

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

#### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes and discusses the findings of the study. The focus of this study was participatory management (PM), organizational commitment (OC) and the relationship between participatory management and organizational commitment in female government high schools in Mashhad, Iran.

The main objective of the study was to determine the extent of participatory management, that is, the participation of teachers in the decision-making process in high schools in Mashhad city in Iran. Participatory management is a new phenomenon in Iran under the concept of school based management (SBM) and local autonomy. In addition, this study had investigated the extent of organizational commitment among high school female teachers in Mashhad district. Organizational commitment among teachers had been problematic in Iran because of the low status of the teaching profession, or because of the increasing workload of teachers.

Another objective of the study was to determine the extent of relationship between participatory management and organizational commitment in female government high schools in Mashhad city. The study also examined the problems and constraints affecting the use of participatory management. Also investigated were the extents of differences of participatory management and organizational commitment with regard to the different districts, teachers' age-groups, and teaching experience of teachers.

This study involved 903 teachers from female government high schools in seven districts of Mashhad during the academic year 2007-2008. A stratify random sampling procedure was used to choose the required teachers for this study.

A questionnaire on participatory management and organizational commitment was constructed, in which the items were derived from readings of relevant literature discussed in Chapter Two. This procedure is to ensure face and construct validity of the instrument. Later, the instrument developed in English was translated to the Persian language by two professors in Ferdowsi University who were experts in Persian language and familiar with the educational management area.

The data were analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences) programs, Version 13. Statistical methods such as mean, standard deviation, *t*-test, Pearson correlation, regression, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) were used to derive the findings of this study.

## **5.2 Overall Summary of Research Findings**

Overall findings of this research has yielded in Table 5.1 until Table 5.5 next pages. These tables summarize the main findings, extracted from the extensive analyses made in Chapter Four before.

**Table 5.1**

*Summarizes the Main Findings Regarding Research Question Number 1*

Components	Results
<b>Trust (PM1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall mean score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Trust component indicate that there was a prominent level of Trust component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV and V had high mean values and Districts I, VI and II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Trust component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed most favourably on the item for “The school head has confidence in teachers’ work and encourages active participation of students in organizing co-curricular activities”.</li> </ul>
<b>Decision making (PM2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall mean score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Decision making component indicate that there was a prominent level of Decision making component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV and V had high mean values and Districts III and II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Decision making component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed most favourably was on the item for “The school head incorporates or implements teachers’ suggestions in managing the school”.</li> </ul>

Table 5.1 (Continued.).

Components	Results
<b>Team working (PM3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall mean score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Decision making component indicate that there was a prominent level of Decision making component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV and V had high mean values and Districts III and II had low mean value .The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Decision making component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed most favourably was on the item for “The school head incorporates or implements teachers’ suggestions in managing the school”.</li> </ul>
<b>Share power (PM4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall mean score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Team working component indicate that there was a prominent level of Team working component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV and VII had high mean values and Districts II had low mean value .The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District I had more agreement about the Team working component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed most favourably on the item for,” Students can take part in different work teams in this school”.</li> </ul>
<b>Motivation (PM5)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Motivation component indicate that there was a prominent level of Motivation component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV and V had high mean values and Districts II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation were the highest for District V,VI, VII meaning the greatest disagreement were among the teachers in the District V,VI,VII in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Motivation component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed most favourably were on the item for” The school head believes in providing genuinely high-quality education by the teachers/staffs for the students”.</li> </ul>



Table 5.1 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>Communication (PM6)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Communication component indicate that there was a prominent level of Communication component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VII had high mean values and Districts III had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District III, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District III in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District II had more agreement about the Communication component .</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “There is open access for free Communication between students and the school head”.</li> </ul>
<b>Involvement (PM7)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Involvement component indicate that there was a prominent level of Involvement component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV had high mean values and Districts II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District III, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District III in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Involvement component .</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The school head encourages the teachers to keep the Teachers’ Council active in this school”.</li> </ul>
<b>Collaboration (PM8)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Collaboration component indicate that there was a prominent level of Collaboration component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV had high mean values and Districts II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation were the highest for District II, VI, meaning the greatest disagreement were among the teachers in the District II, VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Collaboration component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The school head collaborates with the school community in organizing some events”.</li> </ul>

Table 5.1 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>Democracy (PM9)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Democracy component indicate that there was a prominent level of Democracy component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VI had high mean values and Districts I had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District II, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District II in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District I, IV had more agreement about the Democracy component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The teachers feel comfortable sharing their opinions with each other about their work, school, and students, and teachers can express ideas about and criticize educational issues and school organization”.</li> </ul>
<b>Transparency (PM10)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Transparency component indicate that there was a prominent level of Transparency component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV had high mean values and Districts I had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation were the highest for District VI and VII, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI and VII in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Transparency component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The school head informs the teachers about new circulars and policy directives”.</li> </ul>
<b>Innovation (PM11)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Innovation component indicate that there was a prominent level of Innovation component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts V and IV had high mean values and Districts I and III had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District III, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District III in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District I and IV had more agreement about the Innovation component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The school head encourages the teachers to initiate new changes and innovations in the curriculum”.</li> </ul>

Table 5.1 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>Respect (PM12)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Respect component indicate that there was a prominent level of Respect component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV had high mean values and Districts II and I had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VII, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VII in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Respect component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “Staff and teachers present mutual respect while communicating with each other, parents, and students”.</li> </ul>
<b>Problem solving (PM13)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Problem solving component indicate that there was a prominent level of Problem solving component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV had high mean values and Districts II and III had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Problem solving component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The school head tries to find solutions in cooperation with the teachers to solve problems”.</li> </ul>
<b>Identifying common goal (PM14)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Identifying common goal component indicate that there was a prominent level of Identifying common goal component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV had high mean values and Districts III had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District II and VII, meaning the greatest disagreement were among the teachers in the District II and VII in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Identifying common goal component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “The school head provides for the teachers’ being regularly informed about the goals of this school”.</li> </ul>

Table 5.1 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>Equalitarian (PM15)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Equalitarian component indicate that there was a prominent level of Equalitarian component in Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>•The result also shows that the Districts VII had high mean values and Districts II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District III, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District III in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Equalitarian component.</li> <li>•The teachers expressed “The school head believes that as long as the teachers work under her supervision, she must protect all of them”.</li> </ul>
<b>Participatory Management (PM0)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Overall, the mean value and the overall <i>t-test</i> value was more than 60 except for the Share power (PM4) component. The highest mean value is for the Respect (PM12) component whereas the lowest mean value is for the Share power (PM4) component.</li> <li>•The overall mean scores for the Participatory Management and standard deviation value indicate that there was a prominent level of Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad districts. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>•The level of Participatory Management for 14 components was prominent or favourable except for the Share power (PM4) for the female government high schools in Mashhad districts, Iran.</li> <li>•The results also show that District IV had high mean value and District II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for Districts VI and VII, meaning that the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in these two districts in answering the survey questionnaire. However, the teachers in District IV had more agreement about the Participatory Management.</li> </ul>
<b>Organizational Commitment (OC0)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Overall, the mean value and the overall <i>t-test</i> value was more than 60. The highest mean value is for the Involvement (OC9) component whereas the lowest mean value is for the Stabilizing (OC2) component.</li> <li>•The overall mean scores for the Organizational Commitment and standard deviation value indicate that there was a prominent level of Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad districts. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>•The level of Organizational Commitment for 9 components was prominent or favourable for the female government high schools in Mashhad districts.</li> <li>•The results also show that District VI and VII had high mean value. On the other hand, District I and V had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for Districts I, meaning that the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in this district in answering the survey questionnaire. However, the teachers in District III had more agreement about the Organizational Commitment.</li> </ul>

Table 5.2

*Summarizes the Main Findings Regarding Research Question Number 2*

Components	Results
<b>Willing to exert effort (OC1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Willing to exert effort component indicate that there was a prominent level of Willing to exert effort component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts IV and VI had high mean values and Districts I and V had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VI in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District I had more agreement about the Willing to exert effort component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I always like my organization; therefore, I try to put in extra efforts for the progress of this educational organization”.</li> </ul>
<b>Stabilizing (OC2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Stabilizing component indicate that there was a prominent level of Stabilizing component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts III had high mean values and Districts V had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VII, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VII in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Stabilizing component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I like my job that binds me to this organization”.</li> </ul>
<b>Loyalty and allegiance (OC3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Loyalty and allegiance component indicate that there was a prominent level of Loyalty and allegiance component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VI had high mean values and Districts I had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VII, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District VII in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Loyalty and allegiance component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed” I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization”.</li> </ul>

Table 5.2 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>Maintaining membership (OC4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Maintaining membership component indicate that there was a prominent level of Maintaining membership component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts III had high mean values and Districts I had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District I, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in the District I in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Maintaining membership component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I like to maintain membership and remain in this organization”.</li> </ul>
<b>Attachment (OC5)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Attachment component indicate that there was a prominent level of Attachment component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VI had high mean values and Districts V had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District I, and V meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in these District in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District IV had more agreement about the Attachment component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed” I feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization”.</li> </ul>
<b>Feeling of obligation to organization (OC6)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Feeling of obligation to the organization component indicate that there was a prominent level of Feeling of obligation to the organization component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts III and VII had high mean values and Districts V had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District I, and VI meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in these District in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Feeling of obligation to the organization component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I feel obliged to remain with my current employer in this organization”.</li> </ul>

Table 5.2 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>Identification and internalization value (OC7)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Identification and internalization value component indicate that there was a prominent level of Identification and internalization value component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VII had high mean values and Districts II, V and VI had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District VI meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in this District in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Identification and internalization value component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I praise the important values of my school organization”.</li> </ul>
<b>Identification and acceptance goal (OC8)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Identification and acceptance goal component indicate that there was a prominent level of Identification and acceptance goal component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VI and VII had high mean values and Districts I, II and IV had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District I meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in this District in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District III had more agreement about the Identification and acceptance goal value component</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I try to identify and accept my organization’s goals”.</li> </ul>
<b>Involvement (OC9)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall <i>t-test</i> value for the Involvement component indicate that there was a prominent level of Involvement component in Organizational Commitment in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts VI had high mean values and Districts II had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District I meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in this District in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District V had more agreement about the Involvement component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed “I like to engage in scientific activities and extra curricular programs relating to my job”.</li> </ul>

**Table 5.3**

*Summarizes the Main Findings Regarding Research Question Number 3*

Components	Results
<b>PM and OC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Organizational Commitment. Also Identify common goal (PM14) and Transparency (PM10) had the strongest linear correlation with Organizational Commitment rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Organizational Commitment.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII and V had the highest correlation and District IV had the lowest correlation.</li> <li>●There is a strong evidence to show that, from teachers' perspectives, when managers promote a higher level of Participatory Management (PM), then teachers tend to have a higher level of Organizational Commitment (OC), while as to managers with a lower level of PM, teachers tend to have a lower level of OC.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Willing to exert effort (OC1)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Willing to exert effort (OC1). Also Identify common goal (PM14) and Transparency (PM10) had the strongest linear correlation with Willing to exert effort (OC1) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Willing to exert effort.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII and V had the highest correlation and District IV had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Stabilizing (OC2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Stabilizing (OC2).Also Problem solving (PM13) had the strongest linear correlation with Stabilizing (OC2) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Stabilizing.</li> <li>●The results show, District V and VII had the highest correlation and District IV had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Loyalty and allegiance (OC3)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Loyalty and allegiance (OC3). Also Identify common goal (PM14) had the strongest linear correlation with Loyalty and allegiance (OC3) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Loyalty and allegiance.</li> <li>●The results in show, District VII and V had the highest correlation and District I and District VI had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>



Table 5.3 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>PM and Maintaining membership (OC4)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Maintaining membership (OC4).Also Transparency (PM10) had the strongest linear correlation with Maintaining membership (OC4) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Maintaining membership.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII had the highest correlation and District III had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Attachment (OC5)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Attachment (OC5).Also Identify common goal (PM14) had the strongest linear correlation with Attachment (OC5) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Attachment.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII had the highest correlation and District VI had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Feeling of obligation to organization (OC6)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Feeling of Obligation to the Organization (OC6). Also Collaboration (PM8) and Identify common goal (PM14) had the strongest linear correlation with Feeling of Obligation to the Organization (OC6) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Feeling of Obligation to the Organization.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII had the highest correlation and District IV had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Identification and internalization value (OC7)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Identification and internalization value (OC7). Also Collaboration (PM8) and Identify common goal (PM14) had the strongest linear correlation with Identification and internalization value (OC7) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Identification and internalization value.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII had the highest correlation and District V had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>

Table 5.3 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>PM and Identification and acceptance goal (OC8)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Identification and acceptance goal (OC8). Also Identify common goal (PM14) had the strongest linear correlation with Identification and acceptance goal (OC8) rather than other component and Trust (PM1) had the poorest liner correlation with Identification and acceptance goal.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII and III had the highest correlation and District V had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Involvement (OC9)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There were significant liner correlations among the fifteen components of Participatory Management and Involvement (OC9). Also Identify common goal (PM14), Involvement (PM7) and Democracy (PM9) had the strongest linear correlation with Involvement (OC9) rather than other component and Share power (PM4) had the poorest liner correlation with Involvement.</li> <li>●The results show, District VII and III had the highest correlation and District II had the lowest correlation.</li> </ul>

Table 5.4

*Summarizes the Main Findings Regarding to Research Question Number 4*

<b>PM and Educational level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There was a significant differences between PM and educational levels. Also there was a significant difference between all of components of PM and educational levels except Trust (PM1), Share power (PM4) and Communication (PM6). Teachers believe an increase in the levels of education causes a decrease in Participatory Management. Diploma &gt; upper diploma &gt; bachelor &gt; master</li> <li>●There was a significant difference among Participatory Management components and educational level in District I and II.</li> </ul>
---------------------------------	--

Table 5.4 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>PM and Age category</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There was a significant difference between PM and age group. Also there was a significant difference between all of components of PM and age group. Teachers believe an increase in the group of age causes an increase in Participatory Management except in age group 31 to 40 years. 51 years or more &gt; 41 to 50 years &gt; 20 to 30 years</li> <li>● There was a significant difference among some components of Participatory Management and educational level in District I, II, III, V and VII.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Year of service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There was a significant difference between PM and being in job. Also there was a significant difference between all of components of PM and being in job. Teachers believe an increase in the being in job causes an increase in Participatory Management except in being in job 11 to 20 years. 31 years or more &gt; 21 to 30 years &gt; 10 years or less</li> <li>● There was a significant difference among some components Participatory Management and being in job in District I, II, III, IV, VI and VII.</li> </ul>
<b>PM and Other teachers' demography</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There was not a significant difference between Participatory Management and being in school.</li> <li>● There was not a significant difference between Participatory Management and teaching experience.</li> </ul>

Table 5.4 (Continued).

Components	Results
<b>OC and Educational level</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There was a significant difference between OC and educational levels. Also there was a significant difference between all of components of OC and educational levels. Teachers believe an increase in the levels of education causes a decrease in Organizational Commitment. Diploma &gt; upper diploma &gt; bachelor &gt; master</li> <li>●There was a significant difference among some components of Organizational Commitment and educational level in District I, II, III and VII.</li> </ul>
<b>OC and Age category</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There was a significant difference between OC and age group. Also there was a significant difference between all of components of OC and age group except Identification and internalization value (OC7) and Identification and acceptance goal (OC8) Teachers believe an increase in the group of age causes an increase in Organizational Commitment except in age group 31 to 40 years. 51 years or more &gt; 41 to 50 years &gt; 20 to 30 years</li> <li>●There was a significant difference among some components of Organizational Commitment and educational level only in District II, III, and VII.</li> </ul>
<b>OC and Year of service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There was a significant difference between OC and being in job. Also there was a significant difference between all of components of OC and being in job except Stabilizing (OC2). Teachers believe an increase in the being in job causes an increase in Organizational Commitment except in being in job 11 to 20 years. 31 years or more &gt; 21 to 30 years &gt; 10 years or less</li> <li>●There was a significant difference among some components Organizational Commitment and being in job in District III, VI and VII.</li> <li>●There was not a significant difference between OC and being in school and teaching experience.</li> </ul>
<b>OC and Other teachers' demography</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●There was not a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and year of service in school.</li> <li>●There was not a significant difference between Organizational Commitment and teaching experience.</li> </ul>

Table 5.5

*Summarizes the Main Findings Regarding to Research Question Number 4*

Components	Results
<p><b>Constraints in implementing Participatory Management</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●The overall means score and the overall t-test value for the constraints in implementing Participatory Management indicate that there was not a prominent level of constraints in implementing Participatory Management in the female government high schools in Mashhad district. In fact, this situation was the same for all the seven districts.</li> <li>●The result also shows that the Districts III had high mean values and Districts V had low mean value. The value of the standard deviation was the highest for District I, meaning the greatest disagreement was among the teachers in answering the survey questionnaire, and the teachers in the District V had more agreement about the Trust component.</li> <li>●The teachers expressed that there were many constraints in implementing Participatory Management in high schools and they are as follow:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-Lack of a formalized document cause the teams to operate under informal practices that do not promote trust and limit their effectiveness as decision makers, consequently the school head retains the sole authority to endorse or reject a teacher's recommendation.</li> <li>2-Time constraints and technical decisions make teachers unable to attend team meetings.</li> <li>3-Employee barriers exist when non-managerial staffs resist involvement in Participatory Management due to the lack of an organizational climate supportive of employee participation.</li> </ol> </li> <li>●The teachers expressed there were not many constraints in implementing Participatory Management in high school as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1-fear that their effective involvement in Participatory Management will lead to changes in the organization of work that are not to their benefit such as increased workloads or even loss of jobs.</li> <li>2-The school head views Participatory Management as a quick fix solution, underestimating the complexity of shared decision making that inevitably results in the discouragement of teachers.</li> <li>3-Little or no training is provided for the teachers when making the transition to a Participatory Management/ governance structure.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

### 5.3 Discussion of the Findings

Education is a high priority for Iranians, and the Ministry of Education (MOE) of the Islamic Republic of Iran is determined to implement many reforms and innovations in order to improve the development and operation of the education system. One of the reform policies initiated by the MOE is the decentralization policy. This policy was enforced in 2002, and it laid a suitable groundwork for performing school-based management (SBM).

School-based management underscores decentralization, in which contribution of staff ideas, delegation of executive powers and creating flexibility in programs should be in accordance with the school environment. School-based management is a policy which will gradually empower teachers to play a bigger role in management decisions in schools. Fulfilment of this policy requires a shift in the attitudes toward participatory management. Participatory management is a process where subordinates share a significant degree of decision-making power with their immediate superiors (Gono, 2001; Riesgraf, 2002).

School-based management policy is a policy which will gradually transfer some power and authority to schools, and thus will bring about the involvement of many sectors around schools to participate in the learning-teaching process (Khorshidi, 2004). Implementing this policy requires the school managers to believe in the benefits of participatory management. So, the gradual shift to participative management in the workplace is both inevitable and necessary (Wood et al., 2004) and the attitude toward participatory management in school is of great importance (Tasdighi, 2004). The findings of the present study correspond with reports of Esmati (2004), Azemei Yazdi (2002), Akbari (2004), and Jafari (2006).

In addition, researchers report that participatory management is being used more than other forms of administration and this promotes a good educational environment (Ahmadi, 1996; Danesh, 2007; Estarvan, 1998; Ramizani, 1996; Sharifi, 2002; Tasdighi, 2004).

Participatory decision making is better than individual based decision making because it produces widely acceptable policies and decisions. In this respect, female teachers are willing to participate in school (Zeyarati, 2006).

