

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

Nyein Ma Ma Khin¹ and May Phyu Aung²

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the perception of teachers on teacher participation in decision making at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township. All teachers (N=417) from nine selected high schools in Mohnyin Township participated in the study. In this study, the questionnaire for the teachers was used in order to collect the data required for the study. In this questionnaire, "Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire" developed by Keung (2002) was mainly used in order to measure the teachers' perception on their participation in decision making in relation with school managerial practices and their affective outcomes. Based on the research findings, it was found that all teachers from selected high schools actually perceived that they had high participation in "Technical Domain" and moderate participation in "Managerial Domain". According to the teachers' responses, all teachers in selected high schools in Mohnyin Township desired to have a greater involvement in decision making than their actual participation in decision making. In addition, the finding of this study indicated that there was a significant and positive relationship between teacher participation in decision making and school managerial practices ($r=0.300, p<0.01$). Moreover, it was also found that "Teacher Participation in Decision Making" was significantly and positively related to "Teachers' Affective Outcomes" ($r=0.225, p<0.01$) in selected schools.

Keywords: decision making, teacher participation, teacher participation in decision making

Introduction

Education is a complex endeavor. It includes decision-making processes concerning different issues and educational problems. Decision making is the aspect of educational management. The decision making could also be categorized as the collection of scarce teaching and learning resources, the enrollment of students, employment of teaching and non-teaching staff, introduction of the new curriculum, student and staff discipline, staff training and method of improving pedagogy and educational research etc. (Okumbe, 1998, as cited in Gemechu, 2014).

In the past, decision making was thought as management function by itself. But now a days, researchers and management authority relate decision-making with a collaborative work. This is because the changes in the educational system call for rethinking, reformulating and restructuring of educational policies both at national and school levels. As regards the role played by teachers, UNESCO (2005, as cited in Gemechu, 2014) writes that "without the participation of teachers, changes in education are impossible". This preposition proves that teachers are the foundation stone of school activities. The quality of school's performance largely depends upon teachers who occupy the most important place in teaching-learning process. Teacher participation in decision making is one of the features of such trend. Teachers are closest to students, so that they are more aware of the needs of their students and in a better position to anticipate the effects of decision implementation. In addition, teacher participation in decision making has been shown to be one of the key characteristics of effective schools (Taylor et al., 1991, as cited in Keung, 2002).

¹ Associate Professor, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education

² Senior Assistant Teacher, BEHS (2), Mohnyin

Therefore, the involvement of teacher in decision-making is likely motivating teacher to exert their mental and emotional involvement in group situation that may contribute to school goals and shared responsibilities. The involvement of teachers in decision-making at all levels of the school system is very important for the good quality of the schools.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study is to investigate the perception of teachers on their participation in decision making at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township. The specific purposes of this study are:

- To study the situation today with regard to teachers' participation in decision making at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township,
- To analyze whether or not there are any significant differences in teachers' actual and desired participation in decision making at selected high schools,
- To examine the teachers' perception of their schools' managerial practices and their affective outcomes, concerning with their participation in decision making, and
- To explore the relationship among the perception of teachers on their participation in decision making, school managerial practices and their affective outcomes.

Research Questions

This study will seek to answer the following research questions:

- What is the status quo of teachers' participation in decision making and to what degree do teachers desire to participate in decision making at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township?
- Are there any significant differences between teachers' actual and desired participation in decision making at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township?
- What are the teachers' perception of their schools' managerial practices and their affective outcomes at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township?
- Are there any relationship among the perception of teachers on their participation in decision making, school managerial practices and their affective outcomes at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township?

Review of Related Literature

Concepts of Decision Making

Decision making is a process of making a choice from a number of alternatives to achieve a desired result (Lunenburg, 2010). This definition has three key elements. First, decision making involves making a choice from a number of options _ the school district can carry more or less inventory of school supplies. Second, decision making is a process that involves more than simply a final choice from among alternatives _ if the school district decides to renovate the existing high school rather than build a new one, it should be known how this decision was reached. Finally, the desired result mentioned in the definition involves a purpose or target resulting from the mental activity that the decision maker engages in, to reach a final decision _ to locate the new elementary school on the east side of town.

Okumbe (1998, as cited in Gemechu, 2014) defined decision making as the process of specifying the nature of particular problem and selecting among available alternatives in order to solve the problem. This definition of decision making indicates that a problem precedes any decision and that there must be a number of alternatives courses of action from which an optimum course will be selected.

