ED 436 484   SP 038 872

AUTHOR   Winter, Paul A.; Keedy, John L.; Newton, Rose Mary
TITLE   Teacher Service on School Councils: Are Teachers Attracted
                to the Accountability of School-Based Decision Making?
PUB DATE   1999-10-00
NOTE   35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                University Council for Educational Administration
                (Minneapolis, MN, October 29-31, 1999).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Children; Dependents; Elementary Secondary Education;
                Instructional Leadership; Participative Decision Making;
                Principals; School Administration; *School Based Management;
                Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher
                Empowerment; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS   *Local School Councils

ABSTRACT
        This study examined teachers' attraction to school council
service and factors that impacted that attraction. Participants were randomly
selected public school teachers enrolled in graduate education courses at
three Kentucky state universities. They performed three tasks. First, they
completed a biographical form that yielded descriptive statistics and
measures of seven teacher personal characteristics. Next, they read one of
four content-validated versions of a formal job description for a teacher
vacancy on the local school council. Each version emphasized one of two
validated sets of school council job attributes (management or instructional
leadership). Each of the four versions specified whether the principal was
the council chair or a council member with a teacher serving as the chair.
Finally, participants completed a two-item instrument that captured the
degree of teacher attraction to the school council job depicted in the job
description. Results indicated that teachers with greater numbers of
dependent children and prior school council experience rated school council
positions less favorably than did teachers with fewer dependent children and
no experience on school councils. Results also revealed that the combined
effects of dependent children and school council experience explained the 6.8
percent variance in teacher rating of a school council position. (Contains 56
references.) (SM)

Running head: TEACHER SERVICE ON SCHOOL COUNCILS

ED 436 484

Teacher Service on School Councils: Are Teachers Attracted

to the Accountability of School-Based Decision Making?

Paul A. Winter and John L. Keedy

University of Louisville

Rose Mary Newton

Western Kentucky University

Paper presented at the 1999 Annual Meeting of The University

Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), UCEA Convention

'99, October, 29-31, 1999, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Abstract

Randomly selected teachers rated validated job descriptions for school council vacancies. Teachers with greater numbers of dependent children and prior school council experience rated school council positions less favorably than did teachers with fewer dependent children and no experience on school councils. Regression analysis revealed that the combined effects of dependent children and school council experience explained 6.8 percent of the variance in teacher rating of a school council position.

Teacher Service on School Councils: Are Teachers Attracted
to the Accountability of School-Based Decision Making?

Devolution of governance to the school level represents an important change for teachers. In studying school change, Fullan (1991) continually asks: How do teachers perceive policy mandates and what are the problems teachers encounter in implementing these mandates? Teachers as the practitioners responsible for implementing policies in classrooms and schools usually have different perceptions and needs than do policy makers and researchers. The study reported in this manuscript addresses teacher perceptions of school council service in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Are teachers attracted to the job of serving on councils? If so, schools are moving in the right direction in terms of creating instructional capacity to revitalize classrooms for students (cf. Spillane & Thompson, 1997). If not, educators had better make well-crafted policy changes quickly to prevent a massive teacher burnout.

We first conceptualize the hypothesized policy linkage between decentralizing the governance of schooling and teacher empowerment. We then provide the theoretical framework for job attraction and connect these concepts to teacher school council service. After reporting our findings, we suggest that state education agencies in Kentucky and in other states might implement enabling policies to create better workplace, conditions under which council service might become more

efficacious for teachers.

School Decentralization and Teacher Empowerment

School decentralization and teacher empowerment conceptually are fused in redesigning schooling with substantive departures from conventional practices (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Decentralization revitalizes the central office-school site relationship, whereby authority devolves to where decisions can be made closest to students by those who know them best: teachers and parents (Murphy, 1991). Rather than passing down mandates hierarchically, central office administrators facilitate by helping schools achieve mutually negotiated objectives (cf. Louis & Miles, 1990). Decentralization of decision making to the school level is public education's response to site-based management used by the private sector to promote customer satisfaction (cf. Peters & Waterman, 1982) and by governmental agencies to improve efficiency (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

