

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING IN TEACHER
TRAINING COLLEGES IN THE UPPER WEST REGION

BY

NAAH ERIC MUSTAPHA

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 the award of Master of Education Degree in Educational Administration

JANUARY 2010

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation was the result of my original work and that no part of it had been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature..... Date.....

Name: Naah Eric Mustapha

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.

Supervisors Signature..... Date:.....

Name: Dr. Y. A. Ankomah

ABSTRACT

Teacher participation in decision-making at the teacher training colleges promotes a good atmosphere for administrative work and also enhances teaching and learning. However, most teachers were not involved in decision-making at the teacher training colleges. The purpose of this study was to find out whether teachers were involved in decision-making process. The research design used was descriptive survey. The study sampled the opinions of tutors and principals regarding decision-making in teacher training colleges in the upper west region. Questionnaire was used to collect data from 30 professional teachers. Six of them were purposively selected and the remaining 24 teachers were selected through balloting. Descriptive statistics was employed to analyse data collected. Preference was given to teachers who have spent a period of at least two years in their respective colleges. The questionnaire was to sample views of teachers on the extent of teacher participation in decision-making, the structures put in place with regard to teacher participation, the perception of principals on teachers' involvement and teachers demographic characteristics associated with their involvement in decision -making.

The study revealed that, teachers' were willing to participate in school decision- making but principals were not certain as to whether teachers should participate or not. However, teachers participated fully in decisions that were related to curriculum development and instruction. It is recommended that teachers must be allowed to make full use of structures put in place for decision-making at the teacher training colleges' level. These structures referred to various committees set by principals to ensure maximum participation of all teachers in decision –making.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very much grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Yaw A. Ankomah for his effective supervision, important suggestions and expert guidance that has brought this work to a conclusion. Also I am much indebted to all lecturers of institute of educational planning and administration (IEPA) for the able manner they handled me during the programme, not forgetting the tutors of Nasrat Jahan(N.J) Ahmaddiyya teacher training college for their support and encouragement.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my mother Clotilda Mary Naah, my wife and children for their moral support during my stay in the University of Cape Coast.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Significance of the Study	9
Delimitation	9
Limitation of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	10
Organization of the Study	10
TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
Theoretical Framework	13
Concepts Related to Participatory Decision-Making	14
Arguments for Teacher Participation	18
Conceptualisation of Teacher Participation in Decision Making	21
Effects of Teacher Participation in Decision-making	30

The Role of Principals in Participative Decision-making	34
Principals' Perception of Participative Decision-making	38
Summary	41
THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
Research Design	42
Population	44
Sample and Sampling Techniques	44
Research Instruments	45
Pilot Testing of Instruments	46
Data Collection	48
Data Analysis Plan	48
FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
Biographic Data	49
Analysis of Main Data	54
Research Question 1: To what extent are teachers involved in decision making in the school?	54
Research Question 2: What structures are put in place with regards to teachers' participation in decision-making in teacher training colleges?	57
Research Question 3: What is the perception of principals on teacher involvement in decision making?	59
Research Question 4: To what extent are teachers willing to be involved in the decision making process?	61
	Page
Research Question 5: What is the perception of the	

teachers regarding decision making?	63
FIVE: SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Summary of Research Problem and methodology	67
Summary of Findings	68
Conclusions	70
Recommendations	71
Suggestions for Further Studies.	72
REFERENCES	73
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: Introduction Letter	80
APPENDIX B: Questionnaire for Teachers	81
APPENDIX C: Questionnaire for Principals	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Gender of Teachers and Principals	50
2	Age distribution of Teachers and Principals	50
3	Schools of Teachers and Principals	51
4	Time Spent in the school by Teachers and Principals	52
5	Roles played in the Colleges by Teachers	53
6	Status in the Colleges (Principals)	54
7	The extent of Teacher Involvement in the Decision-Making process (Views of Teachers and Principals)	55
8	Availability of Structures for Teachers to Participate in Decision-Making	57
9	Principals Perception on Teacher involvement in the Decision-Making Process	59
10	Teachers' Willingness to be Involved in the Decision-Making Process	62
11	Teachers' Perception regarding Decision-making in their Schools	64

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

School administration is concerned with pupils, teachers, rules, regulations and policies that govern the school system. The school is a community that has a goal. Musaaazi (1985) states that, in school administration, the head of the school and members of staff must of necessity see themselves as a team working for the growth and development of the child. The school administration must therefore be structured in such a way that both teaching and non-teaching staff function as a team. This unity in action serves as a good example for students to emulate in carrying out common tasks.

The structure of a decision-making process follows a broad pattern. Simon (1960) cited by(Pepra-Mensah, 1999) stated that, the individual as a normal human being in one way or the other involves himself in decision-making. He went further to support this by saying that people are intendently and adaptively rational, having goals and seeking to achieve these goals but with imperfect information processing capacities. He stressed that making optimal decisions consists of choosing the alternative whose consequences have greater utility.

In any given situation, the decision taken is the result of efforts by one person or group. According to Atta, Agyenim-Boateng and Baafi-Frimpong

(2000) whatever decision that is taken by an individual depends on the circumstances. They went further to say that an individual's decision may be desirable in emergency issues, and situations where the group have little knowledge or background in the subject area and also where the decisions are fairly easy to reach.

Information on participatory decision-making in the educational sector is limited. Much of the information is related to industries. Group decision-making has become popular in such organizations because it gives members the chance to voice their opinion concerning matters that affect their work. Again it helps to promote esprit de 'corps, boost moral and helps increase productivity. Since industrial decisions are made for people to follow, it is better for them to take part in making the decisions. This can be emulated in the educational sector where decisions are made for subordinates to follow and obey; they must take part in the decision-making process. Cultural values and the community's interpretation of the implications of these values have much to do with the determination of goals and objectives to be achieved by the schools; the teacher has a stake in this important decision-making process.

Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1977) state that, the teachers of the school, because of their insight into the educational alternatives open, and the implications of each alternative or society, should take positions of leadership in helping the citizens determine the kind of educational programme they actively support. He went further to say that; it is a mistake for the administrator to assume that he can obtain an effective understanding of the process of the school by doing

it alone. Teachers with widely varying background are interested in helping to shape schools' policies and programmes, which affect them. How decisions are made seems to be just as important as a determiner of group action as what decisions are made. He emphasized that people involved in determining goals and the way goals are set are crucial factors in bringing about their achievement. For effective administration, there must be flow of information. According to the New African (July, 2007) good communication ensures corporate homeostasis and helps move things up. It went on to say that, good communication gives off fraternity, unity and mutualism. The effect of all this is internal cohesion, which helps, injects workers with motivation for progress. Good communication enhances organizational growth and stability. Hence institutional heads must let information flow from the head or principal to teachers to students and back from students to teaches to the principal or head.

Musaazi (1985) viewed effective administration to consist of an element that requires intelligent decision-making. He stressed that, decisions are intelligent when, they are appropriate for accomplishing specific goals. Hanson (1996) stated that people, who are affected by decisions, must be made to take part in the making of such decisions. Musaazi (1985) supported this by saying that, a principal is likely to be effective in his or her job if he or she controls, leads or guides the staff in discussions on matters affecting the school that are intended to arrive at certain decisions, rather than making-decisions without allowing staff to participate in the decision-making process.

According to Gorton (1980) decision-making is the central element of an organizational administration. It is therefore important that, in the school situation teachers are made to participate in decision-making. It should foster friendly informal discussions and this makes them committed to the decisions they helped to formulate. Hanson (1996) supported this idea by emphasizing that, subordinates who are affected by decisions must take part to ensure its easier implementation and functioning. This is to say that, in the industries, the chief executive does not make decisions, but he supervises and monitors the decision-making process so that it will function at the optimal level (Pepra–Mensah, 1999). It is important to translate what is pertaining in the industries into the institutions. Heads or principals of institutions should not view the institution as a family property but a society that is built on the pillars of democracy. For that matter individuals or groups views must be considered and respected.

Mankoe (2002) states that, administrators must share knowledge and information with others in order to gain their cooperation and also share decision-making process so that ,employees can do some things the way they would like to earn together and share the credit for achievement. Administration sometimes feels insecure of participating subordinates in decision making process. They believe that sharing their authority over certain decisions may diminish their power. Also administrators may think that subordinates lack the requisite competency or training to enable them participate effectively, this may create fears in some administrators that the people will not perform and the work will not be done. Mankoe (2002) emphasized this by saying that, some administrators

may adopt what is known as pseudo-participation. What this means is that, the head or principal may invite his teachers to consult with them on decisions he intend to take. When it comes to implementation of the decision, he will never veer from his initial point of view. This is false participation that can filtrate subordinates.

Mankoe (2002) gave out the following benefits of staff participation in decision making-process.

1. Goals are clearly defined, members of staff understand the goals and are committed to their implementation because they have participated in their formulation
2. There is greater commitment to and coordination of decisions. When staff members understand the objective of an organization, they tend to be more committed to implementing those decisions.
3. Since the goals of the organization are collectively determined it increases the organization's ability to respond to a changing environment with relative ease.

It is beneficial therefore for everyone in an organization to share in decision-making, but this does not mean that it is always appropriate for every employee to participate in the making of every single decision that affects the organization. Owens (1987) cited by Mankoe (2002) identified three rules for identifying decisions in which it is appropriate for teachers to participate;

1. The test of relevance: That is when teacher personal stakes in the decision is high, their interest in participating should also be high

2. The test of expertise: When a teacher's participation in a decision is to be significant, he must have the competency to contribute effectively.
3. The test of jurisdiction: The school has a hierarchical structure, that is, the headmaster or principal, vice principals/Assistant headmaster, subject masters among others. The staff have jurisdiction on some matters by law or regulation. They may have jurisdiction over student discipline, for instance suspending or expelling a student, but they cannot decide to suspend or dismiss a colleague from the profession.

Decision-making is therefore central to administration and management. A leader may put the best set of plans to arrive at an excellent decision. Communicating decisions to workers or employers are what starts and keep the whole decision in motion.

Statement of the Problem

It is a fact that teachers' participation in decision-making process at the teacher training colleges' level is not being encouraged. Undoubtedly some of the indisciplinary behaviours experienced in schools are due to heads or principals not involving their subordinates in the decision-making process. In situations like that, some teachers could incite students to resort to violence so that their voices could be heard. Blasé and Blasé (2000) stated that more inquiry is needed to learn more about how principals' attitudes and skills are formed, especially in order enhance the development and training of up and coming school leaders.

In the educational sector, the involvement of teachers in formulating decisions involving such issues as school budget and expenditure, in-service

training and staff meetings, co-curriculum activities and policies which affect them is often neglected. Mankoe (2002) supported the teacher involvement in decision-making and noted that principals or administrators may feel that it is their responsibility to make the decisions and that teachers do not need to participate in the decision-making process and partly because, teachers or subordinates may take-low quality decisions. Finally for fears that subordinates may expect to participate in all future decisions, they have all along not been involved in matters of administration.

