

**Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana**

By

Alfred Kuranchie ([kuranchiealf@yahoo.com](mailto:kuranchiealf@yahoo.com))

Department of Social Studies Education, University of Education, Winneba, Ghana

Bertha Azaare Akuta ([berthaazaare@gmail.com](mailto:berthaazaare@gmail.com))

Department of Education, St Ambrose College of Education, Dormaa Akwamu, Ghana.

Mable Anane ([mapanane72@gmail.com](mailto:mapanane72@gmail.com))

Department of Education, Foso College of Education, Assin Foso, Ghana.

**Abstract**

The study aimed to unravel teachers' involvement in decision-making in senior high schools. Descriptive survey design was employed to guide the conduct of the study. A sample size of 280 respondents provided data to answer the research questions and test the hypothesis. Stratified and simple random sampling methods were used to select the schools and teachers in two administrative districts in Ghana. The data was gathered via self-administered questionnaire, which was pre-tested. Both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were employed to analyse the data. The study revealed that teachers participate in taking decisions on some issues albeit unsatisfactory. The teachers participate mostly in taking decisions on issues related to student disciplinary problems and sporting activities. There is, however, no statistically significant difference in the participation of male and female teachers in decision making in the schools. It is concluded that, in view of the low involvement of teachers in school level decision making, the cogency of teachers' role in decision-making in the schools had not been given due attention and consideration. This has the potency to affect the quality of overall activities of the schools in general and teaching and learning process in particular. It would be worthwhile for the heads of the schools to create and facilitate conditions that elicit teachers' views of decisions that affect the running of the schools. The teachers' involvement in decision making at the school level needs to be upscaled and intensified by the heads of schools.

**Key words:** Decision making, school-level decision making, teachers' involvement, senior high school.

**Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana**

By

Alfred Kuranchie, Bertha Azaare Akuta and Mable Anane

**Introduction**

Decision making is a process of choosing an action from many alternatives, which may need the inputs of other people (Talat, 2013). Managing a school entails making a lot of decisions. This underscores Lunenburg's (2018) postulation that decision making is 'a way of life' in the education sector and it pervades all levels of education. At the various levels of education, various decisions are taken to guide the affairs of students, teachers, head teachers and other stakeholders of education. Essentially, decisions are made to direct the daily affairs of schools. These are school-level decisions that are made frequently for the smooth running of schools or educational institutions. Besides the major decisions that are made by the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Ghana Education Service (GES) and the Regional and District Directorates of Education, schools have the right to take decisions to regulate their operational activities. School-level decisions could be taken by administrators alone or in collaboration with the staff, depending on the wish of the school leaders. Such decisions are taken on issues ranging from teaching and learning, formulating policies, rules and regulations, budgeting and finances, infrastructure, sports and games as well as student and staff welfare issues.

Decision making is cumbersome but essential, which may need ideas from relevant stakeholders. Involving other people in taking decision is deemed a participatory decision making. Participatory decision-making is perceived as an aspect of shared leadership, and the idea of involving teachers in school-level decision making is known in literature (Cheruto & Salome, 2011). Governing Boards, Parents Associations (PAs) and School Management Committees (SMCs) are also involved in taking some school-level decisions for proper functioning of schools. Due to the growing appreciation of the need for valid and knowledgeable inputs into administrative decision making from various organizational levels, the need to involve stakeholders in decision making is of a paramount importance (Mualuko, 2009). Although the idea of participation in decision making is an ancient old idea and practice in organisations in Ghana, it became a common and vigorous practice in various sectors of the economy as a result of the decentralisation policy adopted in 1988.

Since the decentralisation policy was embraced by the state and widely practised at the district assembly or political level, the practice has been more emphasised in the field of education. All levels of education have bought into the idea of deemphasising centralization as opposed to emphasizing decentralisation. In educational institutions, some amount of power and authority are accorded low levels for decision making and efficient operations. A participatory approach in school management has been acknowledged as an essential ingredient in the quest for better schools (Blase, 2003). Involving teachers in decision making brings about different potential benefits that contribute to the social capital essential for excellent schools (World Bank, 2010, Wadesango, 2011). In schools, effective teacher involvement in decision making can be an approach of practising participatory management. Consequently, school heads are encouraged to

involve teachers in decision making to improve school and students' performance. Teachers are the custodians of instructions, implementers of school policies and curriculum as well as co-organisers of school events and activities. Further, the decisions made in schools affect them and as professionals and specialists in different subject areas, they are better suited to make right decisions having in mind what is required of them as teachers (Mualuko, 2009).