Teacher empowerment is a process whereby school participants develop the competencies to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems (Short & Greer, 1997, p. 134). Empowered teachers transform the traditional norms of teacher classroom isolation, cordiality, and privacy (Lortie, 1975) into those of collaborative activity, shared responsibility for learning, and independent work configurations (Ferrara, 1999). Empowered teachers leverage their decision-making power to improve a school's instructional

capacity (Spillane & Thompson, 1997) to succeed with all learners:

How teachers relate on a daily basis with each other may determine how teachers and students will relate in classrooms. Seeley (1981) and Sizer (1992) were among the first reformers to observe that school reform ultimately means changing how principals, teachers, students, and parents relate with each other. Teachers learning how to redesign their schools with colleagues are more likely to engage students in thoughtful inquiry. Berman and McLaughlin (1977) and Little (1982) both found that teachers engaged in innovative efforts and change in their classroom practices when they perceived that experimentation was encouraged and expected.

In connecting decentralization to teacher empowerment both in schools and classrooms, Marks and Louis (1997) conclude:

Teacher empowerment is linked to achievement [of students] not directly but indirectly. In schools with high levels of teacher empowerment, the school is organized for instructional success through professional community and collective responsibility for student learning. The instructional organization exerts a strong influence on authentic pedagogy, with achievement higher in schools where authentic pedagogy, as determined by instruction and assessment practices, is present. (Cited by Ferrara, 1999, p. 7)

Decentralization emerges as the sine qua non for

empowerment. Principals and teachers first need school-based decision-making ❚ power❚ devolving to them through decentralization of authority within school systems. Only then can empowered teachers empower students. Short & Greer (1997, p. 129) observe: School participants capable of initiating and carrying out new ideas create a positive work environment that, in turn, leads to enhanced learning opportunities for students. Only by empowering teachers (and principals and parents) will schools achieve academic success with all students who can (a) understand mathematical concepts, (b) interpret serious literature, (c) write creatively about their ideas and experiences, and (d) converse thoughtfully about history and science (Cohen & Hill, 1998).

The Commonwealth of Kentucky's school-based decision making (SBDM) model provides an ideal laboratory for examining the practical effects of this policy linkage between decentralization and teacher empowerment. The 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act mandated SBDM, which resulted in the creation of local school councils as the vehicle for school governance (David, 1994). The Kentucky SBDM model (Kentucky Revised Statutes § 160.345) specifies that school councils shall be composed of three teachers, two parents, and the school principal (or a multiple of this configuration).

Council members participate in administrative decision making in eight areas: curriculum, staff assignment, student assignment, scheduling, space utilization, planning and

resolution of instructional issues, discipline and classroom management, and extracurricular programs. Such wide-ranging authority provides Kentucky school councils with arguably the most extensive governance and policy-making authority in the United States. Teachers and parents assume council positions by making voluntary choices to pursue the position and by participating in local peer elections. The plurality of teachers on school councils provides the teacher corps with an influential and potentially decisive role in establishing policies related to school management and classroom instruction.

Whether teachers are attracted to school council service directly affects on how they relate to their peers, and indirectly affects how they relate to their students. Teachers who regard council service positively are more likely to help set collegial norms with their peers and to increase school instructional capacity. Teachers who regard school council service negatively may not contribute to fusing decentralization with teacher empowerment and professionalism, thereby increasing the probability this reform cycle may fail.

The school reform literature is devoid of empirical studies about whether or not teachers are attracted to school council service. Given that legislators and policy makers view SBDM as critical to school revitalization (David, 1994), this gap in the literature is unfortunate. Legislators in Kentucky mandated teacher membership on councils without knowing if

teachers are willing, or even able, to assume the roles of
policy maker and school leader. The purpose of this study was
to examine factors that may influence the attraction of
teachers to school councils.

Theoretical Frame for Teacher Attraction to School Councils

Although there is scant knowledge about factors that
impact teacher attraction to school council service,
researchers in the private- and education-sectors have
addressed individual attraction to traditional and non-
traditional work roles. The private-sector research in
particular offers theoretical frameworks useful for guiding
empirical research about teacher attraction to jobs and
organization roles. One such framework is the Rynes and Barber
(1990) job attraction model. These researchers postulate that
personal characteristics of the individual pursuing a position,
job attributes, and organization characteristics are among the
most salient influencers of individual attraction to position
vacancies. Our research addressed this proposition by assessing
the effects of personal characteristics, job attributes, and
organization characteristics on teacher attraction to positions
on local school councils.

