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ABSTRACT

The main objective of the study was to assess the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job Satisfaction in Addis Ababa city Administration Arada sub city administration office Preparatory Schools. Primarily, the study used a correlational design. Questionnaire was distributed to 58 teachers chosen using systematic random sampling technic. Interviews was also used to collect relevant data from principals and vice principals. The data was analyzed using one sample t-test, independent sample t-test and Pearson correlation methods. One sample t-test was used to evaluate the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process and the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction. Independent sample t-test was used to examine the deference in job satisfaction, participation in decision making process between male and female preparatory school teachers; and Pearson correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the magnitude of relationship teachers’ involvement and and their job satisfaction. The overall results of the study indicated that teachers’ participation in decision making process was found to be low. Added to that teachers’ job satisfaction was also found low in the study area. Even though teachers of job satisfaction and level of satisfactions was generally low, the findings of the study also revealed male teachers’ decision making participation as well as job satisfaction is significantly higher than their female counter parts. The difference was also found to be statically significant. Moreover, the two variables revealed significant intercorrelations r ranging from 0.399 to 0.552 and correlated positively. Furthermore, the study concluded that the higher the level of teachers’ job satisfaction, the more the teachers’ participation in school decision making process. On the basis of the findings of the study, it has been recommended that School authorities and government officials should need to develop and implement strategies to deal with the needs of teachers.

Key words: Job satisfaction, teacher, participation and decision making
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This introductory chapter deals with the issues of the study including the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, operational definition of key terms, scope of the study, and the research questions of the study.

1.1. Background of the study

Participation in decision making and teachers’ job satisfaction are two sides of the same coin. They are important elements for proper functioning of organizations, including institutions of learning and preparatory schools. Due to global competition, institutions are interested in organizational development and professional growth of employees through active participation in decision making and employees’ satisfaction (Ornoy, 2010). While this is true in different types of organizations, and it is also applicable in the learning institutions of our country Ethiopia.

Participation in decision making implies mental and emotional involvement of persons in group situations that encourage them to contribute to group goals and share responsibility for them. The literatures on teacher’s participation in school decision making processes (e.g., Luthans, 2005) indicate that professional teachers are interested to participate in activities that may improve school performance. Inclusion of teachers in decision making should not be obligatory and it should not be imposed up on them. It must be professional commitment, so that the output will be effective and fruitful.

Mohammad etal (2013) supported this view that if managers claim to want participation from their people but never let them become intellectually and emotionally involved and never use their suggestions, the result may be negative. Still in line with the view, Emeneke (2004) buttressed the fact that when people are part of decision making process, there is
greater opportunity of the expression of mind, ideas, existing disputes and more occasions for disagreements and agreements. In some establishments, they are gender biased that women are marginalized in decision making process.

A study which is conducted in a high manufacturing organization had concluded that employees having a high desire to participate in decision making are likely to exhibit high levels of job satisfaction (Ornoy, 2010). Similar trend was observed in a large manufacturing and public utility areas (Schuler, 1983). Thus employees, who view their organizations behaving in their interest experienced greater job satisfaction (Parnell, 2003). Therefore, it is important to understand when and how workplace participation in decision making contributes to gains and job satisfaction for both employees and employers.

Job satisfaction is an extent to which employees feel positively or negatively about different aspects of job e.g. job conditions, timing, structure, compensation, tasks, and relationship with co-workers and responsibilities (Ommé et al., 2009; Spector, 1997). Employee’s satisfaction results in pleasant environment in an organization (Khan, Aslam & Lodhi, 2011). Pay is thought to be a key factor behind job satisfaction besides promotion, recognition, job involvement and commitment. Job satisfaction is a feeling of an employee about his job (Kamal & Hanif, 2009). The management should give priority to its human resources who play a vital role to give a competitive edge to the organization (Khan et al., 2011). Job attachment, dedication and willingness are the key factors that provide satisfaction (Sargent and Hannum, 2005). There is evidence that job satisfaction is related to the work itself. With regard to this, Sargent and Hannum (2005) pointed out that the working conditions at school contribute to the satisfaction of teachers.

According to Diane (2013) employee job satisfaction, engagement and overall happiness has proven to open way to foster employees to do more for their organizations. Satisfied employees are more productive, try harder, and are more loyal to their organizations.
Ensuring long-term employee satisfaction is key to an organization’s success and reducing disruptive tendencies like frequent turnover.

There is a wide multiplicity of methods to increase employee satisfaction, and not all of these will lead to increased productivity. For example those employees are not inspired to increase efficiency only by money incentive. Instead, employees practice the highest satisfaction and increases in productivity, when they examine their work as both significant and as an opportunity to make a difference. Employees who like about what they do and who love their jobs may be the most satisfied and the most fruitful (Kalleberg, 1977).

George (2013) showed that, when employees feel appreciated, both by their organization and by their peers, they are motivated to maintain a high level of work, both to impress management and maintain good standing among peers. It is also the job of the employer to show appreciation to your employees for who they are and the work they do. Employee Engagement: Engaging employees in creating organizational culture that everyone is satisfied with is a must. Creating a constant feedback to engage employees in creating this environment will keep employees satisfied and engaged in their jobs. When employees are satisfied and fulfilled by their organizational culture it allows them to become more motivated in their work.

Therefore; the researcher is initiated to conduct this study on the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job Satisfaction in Addis Ababa arada subcity preparatory schools.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Many people believe that staff participation in decision making leads to higher performance and which is necessary for survival in an increasingly competitive world (Mullins, 2005). Welfson (1998) also states that lack of interest and frustration at work is often the result of
an employee’s lack of involvement in decision making processes with the organization’s goals and a feeling that their ideas are not wanted or listened to.

Participation in decision making is very important for effective school management. But teachers, in most cases, have been excluded in the process of decision making. This is revealed by Muindi (2011) who conducted a research in Kenya and came up with findings that decision-making on school staffing, curriculum and resource allocation had been made by school principals or selected members of administrative managerial teams. The study also proven that in most cases, teachers were usually excluded by school administrators in the process of decision-making. Contrary to this trend, researchers have indicated significance of teachers’ participation in decision making.

According to the work experience of the researcher and ministry of education school administration and community participation document in our country Ethiopia, it has been known that teachers are expected to actively participate in decisions made in every school. Teachers are expected to make decision when they are in class rooms, preparing lesson plans, selecting their department leaders, unit leaders, committee representatives. They are also supposed to discuss and decide in school matters such as promotion policy, working directions in staff meetings. Usually, like any other institutions, teachers of preparatory schools of Ethiopia are not limited only to offering courses, designed for students but are also responsible for participation in deciding school matters. With this reality preparatory schools highly need participation of teachers, students and administrative staff members who are directly or indirectly be affected by the decision made.

Wainaina (2013) conducted a research about effect of teachers’ participation in decision making on the organizational commitment amongst academic staff in the schools found that decisions made in consultation with teachers are more effective. Particularly, those teachers who are involved in decision-making are better equipped to implement such decisions.
According to Moshet (2013) who conducted a research about teacher participation in school decision-making and job satisfaction as correlates of organizational commitment in senior schools in Botswana and found that allowing teacher participation in decision-making results into a more satisfied teacher with greater commitment to organizational goals as well as job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction will pave the way for good production in one organization. So organization leaders should consider many things to create good job satisfaction for their workers. Regarding this, George (2013) said that creating good work environment is a strategy used in some companies to increase both productivity and job satisfaction. This strategy measures employees not on the amount of time they spend at the office, but on the amount of work they accomplish while there.

From the work experience of the researcher, there is lack of ways to increase job satisfaction of teachers in their work place. Some teachers have feeling of dissatisfaction in their work. A teacher who is not satisfied with his/ her job may exert a negative influence on the students’ learning and in general it has negative effects on students’ academic growth. When teachers have satisfaction, they tend to teach well. It is generally believed that satisfied teachers are more productive than dissatisfied teachers. So identifying problems in relation to job satisfaction is important to improve the problem and make an organization be more productive.

In general, most of the studies conducted in this domain have focused on the identification of factors that affect job satisfaction with relatively little attention given to examine the extent of teachers in participation of decision making processes. Previous literatures have paid attention for teachers’ motivation and job satisfaction in a segmented manner. Each of the two variables were treated as a segmented variable in different studies. Thus, previously done research works failed to establish the desirable
associations of teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction simultaneously. Linking the desirable associations of job satisfaction with teachers’ participation in decision making processes still remains to be well understood. Also my study differ from athers with the research design technique which is correlational and the study on this research topic done before was with descriptive research design method. In general, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making processes as well as the extent of job satisfaction in preparatory school teachers were missed to be quantitatively examined.