According to Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), majority of teachers in secondary and teacher training colleges would like to be greatly involved in decision – making, but very often, they are not. The lack of involvement has often led teachers not to participate in the implementation of the decisions. Questions that may be posed are: are teachers willing to be part of the decision-making process? And to what extent do teachers expect to be involved in the decision-making process? Answer to these questions calls for an indepth investigation. Somech (2002) emphasised that, more research is there fore needed to learn how principals are actually implementing shared decision-making.

Purpose of the Study

Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) stated that, most riots or hullabaloo that is experienced in our training colleges and other institutions are as a result of the non-participation of our teachers and students in decision-making that affects them. The main purpose of the study was to: find out the perceptions of teachers

regarding their involvement in decision-making process in the teacher training colleges (TTC) in upper west. Specifically it sought to find out:

- a. the perceptions of principals in decision-making and the structures put in place in teacher training colleges in the upper- west region.
- b. whether teachers are involved in the decision-making process
- c. whether principals are willing to get teachers involved in the decision making process in the teacher training colleges which affects the teachers.
- d. whether there are structures put in place which are associated with teachers involvement or non-involvement in the decision-making process.

Research Questions

This study was to address these questions;

1. What is the extent of teacher participation in decision-making?
2. What are the structures put in place with regard to teacher participation in decision-making in teacher training colleges?
3. What is the perception of principals on teachers' involvement in decision making?
4. To what extent are teachers willing to be involved in the decision making process?
5. What is the perception of the teachers regarding decision-making?

Significance of the Study

This study should help institutional heads to understand and welcome the idea of teacher involvement in decision-making. Heads of institutions will appreciate the importance of teacher participating in decision-making. Principals of training colleges will also determine the level of participation of teachers in their colleges and there by promote a conducive atmosphere for administrative work and also enhance teaching and learning

Delimitation

The study will cover teacher training colleges in the upper west region of Ghana, and there are two teacher training colleges namely: Nasrat Jahan Ahmadiyya teacher training college in the Wa municipality and Tumu training college in the sisala district. Nasrat Jahan teacher training college is a science institution that offers science, mathematics and technical skills with education programmes. Tumu training college on the other hand offers social studies and educational courses. Tumu training college has a teacher population of 26 and a total student's population of 403 and Nasrat Jahan (N.J) training college has teacher population of 35 and a total student population of 614 as at 2007/2008 academic year.

Limitations

The distance from one training college to the other posed a problem. N.J. training college in the regional capital and Tumu training college in the sisala district. However, questionnaire was delivered by hand to respondents. Secondly, retrieving questionnaire after the respondents have responded to them was a

problem but with persistent visit by the researcher, he was able to collect all questionnaires from the respondents.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions of terms were adopted

1. Decision – making: The act of determining in one’s opinion, or a situation where a Perceived problem is explicitly defined, to come out with Alternative solution which are weighed and a choice made and implemented (Gorton 1980).
2. Participation/involvement: A process of taking part or sharing in an activity
3. Consensus: coming to a collective agreement by a group or individuals
4. Principal: The head of teacher training college
5. College: A place where students go to receive professional training

Organization of the Study

Chapter one addresses the introduction of the study and consists of the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions of the study, and significance of the study. Chapter two deals with review of related literature and Chapter three describes the methodology of the study and covers the following areas: Research design, population of the study, sample and sampling technique, instruments used, pilot testing of instruments, data collection, and data analysis plan. Chapter four contains the result of the data analysis and discussion of the results and chapter five contains an overview of the

research problem, methodology, and summary of the results, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter looks at a review of relevant related literature. The chapter describes the findings from a comprehensive review of literature conducted to explore the theoretical frame work, and present practice of participatory decision-making in schools. This review emphasized the role of the principal in participative decision-making, and considers principals' perception and attitudes in addition to their current practice.

In gathering information for this literature review, specific sources were located in the internet, Educational Abstracts, and Education full text. Theses and dissertations, journals and magazines, and books from leading education publishers were used. Participative decision-making is a broad term. This review therefore begins with a summary of definitions of concepts related to participatory decision – making and how each of the related concept differs from participatory decision-making. The review then traces the 20th century roots of employee participation in business management and how it eventually became popular for application in educational contest.

Theoretical Framework

A framework for understanding teacher participation in decision-making, Somech (2002) drew from work of many previous theories that had also grappled with how to define the construct. Participative management and decision-making have been in existence since early in the twentieth century, when business and management theorists began to experiment with giving workers some control over their working environments.

Teacher participation in school decision-making has its roots in organization and management literature. Though the rationale has changed, somewhat, the notion of workers participating in the management of their organizations has existed since the early twentieth century. In 1938, Chester Barnard suggested that workers could be induced to cooperate with management if offered incentive to do so. One such incentive was the opportunity of enlarged participation Barnard (1938). Barnard and his contemporaries believed that, by allowing workers to think they had more control and authority in the workplace, they could eventually improve productivity and efficiency. The idea of worker participation gained some credence, but it remained a component of the centralized, top-down structure of scientific management by Taylor (1911) which was the dominant paradigm of the day.

According to Lawler (1986), theorists began to criticize the traditional organizational structure, arguing that it had negative effect on worker morale, motivation, and productivity in the 1950's. One well known study by Coch and French (1948) of employees in a manufactory company set up experimental

groups of employees who were then involved in varying levels of participation in designing job changes. The study found significant evidence that participation in considering changes to their jobs led to higher productivity, lower turnover, less aggression towards management, and foster learning of new job procedures.

Finally to acknowledge the potential benefits to the organization of participation, during the 1950s worker participation also was increasingly viewed through human relations Bolman and Deal (1997) as a way to actually help employees reach their full potential and feel fulfilled by their work. In 1957 McGregor work about the essential task of management as the arrangement of organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts towards organizational objectives.

Concepts Related to Participatory Decision - Making

In the development of this section, focus has been primarily on scholarly work that uses the term participative decision-making to describe the development of teachers in school management. However, participative decision-making is conceived as just one aspect of shared leadership, and the idea of involving teachers in school-level decision-making is known by many names. Because of the similarities among various conceptions of teacher participation, this review includes as appropriate, related work in the areas of teacher leadership, teacher empowerment and shared governance. Brief definitions of the related concepts are offered here.

There are different processes involved in making-decisions. There are have the group decision support systems which have different decision rules, among them are the following;

Unanimity: is commonly used by juries in criminal trials in the united state. It requires every one to agree on a given course of action, and thus imposes a high bar for action.

Majority: requires support from more than 50% of members of the group. The bar of action is lower than that of unanimity and a group of “losers” is implicit to this rule.

Range Voting: allows a group to select one option from a set by letting each member score one or more of available options. The option with the highest average is chosen.

Consensus Decision – Making: tries to avoid “winners” and “losers” consensus requires that a majority approve a given course of action, but that the minority agree to go along with the course of action. In other words if the minority opposes the course of action, consensus requires that the course of action be modified to remove objectionable features.

Gathering: involves all participants acknowledging each others needs and opinions and tends towards a problem solving approach in which as many needs and opinions as possible can be satisfied. It allows for multiple out comes and does not require agreement from some for others to act

Sub-Committee: involves assigning responsibility for evaluation of a decision to a sub-set of a larger group, which then comes back to the larger group with

recommendations for action, using a sub-committee is more common in larger governance groups, such as a legislature. Sometimes a sub-committee includes those individuals most affected by a decision, although at other times it is useful for the larger group to have a sub-committee that involves more neutral participants.

Plurality: where the largest block in a group decides, even if it falls short of a majority.

Dictatorship: where one individual determines the course of action.

Participatory: where each actor would have a say in decisions directly proportionate to the degree that particular decisions affects him or her. Those not affected by a decision would have no say and those exclusively affected by a decision would have full say. Likewise, those most affected would have the most say while those least affected would have the least say. SOURCE; Plous, (1993).

Teacher Empowerment: that is a concept that is related to teacher participation in decision-making. While participative decision-making is a system or structure, teacher empowerment represents an internal perception by teachers of having increased authority in their positions. Rice and Schneider (1994). According to Rinehart and Short (1998), primarily, empowerment has been defined as a process where by school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems.

Teacher Leadership: Duke (1994) and Silva (2000) describe it as full participation by teachers in developing a shared vision, planning and implementing in situational improvements, working with the community and

participating in professional development in job-embedded, collegial way and participating in decision-making.

Shared Governance: a term used by Blasé and Blasé (1999, 2000) in their work with schools in the league of professional schools, a net work of schools associated with the University of Georgia. Shared governance refers to principals sharing their governing roles with teachers. It is very similar to participative decision making, in which teachers participates in various ways and to varying extents, in making decisions in schools that were traditionally made by the principals. However shared governance encompasses other governance or leadership roles that are distinct from decision-making, including peer supervision or evaluation, action research and school data analysis and leadership in such areas as staff development and personnel hiring. A related term is participative management, which refers to the management strategy of principals that leads to teacher participation.

The other areas on literature review will be concentrated on the following areas;

1. Arguments for teacher participation
2. Conceptualization of Teacher participation in decision-making
3. Effects of Teacher participation
4. The role of the principal in participative decision-making
5. Principal's perception of participative decision-making.

Arguments for Teacher Participation

The arguments for teacher participation in organizational or school based decision-making are grouped under four theoretical orientations. These are Democratic, Socialist, Human growth and Development and Productivity and Efficiency. The democratic argument for participation has been termed ethical approach by some scholars such as Keith (1996) and Somech (2002), Dachler and Wilpert (1978) stated that, the opportunity offered to the individual to participate in the governance of an organization is morally imperative because individuals have the right to exercise some control over their work and their lives. In the school system, this argument suggests that teacher participation is necessary to professionalize and democratize teaching. Barth (2001) stated that, a democratic school environment is believed to encourage children to participate in and sustain our countries of government. Blasé and Blasé (2000) suggested the linking of participation with democracy and pluralistic values is often cited, the emphasis on participation for professionalisation or equity reasons has been found to be less prevalent among school principals than other emphasis.

Duke cited in (Dachler & Wilpert 1978) stated that another emphasis for worker participation in decision-making is the socialist theory, which is based on the belief that, in order to prevent the treatment of labour as a commodity, workers must participate in ultimately control the production process. A detailed exploration by Greenberg (1975) to trace the roots of worker participation in to the struggles of worker participation movement in the mid 20th century in Europe and south America and to the writing of the Italian revolutionary theorist Antonio

Gramsci. According to Greenberg, Gramsci envisioned worker participation as natural proletarian institutions in which the seeds of a revolutionary life could flower. He said to that, an active, educated and self conscious working class could form a base on which the revolutionary party could be build. Marx (1867) supported the socialist theory and harshly criticized the capitalist economic system.

The third argument for participation is the human growth and development and productive and efficiency theory; Dachler and Wilpert (1978) assigned greater importance to the intrinsic motivational properties of work by allowing greater employee influence autonomy, and stated that, the involvement of employees as a means of enhancing their lives by providing the opportunity for growth and learning within the work place. The assumption of the human growth and development theory of participation is that, work must provide intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and must satisfy psychological needs of workers such as affiliation, power and self-esteem.