Teachers at the senior high schools, for instance, possess varied academic backgrounds and experiences that school authorities can galvanise and leverage on to make solid and cogent decisions, *ceteris paribus*, to help move the schools forward. When teachers are made to participate in school-level decisions, their knowledge and experiences could be brought to bear to help make cogent decisions for efficient management of the schools. According to Gemechu (2014), the main goal of teachers' involvement in decision making and school administration is to enhance productivity and effectiveness of schools. The quality of students and schools' performance largely depends upon teachers who occupy most important places in teaching and learning process in schools. According to Mueller and Gokturk (2010), teachers can play a greater role in the overall success of the school when they are made to be active in decision making process. The entire system will benefit when teachers play an active role in controlling their work environment (Pashiardis, 2004). Leithwood and Steinbach (2003) postulate that headmasters need to develop a positive school climate; ensure opportunity for teachers' collaboration and joint planning through a greater involvement in decision-making.

Katzenmeyer and Moller (2006) also contend that headmasters are responsible for striving to make schools a work place in which teachers have autonomy to make decisions about their work. Leaders ought to create an environment favourable for eliciting teachers' views and ideas which are essential for effective running of schools. Teacher participation in decision making does not only improve the affairs of schools but also the teachers and their work. Studies buttress this point. For instance, Wadesango (2010) found that teachers' participation in decision making can result in expansion of their authority and influence at the workplace, enhance motivation and morale, foster collegial interaction, capitalise on and contribute to teachers' expertise and engender satisfaction, enhance commitment and improve performance. Also, Sagvandy and Omidan's (2015) study found that teacher involvement in decision making aids to increase teacher productivity to the benefit of students, Tchapchapchet, Iwu and Ille (2014) found that teacher participation in decision making has a positive impact on the effectiveness, efficiency and productivity of staff. Again, Nguassa and Gabriel's (2017) study established relationship between teacher participation in decision making and teacher commitment. Furthermore, a study conducted by Meintjes (2018) found that the habit of involving teachers in decision making strengthens teacher commitment to work and encourage them to develop accountability as professionals. Ayegbusi and Ogunlade (2015) and Dada (2008) also established relationship between teacher involvement in decision making and job satisfaction.

The search for the nexus between teacher participation in decision making and teacher outputs is unending. More studies have corroborated the earlier ones. A study carried out by Haryanto (2020) revealed a significant link between teachers' participation in academic planning and teacher job performance in secondary schools. Rawis and Kaligis (2017) also found a link between teacher involvement and student academic achievement while Macha and Mhagama (2022) found that teachers' involvement in decision making contributes to enhancing efficiency, commitment, accountability and eventually student performance. Similarly, Okuoko and

**Citation:** Kuranchie, A; Akuta, B. A & Anane, M. (2022). Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*. 6(9), 55 – 69.

Dwamena (2014) cited in Macha and Mhagama (2022) found that teacher involvement in decision making has a positive relationship with commitment and performance. Another study carried out by Uzogor and Nwankwo (2020) unveiled that the principals believed that teacher participation in decision making yields positive dividends. Consequently, the principals greatly involved teachers in decisions especially on phenomena that concerned students and staff. When teachers are highly involved in taking various and vital decisions essential for the running of schools, their commitment to work increases and consequently leads to job performance improvement.

Kipkoech and Chesire (2011) observed that although teacher involvement in decision making helps to improve effectiveness of schools to achieve their set goals, their study found that teacher involvement in school level decision making was low. The plethora of studies highlighted have undoubtedly made it clear that teacher participation in decision making benefits teachers, students and schools in many and diverse ways. In spite of the correlation between teacher participation in decision making and school, teachers and students' development, however, some schools tend to reserve decision making solely for central administrators. Studies have revealed that heads of schools do not take delight in involving teachers in decision making. Some of such studies include the following: According to Wadesango (2011), most teachers indicated that in the schools, their heads made unilateral decisions and imposed them on teachers for implementation.

Hammad's (2017) study also disclosed that teachers did not regard school decision significant and relevant concern to them as important decisions were made by central administration. Another study conducted by Yao (2014) found that most of the school leaders did not include teachers in school decision processes while Gemechu's (2014) study found that teacher involvement in decision making was unsatisfactory. In another twist, Kariuki's (2018) study found that school heads involved teachers in decision making on only pedagogical issues. This finding implies that teachers in the schools were involved in taking decisions that concerned only teaching and learning issues, anything less than that they were not called upon to make inputs.