Taking that into consideration, this study will attempt to assess the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job Satisfaction in Addis Ababa arada subcity preparatory schools.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study will try to find answers for the following major research questions.

➢ What is the level of teachers’ participation in school decision-making?
➢ To what degree teachers are satisfied in their profession?
➢ To what extent teachers’ participation in decision-making relate to their job satisfaction?
➢ Do teachers’ level of participation in decision making vary as a result of their gender?

Hypothesis 1

H0: The level of employee participation in decision-making has no significant effect on their level of job satisfaction.

H1: The level of employee participation in decision-making significantly influences their level of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2

H0: The level of teachers’ participation in decision making process varies as a result of their gender.
H1: The levels of teachers’ participation in decision making process do not vary as a result of their gender.

1.4. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this study is to assess the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job Satisfaction in Addis Ababa, Arada subcity preparatory schools.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

- To examine the level of teachers’ participation in school decision-making process in preparatory schools of Arada Sub-city
- To investigate the extent to which teachers are being satisfied in their job.
- To find out whether teachers’ participation in decision-making are related or not with their job satisfaction in the study area.
- To find out whether teachers’ level of participation in decision making vary as a result of their gender or not.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The present study is hoped to be important in many ways:

- It is hoped to identify the major existing rewarding system to job satisfaction of teachers in the study area and provide information about the situation and that will be lesson for similar organizations;
- It is hoped to identify and forward some applicable suggestions based on the result of the study so as to improve teachers’ role in their participation to school decision-making process;
- It is believed that the study will come up with suggestion of maximizing teachers job satisfaction of their employees to design activities that will increase job satisfaction that will in turn raise productivity.
• It is also assumed that the study may develop some understandings into problem solving skills that may increase the importance of group decision-making.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

In terms of area, this study was confined to Addis Ababa city Administration, Addis Ababa Arada subcity Preparatory Schools. Concerning the issue of the study, it is focused to assess relationship between the level of teachers’ participation in decision making and their job Satisfaction. It would be better to investigate the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job Satisfaction in many schools but due to time limitations, shortage of finance, and material the researcher was forced to be delimited only in it.

1.7 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Due to limitations of time, the study was only carried out at the preparatory schools of Addis Ababa city administration Arada sub city education office.

1.8. DEFINITION OF TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Participation or involvement: teacher’s taking part with others in an activity on a formal basis with specified rights and obligations to contribute possible solutions to the organization.

Level of participation: the magnitude of teacher’s participation in school decision-making process.

Decision-making: - A problem solving process in which a problem is analyzed and a solution is chosen after all possible options have been considered in government.

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction is the positive attitudes or emotional dispositions of people /individuals/ may gain from work or through aspects of work (Brian and Kimberly, 2016). The term here refers to the level of pleasurable or positive emotional state of teachers towards his/her job as measured by a five-points scale ranging from 1 (highly dissatisfied) to 5 (highly satisfied).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Decision Making

2.1.1 What is Decision Making?

Decision-making can be described as selecting between alternatives (Moorhead and Griffin, 2004). It can be considered as the result of mental processes (intellectual processes: memory, thinking, evaluation) leading to the selection of a course of action among several choices. Decision-making includes planning the likely results of decisions, working out the significance of individual factors, and choosing the best course of action to take.

In the decision making process, the decision maker’s activities are directed by a purpose. All of the several alternative courses of action are related to numerous outcomes. Evidence is available on the choices, on the value of each product relative to the goal. The decision maker chooses an alternative on the basis of his/her evaluation of the information (Moorhead and Griffin, 2004).

2.1.2. Participation in Decision Making

Participation of employees is usually described as a process in which influence is shared between individuals who are otherwise hierarchically imbalanced (Locke and Schweiger, 1979; Wagner, 1994). Participatory management exercise balances the participation of managers and their subordinates in information processing, decision making and problem solving activities (Wager, 1994). Beardwell and Claydon (2007), define worker’s participation as the sharing and practice of power, in all its indicators, between the owners and managers of organizations and those working by them. It refers to the direct participation of individuals in decisions linking to their direct work administrations and to the indirect contribution in the decision-making, through representatives in the larger socio-technological and political structures of the Cirm. According to Luthans (2005) the decision-
making can be formal or informal and entails intellectual and emotional as well as physical involvement. This process, according to Graham and Bennet (1997), implies that employees have access to sufficient information on which to base their decisions, that they will be consulted before the decision is made and that negotiations will be made between management and the employees about implementation of the decision.

Participation involves individuals or groups in the process. Individual participation techniques are those in which an employee somehow affects the decision making of a manager. Group participation techniques use consultative techniques and democratic techniques. Consultative techniques indicate that a manager asks for and receives involvement from employees but provides the right to handle the decision while in the democratic form, there’s a full participation and the group not the individual heads and makes the final decision by agreement or majority (Luthans, 2005).

The actual amount of participation in decision-making ranges from one extreme where the manager makes the decision and asks for no help or ideas from anyone, to the other extreme of full participation, where everyone connected with, or affected by the decision is completely involved. In practice, the degree of participation will be determined by factors such as experience of the person/group and the nature of the task. The more the experience and unstructured the task, the more the participation there will tend to be (Luthans, 2005).

2.1.3 Levels of Decision Making

There are four levels of decisions making in an organization. According to Bennet (1997), these levels are: strategic decisions, tactical decisions, operational decisions and policies. Strategic decisions are broad decisions about a firm’s direction and its relations with the outside world. These decisions establish organizational objectives and impose frameworks for controlling the organizations activities. They include decisions on issues Such as what to produce and how the organization will finance its operations. These decisions are usually
made by senior level management (Bennet, 1997). Tactical decisions are concerned with implementation of strategic decisions. They include decisions on issues such as the acquisition and deployment of resources, allocation of duties and specification of secondary objectives, monitoring performance and reporting to higher levels of authority (Bennet, 1997).

Operational decisions on the other hand are concerned with minor administrative matters such as lengths of production runs, shift rosters, stock levels and so on (Bennet, 1997). They focus on the day-to-day activities of the organization. The fourth level of decision-making is policies. Bennet (1997) defines policies as a set ground rules and criteria to be applied when taking decisions related to a particular function or activity. Policies therefore exist to restrict the scope and nature of decisions concerning a specific issue, for example, internal promotion. Policies facilitate the co-ordination of diverse operations and ensure that all decisions made are compatible with the overall aims of the organization.

2.1.4 Approaches Used in Decision Making

There are two major methods to decision making in an organization, the authoritarian method in which a managerial figure makes a decision for the group and the group method in which the group decides what to do. The first is Authoritarian, where the manager makes the decision based on the knowledge he can gather. He then must explain the decision to the group and gain their acceptance of it. The second is the Group, where the group shares ideas and analyses, and agrees upon a decision to implement. Studies show that the group often has values, feelings, and reactions quite different from those the manager supposes they have. No one knows the group and its tastes and preferences as well as the group itself.
2.1.5 Benefits of Participation in Decision Making

Participation in decision-making offers various benefits at all levels of the organization. Rice (1987) explains that putting decision making power as close as possible to the point of delivery makes that implementation of those decisions not only possible, but also successful. Participation in decision-making leads to harmony in the organization (Ward and Pascarelli, 1994) and improves staff morale and support (Parshadiadis, 1987). By creating a sense of ownership in the company, participation in decision-making instills a sense of pride and Motivates employees to increase productivity in order to achieve their goals. Employees who participate in the decisions of the company feel like they are a part of a team with a common goal, and find their sense of self-esteem and creative fulfillment heightened (Helms, 2006).

Managers who use a participative style find that employees are more receptive to change than in situations in which they have no voice. Changes are implemented more effectively when employees have input and make contributions to decisions. Participation keeps employees informed of upcoming events so they will be aware of potential changes. The organization can then place itself in a proactive mode instead of a reactive one, as managers are able to quickly identify areas of concern and turn to employees for solutions (Helms, 2006).

Participation helps employees gain a wider view of the organization. Through training, development opportunities, and information sharing, employees can acquire the conceptual skills needed to become effective managers or top executives. It also increases the commitment of employees to the organization and the decisions they make (Helms, 2006). Creativity and innovation are two important benefits of participative management. By allowing a diverse group of employees to have input into decisions, the organization benefits from the synergy that comes from a wider choice of options. When all employees, instead of
just managers or executives, are given the opportunity to participate, the chances are increased that a valid and unique idea will be suggested (Helms, 2006).

2.1.6 Challenges of Participation in Decision Making

Cole (1997) notes that most managers are not enthusiastic about sharing strategic decisions with employee representatives, partly because they do not want to alert their competitors of important strategic moves (for example, a major investment or Significant take over) and partly because they often have to face up to some unpleasant decisions about redundancies and redeployments among existing staff.