Decision making is very important and significant in school and in any organization at large to conduct work, to distribute resources, to plan short-term and long-term of bring about the future state of affairs as an intention, and activities of the school. Decision making is very important and can have such significant effects on the operations on schools, so it has been suggested that administration is decision making (Lunenburg, 2010). However, it would be a mistake to conclude that only administrators make decisions. Increasingly, important decisions are being made in schools by non-administrative personnel. Furthermore, a school leader's main job is to lead the school through effective decision making. And quite often they have to decide on what is to be done, who to do it, and when and where is to be done. Thus, while decision making is an important administrative process, it is fundamentally a people process.

Teacher Participation in Decision Making

Participation in organizational decision making has emerged as a central concern for teachers because shared decision making and staff consultations are among those process factors that have been repeatedly identified as correlating with positive school outcomes in studies of school effectiveness (Hargreaves, 1991, as cited in Vengrasalam, 2000). Anderson (2002, as cited in Mosheti, 2013) suggests that high teacher participation results in teacher leadership and that teachers' actual participation was dependent upon individual desire and teacher characteristics. Teachers felt greater involvement in decision-making would assist them in helping students reach their potential, as they felt teacher participation in the organization would help them shape both short- and long-term goals. Consequently, teachers would stay longer in the organization, and would be less likely to leave for other schools or leave the teaching profession altogether.

In an earlier study, Smylie (1992, as cited in Mosheti, 2013) suggested four factors that tend to influence a teacher's willingness to participate in decision-making:

1. Principal-teacher working relationship,
2. Norms influencing working relationships among teachers,
3. Teachers' perceived capacity to contribute to or make decisions, and
4. Teachers' sense of responsibility and accountability in their work with students.

These four significant factors associated with participation in decision-making need further investigation to understand how they relate to student outcome and teacher commitment to the organization. Chan, Ching and Cheng (1997, as cited in Keung, 2002) described decision-making by organizational areas of participation, in which they suggested three organizational levels associated with school-based management:

1. Participation at the individual level—decision area close to the teaching task within a classroom
2. Participation at the group level—decision area of topics related to the functioning of groups (departments, subject-areas, and grade-level)

3. Participation at the school level—decision issues at the whole school level including goals, budget, personnel, etc.

In this regard the literature, therefore, suggests further study is needed on the relationship between teacher decision-making and other factors as a key component to student achievement.

Bi-dimensional Models

Some researchers (Parsons, 1951; Mohrman et al., 1978; Schneider, 1984, as cited in Keung, 2002) have described teachers' participation in school decision making as bi-dimensional, consisting of a technical core of activities related to classroom instruction and a managerial core of activities that are school wide in focus. The "technical domain" consists of decisions related to task execution (e.g. selecting texts, resolving learning problems). The "managerial domain" consists of decisions related to what Mohrman et al. term "managerial support functions" (e.g. hiring personnel, planning budgets).

Within these two domains of technical and managerial decision making, teachers may also describe their participation in absolute or relative terms (Alutto et al., 1972, as cited in Keung, 2002). Absolute participation means that teachers assess their actual participation. Relative participation is where teachers assess participation in terms of their desired participation.

The method initially advocated by Alutto and Belasco (1972, as cited in Conley, 1991) in their study of teachers in two districts, measured participation according to three decisional states: deprived, saturated, and in equilibrium. Decision deprivation means involvement in fewer decisions than desired; decision equilibrium means involvement in as many decision as desired; decision saturation means involvement in more decisions than desired. Conley (1991) reviewed various perspectives regarding teacher involvement within decision domains, and noted that technical and managerial decision domains were related but were conceptually distinct constructs and each implied a different orientation of teacher involvement in decision making. For that reason, a number of later studies conducted multidimensional approach to measuring teachers' participation in decision making.

Multidimensional Models

After 1990, most studies adopted a multidimensional model for analyzing the decision domains in which teachers' decision making occurred in place of the simple technical/managerial model. Conley (1991) used eight decision making domains: planning, policy, curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, staff personnel, staff development, school/community and budget/management. It was found that teachers were most willing to participate in curricular and instructional decisions and least willing to participate in general administrative decisions.

Management Practices Affecting Teachers' Participation in Decision Making

In this study, according to Keung (2002), four kinds of school managerial practices were detailed as follows:

Bureaucratic Control: All organizations including schools are bureaucratic to a degree. Bureaucracy is seen as inevitable consequence of increasing the size and complexity of organizations, with written rules and regulations, and formal hierarchical structures. Personal initiative is not encouraged. This is designed to minimize the impact of individuality on decision

making. Scott (1981, as cited in Keung, 2002) argued that bureaucratic control of school organization may be a barrier to implementing teachers' participation in decision making.

