition outside the school. On the contrary, 37(35.3%) of the teachers and 2(40%) of heads of institutions hold different view from the majority group. The view of the majority of the respondents could be attributed to the average low economic status of teachers perceived by the Ghanaian public. Their view contradicts the finding of Serjiovanni (1991) that teachers obtain their greatest satisfaction through a sense of achievement in reacting and offering students, experiencing recognition and feeling responsible. He advised public school principals to be concerned with both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards since job satisfaction may be thought to represent as interplay between external and internal factors.

On social recognition outside the school, the views of all respondents were, 59 (56.2%) of the teachers and 3 (60%) of the heads of institutions expressed their agreement that teachers enjoy social recognition due to participation in decision making process in the schools. As teachers participate, they are well informed about school decisions and policies. This enables teachers to explain circumstances and policies well to students and society for them to appreciate their roles hence the social recognition accorded some teachers. Forty-six (43.8%) of the teachers and 2(40%) of the heads of institution hold a contrary view. They did not enjoy social recognition as the majority expressed. However, the majority view had it that teachers were accorded social recognition in the communities outside the schools. This will

translate into social prestige and serve as morale booster for performance, participation and long stay in the school. This finding is consistent with Agyeman (1986) who stated that the social prestige attached to the job rather than how the individual performs, acts as a strong variable in determining the individual's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the job.

Majority of the respondents, 64(61%) of the teachers and 4(80%) of the heads of institutions indicated positively that teachers desired long stay in their schools as their participation in the decision making process in their schools give them job satisfaction. The minority, 41(39.0%) of the teachers and only 1(20%) head of institution expressed their disagreement. This implies they do not desire any long stay in their schools despite their participation. They may not enjoy satisfaction which will warrant their desire to stay in their schools. However, the majority response confirms that teachers yearn to stay long in their schools. This finding agrees with Bame (1991) who stated that when teachers are recognized as mature individuals in the decision making process of the school and are involved. It gives them job satisfaction which generally means the fulfillment acquired by experiencing various job activities apart from only teaching in the management of organization. It also motivates such employees to stay on the job and give off their best.

Fifty-nine (56.7%) of the teachers and 4(80%) of the heads of institutions expressed that teachers had desire for increased and sustained academic output for their schools. On the contrary 46(43.8%) of the teachers and 1(20%) of the heads of institutions indicated their disagreement which means, in their view, there is no desire for increased and sustained academic work. The majority of the respondents were of the view that teacher

participation in school decision making generated in the teachers the desire for increased and sustained academic output for their schools. This majority view agrees with Havelock (1975) and Herzberg (1987) where both stated that when teachers are to participate in school decision making it fosters friendly informal discussion and they become committed to the decisions they helped to formulate. This encourages them to work hard to help achieve institutional goals.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The main objective of the study was to find out teacher participation in decision making process in second cycle institutions in Kwaebibirem District in the Eastern Region of Ghana. Participatory governance through popular decision making process creates very congenial school climate for effective teaching and learning. Decision making is the mainstay in proper administration and management of public organizations including educational institutions. This study was necessitated by the need to find out whether the accusation that, heads of educational institutions in the district do neglect teachers in the school-based decision making, is only a perception or reality. The study investigated the structures of decision making, category of teachers engaged, perceptions associated with teacher participation, level at which teachers participate and how participation in school-based decision making promotes job satisfaction among teachers.

The teachers of all the four Senior High Schools and the only Technical Institute and heads of these institutions formed the target population for the study. In all, hundred and twenty-five (125) were sampled as respondents. Twenty-five (25) respondents from each institutions were teachers who had stayed in the school for a period not less than three (3) years and the

headmasters. One hundred and twenty-five (125) questionnaires were given out and one hundred and five (105) were collected i.e. 84% return rate.

The instrument for the study was structured questionnaire (appendix 1) which was critically examined by the supervisor and accepted. Items were adopted from the research instrument designed by Wiredu-Kusi (1990) who conducted a similar study in selected senior secondary schools in the Cape Coast Municipality. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyse the data collected as the study was a descriptive one.