Managers attempting to providing maximum opportunities for organizational members to participate or be involved in decision making (Owens, 2001; Wood et al., 2004) allow free flow of information through open communication channels (Matthews et al., 2003; Owens, 2001; Wood et al., 2004) and grant authority, freedom and autonomy for organizational members to make decisions affecting their work (Matthews et al., 2003; Wood et al., 2004).

Overall results of this study indicated that participatory management was high or at favorable level among the teachers in school management in Mashhad districts; hence female teachers were not denied from participatory management.

The findings indicate that Respect (PM12) component was strongly present in high schools whereas Share power (PM4) component was weakly present in high schools. Furthermore, the overall results of this study indicated that organizational commitment was high or at favorable level among the teachers in Mashhad districts. Hence female teachers were committed to their school as a workplace. The findings indicate that the Involvement (OC9) component was strongly present in high schools whereas the Stabilizing (OC2) component was weakly present in high schools. Therefore there were significant linear correlations among the fifteen components of participatory management and organizational commitment. Furthermore Identify common goal (PM14) and Transparency (PM10) had the strongest linear correlation

with organizational commitment rather than other components. Trust (PM1) had the poorest linear correlation with organizational commitment. Hence, there is strong evidence to show that from the teachers' perspectives, when managers promote a higher level of participatory management (PM), then teachers tend to have a higher level of organizational commitment (OC). Correspondingly when managers have lower level of PM, then teachers tend to have a lower level of OC.

With regard to the results, participation in school enlightenment's vision of common goal, Transparency and Respect show that teachers are willing to increase Involvement in their job in school. It is further noticeable that Share power component was weakly present in high schools and hence teachers were weakly present in Stabilizing in high schools.

Despite Trust component being an essential human value that should be developed in every organization (Stanley, 2005), the findings of this study showed that Trust had the weakest linear correlation with organizational commitment. Managers ought to improve the trust component because it is a critical relationship and lack of trust can affect an organization's productivity significantly.

Additionally, organizational commitment is a vital component in any effective organization (Brantley, 1993) and it is important to achieve human resources capabilities (Chang, 2006).

Teacher commitment has been identified as a key aspect of a school's capacity for reform (Geijsel et al., 2003) and renewal through insights and it determines the quality of teaching and the quality of school improvement.

One of the ways of improving job commitment is by instituting a spiritual program. Evidence is emerging that workplace spirituality programs not only lead to beneficial personal outcomes such as increased positive human health and psychological well-being but that they also deliver improved employee commitment, productivity and



reduced absenteeism and turnover (Fry et al., 2005; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Malone & Fry, 2003).

According to Parniyan (2000) and Hafezy (1998), there is a significant connection between gender and organizational commitment. According to Adin (2001) female teachers have more problems for membership in organization than male teachers. Hence female teachers have more commitment than male teachers in educational organizations in Iran (Hafezy, 1998; Parniyan, 2000).

The results of this study show that there were empirical and theoretical relationships between participatory management and organizational commitment of teachers in female government high schools in Mashhad, Iran. The findings indicate that participatory management and organizational commitment were moderately related. The statistical analysis showed that moderate correlations exist among the entire components of participatory management and organizational commitment. Hence, it can be posited that a high participatory management by school managers would lead to a high organizational commitment among teachers.

Studies done by Akbari (2004), Adebzadeh (2004), and Keshvary (2003) showed that their research findings differ from the results of the present study. They showed there were no significant differences among teachers of different educational levels with respect to their perception of participatory management in Mashhad city. According to Zeyarati (2006) and Motamed Shariati (2005), teachers who have more than 10 years service use participatory management more than teachers of other age groups. However, the findings of this study were not supportive of Adebzadeh (2004) and Keshvary (2003) who found no significant differences between participatory management and years of service among teachers in Mashhad districts.

Besides, there are significant differences among educational level of teachers with respect to their organizational commitment. The findings of this study were

supportive of Adin (2001) Parniyan (2000) Hafezy (1998) and Khosravi (2005) because they found there were significant differences in participatory management among teachers with different years of service in Mashhad districts. Moreover results of this study correspond with the findings of Chen and Francesco (2000), Steers (1977), Meyer and Allen (1984) and Yoshimura (2003) where they report that there is a significant difference of organizational commitment among employee's age. In contrast, these results disagree with the findings of Fung (2006) and Keong and Sheehan (2004) where they report that there is no significant difference between organizational commitment and employee's age.

#### **5.4 Implications of the Findings**

The findings implies that the policy makers in (MOE) should pay attention to activate Teachers Training Centers (TTC) and increase the level of trainee teachers to at least a diploma and ensure entrants be at least 18 years old. Furthermore there is need for TTC to enlist the services of trained personnel who have experience in teacher education. They will be able to mould the trainees into efficient and effective teachers. Hence teacher training centers have suitable background to improve participatory management. Improvement of employee academic qualification and teachers' professional skills have been among the basic policies followed by the authorities of MOE in recent years. In this regard, by attracting the assistance and contributions of higher education centers affiliated to MOE as well as with the help of other organizations, a proper ground has been created to provide teachers with higher education. Also, suitable facilities have been provided for teachers to continue their studies up to master and PhD degrees. Furthermore the school principals should have the required related qualifications, knowledge and skills. Regarding this issue some of the most important items are as follows:

- Improving the existing management system by recognizing the existing situation, refining training and stabilizing the principals.

- Attracting qualified and competent principals in accordance with the determined scientific and specialized skills for their appointment.

- Developing motivation in the principals regarding establishment of a scientific system for evaluating the principals' performance

- Delegation of authority to the principals according to school-based policies

- Continuous training and improving the principals' knowledge and academic qualifications

Participatory management features that are carried out to help fulfil the objectives of education may provide positive feedback that would help not only to reform but also refine the educational system. These features include:

- The necessity of informing the executive personnel of the results of participatory management in order to reduce their resistance against the reforms.

- The participatory management occurring in the education system which facilitates the fulfilment of the aims are welcomed more willingly. Moreover, feedback on the system will lead to more effective reforms.

- In the classification of the results obtained through Participatory management, one should establish a classification spectrum. Sometimes the results of the reforms are quite satisfactory in one place and at the same time it may not have any positive effect in another region or the results may be unsatisfactory. So it is essential to regard the region being covered by the reforms and to estimate the expected coefficient of the results.

## 5.5 Suggestions for Further Study

Since this study examined participatory management and organizational commitment as a multidimensional phenomenon that had not been previously studied in Iran, it is an area with promising potential for future research. Much of the previous research on participatory management and organizational commitment in the workplace examined a small number of components, but in this study the researcher considered participatory management with fifteen components and organizational commitment with nine components. So the findings of this study have expanded the understanding on factors which could affect teachers and create a need for continued research in this area. Hence, a similar study should be conducted to include different female government high schools in various regions of the country to confirm the results of this research.

It is recommended that this study should be replicated in male schools in Iran. It would be interesting to explore the diversity of findings for male teachers as a study sample. In addition it is recommended that this study be replicated in different schools other than public and private service departments. Any follow-up study should use the same research instruments to determine whether the results of the original study could be extended to other organizations.

Future research should continue to explore and recognize other components of participatory management and organizational commitment. As mentioned in this study, deeper knowledge in this area will allow managers to understand more fully the organizational commitment of teachers. Continued research is needed to understand more thoroughly the positive influence of participatory management on organizational commitment.

## 5.6 Conclusion

Decentralization policy in Iran in recent years had triggered a movement in education which driven by the belief that it would enhance the quality of education and efficiency of administration of the education system. The policy had led to school based management with a broad autonomy to many areas in school management. One of the spin-offs of school based management was participatory management in schools by which teachers, students, and parents were given more zooms in school improvement efforts.

This research examined the relationship between PM and organizational commitment in female government high schools in Mashhad, Iran. This study examined PM and organizational commitment as multi dimensional phenomena that had not been previously studied in Iran. The previous research on participatory management and organizational commitment in the workplace examined a small number of components. The findings of this study have expanded the understanding on factors which could affect teachers and create a need for continued research in this area.

This study shows that female teachers were involved in participatory management and were committed to their profession and organization. Findings of this study show that there were empirical and theoretical relationships between participatory management and organizational commitment of teachers in female government high schools in Mashhad, Iran.

Although, participatory management increased decision-making power in schools, it is however a tool and not a goal in itself. This study found that some critical components of participatory management have certain amount of effects on organizational commitment. Participatory management provides schools with the

opportunity to increase teachers' professionalism through various activities such as identify common goal, team work, collaboration, transparency, and respect.

In this study, the managers did not consider participatory management as a quick fix solution, but the important constraints of participatory management was lack of a formalized document, and this caused teams to operate under informal practices. Additionally, the school head retains the sole authority to endorse or reject a teacher's recommendation. Since, managers did not have trust in teachers. Since one major barrier to the success of participatory management in female high schools was underestimating the complexity of shared decision making thus principals should try to provide suitable situation to implement participatory management and give results of participatory management in order to reduce their resistance of teachers. More over feedback of the system lead to more effective performance.

The findings of this study could be used to make some changes to the management process of high schools, improve organizational commitment of teachers, and improve organizational performance of schools in Iran. In addition, the findings could be used to obtain a more comprehensive view on the applicability of participatory management in enhancing organizational commitment of staff and organizational performance of schools. Application of the findings would bring about a suitable platform for initiating changes in female high schools in Iran to enhance organizational commitment and thus optimize participation in the teaching learning process.

The findings of this research suggested theoretically that participatory management was a means of democratic decision making process which could lead to a more open and progressive school climate and development based on the spirit of collegiality, autonomy, and commitment.

## REFERENCES

- Abdollahi, B. A. (1996). Study on management style and job satisfaction (Master dissertation, Islamic Azad University of Torbat Jam, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 145, 153LA.
- Abolfazliyan, Eisa. (2004). A study of the role of participatory management in creativity of teachers in secondary schools in Bojnoord (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 186, 130LB.
- ACCEL team. (2007). Employee Motivation: Theory and practice. Retrieved from <http://www.accel-team.com/motivation>
- Acker, G. M. (2004). The effect of organizational conditions (role conflict, role ambiguity, opportunities for professional development and social support) on job satisfaction and intention to leave among social workers in mental health care. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 40(1), 5-73.
- Ackoff, R. L. (1999). Transformational leadership. *Strategy and Leadership*, 27, 20-25.
- Adebzadeh, Hassan. (2004). A comparative relationship of participatory management and performance of teachers in primary schools in Bojnoord (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 135, 134LB.
- Adin, Jafar. (2001). The study of relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment in school (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 155, 134LA.
- Adriana, Blom. Maria. (1999). Democratic personnel management: A case for teacher participation (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Pretoria, South Africa). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 185, AAT 0800903.
- Afshareyan, Maryam. (2001). A comparative survey on style management to morale of teachers in female high school in seven districts in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 115, 104LC.
- Agarwal, S., DeCarlo, T. E., & Vyas, S. B. (1999). Leadership behavior and organizational commitment: A comparative study of American and Indian salespersons. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30, 727-743.
- Ahmadi, Y. (1996). Study on trends of teachers in educational decision making (Master dissertation, Shiraz University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 184, 123LA.
- Akbari, Zahra. (2004). A survey on the number of teachers' participation in decision making in schools and presenting guides for participating (Master dissertation,

Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 129, 110LC.

- Akdogan, Asuman, & Cingoz, Ayse. (2008). The effects of organizational downsizing and layoffs on organizational commitment: A field research. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 14(2), 337-344.
- Albanese, R. (1975). *Management: Towards accountability for performance* (pp. 495-96). Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Allen, G. (1998). Supervision Management ModernTeam Building. Retrieved from [http://ollie.dcccd.edu/mgmt1374/book\\_contents/4directing/trng/train.htm](http://ollie.dcccd.edu/mgmt1374/book_contents/4directing/trng/train.htm)
- Allen, M. W. (1992). Communication and organizational commitment: Perceived organizational support as a mediating factor. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(4), 357-367.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, T., & Rush, M. (1998). The effect of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 247-60.
- Alutto, J. A., Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alonso, R. C. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. *Social Forces*, 51, 448-454.
- Amabile, T. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.
- Amis, J., Pant, N., & Slack, T. (1997). Achieving a sustainable competitive advantage: a resource-based view of sport sponsorship. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 80-96.
- Amis, J., Slack, T., & Berrett, T. (1999). Sport sponsorship as distinctive competence. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(3/4), 250-72.
- Anderson, G., & Arsenault, N. (2002). *Fundamentals of educational research*. London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Anderson, G. L. (1998). Toward authentic participation: Deconstructing the discourses of participatory reforms in education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 35(4), 571-603.
- Andrews, P. H., & Herschel, R. T. (1996). *Organizational communication: Empowerment in a technological society*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Angle, H., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.



- Angle, H., & Perry, J. (1986). Dual commitment and labor-management relationship climates, *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(1), 31-50.
- Anthony, W. P. (1978). *Participative management*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., & Berg, P. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance systems pay off*. ILR Press, Ithaca Austar (2006) Annual Report.
- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Armon, J. M. (1994). Factors that influence faculty organizational commitment in higher education (PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 106, AAT 9524892.
- Arnett, D. B., Laverie, D. A., & McLane, C. (2002). Using job satisfaction and pride as internal-marketing tools. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 87-96.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 267-285.
- Ashkavandei, T. (1995). Survey related style of management regarding to Redin's three diminutions effectiveness in high school in Isfahan (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 143, 100LA.
- Ashrafi, B. (1995). The effect of factors in organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Tarbiyat Moddares University of Tehran, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 183, 121LA.
- Asma Abdullah. (1996). *Going global: Cultural dimensions in Malaysian management*, Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.
- Asmah, Hj .Omar. (1996). *Women in academic leadership position in higher education in Malaysia*. Paper presented at the Commonwealth Higher Education conference, South Africa.
- Arnold, H., & Feldman, D. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67,955-66.
- Azemei Yazdi, Ahmad. (2002). A survey of teachers' opinions about different style of management in schools (Master dissertation, Islamic Azad University of Torbat Jam, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 125, 189LA.
- Babakus, N. (2003). The effect of management commitment to service quality on employees' affective and performance outcomes, *Journal Academy Mark Sci*, 31 (3), 272-286.
- Babin, B. J., & Boles, J. S. (1996). The effects of perceived co-worker involvement and supervisor support on service provider role stress, performance and job satisfaction, *Journal of Retailing*, 72(1), 57-75.

- Bacon, N., & Blyton, P. (2001). High involvement work systems and job insecurity in the international iron and steel industry. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 18(1), 5-16.
- Baker, G. A., & Manzo-Ramos, F. (1996). Personal Assessment of the Organizational Climate (PACE): A report for North Carolina Cooperative Extension system. Study findings presented at the 1996 annual conference of the NC Cooperative Extension Conference, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC. Unpublished Manuscript of the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness.
- Baldrige National Quality Program. (2005). *Criteria for performance excellence*. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.
- Ball, D. (2004). The role of communication and trust in explaining customer loyalty an extension to the ECSI model, *Journal of Marketing*, 38(9/10), 1272-1293.
- Balliet, L. (1989). *Survey of labor relations*. Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.
- Balovich, B. (2006). Respect in the Workplace, Creditworthy News. Retrieved from <http://www.creditworthy.com/3jm/articles/cw81706.html>
- Banihashemi, M. (1998). Participatory management and its relation on effectiveness (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 254, 139LA.
- Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnecut, L. (2002). What is innovation? Ayers Report. Retrieved from <http://www.ayers.com/AYERS%20Spring%202002h.pdf>.
- Bartle, P. (2007). Participatory management, running a project, an NGO, a department or a firm. Retrieved from <http://www.scn.org/ip/cds/cmp/modules/pm-int.htm>
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1991). Matrix management: Not a structure, a frame of mind. In Participative management (pp. 23-30). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Review Paperback.
- Bateman, T., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 95-112.
- Bayat, M. (1997). The role of style in education management and its effectiveness on employer's stay in organization (Master dissertation, Islamic Azad University of Tehran, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 154, 139LA.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-40.

- Beck, K. (1999). Optimizing the organizational commitment of police officers: Background and summary of the research and guidelines for management. *National Police Research Unit*: Payne ham, SA.
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Figures of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 177-190.
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilber, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 464-482.
- Beetham, (1999). *Democracy and human rights*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Belasco, J., & Strayer, R. (1993). *Flight of the buffalo*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Benito, G. (2005). The relationship between decision making and trust: A study of principals and teachers in Edinburgh (Ph.D dissertation, Texas Capella University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 118, AAT 3179180.
- Bentein, R. J., Vandenberghe, C., & Florence, S. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 468-482.
- Berggren, E., & Bernshteyn, B. (2007). Organizational transparency drives company performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(5), 411 – 417.
- Bessire, Dominique. (2005). Transparency: A two-way mirror? *International Journal of Social Economics*, 32(5), 424 – 438.
- Bishop, J., & Scott, K. (2000). An examination of organizational and team commitment in a self-directed team environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 439-50.
- Birnbaum, D., & Somers, M. J. (1993). Fitting job performance into turnover model: An examination of the form of the job performance–turnover relationship and path model. *Journal of Management*, 49(2), 1-11.
- Blase, J., & Blasé, J. (1997). The micropolitical orientation of facilitative school principals and its effects on teachers' sense of empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(20), 138-164.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2001). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blau, G. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 277-288.
- Blau, G. (1986). Job involvement and organizational commitment as interactive predictors of tardiness and absenteeism. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 577-84.

- Blau, G. (2000). Job, organizational, and professional context antecedents as predictors of intent for inter role work transitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 330–345.
- Blau, G. (2003). Testing for a four-dimensional structure of occupational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 469-488.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Blomqvist, K. (2002). Partnering in the dynamic environment: The role of trust in asymmetric technology partnership formation, *Acta Universitatis Lappeenrantaensis*, No.122.
- Bloom, P. J. (2000). *Circle of influence: Implementing shared decision making and participative management*. Lake Forest, IL: New Horizons.
- Bordens, K. S., & Abbott, B. B. (1991). *Research design and method: A process approach* (2nd ed.). California: Mayfield.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Bowling, C. A. (2006). *Perceptual patterns of involvement management and effectiveness in public higher education*. The Pennsylvania State University. AAT 3231808.
- Boyd, W. L. (1990). Balancing control and autonomy in school reform: The politics of Perestroika, in Murphy, J. (Eds), *The educational reform movement of the 1980s*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Bransford, J., & Stein, B. (1984). *The IDEAL problem solver*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Brantley, P. (1993). The many faces of commitment. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 2(1), 3-4.
- Brown, B. B. (2003). Employees' Organizational Commitment and Their Perception of Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Retrieved from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-04072003-224349/unrestricted/BarbaraBrown-4-22-03.pdf>
- Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1994). The effect of effort on sales performance and job satisfaction, *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2), 70–80.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120 (2), 235-55.
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement*, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Bush, T., & Gamage, D. (2001). Models of self-governance in schools: Australia and United Kingdom. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(1), 39-44.
- Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 643-663.
- Camp, S.D. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *Personnel Journal*, 74(3), 279-305.
- Carter, S. L. (1996). The power of integrity: Eight ways to save democracy. *Utne Reader*, 76, 47-50.
- Cascio, W. (1999). Virtual workplaces: Implications for organizational behavior. In L. Cooper & D. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behavior* (pp.1-14). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Cascio, W. (2000). Managing a virtual workplace. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 81-90.
- Case, J. (1998). *The open-book experience: Lessons from over 100 companies who successfully transformed themselves*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ceylan, A., & Ulutürk, Y. H. (2006). Rol belirsizligi, roi çatismasi is tatmini ve performans arasmdaki iliskiler. *Dogus Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 48-58.
- Chalmers, L. E. (1997). The antecedents of organizational commitment: Adding supervisory communication to the Steers' equation [CD ROM]. Abstract from: ProQuest File: Master's Abstracts International Item: 35/03.
- Chan, B. Y. M., & Chui, H. S. (1997). Parental participation in school councils in Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 11(3), 102-110.
- Chang, E. (2006). Composite effects of extrinsic motivation on work effort: Case of Korean employees, *Journal of World Business*, 38, 70-79.
- Chapman, J. D., & Boyd, W. L. (1986). Decentralization, devolution, and the school principal: Australian lessons on statewide educational reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(4), 28-58.
- Clampitt, P. G., & Downs, C. W. (1993). Employee perceptions of the relationship between communication and productivity. *Journal of Business Communication*, 30(1), 5-28.