Collegiality: Collegiality is seen as a key aspect of teacher professional development and a vehicle to increase teacher knowledge. Collegiality stimulates enthusiasm among teachers and reduces emotional stress and burnout (Shah, 2012). Teachers' participation is important because they have the responsibility for implementing changes in policy. Every teacher should be given a chance to be involved and created a climate for collegiality (Liontos, 1994, as cited in Keung, 2002).

Professional Autonomy: Teachers possess autonomy when they are able to have control over any situation and possess freedom to handle all matters using their own approach. One of the elements of autonomy is decision making ability (Pearson, 1995, as cited in Strong, 2011). This element allows teachers choice and determination in the critical issues surrounding their duties. Freedom of choice and decision making promotes creativity and enhances experiences of the teachers. Hence, the level of teachers' involvement in school decision making is likely to correlate with the view taken by the school authority on the professional autonomy of teachers.

Shared Vision: Keung (2002) considered that shared vision was an element of the organizational culture related to school effectiveness. Bondy et al. (1994, as cited in Keung, 2002) found that shared vision was one of the factors for enhancing teacher involvement in decision making. If the vision shared among the teachers, they were willing to put in more effort to make the school successful. Thus, if the principals' visions are strong and shared, the teachers will be empowered. Therefore, it seems that if teachers perceive their management practice as one of shared vision, they will likely to participate in decision making.

Teachers' Affective Outcomes

Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction is a matter of great concern to all organizations. The use of participation in decision-making is believed to increase employees' job satisfaction. In the field of education, participation by professionals is positively correlated to job satisfaction and job commitment. Participation has been examined as a key determinant of such individual and organizational school outcomes as teachers' job satisfaction (Schneider, 1984, as cited in Keung, 2002).

Job Commitment: Employee commitment is very essential in basic education high school settings. This is because it is only when teachers are committed, when they will be able to combine their efforts to see to it that schools operate effectively and in that way learning performance will be maximized. According to Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2004, as cited in Soelistya, Mashud, & Suryanto, 2016), commitment is a feeling of obligation or emotional attachment to the job. Murphy et al. (1995, as cited in Keung, 2002) found that teachers' participation in decision was positively related with their commitment and satisfaction. Thus, if teachers are involved in setting of school goals and the decision making process, they will tend to be committed members to staff.

Workload: Decision sharing at the school site is time-consuming. Addition of workload may be one of the major costs of participatory decision making. In certain circumstances, in the event of certain problems group decisions are superior, but it is a time consuming process. David (1989, as cited in Keung, 2002) found that when the extra time and energy demanded by planning and decision making are balanced by real authority, teachers report satisfaction, even exuberance. He

also stressed the importance of giving schools lots of opportunities to learn and time to learn, if school based management is to work. Specifically, higher participation in decision making will lead to a higher workload.

Methodology

The main purpose of the study is to investigate the perception of teachers on their participation in decision making at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township.

Research Method

The quantitative research method was used in this study to achieve the research objectives, which involved using questionnaires to gather data within a representative sample of a population.

Population and Sample

The target population of this study was all teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township. Simple random sampling method was used to select the sample schools in order to fulfill the sample size of the population. Out of 16 Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township, 9 schools were chosen as sample schools in this study. As teacher sample, all teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools were used as teacher sample. The number of teachers participated in this study was 384.

Instrument

Data were collected by using one questionnaire (Questionnaire for Teachers) in order to gain the perception of teachers on their participation in decision making in relation to school managerial practices and their affective outcomes. This instrument was the “Teacher Participation in Decision Making Questionnaire (TPDM)” developed by Keung (2002).

Data Collection Procedure

To conduct the major study, it needed to have the permission from the responsible persons. After receiving the permission from the responsible persons, the agreement of school principals of the selected schools was taken and distributed the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the perception of teachers on their participation in decision making, school managerial practices and their affective outcomes by using SPSS. The mean scores and standard deviations of these variables were calculated. To determine the level of teacher participation in decision making, the mean value was identified as the mean value from 1.00 to 2.00 was “Low level”, the mean value from 2.01 to 3.00 was “Moderate Level” and the mean value from 3.01 to 4.00 was “High Level”. *t*-test was used to determine whether the mean of perception of actual participation and the mean of desire to participate are significantly different at 0.05 probability levels. Moreover, Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient was used to explore the relationship among teacher participation in decision making, school managerial practices and teachers’ affective outcomes.

Findings

In order to explore the levels of actual and desired participation in decision making, the mean scores and standard deviations for “class level-technical domain”, “class level-managerial domain”, “school level-technical domain”, and school level-managerial domain” were calculated.