Keith (1996) was somewhat critical about the human growth and development rational. She suggested that, the human growth out comes are actually another way to achieve higher productivity and efficiency and are not sought for their own sake. Keith (1996) argued that administrative discourse seems less of importance with reducing administrative controls than achieving them in different ways. Keith's allegations could not get support from other researchers .

The final argument on work participation is the productivity and efficiency of an organization. Greenberg (1975) referred to this school of thought as “The management school”. Somech (2002) calls it a “programmatically” rationale. Conley (1991) stated that, in the educational system where this rationale is widespread, teacher participation is believed to improve the quality of educational decision and therefore to improve instruction. Somech (2002) summarized this theory as follows; “Flatter management and decentralized authority structures carry the potential for achieving outcomes unattainable by the traditional top-down bureaucratic structure of schools”.

Blasé and Blasé (2000) conducted a study on 45 principals affiliated with the league of professional schools in the University of Georgia. He found out that, in the process of working towards shared governance most of the principals cited the improvement of teaching and learning as the primary purpose for employing participatory decision-making structure. Mohrman, Lawler and Mohrman (1992) assented that, in the language of business and organizational literature, worker participation yields higher quality products and services, less absenteeism, less turnover, better decision-making, better problem solving and less management overhead. In short what they meant was that, it brings about greater organizational effectiveness. Imber and Neidt (1990) supported the argument by saying that, increasing teacher satisfaction is the best way to improve students outcomes. Despite the various arguments cited for teacher participation in decision-making there is still a lack of clarity about what teacher participation is and how it is specifically conceptualized.

Conceptualization of Teacher Participation in Decision - Making

Somech (2002) explains that her framework of five dimensions of teacher participation in decision-making was based on the extensive conceptual and theoretical work of numerous previous researchers. A long line of well-known scholars has attempted to conceptualize participative decision-making in order to guide research. Though there is no consensus on the set of dimensions related to teacher participation in decision-making, there is agreement that participative decision-making is multidimensional (Black & Gregersen, 1997). The substantive work to describe teacher participation is summarized here. This section is arranged chronologically to provide an overview of progress in the development of theories of participative decision-making. Alutto and Belasco (1973) developed a continuum of decisional participation which considered the extent to which teachers participated in decisions in their schools. They proposed three levels of participation; Decisional deprivation, Decisional equilibrium and decisional saturation. Their intent was to discover the extent to which the teachers in each category of participation differed demographically from those in other categories. Alutto and Belasco further investigated whether different levels of participation yielded differences in organizational commitment, perceptions of administrative influence, authoritarianism, role conflict, interpersonal trust and attitudes of militancy among teachers.

Alutto and Belasco (1973) found that there were differences in the demographic characteristics of teachers at each of the three levels of participation. Teachers at the elementary levels experienced decisional saturation, while

teachers at the secondary level of decision-making experienced decisional deprivation. Also, male teachers reported decisional deprivation more often than female teachers.

Another development in the conceptualization of teacher participation in decision-making was done by Conway (1976). He examined the relationship between decision-making involvement and job satisfaction. Conway's research marked the beginning of the use of the degree of involvement, rather than the measure or non-involvement.

Another aspect of the conceptualization of participation in decision-making is control in the organization. The control graph was designed by Tannenbaum and Kahn in the 1950's to conceptualize and measure two dimensions of control in an organization; the distribution of control among levels of the organization and the aggregate control present across all levels (Sorensen and Baum, 1977). In their review of the studies that has utilize the graph, Sorensen and Baum concluded that the graph was useful for the measurement of changes in control resulting from the introduction of new management techniques, including increased worker participation.

Further developments in the conceptualization participations decision-making was when Dachler and Wilpert (1978), theorists in the area of organizational management advanced one of the first comprehensive, multi-dimensional conceptual models of participation in an organization. Their model was intended to apply to all organizations including schools and their work has influenced subsequent efforts to conceptualize the specific concept of teacher

participation in school decision-making. Dachler and Wilpert (1978) reviewed intensive literature and they concluded that, a greater emphasis on holistic research approaches may help generate research questions more appropriate to the dynamic systems character of these phenomena.

Mohrman, Cooke and Mohrman (1978) built on some of these earlier works and developed a study of teacher participation that was more sophisticated and multi-dimensional than the work of their predecessors. They looked at the degree of involvement of teachers in the technical and managerial domains of school management. The technical domain includes issues concerning classroom instruction, curriculum and students, the managerial domain includes such administrative issues as budget, staffing, and planning.

The Mohrman, Cooke and Mohrman study found that teachers reported higher job satisfaction and less role ambiguity to higher levels of involvement in the technical domain. Participation in the managerial domain had no significant relationship with job satisfaction, role ambiguity or overload. This was the first time that researchers have used a multidimensional approach to study participative decision-making, which Mohrman et al (1978) argued, and provided a more precise operationalisation of organizational constructs, and increased the accuracy of organization measurement and diagnosis.

Conway (1976) contributed another multi-dimensional conceptualization of participative decision-making in his major review of research on participative decision-making in educational settings. In addition to the distinction between internal and external participative decision-making. Conway used the work of

Dachler and Wilpert (1978) and Locke and Schweiger (1979) summing up the variables associated with participative decision-making as format of participation, degree of participation, content of participation and scope of participation. Format according to Conway (1976) included whether participative decision-making was mandatory or voluntary, formal or informal and direct or indirect.

The work of Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall, and Jennings (1988), significantly expanded the conceptualization of participative decision-making. Cotton et al, (1988) researched in to management and organizational behaviours, reviewed 91 articles on participative decision-making and defined five properties of decision-making. (i) Formal - informal (ii) Direct-indirect (iii) Level of access or influence (iv) Content and (v) Short versus long-term. By reviewing research on participatory decision-making, they attempted to determine whether differential forms of participative decision-making has significantly different out-comes especially examine performance and job satisfaction. Cotton et al (1988) revealed that, most notably, informal participation programmes and employee ownership programmes (informal, indirect participative decision-making) had consistently positive relationships with both performance and satisfaction.

Short-term participation programmes (formal, direct, focused on work) appeared to have no effect on either type of outcome. The study revealed other discrepancies in the effects of varying types of participative decision-making as well. Cotton et al came out with a summary that, the results of the review supported the idea that participation is a multi-dimensional or multi form concept.

Cotton et al (1988) study, not only contributed to the process of conceptualizing participative decision-making, but it also supported the argument that weak evidence of the effects of participative decision-making may be due to a lack of a uniformly accepted, multi-dimensional construct.

Participative decision-making has also been conceptualized in terms of the type of involvement teachers are expected to have. Conley (1989) illuminated the distinction between authority and influence in the decision-making process. Authority is defined by Conley (1989) as a zero sum entity that stems from the legal right to make decisions governing others. Influence, the other type of involvement deals with the capacity to shape decisions through informal means. Influence according to Conley, is derived from personal characteristics, expertise and opportunity. Authority is derived from structural position. The distinction is important in understanding and implementing participative decision-making, because the lack of attention to which decision warrant teachers having authority often leads to conflict and dissatisfaction with the participative decision-making system.

A 1992 article by Mohrman, Lawler and Mohrman looked at how employee involvement models could be effectively applied in schools, posited three approaches that organizations could take to employee involvement; parallel suggestion involvement, job involvement, and high involvement. Their work elaborated on the degree of participative, creating a more complex framework of that dimension. In parallel-suggestion involvement, employee participates' in decision-making outside of their usual job structure. One example of parallel

suggestion involvement is site-base management (S.B.M.). Such activities usually take place during non-school hours and can include tasks and decisions that do not pertain to direct teachers' instructional duties. Secondly, in job involvement, participation is part of the job, such as in work groups or teams. Participation by workers is focused on the individual job level. Finally, high involvement implies significant participation by all members of the organization at all levels and necessitates a major structural change in the organization. Mohrman et al (1992) concluded that, the high involvement model was mostly appropriate for schools because of the condition in schools of high interdependence among workers, high complexity of the work, and high uncertainty and ambiguity in the methods by which results can be achieved.

Since the 1980s, many researchers have studied and attempted to conceptualize participative decision-making (P.D.M.), and many different names for its various dimensions have been used. The most frequent studied dimensions appeared to be focused on the content of the decision and on the degree of participation. Rice and Schneider (1994) suggested that content and frequency of participation are the most important dimensions to consider. Marks and Louis (1997) in their study of the instructional out comes of teacher empowerment, also used the content dimension of teachers participation, which they divided into four areas; (i) School operations and management, (ii) Students' school experiences; (iii) teachers' work life and (iv) Classroom instruction. Other researchers have suggested similar lists of content areas in which teachers may or may not

participate for instance Black and Gregersen (1997), Conley (1989) and Conway (1976).

Black and Gregersen (1997) scholars in leadership and management, attempted to integrate all the dimensions identified in PDM literature in to a comprehensive framework. This resulted in the following six categories of dimensions; (i) Rationale of participation (ii) Structure (formal or informal), (iii) Form (direct or indirect), (iv) Decision issues (describe above as “stages”) (v) Degree of involvement and (vi) Decision-making process (refers to different “stages” of a decision). Black and Gregersen (1997) conducted a study of a mid-size manufacturing company that has implemented an employee involvement group focused on the relationship between process and degree of involvement relative to satisfaction and performance. They looked at each of the five stages of decision-making and the degree of involvement in each, and they found that there was some correlation between participation in all five stages and self-reputed job satisfaction and performance. In general, the relationships were stronger between satisfaction and participation than between performance and participation. Most importantly, Black and Gregersen’s were among the first studies attempted to hypothesize the differential impacts of two important dimensions and to examine these effects empirically.

In an attempt to continue work on a conceptualization of PDM, Koopman & Wierdsma as cited by Somech (2002) built on their work and other scholars such as Black and Gregersen (1997), Cotton et al (1988) in their study of five dimensions of teacher participation in decision making. Somech’s five

dimensions were decision domain, degree of participation, structure, rationale and participation target and her research was an attempt to elucidate the concept of participative management and to explore relationships among the five dimensions. To that end, she created a survey based on the five chosen dimensions of PDM.. She derived specific items in each dimension from interviews and focus groups with principals.

Somech found that more principals utilized consultative decision-making than the more inclusive democratic decision-making, and that formal structures were more common for determining who participates and in which decisions they do so than for determining a process for decision-making itself. In three dimensions, Somech extracted factors from the lists of survey items in order to illuminate different levels of principal's practice or behaviour within each of the five dimensions. She then reported principals' most common responses in each dimension. In the dimension, decision domain items fell in to two categories, the technical and the managerial domains, which along with earlier classifications of the different areas of principals work. Somech survey reveals that teachers were more involved in technical aspects than managerial. In the rationale for PDM, principals cited three types for involving teachers (i) Decision-oriented (ii) Teacher oriented (iii) Principal oriented. Principals most often reported teacher-oriented rationale for PDM. Finally, in the dimension "participated target" a factor analysis revealed that principals determined which teachers to involve based on either task-related or relation-related teachers motivation and interpersonal skills.