- Chen, Huei-Fang, & Chen, Yi-Ching. (2008). The Impact of Work Redesign and Psychological Empowerment on Organizational Commitment in a Changing Environment: An example from Taiwan's State-Owned Enterprises. *Management Washington*, 37(3), 279-309.
- Chen, Z. X., & Francesco, A. M. (2000). Employee demography, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions in China: Do cultural differences matter? *Human Relations*, 3(6), 869-87.
- Chena, C. (2006). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and flight attendants' turnover intentions: A note. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 12(5), 274-276.
- Cheng, Y. C., & Cheung, W. M. (2003). Figures of multi-level self-management in schools. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(3), 100-115.
- Cheney, G., & Christensen, L. (2001). Organizational identity linkages between internal and external communication. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds), *The new handbook of Organizational Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Christensen, L. T. (2002). Corporate communication: The challenge of transparency. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 7(3), 162 – 168.
- Clugston, M. (2000). The mediating effects of multidimensional commitment on job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 477-486.
- Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management*, 26, 5-30.
- Cohen, A. (1993). On the discriminate validity of the Meyer and Allen (1984) measure of organizational commitment: How does it fit with the work commitment construct? In N. S. Bruning (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Administrative Science Association of Canada*. *Organizational Behavior*, 14, 82-91.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.
- Collins, D. (1996a). How and why participatory management improves a company's social performance: Four gain sharing case studies. *Business and Society*, 35(2), 176-210.
- Collins, D. (1996b). Whither democracy? Lost debates in management empowerment, *Journal of Empowerment in Organizations*, 4(1), 12 – 24. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>.
- Connors, L. (1978). *School-based decision making*. Australia: School Commission.

- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39–52.
- Costa, A. C. (2003). Understanding the nature and the antecedents of trust within work teams. In B. Nooteboom & F. Six (Eds), *The Trust Process in Organizations: Empirical Studies of the Determinants and the Process of Trust Development*, pp.105-24. Northampton, MA, Edward Elgar.
- Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A., Froggatt, K. L., Lengnick-Hall, M. L., & Jennings, K. R. (1988). Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(1), 8-22.
- Coulson-Thomas, C. (2004). *Transforming the company, manage change, compete and win*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Counseling Services. (2007). Student Affairs, State University of New York at Buffalo. Retrieved from <http://ub-counseling.buffalo.edu/probsolve.shtml>
- Crane, Tara. Christopher, Dillard, Betty. G., & Hamilton, Jean A. (2003). Empowered teams effecting positive corporate culture change. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 7(2), 182-195.
- Creemers, B. P. M. (1994). The history, value and purpose of school effectiveness studies. In D. Reynolds, B. P. M. Creemers, P. S. Nesselrodt, E. C. Schaffer, S. Stringfield & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Advances in school effectiveness research and practice* (pp. 9-23). England: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Dachler, H. P., & Wilpert, B. (1978). Conceptual dimensions and boundaries of participation in organizations: A critical evaluation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 1-39.
- Dale, K. M. (1997). An investigation of the relationship between work value congruence in a dyad and organizational commitment as mediated by organizational influences (Ph.D dissertation, University of North Texas, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 191, AAT 9727771.
- Danesh, F. (2007). Study of style management in central liberally in Mashhad and Ahvaz. *Journal of Electronic*, 14(3). Retrieved from [http://www.irandoc.ac.ir/data/e\\_j/vol3/danesh.htm](http://www.irandoc.ac.ir/data/e_j/vol3/danesh.htm) -118k
- Daniels, K., & Bailey, A. (1999). Strategy development processes and participation in decision-making: Predictors of role stresses and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 8(1), 27-42.
- Darwish, A.Y. (2002). Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between role stressors and organizational commitment. A study from an Arabic cultural perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(4), 250–266.
- Davari, Nikoo. (2005). A survey of relationship between participatory management and increase of performance of managers in secondary school in district five in

- Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 149, 119LC.
- David, J. L. (1989), Synthesis of research on school-based management, *Educational Leadership*, 46(8), 45-53.
- Davoodipoor, A. (2006). A survey on the possibility of achieving school based management according to mission, participation and organizational commitment employee in the middle schools in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 132, 119LC.
- Dawkins, C. E., & Frass, J. W. (2005). Decision of union workers to participate in employee involvement: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Employee Relations*, 27(5), 511 – 531.
- De Ridder, J. (2003). Organizational communication and supportive employees. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(4).
- DeConinck, J., & Bachmann, D. (1994). Organizational commitment and turnover intention of marketing managers. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10(3), 87-95.
- DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 225-231.
- DeCotiis, T., & Summers, T., (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, 40(7), 445-470.
- Dee, J., & Henkin, A. (2001). *Smart school teams: Strengthening skills for collaboration*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Deetz, S. (2001), Conceptual foundations. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds), *The new handbook of organizational communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Degeling, P., Hill, M., Kennedy, J., Coyle, B., & Maxwell, S. (2000). A cross-national study of differences in the identities of nursing in England and Australia and how this has affected nurses' capacity to respond to hospital reform. *Nursing Inquiry*, 7, 120-35.
- Delavar, Hussan. (2003). A study of relationship in relationship to the level of human behavior on the effectiveness of manager (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 173, 144LB.
- Dempster, N. (2000). Guilty or not? The impact and effects of site-based management on schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(1), 47-63.
- Denison, D. R. (1990). *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*. New York, NY: Wiley.



- Diamond, L. (1995). Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives, Washington, DC: Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict. Retrieved from [http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/democ\\_con\\_manag](http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/democ_con_manag).
- Dienhart, J. R., & Gregoire, M. (1993). Job involvement, job security, and customer focus of quick-service restaurant employees. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 16(2), 29-44.
- DiFonzo, N., & Bordia, P. (1998). A tale of two corporations: Managing uncertainty during organizational change. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3/4), 295-303.
- Dirks, K., & Ferrin, D. (2001). The role of trust in organizational setting. *Organization Science*, 12, 450-467.
- Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004-1012.
- Dirks, K. T., Ferrin, D. L. (2002). The role of trust in organizational settings, *Organization Science*, 12 (4), 450-67.
- Dodd-McCue, D., & Wright, G., (1996). Men, women and attitudinal commitment: the effects of workplace experiences and socialization. *Human Relations*, 49, 1065-1091.
- Dondero, Grace M. (1997). Organizational climate and teacher autonomy: Implications for educational reform. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 11(5), 218-221.
- Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P., & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 601-20.
- Donovan, D. T., Brown, T. J., & Mowen, J. C. (2004). Internal benefits of service-worker customer orientation: job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 128-146.
- Doran, C. (1999). The effectiveness of school-based management from the perspective of secondary school communities in New South Wales. University of Newcastle, Callaghan.
- Downs, C. W., Downs, A., Potvin, T., Varona, F., Gribas, J. S., & Ticehurst, W. (1995). *A cross-cultural comparison of relationships between organizational commitment and organizational communication*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Driscoll, J. W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(1), 44-56.
- Drucker, P. F. (2002). *Managing in the next society*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

- Doyle, J. L., & Wells, S. (1996). LMS: The managerial climate and its effects on the interpersonal climate of the school. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(6), 32-41.
- Duke, D. L., Showers, B. K., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: the costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16(1), 93-106
- Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Casteneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 370-380.
- Dunlap, D. M., & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27(1), 5-29.
- Dutton, B. G. (1973). Staff management and staff participation. *Aslib Proc*, 25(3)111-125.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Education System in Iran. (2007). Student advisory. Retrieved from <http://www.iran-embassy-oslo.no/embassy/educat.html>
- Edwards, L. J. (2002). Comparing the middle manager's willingness to utilize participative decision making with their firm's support of the participative management style: Can this predict intention to leave? (Ph.D dissertation, Colorado Technical University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM 2002.
- Eisenberger, Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 42-51.
- Eisenberger, Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.
- English, P. S. (1979). The concept of leadership and the role of the school principal. *Unicorn*, 5(3), 294-303.
- Esmati, Mohamad Ebrahim. (2004). The relationship of participatory management and productivity in educational environment in Birjand (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 230, 121LC.
- Estarvan, H. (1998). Organizational commitment. *Journal management in education*. Tehran, 5 (17).

- Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Eugene, B. R. (2001). A study of association between organizational trust and decision-making, communications, and collaboration in comprehensive, regional institutions of higher education (Ph.D dissertation, New Mexico State University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 113. AAT 9996985.
- Faille, A. (2000). Employee power. *CA Magazine. Toronto*, 133, p. 45.
- Farrell, D., & Petersen, J. (1984). Commitment, absenteeism, and turnover of new employees: A longitudinal study, *Human Relations*, 37 (8), 681-92.
- Farrell, K. R., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27, 78-95.
- Farrokhi, M. H. (1995). The ways of increasing efficiency and job satisfaction (Master dissertation, University of Tehran , 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 179, 187LA.
- Fatahei, Z. (1998). Survey related style of management of women in high school in Isfahan (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 165, 112LA.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. London, UK. Pitman.
- Festinger, L. et al. (1950). The Functioning of Groups. pp. 3-12 (Chapter 1). In *Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fidler, B., & Bowles, G. (1989). *Effective local management of schools: A strategic approach*. Essex: Longman Industry and Public Service Management.
- Fiedler, A. M. (1993). The effect of vision congruence on employee empowerment commitment, satisfaction, and performance (Ph.D dissertation, Florida International University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 192, AAT 9319048.
- Finegan, J. E. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 149-169.
- Firestone, W. (1990). Succession and bureaucracy: Gouldner revisited. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 345-75.
- Flippo, E. (1970). *Management: A behavioral approach* (2nd ed). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. p. 352. And Glaser, *Managing by Design*, p. 112.
- Ford, R., & Anger Meier, Ingo. (2008). Creating a learning health care organization for participatory management: A case analysis. *Journal of Health Organization and management*, 22(3) 269-293.

- Forginajad, Zahra. (2000). The study of relationship between participatory of teachers in decision making and job satisfaction in female and male high school in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 122, 145LB.
- Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond contract: Power and trust relations*. London, UK: Faber.
- Francis, D. (1989). *Organizational communication*. Aldershot, UK: Gower.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Fritz, M., Rhee, H., & Narasimhan, S. (1998). Communication and coordination in the virtual office. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 14(4), 7-28.
- Fry, L., & Matherly, L. (2006). Workplace spirituality, spiritual leadership, and performance excellence. In S. Roglberg & C. Reeve (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Sage.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727.
- Fry, L. W. (2005). Toward a theory of ethical and spiritual well-being and corporate social responsibility through spiritual leadership. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Positive psychology in business ethics and corporate responsibility*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Fry, L. W., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual Leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 835-862.
- Fukuyama, F. (1996). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Fullan, M. G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fuller & Barnett (2003). A social identity perspective on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(6), 789.
- Fung, Chong Siaw. (2006). The influence of employee characteristics and job attitudes on organizational commitment. *Malaysian Management Review*, 41(1).
- Galbraith, J. R. (1993). The value-adding corporation: Matching structure with strategy. In J. Galbraith (Ed.), *Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gamage, D. T. (1996). *School-based management: Theory, research and practice*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: Karunaratne.

- Gamage, D. T., & Pang, N. S. (2003). *Leadership and management in education: Developing essential skills and competencies*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Gamage, D. T. (2000). Local management of schools in England – 1989-1999: A case study of Leicester. *Perspectives in Education*, 16(4), 209-23.
- Gaminiyan, V. (2002). Relation between freedom in performance and job commitment (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 141, 120LA
- Gay, L. R., & Ariasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Geen, R. G. (1995). *Human motivation: A social psychological approach*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Geijsel, Femke, Sleegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, Doris. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3) 228-256.
- GEMI. (2004). Transparency: A Path to Public Trust. Global Environmental Management Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.gemi.org/Transparency-PathtoPublicTrust.pdf>
- Gerhert, B. (2005). *Human resource Systems*. In C. Ostroff & T. Judge (Eds.), *Perspectives on organizational fit*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Great Southern Plantations (2006) Annual Report.
- Gerry, E. (1979). Human relations management: Concerns for the future. *Management Review*, 68, 47.
- Ghamary, Zahra. (2004). A study of relationship between participation of manager and psychological health of staff in primary schools in district two in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 115, 124LC.
- Ghane, S. (1993). Relation between leadership style with job satisfaction and performance (Master dissertation, Shahid Chamran university of Ahvaz, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 166, 130LA.
- Gholamei Zohan, Fatemeh. (2005). The study of relationship between participatory management and organizational commitment of teachers in Shahed schools in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 267, 134LC.
- Ghorbani, Mahin. (2000). The study of relationship between participatory management in decision making and job satisfaction (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 169, 144LA.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R. A. Giacalone, & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of*

*workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). New York, NY: Sharp.

- Gibson, C., & Kirkman, B. (1999). Our past, present, and future in teams: The role of human resource professionals in managing team performance. In A. L. Kraut & A. K. Korman, (Eds), *Evolving Practices in Human Resource Management: Responses to a Changing World of Work* (pp. 90-117). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gilberg, J. (1988). Managerial attitudes toward participative management. *17*(2), 109-123.
- Gladstein, D. (1984). Groups in context: A model of task group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *29*(4), 499-517.
- Glickman, C. (1993). *Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass,
- Goldring, E., & Rallis, S. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Golshany, J. (2003). Relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, *163*, 125LA.
- Gono, C. (2001). *The impact of participatory management on productivity, quality, and employees' morale*. University of Wisconsin-Stout Menomonie, Wisconsin 54741.
- Gordon, M. E. & Ladd, R. T. (1990). Dual allegiance: Renewal, reconsideration, and recantation. *Personnel Psychology*, *43*, 37-69.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX), the theory of leadership over 25 years-Applying a multi-level and multi-dimension perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 219-47.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1985). Economic action, social structure, and embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, *91*(3), 481-510.
- Grauwe, A. (2005) Improving the quality of education through school-based management: Learning from international experiences. *International Review of Education*, *51*(4), 269-87.
- Greenberg, E. S. (1986). *Workplace democracy: The political effects of participation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Gunter, D. M. (1997). Leadership practices and organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *116*, AAT 9720776.

- Guthrie, J. P. (2001). High-involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 180-90.
- Guzley, R. M. (1992). Organizational climate and communication climate: Predictors of commitment to the organization. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 5(4), 379-402. Abstract from: ERIC Item: EJ444194.
- Guzzo, R., & Dickson, M. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47(1), 307-38.
- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-23.
- Hackett, R. D., Lapierre, L.M., & Hausdorf, P. A. (2001). Understanding the links between work commitment constructs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 392-413.
- Hafezy, M. (1998). The study of relationship between organizational value and organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 153, 112LA.
- Hall, B. (1986). *Leadership support for staff development: A school building level model*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University, College of Education.
- Hampton, R., Dubinsky, A. J., & Skinner, S. J. (1986). A model of sales supervisor leadership behavior and retail salespeople's job-related outcomes. *Academy of Marketing Science Journal*, 14, (3), 33-44.
- Hamzeh Khanloo, M. (2003). Effect of participatory management and its role on motivation and performance (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 152, 137LC.
- Handy, C. (1995). Trust and the virtual organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(3), 40-49.
- Hanifah, Y. (1981). Organizational commitment teachers attitude in the context of peninsula Malaysia (PhD dissertation, Stanford University United Kingdom, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM 1981.
- Harchar, R. L., & Hyle, A. (1996). Collaborative power: A grounded theory of administrative instructional leadership in the elementary school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(3), 15-29.
- Hargreaves, D. H. (2001). A capital theory of school effectiveness and improvement. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(4), 487-503.
- Hargreaves, D. H., & Hopkins, D. (1991). *The empowered school: The management and practice of development planning*. London, UK: Cassell.
- Hart, P., & Cooper, C. (2001). Occupational stress: Toward a more integrative frame work. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.),

*Handbook of industrial work and organizational psychology* (pp. 91-114). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.

- Harris, R. (1998). Introduction to Problem Solving, Virtual Salt Home. Retrieved from <http://www.virtualsalt.com/crebook3.htm>.
- Hashemi Fakhr, Seddigheh. (2001). A comparison on the type and degree of supervision of women managers on teachers' performance by gender in high school and Pre University (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 184, 148LA.
- Hatton, S. A. (1996). Teacher organizational commitment in high performing, low socioeconomic status, border elementary schools (PhD dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 380, AAT 9719374.
- Hawkins, W. D. (1998). Predictors of affective organizational commitment among high school principals (Master dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 103, AAT 9957591.
- Healy, C. M., & McKay, M. F. (2000). Nursing stress: The effects of coping strategies and job satisfaction in a sample of Australian nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31(3), 681-8.
- Heidari, H. G. (1998). Teacher's participation and its relationship with decision making in female and male high school in Shiraz city (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 148, 117LA.
- Henkin, A., & Dee, J. (2001). The power of trust: Teams and collective action in self-managed schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11(1), 48-62.
- Henkin, A., & Wanat, C. (1994). Problem-solving teams and the improvement of organizational performance in schools. *School Organization*, 1(2), 121-39.
- Herscovitch, L. & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 474-487..
- Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., Bliss, J., & Hoy, W. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4, 484-501.
- Holton, J. (2001). Building trust and collaboration in a virtual team. *Team Performance Management*, 7(3/4), 36-47.
- Hossni Rokh, Rafat. (2001). The management styles of Ferdowsi University managers in the basis of theory Y, X and their effects on personnel efficiency (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 329, 150LA.
- Hosani, Hassan. (2002). A survey of relationship between participatory management and efficiency of educational staff (Master dissertation, Center of Education



- Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 194, 152LB.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1987). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1993). A normative theory of participative decision making in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31(3), 4-19.
- Hoy, W., Sabo, D., & Barnes, K. (1996). Organizational health and faculty trust: a view from the middle. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly* (Spring), 21-39.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555-573.
- Huang, T. C. (1997). The effect of participative management on organizational performance: The case of Taiwan. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(5), 677-689.
- Huitt, W. (1992). Problem solving and decision making: Consideration of individual differences using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 24, 33-44.
- Huat, Ching Boon. (2004). Managing organizational change: Managers' perceptions in the Malaysian manufacturing industry. *Malaysian Management Review*, 39(1), 45-56.
- Hunt, S. D., & Morgan, R. M. (1994). Organizational commitment: One of many commitments or key-mediating construct? *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 1568-1587.
- Hunton, J. E., Hall, T. W., & Price, K. H. (1998). The value of voice in participative decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(5), 788-797.
- Hutt, M. D., Stafford, E. R., Walker, B. A., & Reingen, P. H. (2000). Defining the social network of a strategic alliance. *Sloan Management Review*, 41(2), 17-23.
- Iranian Education. (2001). Iran chamber society. A brief review of Iranian educational System. Retrieved from [http:// www. Iran chamber.com/education/ articles /educational\\_system.php](http://www.Iranchamber.com/education/articles/educational_system.php)
- Iverson, R. D., & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment: Can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 36, 307-333.
- Iverson, R. D & McLeod, C. S. (1996). The role of employee commitment and trust in service relationships. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 14 (3), 36-44.
- Jafari, Mahbobeh. (2006). The study of relationship between participatory management and job stress of teachers of female government high school in seven districts in

- Mashhad. Unpublished master thesis (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 208, 156LB.
- Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319–337.
- Jaros, S. J., Jermier, J. M., Koehler, J. W., & Sincich, T. (1993). Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equation models. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 951–995.
- Jenkins, G. D., Jr., & Lawler, E. E. (1981). Impact of employee participation in pay plan development. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28(1), 111-128.
- Joyce, B. R. (1991). The doors to school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 48(8), 59-62.
- Joan, S. K. (1993). The effects of a participatory process to improve college teaching (PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin - Madison, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 370, AAT 9408582.
- Johlke, M., & Duhan, D. (2001). Testing competing models of sales force communication. *The Journal of Personal selling and Sales Management*, 4, 265-86.
- Kahnweiler, W. M., Margaret, A. T., & Thompson, A. M. (2000). Levels of desired, actual, and perceived control of employee involvement in decision-making: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14(3), 407-427.
- Kalaichelvi, N. (2005). Performance management in education: A study of a school in Kuala Lumpur (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM 2005NKA.
- Kaliannan, M. (1988). Education reform in Malaysia: An analysis of teacher's evaluation of the secondary schooling system (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LA 1236MAN.
- Kamarul Zaman, Ahmad, & Raida, Abu. Bakar. (2003). The association between training and organizational commitment among white-collar workers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 7(3), 166-185.
- Kamyab, Hamid. (2003). The role of participatory management in psychology health of teachers in secondary school in Ghochan (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 139, 159LB.
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organizations: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 499-517.

- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70, 71-79.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2004). *Strategy maps: Converting intangible assets into tangible outcomes*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, (1975). The literature of participation: from optimism to realism. *Coll. & Res. Lib*, 36(6), 473-9.
- Karadal, Himmet, Ay, Unal, & Cuhadar, M. Turan. (2008). The effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study in the public and private sectors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 13(2), 176-182.
- Kardaneh Yazd, Ellaheh. (2004). A survey on management style of educational managers in relation to organizational commitment of personnel in female primary schools (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 290, 139LC.
- Karnes, G. L. (2002). The participation factor: How to increase involvement in occupational safety professional safety. *Park Ridge*, 47(4), 22.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *Social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Katzenbach, J., & Smith, D. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kawakubo, M. K. (1988). Perception of authority, control, and commitment in Japanese organizations (PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin - Madison, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 212, AAT 8800364.
- Kearney, R. C., & Hays, W. S. (1994). Labor-management relations and participative decision-making: Toward a new paradigm. *Public Administration Review*, 54 (1), 44-51.
- Kefford, R. (1985). Clayton's participatory decision-making: A dilemma for the school administrator. *Unicorn*, 11(2), 146-152.
- Keong, Chin Kuen, & Sheehan, B. (2004). An assessment of the multidimensionality of organizational commitment in Malaysia. *Malaysian Management Review*, 39(2), 43-51.
- Keshvary, Mansoreh. (2003). A comparative study of relationship of participatory management and performance of teachers in secondary schools in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 171, 163LB.

- Khosravi, Ali. (2005). A survey of perception of manager from organizational equity and its relationship with organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 180, 143LC.
- Khorshidy, A. (2004). School-based management. *Journal Management in Education*, 10(40), 113-128.
- Khoynezhad, G. R. (2001). *Research methods in educational and behavioral science*. Tehran: Samt.
- Kim, A. (2004). Parent-school partnership formation through the school council in Korea. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 3, 127-39.
- Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 231-241.
- Kim, W. G., & Lee, Y. K. (2005). Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 171-193.
- Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J., Rayton, B., & Swat, J. (2005). Satisfaction with HR Practices and Commitment to the Organisation: Why One Size Does not fit all Human *Resource Management Journal*, 15(4), 9-29.
- Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B. (2000). Powering up teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(3), 48-66.
- Knoop, R. T. (1991). Achievement of work values and participative decision making. *Psychological Reports*, 58, 775-81.
- Ko, J. (1996). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three component model of organizational commitment in South Korea (PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 264, AAT 9629678.
- Kosdrosky. (2007). Managing Employees the Right Way. Retrieved from <http://web.ics.purdue.edu/%7Eakosdros/good%20manager.doc>
- Kramer, M. W. (1999). Motivation to reduce uncertainty: A reconceptualization of uncertainty reduction theory. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13(2), pp. 305-16.
- Lam, S. S. K., Chen, X. P., & Schaubroeck, J. (2002). Participative decision making and employee performance in different cultures: The moderating effect of allocentrism/idiocentrism and efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(5), 905-14
- LaMastro, V. (2000). Commitment and perceived organizational support. *National Forum Journals*, 13(3).
- Lambert, E. (1999). A path analysis of antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among correctional staff turnover

- and absenteeism (PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 520, AAT 9920568.
- Lambert, E. (2003). The impact of organizational justice on correctional staff, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 155–168.
- Lambert, E. (2004). The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff members. *Prison Journal*, 84, 208–227.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N., Barton, S., & Clarke, A. (2002). The impact of instrumental communication and integration on correctional staff. *Justice Professional*, 15, 181–193.
- Larson, C., & LaFasto, F. (1989). *Teamwork: What must go right/what can go wrong*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Larson, E., & Fukami, C. (1984). Relationships between worker behavior and commitment to the organization and union. *Proceedings of the Academy of Management* (pp. 222-226).
- Laschinger, H. (2001). The impact of workplace commitment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment, *Health Care Management Review*, 26(3), 7-24.
- Latham, G. P., Winters, D. C., Locke, E. A. (1994). Cognitive and motivational effects of participation: A mediator study. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 1(15), 49-63.
- Lau, C. M. & Lim, E. W. (2002). The intervening effects of participation on the relationship between procedural justice and managerial performance. *The British Accounting Review*, 34(1).
- Lawler, E. E. (1990). Achieving competitiveness by creating new organization cultures and structures. In D. B. Fishman & C. Cherniss (Eds.), *The human side of corporate competitiveness* (pp. 69-101). Newbury Park, NJ: Sage.
- Lawler, E. E. (1993). Creating the high-involvement organization. In J. Galbraith (Ed.), *Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. (1996). *From the ground up: Six principles for building the New Logic Corporation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., & Jay Galbraith. (1993). New roles for the staff: Strategic support and services. In J. Galbraith (Ed.), *Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E., Mohrman, S. A., & Ledford, G. E., Jr. (1992). *Employee Involvement and Total Quality Management: Practices and Results in Fortune 1000 Companies*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Lawler, E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the High Involvement Organization*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. (1992). Affective attachment to nested groups: A choice process theory. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 327-339.
- Ledford, G. E., Jr. (1993). Employee involvement: Lessons and predictions. In J. Galbraith (Ed.), *Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J. J., & Allen, N. J. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 799-811.
- Lee, Y. K., Park, D. H., & Yoo, D. (1999). The structural relationships between service orientation, mediators, and business performance in Korea hotel firms. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(1), 59-70.
- Lewis, L. K., & Seibold, D. R. (1998). Reconceptualizing organizational change implementation as a communication problem: A review of literature and research agenda. In M. E. Roloff (Eds), *Communication Yearbook 21* (pp.93-151). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lichtenstein, A. (2000). Participatory management: A critical look. *Journal of Library Administration*, 31(1), 37.
- Lienhart, A. M. C., & Willert, H. J. (2002). Involving stakeholders in resolving school violence. *NASSP Bulletin*, 86(631), 32-43.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1969). Supervision. In David Allison (Ed.), *The R & D game* (pp. 161-181). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Lindelow, J., & Bentley, S. (1989). Team management. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for excellence* (pp. 135-151). Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Lindelow, J., Coursen, D., Mazzarella, J. A., Heynderickx, J. J., & Smith, S. C. (1989). Participative decision-making. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for excellence* , Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
- Locke, E. A., & Schweiger, D. M. (1979). Participation in decision-making: One more look. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 265-359.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A cross-national comparison, *The Journal of Management Development*, 23(3/4), 321.

- Louis, K. (1991, April). *The effects of teacher quality of work life in secondary schools on commitment and sense of efficacy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Luecke, R., & Katz, R. (2003). *Managing creativity and innovation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and power*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Maccoby, M. (1989). *Why work? Motivating and leading the new generation*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Makanjee, C. R. (2006). The effect of perceived organizational support on organizational commitment of diagnostic imaging radiographers. *Journal of Radiography*, 12(2), 118-126.
- Malone, P. F., & Fry, L. W. (2003). *Transforming schools through spiritual leadership: A field experiment*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Seattle, WA.
- Manzari, A. (1996). Study of relation leadership style with job satisfaction and performance evaluation (Master dissertation, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 159, 142LA.
- Marchant, M. P. (1982). Participative management, job satisfaction and service. *Library Journal*, 107(8), 783.
- Markowitz, Linda. (1996). Employee Participation at the Workplace: Capitalist Control or Worker Freedom? *Critical Sociology*, 22(2), 89-103.
- Marsh, R. M., & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A predictive study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 57-75.
- Martell, C. (1987). The nature of authority and employee participation in the management of academic libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 48 (2), pp. 110-9.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- Matthews, R. A., Diaz, W. M., & Cole, S. G. (2003). The organizational empowerment scale. *Personnel Review*, 32 (3), 297-318.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-34.
- Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2002). Leader communication strategies critical paths to improving employee commitment. *American Business Review*, 20(2), 89-95.

- Mc, Burney, D. H. (2001). *Research method*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McCready, A., Lockhart, C., & Sieyes, J. (2001). Telemanaging. *Management Services*, 45(12), 14-16.
- McCroskey, Stacey D. (2007). The relationship between leadership practices and the three-component model of organizational commitment: An empirical analysis (PhD dissertation, Capella University, Minnesota, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 202, AAT 3262852.
- McDaniel, R. R. & Ashmos, D. P. (1980). Participative management: An executive alternative for human service organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 19(1), 14-18
- McLagan, P., & Nel, C. (1995). *The age of participation: New governance for the workplace and the world*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- McLagan, P., & Nel, C. (1996). The shift to participation. *People Dynamics*, 14(5), 12-17.
- McNeese-Smith, D. K. (1999). A content analysis of staff nurse descriptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29(6), 1332–1341.
- Mehraban, Hamid. (2001). The study of relationship between communication skills of manager and organizational commitment of teachers in high school (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 217, 181LC.
- Mellat majlis. (2006). Retrieved from [http:// mellat.majlis.ir/archive/1385/02/12 daytalk.html](http://mellat.majlis.ir/archive/1385/02/12/daytalk.html)
- Menon, K. U., & Goh, K. T. (2005). Transparency and trust: Risk communications and the Singapore experience in managing SARS. *Journal of Communication Management*, 9(4), 375 – 383.
- Merkel, H. L. (2004). Sharing Power with the people: Family group conferencing as a democratic experiment. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 31(1), 155-73.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the “side-bet” theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1986). *Development and consequence of three components of commitment*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Whistler, June 1986.



- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, L. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, pp. 710-720.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P. & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. ., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74.
- Miller, K. (1999). *Organizational Communication* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Ming, L.I. (2004). Workers' participation in management and firm performance: Evidence from large and medium-sized Chinese industrial enterprises. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 36(3).
- Mohr, A. T., & Puck, J. F. (2006). Role conflict, general manager job satisfaction and stress and the performance of IJVs. *European Management Journal*, 25(1), 25-35.
- Momayen, K. (1995). Survey related efficiency of high school in Khuzestan province (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 188, 132LA.
- Montano, D. (2006). Innovation Strategies of the World's Most Innovative Companies. Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Innovation>.
- Moradi, N. (1995). Factors of job satisfaction in Lorestan Pravience. (Master dissertation Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 151, 180LB.
- Moran, M. T. (2000). Creating smarter schools through collaboration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(3), 247-272
- Morgan, R., & Hunt, S. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 2.
- Morris, J. H., & Sherman, J. D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 512-526.

- Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226-256.
- Morrow, P. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment*. Jai Press.
- Moshabbaki, A. (1998). Pavilion of participation in organizational productivity. *Journal Modiriyat dolaty Tehran*, 39.
- Motamed Shariati, Esmat. (2005). The study of relationship between philosophic mind of managers and style of decision making in female and male government high school in seven districts in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 162, 774LB.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinates of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, 41, 467-482.
- Mourtos, N. J., DeJong Okamoto, N., & Rhee, J. (2004). Defining, teaching, and assessing problem solving skills. 7th UICEE Annual Conference on Engineering Education Retrieved from <http://www.Engr.sjsu.edu/nikos/pdf/UICEE%2004%20Mumbai.pdf>
- Mowday, R., Porter, L. & Steers, R. (1982). *The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York, NY: Academy Press.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(1) 43-77.
- Mowday, R.T. (1999). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 8(4), 387-401.
- Mowday, R. T., & Dubin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12, 231-48
- Mukherjee, G. H. (1970). The principle staff leadership role: A survey of principals and teacher expectations in selected Petaling Jaya and Kuala Lumpur schools (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB2806MUK.
- Muksan, H. (1989). Hubungan guru dengan pengetua dalam proses pembuatan keputusan (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1989). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB1570SAHHM.
- Mulford, B., Kendall, L., Kendall, D. (2003). Local school management: Does it make a difference? In M. Wallace & L. Poulson (Eds), *Learning to read Critically in Educational Leadership and Management* (pp. 65-89). London Sage.
- Naghei Poor, A. (2003). Trust and collaboration between teachers (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 167, 136LA.

- Najafzadeh, Ramezan Ali. (2004). A study of teachers' attitude about participatory management and its effect on efficiency of staff in male secondary schools (Master dissertation, University of Tehran, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 151, 202LC.
- Naquin, C., Tynan, R. (2003). The team halo effect: Why teams are not blamed for their failures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 332-40.
- Nilles, J. (1998). *Managing telework: Strategies for managing the virtual workforce*. New York, NY. Wiley.
- Nik Mu'tasim, Ab. Rahman., Nordin, Muhamad., & Abdullah, Sanusi. Othman. (2006). The relationship between Islamic work ethics and organizational commitment: A case analysis. *Malaysian Management Review*, 41(1), 37-42.
- Noroozi, S. (2002). Relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Tarbiyat Moalem University of Tehran, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 147, 162LA.
- Nurick, A. (1982). Participation in organizational change: A longitudinal field study. *Human Relations*, 35(5), 413-430.
- Nyhan, R. C. (2000). Changing the Paradigm Trust and its Role in Public Sector Organizations, *American Review of Public Administration*, 30(1), 87-109.
- Nykodym, Nick., Simonetti, Jack L., Nielsen, Warren. R., & Welling, Barbara. (1994). Employee Empowerment. *Journal of Empowerment in Organizations*, 2(3) 45-55.
- Odiorne, G. (1972). *La direction poor objectives*. Barcelona: Labor.
- Oosthuizen, Gerrida. J., & du Toit. Adeline S. A. (1999). Participative management in academic library services. *Library Management*, 20(4), 213-214.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. E.(1981). The commitment and job tenure of new employees: Some evidence for post decisional justification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 597-616.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-9.
- Organ, D., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour, *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.
- Ormrod, J. (2003). *Educational psychology: Developing the learners* (4th ed.). Upper -Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ormrod, J. (2006). *Educational psychology: Developing learners*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

- Orpen, C. (1994). The effects of exchange ideology on the relationship between perceived organizational support and job performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134*(3), 407.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000 a). Correlates of pay satisfaction in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management, 14*(1), 31-39.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000 b). Is length of service related to the level of job satisfaction? *International Journal of social Economics, 27*(3), 213-226.
- Ospina, S., & Yaroni. A. (2003). Understanding cooperative behavior in labor management cooperation: A theory-building exercise. *Public Administration Review, 63*(4), 455-469.
- Ostroff, C., & Bowen, D. (2000). Moving HR to a Higher level: FIR practices: An Organizational Level Analysis in K. Klein and S. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research and methods in Organizations: Foundations, extensions and new directions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Owens, R. G. (1998). *Organizational behavior in education* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Owens, R. G. (2001). *Organizational Behavior in Education: Instructional Leadership and School Reform* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon,
- Parniyan, Ali Reza. (2000). The relationship between organizational commitment of Ferdowsi University staff members and their perception of equity (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts, 225*, 177LA.
- Pashiardis, P. (1994). Teacher participation in decision making. *International Journal of Educational Management, 8*(5), 14-17.
- Patman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Paulina, M. Fergusona, R., & Bergeronb, J (2006). Service climate and organizational commitment: The importance of customer linkages. *Journal of World Business, 59*(8), 906-915.
- Peterson, A. M. (1997). Aspects of school climate: A review of literature. *ERS Spectrum, 15*(1), 36-42.
- Pierce, J., & Dunham, R. (1987). Organizational commitment: Pre-employment propensity and initial work experiences. *Journal of Management, 13*(1), 163-78.
- Pillai, R., Williams, E. S., & Tan, J. J. (2001). Are the scales tipped in favor of procedural or distributive justice? An investigation of the U.S., India, Germany,

- and Hong Kong (China). *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 312-332.
- Pishva, S. (1999). Relationship between organizational climate and organization and commitment in female schools (Master dissertation, Shiraz University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 137, 135LA.
- Poorpir Ali, Z. (2003). Relation between participatory decision making and personnel morale (Master dissertation, Isfahan University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 147, 161LA.
- Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (1992). Ask not what your country can do for you: The normative basis of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 41, 1-12.
- Porter, L. , Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P.(1974).Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59,603–609.
- Porter, L. W., Crampton, W. J., & Smith, F. J. (1976). Organizational commitment, managerial turnover. *Organizational Behavior and human Performance*, 15, 87-98.
- Potvin, T. C. (1991). Employee organizational commitment: An examination of its relationship to communication satisfaction and an evaluation of questionnaires designed to measure the construct (organizational commitment) PhD dissertation, University of Kansas, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 221, AAT 9210102.
- Powell, D. M., & Meyer, J. P. (2004). Side-bet theory and the three-component model of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 157–177.
- Powers, D. R., & Powers, M. F. (1983). *Making participatory management work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Price, J. L. (1997). Handbook of organizational measurement, *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(4/5/6), 303-558.
- Purcell, J., Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Rayton, B., & Swart, J. (2003). *Understanding the people and performance link: Unlocking the Black Box*. London, UK: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development.
- Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (1997). Teacher learning: Implications of new views of cognition. In B.J, Biddle, T.L., Good, & I.F Goodson (Eds), *The International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 1223-96). Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Kluwer.
- Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Phua, J. (1990). Communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 15(1), 44-52.