Table 1 Mean Scores of the Actual Participation in Decision Making Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

| Dimension School | Class level- Technical | Class level- Managerial | School level- Technical | School level- Managerial | Actual Participation in decision making |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| A (N1=53) | 3.27 (.332) | 2.24 (.675) | 2.76 (.720) | 2.06 (.580) | 2.58 (.467) |
| B (N2=44) | 3.36 (.375) | 2.46 (.358) | 3.01 (.407) | 2.72 (.529) | 2.89 (.266) |
| C (N3=47) | 3.22 (.470) | 2.47 (.367) | 3.02 (.437) | 2.49 (.317) | 2.80 (.271) |
| D (N4=34) | 3.27 (.437) | 2.61 (.455) | 2.97 (.395) | 2.59 (.389) | 2.86 (.316) |
| E (N5=56) | 3.32 (.381) | 2.56 (.421) | 3.06 (.366) | 2.59 (.482) | 2.88 (.270) |
| F (N6=62) | 3.49 (.380) | 2.59 (.500) | 3.30 (.392) | 2.63 (.526) | 3.00 (.342) |
| G (N7=35) | 3.23 (.238) | 2.73 (.206) | 3.07 (.203) | 2.31 (.330) | 2.83 (.192) |
| H (N8=34) | 3.58 (.402) | 2.71 (.460) | 3.34 (.405) | 2.83 (.418) | 3.11 (.260) |
| I (N9=19) | 3.21 (.315) | 2.65 (.220) | 2.96 (.403) | 2.53 (.647) | 2.84 (.293) |
| Total (N=384) | 3.34 (.393) | 2.53 (.469) | 3.06 (.475) | 2.52 (.523) | 2.86 (.343) |

1.00-2.00=low participation, 2.01-3.00=moderate participation, 3.01-4.00=high participation

According to Table 1, it was found that teachers from all schools perceived that they had high participation in “class level-technical domain” and “school level-technical domain”; moderate participation in “class level-managerial domain” and “school level-managerial domain”. All in all, teachers from selected high schools actually and moderately participated in decision making.

Table 2 Mean Scores of the Desired Participation in Decision Making Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

| Dimension School | Class level- Technical Domain | Class level- Managerial Domain | School level- Technical Domain | School level- Managerial Domain | Desired Participation in Decision Making |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| A (n1=53) | 3.51 (.404) | 2.96 (.568) | 3.26 (.379) | 2.70 (.721) | 3.11 (.365) |
| B (n2=44) | 3.43 (.419) | 2.95 (.462) | 3.17 (.382) | 3.00 (.455) | 3.14 (.346) |
| C (n3=47) | 3.35 (.413) | 2.97 (.484) | 3.15 (.336) | 2.78 (.453) | 3.06 (.322) |
| D (n4=34) | 3.37 (.405) | 3.10 (.421) | 3.18 (.307) | 2.88 (.358) | 3.13 (.256) |
| E (n5=56) | 3.66 (.441) | 2.84 (.519) | 3.19 (.364) | 2.84 (.409) | 3.13 (.301) |
| F (n6=62) | 3.58 (.420) | 2.99 (.479) | 3.42 (.413) | 2.98 (.499) | 3.24 (.362) |
| G (n7=35) | 4.00 (.000) | 3.61 (.200) | 3.83 (.121) | 3.57 (.149) | 3.75 (.094) |
| H (n8=34) | 3.70 (.383) | 3.01 (.626) | 3.45 (.445) | 3.08 (.493) | 3.31 (.367) |
| I (n9=19) | 3.37 (.436) | 3.00 (.411) | 3.36 (.402) | 2.89 (.707) | 3.16 (.430) |
| Total (n=384) | 3.56 (.433) | 3.03 (.520) | 3.32 (.410) | 2.95 (.539) | 3.21 (.373) |

1.00-2.00=low participation, 2.01-3.00=moderate participation, 3.01-4.00=high participation

According to Table 2, it was found that teachers from all selected schools perceived that they desired to participate at high levels in “class level-technical domain”, “class level-managerial domain”, and “school level-technical domain” but they desired to participate at moderate level in “school level-managerial domain”.

In order to find out whether or not there were significant differences between perceptions of teachers on the “level of actual participation in decision making” and “the level of desired participation in decision making”, the data was calculated by using the statistical Paired - Samples *t* Test. In this case the difference between the values of the variables of actual participation and desired participation for each case were tested to establish if the average of discrepancy differed from 0. Table 3 summarizes the results of the *t*-test on the mean scores of actual and desired participation in the four decision domains including the overall decision domain.