Key Findings

1. The study showed that there were many ways and methods by which administrators of the schools allowed teachers to be engaged in the school decision making process. Majority of the respondents i.e. the heads of institutions and the teachers were of the view that staff meetings were frequently held where many issues were discussed and decisions made. Teachers have opportunities to make input into school decision as their suggestions on issues are accepted by the head of their school. There was also consensus building among others in the schools as stated by the respondents.
2. The two main categories of perception held by respondents were as follows:
 - i. There were positive perceptions as respondent were of the mind that teacher participation in school decision making promotes the quality of decision, increases the professional growth of the teacher, and ensures collective responsibility of decisions.
 - ii. Conversely, there existed negative perceptions such as; teacher participation in school decision making delays prompt action which may

impact adversely on administrative processes in the schools, makes teachers' work too much loaded, does not ensure collective responsibility of decisions. Some respondents especially the heads of institutions perceived that, teacher participation in school decision making reduces their authority and affords teachers opportunities to sabotage their works in administering the schools.

3.i Decision making was not restricted to heads of institutions, their assistants and senior teachers only.

- ii. Majority of the heads of institutions were inclined more to engaging favoured teachers and there was a form of selectivity.
- iii. Teachers' views on the issue were divided

4. To make this section of the questionnaire more understandable to respondents, items were grouped into three subsections: instructional or technical decisions, operational decisions, and executive or managerial decisions.

Findings have shown that:

- i. Teachers were allowed to participate freely in some instructional decisions as teachers recommend or choose appropriate textbooks and were involved in discussing instructional policies
- ii. Majority of the teachers consented that they were sometimes engaged in operational decisions also.
- iii. Teachers were hardly engaged in planning and budgeting for the school nor involved in resolving departmental grievances of staff. However, teachers participate in determining specific departmental assignments

according to majority of the teachers. Their participation in executive decisions was not as good as in operational and instructional decision.

5. Majority of the teachers held the view that their job (teaching) was not recognized outside the schools. The appreciable levels of job satisfaction enjoyed by the teachers as result of their participation had created in the majority of the teachers the desire for long stay in the schools to promote academic work.

Conclusions

Based on the literature and findings of the study, the study has shown that:

1. Teachers had many opportunities or there were structures in the schools that allow them to participate in the school decision making process. Examples of such structures are; staff meetings being held frequently to discuss issues, consensus building among others.
2. Both teachers and heads of institutions had positive and negative perceptions about teacher involvement in school decision making process. This implies, it has merits and challenges for school administrator
3. It was not only school administrators and senior teachers who participated in the school decision making process. Any teacher could be engaged however, there was the tendency of engaging favoured teachers more than others.
4. Teachers participated freely in instructional or technical decisions and sometimes were involved in operational decisions as well. i.e planning new structures, projects and programmes. There was minimum or no

participation in executive or managerial decisions. i.e. teachers were hardly engaged in planning and budgeting for the school.

5. Teachers enjoyed forms of job satisfaction when engaged in school decision making process. Consequently they desired to stay long in the school to contribute to academic progress.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. School administrators should effectively use all approved structures in the schools to engage teachers in decision making to give meaning to collective decision. As such the style of heads of institution having the final word as part of decision making process should give way to consensus building to further enhance the quality of decisions.
2. Participatory decision making in the schools should be strengthened by applying the appropriate procedures to arrive at decision to correct the negative perceptions held by some heads of institutions and teachers.
3. All teacher should be encouraged to get involved in the decision making process to promote greater harmony in the schools and its related job satisfaction.
4. Heads of institutions should involve teachers in planning and budgeting decisions of the schools.

Suggestions for Further Research

The following are suggested for further research:

1. The study should be replicated in other districts to establish good basis for generalization of the study.
2. Further research should be carried out more work on executive or managerial decisions for clarity.
3. Other research instruments like interviews could be used to enhance data collection.
4. Teachers' divided views on category of teachers involved in decision making in the schools should be investigated further.

REFERENCES

- Adamelokun, N. K. (1989). *Selected topics in university administration*. Lagos: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Afful-Broni, A. (2004). *Theory and practice of educational leadership in Ghana*. Accra: Yamens Press Ltd.
- Agyeman, D, K. (1986). *The sociology of education for African student*. Accra: Black Mask.
- Agyenim-Boateng, E.O., Atta, E.T., & Baafi-Frimpong, S. (2009). *Educational management and administration*. Cape Coast: Yaei Publications
- Alluto, J.A. & Acito, R. (1974). Decisional participation and sources of job satisfaction: A study of manufacturing personnel. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17, 160 – 167.
- Alluto, J.A. & Belasco, J. A. (1976). A typology for participation in organizational decision-making. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 17, 22-31.
- Amuzu-Kpeglo, A. (1991). Classification of organizational systems and the decision making process: The case of the Ghana Education Service 1974-1985. *Journal of Institute of Education*, 2(1), 69-77.
- Ankoma, Y.A. & Amoako-Essien M. (2002). Job satisfaction of teachers' in private schools: A case study in the Accra metropolis of Ghana. *Journal of Educational Management*, 4, 177-189.
- Arnold, G. R. (1966). *Factors associated with the principals' behaviour in encouraging teacher participation in school decision-making*. Stanford: Stamford University.