- Porter, L. W., Crampton, W. J., & Smith, F. J. (1976). Organizational commitment, managerial turnover. *Organizational Behavior and human Performance*, 15, 87-98.
- Rahimah, Ahmad. (1981). The relationship between and among leader style school climate and student achievement in the elementary school principal in the federal territory of Kuala Lumpur Malaysia (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM1981.
- Rahimah, Hj. Ahmad. (1999). Kepimpinan sekolah ke arah perubahan pada alaf baru. Seminar kebangsaan pembangunan pendidikan.
- Ramizani, A. (1996). Study of on management styles on amount of manager's attention to motivation factors in school (Master dissertation, University of Tehran, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 173, 220
- Randall, D. M. (1990). The consequences of organizational commitment: Methodological investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 361–378.
- Randall, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Longenecker, C. O. (1990). The behavioral expression of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36, 210–224.
- Rasmussen, V. B., & Rivett, D. (2000). The European Network of Health Promoting Schools – an alliance of health, education and democracy. *Journal of Health Education*, 100(2), 61 – 67. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight. Com/10.1108/09654280010312397>
- Razali, M. Z. (1998). *Participation and commitment among Malaysian professionals*. Published in Malaysia by Penerbit University Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Razali, M. Z., & Nungsari, A. R. (1989). An analysis of the relationship between job characteristics and stress outcomes: A case of Alor Setar General Hospital, Malaysia. A paper presented at 1989 Meeting of Southeast Asian Region Academy of International Business, organized by Institute of Technology, Nanjing, Peoples Republic of China.
- Razali, M. Z. (1993). Building commitment in Malaysian public service: Some conceptual issues and considerations. In *Issues in management and business*. Bangi, Selangor: National University of Malaysia, Faculty of Business Management.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10 (3), 465.
- Reilly, N. P., & Orsak, C. L. (1991). A career stage analysis of career and organizational commitment in nursing, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39(3), 311–330.
- Resalatpoor, M. (1994). Relation between management styles with job satisfaction in school (Master dissertation, University of Tehran, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 114, 223LA.

- Reychler, L. (1999). Democratic Peace-Building and Conflict Prevention: The Devil is in the Transition. Retrieved from <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/>
- Reyes, P. (1990). *Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance and productivity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rezazadeh, M. (2002). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Master dissertation, Shahid Beheshti University of Tehran, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 142, 121LA.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
- Rice, E. M., & Schneider, G. T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: an empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision making. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(1) 43-58.
- Riesgraf, K. M. (2002). Effects of school-based management practices on decision making for special education. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Rietbergen-Mc Cracken, J., & Narayan, D. (1997). *Stakeholder analysis Module 11, Social Policy and Resettlement Division, Environment Department*. Washington, DC: The World Bank,
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 257-266.
- Robert, C. (2000). Empowerment and continuous improvement in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India: Predicting fit on the basis of the dimensions of power distance and individualism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (5), 643-658.
- Robert.C., & Moran.S. (1998). *Library and Information Center management* (5th ed.). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Robinson, Davis Marvin. (2007). Mentoring African American men: A study of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (PhD dissertation, University of Louisville, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 252, AAT 3267109.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F., & Simourd, L. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers, *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 60-77.
- Rodwell, J. J., Kienzle, R., & Shadur, M. A. (1998). The relationships among work-related perceptions, employee attitudes, and employee performance: The integral role of communication. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3/4), 277-93.
- Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, J. W. (1943). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Romzek, B. S. (1989). Personal consequence of employee commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3), 649-662.

- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1977). Influence of subordinate characteristics on trust and use of participative decision strategies in a management simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(5), 628-31.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 217-233.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *The Academy of Management*, 23(3), 393-404.
- Rule, E., & Keown, S. (1998). Competencies of high- performing strategic alliances, *Strategy and Leadership*, 26(4), 36-44.
- Sadegheyan, Nayeb Ali. (2004) .The study of relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment of teachers in Shirvan (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 222, 185LC.
- Safarpour, Mohsen. (2004). The study of relationship between organizational behaviour of manager and organizational commitment of teachers in high school in district five in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 125, 189LC.
- Sager, J. K. (1990). Reducing sales manager job stress. *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 7(4), 5-14.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B. M. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New directions in organizational behavior*. Chicago, IL: St. Clair Press.
- Salehpour, M. (2003). Relation between job satisfactions with organization commitment. *Journal of Management in Education*, 10(40) 189-218.
- Salleh, Nor Azizah Mohd. (1988). Job satisfaction and professional needs of college trained teachers in Selangor, Malaysia and its implication for continuing education (PhD dissertation, Services Michigan: Bell and Howell, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 167, AAT 3457109.
- Saroghei, A. (1996). Organizational commitment and relationship with turnover. *Journal government management*, 35.
- Sashkin, M. (1984). Participative management is an ethical imperative. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12, 5-22.
- Saunders, M. N. K., & Thornhill, A. (2003). Organizational justice, trust and the management of change. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 360-375.
- Saxton, G. (2004). The rise of the participatory society: Challenges for public administration. *PA Times*, 27 (11), 4-5.



- Scarr, L. (1982). For effective school leadership, keep your management team on the right track. *Executive Educator*, 4(12)50-63.
- Schein, E. (1970). *Organizational psychology*. Engle wood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J., & Osborn, R. (1994). *Managing organizational behavior*, New York, NY: Wiley.
- Schuler, R. S. (1980). A role expectancy perception model of participation in decision making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(2), 331-40.
- Schmid, W. T. (1980). *Media Center management*. New York, NY: Hastings House.
- Schweiger, D., & Denisi, A. (1991). Communication with employees following a merger: a longitudinal experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(1), 110-35.
- Selaman, Safar. (1986). Tingkahlaku guru besar sekolah menengah di daerah Pontian dan Batu Pahat Johor (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM1986.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81.
- Shah, F. H. (2001). Social Performance through Participatory Management: A Snapshot From the Athletic Ball Industry Shaping Paper for the ILO Executive Round Table Cambridge, UK. Retrieved from [http://www.oli.org/images/empent/static/mcc/case\\_study.pdf](http://www.oli.org/images/empent/static/mcc/case_study.pdf)
- Shah Nazari, Ali. (2004). The relationship of participatory management and psychology health of teachers in secondary school in districts two in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 178, 191LC.
- Shammugam, Mumisamy. (1998). Leadership behaviors of primary school headmasters (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB2831.626.M4SHA.
- Shariatzadeh, Pedram. (2005). The study of relationship between communication skills of manager and organizational commitment of teachers in secondary school (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 142, 193LC.
- Sharifi, Mohammad Eshagh. (2002). Investigation of the faculty member's participation rate in manager's decision-making of Ferdowsi University and its dissemination method (Master dissertation, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 154, 179LA.
- Shapiro, S. P. (1987). The social control of impersonal trust. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(3), 623-58.

- Shaw, J. D. (1999). Job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The moderating role of positive affect. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 139*(2), 242–244.
- Sheble, M. A. & Hill, D. W. (1994). Academic library committees: Their role in participative management. *College and Research Libraries, 55*(6), 511-26.
- Sherkat, O. (2005). Participatory management and organization culture. *Journal of Tadbir, 16*(160).
- Shojaeefar, Habib Allah. (2001). The relationship between job satisfaction of the managers of the faculties and their organization on commitment at Ferdowsi university of Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts, 148*, 193LC.
- Shore, L., & Tetrick, L. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(5), 637-43.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior comparison of affective and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(5), 774–780
- Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1989, March). *Increasing teacher autonomy through shared governance: Effects on policy making and student outcomes*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Siegall, M., & Worth, C. (2001). The impacts of trust and control on faculty reactions to merit pay. *Personnel Review, 30*(6), 646-656.
- Siepert, A. F. (1964). Creating the Management Climate for Effective Research in Government Laboratories. In Karl Hill (Ed.), *The management of scientists*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Simon, J. L., & Burstein, P. (1985). *Basic Research Methods in social science Education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Simmons, J. (1999). Participation provides hope for the new millennium. *The Journal for Quality and Participation, 22*(6), 64.
- Sisk, T. D. (2003) Democracy and Conflict Management Retrieved from [http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/democ\\_con\\_manag/?nid=1353](http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/democ_con_manag/?nid=1353)
- Siti Hawa. (1980). Implementing a new curriculum for primary schools. A case study from Malaysia (PhD dissertation, University of London, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International, LB1060STTHM*.
- Skinner, Denise, & Spira, Laura F. (2003). Trust and control a symbiotic relationship? *Corporate Governance Journal, 3*(4), 28 – 35.
- Sklansky, D. A. (2005). Democratic Policing Inside and Out. Retrieved from [http://www.law.columbia.edu/null/Democratic+Policing+Inside+and+Out?exclusive=filemgr.download&file\\_id=96551&showthumb=0](http://www.law.columbia.edu/null/Democratic+Policing+Inside+and+Out?exclusive=filemgr.download&file_id=96551&showthumb=0)

- Slate, R. N. (2003). Opening the Manager's Door: State Probation Officer Stress and Perceptions of Participation. In Spence-Laschinger, Heather, Joan E. Finegan, Judith Shamian & Piotr Wilk (2004). A longitudinal analysis of the impact of workplace empowerment on work satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 527-545.
- Smith, E. (1969). Do libraries need managers? *Lib. Journal*, 94 (3), 502-6.
- Smith, P. A. (2005). The organizational trust of elementary schools and dimensions of student bullying, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(6), 469-485
- Smith, P., Hoy, W., & Sweetl and, S. (2001). Organizational health of high schools and dimensions of faculty trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 135-50.
- Smither, R. D., Houston, J. M., & McIntire, S. A. (1996). *Organizational development: Strategies for changing environments*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Somech, A. (2002). Explicating the complexity of participative management: An investigation of multiple dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3), 341-371.
- Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of teacher organizational and professional commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(4), 555-77.
- Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover, and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 49-58.
- Somers, M. J., & Birnbaum, D. (1998). Work-related commitment and job performance: It's also the nature of the performance that counts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 621-634.
- Spence-Laschinger, H., & Finegan, J. E. (2004). Empowerment, interactional justice, trust and respect: A nursing recruitment and retention strategy. *Academy of Management Proceedings* p. C1.
- Stanley, T. (2005). Trust: a management essential, *Supervision*, 66(2), 6-8.
- Staples, S. (2001). Making remote workers effective. In N. Johnson (Ed.), *Telecommuting and virtual offices: Issues and opportunities* (pp. 186-212). Hersey, PA: Idea.
- Sturges, J., & Guest, D. (2001). Don't leave me this way: A qualitative study of influences on the organizational commitment and turn over intentions of graduates early in their career. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 29(4), 447-462.
- Steele, L. W. (1969). Loyalties. In David Allison (Ed.), *The R & D Game*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46-56.
- Stohr, M. K., Self, R. &, Lovrich, B. A. (1992). Staff turnover in new generation jails: An investigation of its causes and preventions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 455-478.
- Suaidah, Ahmad. (1984). Tingkahlaku kepimpinan guru besar dan hubangnya dengan kepuasan tekanan dan prestasi kerja guru-guru (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM 1984.
- Suliman, A. M. (2002). Is it really a mediating construct? The mediating role of organizational commitment in work climate-performance relationship. *The Journal of Management Development*, 21(3/4), 170-184.
- Sumukadas, N. (2006). Employee involvement: A hierarchical conceptualization of its effect on quality. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 23(2), 143 – 161.
- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36, 703-29.
- Tadris Hasani, D. (1994). Organization commitment and its relationship with turnover. *Journal Modiriat dolati Tehran*, 35.
- Tanner, Bobbie. M. (2007). An analysis of the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational trust and organizational commitment in an acute care hospital (Doctoral dissertation, Say brook Graduate School and Research Center, The San Francisco, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 152, 741A.
- Tanriverdi, Haluk. (2008). Workers' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: Mediator Variable Relationships of Organizational Commitment Factors. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 14(1), 152-164.
- Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Toward a contingency theory of decision making. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(3), 212-228.
- Tasdighi, M. A. (2004). The barrier and perspective of education. *Journal of Management in Education*, 10(40), 151-168.
- Tepper, B., Duffy, M., Hoobler, J., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). Moderators of the relationships between coworkers' organizational citizenship behavior and fellow employee's attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 455-465.
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A Personality Trait-Based Integrations Model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 500-517.
- Thandi, H. S. (1972). Some aspects of teachers' perceptions of school principals' administration behavior in selected primary school in Johore (Master

- dissertation, University of Malaya, 1972). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB2822.5THA.
- Thandi , H. S. (1977). The relationship between principal's professional leadership and teachers' feeling of power in Malaysian school (PhD dissertation, University of Malaya, 1977). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB2806THA.
- Ting, L. S. (1999). Teachers' participation in decision making process in secondary school (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB7 UM1999TIN.
- Townsend, A., DeMarie, S., & Hendrickson, A. (1998). Virtual teams: technology and the workplace of the future, *Academy of Management Executive*, 12 (3), 17-29.
- Trombetta, J.J., & Rogers, D.P. (1988). Communication Climate, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment: The Effects of Information Adequacy, Communication Openness, and Decision Participation Management *Communication Quarterly*, 1, 494-514.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (1998). Trust in schools: a conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration* 36(4), 334-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust, *Review of Educational Research* 70 (4), 547-93.
- Tuzun, Ipek Kalemci. (2009). The impact of identification and commitment on job satisfaction, The case of a Turkish service provider, *Management Research News*, 32(8) 728-738.
- Tzafir, S. (2004). The Consequences of Emerging HRM Practices for Employees' Trust in their Managers, *Journal of Personnel Review*, 33 (6), 628-647.
- Ucok, O. (2006). Transparency, communication and mindfulness, *Journal of Management Development*, 25 (10), 1024 – 1028.
- UNESCO (2004). why education is important? Retrieved July 3, 2007 from <http://www.unesco.org/education/wef/countryreports/iran>.
- Vahidi, H. (1996). Relation between job motivations with leadership style of management (Master dissertation, Shahid Beheshti University of Tehran, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 157, 139LA.
- Vairo, L. (2002). U. S. Olympic Team Assistant Coach. Retrieved 4Aug, 2007 from [http://www.usahockey.com/servlets/FileServlet/relatedDocuments/D72CD410C29635F2E0340003BA5FE009/teamwork\\_0504.pdf](http://www.usahockey.com/servlets/FileServlet/relatedDocuments/D72CD410C29635F2E0340003BA5FE009/teamwork_0504.pdf).

- Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., & Stinglhamber, F. (2004). Affective commitment to the organization, supervisor, and work group: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 47-71.
- VanYperen, N. W., Van den Berg, A. E., & Willering, M.C. (1999). Towards a better understanding of the link between participation in decision making and organizational citizenship behavior: A multilevel analysis *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 377-392.
- Vejdaninajad, Ali Akbar. (2004). A study of the role of participatory management in efficiency of teachers (Master dissertation, Center of Education Governmental Management in Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 146, 200LB.
- Vretveit, John. (2002). How to run an effective improvement collaborative, *Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 15 (5), 192-196.
- Vroom, V. H. (1960). Some personality determinants of the effects of participation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Wahn, J. (1993). Organizational dependence and the likelihood of complying with organizational pressures to behave unethically, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12, 245-251.
- Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2000). Mapping the way ahead: leading educational leadership into the globalised world. *School Leadership and Management*, 20(2), 227-233.
- Wallace, J. E. (1997). Becker's side-bet theory of commitment revisited: Is it time for a moratorium or resurrection? *Human Relations*, 50, 727-749.
- Wasti, S .A. (2005). Commitment Figures: Combinations of organizational commitment forms and job outcomes , *Journal of Vocational Behavior* , 290-308
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced leadership: what 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. Denver, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Education Laboratory.
- Watkins, P. (1985). Collective strategies: collaborative approaches towards the administration of education. *Unicorn*, 11(2), 105-113.
- Watson, N. (2000). Promising practices: What does it really take to make a difference? *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11, 453-457.
- Webb, B. (2000). Elements of Motivation Retrieved from <http://www.motivation-tools.com/elements/index.htm>.
- Webler, T. (1995). "Right" discourse in citizen participation: an evaluative yardstick. In: O. Renn, T. Webler and P. Wie Allan demann, Editors, Fairness and competence in citizen participation, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

- Weisberg, J. (1994). Measuring workers' burnout and intention to leave, *International Journal of Manpower*, 15 (1), 4–14.
- Weiss, C. H., Cambone, J., & Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: teacher conflicts in shared decision making. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 350-367.
- Wetzel, K. W., & Gallagher, D. G. (1990). A comparative analysis of organizational commitment among workers in the cooperative and private sectors. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 11, 93-109.
- Whitener, E. M. (2001). Do "high commitment" human resource practices affect employee commitment? A cross-level analysis using hierarchical linear modeling. *Journal of Management*, 27, 515-535.
- Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard, W.J.M. (1998) .Managers as initiators of trust: an exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior, *Academy of Management*, 23(3), 513-30.
- Wiener, Y. (1982).Commitment in organizations: A normative view, *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.
- Williams, L. J., & Hazer, J. T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71,219–231.
- Williams, T. (1998). Job satisfaction in teams. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(5), 782-799.
- Wilson, A. A. (1990). Participating in a participative management system: The role of active participation, organizational knowledge, and individual motivation in employee satisfaction and performance, Purdue University, 266 pages; AAT 9031412.
- Witt, L.A. (1993). Reactions to work assignment as predictors of organizational commitment: the moderating effect of occupational identification. *J. Bus. Res.* 26, 17-30.
- Witt, L. A., Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). The role of participation in decision-making in the organizational politics job satisfaction relationship. *Human Relations*, 53 (3), 341-58.
- Wonder, J., & Donovan, P. (1984). *Whole-brain thinking: Working from both sides of the brain to achieve peak job performance*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Wong, C., & Low, K. S. (2002). The effect of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 243-274.
- Wood, J., Chapman, J. D., Fromholtz, M., Morrison, V., Wallace, J., Zeffane, R. M., Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J., & Osborn, R. N. (2004). *Organizational behavior: A Global Perspective* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

- Woods, D. R. (1975). Teaching Problem-Solving Skills. *Engineering Education*, 66(3), 238-243.
- Wrege, C. D. (1978). Frederick W. Taylor, the father of Scientific Management: Myth and reality. City?? Publisher
- Wright, B., & Kim, S. (2004). Participation's influence on job satisfaction: The importance of job characteristics. University of North Carolina at Charlotte. *Syracuse University Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24(1), 18-40.
- Wright, P. and Nishii, L. (2004). Strategic HRM and organizational behavior: Integrating multiple levels of analysis. Presented at the "HRM: What's Next?" Conference, Rotterdam, June 2004. Sponsored by Erasmus University, Rotterdam School of Economics.
- Yavas, U., & Bodur, M. (1999). Satisfaction among expatriate managers: Correlates and consequences. *Career Development International*, 4(5), 261-269.
- Yoshimura, K. (2003). Employee traits, perceived organization support, supervisory communication, affective commitment, and intent to leave: group differences, Faculty of North Carolina State University. Retrieved from [http:// www.lib.ncsu.edu / theses / available/etd-11112003-134047/unrestricted/etd.pdf](http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/theses/available/etd-11112003-134047/unrestricted/etd.pdf)
- Young, B. S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, D. J. (1998). Organizational Commitment among Public Service Employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(3), 339-348.
- Yousef, D. A. (1998). Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 19(3), 184-194.
- Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-24.
- Yuhana, Yaacob.(1998). Leadership style of women principals (Master dissertation, University of Malaya, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, LB2831.626.MUYUHY.
- Yusof, Ab. Aziz., & Noor Asyikin, Shamsuri. (2006). Organizational justices as a determinant of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, *Malaysian Management Review*, 41(1), 32.
- Zainun, Hamzah, Mohad,Yusoff, Saufi, Roselina. Ahmad., & Wafa, Syed. Azizi. (2002). Leadership style preferences of Malaysian managers, *Malaysian Management Review*, 37 (1), 56.
- Zahavy, A. D., & Somech, A. (2002). Team heterogeneity and its relationship with team support and team effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(1), 44-66.
- Zaraei, M. (2002). A survey of relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction of managers and teachers of physical education school in



Khorasan province (Master dissertation, Boalisina University of Mashhad, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 119, 68LA.