Table 3 Summary of *t*-Test Results for Actual and Desired Participation in the Four Decision Domains

| Decision Domain | Participation | Mean Scores | SD | Mean Difference | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|------------|----------|
| Class level-Technical | Actual | 3.34 | 0.393 | 0.22 | -9.056*** | 0.000 |
| | Desired | 3.56 | 0.433 | | | |
| Class level-Managerial | Actual | 2.53 | 0.469 | 0.50 | -16.654*** | 0.000 |
| | Desired | 3.03 | 0.520 | | | |
| School level-Technical | Actual | 3.06 | 0.475 | 0.26 | -9.518*** | 0.000 |
| | Desired | 3.32 | 0.410 | | | |
| School level-Managerial | Actual | 2.52 | 0.523 | 0.43 | -13.156*** | 0.000 |
| | Desired | 2.95 | 0.539 | | | |
| Actual and Desired Participation | Actual | 2.86 | 0.343 | 0.35 | -15.451*** | 0.000 |
| | Desired | 3.21 | 0.373 | | | |

According to Table 3, there were significant differences in perception of teachers on actual participation and desired participation in overall decision making domain at the $p < 0.01$ level.

Table 4 presents the school managerial practices perceived by teachers at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township.

Table 4 Mean Scores of School Managerial Practices Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

| Dimension School | Bureaucratic Control | Collegiality | Professional Autonomy | Shared Vision | Overall Management Practices |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| A (N1=53) | 3.89 (.488) | 4.18 (.462) | 4.05 (.483) | 4.01 (.375) | 4.03 (.372) |
| B (N 2=44) | 4.09 (.325) | 4.19 (.332) | 4.12 (.347) | 4.19 (.350) | 4.15 (.278) |
| C (N 3=47) | 3.84 (.667) | 4.03 (.624) | 3.95 (.692) | 3.99 (.711) | 3.95 (.646) |
| D (N 4=34) | 3.88 (.263) | 4.12 (.330) | 4.04 (.382) | 3.95 (.447) | 3.99 (.257) |
| E (N 5=56) | 3.96 (.336) | 4.12 (.245) | 4.08 (.283) | 4.12 (.278) | 4.07 (.207) |
| F (N 6=62) | 4.16 (.382) | 4.42 (.428) | 4.39 (.421) | 4.27 (.546) | 4.31 (.351) |
| G (N 7=35) | 4.35 (.309) | 4.19 (.172) | 4.27 (.177) | 4.05 (.208) | 4.22 (.147) |
| H (N 8=34) | 4.18 (.488) | 4.44 (.404) | 4.24 (.480) | 4.42 (.430) | 4.32 (.357) |
| I (N 9=19) | 3.93 (.566) | 4.06 (.325) | 4.05 (.492) | 4.01 (.468) | 4.01 (.368) |
| Total (N =384) | 4.03 (.460) | 4.21 (.420) | 4.14 (.458) | 4.12 (.468) | 4.12 (.381) |

1.00-2.33=low involvement, 2.34-3.67=moderate involvement, 3.68-5.00=high involvement

Based on the teachers' responses in Table 4, it was found that teachers from all selected schools were involved at high levels in four types of managerial practices in their schools. Table 5 presents the mean scores of their affective outcomes perceived by teachers at selected Basic Education High Schools in Mohnyin Township.

Table 5 Mean Scores of Affective Outcomes Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

| Dimension School | Job Satisfaction | Job Commitment | Workload | Overall Affective Outcomes |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| A (n1=53) | 3.72 (.342) | 3.84 (.360) | 3.14 (.558) | 3.57 (.284) |
| B (n2=44) | 3.47 (.605) | 3.85 (.401) | 2.95 (.721) | 3.42 (.445) |
| C (n3=47) | 3.44 (.536) | 3.73 (.629) | 3.06 (.697) | 3.41 (.472) |
| D (n4=34) | 3.34 (.637) | 3.86 (.445) | 2.98 (.587) | 3.40 (.449) |
| E (n5=56) | 3.82 (.345) | 4.11 (.394) | 2.93 (.562) | 3.62 (.333) |
| F (n6=62) | 3.93 (.328) | 4.10 (.420) | 2.83 (.509) | 3.62 (.9295) |
| G (n7=35) | 4.31 (.258) | 4.17 (.297) | 2.68 (.347) | 3.72 (.169) |
| H (n8=34) | 3.67 (.626) | 4.28 (.427) | 2.97 (.500) | 3.64 (.352) |
| I (n9=19) | 3.60 (.600) | 3.95 (.480) | 2.73 (.657) | 3.43 (.364) |
| Total (N =384) | 3.72 (.536) | 3.98 (.463) | 2.94 (.588) | 3.55 (.372) |

1.00-2.33=low level

2.34-3.67=moderate level

3.68-5.00=high level

According to Table 5, the total mean score of the overall teachers' affective outcomes was 3.55 in selected high schools. Out of the three dimensions of teachers' affective outcomes, the levels of job satisfaction and commitment perceived by teachers were at high levels but the level of their workload perceived by teachers was at moderate level in decision making process.