- Asare-Bediako, K. (1990). Managing decision-making in groups. *Management Today*, 14, 1-10.
- Asiedu-Akrofi, A. (1978). *School organization in Africa*. Accra: Ghana Publishing Corporation.
- Bame, K. N. (1991) *Teacher's motivations and retention in Ghana*. Accra: Ghana University Press.
- Bennet, J, R. (1987). *The relationship between principles stated allocation of decisional power to teacher and their perception of organizational conditions and practices of the central office*. Syracuse: Syracuse University.
- Blasé, J., Anderson, G. L., & Dungan, S. (1995). *Democratic principal in action: Eight pioneers*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Boyan, N. J. (1988). (Ed.). *Handbook of research on educational administration*. New York: Longman.
- Brodinsky, B. & Neill, S. B. (1983). Building morale motivating staff: Problems and solutions. *A.A.SA Critical Issues Report*, 12, 227-321,
- Burke, T. D. (1987). Teachers' participation in school decision-making. Doctoral Dissertation. Rutgers States University in *Dissertation Abstract International*.
- Campbell, R.F. Bridges, E.M., & Nystrand, R.O. (1977). *Introduction to educational administration* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn& Bacon Inc.
- Chapman, J. D. (1988). Decentralization, devolution and the teacher: Participation by teachers in the decision making of schools. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26, (1), 39 – 72.
- Clegg, I. (1971). *Workers self management in Algeria*. London: Allen Lane.

- Denys, J. (1980). *Leadership in schools*. London: Heineman Educational Books Ltd.
- Daft, R. (2003). *Management* (6th ed.). South –Western:Tomson.
- Ettling, J. & Jago, A. G. (1988). Participation under condition of conflict more on the validity of the Vroom of Yetton model. *Journal of Managements Studies* 25 (1), 34-45.
- Ejiogu, A.M. (1983). Participative managements in a developing economy: Poison or Place be. *Journal of Applied Behaviors Science*, 19(3), 239-247.
- Field, R. H. G. (1982). A test of the Vroom-Yetton normative model of leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 523 – 523.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N.E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1992). *Teacher development and educational change*. London: Falmer Press.
- Gitlin, A. & Smyth, J. (1989). *Teacher evaluation: Educative alternatives*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Glickman, C. (1993). *Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-basedaction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gorton, R. A. (1980). *School Administration and supervision: Improvement issues and concepts and case studies*. (2nd ed.). Dupuque, Iowa: Won C. Brown 10 publishers.
- Graham, C. K. (1976). *The history of education in Ghana*. Accra: Ghana Publishing Corporation.

- Griffin, G. A. (1995). Influences of shared decision-making on school and classroom activity: Conversation with five teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96, (1), 29-45.
- Hanson, E. M. (1996). *Educational administration and organizational behaviour*. Boston: Allyn Bacon Publishers.
- Harding, H. (1987). *Management appreciation: An essential handbook*. California: Pitman Publishing Company.
- Havelock, R. G. (1975). Strategically of innovation in education. *Innovation*, 3-5.
- Handerson, L. E. (1976). An investigation to measure the preferred role of teachers in education decision-making. Arkansas: University of Arkansas.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees. *Harvard Review*, 109-120.
- Hoy, W, K. & Miskel, C .G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory research and practice*. New York: Random House.
- Jenning, A. (1975). *Participation of teaching staff in decision making in school. A case study in management. (2nd ed.)*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Johnson, R. A. (1975). *The theory and management of systems (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Keef, J. L. (1976). Teachers professionalism and decision-making made in selected elementary schools as determination of job satisfaction. Doctoral dissertation. University of Oregon. *Dissertation Abstract*. 39.
- Liontos, L. B. (1994). *Shared decision-making*. Eugene, Oregon: Eric Clearing.