Participative management is not a magic cure for all that ails an organization has. Managers should carefully weigh the pros and cons before implementing this style of management. Pashiardis (1994) in the article, ‘Teacher Participation in Decision Making’, notes that for participation in decision making to be successfully implemented, policy has to be changed to support this approach. He further adds that time, resources, participatory involvement and support will determine the effectiveness of participation in decision making and recommends training to enable members participate effectively.

2.1.7 Decentralisation of decision-making authority to schools

This sub-section attempts to discuss what international literature tells us about education management at school level and how it contributes to improving critical decision-making. Today, greater decentralisation of educational decision-making is becoming the common aspiration of many developing countries (De Grauwe et al. 2011). Some researchers argue that the participation of communities and students in the day-to-day activities of the schools (for example, in supervision, monitoring and evaluation) is part of the decentralisation of school management (J. Naidoo 2005). In some Asian countries, like Malaysia, school management has improved because it involves students and communities in school decision-
making (Luck 2011: 1–2). The same is true in South Africa where the participation of communities and students in decision-making has played a role in the improved and expanded school-based management (J. Naidoo 2005). Researchers have identified some benefits of decentralisation for critical decision-making at school level. First, as Dunne et al. (2007: 10) have pointed out, education decentralisation reduces inequities mainly when financial responsibility is delegated to local government. Sub-Saharan African countries, from Ethiopia to South Africa, have recently been engaged in administrative decentralisation, and efforts have been made to increase school-level independence through the provision of direct financial support to schools in the form of school grants and by promoting community participation in school governance (J. Naidoo 2005: 122). Therefore, decentralisation facilitates responsiveness to local needs through community participation, transparency and accountability in school management (Dunne et al. 2007: 9). Second, decentralisation leads to a change in school management. Many African countries, for example, regard decentralisation as a means for management restructuring (Dunne et al. 2007: 6). In many developing countries the school administration is a combination of headteacher, teachers, school administrators, community representatives and local government authorities. The decentralisation process has achieved important outcomes as school administration and communities play greater roles in building classrooms, recruiting contract teachers, and raising community contributions (Dunne et al. 2007: 9). Moreover, the school administration are involved in the setting of staff qualifications, textbook development, monitoring and evaluation, teacher training, partial financial administration, designing school rules, and maintenance of school facilities (J. Naidoo 2005: 42). Third, the decentralisation of school management can make decision-making more democratic and lead to improved efficiency and effectiveness. The expansion of good governance and democracy to schools requires the involvement of stakeholders such as policymakers, teachers, students, parents and community members (J. Naidoo 2005). Vegas (2007) describe the effects of
devolution of decision-making authority to schools as follows: School-based management reforms that devolve decision-making authority to the schools, for example, have had important effects on teacher performance and student learning by making schools more accountable to their communities. Devolution of decision-making authority to schools in Central America has, in many cases, led to lower teacher absenteeism, more teacher work hours, more homework assignments, and better parent-teacher relationships. However, while decentralisation may be a goal of many education reforms, research from many developing countries indicates that decentralisation policy does not necessarily produce the expected outcomes (Dunne et al. 2007: 9). Some of these challenges are discussed below.

On the one hand, decentralisation has not devolved power and control over education management, financial administration and teacher management to the school level. Studies in some African countries, for example, indicate that decentralisation is loaded with bureaucratic bottlenecks (De Grauwe et al. 2011). Furthermore, in many developing countries, the shift to decentralisation as a way of improving service delivery has been initiated because of pressure from international organisations. It is not an internally driven force that will bring realistic outcomes in the system (De Grauwe et al. 2011). Another challenge is that problems such as poverty, difficult socio-political situations and limited economic opportunities have prevented decentralization from bringing about the desired outcomes in local contexts (Dunne et al. 2007: 6).

2.2. Job Satisfaction

2.2.1. The concept of job satisfaction

According to Locke (1976) Job satisfaction is employee satisfaction that can be defined in many different ways. Some believe it is simply how content an individual is with his or her job, in other words, whether or not they like the job or individual aspects such as nature of
work or supervision. Others believe it is not as simple as this definition suggests and instead that multidimensional psychological responses to one's job are involved.

One of the most widely used definitions in organizational research is that of Locke (1976), who defines job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1304). Others have defined it as simply how content an individual is with his or her job; whether he or she likes the job or not. It is assessed at both the global level (whether or not the individual is satisfied with the job overall), or at the facet level (whether or not the individual is satisfied with different aspects of the job) (Locke, 1976).

Job satisfaction refers to the satisfaction that a person receives from performing his job. The satisfaction can take many forms-satisfaction at the work that he has accomplished, satisfaction at the effort he puts into the job satisfaction at the help he has provided others. Job satisfaction can often be difficult to measure, because people define satisfaction in different ways (Michael, 2005).

Job satisfaction can also be seen within the broader context of the range of issues that affect an individual's experience of work, or their quality of working life. Job satisfaction can be understood in terms of its relationships with other key factors, such as general well being, stress at work, control at work, home-work interface, and working conditions (Mohammad et al, 2013).

**2.2.2. Relationship between Motivation, participation and Satisfaction**

Motivation and satisfaction are closely related, in that job satisfaction can be described as a type of motivation. However, a person's satisfaction with his job and his motivation to perform the job can exist independently of each other. For example, a person can be satisfied
by his job but his motivation for doing the job can exist independently of his satisfaction. He might do the job for money (Ornoy, 2010).

According to Geomani, (2012) there are three factors in every organization. These factors are; culture, structural and resources-material and human. Human resource is the pillar of every organization. Managers who control, plan, coordinate, direct lead and organize other resources to achieve the objectives of that establishment lead them. The job of a manager in the workplace is to get things done through employees. To do this the manager should be able to motivate employees adequately. By observing what someone says or does in a given situation, one can draw reasonable inferences about his or her underlying motivation.

Motivation is a decision-making process, through which the individual chooses the desired outcomes and sets in motion the behavior appropriate to them. Motivation is defined as an urge in an individual to perform goal directed behavior. Therefore, motivation cannot be inflicted from outside but it is an intrinsic desire in a man to achieve the target goal through performance or activity. According to a model by Herzberg, “motivation is influenced by maintenance and motivational factors. Important motivational factors are the work itself, achievement, growth, responsibility, advancement and recognition. These are primary intrinsic motivators rather than extrinsic ones”.

In recent times there has been a great challenge in the area of employee motivation. This challenge is due to rapid changes in the operating environment of almost all organizations. Workers would like to work at places where there are good motivational packages. Motivation has engrossed the mind of most managers who are concerned with what should be done to achieve sustained high level of performance through people. Therefore, motivation is very significant in the achievement of every organization’s growth (Michael, 2005).
2.2.3 What is expected from Organizations?

In an industry or organization where the reservations are freely known, the development and success of the business is totally endangered. With the help of the valuable players, who are the employees, the organization still has their option and chance towards the future success. The most appreciated approach in an industry other than training and development is through the use of motivational approaches that almost all of the organizations, in whatever size or type, used to apply (Byham and Moyer, 2005 as cited from Rahat, 2010)). Considering the fact that the motivational approaches can drive the job performance of an employee. Therefore; the issue of employee motivation is extremely important to management as well as employee performance and satisfaction.

The motivation of employees is important to organizations since it is one of the several factors that significantly affect the productivity of employees. Most find they in superiority position where they make all the decisions and employees just follow. This is not a good practice because they exclude the employees and they feel as if they have no say in the company. This is hierarchal structure of the work place. The first step to performance is to ensure that your employees know what is expected of them; they know what they are supposed to do and how well to do it (Nhat, 2012).

2.2.4. Various factors affecting Employees’ satisfaction

A Study of Some Selected schools in Anambra State Nigeria by Muogbo U.S. results obtained from the analysis showed that there existed relationship between employee, participation motivation and the organizational performance with satisfaction. The study reveals that extrinsic motivation given to workers in an organization has a significant influence on the workers performance.
As to Quratul, (2011) employees want to earn reasonable salary and payment, and employees desire their workers to feel that is what they are getting. Money is the fundamental inducement, no other incentive or motivational technique comes even close to it with respect to its influential value. It has the supremacy to magnetize, maintain and motivate individuals towards higher performance. He and his scientific management associate described money as the most fundamental factor in motivating the industrial workers in Pakistan industry to attain greater productivity.

As to Spector (1997) who lists the following common factors for job satisfaction: Appreciation, Communication, Coworkers, Fringe benefits, Job conditions, Nature of the work, Organization, Personal growth, Policies and procedures, Promotion opportunities, Recognition, Security, and Supervision.