In order to find out the relationships among teacher participation in decision making, school managerial practices and their affective outcomes, Pearson product moment correlation method was also used. Table 6 shows these results.

Table 6 Relationship among Teacher Participation in Decision Making, School Managerial Practices and Teachers' Affective Outcomes at Selected High Schools

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|--------|--------|---|
| Teacher Participation in Decision Making | 1 | | |
| School Managerial Practices | .300** | 1 | |
| Affective Outcomes | .225** | .571** | 1 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 6, there was a positive correlation between “Teacher Participation in Decision Making” and “School Managerial Practices” ($r=.300, p<0.01$) in selected schools. Similarly, it was also found that “Teacher Participation in Decision Making” was significantly and positively related to “Teachers’ Affective Outcomes” ($r=.225, p<0.01$). Again, when analyzing the relationship between school managerial practices and teachers’ affective outcomes in selected high schools, there was a moderately and positively correlation between “School Managerial Practices” and “Teachers’ Affective Outcomes” ($r=.571, p<0.01$).

In addition to quantitative data, teachers were asked four open-ended questions in “Questionnaire for teachers”. The first question asked teachers to describe the role of their participation in decision making in their schools. Out of selected teachers, 315 (82.03%) teachers responded to this question. 69 (17.97%) teachers had no responded to this question.

According to teachers’ responses, 56 teachers (14.58%) from selected schools expressed that they had participated in issues related with the instruction in class. In addition, 31 teachers (8.07%) reported that they had participated in management issues of class such as class control, setting class penalty rules, etc. Again, 27 teachers (7.03%) answered that they took part in deciding issues of evaluation of students’ achievement such as examination marks, test scores, etc. Moreover, 21 teachers (5.47%) from selected schools stated that they had participated in decision making about the matters of discipline committee.

Furthermore, 42 teachers (10.94%) described their participation in decision making. They had participated in deciding issues in relation with the school development activities. Similarly, 4 teachers (1.04%) stated that they had carried out in deciding issues of school managerial functions such as budget allocations, setting school rules and regulations, delegating duties to other staffs, etc. However, 134 teachers (34.89%) from selected schools reported that they had no participation in decision making in their schools. But, they had carried out the duties according to their principals’ directions.

The second question asked teachers to describe the perceptions of teachers on their school managerial practices in their current schools. Among selected teachers, 327 (85.16%) teachers responded to this question but 57 (14.84%) teachers had no response. 96 teachers (25%) answered that they must always get their orders from their principals. Again, ten teachers (2.60%) stated that quality education was a management problem that should be solved by tight controls and school development depended upon principals’ management functions. In addition, 115 teachers (29.95%) described that their principals’ school management functions seemed to be good.

Moreover, 33 teachers (8.59%) mentioned that principals work together with the grade deans, subject deans, personnel who held the school administrative duties, the school associations including board of trustees, PTA; in deciding school managerial issues and in planning for school development. And also, principals had a good relationship and the collegiality among the school staff members. In addition, 22 teachers (5.73%) perceived that school management functions by principals were moderately good.

Furthermore, 23 teachers (5.99%) suggested that principals should work together and collaborate with teaching staff including teachers so that they could succeed in school improvement and effectiveness. However, 28 teachers (7.29%) perceived that their school management functions were not good because some teachers didn’t obey school disciplines,

some didn't cooperate and collaborate with others. Sometimes, there was a limitation such as budget and time limitations in carrying out of the school development plans.

The third question asked teachers to describe whether teachers satisfy with teaching as a career or not. 362 (94.27%) teachers from selected schools answered to this question but 22 (5.73%) teachers didn't respond to this question. According to teachers' responses, 349 teachers (90.89%) were satisfied with teaching as career because teaching profession was their hobby and they perceived that they had carried out for human resource development by contributing their knowledge to the new generations.

But 13 teachers (3.39%) from selected schools mentioned that they had no satisfaction with teaching profession because of students' misbehaviours. They also perceived that they must work the duties according to their higher orders and education system was not seemed to be good. In addition there was no enough salary for educational staff. Thus, they perceived that their living standard was low level.

The fourth question asked teachers to describe teachers' commitment to their teaching and their schools at current situation. 359 (93.49%) teachers responded to this question but 25 teachers (6.51%) had no answer. Based on the teachers' responses, it was found that 340 teachers (88.54%) from selected schools had committed to teaching and their schools because they had a high degree of commitment to the school and their teaching. And they were willing to do extra work in order to help the school to be successful. They perceived that the school improvement or development was their dignity.