- Lischeron, J. A. & Wall, T. D. (1995). towards participation among local authority employees. *Human Relations*, 10(2), 13 – 25.
- Mankoe, J.O. (2007). *Educational administration and management in Ghana*. Kumasi: Paules Publication Ltd.
- Marfo-Yiadom, E. (2005). *Principles of management*. Accra: Woeli Publishing Services.
- Marks, P. & Louis, S. (1997). *Eric information analysis products (IAPs): Eric clearing house on educational managements*. University of Oregon: Eugene.
- Merrit D. R. (1987). *The concepts of shared governance in urban school districts as perceived by selected teachers principals control office administration classified employees and parents*. South Mississippi: University of south Mississippi.
- Miller, E. (1995). Shared decision-making by itself doesn't make better decision. *The Harvard Education Letter*, (11), 1-4.
- Munford, E. (1972). *Job satisfaction: A study of computers specialists*. London: Longman.
- Nwandinigwe, I. P. (2002). *Fundamentals of research methods and statistics*. Lagos: Sibon Books Limited.
- Oduro, G. K. T. (1998). Moving from teacher accountability to teacher development: Lesson from teacher appraisal. *Journal of Educational Management*, 1(1), 68-76.
- Okae-Anti, C. (1999). Public relations specialist, any role(s) in university style administration. *Journal of Educational Management*, 2,155-157.

- Okumbe, J. A. (1998). *Educational management: Theory and practice*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.
- Osuala, E. C. (1991). *Introduction to research methodology*. Onitsha: Africa-Feb Publishers Ltd.
- Owen, J. G (1973). *Management of curriculum development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Pastor, M. C. & Erlandson, J. (1982). A study of high order need strength and job satisfaction in secondary public teachers. *Journal of educational administration*, (20), 172-183.
- Patchen M. (1970). *Participation, achievement and involvement in job*, Englewood cliff, N.J.: Printice Hall.
- Peretomode, V. F. (1992). *Educational administration applied concepts and theoretical perspectives for students and practitioners Lagos: Joja Educational Research & Publishers Ltd.*
- Peters, R. S. (1976). *The role of the head*. London:Routledge&kegan Paul.
- Piper, L. D. (1974). Decision-making: Decision made by individuals verses those made by group consensus or group participation.*Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 10, 16-25.
- Prestine, N. (1993). Extending the essential schools metaphor: Principals as enabler.*Journal of School Leadership*, (4) 356-379.
- Price, M. & Raid, K. (1987). Personal variables affecting the perspectives of head teachers and teachers towards teacher participation in school decision-making, *School Organization*, 7(1), 34-45.
- Rebore, R.W. (2007).*Human resources administrarion in education: A management approach*, (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

- Rice, P. & Schneider, R. (1994) Eric information analysis products (IAPs) Eric clearing digest on *Educational Managements*. University of Oregon: Eugene.
- Richardson, E. (1979). *The teacher, the school and the task of management*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Richman, B. M. & Farmer, R. N. (1975). *Managements and organization*. New York: Random House.
- Rockter, P.V. (1987). *Relation between teacher's collaboration and teacher's principal influence and participation in school decision making*. Ph D. Dissertation. Michigan University.
- Rose, G. L., Menasco M. B. & Curry D.J. (1982). When disagreement facilitates performance in judgments tasks: Effects of different environments and human information processing characteristics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 29(3), 23-36..
- Rue, W. L. & Byers L. L. (1986). *Supervision, key link to productivity*. Boston: Irwin Inc.
- Schlechty, P. (1990). *School for the 21st century*. San Francisco: Jossey Boss.
- Serjiovanni, J. J. (1991). *The Principal: A reflective practice (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Allyn of Bacon.
- Siddle, J. (1978). *The head of school and the task of management*. Harts: The association of school education.
- Shanahan, M. T. (1987). *A study of the perception of Oklahoma school principals regarding the use of participative management*. Educational degree thesis. Oklahoma State: university of Oklahoma.
- Shaw, M. E. (1978). *Groups dynamics (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Smith, G. A. (1987). *JM.B. Experiences of moderation of internal assessments occasional paper38*. Manchester English Joint Matriculation Board, Manchester.
- Smylie, M. A. (1996). Teacher participation in school decision-making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 14, 53-67.
- Spaulding, A. M. (1994). *The politics of the principal: Influencing teachers' school based decision-making*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.
- Styles, J. & Germinario, V. (1985). The relationship between teachers decisional status and loyalty. *Journal of Education Administration*, 23(1), 31-45.
- Tamburo, P. P. (1987). *Elementary school teacher's perceptions of participation in 12 building level situations*. Syracuse: Syracuse University
- Taylor, D. & Tashakkor, A. (1997). Toward an understanding of teachers desire for participation in decision making. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 609 – 628.
- Terry, D. S. & Appelbaum, R. P. (1988). Employing teachers: Do principals have the power. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70(4), 23-32.
- Thierbach, G. L. (1980). *Teacher involvement in decision making: Analysis at the middle and junior high school level*. Fairborn, Ohio: National Middle School Association.