Quratul, (2011) by citing Kalimullah et al, 2010. It has suggested that reward now cause satisfaction of the employee, which directly influences performance of the employee. Rewards are management tools that hopefully contribute to firm’s effectiveness by influencing individual or group behavior. All businesses use pay, promotion, bonuses or other types of rewards to motivate and encourage high level performances of employees. To use salaries as a motivator effectively, managers must consider salary structures which should include importance organization attach to each job, payment according to performance, personal or special allowances, fringe benefits, pensions and so on (Quratul, 2011).

Chintalloo and Mahadeo (2013) also added that as to study finding in one company, one of the main factors that motivate the employee Ireland Blyth Limited which is one of the largest conglomerates in Mauritius to work harder and better is money. Employees do receive an income from the company, they generally wish for a salary increase. Therefore, they recommend that it should review its wage system for certain employees who have
expressed their discontentment about it. It is also added that when employees are involved in every transaction of the company, they feel „desired/needed” at work, to a certain extent allows employee participation in the decision making process. But the policies, short and long term objectives are those points that need strategic planning (top management) along with assistance of some employees. As it is the employees who have to abide by these rules and work to achieve goals, therefore their advice must be sought at any level. A trade union cannot do much when a decision has already been taken. Therefore, employees’ advice should be sought before the implementation process. Then, employees are also more motivated and are in a better position to follow to the policies. When there is a vacancy at the organization, internal promotion undoubtedly motivates employees. In that way, they feel potentially capable of achieving their goals and organizational objectives and this also boosts their self-esteem. However, the system should reflect transparency and adhere to the fact that the right person should be at the right place (Muogbo, 2013 & Parnell, 2003).

Profit-related pay can be defined as pay that is directly related to the employers’ profit. Thus if one rises, so does the other. This is another financial-way to motivate the employee and helps him to understand better how the economic climate work, supply and demand (costs and prices) (Chintalloo & Mahadeo, 2013).

On the other side, the study done from Petrovietnam Nghe, Construction Joints Stock Corporation (PVNC), in Vietnam, finally found that stresses the avoidance of disparities in pay/reward among staff of the same rank as a strategy to motivate and retain high quality staff in the PVNC. The study thus raises red flags that warn the management to be extra careful in their attempt to motivate staff of PVNC for effective (Nhat, 2012).

As to Mohammad & etal, (2013) in Malaysian Service Industry, it is revealed that training contributed 40.4% to job performance while promotion contributed an additional 3%. An interesting finding of the research is that intrinsic motivational factors are considered more
important compared to extrinsic motivational factors such as payment, job security, and friendly environment. Freedom an intrinsic variable however not found to be significantly related to job performance.

The influencing factors for job satisfaction also include the following (Nhat; 2012, Mullins, 2004; & Muogbo, 2013).

**Communication overload and under load:** One of the most significant features of an individual’s work in a contemporary organization interests the management of communication demands that he or she confronts on the job. According to the ideas of communication over-load and under-load, if an individual does not receive enough input on the job or is unsuccessful in processing these inputs, the individual is more likely to become dissatisfied, aggravated, and unhappy with their work, which leads to a low level of job satisfaction.

**Superior-subordinate communication:** Superior - subordinate communication is an important influence on job satisfaction in the workplace. The way in which subordinates perceive a supervisor's behavior can positively or negatively influence job satisfaction. Communication behavior such as facial expression, eye contact, vocal expression, and body movement is crucial to the superior-subordinate relationship. Nonverbal messages play a central role in interpersonal interactions with respect to impression formation, attraction, social influence, and emotional. Nonverbal immediacy from the supervisor helps to increase interpersonal involvement with their subordinates impacting job satisfaction. A supervisor who uses nonverbal immediacy, friendliness, and open communication lines is more likely to receive positive feedback and high job satisfaction from a subordinate. Conversely, a supervisor who is antisocial, unfriendly, and unwilling to communicate will naturally receive negative feedback and create low job satisfaction in their subordinates in the workplace.
**Employee recognition:** Employee recognition is not only about gifts and points. It's about changing the corporate culture in order to meet goals and initiatives and most importantly to connect employees to the company's core values and beliefs. Strategic employee recognition is seen as the most important program not only to improve employee retention and motivation but also to positively influence the financial situation.

**Emotion:** Mood and emotions at work are related to job satisfaction. Some research suggests moods are related to overall job satisfaction. Positive and negative emotions were also found to be significantly related to overall job satisfaction. Suppression of unpleasant emotions decreases job satisfaction and the amplification of pleasant emotions increases job satisfaction.

**Psychological well being:** Particularly, psychologically well people are more prone to experience positive emotions and less prone to experience negative emotions.

### 2.2.5. Ways to Improve Job Satisfaction

According to George (2013) when you are a manager, one of your jobs is to motivate and develop your employees to improve job satisfaction. If you want to improve your own productivity, you should also be concerned with your own job satisfaction. There are ways in which managers can monitor activity and develop plans that will improve their own performance (George, 2013).

Goals: Employees are motivated by performance goals, and they find pride in achieving or exceeding their goals. Managers should also make goals designed to bring personal and professional satisfaction. For example, if as a sales manager you get a quarterly bonus based on revenue numbers, then set a goal to exceed those numbers and claim a larger bonus. A manager can also set a goal to increase departmental production to get the executive team to allow for necessary upgrades and changes to departmental equipment.
Get Subordinates Involved: Managers who feel the need to perform all of the administrative and managerial tasks for their departments on their own are adding to their own stress and alienating their staff. Learn to get your employees involved in making daily decisions by empowering employees to develop their own work methods. Have a weekly staff meeting where the employees give input on solving departmental issues. Your employees will feel a sense of involvement in the success of the department, and you will have reduced your stress and gained the satisfaction of improving employee development.

Take Breaks: The stress of being a manager can drain some of the sense of satisfaction you get from departmental and personal accomplishments. Taking breaks throughout the day is simple but effective ways to avoid overworking yourself and allow yourself time to collect your thoughts. Your job satisfaction improves because you are giving yourself a chance to relieve stress as opposed to constantly feeling the need to work (George, 2013).

Training: To get more out of yourself as a manager, you need to continue your educational and professional development. Industry training and advancing your educational background can help you to contribute more to your team. You can also improve your own career path by maintaining your own personal development (George, 2013).

2.2.6 Measure of Employee Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1967) claimed that one of the major reasons for measuring job satisfaction is to answer the question, “what does the worker want from his/her job?” and that the answer to this question will assist management in discovering new methods of motivating employees. Employees that have a high job satisfaction care more about the quality of their work and, therefore are more committed to their organization (Scott and Sun, 2003). Job satisfaction is a very important attribute which is frequently measured by organizations. Employee retention and turnover are the most objective measures of employee satisfaction/dissatisfaction in organizations. Luthans (2005) argues
that since job satisfaction is an attitude, it can not be directly observed and therefore must rely on the employees’ self reports. According to him, some of the most common ways of measuring job satisfaction are rating scales, critical incidents, interviews and action tendencies.

The most common way of measurement is the use of rating scales where employees report their reactions to their jobs. Questions relate to rate of pay, work responsibilities, variety of tasks, promotional opportunities, the work itself and co-workers. Some questioners ask yes or no questions while others ask to rate satisfaction on 1-5 scale (where 1 represents "not at all satisfied" and 5 represents "extremely satisfied" One of the most popular rating scale is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967). MSQ was designed to measure employee satisfaction with their jobs. This instrument provides a detailed picture of the specific satisfactions and dissatisfactions of employees. The MSQ measures satisfaction with several aspects of work and the work environment. Several studies have demonstrated good reliability and validity data for the MSQ (e.g., Albright, 1972; Anderson, Hohenshil, and Brown, 1984; Bolton, 1986; Brown, Hohenshil, and Brown, 1998; Decker and Borgen, 1993; Guion, 1978; Levinson, Fetchkan, and Hohenshil, 1988).

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is also popular. The facets of the JDI are derived from the definition of job satisfaction put forth by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). Smith et al. (1969) defined job satisfaction as “feelings or affective responses to facets of the situation” (p. 6). Because of this definition, the JDI viewed satisfaction as the accumulation of five facets: work on present job, present pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and people on your present job (co-workers). JDI has been widely used by organizational behavior researchers over the years and provides a broad picture of employee attitudes toward the major components of jobs. The JDI has been widely used in business and
government (Hulin, 1968; O'Reilly and Roberts, 1973; Waters and Waters, 1969) as both a research tool and a diagnostic indicator. A strong case has been built for construct validity, both in original source (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969) as well as in numerous other publications that report correlation between JDI scales and other measures of job satisfaction (e.g., Dunham, Smith, and Blackburn, 1977).