A similar study by Kipkoech and Chesire (2011) found that teachers were less involved in taking decision on procurement of school materials and that as the school heads took most of the managerial decisions. Studies such as Smylie (2002), Algoush (2010), Gardian and Rathore (2010) and Dampson and Afful-Broni (2018) also came up with similar findings that teacher participation in school decision making was unsatisfactory. It is however averred by UNESCO (2015) that "without the participation of teachers in the management of affairs of schools, changes in education are impossible". In an apparent support of this view, Bush (2003) avers that successful school managers in Britain involve their teachers in all vital policy decision issues. This presupposition confirms that teachers are the cornerstone of school activities, who have to be made part and parcel of deciding important issues that affect management of schools. According to UNESCO (2005), decision making in senior high schools without the involvement of teachers, schools' development is restricted and will further affect the development of nation's human resources. On the contrary, studies have discovered that not all schools shun teachers' inputs in decision making. Some schools actively involve teachers in decision making at the school level. A study executed by Newcombe and McCormick (2001) noted that in some schools, teachers were required to attend many meetings such as budget and finance planning

**Citation:** Kuranchie, A; Akuta, B. A & Anane, M. (2022). Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*. 6(9), 55 – 69.

group committees. They were encouraged to be involved in a wide variety of financial issues. Asefa (2005), Legesse (2008) and Wondesen (2011) also unraveled that teachers did participate in decision making in the schools.

Another study conducted by Mugambi (2015) found that most school heads involved their assistants and teachers in decision making. Not all, a study carried out by Eris, Kayhan, Bastas and Gamar (2017) discovered that school heads well involved their staff in decision making processes. Ayegbesi and Ogunlade (2020) also discovered active involvement of teachers in decision making on issues such as school financial management, staff welfare and school academic and co-curricular activities. The plethora of researches reviewed demonstrate mix findings on teacher involvement in school-level decision making. That is, while some studies have unearthed school heads' unilateral decision making pattern in some schools, others portray the contrary where some heads of schools reckon the essence of involving teachers in school-level decision making and consequently make them part and parcel of taking decisions for effective management of their schools.

The discrepancies in the findings of the previous studies ignited the need to join the discussion by surveying the extent of teacher participation in senior high schools in one of the burgeoning regions of Ghana, the Bono region which has schools that are well placed in the ranking of senior high schools; a rating of senior high schools' performance by the West African Examination Council (WAEC). There was also dearth of data as whether or not both male and female teachers are equally made to participate in school-level decision making. Essentially, education practitioners, authorities and researchers, among other stakeholders, ought to know the gender difference or otherwise in teacher participation in decision making at the school level.

### **Study Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- i) examine the extent of teachers' involvement in decision-making in the schools.
- ii) determine the gender differences in teacher involvement in decision making in the schools.
- iii) gauge teachers' views on the importance of teacher involvement in decision making in school.

### **Research Questions and Hypothesis**

The following research questions and hypothesis guided the study:

- i) To what extent are teachers involved in decision-making in the schools?
- ii) What are teachers' views on importance of teacher involvement in decision making in schools?
- iii) Ho: There is no statistically significant difference in male and female teachers' involvement in decision making in the schools?

### **Methodology**

#### **Research Approach and Design**

Quantitative approach informed the direction of the study in view of the set objectives. Descriptive survey design was employed for the study. The choice of the descriptive research design to guide the conduct of the study helped to gather data to describe and interpret current conditions of the phenomena under investigation. Descriptive survey describes with emphasis

what actually exists such as current conditions and practices of situations or phenomena (Kuranchie, 2021, Best & Kahn, 2010). Via this design, the study sought information on the extent of teacher participation in decision making at the school level and teachers' views on the relevance of their involvement in school-level decision making. The design also assisted in describing the characteristics of a large population and utilised a large sample in making the results of the study statistically relevant.

### **Population and Sample**

The population of the study was made up of teachers in the Bono region of Ghana while those of the senior high schools in two administrative districts formed the accessible population. Through stratified proportionate and simple random sampling methods, 285 teachers were selected to participate in the study. Teachers who had worked in the schools for more than two years but were not holding administrative positions qualified for inclusion in the study. Teachers who had been in the schools for two or more years would have had ample time and opportunity to be involved in taking decisions on some of the issues studied. Besides, those holding administrative positions would necessarily be involved in taking some vital decisions for the school. Meanwhile, the intention of the study was to ascertain teachers in general participation in decision making at the school level. The selected respondents met the inclusion criteria set and hence they provided data to answer the research questions and also tested the hypothesis.