A final contribution of Somech's work was her findings with regard to the variables school enrolment and principal seniority. In her analysis, Somech found that more senior principals were inclined towards consultative decision-making, but they did not commonly go as far as democratic decision-making. Schools enrolment also appeared to be related to the degree of decision-making. Larger schools principals reported less democratic decision-making, while smaller schools principals reported more information sharing style-decision-making.

Much of the work reviewed in the conceptualization of teacher participation in decision-making has attempted to conceptualize PDM and has been carried out in order to advance understanding of the effects of PDM. A reason sometimes cited for the lack of conclusive evidence about whether teacher participation has any effect on the operation of schools according to Bachorach, Bamberger, Conley and Bauer (1990) is that, there is not yet a generally accepted construct or conceptual, section of teacher participation and how it works. In 1978, Mohrman et al (1978) argued that research on PDM had been dominated of out comes and had neglected to focus on how best to differentiate the dimensions of the construct. Greenberg (1975) in a similar review of theoretical literature argued that much of our confusion arises from the fact that neither advocates of non-scholars of workplace participation have been very precise about the nature of their proposals or consistent in their use of concepts or terminology. Next, the available literature on how teacher participation in school decision-making affects teacher students and schools is reviewed.

Effects of Teacher Participation in Decision-making

Research in the area of organizational management seems to support the existence of positive effects of participation on both workers and organizational effectiveness, when involving employees in decisions affecting their work. A classic study by Coch and French (1948) found a dramatic improvement in absenteeism, turnover, and efficiency. In the consideration of the effect of participative decision-making, it is important to call attention to the potential difficulty in generalizing the findings of research in the private sector to public schools. Sorensen and Baums (1977) review of literature on participation of workers in decision-making revealed that, higher educational institutions did not fit the patterns they saw among other organizations. Conway (1976) explored the relationship between educational and private sector organizations. Conway used Cacke and Schweoger's (1979) findings from an extensive review of research on the effects of PDM. Conway separated the results of studies of factory workers from the results of studies of professionals. An examination of the effects of participative decision-making on professional workers revealed that participation appeared to have less effect on productivity and satisfaction for them it did for the workers in the factory setting. Conway argued that the discrepancy is a signal for being cautious about making direct inferences from machine bureaucracies to professional bureaucracies such as schools.

Brown (1993) explained that workers in the private sector can be rewarded with increased job security as a result of participation in decision making. Teachers on the other hand, work in a system that is driven largely by political

trends and a changing economic environment. Therefore “A school’s costs and revenues are not affected by performance in the short or long run, so security commitments do not increase the teachers’ stake in the school”. Brown concluded that employee involvement programmes could be effective for improving well-functioning public schools, but that they are not sufficient for overturning poorly performing schools.

Brown has indicated a reason for caution in the application of industrial models and research of PDM to the realm of public education. While the present review draws from both sources to explore the background and practices of teacher participation, it is important to be cognizant of the potential differences between participation programmes in businesses and in schools.

Though the positive effects of teacher participation (teacher leadership, shared decision-making, shared governance and teacher empowerment) are frequently cited as a rationale for employing this strategy for school improvement, there is limited empirical evidence of its actual benefits. Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) cited cases of studies on teacher participation and leadership, and have been criticized because they made use of small sample sizes with interview and observational data. Mark and Louis (1997) supported this by indicating that, research on participation has generally centred on non – instruction individual and organizational outcomes. Very few studies have attempted to relate teacher participation in school decision-making to student performance. It concluded that, while it is generally acknowledged that participation in decision- making is positively related to teacher attitudes about work, research examining the

instructional outcomes of participative decision-making yields generally equivocal conclusions.

Smylie, Lazarus and Brownlee- Conyer (1996) in a study of the instruction outcomes of teacher leadership, hypothesized that the connection between teacher participation in leadership and improvement in student achievement is not a simple cause and effects of teacher leadership are actually mediated by the intervening variables of control, motivation and learning. To test their theory, Smylie and his colleagues studied students and teachers over five years, using survey, observation and student standardized achievement test data. Control, motivation and learning were operationalisation and measured as teacher' perceived autonomy, accountability and organizational learning opportunities. The study found substantial support for the analytical model and it was concluded that teacher participation in school-based decision-making is related positively to instructional improvement and to student academic outcomes.

Mark and Louis (1997) used methodologies and similar to those used by Smylie et al (1996) to study PDM of teachers. They collected Teachers survey ratings of pedagogical quality, and student achievement data from 24 schools. They measured teacher empowerment using teacher-reported information about involvement in school management, influence over their own work lives and their sense of control over classroom management.

These researchers looked for a relationship between teacher empowerment and school and student outcomes but they found none. They concluded that, empowering teachers may be a useful strategy to improve student achievement

and teacher performance is not as straight forward as some early proponents of empowerment believed. Over all, empowerment is an important but insufficient condition to obtain real changes in teachers' ways of working and instructional practice.

From the above review, it can be deduced that there is there are some benefits derived from teacher participation in the school-level decision-making. Rice and Schneider (1994) in a replication of an earlier study on the relationship between teachers' level of involvement and their job satisfaction found that teachers were more likely to be satisfied in their work when they reported high levels of involvement. Principals who shared decision-making authority with teacher have been found to have more loyalty from teachers.

Other scholars have also investigated and identified certain challenges inherit in participative decision-making. In a study conducted by Weiss, Combone and Wyeth (1992) and high schools, found conflict among, between and within teachers involved in shared decision-making. Conflict emerged about who would participate and who could not. Weiss et al (1992) also unveiled confusion among teachers about the locus of final decision-making authority. Placing a more negative interpretation on such struggles with PDM, Marks and Louis (1997) cited several studies that suggested that shared decision-making can deplete teachers' energy and detract from instruction. Some of these are the measurement of teacher empowerment using teacher- reported information about involvement school management.

Still other Researchers have also found that teacher participation in decision-making does not have significant positive or negative effects on school outcomes. Taylor and Bogotch (1994) conducted a study on 33 schools to ascertain the effects of teacher participation on teacher job satisfaction and teacher attendance, and on student achievement behaviour and attendance. The study revealed that teachers' participation did not lead to significant difference in outcomes for teachers or students.

Finally teacher participation in decision-making positively affects teachers' professional practice as stated by Marks and Louis (1997) they moved to find a definite evidence of relationship between participation and quality of instruction or student learning. However, teacher participation remains a central part of many schools improvement efforts. It has been around for many years and is likely to remain both a component of continuing investigation.

The Role of Principals in Participative Decision - making

This section will consider the specific roles of the principal in developing and sustaining participative approaches to decision-making with the school.

Wohlestetter and Smyer cited by (Mohrman et al 1992) stated that a successful principal helps the school to develop a vision set goals and establish high expectation. Lawler (1992) supported this by stating that, organizational management theorists agreed that the behaviour of managers is a critical determinant of the effectiveness of any organization. Mohrman et al (1992) revealed that, the manager is pivotal in a business; the principal is also pivotal in the successful operation of participative decision-making systems in schools.

Bridges (1967) emphasized the importance of principals and the unique opportunity they have to facilitate participation. Bridges provided a detailed description of how principals can lead actual decision-making meetings and concluded with the suggestion that principals would do their best to encourage involvement by withholding evaluation and criticizing of proposals and by avoiding a show of surprise when unusual ideas come from the group. Other scholars have underscored the need for principals to be supportive facilitators of teacher participation. According to Somech (2002) administrators must be willing to let go of traditional authority roles, not only allowing teachers to have a greater voice but helping to prepare them and establish trust in them. The literature on teacher leadership, a component of which is teacher participation in shared decision-making, suggests that principals must develop and facilitate strong relationships with their teachers. The relationship between teacher leadership and principals is consistently identified as a strong influence on teacher performance

Where teacher leadership is seen flourishing principals have actively supported it or at least encouraged it. Principals are viewed as people with great power, and the one who must set the tone for the relationship between principals and teachers to exist.

Rinehart, Short, Short and Eckley (1998) supported the hypothesis that, the relationship between principals and their teachers is vertical factor in determining teachers' perceptions of their empowerment. Which turn to enhance their participation in decision-making process? Rinehart et al (1998) based their work on social influence theory, which suggests that social attractiveness.

Reference power and credibility (a combination of trust worthiness and expertness) are the determinants of the influence principals have over teachers who perceived higher involvement to grow professionally and greater self-efficacy. Looking deeper in to the relationship between principals and teachers smylie and Hart (2000) used the concepts of human and social capital in framing school leadership. Human capital includes the knowledge skills and attributes within individuals. Social capital refers to the resources that exist within the collective relationship among individuals. In addressing the role of principals in developing teacher leaders, they have also focused on the importance of interpersonal relationships. Smylie and Hart argued that, studies have shown that principals play a vital role in the development and maintenance of social capital among teachers. Their contribution comes through creating structures and occasions for interaction to take place. Beyond this managerial function, principals play an active role in fostering productive social relations within the structures they may help create.

Scholars who have not specifically identified interpersonal skills as central to effective principal leadership still have advocated behaviour that enhances relationships. Melenyzer cited by (Blasé and Blasé, 2000) provided leadership characteristics that promote teacher empowerment. A study conducted by Blasé and Blasé (2000) to sought principals views about what their roles were in implementing shared governance. Responses of the principals were categorized as building trust encouraging teacher expression, setting clear limits among others.

A study conducted by Alutto and Belasco (1973) in participation decision making of about 400 teachers in two districts found significant patterns related to the level of participation and the demographic characteristics of teachers. They concluded that educational administrative strategies must recognize the existence of different patterns of decisional participation among the teaching population and bring into action participative management programmes designed specifically to respond to these varying decisional needs. Keith (1996) argued that it is the job of school administrators to ensure participation by all stakeholders, especially those who have been marginalize in the past.

According to Foster (1986) leadership as a search for increase participation that involves continuous reflection and attempts to develop the potential of others. Keith (1996) further revealed that the role of principals is to strive to become conscious of their own propensity to dominate through paternalism, and work for change by exposing themselves to the alternative social construction.

Much discussion of the role of the principal in shared decision-making emphasized the rapport principals have with teachers in their associations with one another. However, work in the field of organizational management, in which the concept of work participation originated, underscores other sorts of necessary leadership behaviour. In his guide for developing high-involvement organization, Lawler (1992) argued that managers must deliver information knowledge, power and rewards to employees. Information about the company and work of the field should be shared with workers, as suggested by Blasé and Blasé (2000).

According to Lawler (2000) power can be shared, by allowing workers the opportunity to participate; in making decisions that affect their work. The choice of decision-making model on a continuum from a top to down system to a totally democratic system is critical. Finally, managers must provide rewards in addition to financial rewards, appreciation of accomplishments and other social rewards.

In conclusion, though there is no consensus on exactly how successful principals manage their schools, Hollinger and Heck (1996). It is clear from the literature that strong interpersonal relationship is essential. Principals must build these relationships with teachers and nourish them with continued information support and skills. In addition, principals must be able to determine the most appropriate structures and systems for participation to balance the needs; and deters of the teachers with these situations.