- Van de Van, A. & Delbeca, A. C. (1974). Effectiveness of nominal Delphi and interacting group decision-making process, *Academy of Managements*, 17(5), 44-56.
- Weiss, C. N. (1993). Shared decision-making about what: A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation, *Teachers College Record*, 95(1), 69-92.
- Wilson, R. E. (1966). *Educational administration*. Columbus Ohio: Charles E. Merills Book Inc.
- Wiredu-Kusi, M. (1990). *Teacher's participation in school- based decision making in some selected secondary school in cape coast municipality*. A degree thesis. Cape Coast: University of Cape Coast Printing Press.
- Wood. N. S. (1986). What is wrong with public administration in Ghana. *Journal of Management Studies*, 3(3), 14 – 21.
- Young, B. L. (1988). Teachers' job satisfaction: A study of the overall job satisfaction and work facet satisfaction of k-8 teachers, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49(7), 34-35.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire for Heads of Institutions and Teachers

Teacher Participation in Decision Making Process in Senior High and Technical Schools in the Kwaebibirem District in the Eastern Region of Ghana

Information provided is purely for academic work. The researcher wishes to assure you that your response will be treated confidentially. Please do not write your name. Kindly provide responses to all the statements contained in this set of questionnaire.

Please give a tick [√] in the box that appropriately applies to you.

STATUS OF RESPONDENT: Head of Institution[] Teacher []

From the options, tick [√] only one that describes the situation in your school.

A. Structure or opportunity or mode of decision making in your school	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Staff meetings are frequently held in school.				
2. Many school matters are brought to staff meeting.				
3. Head of institution often has the final word				
4. Teachers' suggestions				

are well taken by the head of institution.				
5. Our school always adopts consensus in decision making.				
B. Perception of teacher participation in school decision making process.				
Teacher participation in decision making in my school :				
6. Enhances the quality of decision.				
7. Delays prompt action.				
8. Develops the professional competence of the teacher.				
9. Makes teacher's work too much loaded.				
10. Ensures collective responsibility of decision.				
11. Reduces head of institution's authority				
12. Promotes				

commitments to decision.				
13. Enhances sabotage by teachers.				
C. Category of teachers often involved in decision making in your school.				
14. Head of institution and assistants only are involved in decision making.				
15. Only senior teachers are involved.				
16. Only favoured teachers are engaged.				
17. Any teacher willing to participate in the process				
D. Extent/level of teacher participation in decision making in your school.				
I) Technical or Instructional Decision				
18. Teachers are free to select appropriate				

textbooks.				
19. Teachers are free to solve learning problems.				
20. Teachers are free to choose their own teaching methods.				
21. Teachers are included in the discussion of instructional policies.				
II) Operational Decision				
22. Teachers are allowed to make classroom disciplinary policies.				
23. Teachers participate in planning new structural facilities for the school.				
24. Teachers participate in planning new projects or programmes for the school.				
III) Executive decisions				
25. Teachers are involved in planning and budgeting				
26. Teachers are involved				

in determining specific departmental assignments.				
27. Teachers are involved in resolving departmental grievances of staff.				
E. Teacher participation in decision making and job satisfaction				
Active involvement of teachers in the decision making process generate:				
28. A high level autonomy in the job.				
29. High sense of well-being.				
30. Feeling of inclusiveness.				
31. Job recognition outside school.				
32. Social recognition outside school.				
33. Desire for long stay in the school.				

34. Desire for increased and sustained academic output for the school.				
---	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX B



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

Tel. No. : 042-33824
Fax No. : 042-30588
E-mail : ucciepa@yahoo.co.uk

University Post Office
Cape Coast
Ghana

Our Ref: EP/144.8/V.2/123

November 6, 2009

.....
.....
.....
.....

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

The bearer of this letter, **Samuel Tetteh Drah** is a graduate student of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration of the University of Cape Coast. He requires some information from your outfit for the purpose of writing a Dissertation as a requirement of M. Ed degree programme.

We should be grateful if you would kindly allow him to collect the information from your outfit. Kindly give the necessary assistance that he requires to collect the information.

While anticipating your co-operation, we thank you for any help that you may be able to give.

Mr. Y.M. Anhwere
Asst. Registrar
For Director