### **Instrumentation**

Questionnaire was designed and used to gather data from the respondents. The questionnaire comprised only open-ended items. The instrument had three sections: Section 'A' covered personal information about the respondents; Section 'B' elicited data about the extent of teachers' involvement in decision making at the school level; and Section 'C' dealt with teachers' views on teacher involvement in decision making. Prior to administration of the instrument, it was taken through a rigorous process to check for validity and reliability. Pre-testing of the instrument was conducted in three senior high schools in an administrative district which shares similar features with the schools where the main study was done. The pre-testing result, ( $r=0.83$ ), showed that the instrument was good enough to warrant its use for data gathering for the main study. Both validity and reliability processes resulted in having a good instrument for the data collection.

Two weeks were used to gather data from the respondents in the sampled schools after all administrative procedures had been done. Although all the questionnaires administered were retrieved, some of them were found unusable as they were not properly filled by some respondents. This resulted in as a 95% return rate of the self-administered instrument.

### **Data Analysis**

When the data was collected, it was screened, coded, tabulated and organised for analysis. The organised and coded data was stored in an editable excel spreadsheet which was imported to SPSS, version 25.0. Frequency and percentage, mean and standard deviation, and independent samples t-test were used to analyse the data. All required ethical procedures were scrupulously followed in the conduct of the study. For example, the respondents were assured of confidentiality of their responses and concealment of their identity: they were not required to

provide data that could reveal their identity. The respondents also voluntarily participated in the study and they had the right to opt of the process at any time they wanted without assigning any reason. In addition, the respondents were not coerced, in any form, to provide data.

### **Study Results**

This section of the write-up presents results of the study. The section is in two parts: Part 1: Personal information of the respondents and Part 11: Answers to the research questions and the hypothesis.

#### **Part: Personal Information of the Respondents**

In order to have a good picture of the teachers who took part in the study, the respondents were required to indicate their gender, age range, years of work experience and educational attainment. This information helps to make a mental picture of the calibre of respondents who participated in the study and the cogency of data they provided. Table 1 presents the personal information of the respondents as they provided during the data collection.

**Table 1: Personal of the Respondents**

		Frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	154	55
	Female	126	45
<b>Total</b>		<b>280</b>	<b>100</b>
Age range	<30 years	52	18.6
	31-40 years	41	14.6
	41-50 years	105	37.5
	51-60 years	82	29.3
<b>Total</b>		<b>280</b>	<b>100</b>
Years in service	1-5 years	42	15.0
	6-10 years	34	12.1
	11-15 years	134	47.9
	16-20years	58	20.7
	>20 years	12	4.3
<b>Total</b>		<b>280</b>	<b>100</b>
Highest qualification	1 <sup>st</sup> degree	216	77.1
	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree	56	20.0
	Others	8	2.9
<b>Total</b>		<b>280</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Field study, 2022**

As can be observed in the Table 1, 55% of the respondents were males while 45% were females. The responses indicate that the male representation of the teachers in the study is slightly above that of the female. The difference in the gender representation in the study necessitated the need to ascertain whether both male and female teachers were offered equal chance to contribute to

decision making at the schools. Hence, the testing of the hypothesis on the gendered nature of teacher involvement in school-level decision.

The responses also portray that 37.5% of the respondents were between the 41 and 50 years, which was followed by 29.3% who were between the 51 and 60 years bracket. It is also seen in the table that 18.6% of the respondents were less than 30 years while 14.6% of them were between 31 and 40 years. The responses depict that the majority of the respondents were over 40 years, insinuating that most of the teachers in the schools were matured enough to make substantial contributions to decisions that are made at the school level should they be given the opportunity to be involved in the decision making process. The responses further demonstrate that the respondents who had been in the teaching service between 11 and 15 years (47.9%) formed the majority, which was followed by those (20.7%) who had served the education service between 16 and 20 years.

The results portray that cumulatively, the respondents who had served more than 10 years in the teaching service were close to 70%, which formed a vast majority of the respondents. The respondents who had been in the teaching service between 1-10 years were about 30%. The disproportionate chunk of the teachers who had worked with the Ghana Education Service for more than a decade was convincing enough to study their participation in decision making at the school-level. Their long years in the teaching service positioned them to make good contributions to decision making at the school level. They also were probable to have good institutional memory of the practices of the teaching service which could serve as a reservoir of knowledge to help make good decisions for the education service.