Principals Perceptions of Participative Decision-Making

The role and influence of principals in share decision-making has been well documented. Blasé and Blasé (2000) pointed out the need for research addressing the personal and professional socialization factors linked to the development of principals' perceptions on shared governance. According to Somech (2002), literature on PDM has focused primarily on the study of teachers, their views and experiences with PDM. Somech contended that studies have neglected the voice of principals; hence more research is needed to examine principals' attitudes towards and perceptions of participative management.

A study conducted in Texas on PDM revealed that principal's expensed attitudes about PDM were not always consistent with their actual behaviour and

leadership styles, Gates and Siskin (2001). The study compared a measure of leadership styles of principals with survey data collected about decision –making procedures in their schools. Majority of the principals strongly supported shared decision-making. Gates and Siskin (2001) speculated that their study had been subjected to a response effect, in which principals answered affirmatively about teacher involvement in an effort to respond correctly though their reported leadership practices would not offer much support for shared decision making.

Blasé and Blasé (1999) conducted a study on principals of schools involved with the league of professional schools, in which schools worked to develop shared governance practices. The schools all demonstrated support for participative decision-making. Though the principals believed in the benefits of increasing teacher participation, they reported feeling challenge by the shift in perceived power structure. Many of them wondered if they were really needed. Some principals struggle with when to maintain authority and when to give it up. In the same study some principals reported numerous rewards ranged from higher motivation, increased self-confidence, and awareness of values and involvement in the learning and growth of others. Theorists from psychology and education have considered the more complex effects of work role transitions on principals moving toward sharing decision-making with teachers.

Nicholson (1984) predicted two factors, the amount of control an individual perceives and the extent to which the new role differs from the old, determines the success of a worker’s adjustment to a new work role. In another study by Bredeson (1993) of principals in restructured schools, supported

Nicholson's theory. Bredeson (1993) studied 20 principals whose schools had undergone restructuring initiatives that involved implementing participative decision-making structures. He posited that the successful role transition of the principals was also related to their level of experience, trust by the staff, personal leadership style and the degree of support they received from district administration.

According to Blasé and Blasé (2000) another aspect of principals' perceptions of PDM is the consideration of how their opinions and attitudes on the concept are influenced and formed. In their study in (1999) they investigated the socialization factors that had contributed to the principal present attitudes. They found out that many of the principals had acquired both their opinions and their relevant skills prior to becoming principals. Blasé and Blasé stated that data collected indicates that principal learned the importance of trust, respect, tolerance, patience and openness in dealing with others; they also developed a strong belief in teacher autonomy and collaboration. They concluded that principals learn these things through the involvement in shared governance initiatives in a position other than principal. More inquiry is needed to learn more about how principals' attitudes and skills are formed, especially in order to enhance the development and training of up and coming school leaders. As mentioned above, there have been few large-scale studies of shared decision-making and very few studies that have explored the perceptions and actual practices of principals, Somech (2002). More research is therefore needed to learn how principals are actually implementing share decision-making

Summary

In conclusion, this chapter has reviewed some of the existing of literature on teacher participation in school decision-making process from business management to educational settings. It has also explored on -going attempts to conceptualize participation decision-making. It has explored the role of principals in instigating and sustaining teacher participation, and the effects the new model can have on the school head. Although there has been some inquiry into teacher participation in school decision-making, many questions still remain unanswered. First there is still no definite model to guide further investigations of the effects of teacher participation and second, there is no clear sense of what principals actually do in practice. Finally the extent to which participative decision-making is actually taking place at business and educational institutions.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methods and procedures used in collecting data for the study. It involves the description of the research design, the targeted population, sample and sampling techniques, instruments used, data collection procedure and data analysis plan.

Research Design

A descriptive survey was used. The study was to sample opinions of tutors and principals regarding decision-making in our Colleges. Descriptive survey specifies the nature of a given situation. It tries to describe the situation as it currently exists (Gay, 1992). It involves collection of data to test hypotheses or answer research questions with regards to the current status of the subject matter under study.

A descriptive survey was taken in order to describe the situation as it currently exists. The reason why descriptive survey was used was to describe and document aspects of a situation as it naturally occurs. Best and Khan (1995) stated that descriptive research is concerned with the condition or relationship that exist, that is the nature of prevailing conditions, processes that are going on or the trend that are developed.

Finally descriptive survey deals with interpreting the relationship among variables and describing their relationships. Descriptive survey seeks to find answers to questions through the analysis of relationships between or among variables.

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) also note that descriptive surveys provide information on the current status of the phenomena, and determine the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study. These authors further point out that descriptive survey has the advantages of procuring good amount of responses from a wide range of people, and giving a clear meaning of events and seeking to explain peoples' perception and behaviours on the basis of data gathered at the point in time among other things. A descriptive survey simply describes and provides an understanding of a phenomena usually with simple descriptive statistics and is particularly valuable when an area of study is fairly new (Macmillan, 1996)

The choice of descriptive survey design has a number of advantages. The data collected enabled the researcher to discuss the views of the respondents as it is related to the topic under survey. Again, this approach enabled the researcher to make some diagnosis of the problem as they were and to make some prognosis with the view of coming out with possible suggestions and recommendations for the challenges associated decision making in our colleges.

Population

The target population for the study includes all principals and teachers of the two training colleges in the upper west region of Ghana. These colleges are Tumu teacher training college in Tumu, the Sisala district in the upper west region and Nasrat Jahan Ahmadiyya teacher training college in the Wa municipality of the regional capital. Both (TTCs) are mixed institutions that men and women are admitted to pursue programmes in the colleges. One is a mission school operated by the Ahmadiyya Muslim Movement. The two teacher training colleges have a teacher population of 60 out of which 11 are females and 49 males as at 2007/2008 academic year. Tumu teacher training college has 26 are teachers made up of 3 females and 23 males and Nasrat Jahan Ahmadiyya teacher training College has 34 teachers out of which 8 are females and 26 males.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

Thirty teachers were involved in the study, comprising 15 teachers from either college. Out of this number, 6 are principals. That is one principal and two vice principals and a teacher population of 24. The number 30 represents 50 per cent of the total population. Even though Royse (1991) stated that the general rule for selecting a sample for a survey should be ten percent or more of the population, the researcher choose to use a larger percentage because Nesbary (2000) opines that the larger the sample size, the greater the probability that the sample will reflect characteristics of the general population. The composition of the sample was not based on percentages for males and females because random sampling (where everyone had equal chance of being chosen) was used.

Balloting was employed for teachers to ensure that there was no researcher bias in selecting the respondents. According to Patton (1990) the quality of the sample affects the quality of the research generalizations. Patton further explains that obtaining an unbiased sample is the main criterion when evaluating the adequacy of a sample. Patton identifies an unbiased sample as one in which every member of the population has equal opportunity of being selected in the sample. In the balloting, a list of all the teachers was obtained from the principals. The names were written on pieces of paper, folded and put in a container.

It was then mixed and one paper was removed at a time without looking into the container. A name selected was recorded. The process continued until the required number of respondents was recorded.

Purposive sampling was employed for 2 principals and 4 vice principals of the colleges. These categories of respondents were in key positions and would give relevant information and so it was appropriate to seek their views and opinions. Sarantakos (1998) explains that this type of sampling allows the researcher to choose subjects who in his or her opinion are relevant to the research.

Research Instruments

Questionnaires were used to collect data for the study. The questionnaire was put in two categories, one for principals and the other one for tutors. Questionnaire items were in three sections in each for both principals and tutors. Section A consisted of four items that sought to gather information concerning respondents' background. Section B had 5 items seeking to gather data on the

extent of teachers' involvement in decision-making. Section C was made up of 6 items that sought to find out respondents' views regarding structures put in place for teacher involvement in decision-making. Section D was to find out which areas of the school administration teachers were involved.

Section A of the questionnaire for the tutors had 39 items constructed to determine the extent to which they were willing to participate in some administrative areas. Section B sought to find out perceptions of teachers regarding decision-making. The last part (section C) of the questionnaire was to obtain the views of teachers on whether they were involved in decision-making in the school.

Borg, Gall, and Gall (1993) agreed that survey research typically employs the questionnaires to ascertain the opinion, attitude, preferences and perception of persons of interest to the study. Since the researcher was interested in assessing perceptions and preferences of respondents, it was appropriate to use questionnaire to determine opinions and attitude consistent with the comments of Borg et al stated above.

Pilot Testing of Instrument

The pilot testing of the instrument was conducted at the Tamale Training College in the Northern Region of Ghana. The purpose of pilot testing was to discover possible weakness, inadequacies, ambiguities and problems in the instrument. The college used for pilot testing of the instrument and the sample were considered appropriate because they have the same characteristics with study schools and sample. Ten (10) respondents were involved in the pilot study

and a (39) item questionnaire was personally administered and retrieved by the researcher.

To determine the validity of the items, the questionnaire was given to experts in the area of teacher development. Their assertion of its appropriateness guided me in the review of the items. Best and Khan (1993) contends that content validity is normally assessed by experts who judge its adequacy.

Creswell (1994) states that researchers have no single stance or consensus on addressing traditional topics such as validity and reliability. As a result, another strategy the researcher used to ensure validity of the instrument was the performance of pilot test.

According to Wilson and MacLean (1994) piloting is able to help in establishing the reliability, validity and practicability of the questionnaire because it helps to check the clarity of the questions, give feedback on validity of test items and also makes sure that the data required will answer the research questions.

The researcher as part of the pilot-testing, asked the respondents to comment and recommend suggestions to improve the instrument. Some very useful and valuable suggestions emerged from the pre-testing. These views were collated and studied closely and helped the researcher to remove ambiguous statement, particularly in the likert scale items, some statements were completely deleted either because of similarity or non relevance. For instance, asking Principal and tutors their exact ages instead of giving a range.

Data Collection

Robson (2002) cautioned that some respondents do not treat questionnaires seriously. To ensure that this does not happen, the questionnaire was administered and retrieved personally by the researcher. A period of one week was allowed for respondents to answer the questionnaire in each college, the third week was used to mop up the remaining questionnaires that were not returned within the given time. Thirty copies of the questionnaire were administered and all were retrieved. The return rate was thus one hundred percent. Data collection was done within three weeks; this was between 19th march 2008 to 10th April 008 for administering and collection of questionnaires

Data Analysis Plan

Based on the questions raised, a multiple methodology approach was adopted in the analysis of data collected. Descriptive statistics was employed to answer research questions. Responses to questionnaire was categorised according to how they related to the research questions. Five options were available for respondents under each item. For easy analysis, strongly agree and agree were combined for the statement and strongly-disagree and disagree were also combined for responses against the statement. Best and Kahn (1995) advised that “if a likert scale is used, it may be possible to report percentage responses by combining the two outside categories” (p.24).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis and discussion of the results have been presented in this chapter. Each item on the questionnaire which answered the research questions was selected and the results presented in a table. The frequencies and percentages were determined using SPSS. Each table was presented with a brief analysis and a discussion of the results. The research was on teacher participation in decision making in Teacher Training Colleges in the Upper West region of Ghana. Two separate questionnaires were devised for the principals and teachers of the selected Teacher Training Colleges.