However, 19 teachers (4.94%) from selected school had no commitment to teaching and their schools because they had no will to invest extra time and effort in activities beyond the classroom borders. They didn't want to carry out the duties according to the higher orders. Sometimes, the class size was so big that their teaching could not be effective.

Discussion

According to Mosheti (2013), involving teacher in decision making created change in the manner that schools were governed by removing the decision making power from the hands of the central office or administration and sharing it among the teachers, principals and sometimes parents. Employees who participate in decision making may feel more committed to execute them properly. In the current study, teachers' participation in decision making was examined at the classroom level and at the school level in terms of both technical and managerial decisions. One of the purposes in conducting the research was to establish the degree to which teachers wanted to be involved in decision making. This was investigated by asking teachers to distinguish between the actual participation in decision making, and decisions in which they desired to participate but they are not involved. Based on the information, it was intended to describe decision states that were distinguished as decision saturation, decision equilibrium and decision deprivation.

One factor that influenced the research design was the suggestion in some recent reports that the involvement of teachers in decision making varied between different schools and that one of the factors that accounted for this was the managerial practices of the school (Chan *et al.*, 1997, as cited in Keung, 2002). In the current study, the management practices of the school have been examined under four specific school managerial practices: bureaucratic control, collegiality,

professional autonomy and shared vision. Another factors thought to relate to teachers' participation in decision making were teachers' affective outcomes: job satisfaction, job commitment and their workload. The literature asserts that teachers' participation in decision making increases their job satisfaction and work commitment (Murphy *et al.*, 1995, as cited in Keung, 2002). One instrument including five sections was developed to investigate teachers' perceptions of the issues that form the purpose of the study.

Analyses of quantitative data collected from the study attempted to answer the research questions. The researcher examined the levels of teacher actual participation and desired participation in decision making perceived by teachers in selected Basic Education High Schools. According to the teachers' responses, teachers from nine selected high schools agreed that class level-technical dimension and school level-technical dimension of participation in decision making were actually high participated. However, all teachers from selected schools proposed that two dimensions of class level-managerial and school level-managerial decision domains were moderately participated. Participation of teachers in decision making has many benefits. According to Wadesango (2012), participation in decision making nurtures teachers' creativity and initiative there by empowering them to implement innovative ideas. Participation of teachers in decision making also enables teachers to become active participants in school management processes.

In the results of teacher desired participation, it was found that the teachers from all high schools had desired high participation in "class level-technical domain", "class level-managerial domain" and "school level-technical domain"; and also moderate participation in "school level-managerial domain". It can be interpreted that teachers from all high schools had desired to be highly participated in dealing with the instruction, instructional materials and classroom management functions, and moderately participated in dealing with the school level managerial support functions.

The researcher also explored any significant difference between teachers' perceptions of the level of actual participation and the level of desired participation in four decision domains with the overall participation of decision domain. Paired samples *t*-test procedure was used to explore the mean difference between the values of the variables of actual participation and desired participation for each case. The overall pattern of teachers' participation in decision making was a condition of decision deprivation. This was true for both managerial and technical issues and at both the classroom and school levels. Neither the decision condition of equilibrium nor the decision condition of saturation was significant.

Moreover, the researcher examined the perceptions of teachers on their school managerial practices and their affective outcomes in selected basic education high schools. When studying the mean scores of school managerial practices perceived teachers, it was found that all schools had high involvement in four dimensions of school management; "Bureaucratic Control", "Collegiality", "Professional Autonomy" and "Shared Vision". It can be said that principals and teachers from all selected schools had adopted these four managerial practices alternatively.

And then, the researcher examined the levels of teachers' perceptions on their affective outcomes in selected high schools. When studying the mean scores of teachers' affective outcomes perceived by them, it was found that all teachers from selected high schools had high level of teachers' affective outcomes. According to teachers' responses, teachers were satisfied with teaching as career because teaching profession was their hobby and they perceived that they

had carried out for human resource development by contributing their knowledge to the new generations. Teachers from selected schools had also committed to teaching and their schools because they had a high degree of commitment to the school and their teaching. And they were willing to do extra work in order to help the school to be successful. They perceived that the school improvement and development was their dignity.

Finally the researcher examined to investigate the relationships among teacher participation in decision making, school managerial practices and teachers' affective outcomes at selected Basic Education High Schools. Based on the research findings, the correlation ($r=0.300$, $p<0.01$) there was a moderate and positive relationship between teacher participation in decision making and school managerial practices in selected Basic Education High Schools. It can be interpreted that the relationship between school managerial practices and the level of teacher participation in decision making were proved to be significant, so that it would be possible to fine-tune the managerial practices to induce a higher level of participation.