Zeffane, R. (1994). Patterns of organizational commitment perceived management style: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Human Relations*, 47(8), 977-1007.

Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Contradictions and tensions in the professionalization of teaching and the democratization of schools , *Teachers College Record*, 92(3), 363-79.

Zeyarati, Abolfazl. (2006). A survey relationship between decision making style of managers and organizational commitment of teachers in secondary school in district five in Mashhad (Master dissertation, Planning Management Organization of Khorasan, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 227, 170LC.

# **APPENDIX**

Appendix A: The English Questionnaire

Number	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PART ONE OF THE SURVEY : PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p><i>Directions:</i> Please read the following statements on individuals' perceptions about your school. Please mark with a tick (✓) the statements according to the scale given from 1 (totally not prominent) to 5 (very prominent). Please make sure to mark all the items. Thank you for your cooperation.</p>	Totally Not Prominent	Fairly Not Prominent	Fairly Prominent	Prominent	Very Prominent
1	There is a high level of trust among the teachers/ staffs in this school.					
2	The school head has a complete trust in the teachers /staffs.					
3	The school head delegates duties and responsibilities to the teachers/staffs.					
4	The school head expresses confidence the in teachers' work.					
5	The school head encourages active participation of students in organizing co-curricular activities.					
6	There is active involvement of teachers/staffs in decision making processes in this school.					
7	Decisions are made by collective agreement in this school through meetings at various committee levels.					
8	The school head incorporates or implements teachers'/staffs' suggestions in managing the school.					
9	The school head always seeks students' ideas regarding students' welfare and services in the school.					
10	The school head always consults teachers/staffs in resolving some issues/problems.					
11	Decisions are made cooperatively between the school head and the different work teams.					
12	There are work teams that coordinate efforts with appropriate individuals and teams in this school.					
13	Students can take part in different work teams (such as Basij, Shoray daneshamozy, Emdad...) in this school.					
14	There are differentiated member roles with definite tasks to be performed in the work teams.					
15	Team-work is encouraged and practiced in this school in sports, cultural activities, and co-curricular activities.					
16	School head encourages teamwork among the staffs and the students.					
17	There is a culture of teamwork and cooperation in this school.					

Appendix A: (continued.).

18	The school head delegates some responsibilities and power (authority) to the teachers/staffs in implementing administrative policies.					
19	The school head and teachers share power in designing and implementing the curriculum.					
20	Student associations are given the power to organize students' activities and programs.					
21	The school head delegates' responsibilities to the teachers/staffs to act as a representatives in meetings that are arranged outside the school.					
22	Teachers are given the power to discipline the students in both the classes and the school.					
23	Performance evaluation is done by teachers themselves, heads of the departments, and the school head.					
24	The school head is result-oriented but gives teachers/staffs the freedom to come up with their own ways of doing their job.					
25	The school head believes in providing genuinely high-quality education by the teachers/staffs for the students.					
26	The school head believes that if she gives autonomy to teachers/staffs, then they will perform their responsibility in the best way.					
27	Teachers/staffs receive useful and constructive feedback about their performance from the school head.					
28	The school head gives praise and recognition when the teachers/staffs do a good job.					
29	The school head introduces winners of "Excellent Teacher Award" and "Excellent Teaching Award" to the Ministry of Education.					
30	The school head understands teachers' needs and tries to motivate the teachers/staffs to get things done in this school.					
31	The school head encourages different extra curricular programs for the students such as debates, scientific exhibitions, and sports.					
32	The school head shares information and knowledge openly within this school.					
33	The school head has meetings with teachers/staffs regarding some of the school and official issues.					
34	The school head establishes the impression of free communication for the teachers to express ideas and suggestions.					
35	The school head listens to the teachers/staffs in this school and benefits from their suggestions.					
36	There is an opportunity for free communication between the students and the school head.					
37	Teachers/staffs receive useful information related to their jobs by both the school head and the other teachers in this school.					

Appendix A: (continued.).

38	The school head takes part in giving solutions to the teachers'/staffs' problems.					
39	The teachers/staffs are actively involved in extra curricular programs in the school such as Bahman22nd Celebration, Teacher's Day, Students' Day, and Research Week.					
40	The school head and teachers are jointly involved in the process of teaching and learning in this school.					
41	The school head encourages the teachers to keep the Teachers' Council active in this school.					
42	The school head encourages the students to engage in scientific activities such as Olimpiad, Kharazmy Festival and the other scientific occasions.					
43	The teachers/staffs have the opportunity to express their ideas relating to mobilized classes, the library and the laboratory.					
44	The school head provides opportunities for the teachers/staffs to upgrade academic research work.					
45	The school head is considerate in helping the teachers to solve their personal problems in order to minimize the disturbance effects.					
46	Teachers/staff have many opportunities to express their ideas in appropriate forms in this school.					
47	In order to increase educational information the school head tries to establish collaboration with other schools.					
48	The teachers/staffs cooperate with the school head in managing the school.					
49	The school head collaborates with the school community in organizing some events.					
50	The school head encourages teachers/staffs to collaborate with governmental educational centers/offices in designing educational curriculum and programs for the students.					
51	In order to raise educational knowledge and skills, the school head encourages active collaboration between the students and teachers in conducting extra-curricular activities and projects.					
52	The school head allows teachers/staffs to feel free and discuss their professional problems in this school.					
53	The students have the right to freely express their ideas and make suggestions relating to students' activities and programs in this school.					
54	Teachers/staffs can express ideas about and criticize educational issues and school organization.					
55	The school head practices democracy in decision making by getting the teachers and students involved.					
56	The teachers/staffs feel comfortable sharing their opinions with each other about their work, school, and students.					
57	The school head believes that democracy is important for a peaceful environment in this school.					

Appendix A: (continued.).

58	The school head always shares critical information relating to teachers'/staffs' activities with them in this school.					
59	The teachers/staffs receive information about official and management issues from the school head.					
60	The students can obtain useful information relating to their programs and activities from the school management.					
61	The school head sets up different meetings for the teachers/staffs to give useful information and knowledge related to their work.					
62	The school head informs the teachers/staffs about new circulars and policy directives.					
63	In this school, the teachers/staffs share all the information with colleague that are needed to do their job effectively.					
64	The school head provides timely feedback regarding teachers'/staffs' work.					
65	The school head actively seeks new ideas to initiate new changes in the management of this school.					
66	The school head encourages the teachers/staffs to initiate new changes/ innovations in the curriculum.					
67	The school head encourages innovations for creating change in this school.					
68	The school head believes that this school has a pool of creative teachers/staffs and students.					
69	The school head allows the students to bring in new ideas related to the students' activities and programs.					
70	The school has made impressive achievements due to some innovations made.					
71	After completion of a job, the school head shows his appreciation towards the teachers/staffs.					
72	The teachers/staffs express mutual respect while communicating with each other, parents, and students.					
73	The school emphasizes the culture of respect.					
74	The school head shows politeness and respect to the students.					
75	The school head considers other people's opinions and suggestions.					
76	The teachers/staffs respect their school head as a competent professional.					
77	The school head tries to find solutions in cooperation with the teachers/staffs to solve problems.					
78	The school head gets teachers' ideas and opinions and makes constructive use of them in solving problems.					
79	Meetings are being used by the teachers/staffs for solving school problems and issues.					
80	The school head believes in the teachers'/staffs' having the potential to solve the problems on their own.					
81	The school head supports teachers'/staffs' participation for finding solutions to the current problems work issues.					
82	The school head defines ways and means for achieving school/organizational goals to the teachers/staffs and students.					

Appendix A: (continued.).

83	The school head encourages the teachers/staffs to overcome resistance towards achieving school/organization's goal.					
84	The school head believes that the teachers/staffs should help to identify and accept the school's/organization's goals.					
85	The teachers/staffs have a good understanding of the goals of this school /organization.					
86	The teachers/staffs have an opportunity to participate in the goal setting processes in this school.					
87	The school head tries to define the school's/organization's goals for students so that they get familiar and understand the organization's goals					
88	The school head provides for the teachers'/staff s' being regularly informed about the goals of this school /organization.					
89	The directions of activities and programs planned reflect the school's goals.					
90	The school head promotes equal opportunity for educational progress for all the students.					
91	The school head tries to balance up power inequity.					
92	The teachers/staffs believe they have ample opportunities to work together with each others in this school.					
93	The school head believes all of the teachers/staffs have equal rights in using the school facilities in this school.					
94	The school head believes that as long as the teachers/staffs work under her supervision, she must protect all of them.					
95	The school head feels responsible for the teachers'/staffs' success or failures.					
96	The school head believes an equitable distribution of work for all the teachers/staffs in this school.					
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PART TWO OF THE SURVEY: TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT</b></p> <p><i>Directions:</i>  Please read the following statements on individuals' perceptions about your commitment. Please mark with a tick (✓) the statements according to the scale given from 1 (totally not prominent) to 5 (very prominent). Please make sure to mark all the items. Thank you for your cooperation.</p>						
97	I feel that I don't have options to consider leaving this educational organization.					
98	Right now, performing my duties as a member of the organization board is a matter of necessity as much as I desire another organization which may not match the overall benefits that I have here.					
99	I owe a great deal to the organization and I willingly to exert much effort on behalf of the organization.					

Appendix A: (continued.).

100	I believe this organization provides a suitable environment that I am interested in exerting effort for doing my work.					
101	I always like my organization; therefore, I try to put in extra efforts for the progress of this educational organization.					
102	Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.					
103	I like my job that binds me to this organization.					
104	I believe another organization may not match the overall benefits that I have here.					
105	I always feel my organization is a good organization and I am interested in being stable in this organization.					
106	I feel as if this organization's problems are my own.					
107	I believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.					
108	I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.					
109	This organization deserves my loyalty.					
110	I feel honored in this organization.					
111	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.					
112	If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I feel it would be wrong to leave my organization.					
113	Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.					
114	I would not leave my organization right now.					
115	I like to maintain membership and remain in this organization.					
116	I feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.					
117	I feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.					
118	I praise this organization and I am willing to attach to it.					
119	I believe attachment to this organization is right.					
120	I would feel guilty if I leave my organization now.					
121	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.					
122	I feel a strong obligation to the organization; hence, I enjoy discussing my organization matters with people outside of it.					
123	One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.					
124	I am apathetic about issues relating to this organization in the mass media.					
125	I believe this organization has the potential to be really good; hence, I feel obliged to this organization.					



Appendix A: (continued.).

126	I feel obliged to remain with my current employer in this organization.					
127	I would feel guilty if I were reluctant to my job in this organization.					
128	The value of this organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.					
139	The organization's values are very close to my own values.					
130	I praise the important values of my school organization.					
131	I try to Identify and keep up to my organization's value.					
132	I identify and respect the organization's rules, rewards and values.					
133	I try to internalize the organization's goals.					
134	I try to identify and accept my organization's goals.					
135	My goals are near to the organization's goals.					
136	I feel obliged to the force that binds an individual to the courses of action relevant to the organizational goals.					
137	The organization's goals are clear to me.					
138	I am willing to engage in teacher's council actively.					
139	I am willing to help other teachers to solve their personal problems.					
140	I like to express my ideas for enhancing the quality of classes, library and laboratory.					
141	I like to engage in scientific activities and extra curricular programs relating to my job.					
142	I believe this organization provides a good condition for involvement in the process of teaching and learning for me.					
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PART THREE OF THE SURVEY: CONSTRAINTS IN IMPLEMENTING PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p><i>Directions:</i> Please answer the following items honestly and accurately by marking the boxes with a tick (✓) from 1 (totally not prominent) to 5 (very prominent). Thank you for your cooperation.</p>					
143	Teachers/staffs fear that their effective involvement in participatory management will lead to changes in the organization of work that are not to their benefit such as increased work loads or even loss of jobs.					
144	Adversarial relations between the school head and teachers/staff occur as a result of previous and /or current autocratic					

Appendix A: (continued.).

144	practices that place high value on tradition and maintenance of the status quo.					
145	The school head views participatory management as a quick fix solution, underestimating the complexity of shared decision making that inevitably results in the discouragement of teachers/staff.					
146	A lack of teachers'/staffs' commitment causes the school head to endorse the shift from a top-down hierarchical governance structure.					
147	Little or no training is provided for the teachers/staffs when making the transition to a participatory management/governance structure.					
148	The quality of products and /or process appears to deteriorate rather than improve because of the higher standards, which initially result in term discouragement.					
149	Adversarial relations between the school head and teachers/staffs occur as a result of previous and /or current autocratic practices that adhere to a rigid bureaucratic government structure.					
150	Time constraints and technical decisions make teachers unable to attend team meetings.					
151	Employee barriers exist when non-managerial staffs resist involvement in participatory management due to the lack of an organizational climate supportive of employee participation.					
152	Lack of a formalized document cause the teams to operate under informal practices that do not promote trust and limit their effectiveness as decision makers, consequently the school head retains the sole authority to endorse or reject a teacher's recommendation.					
153	The school head acknowledges the benefits of participatory management but does not know how she could confidently empower team members to make decisions and be held accountable.					
154	Teachers/staffs do not comprehend the concept of participatory management, thus they fail to work closely together to find the best ways of getting the job done.					
155	The school head's lack of confidence in teachers'/staffs' ability to contribute to the process is counteractive toward the fostering of a new participatory management philosophy.					

Appendix A: (continued.).

**PART FOUR OF THE SURVEY : TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHICS**

*Directions:*

1. Please answer the following items honestly and accurately.
2. For each item, please select and put ONE tick (✓) in the brackets provided.

156	1-What is your educational level? Diploma ♦      Upper part diploma ♦      Bachelor ♦      Master ♦
157	2-How old are you? 20-30 ♦      31-40 ♦      41-50 ♦      51 or more ♦
158	3-How many years of service do you have in school? 10 or less ♦      11-20 ♦      21-30 ♦      31 or more ♦
159	4-How many years of service do you have? 10 or less ♦      11-20 ♦      21-30 ♦      31 or more ♦
160	5-How many years of teaching experience do you have? 10 or less ♦      11-20 ♦      21-30 ♦      31 or more ♦

Appendix B: *Component of Participatory Management and Organizational Commitment*

PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT			
COMPONENT	NUMBER	QUESTIONS	BERIF QUESTION
Trust	1	There is a high level of trust among teachers/ staff in this school.	High level of trust among teachers
	2	The school head has a complete trust in teachers /staff.	Head has a complete trust in teachers
	3	The school head delegates duties and responsibility to teachers/staff.	Head delegates responsibility
	4	The school head expresses confidence in teacher's work.	Head expresses confidence in teacher
	5	The school head encourages active participation of students in organizing Co-curricular activities.	Head encourages participation of students
Decision making	6	There is active involvement of teachers/staff in decision making process in this school.	Involvement teachers in decision making
	7	Decisions are made by collective agreement in this school through meetings at various committee levels.	Decisions are made by collectively
	8	The school head incorporates or implements teachers/staff suggestions in school management	Head incorporates teachers' suggestions
	9	The school head always seeks students' ideas regarding students' welfare and services in school	Head always seeks students' ideas
	10	The school head always consults teachers/staff in resolving some issues/problems.	Head consults teachers in resolving issues
Team working	11	Decisions are made cooperatively between the school head and the different work teams.	Decisions are made cooperatively
	12	There are work teams that coordinate efforts with appropriate individuals and teams in this school.	Work teams that coordinate efforts
	13	Students can take part in different team work (such as Basij, Shoray daneshamozy, Emdad...) in this school	Students take part in different team work

Appendix B: *(continued.)*

Team working	14	There are differentiated member roles with definite tasks to perform in team work.	There are differentiated member roles
	15	Teamwork is encouraged and practiced in this school in sports, cultural activities, and co-curricular activities.	Teamwork is encouraged and practiced in school
	16	School head encourages teamwork among staff and students	Head encourages teamwork
	17	There is a culture of teamwork and cooperation in this school.	There is a culture of teamwork
Share power	18	The school head delegates some responsibilities and power (authority) to teachers/staff in implementing administrative policies.	Head delegates some power
	19	The school head and teachers share power in designing and implementing the curriculum.	Head and teachers share power in designing
	20	Student associations are given the power to organize students' activities and programs.	Student associations are given the power
	21	The school head delegates' responsibility to teachers/staff to act as a representative in meeting that are arranged outside school.	Head delegates representative to teachers
	22	Teachers are given the power to discipline students in classes and school.	Discipline students in classes by teacher
	23	Performance evaluation is done by teachers themselves, head of departments, and the school head.	Performance evaluation is done by teachers
Motivation	24	The school head is result-oriented but gives teachers/staff the freedom to come up with their own ways of doing their job.	Head is result-oriented
	25	The school head believes this school provides genuinely high-quality education to students by teachers/staff.	Head believes this school provides high-quality education
	26	The school head believes that if she gives autonomy to teachers/staff, then they will perform their responsibility in a best way.	Head believes teachers perform their responsibility
	27	Teachers/staff receive useful and constructive feedback about their performance from head school.	Teachers receive useful feedback
	28	The school head gives praise and recognition when teachers/staff do a good job.	Head gives praise and recognition
	29	The school head introduces "Excellent Teacher Award" and "Excellent Teaching Award" to the Ministry of Education.	Head introduces "Excellent Teacher Award"

Appendix B: *(continued.)*

Motivation	30	The school head understands teachers' needs and try to motivate teachers/staff to get things done in this school.	Head understands teachers' needs
	31	The school head encourages different extra curricular programs for students such as debates, scientific exhibition, and sports.	Head encourages extra curricular programs
Communication	32	The school head shares information and knowledge openly within this school.	Head shares information
	33	The school head has meetings with teachers/staff regarding some of the school and official issues.	Head has meetings with teachers
	34	The school head establishes impression of free communication for teachers to express idea and suggestion by teacher.	Head establishes free communication
	35	The school head listens to teachers/staff and benefit from their suggestions in this school.	Head listens to teachers
	36	There is open access for free communication between students and school head.	There is communication between students
	37	Teachers/staff receive useful information related to their job by school head and other teachers in this school.	Teachers receive useful information
Involvement	38	The school head takes part in giving solutions to teacher/staff's problems.	Head give solutions to teacher's problems.
	39	Teachers/staff are actively involved in extra curricular programs such as 22Bahman celebration, teacher's day, students' day, research' week... in this school.	Teachers are involved in extra curricular programs
	40	The school head and teachers are jointly involved in the process of teaching and learning in this school.	Head and teachers are involved in teaching
	41	The school head encourages teachers to make the teachers' council active in this school.	Head encourages teachers' council
	42	The school head encourages students to engage in scientific activities such as Olmpiad, Kharazmy festival celebration and another scientific meeting.	Head encourage students to engage learning activities outside the school
	43	Teachers/staff have the opportunity to express their ideas relate to mobilize class, library and laboratory.	Teachers express their ideas
	44	The school head provides opportunities for teachers/staff to upgrade their academic paper.	Head provide opportunities for teachers

Appendix B: *(continued.)*

	45	The school head is considerate in helping teachers to solve their personal problems for minimizing disturbance effect.	Head helps teachers to solve their problems
	46	Teachers/staff have many opportunities to express their ideas in appropriate forms in this school.	Teachers express ideas in appropriate forms
Collaboration	47	In order to increase educational information the school head tries to establish collaboration with other schools.	Head tries to establish collaboration with other schools.
	48	Teachers/staff cooperate with the school head in managing the school	Teachers cooperate with the head
	49	The school collaborates with the community in organizing some events	School collaborates with the community
	50	The school head encourages teachers/staff to collaborate with government agencies in educating in designing educational curriculum and programs for students.	Head encourages teachers to collaborate with government
	51	In order to raise educational knowledge and skill, the school head encourages active collaboration between students and teachers in conducting extra-curricular activities and projects.	Head encourages collaboration between students and teacher
Democracy	52	The school head allows teachers/staff to feel free and discuss about their professional problems in this school.	Head allows teachers to feel free
	53	Students have the right to freedom for expressing ideas and suggestion relating to students' activities and programs in this school.	Students express ideas
	54	Teachers/staff can express ideas and criticisms about educational issues and school organization.	Teachers express ideas about school
	55	The school head practices democracy in decision making with teachers and students.	Head practices democracy in decision making
	56	Teachers/staff feel comfortable sharing their opinions with each other about their work, school, and students.	Teachers sharing their opinions
	57	The school head believes that democracy is important for a peaceful environment in this school.	Head believes that democracy is important

Appendix B: *(continued.)*

Trans parency	58	The school head always share critical information relating to teachers/staff' activities with them in this school.	Head share critical information
	59	Teachers/staff receive information about official and management issues from the school head.	Teachers receive information from head.
	60	Students can obtain useful information relating to their programs and activities from the school management.	Students obtain useful information from head
	61	The school head sets up different meetings for teachers/staff to give useful information and knowledge related to their work.	Head sets up different meetings
	62	The school head informs teachers/staff about new circulars and policy directives.	Head inform teachers about new circulars
	63	In this school teachers/staff share all the information with colleagues that are needed to do their job effectively.	Teachers share all the information with colleagues
	64	The school head provides timely feedback regarding teacher/staff's work.	Head provides timely feedback
Innovation	65	The school head actively seeks new ideas to initiate new changes in the management of this school.	Head actively seeks new ideas
	66	The school head encourages teachers/staff to initiate new changes/ innovations in the curriculum.	Head encourages teachers to initiate new changes
	67	The school head encourages innovations for creating change in this school.	Head encourages innovations
	68	The school head believes that this school has a pool of creative teachers/staff and students.	Head believes that this school has creative teacher
	69	The school head allow students to bring new idea relate students' activities and programs.	Head allow students to bring new idea
	70	The school head has made impressive achievements due to some innovations made.	Head has made impressive achievements
Respect	71	After completion of a job, the school head shows his appreciation towards teachers/staff.	Head shows his appreciation towards teachers
	72	Teachers/staff express mutual respect while communicating with each other, parents, and students.	Teachers express mutual respect
	73	The school emphasizes the culture of respect.	School emphasizes the culture of respect.