Although teacher attraction to positions on school
councils has yet to be investigated empirically, there are
empirical studies about teacher attraction to the traditional
role of classroom instructor (Winter, 1997). These studies
informed the present research relative to: (a) factors that

influence teacher job attraction, (b) media used to operationalize announcements about teacher job vacancies, and (c) methods used to collect and analyze data about teacher job attraction.

Studies by Winter (1996a, 1996b) and by Young, Rinehart, and Heneman (1993) are recent empirical studies addressing factors that influence teacher job attraction. In one study examining the reactions of experienced female teachers to formal position announcements, teachers varied in their attraction to the job according to both the tone of the announcement and the stimulus used to encourage teachers to pursue the job (Winter, 1996b). Teachers rated a teaching vacancy most favorably when the position announcement had a personal rather than an impersonal tone. Also, a personal call from the school organization, rather than a mailed information packet or no inducement to apply for the job, resulted in greater likelihood that teachers would pursue the teaching vacancy. In a similar study Young, Rinehart, and Heneman (1993) detected two significant main effects. First, job applicants for teaching positions reacted more favorably to teaching positions described with intrinsic or work context job attributes than they did to jobs described with economic job attributes. Second, experienced applicants rated the teaching vacancies more favorably than did inexperienced applicants across all levels of job attributes. The above studies provide evidence that teacher reactions to jobs are influenced by

organization characteristics, job attributes, and personal characteristics.

With respect to the <u>media</u> used to operationalize teacher job vacancies, researchers have used a wide variety of externally valid media. These media have included formal position advertisements (Winter, 1996a), recruitment videos (Young, et al., 1993; Young, Rinehart, & Place, 1989), formal job descriptions (Rynes & Lawler, 1983), and recruitment brochures (Winter & Dunaway, 1997). The medium selected to operationalize the school council jobs in this study was the formal job description.

Relative to <u>methods</u> used to collect and analyze data, two methods used by researchers to address teacher job attraction have gained wide acceptance. The first method is the correlation design, whereby the independent variables are cast as predictors in a multiple regression analysis with teacher ratings of the job or work role serving as the criterion variable (e.g., Young & Heneman, 1986). The second method is the experimental design, usually involving factorial analysis of variance. With the experimental approach (e.g., Winter, 1996a; Winter, 1996b; Winter, 1997; Young, et al., 1989; Young, et al., 1993), factors posited as influencing teacher attraction to a job vacancy are cast as independent variables of interest with teacher job ratings serving as the dependent variable.

Methods

This research involved a blend of the correlation and experimental approaches described above. Randomly selected teachers role-played individuals considering a school council job and reacted to content-validated descriptions for a vacancy on the local school council. Personal characteristics of the participating teachers, job attributes, and organization factors associated with school councils served as the study focus. The data analysis procedure was hierarchical multiple regression (Cohen & Cohen, 1983, p. 120).

Variable entry into the regression equation proceeded according to a pre-specified order based on the logical order in which the variable becomes associated with a teacher. Teacher personal characteristics (age, gender, race) entered the equation first. Personal characteristics acquired through family and professional experience (number of dependent children, years of teaching experience, level of school assignment, experience as a school council member) entered the equation second. Organization factors (role of the principal on the council [chair, member]) and council job attributes (management, instructional leadership) associated with school councils entered the equation third. Dummy coding provided metric representation for nominal variables such as gender (1 = male, 2 = female) and council experience (0 = no, 1 = yes). The dependent variable for this investigation was a two-item

composite score for teacher rating of a school council
position.

Participants

The population for this study was all certified public
school teachers enrolled in graduate education courses at three
major state universities in Kentucky. The study participants
were experienced teachers ($\underline{N}$ = 318) who role-played teachers
evaluating a teacher vacancy on the local school council. The
role-playing exercise was externally valid because over 93% of
the schools in Kentucky had councils (Lindle, 1996) at the time
data were collected for this research. The participants
represented a broad cross-section of teachers in Kentucky in
terms of such personal characteristics as age, gender, level of
school assignment, and teaching experience. Descriptive data
for the study participants appear in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Sampling Procedure

The teachers participating in the study were selected at
random and assigned at random to treatment conditions varied
across three factors: level of teacher job assignment
(elementary school, middle school level, high school), council
job attributes (management, instructional leadership), and role

of the principal on the council (chair, member with a teacher serving as chair).