In addition, based on the research findings, the correlation ($r=0.233$, $p<0.01$) indicated that there was a positive relationship between teacher participation in decision making and teachers' affective outcomes in selected high schools. It can be concluded that teacher participation in decision making could lead to positive affective outcomes such as job satisfaction and greater commitment to their work, which could improve their effectiveness. On the other hand, the increased workload was associated with greater participation in decision making.

In conclusion, teachers as professionals desired to participate in decision making in the organizations in which they were employed. School administrators should engage teachers in all the decision domains but especially the decision area of class level management. Teachers would prefer to concentrate on teacher-related concerns about the curriculum and instruction and it is through this preference that teachers might be encouraged to participating in a decision making process. The researcher suggests that schools need to build up a collegiate culture and shared vision; they should treasure teacher professionalism and allow teachers discretion in their work. They should diminish bureaucratic control and involve teachers in decision making. This is the way to more effective schools.

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my profound gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Saw Pyone Naing (Rector, Sagaing University of Education), Dr. Myat Myat Thaw (Pro-Rector, Sagaing University of Education) for their guidance and suggestions for this study. Second, I want to express my sincere thanks and deep respect go to Dr. Zin Nwe Than (Associate Professor and Head of Department, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education) for her tremendous assistance and criticisms towards the completion of this study. I recognize and appreciate the encouragement to all my teachers and colleagues from the Department of Educational Theory for their unceasing support. Finally, I most sincerely wish to thank the principals and the teachers who participated in the essential task of data collection.

References

- Conley, S. (1991). Review of Research on Teacher Participation in School Decision Making. *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 17, pp. 225-266. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1015.3832&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Gemechu, D. (2014). *The Practices of Teachers' Involvement in Decision-Making in Government Secondary Schools of Jimma Town*. Jimma University. Retrieved from <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/123456789/5337/whole%20research%202014.pdf?sequence=1>
- Keung, C. C. (2002). *Teacher Participation in Decision Making of Secondary School Teachers from Aided Schools in Hong Kong*. University of Leicester. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/42016379.pdf>
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). The Decision Making Process. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*. Sam Houston State University. Retrieved November from <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volume/Lunenburg%20Fred%20The%20Decision%20Making%20NFEASJ%20V27%20N4%202010.pdf>
- Mosheti, P. A. (2013). *Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making and Job Satisfaction as Correlates of Organizational Commitment in Senior Schools in Botswana*. Andrews University. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1568&context=dissertations>
- Nagussa, B. and Gabriel, L. (2017). Participation in Decision Making and Teachers' Commitment: A Comparative Study between Public and Private Secondary Schools in Arusha Municipality, Tanzania. *American Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 5, No.7, pp. 801-807. Retrieved from <http://pubs.sciepub.com/education/5/7/17/index.html>
- Shah, M. (2012). *The Importance and Benefits of Teacher Collegiality in Schools_ a Literature Review*. University of Malaya. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812014115/pdf>
- Soelistya, D., Mashud, M., & Suryanto, S. (2016). Problems of employee commitment from the perspective of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4(5), 45-64. Retrieved from <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Problems-of-Employee-Commitment-from-the-Perspective-of-Maslow%E2%80%99s-Hierarchy-of-Needs-1.pdf>
- Strong, L. (2011). *A Psychometric Study of the Teacher Work-Autonomy Scale with a Sample of U.S. Teachers. Doctor of Education*. Lehigh University. Retrieved from <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2092&context=etd>
- Vengrasalam, R. (2000). *A Survey of Teachers' Participation in Decision Making Process in Batu Pahat District Schools*. University Malaysia Sarawak. Retrieved from <http://ir.unimas.my/3502/1/A%20survey%20of%20teacher%27s%20participation%20in%20decision%20making%20process%20in%20Batu%20Pahat%20district%20schools.pdf>
- Wadesango, N. (2012). *The Influence of Teacher Participation in Decision-making on Their Occupational Morale*. Walter Sisulu University. Retrieved from [http://www.krepublishers.com/02Journals/JSS/JSS31000012Wed/JSS31300012AbstPDF/JSS313361121341WadesangoN/JSS313361369121341WadesangoNTx\[13\].pdf](http://www.krepublishers.com/02Journals/JSS/JSS31000012Wed/JSS31300012AbstPDF/JSS313361121341WadesangoN/JSS313361369121341WadesangoNTx[13].pdf)