Biographic Data

The sexes of tutors and principals who took part in the study are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Gender of Respondents

Gender	Teachers		Principals	
	Number	%	Number	%
Male	22	91.7	5	83.3
Female	2	8.3	1	16.7
Total	24	100.0	6	100.0

Source: Field work, 2008

Table 1 indicates that the 22 (91.7%) of the total respondents were males teachers while two (8.3%) were females. Of the principals, five (83.3%) were male while one (16.7%) was female are shown in Table 1.

The age distribution of tutors and principals who took part in the study is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Age Distribution of the Respondents

Age (years)	Teachers		Principals	
	Number	%	Number	%
20 – 25	1	4.2	0	0
26 – 30	7	29.2	0	0
Over 36	16	66.7	6	100
Total	24	100.0	6	100.0

Source: Field work, 2008

The age distribution of the respondents with over 36 years recorded the highest frequency of 16, representing (66.7%). While those between 20 and 25

years formed the minority of one, representing (4.2%). All the principals were above 36 years of age as indicated in Table 2. The number of tutors and principals from the two colleges is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Schools of Respondents

Schools	Teachers		Principals	
	Number	%	Number	%
Nasrat JahanTTC	12	50.0	3	50.0
Tumu TTC	12	50.0	3	50.0
Total	24	100.0	6	100.0

Source: Field work, 2008

Table 3 indicates that the school to school ratio of the respondents is 1:1 since both formed 50% each of the respondents. Three (50%) of the principals were from Tumu teacher training college and three (50%) were from Jahan teacher training college are shown in Table 3. Time spent by tutors and principals in various colleges is presented by Table 4.

Table 4

Time Spent in the School by Respondents

Duration (years)	Teachers		Principals	
	Number	%	Number	%
1 – 5	5	20.8	1	16.7
6 – 10	15	62.5	2	33.3
11-15	3	12.5	1	16.7
Above 16	1	4.2	2	33.3
Total	24	100.0	6	100.0

Source: Field work, 2008

When the respondents were asked the duration of their stay in their respective teacher training colleges, 15 (62.5%) of the respondents indicated between 6 and 10 years while 1(4.2%) had spent over 16 years. When principals were asked the duration that they have spent in their respective teacher training colleges. Two representing (33.3%) of the respondents indicated above 16 years while one representing (16.7%) chose between 1 and 5 years. This is shown in Table 4. The role played by tutors in their respective colleges is presented by Table 5.

Table 5

Roles Played in the Colleges by Teachers

Role	Number	(%)
Classroom Teacher	11	45.8
House master	7	29.2
Head of department	4	16.7
Senior house master	2	8.3
Total	24	100

Source: Field work, 2008

Eleven (45.8%) of the total respondents in the colleges played the role as classroom Teachers while two (8.3%) were senior house masters or mistresses as depicted in Table 5. 7 (29.2%) of the respondents were House masters and 4(16.7) were Heads of departments. Five (83.3%) of the respondents were males while one (16.7%) were females as shown in Table 6.

All the respondents were above 36 years of age as indicated in Table 7. Three (50%) of the respondents were principals from Tumu teacher training college and three (50%) were from Jahan teacher training college as shown in Table 8.

When the respondents were asked on the duration that they have spent in their respective teacher training colleges, two (33.3%) of the respondents indicated above 16 years while one (16.7%) chose between one and five years. 6. This is shown in Table 9.

The status of the principals in their respective colleges is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Roles in the Colleges (Principals)

Role	Number	(%)
Principal	2	33.3
Vice Principal (administration)	2	33.3
Vice Principal (academic)	2	33.3
Total	6	100

Source: Field work, 2008

Two (33.3%) of the total respondents in the colleges were Principals, Two (33.3%) were vice principals (administration) and Vice principals (academic) formed two (33.3%) as indicated in Table 10.

Analysis of Main Data

The data collected in relation to the research questions are presented in table below. The discussions to each data follow each table.

Research Question 1: To what extent are teachers involved in decision-making in the training college?

This question sought to find out from respondents whether teachers were allowed to get involved in the decision making process in the school, and whether teachers think they are allowed to involve themselves in the decision making process in the school. The various areas are identified in the discussion that follows the table. The views of tutors and principals on the extent of teacher involvement in decision-making is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

The Extent of Teacher Involvement in the Decision-Making Process

Responses	Teachers		Principals	
	Number	%	Number	%
Strongly Agree	5	21.0	1	16.7
Agree	10	41.6	2	33.3
Disagree	7	29.1	2	33.3
Strongly Disagree	2	8.3	1	16.7
Total	24	100.0	6	100.0

Source: Field work, 2008

The analysis of the data regarding the extent of teacher involvement in decision-making at the TTCs level revealed that the institutional heads were uncertain whether the teachers were involved or not. From the analysis on Table 7, two respondents representing (33.3%) agreed that teachers are involved in decision-making while two respondents (33.3%) disagreed that teachers are not involved in the decision-making process. One (16.7%) strongly agreed while one (16.7%) strongly disagreed. However teachers were willing to be involved in Decision-making process. Alutto and Belasco (1973) developed a continuum of decisional participation to which they considered the extent to which teacher participated in decision making in schools. They proposed three levels of participation; Decisional deprivation, Decisional equilibrium and decisional saturation.

The main areas of teachers participation in decision- making were: teaching and learning; maintaining discipline; allowances; preparing school budget; procurement; planning and execution of projects; planning of school curriculum; raising funds etc. Results from the study showed that principals studied were divided as to whether teachers are allowed to participate in the decision making process in the schools. However, out of the 24 teachers studied, about (63%) agreed to the fact that they were involved in the decision-making process in the school. Two issues can be seen from this data: either the heads do not allow for teacher participation or some teachers are not willing to participate in the decision-making process. But a critical examination of the data, one can see that some principals were reluctant to delegate.

It was found out that, there was a difference in each of the levels of participation. Conway (1976) examined the relationship between decision-making involvement and job satisfaction. Conway emphasised on the degree of involvement that will determine job satisfaction. What is happening in the TTCs is that many of the teachers have the anxiety to take part in the running of the schools but the principals are not certain as to whether teachers should be given the chance. Mohrman et al (1978) looked at the degree of involvement of teachers in technical and managerial domains of the school management. The technical domain includes issues concerning classroom instructions, curriculum and students while the managerial domain includes administrative issues as budget, staffing and planning. From their findings, teachers reported higher level of involvement in technical domain then managerial domain.

Research Question 2: What structures are put in place with regard to Teachers' participation in decision-making in teacher training colleges?

The researcher wanted to find out if respondents agree to the fact that structures have been put in place to allow teachers have say in the decision-making in the school. The respondents who were the principals were to agree or disagree with specific structures mentioned in the discussion below the table.

Table 8 presents responses by principals with regard to availability of structures in the college for teachers to participate in decision-making.

Table 8

Availability of Structures for Teachers to Participate in Decision-Making

Responses	Number	%
Strongly Agree	1	16.7
Agree	2	33.3
Disagree	2	33.3
Strongly Disagree	1	16.7
Total	6	100

Source: Field work, 2008

Following the trend observed in Table 7 above, 3 (50%) principals agreed to the fact that structures have been put in place to make teachers able to participate in the decision making process in the schools. The other half did not agree to this fact. This tells that in most instances structures are not available but even if available; the teachers are not allowed the room to be able to operate.

These structures include the creation of positions on the various committees for teachers to be able to air their views.

Also the study into structures put in place by principals for teacher participation in decision-making revealed that, the principals agreed that structures have been put in place for teachers and the other half disagreed. Research has revealed that in areas of organisational management, there is a positive effect on both workers and organisational effectiveness involving employees in decisions affecting their work. Coch and French (1948) found out that there is always dramatic improvement in absenteeism, turn over and efficiency. Duchler and Wilpert (1978) stated that, the involvement of employees is a means of enhancing their lives by providing the opportunity for growth and learning within the work place. The assumption of the human growth and development theory of participation is not; work must provide intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and must satisfy psychological needs of workers such as affiliation, power and self-esteem. But the findings from this data analysis revealed that structures were not available, even if available, teachers were not allowed the room to be able to operate. Blasé and Blasé (2000) conducted a study on principals in the process of working towards shared governance and found that most of the principals cited the improvement of teaching and learning as the primary purpose for employing participation decision-making structures. Morhman et al (1992) stated that in the language of business and organisational literature, worker participation yields higher quality products and services, less absenteeism, less turnovers, better decision-making, better problem solving and

less management overhead. In short what they mean is that, it brings about greater organisational effectiveness. Imber and Neidt (1990) supported the idea by saying that, increasing teacher satisfaction is the best way to improve students' outcome.

Research Question 3: What is the perception of principals on teacher Involvement in decision- making?

This was to find out how principals viewed teacher involvement in decision-making. Questions here aimed at finding out from the principals if they agreed that teachers should be allowed to be involved in decision making or not.

Table 9 presents principals perception on teacher involvement in decision-making in the colleges.

Table 9

Principals' Perception on Teacher Involvement in the Decision-Making Process

Responses	Number	%
Strongly Agree	2	33.3
Agree	3	50
Disagree	1	16.7
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
Total	6	100

Source: Field work, 2008

Results from the study indicated that, most principals agreed that teachers should be allowed to participate in the decision-making process. This is shown by two strongly agreed and three agreed giving a total of five (5) of the respondents agreeing. Two (33.3%) strongly agreed while 3 (50%) agreed to the fact. Only 1(16.7%) disagreed. This means that most of the principals would like teachers to be involved in decision-making process. However, the 16.7% disagreement of the results indicates that some principals would always want to decide for the teachers.

On principals' perception on teacher involvement in decision-making, these were the outcomes: As to whether teachers should participate in decision-making, the principals agreed that they should participate; only one principal disagreed. Gates and Siskin (2001) conducted a study, about principals' perception of decision-making in their schools. Majority of the principals supported shared decision-making. Gates and Sisker concluded that, their study has been subjected to response effect, in which principals answered affirmatively about teacher involvement, but their reported leadership practices would not offer much support for shared decision-making. According to Blasé and Blasé (1999) though principals believed in the benefits of increasing teacher participation, they reported feeling challenge by the shift in perceived power structure. Some principals wondered whether it was necessary to involve teachers, and others struggled with when to maintain power and when to give it out.

Another aspect of principals' perception of decision-making is the consideration of how their opinions and attitudes on the concept are influenced

and formed. Blasé and Blasé stated that, principals learned the importance of trust, respect, tolerance, patience and openness in dealing with others. They also developed a strong belief in teacher autonomy and collaboration. Principals have different perceptions about participative decision-making. Atta et al (2000) says some heads of institutions feel insecure and fear of diminishing their power when they allow teachers to participate in decision-making. As a result they adopt pseudo- participation by consulting their teachers for ideas in order to take a decision, but in reality, such ideas do not sometimes influence their final decision.

Research Question 4: To what Extent are Teachers willing to be Involved in the Decision Making Process?

This research question sought to find out if teachers are willing to be part of the decision making process. A number of questions were asked and the responses of teachers are represented in table 9 and discussion follows.