The number of participants was determined by a power analysis conducted according to procedures explicated by Cohen and Cohen (1983, pp. 116-118). The purpose of the power analysis was to minimize the probability of committing a Type II error; that is, failing to detect significance when significance exists (Cohen, 1988). The parameters for the power analysis were: (a) a minimum power level (power = .80); (b) a specified alpha level (alpha = .05); and (c) an estimated effect size ($\underline{R}$-squared = .05). The above procedures rendered a minimum required sample size ($\underline{N}$ = 318).

Data Collection

The study participants performed three tasks. First, participants completed a biographical data form that yielded information required for descriptive statistics and for measures of the seven teacher personal characteristics serving as independent variables. Second, the participants read one of four content-validated versions of a formal job description for a teacher vacancy on the local school council. Each version of the job description emphasized one of two validated sets of school council job attributes: management job attributes or instructional leadership job attributes. Also, each of the four versions of the position description specified whether the principal was the council chair or a council member with a teacher serving as chair. As the third research task the

participants completed a two-item instrument that captured the
degree of teacher attraction to the school council job depicted
in the job description.

Independent Variables

The nine independent variables examined in this study
included these seven personal characteristics of the teachers:
age, gender, race, number of dependent children, years of
teaching experience, level of school assignment (elementary,
middle school, high school), and experience as a school council
member (yes, no). Two other independent variables were
experimentally manipulated factors related to characteristics
of the school organization and job attributes associated with
school council service. The organization characteristic was the
role of the principal (chair, member only with a teacher
serving as chair). The job attributes factor consisted of
school council job attributes (management, instructional
leadership) emphasized in the school council job descriptions.

Examining the contrast of the principal as the council
chair versus a teacher serving as the council chair was
selected as a focal organizational characteristic in this study
because some researchers (e.g., Malen & Ogawa, 1988) have found
that teacher willingness to participate in decision making is
impacted negatively by teacher reluctance to challenge the
authority of the principal as the administrator and decision
maker. (See Cuban [1988] for principal's traditional managerial
authority.) Casting the principal as either the chair or as a

member with a teacher serving as chair was an a valid procedure. School council regulations in Kentucky permit the principal either to serve as the council chair or to request a waiver from the Kentucky Department of Education for another council member, usually a teacher, to serve as the council chair.

Investigating managerial versus instructional leadership job attributes was a study focus because researchers (e.g., Johnson, 1990; Schneider, 1984) have found that teacher participation in administrative decision making represents a challenge to implicit agreements between principals and teachers to stay within the boundaries of their tradition roles as, respectively, school administrator and classroom instructor. Developing the management and instructional leadership job attributes proceeded according to content validation procedures explicated by Anastasi (1976) and used in previous teacher job attraction investigations (Winter, 1996a; Winter, 1996b; Winter & Dunaway, 1997; Young, et al., 1989; Young, et al., 1993).

The validation process consisted of six steps. The first step was a literature review (e.g., Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Cuban, 1988; Greenfield, 1995; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Murphy, 1992) conducted to generate a preliminary list of management and instructional leadership job attributes. The second step was to identify management and instructional job attributes specified by the Kentucky Education Reform Act

legislation as job duties accorded to school councils. In the third step a panel of six experts Q-sorted the job attributes into management and instructional leadership content domains.

As the fourth validation step, a pilot group of 24 teachers rated the job attributes. The fifth step was to array the rated job attributes by content domain (management, instructional leadership) in rank order according to mean score, and by job attribute pairs (the highest rated management attribute paired with the highest rated instructional leadership attribute and so forth). The last validation step was to select attribute pairs (management-instruction) equivalent in mean score and standard deviation to serve as the basis for writing council job descriptions reflecting either management or instructional leadership job attributes.