The JDI is an instrument that is used to assess job satisfaction more than any other inventory (Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, and Carson, 2002). Spector (1997) also states that it may also be the “most carefully developed and validated” job satisfaction measure (p. 12). It is designed to measure job satisfaction on the basis of five facets, including an overall job satisfaction facet, the Job in General (JIG) scale (Kinicki et al., 2002). The basis for the JDI is that job satisfaction is important for three different reasons: humanitarian concerns, economic concerns, and theoretical concerns.

Rating scales offer a number of important advantages in measuring job satisfaction. One is that they are usually short and can be filled out quickly and easily. Another is that they tend to be worded in general language so that they can be used with employees in many different types of organizations. A third is that because they have been so widely used in research, there is usually normative data available so that the responses can be compared with those of employees in other organizations who have taken the test in previous years.

The Critical Incidents technique as a measure of job satisfaction was popularized by Fredrick Herzberg et al (1959). He and his colleagues used it in their research on the two factor theory of motivation. Employees were asked to describe incidents on their job when they were particularly satisfied and dissatisfied. These incidents were then content analyzed in determining which aspects were most closely related to positive and negative attitudes. Other methods are interviews and action tendencies. Interviews allows for an in-depth exploration of job attitudes. If the respondents say something that the interviewer does not
understand or would like to learn more about, the interviewer can follow up with additional questions. Action tendencies are the inclinations people have to approach or to avoid certain things. By gathering information about how they feel like acting with respect to their jobs, the job satisfaction can be measured.

2.2.7 Job Satisfaction and Participation in Decision Making

It is known from various authorities that there is a relationship between various variables in the work environment and job satisfaction. Many studies have been carried out to prove that both management style and job design have an effect on the level of perceived job satisfaction by the employee. Hertzberg et al (1957) notes that aspects of a job such as responsibility, the degree of freedom to act, scope to use and develop skills and abilities, interesting and challenging work opportunities for advancement, rewards and punishment coupled with the quality of supervision will affect the employee’s level of job satisfaction.

Studies show that employees who participate in decision making may feel more committed to execute them properly. Further, the successful process of making a decision, executing it and then seeing the positive consequences can help satisfy one’s need for achievement, provide recognition and responsibility and enhance an employee’s sense of self esteem. By participating in decision making, employees may better understand linkage between their performance and rewards they want most (Moorhead and GrifCin, 1989).

2.3. Conceptual framework

A conceptual framework is an analytical tool with several variations and contexts. It can be applied in different categories of work where an overall picture is needed. It is used to make conceptual distinctions and organize ideas. Strong conceptual frameworks capture something real and do this in a way that is easy to remember and apply. The above researchs shows that there are opinions which support that employee participation in decision making
is related to job satisfaction. However there are other factors that can appropriate and interfere in these two variables. The employee's characters and personality can have a arbitrating effect on job satisfaction. Basically, there always occurs a gap between an individual’s actual state and some desired states and therefore employers should always attempt to learn about the characteristics of their employees and work worrying reducing this gap to maintain a satisfied workforce. People differ; they distinguish themselves from each other regarding their needs, backgrounds, expectations, and individual characteristics. In other words, what may satisfy one employee may be different from what will satisfy another, at least in terms of the satisfaction degree, moreover, some needs may change over time, getting stronger or weaker. A group of employees sharing the same individual features may have the same needs and expectations toward work and may be satisfied in the same way. The knowledge of those factors may be of great value for the organization in order to increase the employees’ satisfaction with the work (Bassy, 2002). Employees’ characteristics in this case include the age, level of education, gender, number of years worked in the organisation, and whether they are employed on part time or full time basis.

The dominant variable in this case is the environment in which the context of decision making in the preparatory school occurs. This includes the preparatory schools which outlines the decision making process and also the hierarchy. The legal structures of the country, the national constitution and human rights laws also are intervening variables in this context. The conceptual framework shown below shows that there is a relationship between participation in decision making but this is moderated by the employees’ characteristics. The intervening variables also have an impact on the level of employees’ participation and hence their job satisfaction.
Employee characteristics:
- Age
- Experience
- Gender
- Part-time/fulltime
- Education levels

Independent variable:
Level of teachers’ participation in school decision-making

Dependent variable:
Level of teachers’ job Satisfaction
- Working conditions
- Pay and promotion potential
- Working relationships
- Use of skills and abilities

Source: Adopted from Ngussa, B. & Gabriel, (2017)
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Design

This study used mixed method of research. Accordingly, it had both qualitative and quantitative research approach. In terms of design, the study was primarily a correlational survey design. This design is used when researchers seek to relate two or more variables to Ketner, Smith, & Parnell, 1997). Correlational design is also used researchers know and can apply statistical knowledge based on calculating the correlation statistical test. This is useful to further clarify the current situation in association to sort out and put standards against the current phenomenon that usually presented in a particular phenomenon (Cohen, 2000). Moreover, this design is easy to generalize data by using the appropriate statistical tools. To support this Kohlbacher (2006) stated that the design is important to make empirical enquiry that can investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real life situation and in which multiple sources of evidence will be used.

3.2. Study Population.

Fundamentally, the population source of the research comprises of Addis ababa Arada subcity Preparatory School teachers who have been teaching there. Thus, In Addis Ababa Arada subcity there are 2 preparatory schools. In these schools, there are a total of 228 teachers. Because of the high amount of number of teachers in the two preparatory schools and time 25 % of teachers. On the other hand, selection of 2 principals and 6 vice principals who are the key informants for the interview was purposive and who are currently working in these 2 schools are the total populations of the study.

3.3. Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sampling technique to select the population size in the study used was simple random sampling technique. Simple random sample is one type of random sampling in which each
element of the population has an equal and independent chance of being included in the sample i.e. a sample selected by randomization method is known as simple-random sample and this technique is simple random-sampling. Considering this, the school teachers were targeted and selected.

3.4. Sample Size, Sampling frame and Sampling Procedure

To determine the sample size from the target population of the study, different authors use different formulas. However, due to the size of the target population, the study used 25% of 228 teachers to be included as respondents.

The researcher took the list of all teachers and principals in the selected schools namely kelemework and Minilik II preparatory school directors. Then 25% of the teachers who are going to participate in this study were be selected by applying systematic random selection method. Systematic sampling is an improvement over the simple random sampling. This method requires the complete information about the population.

3.5. Data Collection Methods

The data for the study were be collected through questionnaire and interview. The structured standardized questionnaires was used and prepared in English language and administered by data collectors who were trained. Accordingly, data collected using questionnaire that contains close ended questions. The questionnaires was also contextualized according to our context.

**Questionnaire:** Teachers participation in decision making, and their job satisfaction in relation to the issue was measured through standardized measurements developed by scholars to measure those mentioned variables (Saha & Kumar, 2017). Added to that the questionare had five general itmes in the beginning session and teachers’ participation in decision-making was measured by a scale developed by van Veldhoven and Meijman (1994)
consisting of ten items (e.g., "Can you discuss work problems with your superior?"). All items will be measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'always' to 'never'.

As far as teachers' job satisfaction in relation to their participation in decision making, a scale developed by Warr, Cook & Wall's (1979) was adopted and used and it has a total of eight items. The items were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'I am extremely satisfied' (5) to 'I am extremely dissatisfied' (1).

Interviews: were presented to principals and vice-principals and recorded with audio recorded in order to be transcribed and translated for data analysis, and the interviews were pre-tested to make the necessary changes, if any, on the questions which might create ambiguity on the respondents' side. Interviews were conducted to school principals and vice principals.

3.6. Reliability and Validity

According to Kumar (1996) in terms of measurement procedures, validity is the ability of an instrument to measure what it wishes to measure. To further strength the validity of the instrument, the researcher used simple appropriate English, which are easily understandable by the respondents to facilitate respondent cooperation and enhance respondents' understanding. The data quality confirmed with the interview and questionnaire which was be pretested before the actual data collection process. Besides, it was evaluated by the thesis advisor. As a result, adjustments were conducted.

Reliability

Reliability is one of the major criteria for evaluating research instruments. Reliability measures the internal consistency of the model. In this research, Cronbach’s alpha was be used to test the reliability of the measures. Reliability is also the extent to which results are consistent over time and accurately represent the characteristics of the total population under
study. A study is reliable if the results can be reproduced under a similar methodology. Therefore, validity and reliability of the instrument was tested and reported.

In order to prove the internal reliability, this study has performed Cronbach’s Alpha Test of Reliability. Cronbach’s alpha is a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set are positively related to one another. This test specifies whether the items pertaining to each variable are internally consistent and whether they can be used to measure the same construct. It is computed in terms of the average inter-correlations among the items measuring the concept. Reliability is calculated in such a way that it represents the reliability of the mean of the items, not the reliability of any single item. Thus, according to Nunnally (1978), Cronbach’s alpha should be 0.7 or above in order to be reliable. Thus it can be concluded that the measures used in this study are valid and highly reliable. Thus pretest was conducted on 20 sampled teachers. The result is presented with the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers participation in decision making</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of teachers job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over all reliability of items</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus according to the table presented above, the internal consistency of the data for participation and job satisfaction were 0.823 and 0.92 respectively. In addition, the overall reliability of the data was 0.93 thus, the questionnaire is consistent and can be considered as reliable.