Table 10 presents tutors willingness to be involved in decision-making at the college level

Table 10

Teachers' Willingness to be involved in the Decision- Making Process

Responses	Number	%
To a great extent	5	20.8
To some extent	7	29.2
To a little extent	11	45.8
Not at all	1	4.2
Total	24	100

Source: Field work, 2008

Teachers were asked if given the chance, they were willing to participate in the decision making process of the school. 5 (20.8%) of the teachers were willing to a great extent. 7 (29.2%) were to some extent willing to participate. 11 (45.8%) were willing to a little extent. 1 (4.2%) of the teachers was not willing to participate. In general, half of the teachers studied were willing to take part in the decision-making process of the school while the other half were willing to a little extent. This means that most of the time teachers are not ready to bear extra loads aside teaching in the classroom. However, if they don't get involved heads would take decisions which would bind them all together. This may also be the reason for which principals mostly do not agree to allowing teachers to take part in the decision making process.

Furthermore, on the extent of teacher willingness to be involved in decision-making; the findings revealed that most teachers were willing to be part of the

decision-making process. Half of the teachers agreed to some extent and the rest were only willing to a little extent. This means that, most of the time teachers are not ready to bear extra load apart from teaching. And it could be that because of the perception of their heads regarding their participation in decision-making, they have decided to stay away. On the other hand this could also be the reason why principals do not allow them to take part in decision-making.

Brown (1993) explains that workers in the private sector can be rewarded with increased job security as a result of participation in decision-making. Teachers on the other hand, work in a system that is driven largely by political trends and changing economic environment. This goes to explain that, a school costs and revenues are not affected by performance in the short or long run, so security commitments do not increase the teacher state in a school. It can therefore be said that, participation in decision-making is positively related to teacher attitudes about work; research examining the instructional out-comes of participative decision-making yields generally equivocal conclusions.

Mohrman (1992) stated that a successful principal helps the school to develop a vision set goals and establish high expectations. This goes to support the fact by theories of management (Lawler 1992) that, the behaviour of managers is a critical determinant of effectiveness of any organisation.

Research Question 5: What is the perception of the teachers regarding decision making?

The researcher through this question wanted to find out how teachers perceived the process of decision making and whether they agree that structures have been put in place for them to participate.

Table 11 presents the perception of tutors regarding decision-making in their colleges.

Table 11

Teachers' perception regarding decision-making in their schools

Responses	Number	%
Strongly Agree	6	27
Agree	10	43.6
Disagree	6	25
Strongly Disagree	1	4.4
Total	24	100

Source: Field work, 2008

The study showed that, most teachers agree that structures have been put in place to make them participate in the decision making process. These structures included the various committees set by the principals in the school. 16 (70.6%) of the teachers confirmed or agreed to the fact that structures have been put in place while the rest did not agree.

Finally the perception of teachers themselves regarding their participation in decision making revealed that, a great number of them agreed. Here the researcher tried to find out how teachers perceived the decision-making process

and whether structures were put in place for them to participate. Mark and Louis (1997) came out clearly that, empowering teachers may be a useful strategy to improve students' achievement and teacher performance is not as straight forward as some early proponents of empowerment believed. It is clear that empowerment is important, but insufficient condition to obtain real changes in teachers' ways of working and instructional practice. Rice and Schneider (1994) stated that teacher's involvement make them more satisfied in their work. Principals who shared decision-making authority with teachers have been found to have more loyalty from teachers. Also Owens as cited by Mankoe (2002) supported the fact that "participation is a mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation that encourages the individual to contribute to goals and share responsibilities for them"

Furthermore Keith and Girling (1991) cited by (Mankoe, 2002) came out strongly that, "participating management refers to the regular and significant involvement in organisational decisions as well as their individual standard and making sure their organisation is on target in terms of responding to the needs of the clients it serves". This implies that, the extent to which the head involves the teacher in decisions that affect the entire school as well as the teachers' standard, and making sure that the attainment of school objectives is on track in terms of responding to the needs of the pupils they teach, will influence the teachers' effectiveness.

All in all, the results of the research showed that principals were some how unwilling to allow teachers to participate in the decision making process of

the school. And at the same time most teachers were also unwilling to participate. In terms of structures, both teachers and principals agree that provision has been made for teachers to participate in decision making. When questioned further whether they agree to delegating authority to teachers or not, results from the study indicated that most principals do not agree to allow teachers to participate in decision making in the school.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter consists of an overview of the research problem and the methodology of the study. It also presents the summary of results, conclusions and recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

Summary of Research

Teachers' participation in decision-making at the training college level is believed to be a key factor to improving the quality of academic work. According to Conley (1991), teacher participation in decision-making at the teacher training college level is paramount to improving the quality of educational decisions and therefore improving instruction. Asiedu-Akrofi (1978) stated that majority of teachers are willing to be involved in decision-making.

Despite, the various arguments cited for teacher participation in decision, there is still lack of clarity about what teacher participation is. The study therefore is to find out how teachers are involved in decision- making and the state of affairs of teacher participation in the Upper West Region of Ghana.

The number of teachers involved in the study was 30. Balloting was used to sample teachers who have stayed in their present college for at least two years. They were required to provide information on the following research questions: To what extent are teachers involved in decision-making in the school?; What are

the structures put in place with regards to teacher participation in decision-making in teacher training colleges?; What is the perception of principals on teachers involvement in decision making process?; To what extent are teachers willing to be involved in the decision-making process?; What is the perception of the teachers regarding decision making?

Data were collected using a questionnaire administered by the researcher himself. These questionnaires were administered and collected from the respondents personally. In Tumu teacher training college, the Vice-principal administration assisted the researcher in collecting the questionnaires back after the respondents had attended to them, however in Nasrat Jahan TTC where the researcher was a resident tutor, he collected the questionnaire back himself from the respondents. This was done within a period of three weeks. The responses of the individuals were tallied using computer software called Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

The results were presented as frequencies and percentages for comprehensiveness. The item scoring the highest frequency or percentage was considered the majority opinion of the respondents.

Summary of the Findings

The analysis of the field data for the study revealed the following results:

1. It was revealed that 22 (91.7%) of the total respondents were male tutors in the TTCs while 2 (8.3%) represent female tutors

2. On the age distribution, 16 (66.7%) were those above 36 years of age while those within the age range of 20-25 years form the minority group with 1 (4.2%).
3. All the two TTCs gave equal number of respondents and that gave 12 (50%) each.
4. Sixty two point five percents of the respondents spend 6-10 years in their respective schools and that forms the majority. 12.5% of the respondents spend 1-5 years and the same percentage spends 11-15 years. 1 (4.2%) being the minority group spend over 16 years in their schools.
5. With regard to role played in the school, 11 (45%) being the majority of respondents were class teachers, & (29.2%) house masters, 16.7% heads of department and 2 (8.2%) were senior house masters.
6. As to the extent of teacher participation in decision-making, 15 (62%) of the respondents who were teachers agreed to the fact that they were involved in decision-making process in schools. However, the views of principals were divided. 3 (50%) agreed that they allowed teachers to take part in decision- making and 3 (50%) disagreed that they do not allow teachers to take part in decision making process.
7. With regard to structures put in place for teacher participation, here again principals were having different views. 3 (50%) agreed that structures were put in place for teachers to participate in decision making and 3 (50%) disagreed. This is to say that either the structures were there but

they do not allow teachers to be involved or the structures where just not there for teachers to be involved.

8. Eighty three point seven percent of the respondents agreed that teachers should be involved in decision-making while 1 (16.7%) disagreed
9. Forty five point five percent teachers said they will be involved in decision-making to a little extent, 7(29.2 %) said they will be involved to some extent, 5 (20.8%) to a great extent while 1 (4.2%) said not at all. They will not be involved in any thing that concerns decision making.
10. With structures put in place, 16 (70.6%) of teachers agreed that structures have been put in place for them to participate in decision-making while 7 (31.8)% disagreed. This means that either the structures were there but they were not allowed to take part.

Conclusions

From the findings a number of conclusions can be drawn. It can be deduced that principals were some how unwilling to allow teachers to participate in decision making process in the school and at the same time, some teachers were not also willing to be part of decision making process. On the part of structures, both principals and teachers agreed that structures were put in place, but as to whether all the teachers were allowed to make use of these structures is another thing. It was found out that 50% of the principals disagreed and 28.4% of teachers also disagreed that structures where not put in place. This implies that, some of the principals do not allow teachers to be part of the decision making

process. Hence it can conveniently be concluded that, teachers are willing to be involved in decision making but principals are not willing to give them the chance.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings and conclusion drawn, the following recommendations were made:

- a) Principals should delegate or decentralise decision-making in TTCs to allow greater teacher participation.
- b) They should allow teachers to be greatly involve or participate in the structures put in place
- c) The Ghana Education Service (GES) should come out with modalities or well organised formulated guidelines for compositions of committees in TTCs like what is done for school boards of governors, school management committees (SMC) etc. This will give the chance to teachers to serve at least one committee instead of just a few who are in the good books of the principals.
- d) Finally, principals should create a serene environment for teachers to participate in decision-making in pursue of goals of their schools, and also give teachers the opportunity to satisfy their needs in order to bring improvement in their own performance.

Suggestions for Further Studies

The study revealed that, structures put in place for teacher participation in decision-making were not implemented by principals. These structures refers to the various committees set by the principals (refer to appendix B).

Also, some teachers who were to be involved freely in decision-making process also disagreed strongly that they would not take part in the decision-making process. This study, therefore suggest a follow up study to find out why some teachers are not willing to be involved in decision-making and why some principals are not willing to involve teachers in decision-making.

REFERENCES

- Alutto, J. A., & Belasco, J. A. (1973). Patterns of teacher participation in school system decision making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2), 126 – 167.
- Asiedu-Akrofi, A. (1978). *School Organisation in Africa*. Tema: Ghana Publishing Corporation.
- Atta, E.T., Agyenim-Boateng, E.O. & Baafi-Frimpong, S. (2000). *Educational management and administration*. Cape coast: University of Cape Coast.
- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., Conley, S. C., & Bauer, S. (1990). The dimensionality of decision-making. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 9(1), 27 – 41.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). The economy of incentives. In J.K. Shafritz and J.S. Ott (Eds.). *Classic of organisation theory* (5th ed.), pp. 93-102). Texas: Harcourt College.
- Barth, R. S. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 443 – 449.
- Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (1993). *Research in education*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.
- Best, W. & Khan, J. V. (1995). *Research in education* (8th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Black, J. S. & Gregersen, H. B., (1997). Participative decision making. *An integration of multiple dimensions, Human Relations*, 50(7), 859 – 878.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (1999). Shared governance principals: The inner experience. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(606), 81 – 90.

- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2000). Principals' perspectives on shared governance leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(1), 9 – 39.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organisations: Artistry, Choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Borg, W. R., Gall, J. P. & Gall, M. D. (1993). *Applying educational research: A practical guide*, (3rd ed). New York: Longman publishing Group.
- Bredeson, P.V. (1993). Letting go of out lived professional identities: A study of role transition and role strain for principals in restructured schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 34 – 68.
- Bridges, E. M. (1967). A model for shared decision making in school principal ship. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3(1), 49 – 61.
- Brown, C. (1993), Employer involvement in industrial decision-making: Lessons for public schools. In J. Hannaway and M. Carnoy (Eds.). *Decentralization and school improvement: can we fulfil the promise.* (pp. 202 – 231). San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.
- Campbell, F. Bridges, & M., Nystrand, O. (1977). *Introduction to educational administration* (5th ed), Allyn and Bacon INC London.
- Coch, L., & French, J. R. P. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change *Human relations*, 4(1), 512 – 532
- Conley, S. (1991). Review Research on teacher participation in school decision-making. *Review of Research in Education*. 17, 225 – 265.
- Conley, S. C. (1989). Who's on first: School reform, teacher participation, and the decision-making process. *Education and urban Society*, 21(4), 366 – 379.

- Conway, J. A. (1976). Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision-making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 130 – 139.
- Cotton, J. L., Vollarath, D. A., Froggatt, & K. L., Lengnick- Hall, M. L. & Jennings, K. R. (1988). Employee participation: Diverse forms and different out comes. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 8 – 22.
- Cresswel, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage.
- Foster, W., (1986). Paradigms and Promised. *New approaches to educational Administration*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Freankel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (1993). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Gates, G. S. & Siskin, D. (2001). Principal's leadership styles and attitudes towards shared decision making with teachers. *Planning and Changing*, 32(3), 164 – 183.
- Gay, R. (1992). *Staff development and instructional improvement, community District 2*, New York: A paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and American's Future, Graduate School of Education, Harvard.
- Gorton, R. (1980). *School Administration and supervision: Improvement Issues, Concepts, and case studies* (2nd ed.). Iowa: Wm. C. Broun Company publishers.
- Greenberg, E.S. (1975). The consequences of worker participation: A clarification of the theoretical literature. *Social Science Quarterly*, 56, 191 – 209.

- Hanson, E. M. (1996). *Educational administration and organizational behaviour*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Imber, M., & Neidt, W. A. (1990). Teacher participation in school decision-making. In P. Reyes (Ed), *Teachers and their work place: Commitment, performance, and productivity* (pp. 67 – 85). Newbury Park: SAGE Publishers.
- Keith, N. Z. (1996). A critical perspective on teacher participation in urban schools *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 45 – 79.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). *High involvement management*. Sam Francisco: Jossey – Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the high involvement organization*. San Francisco: Jossey –Bass.
- Leithwood, L. K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of Oprincipal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35, 679 – 706.
- Locke, E.A., & Schweiger, D.M. (1979). Participation in decision-making: One more looks. In B. M. Staw (Ed). *Research in organizational behaviour*.1, pp.266. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Mankoe, J. O. (2002). *Educational administration and management in Ghana*. Accra: Ghana.
- Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Do teacher empowerments affect the classroom: The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional

practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and policy Analysis*, 19(3), 245 – 275.

McGregor, D.M. (1957). The human side of enterprise. In J.M. Shafritz and J.S. Ott (Eds), *Classics of organization theory* (5th ed., pp. 179 – 184). Fort Worth, Tx: Harcourt College.

McMillan, J. H. (1996). *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer*. (2nd ed). New York: Harper Collins.

Mohrman, A.M., Cooke, R.A., & Mohrman, S.A. (1978). Participation in decision-making. A multidimensional perspective. *Educational Administration. Quarterly*, 14, 13 – 19.

Mohrman, S.A., Lawler, E.E., & Mohrman, A.M. (1992). Applying employee involvement in Schools. *Educational Evaluation and policy Analysis* 14(4), 347 – 360.

Musaazi, J.C.S. (1985). *The theory and practice of educational administration*. London: Macmillan Publishing Ltd.

Nesbary, D. K. (2000). *Survey research and the worldwide web*. Boston: Ally & Bacon.

New Africa, (July, 2007 ed.). *An ic Publication*. Pan-African Magazine (Story by William F. Kumuyi).

Nicholson, N. (1984). A theory of work role transitions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(2), 172 – 191.

Patton, M. Q., (1990). *Quantitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd Ed.). Newbury.

- Pepra-Mensah, J. (1999). *Student participation in decision- making in selected teacher training colleges in the Eastern Region of Ghana*. Cape Coast: M.PHIL Theses, University of Cape Coast.
- Plous, S., *The Psychology of Judgement and Decision-Making* (McGrwo-Hill, 1993).
- Rice, E. M., & Schneider, G.T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision-making, 1980 -1991, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(1), 43 – 58.
- Rinehart, D. S., Short, P. M., Short, R. J., & Eckley, M. (1998). Teacher empowerment and principal leadership: Understanding the influence process. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 630 – 649.
- Royse, D. (1991). *Research method is social work*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Sarantakos, S. (1998). *Social research*. London: Macmillan
- Silva, D. Y., Gimbert, B, & Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 102(4), 779 – 804.
- Simon, H. A. (1960). *The new Science Management Decision*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Smylie, M. A. & Hart, A. A., (2000). *School Leadership for Teacher Learning and Change: A human and social capital development perspective*. In J. Murphy & S. K. Louis (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Education*

Administration (2nd Ed. Pp. 421-441). San Francisco Jossey – Bass Publications.

Smylie, M. A. Lazarus, V. & Brownlee- Conyers, J. (1996). Instructional outcomes of school – based predicative decision-making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 181 – 198.

Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity of participative management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3), 341 – 371.

Sorensen, P. F., & Baum, B. H. (1977). The measurement of intra-organisational power: The application of the control graph to organization development. *Group and Organization studies*, 2(1), 61 – 74.

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

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*, New York: Harper and Row.

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

Wilson, G. & Maclean, S, (1994). *Questionnaire design: A practical Introduction*. Etton Abbey: University of Alster Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION LETTER

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

The purpose of this research is to study teacher's participation in decision-making at the teacher training college level. Since it is for research purpose it will be much appreciated if you could answer the questions as objectively as you can. You will be contributing immensely to the development of effective teacher participation in the Teacher Training Colleges. Your anonymity is preserved.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please, respond to each of the items in this section by ticking () the response that is appropriate to your situation.

1. Sex: (a) Male () (b) Female ()
2. Age as at last birth
 - (a) 20 – 25 years ()
 - (b) 26 – 30 years ()
 - (c) 31 – 35 years ()
 - (d) Over 36 years ()
3. What is the name of your school?
 - (a) Nasrat Jahan Teacher Training College ()
 - (b) Tumu Teacher Training College ()
4. How many years have you spend in your present school?
 - (a) 1 - 5 years ()
 - (b) 6 - 10 years ()
 - (c) 11 – 15 years ()
 - (d) 16 and above ()

5. Status (role) played in the school
- (a) Senior Housemaster/ Mistress ()
 - (b) Head of Department ()
 - (c) Form master/ Housemaster ()
 - (d) Class room teacher ()

PART 2

Please, respond to all statements in the questionnaire. It is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure the confidentiality of respondent responses. So you are required not to write your name.

Indicate the extent to which you are willing to participate in the following areas by ticking () the appropriate column.

I am willing to participate in decisions parting to:	To a great extent	To some Extent	To a little extent	No at all	Give reasons for not at all
6. Teaching and Learning in the School.					
7. Maintaining Discipline in the school					
8. Preparing of budget and its expending					
9. Allowances due me					
10. Procuring of laboratory, workshop tools and equipment and other materials					
11. Procuring of food items for feeding students					

12. Planning, executing and management of school projects					
13. Procuring of school uniforms					
14. Planning the school curriculum and co-curriculum activities					
15. Raising internally generated funds and its disbursement in the school					

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements as perceptions of teachers regarding decision-making. Tick () the appropriate column.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
16. Sharing of knowledge and experience with teachers by principals				
17. Goals and objectives of the school well defined				
18. Hierarchical organisational structure well laid and followed				
19. Consultation with staff for recommendation on decisions and actions				
20. Appointment and promotions based on merit and qualification.				
21. Achievement in school generously praised by principals				
22. Flow of information from down to subordinates and back to head				
23. Staff meetings democratically conducted				

CURRENT SITUATION

Are you involved in decision- making Concerning the following activities	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
24. School discipline				
25. Purchasing of school items				
26. Generating and disbursing of internal generated fund				
27. Classification of				

Student				
28. Classification of Teachers				
29. Examination				
30. Time table				
31. Development of projects				
32. School welfare				
33. Supervision				
34. Motivation				
35. Admissions				
36. Housing and accommo				
37. Sports				
38. Guidance and counsel				
39. School council				

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

The purpose of this research is to study teacher's participation in decision-making at the Teacher Training College level. Since it is for research purpose it will be much appreciated if you could answer the questions as objectively as you can. You will be contributing immensely to the development of effective teacher participation in the Teacher Training Colleges. Your anonymity is preserved.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please, respond to each of the items in this section by ticking () the response that is appropriate to your situation.

1. Sex: (a) Male () (b) Female ()
2. Age as at last birth
 - (a) 20 – 25 year ()
 - (b) 26 – 30 years ()
 - (c) 31 – 35 years ()
 - (d) Over 36 years ()
3. What is the name of your school?
 - (a) Jahan Teacher Training College ()
 - (b) Tumu Teacher Training College ()
4. How many years have you spend in your present school?
 - (a) 1 - 5 years ()
 - (b) 6 - 10 years ()
 - (c) 11 – 15 years ()
 - (d) 16 and above ()

5. Status (role) played in the school

(a) Principal ()

(b) Vice principal administration ()

(c) Vice principal academic ()

PART 2

Respond to the following statements by ticking the degree to which you agree or disagree. Indicate the extent of teacher involvement in the following statements.

Teachers are involved in:	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
6. Teaching and learning in the school.				
7. Maintaining discipline in the school				
8. Taking decisions on allowances due them				
9. Preparing of school budget and its expending				
10. Procurement of laboratory and work-shop tools, materials and equipment				
11. Procurement of food for feeding student				
12. Planning execution and management of School projects				
13. Procurement of school uniforms				
14. Planning the school curriculum				

15. Raising internal generated funds (IGF) and it expenditure				
16. Contribute and take decisions freely during staff meetings				

Indicate your opinion on the extent to which you agree or disagree to the following structures on the involvement of teachers for decision making at the college level, by ticking the appropriate column.

Structures put in place	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17. Food committee				
18. Disciplinary committee				
19. Admission committee				
20. Entertainment committee				
21. Welfare Committee				
22. Procurement committee				
23. Housing and accommodation				
24 Examinations				
25. Sports				
26. Guidance and counselling				
27. The school council				
28. Suggestion box				
29. Regular staff meetings				
30. Delegation of powers				
31. Channels of communication				

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that teachers are to be involved in the following areas of the college by ticking the appropriate column.

Teachers be involved in:	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Give a reason
32. School budgeting and its expenditure					
33. Food procurement					
34. Admission of new students					
35. Appointments and promotions					
36. Conducting internal and external examinations					
37. Formulation and implementation of school rules and regulations.					
38. Staff development					
39. School project planning and management					