The job descriptions had three paragraphs. The first paragraph (held constant across the four versions of the position description) contained such general information as: "a teacher school council position is available." The second paragraph described job duties for a teacher position on the local school council using either managerial or instructional job attributes. The job duties paragraph manipulated the job attributes variable (management, instructional leadership) based on the job attributes derived from the content validation procedures described above. A third paragraph indicated that the principal served either as the council chair or member with a teacher serving as chair. Manipulation checks conducted with

17

a pilot group ($\underline{N}$ = 18) confirmed study participants perceived

the job attributes and principal role descriptions as intended.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was teacher rating of a school

council position, measured by an additive composite score

composed of two items with five-point, Likert-type scales (5

being most favorable): (a) "How likely would you be to pursue

the job of school council member described?" and (b) "How

likely would you be to run for the job of school council member

if nominated by other teachers?" The items forming the

composite score were modified versions of items used in

previous research about teacher job attraction (Winter, 1996a;

Winter, 1996b; Young et al., 1989; Young et al., 1993). The

computed internal consistency for the two-item composite score,

as measured by coefficient alpha, was .88 (a reliability

coefficient well above the minimum recommended by Nunnally and

Bernstein [1994] for use of a composite score in statistical

analysis).

Study Limitations

Two factors may have influenced the generalizability of

our study. Our teacher participants reacted to job descriptions

for positions on a school council as a simulation. Teachers

pursuing council positions under actual conditions might have

reacted to the job descriptions differently than did the

participants in this study. Second, our teacher participants

were from Kentucky, a state with reform legislation specific to

school councils. Teachers from other states operating under

council mandates different from those in Kentucky might have

reacted differently than did the participants in this study.

<div align="center">Results</div>

The results of the multiple regression provided an

assessment of teacher attraction to council service (see Table

2). Holding all other variables in the equation constant,

_____

<div align="center">Insert Table 2 about here</div>

_____

the number of dependent children had a significant negative

impact on teacher ratings ($p < .01$), with teacher attraction to

the job decreasing as the number of dependent children

increased. Experience in having served on a school council also

had a significant negative impact on teacher ratings ($p < .01$).

Teachers who had served on school councils rated the job less

favorably than did teachers who had never served on councils.

As indicated by the computed R-squared (see Table 2), the two

significant factors explained 6.8 percent of the variance in

teacher rating of a school council position.

<div align="center">Discussion</div>

How teachers react to council service is important because

many school reform packages in both Canada and the United

States (Wohlstetter, Smyer, & Mohrman 1994) mandate teacher

<div align="center">19</div>

participation in site-based decision making. Empowered staffs,
the reasoning goes, are more likely to form professional
communities to maximize academic opportunity for all students.
In our research job attraction theory grounded a study of
school councils in Kentucky, the state with perhaps the most
comprehensive reform package.

The finding that teachers with larger numbers of dependent
children were less attracted to school council service than
were teachers with fewer dependent children is salient because
family commitments is one of several contextual factors largely
ignored by policymakers. Reformers and legislators, however,
cannot ignore the practical realities of the everyday life of
the teacher. Women currently represent 74% of the teacher corps
(National Center for Education Statistics, 1998), and many
teachers are juggling career and family responsibilities. The
additional role of school policy maker translates into an
immense add-on to the already-considerable workload of school
teachers. Other researchers have commented about the trade-off
between council service and teacher work life. Van Meter (1994)
found that teacher turnover on Kentucky school councils was
high because, at the same time teacher service on school
councils was mandated, teachers assumed responsibility for
implementing the many other programmatic features of the
Kentucky Education Reform Act (e.g., ungraded primary program,
Family Resource Center, accountability measures).

That teachers with experience on school councils regarded the job more negatively than teachers who had never served on a council is a cause for concern. Rinehart, Short, and Johnson (1994) found there was little evidence that Kentucky teachers perceived themselves as more empowered as a result of SBDM. In our study teachers rating school council service as ''less attractive'' after they have served are unlikely to perceive themselves as empowered. Both these findings negate the assumed connection between SBDM and creating organization conditions conducive to school renewal made by school reformers such as Wohlstetter et al., (1994):

> [E]ffective SBDM results when districts and schools establish organizational conditions that foster involvement, and these conditions provide the context necessary for promoting organizational learning and integrating processes. In turn, these learning and integrating processes enable participants to generate, implement, and become effective at applying new approaches to curriculum and instruction. (p. vi)