3.7. Ethical Considerations

The ethics in collecting and gathering the study data were considered by the researcher. On top of that, the issue of honesty and integrity when collecting the respondent’s information also needed attention from the researcher. In this case, since the research was carried out particularly with the teachers’ participation in decision making process, issues like,
confidentiality, honesty and integrity were kept. In addition to this, oral consents were taken with respondents. The researcher also created a good relationship and rapport within the subjects in order to get appropriate data. Further, the researcher respected the respondent’s views and responses that were given in the questionnaire and interview.

3.8. Data Analysis Methods

After data collection, each questionnaire was checked for completeness and code were given before data entry. Data was then entered, sorted, edited and cleaned for missed values. The quantitative (questionnaire) data was processed with Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 and analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

A combination of qualitative and quantitative data analysis method was employed to analyze data that was collected. The qualitative (interview) data was analyzed through narration, description and discussion.

As far as inferential statistics was concerned, one sample t-test was employed to examine the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making as well as the levels of job satisfaction in the study area. to conduct this test, the moderate value or “3” was taken as a test value.

In addition to this, the study employed independent sample t-test in order to examine the difference in job satisfaction and participation in decision making process between male and female preparatory schools.

Thus, to test the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision-making and job satisfaction, Pearson Correlation coefficient was used depending on the nature and distribution of the data.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the results of a statistical analysis of the data obtained from the respondents. First, the demographic information describing the participants is organized, presented in table. Next, it is followed by the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the Likert scale questionnaire which was prepared to assess the relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction in Addis Ababa Arada Subcity Preparatory Schools. The findings of the study were also presented in mean and standard deviations. Subsequently, inferential statistics and correlation were applied. And also data in relation to the literature review were compared to the data collected from the case study.

4.1. Response rate

The study gathered information from teachers in Minilik II and Mis kelemework Preparatory School teachers in Addis Ababa city administration Arada sub city. Out of the fifty six (56) questionnaires distributed to respondents fifty five (55) were returned. From the returned responses one was found invalid where as the remaining fifty four (54) responses were found valid (96% response rate) and used for the analysis. Thus, based on the responses obtained from the respondents data presentation and analysis were made.

4.2. Demographic profile of the respondents

Consideration and analysis of the general background information of the respondents of the present study may give insights about the study and for further assessments of relevant issues. So the results and the corresponding interpretations are presented with the table below.
4.2.1. Sex, work place and educational status of respondents

Table 4.1 sex, department and educational status of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of the respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from above table and pie chart, among all the sampled teachers, 43(79.6%) were males and 11(20.4%) were females. From the result it can be seen that, male teachers constitute three fourth of all the sampled teachers in the study area. Here we can say that
majority of the study respondents participated in providing information to the study were males.
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**Figure 2 respondents Department**

As the above table and piechart shows, of those completing the survey 16(29.6%) were social science teachers while the rest, 38(70.4%) of the respondent teachers were natural science teachers. Here, the survey result further indicated that, more than half of sample teachers were natural science teachers.

In addition, from the survey result shown above, about 5(9.3%) teachers were diploma holders. While 25(46.3%) and 24(44.4%) of the teachers had first degree and masters’ degree respectively. The result indicated that, majority of teachers in the study area were first degree and masters degree holders which constitutes nearly two third of the whole respondents in the study area.
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**Figure 3 respondents Educational status**
4.2.2. Age and Work experience of the respondents

The age distribution of the respondents was also assessed and the result is presented as follows

**Table 4.2 Age and experience of the respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of the respondent</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 31 - 40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 41 - 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11 - 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 21 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those completing the survey 11 (20.4%) were aged below 30, 33(61.1%) aged between 31 and 40 and 10(18.5%) of respondents were aged 41 and above. The result indicates majority of the respondents 61.1 % aged above 30 years. The survey results further indicated that, the average age of the sample respondents were 35.67 years with a standard deviation of 5.769 years. The minimum and maximum age of sampled teachers were also 26 and 48 years respectively. Furthermore, the researcher needed to know the age distribution of respondents so as to get balanced views towards participation on decision making.

Respondents were also requested to indicate their work experience. This was considered significant variable because it has relationship with participation in decision making process among teachers in the study area. The percentage of respondents having been within teaching for 10 years and below is 20(37%), those having been with the profession for 11 to 20 and 21 - 30 years’ account for 51.8% and 11.2% respectively.

In relation to this, the average work experiences of the surveyed teachers were 13 years with
a standard deviation of 7.025. The work experience of surveyed teachers ranges from a minimum of 2 year to maximum of 37 years.

4.3. Level of teacher’s participation in school decision making

The level of teachers’ participation in decision making process was evaluated by using one sample t-test. The extent of participation in decision making process was evaluated by using “3” as a cutoff point/ test value. The results are presented with the table below.

Table 4.3. One sample t-test for the level of teachers’ participation in decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation of teachers in decision making</th>
<th>Test Value = 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 How often you discuss work problems with your administrators?</td>
<td>2.3317</td>
<td>.60349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How often do you have a large degree of influence concerning your work?</td>
<td>2.9568</td>
<td>.48026</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How often do you influence how quickly you have to work?</td>
<td>1.8291</td>
<td>1.09681</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How often do you have a say in choosing who you work with?</td>
<td>2.2161</td>
<td>1.46285</td>
<td>-7.560</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How often do you influence the amount of work assigned to you?</td>
<td>2.1910</td>
<td>1.37206</td>
<td>-8.318</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How often do you have any influence on when you work?</td>
<td>2.9548</td>
<td>1.08384</td>
<td>-0.604</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 How often do you have any influence on HOW you do your work?</td>
<td>2.9618</td>
<td>1.35205</td>
<td>-0.659</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How often do you have any influence on WHAT you do at work?</td>
<td>2.9975</td>
<td>1.37023</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 How often do you have any influence on your work environment?</td>
<td>1.6583</td>
<td>0.37944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 How often do you influence the quality of your work?</td>
<td>3.0774</td>
<td>1.23019</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group mean</td>
<td>2.5175</td>
<td>.56808</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table above shows one sample t-test for the extent of the teachers’ participation in decision making was reported by the respondents. The result reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers discuss work problems with their administrators and the expected mean value (t=−38.998, p < 0.05). That is, the extent of
teachers’ participation in making decisions concerning their work is below the expected mean value (M=2.3317, SD= 0.6349). This implies that the extent of teachers’ participation in making decisions concerning their work was found low.

There was statistically insignificant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in having large degree of influence concerning their work and the expected mean value (t=-0.267, p > 0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in having large degree of influence concerning their work is the same as the expected mean value (M=2.9568, SD=0.48026). This implies that level of teachers’ participation in having large degree of influence concerning their work was found medium.

In addition, there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ decision making in influencing how quickly they work and the expected mean value (t=-15.059, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ decision making in influencing how quickly they work is above the expected mean value (M=1.8291, SD= 1.0961). This implies that the extent of teachers’ decision making in influencing how quickly they work was found low.

There was also statistically significant mean difference between the extent of having a say in choosing who works with them and the expected mean value (t=-7.560, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process in having a say in choosing who works with them is below the expected mean value (M=2.2161, SD=1.4629). This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process in having a say in choosing who works with them was found low.

In addition, there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process to influence the amount of work assigned to them and the expected mean value (t=-8.318, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’
participation in decision making process to influence the amount of work assigned to them is below the expected mean value (M=2.1910, SD=1.37206). This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process to influence the amount of work assigned to them was found low.

Furthermore, there was statistically insignificant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process in having any influence when they work and the expected mean value (t=-0.604, p>0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process in having any influence when they work is the same as the expected mean value (M=2.9548, SD=1.08384). This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process in having any influence when they work was found moderate in the study area.

There was no statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process on having any influence in how to do their work and the expected mean value (t=-0.659, p>0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process on having any influence in how to do their work is the same as the expected mean value (M=2.9618, SD=1.35205). This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process on having any influence in how to do their work was found medium.

Furthermore, there was no statistically significant mean difference between the extent of influence on what to do at work and the expected mean value (t=-0.173, p>0.05). That is, the extent of influence on what to do at work is the same as the expected mean value (M=2.9975, SD=1.37023). This implies that the level of influence on what to do at work was found medium.
There was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of having any influence on their work environment and the expected mean value \( t=-13.494, p < 0.05 \). That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making to have an influence on their work environment is below the expected mean value \( M=1.6583, \ SD=0.37944 \). This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making in having an influence on their work environment was found low.