Moreover, the responses show that 77.1% representing the majority of the teachers had first degree while 20% of them had second degree. It is unequivocally clear that the teachers were qualified to teach and participate in decision making in the schools. The Ministry of Education's directive is that teachers at the second level of education or senior high school ought to hold a minimum of a first degree. The results therefore imply that the teachers had good academic backgrounds that would enable them deliver proficiently and also contribute meaningfully to decision making in the schools, if they are permitted. Their rich academic backgrounds could have a positive effect on teaching and learning process in general and participation in school level decision-making in particular, if given the chance. In the Ghanaian educational system, most senior high schools have more than five departments with varied specialisations and that teachers in the schools could bring their knowledge and experience to bear when taking decisions in the schools. With the worth of teaching experience, high educational attainment and varied specialisations, involving teachers in taking decisions on various issues have the propensity to yield fruitful results that would eventually inure to the benefits of the schools and other stakeholders of education.

### **Part 11: Answers to the research questions and the hypothesis**

The first issue covers the extent to which teachers were involved in decision making in the schools. Since the extent of involvement was measured on a five-point scale (Very Low-1, Low-2, Moderate-3, High-4 and Very High-5), the mid-point of 2.5 was used as a mean of determination or decision rule.



**Table 2: Extent of teachers' involvement in decision making at the school-level**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S D</b>
Setting mission, vision and values for the school	2.13	1.23
Setting rules and regulations to guide students	3.32	1.02
Planning school activities such as anniversaries, open days etc	3.38	1.32
Planning of supervision of instructions and other activities	1.56	1.20
Solving teachers' disciplinary issues	2.03	0.84
Solving students' disciplinary issues	3.78	1.02
Planning for sports and games (within and outside school)	3.21	0.53
Planning of environmental and hygiene issues	3.05	1.11
Preparing school budget (determining income and expenditure etc)	1.23	0.32
Determining guidelines and standards for evaluation of teachers	2.56	1.23
Planning of construction of school buildings	1.93	1.00
Planning of expansion and maintenance of school buildings	1.20	1.02
Assigning school buildings such as offices, labs, residences etc	1.34	1.04
	<b>2.36</b>	<b>1.02</b>

**Source: Field study, 2022**

The results show that teachers' involvement in taking decisions concerning setting mission, vision and values for the schools is low. This idea emanates from the fact that the mean is 2.13, which is below the mean of determination. However, teachers' involvement in setting rules and regulations to guide the activities and conduct of students is above average (3.32). Similarly, teachers' involvement is above average (3.38) on the issue of planning school activities like events, anniversaries, open days and others. On the issue of planning of supervision of instructions and other activities, teachers' participation is low (1.56). This finding is inconsistent with Uzogor and Nwankwo (2020) who discovered that in taking decisions that affect teachers, the principals largely involved the teachers. They did that knowing very well that when teachers are involved in taking decisions that affect them, they tend to greatly participate in their implementation. Wadesango and Bayaga (2013) buttress this point by asserting that teachers accept and get fully involved in the implementation of decisions which they were a part of during the process of coming up with them. This unequivocally signals to school leaders that they ought to eschew taking unilateral decisions on issues that border on teachers' welfare. For successful school managers in Britain, for instance, involve their staff in all major important policy decision issues (Bush, 2003).

The results also demonstrate that handling teachers' disciplinary issues does not much involve teachers as the mean for that item is 2.03. On the other hand, teachers moderately participate in taking decisions on students' disciplinary issues (3.78), planning for sports and games (3.21) and planning environmental and hygiene issues (3.05). Teacher involvement in the rest of the activities in the schools was rated low: planning school budget and finances (1.23), determining guidelines and standard for evaluation of teacher (2.56), planning construction of school buildings (1.93), planning expansion and maintenance of school buildings (1.20) and assigning school buildings to classes and officers (1.34). A study by Gemechu (2014) revealed that teachers were involved in only decision making processes on students' affairs and, to some

extent, buildings. This is consistent with the finding of the current study. This study discovered that teachers were made to actively participate in taking decisions that affect students' affairs while their participation in decision making on school infrastructure is low. The overall results indicate that the involvement of teachers in decision making at the school level was low as the mean of means is below the threshold of 2.5. This means that the teachers in the schools do not feel more involved in school-level decision making. They felt that they were not made to actively participate in taking decisions on vital phenomena such as school planning, planning school policy and regulations, planning school budget and finance, curriculum and instruction, school infrastructure and student affairs and discipline.