Our finding, and that of Rinehart et al. (1994) are consistent, however, with what researchers have learned over the last 25 years about school change. The prevalent, seemingly intractable teacher workplace norms of privacy, autonomy, and equality identified by Lortie (1975) are antithetical to the role of teacher as school decision maker. Teachers are socialized to respect peer individual autonomy. Creating

teacher leaders with managerial responsibilities implies that
some colleagues are higher than others in professional status.
In our study, council service unintentionally may have cast
teachers in a role perceived by their peers as counter to
prevailing norms: Teachers are classroom experts and not
managers. (See Hart [1990] and Smylie & Denny [1990] for this
dilemma.)

It is one thing for a school council to implement a policy
of block scheduling with built-in time for teacher counseling
with homeroom students. It is quite another, however, for the
very teachers who helped formulate the policy to then revert to
the teacher role and actually implement these changes. An
observation by a teacher-participant in Smylie and Denny's
(1990) study about lead teachers stepping outside of their
classroom role is illustrative: ". . .I don't want to be
different from other teachers" (p. 254).

Implications and Recommendations

This study does not paint council service as a yellow-
brick road to teacher empowerment, which once again bumps up
against the harsh realities of teacher work life. If we are not
accumulating evidence that school councils empower teachers
(e.g., by setting collaborative norms within the teacher
corps), then we might speculate that council service is
detrimental to the ultimate goal: teachers achieving success
with all learners. Council service involves a new role and work
duties that fall within the policymaking and administrative

arenas, roles for which many teachers (a) have no formal training and little or no professional experience, and (b) may have little inclination to accept. In the haste to implement the 1990 reform package, Kentucky legislators paid too little attention to teacher work life in two regards. First, teachers have lives outside of school and they now are overwhelmed with policy demands ranging from serving on school councils to participating in school planning to performing student assessment. Second, when not playing the role of school policymaker, teacher leaders have to survive along with their teacher peers in the trenches.

Findings from this study imply that legislators and other reformers did not heed the advice of astute school observers like Waller, who in 1932 concluded that education reform needed to start with teacher commonsense and insight. Almost 60 years later Fullan (1991) reiterated that the teacher perspective (e.g., teacher readiness and resources for change) was not being heeded. The truth of the matter is that we have not treated teachers well in the US reform cycles. Since World War II our reform policy has been regulatory and prescriptive (Kirst & Jung, 1986) and not sensitive to the work context of teachers.

There is no evidence in the school reform literature that teachers are willing to assume an additional workload, such as that imposed by school council service, without job restructuring or work incentives. Wohlstetter, et al. (1994, p.

283) question "whether the massive changes implied by school reform can be accomplished without incentives." (See Conley and Levinson [1992] for job work redesign.) That teachers who have served on school councils regard the job more negatively than do teachers who have not served on councils underscores the disjunction between policy formation and implementation.

Empowering teachers to be vital, influential school leaders is a difficult task. In examining field studies about schools going through ''restructuring,'' Keedy and Achilles (1997) speculated that schools might be confusing structural thinking (adopting and implementing organization structures like SBDM, cooperative learning groups, teacher-student advisories) with normative thinking (reconceptualizing how norms characterizing ideal relationships among teachers, principals, and students can be supported and developed through organization structures). The school council is a means to an end (empowering teachers, parents, and students) not an end in itself. Teachers serving on school councils, however, may be burning out already.

The above observation leads us to the crucial reform dimension of enabling policies (cf. Elmore, 1995). Policy makers not only should provide teachers with incentive packages but also with intellectual workplace learning conditions, because teachers now must learn more subject matter and improve their skills. According to Spillane and Thompson (1997), teachers also must unlearn much of their practical pedagogical

knowledge, such as assumptions about the classroom conditions
for student learning. This ''reconstructive learning'' requires
sustained, honest, and substantive interaction about new ideas
with people who understand these new ideas for effective
instruction at least a little better than most teachers. (Also
see David [1994, p. 4] for capacity building.)