Appendix B: *(continued.)*

Respect	74	The school head shows politeness and respect to students.	Head shows respect to students.
	75	The school head considers other people's opinions and suggestions.	Head considers other people's opinions
	76	Teachers/staff respect their school head as a competent professional.	Teachers respect school head
Problem solving	77	The school head tries to find solutions in cooperation with teacher/staff to solve problems.	Head tries to find solutions cooperatively
	78	The school head gets teachers' ideas and opinions and makes constructive use of them in solving problems.	Head gets teachers' ideas and opinions
	79	Meetings are being used for teachers/staff for solving school problems and issues.	Meetings are arranged for teacher
	80	The school head believes teachers/staff have the potential to problem solving alone.	Head believes teachers can problem solving alone.
	81	The school head supports teachers/staff's participation for finding solutions to problems on current work issues.	Head supports teachers for finding solutions
Identify Common goal	82	The school head defines ways and means for achieving school/organizational goals to teachers/staff and students.	Head defines ways of achieving school goals
	83	The school head encourage teachers/staff to overcome toward the achieve school/organization's goal.	Head encourage teachers for achieving goal.
	84	The school head believes teachers/staff should help to identify school/organization's goal and to accept it.	Teachers should help to identify goals
	85	Teachers/staff have a good understanding of the goals of this school and organization.	Teachers understand the goals
	86	Teachers/staff have an opportunity to participate in the goal setting process in this school.	Teachers participate in the goal setting
	87	The school head tries to define school/organization's goal for students so that they are familiar and understand the organization's goals.	Head tries to define school's goal
	88	The school head provides for teachers/staff regular information about the goals of this school and organization.	Head provides for teachers information about the goals
	89	The directions of activities and programs planned reflect the school's goals.	Programs planned reflect the school's <u>goals.</u>

Appendix B: *(continued.)*

Equalitarian	90	The school head promotes equal opportunity to educational progress for all students.	Head promotes equal opportunity for students.
	91	The school head tries to balance up power inequity.	Head tries to balance up power inequity.
	92	Teachers/staff believe they have ample opportunities to work together with others in this school.	Teachers work together with others
	93	The school head believes all of the teachers/staff have the same weight in using the school facilities in this school.	Head believes teachers have the same weight in using l facilities
	94	The school head believe as long as teachers/staff work in school or under her supervision, she must protect all of them.	Head believes teachers must protect by him
	95	The school head feels responsible for teacher/staff's success or failures.	Head feels responsible for teachers
	96	The school head believes an equitable distribution of work for all teachers/staff in this school.	Head believes an equitable amount of work for all teachers
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT			
Willing to exert effort	97	I feel that I don't have options to consider leaving this educational organization.	I don't have options to leave this org.
	98	Right now, performing my duties as a member of the organization board is a matter of necessity as much as I desire another organization which may not match the overall benefits that I have here.	Performing my duties is a necessity
	99	I owe a great deal to the organization and I willingly to exert much efforts on behalf of the organization.	I owe a great deal to the organization.
	100	I believe this organization provides a suitable environment that I am interested to exert effort for doing my work.	This organization provides a suitable environment
	101	I always like my organization therefore I try to put in extra efforts for the progress of this educational organization.	I try to put in extra efforts for organization

Appendix B: (continued.).

Stabilizing	102	Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.	Jumping from organization does not unethical
	103	I like my job that binds me to this organization.	I like my job
	104	I believe another organization may not match the overall benefits that I have here.	Another organization may not match the benefits I derive here
	105	I always feel my organization is a good organization and I am interested to be stable in this organization.	My organization is a good organization.
Loyalty and allegiance	106	I feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	Organization's problems are my own.
	107	I believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.	Person must be loyal to her organization.
	108	I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.	I have loyalty to organization.
	109	This organization deserves my loyalty.	Organization deserves my loyalty
	110	I feel honored in this organization.	I am honored
Maintain membership	111	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	I spend the rest of my career with org
	112	If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I feel it was wrong to leave my organization.	It was wrong to leave my organization.
	113	Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.	People stay with one organization.
	114	I would not leave my organization right now.	I would not leave my organization.
	115	I like to maintain membership and remain in this organization.	I like to maintain membership
Attachment	116	I feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.	I am part of the family' at my org
	117	I feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.	I attached to org.
	118	I praise this organization and I am willing to attach to it.	I praise this org
	119	I believe attachment to this organization is right.	Attachment to organization is right
	120	I would feel guilty if I leave my organization now.	I feel guilty if I leave my org
	121	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	I do not leave my org

Appendix B: (continued.).

Feeling of obligation to the organization	122	I feel a strong obligation to the organization hence I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.	I feel obligated to the org
	123	One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.	I feel obligated to remain.
	124	I am apathetic about issues relating to this organization in mass media.	I am apathetic to this org
	125	I believe this organization has the potential to be really good hence I feel obliged to this organization.	this organization has the potential I feel obliged to org
	126	I feel obliged to remain with my current employer in this organization.	I obliged to remain with my current employer
	127	I would feel guilty if I am reluctant to my job in this organization.	I feel guilty if I am reluctant to my job
Identification and internalization	128	The value of this organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	The value of organization has meaning for me.
	139	The organization's values are very close to my own values.	Organization's values are close to my own values.
	130	I praise the important values of my school organization.	I praise the important values of org
	131	I try to Identify and keep up to my organization's value.	Identify and internalization values
	132	I identify and respect the organization's rules, rewards and values.	I respect to organization's rules
Identification and acceptance	133	I try to internalize of the organization's goals.	I internalize of the organization's goals.
	134	I try to identify and accept my organization's goal.	I acceptance organization's goal.
	135	My goals are near to organization's goals.	My goals are near to organization's goals.
	136	I feel obliged to the force that binds an individual to courses of action relevant to the organizational goals.	I bind to organizational goals.
	137	The organization's goals are clear to me.	Goals are clear to me.
Involve	138	I am willing to engage in teacher's council actively.	I engage in teacher's council
	139	I am willing to help other teachers to solve their personal problems.	I help teachers to solve problems
	140	I like to express my ideas for enhancing the quality of classes, library and laboratory.	I like to express my ideas
	141	I like to engage in scientific activities and extra curricular programs relating to my job.	I like to engage my job.

Appendix B: *(continued.)*

	142	I believe this organization provides a good condition for involvement in the process of teaching and learning for me.	Organization provide condition for teaching and learning
<b>CONSTRAINTS IN IMPLEMENTING PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT</b>			
<b>Constraints</b>	143	Teachers/staff feared that their effective involvement in participatory management would lead to changes in the organization of work that were not to their benefit such as increased work loads or even loss of jobs.	PM lead to work loads or loss of jobs
	144	Adversarial relations between the school head and teachers/staff occurred as a result of previous and /or current autocratic practices that Placed high value on tradition and maintenance of the status quo.	Adversarial relations between head and teachers
	145	The school head views participatory management as a quick fix solution, underestimating the complexity of shared decision making that inevitably resulted in the discouragement of teachers/staff.	PM as a quick fix solution
	146	A lack of teachers/staff's commitment causes the school head to endorse the shift from at top down hierarchical governance structure.	A lack of teachers/staff's commitment
	147	Little or no training was provided for teachers/staff when making the transition to a participatory management/ governance structure.	Little or no training was provided for teacher
	148	The quality of products and /or process appeared to deteriorate rather than improve because of the higher standards, which initially resulted in term discouragement.	The quality of products
	149	Adversarial relations between the school head and teachers/staff occurred as a result of previous and /or current autocratic practices that adhered to a rigid bureaucratic government structure.	Adhered to a rigid bureaucratic government structure.
	150	Time constraints and technical decisions make teachers unable to attend team meetings.	Time constraints prevent teachers from attending meetings.

Appendix B: (continued.).

Constraints	151	Employee barriers exist when non-managerial staff resists involvement in participatory management due to the lack of an organizational climate supportive of employee participation.	Lack of an organizational climate supportive of employee participation.
	152	Lack of a formalized document caused teams to operate under informal practices that did not promote trust and limited their effectiveness as decision makers, consequently the school head retained the sole authority to endorse or reject a teacher's recommendation.	Lack of a formalized document
	153	The school head acknowledges the benefits of participatory management but did not know how she could confidently empower team members to make decisions and be held accountable.	Management not knows how she could empower team members to make decisions.
	154	Teachers/staff do not comprehend the concept of participatory management, thus they fail to work closely together to find the best ways of getting the job done.	Teachers/staff do not comprehend the concept of participatory management.
	155	The school head's lack of confidence in teachers/staff ability to contribute to the process is counteractive toward the fostering of a new participatory management philosophy.	Head's lack of confidence in teachers ability to contribute to the fostering of a new participatory management.
TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHICS			
	156	1-What is your educational level? Diploma ♦      Upper part diploma ♦      Bachelor ♦      Master ♦	Educational level
	157	2-How old are you? 20-30 ♦      31-40 ♦      41-50 ♦      51 or more ♦	Age group
	158	3-How many years of service do you have in school? 10 or less ♦      11-20 ♦      21-30 ♦      31 or more ♦	Year of service in school
	159	4-How many years of service do you have? 10 or less ♦      11-20 ♦      21-30 ♦      31 or more ♦	Year of service
	160	5-How many years of teaching experience do you have? 10 or less ♦      11-20 ♦      21-30 ♦      31 or more ♦	Teaching experience

Appendix C: The Persian Questionnaire

ردیف	مدیریت مشارکتی				
	خیلی کم	کم	متوسط	زیاد	خیلی زیاد
	<p>راهنما: این پرسشنامه شامل توصیف هایی از مدرسه شما است، لطفاً میزان موافقتتان را با شماره های 1 تا 5 (1=خیلی کم و 5=خیلی زیاد) نشان دهید. از اینکه به کلیه سوالات با حوصله و دقت پاسخ می دهید متشکرم</p>				
1					در این مدرسه اعتماد بالایی بین معلمان (کارکنان) وجود دارد.
2					مدیر مدرسه به معلمان (کارکنان) اعتماد کامل دارد.
3					مدیر مدرسه مسئولیت و وظایف را به معلمان (کارکنان) تفویض می کند.
4					مدیر مدرسه اعتماد خود را نسبت به کار معلمان ابراز می کند.
5					مدیر مدرسه دانش آموزان را به مشارکت در فعالیتهای فوق برنامه تشویق می کند.
6					در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) فعالانه در فرآیند تصمیم گیری مشارکت دارند.
7					در این مدرسه تصمیمات از طریق توافق جمعی در جلسات و کمیته های مختلف گرفته می شود.
8					مدیر مدرسه پیشنهادات معلمان (کارکنان) را در اداره مدرسه بکار می گیرد.
9					مدیر مدرسه همیشه نظرات دانش آموزان را برای آسایش و کمک به آنان در نظر می گیرد.
10					مدیر مدرسه همیشه برای حل مشکلات و مسائل با معلمان (کارکنان) مشورت می کند.
11					در این مدرسه تصمیمات با تشریک مساعی بین مدیر و گروه های کاری (شورای معلمان، انجمن اولیاء و مربیان و...) مختلف گرفته می شود.
12					در این مدرسه گروه های کاری به طور مناسب کوشش های فردی و گروهی را هماهنگ می کنند.
13					دانش آموزان در فعالیتهای گروهی مختلف (بسیج، شورای دانش آموزی، امداد و...) شرکت و فعالیت دارند.
14					در گروه های کاری نقش ها و وظیفه های مختلف برای انجام کار وجود دارد.
15					در این مدرسه گروه های کاری مختلف (مانند گروه های ورزشی، فعالیتهای فرهنگی، فعالیتهای فوق برنامه و...) تشویق و بکار گرفته می شوند.
16					مدیر مدرسه مشوق کار گروهی بین معلمان (کارکنان) و دانش آموزان است.
17					فرهنگ کار گروهی و همکاری در این مدرسه وجود دارد

Appendix C: (continued.).

					مدیر مدرسه در اجرای سیاستها به معلمان (کارکنان) مسئولیت و قدرت، تفویض می کند.	18
					مدیر و معلمان در طراحی و اجرای برنامه های آموزشی با هم مشارکت دارند.	19
					انجمن های دانش آموزی به ساماندهی فعالیت ها و برنامه های دانش آموزان کمک می کند.	20
					مدیر مدرسه مسئولیت حضور در جلسات خارج از مدرسه را به معلمان (کارکنان) به عنوان نماینده خود واگذار می کند.	21
					معلمان مجاز به تادیب دانش آموزان در کلاس و مدرسه هستند.	22
					ارزشیابی و عملکرد معلمان توسط خود معلم، سرپرست و مدیر مدرسه انجام می شود.	23
					مدیر مدرسه به نتیجه فعالیت بیشتر اهمیت می دهد ولی به معلمان (کارکنان) اجازه می دهد تا با روشهای خودشان کار را انجام دهند.	24
					مدیر مدرسه بر این باور است که معلمان (کارکنان)، آموزش با کیفیت بالا را برای دانش آموزان فراهم می آورند.	25
					مدیر مدرسه بر این باور است که اگر به معلمان (کارکنان) استقلال دهد آنها مسئولانه و به بهترین روش، کارشان را انجام خواهند داد.	26
					معلمان (کارکنان) بازخوردهای مفید و مناسب در مورد عملکردشان از جانب مدیر دریافت می کنند.	27
					هنگامی که معلمان (کارکنان) کار خود را خوب انجام می دهند، مدیر مدرسه از آنها قدردانی می کند.	28
					مدیر مدرسه "معلم نمونه" و "روش تدریس نمونه" را به آموزش و پرورش اعلام می کند.	29
					در این مدرسه مدیر نیازهای معلمان را درک می کند و تلاشش بر این است که به آنها انگیزه دهد.	30
					مدیر مدرسه برنامه های آموزشی مختلف از قبیل جلسات بحث، نمایشگاه علمی و ورزشی را برای دانش آموزان فراهم می آورد.	31
					مدیر مدرسه دیگران (معلمان) را در اطلاعات و دانسته های خود سهیم می کند.	32
					مدیر مدرسه با توجه به برخی مسائل و موضوعات اداری، جلساتی را با معلمان (کارکنان) برگزار می کند.	33
					مدیر مدرسه ارتباطات آزاد برای بیان ایده ها و پیشنهادات توسط معلمان را پایه گذاری می کند.	34
					در این مدرسه مدیر به نظرات معلمان (کارکنان) گوش می دهد و از پیشنهادات آنها سود می برد.	35
					در این مدرسه بین دانش آموزان و مدیر مدرسه امکان برقراری ارتباط به راحتی انجام پذیر است.	36



Appendix C: (continued.).

					37	در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) در رابطه با کارشان اطلاعات لازم و مفید را از مدیر و سایر معلمان دریافت می کنند.
					38	مدیر مدرسه بندرت راه حلی در مورد مشکلات معلمان (کارکنان) ارائه میدهد.
					39	در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) به صورت فعال در فعالیتهای فوق برنامه آموزشی مانند "22 بهمن روز معلم، روز دانش آموز و ... شرکت می کنند.
					40	در این مدرسه مدیر و معلمان به صورت مستمر در فرآیند یاددهی - یادگیری شرکت می کنند
					41	در این مدرسه مدیر، معلمان را به شرکت فعال در شورای معلمان تشویق می کند.
					42	مدیر مدرسه، دانش آموزان را به شرکت فعالانه در المپاد، جشنواره خوارزمی و جشن ها و دیگر جلسات تشویق می کند.
					43	معلمان (کارکنان) فرصت ارائه عقیده در ارتباط با تجهیز کلاس، آزمایشگاه و کتابخانه را دارند.
					44	مدیر مدرسه علاقه منداست برای معلمان (کارکنان) فرصت ارتقا مدرک تحصیلی را فراهم آورد.
					45	مدیر مدرسه کمک به معلمان برای حل مسائل شخصی شان را مدنظر دارد تا اضطراب آنها را به حداقل برساند.
					46	در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) فرصت های فراوانی برای ارائه ایده هایشان به شکل مناسب دارند.
					47	به منظور افزایش اطلاعات آموزشی، مدیر مدرسه تلاش می کند با سایر معلمان همکاری کند.
					48	معلمان (کارکنان) بندرت با مدیر برای اداره مدرسه همکاری دارند.
					49	مدرسه با جامعه در زمینه بزرگداشت بعضی رویدادها مثل "22 بهمن روز معلم، روز دانش آموز و ..." همکاری می کنند.
					50	مدیر، معلمان (کارکنان) را تشویق می کند تا در زمینه طراحی برنامه های آموزشی دانش آموزان با صاحب نظران سازمان آموزش و پرورش، همکاری داشته باشند.
					51	مدیر مدرسه به منظور ارتقا دانش و مهارت، معلمان و دانش آموزان را به همکاری جدی در زمینه پروژه ها و فعالیتهای فوق برنامه آموزشی تشویق می کند.
					52	مدیر مدرسه به معلمان (کارکنان) اجازه می دهد تا درباره مسائل حرفه ای (شغلی) خودشان آزادانه بحث کنند
					53	دانش آموزان، ایده ها و پیشنهادات مربوط به فعالیتهای و مسائل مربوط به خود را آزادانه بیان می کنند.
					54	معلمان (کارکنان) می توانند ایده ها و انتقادهای خود را در مسائل آموزشی و مدرسه بیان کنند.