There was statistically insignificant mean difference between the extent of influence the quality of their work and the expected mean value \( t= 0.993, p > 0.05 \). That is, the extent influences the quality of their work is the same as the expected mean value \( M=3.0774, \ SD=1.23019 \). This implies that the level of influence the quality of their work was found moderate in the study area.

The result of the grand mean reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making and the expected mean \( t=-12.661, p < 0.05 \). That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process is below the expected mean value \( M=3.0774, \ SD=0.56808 \). This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in school decision making process was found low in the study area.

In addition, key informant interviewees also indicated, the participation of teachers in decision making in both two schools is very low because of their willingness and the commitment of administrators to be open on the whole decision making process. According to the key informants there is no any special effort exerted to improve the teachers participation in decision making process. Because of there low participation in the decision making process many decisions was influenced by teachers. Some times the school administrators tried to participate teachers who are a member of teachers association but they are not willing to participate in the decision making process.
### 4.4. The extent of teachers’ job Satisfaction

To investigate the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction, one sample t-test was computed and the result is described below.

#### Table 4.5. One sample t-test for the level of teachers’ job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Test Value = 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 How satisfied are you with your work prospects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 How satisfied are you with the people you work with?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3317</td>
<td>.60349</td>
<td>-28.968</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 How satisfied are you with the physical working conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3568</td>
<td>.48026</td>
<td>-48.267</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How satisfied are you with the way your department is run?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.18065</td>
<td>-11.948</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 How satisfied are you with the way your abilities are used?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2462</td>
<td>1.23692</td>
<td>-8.597</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 How satisfied are you with the interest and skills involved in your job?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7688</td>
<td>.83293</td>
<td>-20.851</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 How satisfied are you with your job as a whole, everything taken into consideration?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9648</td>
<td>1.07955</td>
<td>-0.527</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 How satisfied are you with your usual take home pay?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8593</td>
<td>1.01020</td>
<td>-15.929</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 How satisfied are you with your usual take home pay?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1286</td>
<td>.94106</td>
<td>-29.058</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group mean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.8320</strong></td>
<td><strong>.50876</strong></td>
<td><strong>-23.772</strong></td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above table, there was statistically significant mean difference between the level of teachers’ satisfaction with their work prospects and the expected mean.
value (t=-38.998, p<0.05). That is, the extent of level of teachers’ satisfaction with their work prospects is below the expected mean value (M=1.3317, SD=0.60349). This implies that the level of teachers’ satisfaction with their work prospects was found low.

There was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the people they work with and the expected mean value (t=-48.267, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the people they work with is below the expected mean value (M=1.3568, SD=0.4026). This implies that the level of teachers’ satisfaction with the people they work with was found low.

There was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the physical working conditions and the expected mean value (t=-11.948, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the physical working conditions is below the expected mean value (M=2.00, SD=1.18065). This implies that the level of teachers’ satisfaction with the physical working conditions was found low.

There was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the way their department is run and the expected mean value (t= -8.597, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the way their department is run is below the expected mean value (M=2.2462, SD=1.23692). This implies that the level of extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the way their department is run was found low.

There was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the way their abilities are used and the expected mean value (t=-20.851, p<0.05). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the way their abilities are used is below the expected mean value (M=1.7688, SD=0.83293). This implies that the level of teachers’ satisfaction with the way their abilities are used was found low.
In addition, there was statistically insignificant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the interest and skills involved in their job and the expected mean value ($t=-0.527$, $p<0.05$). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the interest and skills involved in their job is the same as the expected mean value ($M=2.9648$, $SD=1.07955$). This implies that extent of teachers’ satisfaction with the interest and skills involved in their job was found moderate.

Moreover, there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with their job as a whole, and the expected mean value ($t=-19.058$, $p<0.05$). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with their job as a whole is below the expected mean value ($M=1.8593$, $SD=1.0102$). This implies that the level of teachers’ satisfaction with their job as a whole was found low.

Furthermore, there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with their payment and the expected mean value ($t=-29.058$, $p<0.05$). That is, the extent of teachers’ satisfaction with their payment is below the expected mean value ($M=1.1286$, $SD=0.94106$). This implies that the level of teachers’ satisfaction with their payment was found low.

Generally, the result of the grand mean reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers job satisfaction and the expected mean ($t=-23.772$, $p<0.05$). That is, the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction is below the expected mean value ($M=1.8320$, $SD=0.50876$). This implies that the level of teachers’ job satisfaction was found low in the study area.

The key informants also indicated that, teachers are not satisfied with there profession. According to the informants the reason behind the dissatisfaction is the salary and other related rewards. Teachers need adequate teachers’ strategy and administration in terms of
adequate pay/salary, which is proportionate with the job they do and the hours spent on it to be able to satisfy their needs. Moreover teaching is considered to be one of the most stressful and demanding professions due to the workload and deadlines to be met.

4.5. Group difference in participation in decision making between male and female teachers

The existence of group difference between male and female preparatory school teachers in Arada subcity education office was also examined by employing independent sample t-test. The computation of the group difference in equality of means is presented with the table below.

Table 4.5. Independent sample t-test for group difference in Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.584</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2.7299</td>
<td>.61905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions of Independent sample t-test

Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances tests the hypothesis that the two group (Female teachers and male teachers) variances are equal. In the above table the Levene statistic F = 3.584, 0.116 and 0.626 were to the level of participation in decision making respectively; and the corresponding levels of significances are large i.e. p > .05. Thus, the assumption of homogeneity of variances have not been violated in all the two variables, and the Equal variances assumed t-test statistics were used for evaluating the null assumptions of equality of means.
4.5.1. Participation in school decision making process

As far as the teachers participation in decision making processes were concerned, according to the data obtained from the survey result, there was a significant group difference observed between Female teachers and male teachers at 0.05 error level. The independent sample t test result revealed that significant (t= 2.858, p < 0.05) group difference was observed. The difference is significant because higher level of participation in decision making process was reported by male teachers. This can be easily seen by taking the mean results of teachers’ response. The mean values for male and female teachers were 2.7299 and 2.3049 respectively.

The result indicated, those teachers who are males in the preparatory schools also posited that, their participation in decision making processes were higher than female teachers in the study area. In contrary to this, those female teachers reported that they had a lower level of participation in school decision making process. This implies that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process was high in male preparatory school teachers than female teachers in the study area.

4.6. The relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and job Satisfaction.

To compute the degree of relationship between teachers’ participation in school decision making process together with the level of teachers’ job satisfaction the study used Pearson’s correlation coefficients.

To determine the relationship between teachers participation and job satisfaction Pearson product moment correlation analysis technique was employed. The researcher recoded the group mean values for each of the two variables such as participation and job satisfaction scores. To do this assumptions of linearity and multicolinearity were examined. Firstly, the
existence of linear relationship between each variable were examined by using scatter plots and the result is presented with the table below.

**Table 4.6. relationships between job satisfaction and participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Participation of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.552**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of teachers in school decision making</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the correlations among teachers’ level of job satisfaction and participation in decision making process.

The correlation test reveals that there was statistically significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction in decision making ($r= 0.530$, $p<0.01$). This implies that when the teacher job satisfaction increases teachers’ commitment in school decision making process also increases significantly in the study area and vice versa.

The findings suggest that teachers who have a higher level of participation in school decision-making were experiencing relatively higher levels of job satisfaction. These findings are similar to those reported in the literature, which indicated that if teachers are dissatisfied with their work thereby teachers lacked commitment to participate in any decision making process to their organizations (Rosenholtz, 2010)

There was also statistically positive significant relationship observed between teachers’ level of job satisfaction and participation in decision making processes ($r= 0.552$, $p < 0.01$). This implies that when the teachers level of satisfaction increases, the participation in school decision making process also increase and vice versa. The result also revealed that, a moderate and positive relationship was also exhibited.
4.7 Results and discussions

The result of the study reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making and the expected mean. That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process is below the expected mean value. The result correlated positively with job satisfaction.

The result of this study is also consistent with the findings of Taylor (2014). The result of this study revealed that, there is a positive relationship between teachers’ participation in decision making and their job satisfaction. The study also evidenced the fact that most of the elements of participation in decision-making had positive correlation coefficients with the overall measure of job satisfaction, which suggest, that teacher involvement and participation in decision-making increases their level of job satisfaction (Taylor, 2014).

Wyman (2000) also supported shared decision-making, adding that if used correctly it could bring together teachers, parents, administrators, and the community members. In addition, participation in decision-making was one of the many reforms brought to education that attempted to increase teachers involvement, create a sense of community, and increase teacher morale and satisfaction. A major reason for the popularity of this reform is the general trends toward decentralization of school decision-making and consequent improvement of teachers’ involvement in decision making process (Latham, 1998).