The question remains: Where have Kentucky legislators
provided for these enabling policies relative to school
councils? Teachers serving on school councils should either be
paid for their time or have eleven-month contracts. They need
to be trained in problem solving, conflict resolution, and data
analysis. Lindle (1996) suggested that technical assistance be
delivered on an as-needed, issue-related basis rather than via
single-presentation, topic-based six hour training sessions.
(Also see David [1993] on the need for long-term training.)
Training also might occur during council service so that
consultants can facilitate the change from classroom teacher to
decision maker. Teachers might serve three-year terms so they
have time to learn how to excel at shared decision making.

Our findings do not dispute the assumption that teacher
empowerment through shared governance will result in improved
instruction and student learning (cf. Smylie, 1992).
Researchers, however, have yet to establish an empirically
based linkage between shared governance and teacher
empowerment. Our findings suggest family commitments such as
dependent children and service on school councils attenuate

teacher attraction to council service. These findings make sense because council service adds duties to the teacher workload and casts teachers in the non-traditional role of policymaker.

Additional research is needed about factors that increase teacher attraction to school councils. Under what conditions are teachers attracted to school councils? How do our most proficient principals help create school conditions conducive to developing teacher leaders? Should school boards provide incentive packages for teachers to serve on school councils? On-going research is vital to addressing the concerns brought up both by this study and by researchers like Wohlstetter et al. (1994), David (1994) and Lindle (1996). If teacher willingness to serve on school councils is essential both to teacher empowerment and to improving curriculum and instruction, then we hope that future studies can discover the factors and working conditions that make school council service attractive to teachers.

References

Anastasi, A. (1976). Psychological testing (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. 7. Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal, Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 34-64.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Cohen, D. K., & Hill, H. C. (1998). State policy and classroom performance: Mathematics reform in California (CPRE Policy Briefs). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Conley, S., & Levinson, R. (1992, April). Rewards, incentives, and work redesign. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

David, J. L. (1993). School-based decision making: Progress and promise. Lexington, KY: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 044)

David, J. L. (1994). School-based decision making: Kentucky's test of decentralization. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 706-712.

Elmore, R. F. (1995). Structural capacity and high-performance standards. Educational Researcher, 24, 23-26.

Ferrara, D. L. (1999, April). School-site autonomy in Italian schools: Receptivity to and capacity for change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Fullan, M. G., with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31, 61-85.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32, 5-44.

Hart, A. W. (1990). Impacts of the school social unit on teacher authority during work redesign. _American Educational Research Journal, 27,_ 503-532.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Redesigning teachers' work. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), _Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform_ (pp. 125-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keedy, J. L., & Achilles, C. M. (1997). The need for school-constructed theories in practice in U.S. school restructuring. _Journal of Educational Administration, 35,_ 102-121.

Kentucky Education Reform Act, Kentucky Revised Statute § 160.345 (1990).

Kirst, M. W., & Jung, R. (1986). Beyond Mutual Adaptation, Into the Bully Pulpit. _Educational Administration Quarterly, 22, (1),_ 17-33.

Lindle, J. C. (1996). School-based decision making. In J. C. Lindle, J. Petrosko & R. Pankratz (Eds.), _1996 Review of Research on the Kentucky Educational Reform Act,_ (pp. 245-267). Frankfort, KY: The Kentucky Institute for Education Research.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. _American Educational Research Journal, 19,_ 325-340.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). _Schoolteacher: A sociological study._ Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). <u>Improving the urban</u> <u>high school</u>. New York: Teachers College Press.

Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. <u>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10,</u> 251-270.

Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. <u>Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19,</u> 245-275.

Murphy, J. (1991). <u>School restructuring: Capturing and</u> <u>assessing the phenomena.</u> New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. (1992). <u>The landscape of leadership</u> <u>preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators.</u> Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). <u>Digest</u> <u>of education statistics, 1998</u> (U. S. Department of Education Publication No. NCES 1999-036). Washington, DC: Author.

Newmann, F. M., Wehlage, G. C. (1995). <u>Successful school</u> <u>restructuring: A report to the public and educators by the</u> <u>Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.</u> Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Noblit, G. W., Rogers, D. L., & McCadden, B. M. (1995). In the meantime: The possibilities of caring. <u>Phi Delta Kappan,</u> <u>76,</u> 680-685.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). Reinventing government. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Warner Books.