The finding is consistent with Kipkoech and Chesire's (2011) discovery that teachers' involvement in managerial decision making was low. For instance, the teachers were less involved decision making on procurement of school materials and that only the heads of schools alone took most of the managerial decisions. Findings of studies such as Ayegbusi and Ogunlade (2015) and Macha and Mhagama (2022) are in line with the current study's findings which indicate that some school heads did not actively involve their teachers in decision making processes in their schools. This situation violates Chopra's (2020) contention that equity in education can only be found where there is shared leadership based on democratic values. However, the finding disconfirms studies by Newcombe and McCormick (2001), Asefa (2005), Wondesen (2011), Mugambi (2015) and Eris et al (2017) that school heads did involve their teachers in decision making at the school level. Tijani (2020) also found teacher participation in decision making was high; teacher participation in decision had significant relationship with job satisfaction. While these studies found that school heads realised the need to include teachers in taking decisions that aid in the management of their schools, those heading the schools used in this study did otherwise.

The study further sought to ascertain differences or otherwise in the involvement of male and female teachers in taking decisions at the school level. The results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Independent Samples t-test on Gender Difference in Teacher involvement in Decision making**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>T</b>	<b>P</b>
Male	154	2.47	1.21	278	-1.130	0.261
Female	126	2.39	1.96			

**Source: Field study, 2022**

The results point out that there is no statistically significant gender difference in the involvement of teachers in decision making in the schools. Although the male teachers' involvement in school-level decision making is slightly above the female teachers' (M=2.47, SD=1.21 and M=2.39, SD 1.96), the difference is not statistically significant (t=1.130, p=0.261). Since the p-value of 0.261 is more than the standard significant value of 0.05, the difference in the involvement of male and female teachers in school-level decision making is not significant. Both male and female teachers were marginally involved in making decisions on essential issues in the schools. Consequently, the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference in the involvement of male and female teachers in school-level decision making is upheld.

The finding confirms Kuku and Taylor's (2002) study which revealed no significant gender difference in teacher participation in decision making. Kuku and Taylor also discovered that both male and female teachers were not actively involved in taking decisions in their schools. A study by Mehta (2015) found high involvement of teachers in school-level decision; however, no significant difference in teacher participation in decision making at the schools. In the schools, both male and female teachers were highly involved in taking decisions as opposed to the marginal involvement of male and female teachers in decision making as established by the current study.

The study also ascertained the teachers' views on the effects of their involvement in taking decisions at the school level. It was necessary to find out the teachers' views ways their involvement in decision making benefit them. The results are displayed in Table 4.

**Table 4: Teachers' Views on Importance of Teacher Participation in Decision Making**

	No N(%)	Uncertain N(%)	Yes N(%)
<b>Teacher participating in decision making helps to</b>			
create new and innovative ideas	25(8.9%)	13(4.7%)	242(86.4%)
find solutions to challenges	32(11.5%)	18 (6.4%)	230(82.1%)
reduce of conflicts	88(31.5%)	95(33.9%)	97(34.6%)
enhance collaboration	34(12.1%)	62(22.1%)	184(65.7%)
improve job performance	45(16.1%)	32 (11.4%)	203(72.5%)
increase in efficiency	26(9.3%)	45(16.1%)	209(74.6%)
boost morale and satisfaction	15(5.4%)	23(8.2%)	242(86.4%)
increase commitment	35(12.5%)	28(10%)	217(77.5%)

**Source: Field study, 2022**

The results of the study indicate that while only 8.9% and 4.7% did not believe that involving teachers in decision making helps create new and innovative ideas, a vast majority (86.4%) of the respondents felt otherwise. The majority of the teachers thought that teacher involvement in decision making helps schools to garner new and innovative ideas to enhance the running of the schools. Again, the majority of the respondents (82.1%) held the view that involving teachers in decision making generates solutions to handling challenges that schools encounter in their activities. Further, the majority (86.4%) of the respondents believed that getting teachers involved in decision making makes them feel satisfied and thus boosts their moral to perform their responsibilities.

The results further demonstrate that teacher involvement in school-level decision making increases teacher commitment, increases efficiency, increases job performance and enhances collaboration. The only issue that the respondents did not believe teacher involvement in decision making does is helping to reduce conflicts in schools. They do not believe that allowing teachers to participate in school level decision helps to prevent conflicts from arising among actors in schools. It is therefore gleaned from the above that the teachers had a strong believe that teacher involvement in school-level decision making does a lot for teachers which eventually contribute to enhancing their work performance for the betterment of the schools and their