Similarly, the results of this study is also consistent with the findings of Simpson (2012). Simpson, (2012) revealed that low teacher commitment to teaching and low teacher commitment to current school are associated with low teacher participation in decision-making, low teacher job satisfaction in general, and low teacher job satisfaction in the current school. Therefore, if teachers are participating less in school decision-making and are less satisfied with their job, they will be less committed to the school and to the teaching profession.
Moreover, the findings also revealed that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers job satisfaction and the expected mean. That is, the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction is below the expected mean value. The result implies that; the level of job satisfaction was found low in the study area.

In line with this, the findings of previous studies also revealed a similar result. Moreover, findings indicate a relationship between ‘pay/salary’ and teacher dissatisfaction. This is consistent with other published research findings of Zembylas et al., (2006) and Ololube (2006). the results of this studies indicated teachers are also dissatisfied with education policies and administration’ as well as ‘insufficient material support.

Teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction revealed significant intercorrelations $r$ ranging from 0.399 to 0.552 and significant for the two total groups of variables. Furthermore, from weak to moderate intercorrelations were revealed among teachers’ participation in decision making and the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction.

The result is also consistent with previously done research works conducted by Bono & Judge (2003). This study showed that the way teachers respond to the organization, students, parents, and job in general may be determined by the degree of their satisfaction and the extent to which they participate in decision-making, which could fit the long-standing discovery that high levels of organizational commitment were associated with both high job satisfaction and participation in organizational processes (Bono & Judge, 2003)
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMERY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary

The research had targeted 58 teachers but 54 questionnaires were completed successfully which leads to a response rate of 96%. This was used to the analysis of the study. In addition, from the survey result shown above, about 5(9.3%) teachers were diploma holders. While 25(46.3%) and 24 (44.4%) of the teachers had first degree and masters’ degree respectively. The result indicates that majority of the respondents 61.1 % aged above 30 years. The percentage of respondents having been within teaching for 10 years and below is 20(37 %), those having been with the profession for 11 to 20 and 21 - 30 years’ account for 51.8% and 11.2% respectively.

The result of the study reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making and the expected mean. That is, the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process is the below the expected mean value (M=3.0774, SD=0.56808). in relation to this the result of the grand mean reveals that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers’ in school decision making processes and the expected mean.

Moreover the findings revealed that there was statistically significant mean difference between the extent of teachers job satisfaction and the expected mean. That is, the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction is below the expected mean value (M=1.8320, SD=0.50876).

There was a significant group difference observed between male and female preparatory school teachers in the level of participation on decision making and job satisfaction between males and female teachers at 0.05 error level. More over all of the two variables have shown a significant relationship with each other.
5.2. Conclusion

The study was conducted on teachers in Mis kelemework and Minilik II preparatory schools in Addis Ababa city administration arda subcity eeducation office. The research had targeted 58 teachers but 54 questionnaires were completed successfully which leads to a response rate of 96%. This was used to the analysis of the study.

The result of the study revealed that the extent of teachers’ participation in decision making process is the below the expected mean value. Based on the above finding the study concluded that the level of teachers’ participation in school decision making process was found low in the study area.

The result of the study also showed that the extent of teachers’ job Satisfaction also revealed that statistically significant mean difference between the extent teachers job satisfaction and the expected mean. The result further portrayed the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction is below the expected mean value. Similarly, the study concluded that the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction was found low in the study area.

The findings of the study revealed statistically significant group difference in participation on decision making between male and female preparatory school teachers.

The findings revealed that teachers’ participation in decision making processes have shown significant group difference between female and male preparatory school teachers. The difference is significant because higher level of participation in decision making process was reported by male teachers. From the findings, the study concluded that the level of teachers’ participation in decision making process were high among male preparatory school teachers than female preparator school teachers in the study area.
Finally, Pearson correlation matrices were conducted for the total sample group and for each of the two major variables in the study. The variables were teachers’ participation in decision making and job satisfaction. The two variables revealed significant intercorrelations \( r \) ranging from 0.399 to 0.552 and significant for the two total groups of variables. Furthermore, from weak to moderate intercorrelations were revealed among teachers’ participation in decision making and the extent of teachers’ job satisfaction. From the result the study concluded that, the higher the level of teachers’ job satisfaction the more the teachers’ participation in school decision making process.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the study recommends the following major points.

- Principals should involve teachers in school decision-making as per ministry of education school administration and community participation guideline specifically in selecting their department leaders, unit leaders, commite representatives, generally in school matters such as promotion policy and working conditions in different staff meetings as a way to develop them on the job for further career advancement and improve their satisfaction in order to enhance guarantee to the profession as well as to the schools.

- School principals, who are hoping for a more satisfied facility, to find creative ways to get their teachers more involved in their work, principals should be aware of overloading and under loading teachers.

- School authorities and government officials should need to develop and implement strategies to deal with the needs of teachers. Proactive attention to this could improve teacher participation in decision-making, teacher job satisfaction, and, therefore, their commitment to the decision making process in the school.

- School principals should involve male and female teachers in the decision making process equally.
• Administrators should be identify the decision making process which needs teachers involvement and decision-making power shall be shared from the hands of the administration towards teachers.

• Teachers should be actively involved in decision-making in their schools so as to encourage, motivate, and utilize their wide range of experience, expertise, and personal characteristics and capability.
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Appendix

Appendix; Questionnaire (Standardized)

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

DEPARTEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Dear respondents,

I am a graduate student of Educational Leadership and Management in Addis Ababa University. As a partial requirement for the completion of the program, I am undertaking a research on the “The relationship between Teachers Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction in Addis Ababa Arada subcity preparatory schools.” The purpose of this questionnaire is to capture first-hand information related to the topic. All the your responses you provide will be used for academic purposes only. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. Therefore, please feel free to genuinely respond to the questions to the best of your knowledge.

Thank you in advance for your collaboration!
**Instructions**

Please put a tick mark (✓) in front of the appropriate alternative(s) for raised questions.

**Part one: Demographic background**

Demographic background of the respondent

1. Sex
   - Male [✓]  
   - Female [ ]
2. Age:
3. Educational status: Diploma [ ] First degree [ ] Masters and above [ ]
4. Experience in years: __________________
5. Department Stream: Social Science [✓] Natural Science [ ]

**Part Two: Teachers Participation in Decision making**

Please tick (✓) the appropriate choice of your response that shows your level of agreement and disagreement to the statement provided.

*(Key: Never/hardly ever = 1  Seldom= 2  Sometimes = 3  Often = 4  Always = 5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. no</th>
<th>Participation in decision making. (Source: A questionnaire on psychosocial working conditions, adopted from Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ), 2012)</th>
<th>Never/hardly ever(1)</th>
<th>Seldom(2)</th>
<th>Sometimes(3)</th>
<th>Often(4)</th>
<th>Always(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Teachers participation in decision making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>How often you discuss work problems with your administrators?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>How often do you have a large degree of influence concerning your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>How often do you influence how quickly you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. no</td>
<td>Participation in decision making. (Source: A questionnaire on psychosocial working conditions, adopted from Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ), 2012)</td>
<td>Never/hardly ever(1)</td>
<td>Seldom (2)</td>
<td>Sometimess(3)</td>
<td>Often(4)</td>
<td>Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have to work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>How often do you have a say in choosing who you work with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>How often do you influence the amount of work assigned to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>How often do you have any influence on when you work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>How often do you have any influence on HOW you do your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8</td>
<td>How often do you have any influence on WHAT you do at work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.9</td>
<td>How often do you have any influence on your work environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10</td>
<td>How often do you influence the quality of your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part Three: Teachers Job Satisfaction**

Please tick (✓) the appropriate choice of your response that shows your level of agreement and disagreement to the statement provided.

(Key: 1= Highly unsatisfied  2= Unsatisfied  3= Moderate  4= Satisfied  5= Highly satisfied)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th><strong>JOB SATISFACTION</strong></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with your work prospects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the people you work with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the physical working conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the way your department is run?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the way your abilities are used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with the interest and skills involved in your job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with your job as a whole, everything taken into consideration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>How satisfied are you with your usual take home pay?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview guide questions for school administrators

- Do you think teachers are adequately involved in decision-making? Why? Why not?
- Can you tell me about special efforts that you exert to involve teachers in decision-making process?
- Do you remember occasions where teachers influenced your decisions if yes do you know the reason?
- How far do you think teachers are satisfied in their profession?
- Do you think teachers are satisfied in any decisions made by the school principals? If No what is the reason behind?
- What are the major barriers to teachers’ decision making in your school?
- In general what should be done to better enhance teachers participation in decision-making and job satisfaction?