Rinehart, J. S., Short, P., & Johnson, P. (1994, April). Empowerment and conflict in school based and non-school based sites. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Rynes, S. L., & Barber, A. E. (1990). Applicant attraction strategies: An organizational perspective. Academy of Management Review, 15, 286-310.

Rynes, S. L., & Lawler, J. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue job alternatives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 620-631.

Schneider, G. T. (1984). Teacher involvement in decision making: Zones of acceptance, decision conditions, and job satisfaction. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18, 25-32.

Seeley, D. S. (1981). Education through Partnership. Cambridge: Ballinger.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Sizer, T. R. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14, 53-67.

Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 235-259.

Spillane, J. P., & Thompson, C. L. (1997). Reconstructing conceptions of local capacity: The local education agency's capacity for ambitious instructional reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19, 185-203.

Van Meter, E. J. (1994). Implementing school-based decision making in Kentucky. NASSP Bulletin, 78(563), 61-70.

Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley.

Wasley, P. A. (1991). From quarterback to coach: From actor to director. Educational Leadership, 48, 35-36.

Winter, P. A. (1996a). Applicant evaluations of formal position advertisements: The influence of sex, job message content, and information order. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10, 105-116.

Winter, P. A. (1996b). Recruiting experienced educators: A model and a test. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 29, 163-171.

Winter, P. A. (1997). Educational recruitment and selection: A review of recent studies and recommendations for best practice. In L. Wildman (Ed.), Fifth NCPEA Yearbook (pp. 133-140). Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Winter, P. A., & Dunaway, D. M. (1997). Reactions of teachers, as applicants, to principal recruitment practices in a reform environment: The effects of job attributes, job information source, and school level. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 30, 144-153.

Wohlstetter, P., Smyer, R., & Mohrman, S. A. (1994). New boundaries for school management: The high involvement model. Educational Evaluation and Policy analysis, 16, 268-286.

Young, I. P., & Heneman, H. G. III (1986). Predictors of interviewee reactions to the selection interview. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19, 29-36.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., Heneman, H. G. III (1993). Effects of job attribute categories, applicant job experience, and recruiter sex on applicant job attractiveness ratings. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7, 55-66.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Place, A. W. (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical contact. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5, 329-336.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Study Participants

Variable	Mean	Median	SD	Range
Age	34.1	32.0	7.6	24-56
Gender	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)
Race	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)
# Dependent Children	1.0	1.0	1.1	0-4
Teaching Exper. (Years)	5.3	4.0	4.3	1-25
School Level Assignment	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
Teacher Rating Dep. Var.	5.6	5.0	2.3	2-10

(a)   Female (n = 252), Male (n = 66)

(b)   White (n = 296), Minority (n = 22)

(c)   Elementary (n = 149), Middle School (n = 89),

      High School (n = 80)

N = 318

Table 2

Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Teacher Job Rating on the
Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Beta Coefficient	$\underline{t}$ Value
Age	-.003	-.039
Gender	.039	.671
Race	.051	.922
Dep. Children	-.152	-2.519*
School Level	-.071	-1.181
Teaching Exper.	-.006	-.098
Council Member	-.153	-2.686*
Job Attributes	.077	1.388
Council Role	-.016	-.282

$\underline{R}$-Square = .068   [$\underline{F}$ (9, 308) = 2.497. $\underline{p}$ < .01]

$\underline{N}$ = 318

* $\underline{p}$ < .01

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: " TEACHER SERVICE ON SCHOOL COUNCILS: ARE TEACHERS ATTRACTED TO THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF SCHOOL-BASED DECISION MAKING?"

Author(s): PAUL A. WINTER, JOHN L. KEEDY, AND ROSE MARY NEWTON

Corporate Source: ANNUAL MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION (UCEA)

Publication Date: OCTOBER 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ ☒	Level 2A ↑ ☐	Level 2B ↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Paul A. Winter

Organization/Address: UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE EDUC. BLDG. #325 LOUISVILLE, KY 40292

Printed Name/Position/Title: PAUL A. WINTER, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Telephone: (502) 852-0617 FAX: (502) 852-0616

E-Mail Address: WINTER@ louisville.edu

Date: 11-3-99

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
N/A
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
N/A
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com