clients. When teachers are motivated by their involvement in administrative processes such as decision making in schools, it increases their satisfaction; which is directly correlated to the level of their participation in administrative process or decision making in schools (Wadesango, 2012). However, their views on the relevance of teacher involvement in decision making at the school level do not materialise as their rating of their involvement in decision making at the schools fell below average. In other words, although the teachers felt that being involved in decision making can do a lot, their wish did not see the light of day, as expected. If teachers are vehemently involved in making decisions on issues that are central to the management of senior high schools, they would not be much enthused and possibly increased their commitment to work which may eventually contribute to their service delivery.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The overall impression from the findings is that the extent of teachers' participation in school-level decision making is minimal. The heads of schools do not seem to adopt more democratic ideals in decision making process and in the running of their schools. The teachers are not much involved in school-level decision making although they regarded their involvement vital to the achievement of school and national goals on education. The heads of schools seem to pay less attention to teachers' contributions to many aspects of decision making in the schools for efficient and effective running of the schools. This situation can affect the overall activities of the schools in general and teaching and learning process in particular.

The school heads do not seem to facilitate the environment for more teachers' participation in school decision making. It is worthwhile for heads of schools to heed to the admonition of Somech (2002) that school leaders must be willing to let go of their traditional authority roles, not only allowing teachers to have a greater voice but helping to prepare them, providing support and establishing an environment of trust. UNESCO (2005) also recommends a restructuring of schools' policies to involve teachers in school base decision-making. Teachers' leadership in the administration of senior high schools is no longer optional due to the complex nature of educational management system (Bush, 2003). Consequently, it is proposed that further study should be conducted to unravel factors that prevent school heads from involving teachers in decision making processes in their schools. Knowing the factors would help inform stakeholders of education on the ways to improve the situations in the schools. Again, the extent of female heads of schools' solicitation for teachers' involvement in decision as compared to their male heads of schools counterparts could be studied. Studying teachers' involvement in decision can have implications on the steps that stakeholders can take to improve teacher participation in school level decision making. Lastly, a comparative study of teacher participation in school-level decision making in grades "A", "B" and "C" senior high schools is suggested and to ascertain whether or not this practice counts in the disparity in the performance of students of the schools. Such a study may come up with a lot of vital ideas to help senior high schools' progress and development in the country.

**Citation:** Kuranchie, A; Akuta, B. A & Anane, M. (2022). Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*. 6(9), 55 – 69.

## References

- Algoush, K. S. (2010). *Assessment of the relationship between involvements decision making process and teachers' job satisfaction*. Open University, Malaysia.
- Asefa, A. (2005). *Teachers' participation in decision-making in the technical and vocational school of Ethiopia*. Master's Thesis. A.A.U.
- Ayegbusi, A. T. & Ogunlade, L. A. (2020). Teachers' decisional participation and job satisfaction in secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 1-11.
- Best, J. W. & Khan, J. Y. (2010). *Research in education*. (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Blase, J. (2001). The micropolitics of effective school leadership: Teachers' perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(3), 30-41.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management*. Sage Publications.
- Cheruto, L. K., & Salome, C. (2011). The levels of teachers' involvement in managerial decision making in schools in Kenya: *Problems of Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, 34.
- Chopra, P. (2020). Teachers' participation in school decision making processes: The case of Indian government secondary school. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 12(1), 41-55.
- Dada, C. Y. (2008). *Participatory, managerial and productivity among secondary school teachers in South West Nigeria*. Thesis. University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.
- Dampson, D. G. & Afful-Broni, A. (2018). Teacher participation in school decision making in Ghanaian basic schools: Looking back and going forward: What stakeholders say? *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 5(2), 91-102.
- Eris, H., Kayhan, H., Bastas, M. & Gamar, C. (2017). Teachers and administrative staff views on teacher participation in the decision-making process. *Eurasian Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 13(11), 411-420.
- Gardian, A. & Rathore, H. C. (2010). Teacher participation in decision-making process: Reality and repercussions in India Higher Education. *India Kamacha, Varansi*, 40(5), 657-671.
- Gemechu, D. (2014). *The practices of teachers' involvement in decision making in government secondary schools in Jimma town*. M A Dissertation. Jimma University.
- Hammad, W. (2017). Decision making domains and teacher participation: A qualitative investigation of decision making in Egyptian schools. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(9), 2478-2493.
- Haryanto, S. (2020). Teachers' involvement in decision making and job performance in secondary schools in Kwara state. *Journal Pendidikan Saembosial*, 1-12.
- Kariuki, J. D. (2018). *Principals' transformational leadership and teachers' performance among public schools in Nyarua County*. Master's Thesis. The Catholic University of East Africa.
- Katzaenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (2006). *Awaking the sleeping leadership of development of teachers*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Crown Press Inc.
- Kipkoech, L. C. & Chesire, S. (2011). The levels of teachers' involvement in managerial decision making in schools. *Problems of Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, 34, 79-87.
- Kuranchie, A. (2021). *Research made easy*. Bookworm Publications.
- Kuku, S. M. & Taylor, J. W. (2002). Teachers' participation in decision making: A comparative study of school leaders and teachers' perception in North Philippines academies. *Info*, 5(1), 19-42.

**Citation:** Kuranchie, A; Akuta, B. A & Anane, M. (2022). Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*. 6(9), 55 – 69.

- Legesse, D. (2008). *Trainers' participation in decision-making in selected Governmental Technical Vocational and Training College of Addis Ababa*. Master's Thesis. A.A.U.
- Leithwood, K. & Steinback, R. (2003). *The concept for school improvement of difference in principals' problem solving process*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Rutledge.
- Lunenburg, C. (2018). National policy/standard. In *Wiley Handbook of Educational Supervision*. (379-405), John Wiley & Son Inc.
- Macha, P. E. & Mhaga, M. (2022). Teachers' participation in decision making and work performance in public secondary schools in Meru District Council in Arusha, Tanzania. *International Journal of Humanities and Education Development*, 4(1), 124-138.
- Mehta, D. (2015). A study of teachers' participation in decision making: Gender specific roles. *European Academic Research*, 11(11), 14595-14608.
- Meintjes, S. N. (2018). *Participatory decision making in schools: A study of two schools in Gauteng*. Master's dissertation. University of Witwaterands, South Africa.
- Mugambi, M. D. (2015). *The role of principals in promoting students' academic performance in Tiganin West sub-county, Kenya*. Master's Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Mualuko, H. (2009). *Improving decision-making in school through teachers' participation*. Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya
- Mueller, R. O., & Gokturk, S. (2010). Multidimensionality of teacher participation in school decision making. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 10(14), 56-78.
- Newcombe, N. & McComick, J. (2001). *Trust and teacher participation in school based financial decision making*. Sage Publications.
- Nguassa, B. M. & Gabriel, L. (2017). Participation in decision making and teachers' commitment: A comparative study between private and public secondary schools in Arusha, Tanzania. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(7), 801-807.
- Pashiardis, P. (2004). Teachers' participation in decision-making. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 8(5), 1417.
- Rawis, J. A. M. & Kaligis, J. N. (2017). Teacher participation in decision making in high school achievement. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 6(5), 29-35.
- Sagvandy, R. S. & Omidan, F. (2015). Teachers' participation in different levels of decision making in council and developing skills in Iran. *World Scientific News*, 9, 17-27.
- Smylie, M. A. (2002). Teacher participation in school decision-making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 14(1), 53-67.
- Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity participative management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(8), 49-61.
- Talat, S. (2013). Decision making style of women university teachers. *Journal of Social Science Research and Policy*, 50(2), 191-206.
- Tchapchapchet, E. T., Iwu, C. G. & Ille, C. A. (2014). Teacher participation in decision making and productivity in South Africa universities: Implications. *Human Resource Management* 12(4), 293-304.
- Tijani, A. A. (2020). Teachers' involvement in decision making and job performance in secondary schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Pandidikan*, 13(1), 1-12.
- UNESCO (2005). *Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO (2015). *Teacher involvement in educational change*. Regional Bureau of Education University Press.

**Citation:** Kuranchie, A; Akuta, B. A & Anane, M. (2022). Teachers' Involvement in Decision Making in Senior High Schools: A Case of Two Districts in Ghana. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*. 6(9), 55 – 69.

- Uzogor, B. A. & Nwankwo, I. N. (2020). Extent of principals' involvement of teachers in decision making for effective administration of secondary schools in Anambra state. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(6), 506-512.
- Wadesango, N. (2012). The influence of teacher participation in decision-making on their occupational morale. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 31(3), 361-369.
- Wadesango, N. (2011). Strategies of teacher participation in decision making in schools: A case study of Gwene District secondary schools in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Science*, 27(2), 85-94.
- Wadesango, N. (2010). The extent of teacher participation in decision making in schools: *School Leadership and Management*, 30, 263-282.
- Wadesango, N. & Bayaga, A. (2013). Management of schools: Teacher involvement in decision making process. *African Journal of Business Management*, 7(17), 1689-1694.
- World Bank (2010). *Education in Ghana: Improving equity, efficiency and accountability of education service delivery*. World Bank.
- Wondesen, B. (2011). *An assessment of the practices and problems of decision making in secondary schools of Nekemte*. MPhil Thesis, AAU
- Yao, I. L. (2014). Teachers' involvement in school decision making. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 4(3), 50-58.