Appendix C: (continued.).

					مدیرمدرسه به مشارکت در تصمیم گیری با معلمان و دانش آموزان علاقمند است.	55
					معلمان (کارکنان) به راحتی نظرات خود را در مورد کار، مدرسه و دانش آموزان با دیگر معلمان در میان می گذارد.	56
					در این مدرسه مدیر باور دارد که آزادی برای ایجاد محیط امن با اهمیت است.	57
					در این مدرسه مدیر همیشه اطلاعات مهم مرتبط با فعالیتهای معلمان (کارکنان) را با آنها در میان می گذارد.	58
					در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) بندرت اطلاعات مربوط به مسائل اداری و مدیریتی را از مدیر دریافت می کنند.	59
					دانش آموزان می توانند اطلاعات مفیدی در رابطه با برنامه و فعالیتهای خودشان از مدیر مدرسه دریافت کنند.	60
					مدیر مدرسه جلسات مختلفی برای معلمان (کارکنان) ترتیب می دهد تا بتواند اطلاعات مفید در رابطه با کارشان به آنها ارائه نماید.	61
					مدیر مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) را از پیشنهادها و مقررات جدید آگاه می سازد.	62
					در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) به منظور اثربخشی کار اطلاعات را با دیگر همکاران در میان می گذارند.	63
					مدیر مدرسه به طور مرتب بازخوردهایی در رابطه با کار معلمان (کارکنان) به آنها می دهد.	64
					در این مدرسه مدیر فعالانه بدنبال ایده های نو و تغییرات جدید می باشد.	65
					مدیر مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) را به ایجاد تغییرات جدید و نوآوری در برنامه های آموزشی ترغیب می کند.	66
					در این مدرسه مدیر بندرت نوآوری و تغییر را مورد تشویق قرار می دهد.	67
					مدیر برای باور است که در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) و دانش آموزان خلاق وجود دارند.	68
					مدیر مدرسه به دانش آموزان اجازه می دهد تا در ارتباط با برنامه ها و فعالیتهای دانش آموزی ایده های جدید ارائه دهند.	69
					مدیر مدرسه بر اساس نوآوریها، دستاوردهای موثری می سازد.	70
					مدیر مدرسه پس از اتمام کار قدر دانی خود را نسبت به معلمان (کارکنان) ابراز می دارد.	71
					معلمان (کارکنان) احترام متقابل را در تعاملات با دیگران، اولیا و دانش آموزان اظهار می دارند.	72

Appendix C: (continued.).

					مدرسه بر فرهنگ مبتنی بر احترام تاکید می ورزد.	73
					مدیر مدرسه نسبت به دانش آموزان مودبانه و محترمانه رفتاری کند.	74
					مدیر مدرسه نظرات و پیشنهادات دیگران را در نظر می گیرد.	75
					معلمان (کارکنان) به مدیرشان به عنوان "یک مدیر" لایق احترام می گذارند.	76
					مدیر مدرسه تلاش می کند با همکاری معلمان (کارکنان) راه حل مشکلات را پیدا کند.	77
					مدیر مدرسه نظرات و ایده های معلمان را در جهت حل مشکل آنها دریافت می کند.	78
					معلمان (کارکنان) از جلسات برای حل مسائل و مشکلات مدرسه استفاده می کنند .	79
					مدیر مدرسه بر این باور است که معلمان (کارکنان) بندرت می توانند مشکلات راه تتهایی حل کنند.	80
					مدیر مدرسه از مشارکت معلمان (کارکنان) برای یافتن راه حل برای مشکلات جاری استفاده می کند.	81
					مدیر مدرسه باور دارد که باید به معلمان (کارکنان) در شناخت و قبول اهداف سازمانی کمک کرد.	84
					در این مدرسه معلمان (کارکنان) فهم و ادراک درستی از اهداف سازمان دارند.	85
					در این مدرسه به معلمان (کارکنان) در فرآیند هدف گذاری فرصت مشارکت داده می شود.	86
					مدیر مدرسه سعی می کند اهداف مدرسه (سازمان) را برای دانش آموزان توضیح دهد.	87
					مدیر مدرسه برای معلمان (کارکنان) اطلاعات ، بخشنامه ها و مقررات لازم را جهت تحقق اهداف مدرسه را در دسترسشان قرار می دهد.	88
					فعالیتها و برنامه های طرح ریزی شده، انعکاسی از اهداف مدرسه است.	89
					مدیر مدرسه برای پیشرفت آموزشی همه دانش آموزان فرصت های برابر را ایجاد می کند.	90
					مدیر مدرسه برای رفع تبعیض بندرت تلاش می کند.	91
					در این مدرسه معلمان بر این باورند که فرصت کار با یکدیگر را دارند.	92
					در این مدرسه مدیر باور دارد موقعیت استفاده از تسهیلات برای همه معلمان (کارکنان) یکسان است.	93

Appendix C: (continued.).

94	مدیرمدرسه باور داردتازمانیکه معلمان (کارکنان) تحت سرپرستی او هستند باید از آنها حمایت کند.					
95	مدیرمدرسه احساس می کند در موفقیت و شکست معلمان (کارکنان) مسئول است.					
96	مدیرباور دارد در این مدرسه حجم کار و مسئولیت برای همه معلمان (کارکنان) منصفانه است.					
<b>تعهد سازمانی معلمان</b>						
97	من احساس می کنم که دلیلی برای ترک این سازمان وجود ندارد.					
98	در حال حاضر بعنوان عضو سازمان ، انجام وظایفم مهمتر از حضور در سازمان دیگری است که منافع فعلی مرا تامین نمی کند.					
99	من به سازمان مدیونم و میایم حداکثر کوشش ام را در رابطه با آن به کار بگیرم.					
100	معتقدم این سازمان محیط مناسبی فراهم می آورد تا مرا به کوشش در انجام کارم علاقمند سازد.					
101	من همیشه سازمانم را دوست دارم وسیعی می کنم برای پیشرفت این محیط آموزشی تلاشم را بکار بگیرم.					
102	در باور من رفتن از این سازمان به سازمان دیگر اخلاقی نیست.					
103	من کارم را که باعث علاقمندی من به سازمان من است، دوست دارم.					
104	معتقدم ممکن است در سایر سازمانها تمام منافعی که من در این سازمان دارم تامین نشود.					
105	من همیشه احساس می کنم سازمانم، سازمان خوبی است و من علاقه مندی به ماندن در این سازمان هستم.					
106	من بندرت مشکلات سازمان را مشکلات خودم می دانم.					
107	معتقدم که فرد همیشه باید به سازمانش وفادار باشد.					
108	یاد گرفته ام ارزش وفاداری به سازمان را بآورد کنم.					
109	این سازمان شایستگی وفاداری را دارد.					

Appendix C: (continued.).

					من به سازمانم افتخار می کنم.	110
					من بسیار خوشحالم که وقت آزادشغلی ام رادر این سازمان صرف کنم .	111
					من احساس می کنم ترک سازمان کار اشتباهی است حتی اگر پیشنهاد شغل بهتری داشته باشم .	112
					معتقدم بهتری بود که افراد تمام دوره کاری خود را در یک سازمان بگذرانند	113
					در حال حاضر من مایل نیستم سازمانم را ترک کنم .	114
					مایلم که عضویت ام رادر این سازمان حفظ کنم و در آن باقی بمانم.	115
					احساس می کنم که جزیی از سازمانم هستم.	116
					احساس وابستگی شدیده سازمان دارم.	117
					به سازمانم ارج می نهم و مایلم پیوندم را با این سازمان حفظ کنم .	118
					احساس می کنم پیوستن به این سازمان درست است.	119
					اگر این سازمان را ترک کنم احساس گناه خواهم کرد.	120
					حتی اگر به نفع من باشم من احساس می کنم درست نیست این سازمان را در حال حاضر ترک کنم.	121
					به دلیل احساس وابستگی شدیده سازمانم ، صحبت کردن در مورد سازمانم با دیگران برایم لذت بخش است.	122
					یکی از دلایل اصلی من برای ادامه کار در این سازمان این است که احساس می کنم وابستگی اخلاقی برای ماندن در این سازمان دارم.	123
					به بندرت مسائل مطرح شده در مورد سازمانم در رسانه های گروهی توجه مرا جلب می کند.	124
					در باور من این سازمان می تواند سازمان خوبی باشد از این رو احساس می کنم به این سازمان متعهدم.	125
					من بندرت احساس تعهد به همکاری یا کار کردن با همکارانم در این سازمان را دارم.	126
					در صورت نارضایتی و دلزدگی از کار احساس شرم و گناه می کنم .	127
					ارزشهای این سازمان مبین ارزشهای من است.	128

Appendix C: (continued.).

					ارزشهای این سازمان خیلی به ارزشهای من نزدیک است.	129
					من ارزشهای مهم سازمانم راتحسین می کنم.	130
					من سعی می کنم ارزشهای سازمانم رابشناسم وآنها را در وجودم نهادینه کنم.	131
					من قوانین،مقررات،ارزشها وپاداشهای سازمانم رامی شناسم وبه آن احترام می گذارم.	132
					سعی می کنم اهداف سازمانم را نهادینه کنم.	133
					سعی می کنم اهداف سازمانی ام رابشناسم وآنها را نهادینه کنم.	134
					اهداف من به اهداف سازمانم نزدیک است.	135
					احساس می کنم نیرویی مراجعت رسیدن به اهداف سازمانی مقید می کند.	136
					اهداف سازمان برای من روشن وشفاف است.	137
					بندرت تمایل به شرکت فعالانه درشورای معلمان دارم.	138
					مایلم تابه دیگرمعلمان درحل مشکلاتشان کمک کنم.	139
					مایلم ایده ها وعقایدم رابرای افزایش کیفیت کلاس ،کتابخانه وآزمایشگاه و.... ابرازکنم.	140
					مایلم درفعاليتهاوآموزشهای مرتبط باشغلم شرکت کنم.	141
					معتقدم که این سازمان شرایط مناسبی برای جذب من درفرآیندپاددهی- یادگیری فراهم می آورد.	142
<b>موانع اجرایی مدیریت مشارکتی</b>						
					معلمان(کارکنان) از شرکت مؤثر در مدیریت مشارکتی که باعث ایجاد تغییرات در سازمان می شود می هراسند چرا که مدیریت مشارکتی به ضرریشان تمام شده و موجب افزایش حجم کاری و حتی از دست دادن شغل می شود.	143
					زمانیکه مدیر سعی در حفظ ارزشهای سنتی دارد ولی معلمان به اصول ارزشمند مدیریت مشارکتی معتقدند عدم توافق بین آنان شدت می گیرد.	144

Appendix C: (continued.).

145	مدیر، مدیریت مشارکتی را بعنوان يك راه حل سریع در نظر دارد ولی عدم توجه مدیر به تصمیم گیرهای جمعی سبب دلسرد شدن معلمان میشود				
146	عدم تعهد معلمان ( کارکنان ) موجب می شود تفویض اختیار از سوی مدیر مدرسه بندرت صورت گرفته و مدیر تصمیم گیرنده اصلی باشد.				
147	در مرحله گذر به مدیریت مشارکتی هیچگونه آموزش یا آموزش محدودی برای معلمان ( کارکنان) آماده و در دسترس قرار نمی گیرد.				
148	طی اجرای فرآیند زمان بر (دیر بازده ) مدیریت مشارکتی وضعیت موجوده تنها بهبود نمی یابد بلکه باعث دلسردی معلمان نیز می شود .				
149	تمایل مدیر به ساختار متمرکز در تصمیم گیری های جاری به جای مدیریت مشارکتی منجر به عدم توافق بین مدیر و معلمان می شود.				
150	تصمیم گیری های تخصصی (شغلی ) و کمبود وقت معلمان مانع شرکت فعال آنان در جلسات گروهی می شود.				
151	تاکید کارکنان بر مدیریت مشارکتی از يك طرف و فقدان جوسازمانی حمایتی از سوی دیگر سبب بروز مشکلات برای معلمان می گردد.				
152	فقدان بخشنامه رسمی درمورد مدیریت مشارکتی سبب می شود معلمان به سمت روشهای غیر رسمی گرایش پیدا کنند که این گرایش ها، اعتماد مدیر به معلمان را کاهش داده و اثر بخشی او را نیز محدود می سازد. در نتیجه قدرت مدیر حفظ شده و توصیه های معلمان را نمی پذیرد .				
153	مدیر مدرسه اهمیت مدیریت مشارکتی را می پذیرد، اما نمی داند چگونه معلمان را برای تصمیم گیری و مسئولیت پذیری توانمند سازد.				
154	معلمان (کارکنان) مفهوم مدیریت مشارکتی را درک نکرده اند ، بنابراین برای یافتن بهترین روشهای انجام امور بصورت گروهی شکست می خورند.				
155	عدم اعتماد مدیرمدرسه به توانایی معلمان (کارکنان )مانع رشد فلسفه های جدیدمدیریت مشارکتی می شود.				
156	سطح تحصیلات	♦فوق لیسانس	♦لیسانس	♦ فوق دیپلم	♦دیپلم
157	سن	♦ 51 or more	♦ 41-50	♦ 31-40	♦ 20-30
158	سنوات خدمت در این مدرسه	♦ 31 or more	♦ 21-30	♦ 11-20	♦ 10 or less
159	سنوات خدمت بطور کلی	♦ 31 or more	♦ 21-30	♦ 11-20	♦ 10 or less
160	سابقه تدریس	♦ 31 or more	♦ 21-30	♦ 11-20	♦ 10 or less

Appendix D: *ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Educational Level*

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>PM1</b>	Between Groups	805.949	3	268.650	.870	.456
	Within Groups	274509.822	889	308.785		
	Total	275315.771	892			
<b>PM2</b>	Between Groups	8718.750	3	2906.250	7.171	.000*
	Within Groups	360290.727	889	405.276		
	Total	369009.477	892			
<b>PM3</b>	Between Groups	4377.227	3	1459.076	3.748	.011*
	Within Groups	346058.582	889	389.267		
	Total	350435.809	892			
<b>PM4</b>	Between Groups	1466.402	3	488.801	1.914	.126
	Within Groups	227263.295	890	255.352		
	Total	228729.697	893			
<b>PM5</b>	Between Groups	3911.502	3	1303.834	4.761	.003*
	Within Groups	243743.853	890	273.869		
	Total	247655.355	893			
<b>PM6</b>	Between Groups	2437.098	3	812.366	2.078	.102
	Within Groups	347920.990	890	390.922		
	Total	350358.088	893			
<b>PM7</b>	Between Groups	5093.209	3	1697.736	4.784	.003*
	Within Groups	315827.418	890	354.862		
	Total	320920.627	893			
<b>PM8</b>	Between Groups	5613.106	3	1871.035	5.355	.001*
	Within Groups	310596.197	889	349.377		
	Total	316209.303	892			
<b>PM9</b>	Between Groups	4176.045	3	1392.015	3.615	.013*
	Within Groups	342368.993	889	385.117		
	Total	346545.039	892			
<b>PM10</b>	Between Groups	3417.595	3	1139.198	3.095	.026*
	Within Groups	327255.686	889	368.117		
	Total	330673.282	892			
<b>PM11</b>	Between Groups	4719.813	3	1573.271	3.392	.018*
	Within Groups	412345.481	889	463.831		
	Total	417065.294	892			
<b>PM12</b>	Between Groups	2613.476	3	871.159	2.527	.056*
	Within Groups	306499.027	889	344.768		
	Total	309112.503	892			
<b>PM13</b>	Between Groups	6732.992	3	2244.331	5.736	.001*
	Within Groups	347820.182	889	391.249		
	Total	354553.173	892			
<b>PM14</b>	Between Groups	4662.392	3	1554.131	4.735	.003*
	Within Groups	292124.973	890	328.230		
	Total	296787.365	893			
<b>PM15</b>	Between Groups	4345.776	3	1448.592	3.743	.011*
	Within Groups	343663.927	888	387.009		
	Total	348009.703	891			

Note: \* means statistically significant



Appendix E: ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Educational Level in Seven Districts

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>District II</b>	PM0	Between Groups	3293.258	3	1097.753	4.028	.009
		Within Groups	40065.810	147	272.557		
		Total	43359.068	150			
	PM2	Between Groups	3950.650	3	1316.883	3.129	.028
		Within Groups	61443.816	146	420.848		
		Total	65394.466	149			
	PM3	Between Groups	3026.955	3	1008.985	2.706	.048
		Within Groups	54444.072	146	372.905		
		Total	57471.027	149			
	PM5	Between Groups	2505.705	3	835.235	3.005	.032
		Within Groups	40860.509	147	277.963		
		Total	43366.214	150			
	PM6	Between Groups	2887.014	3	962.338	3.080	.029
		Within Groups	45930.098	147	312.450		
		Total	48817.112	150			
	PM7	Between Groups	4223.200	3	1407.733	4.152	.007
		Within Groups	49836.381	147	339.023		
		Total	54059.581	150			
	PM8	Between Groups	6044.761	3	2014.920	5.186	.002
		Within Groups	57111.913	147	388.516		
		Total	63156.674	150			
	PM10	Between Groups	5611.303	3	1870.434	5.199	.002
		Within Groups	52882.495	147	359.745		
		Total	58493.798	150			
	PM11	Between Groups	3946.788	3	1315.596	2.689	.049
		Within Groups	71926.047	147	489.293		
		Total	75872.835	150			
	PM14	Between Groups	4509.906	3	1503.302	3.910	.010
		Within Groups	56514.111	147	384.450		
		Total	61024.017	150			
	PM15	Between Groups	3275.645	3	1091.882	2.744	.045
		Within Groups	58490.723	147	397.896		
		Total	61766.368	150			
<b>District I</b>	PM0	Between Groups	1645.252	3	548.417	2.710	.047
		Within Groups	30153.334	149	202.371		
		Total	31798.586	152			
	PM4	Between Groups	2023.631	3	674.544	2.697	.048
		Within Groups	37263.985	149	250.094		
		Total	39287.615	152			
	PM12	Between Groups	2311.141	3	770.380	2.829	.041
		Within Groups	40576.822	149	272.328		
		Total	42887.962	152			

Note: Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

Appendix F: ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Age Group

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>PM1</b>	Between Groups	3077.198	3	1025.733	3.364	.018*
	Within Groups	271984.961	892	304.916		
	Total	275062.158	895			
<b>PM2</b>	Between Groups	6927.538	3	2309.179	5.658	.001*
	Within Groups	364051.147	892	408.129		
	Total	370978.685	895			
<b>PM3</b>	Between Groups	10291.032	3	3430.344	9.117	.000*
	Within Groups	335625.029	892	376.261		
	Total	345916.061	895			
<b>PM4</b>	Between Groups	2655.326	3	885.109	3.492	.015*
	Within Groups	226100.478	892	253.476		
	Total	228755.804	895			
<b>PM5</b>	Between Groups	2716.607	3	905.536	3.316	.019*
	Within Groups	243576.800	892	273.068		
	Total	246293.406	895			
<b>PM6</b>	Between Groups	5724.211	3	1908.070	4.963	.002*
	Within Groups	342917.122	892	384.436		
	Total	348641.333	895			
<b>PM7</b>	Between Groups	7428.593	3	2476.198	7.092	.000*
	Within Groups	311448.022	892	349.157		
	Total	318876.616	895			
<b>PM8</b>	Between Groups	8844.665	3	2948.222	8.536	.000*
	Within Groups	307742.804	891	345.390		
	Total	316587.469	894			
<b>PM9</b>	Between Groups	8024.657	3	2674.886	7.063	.000*
	Within Groups	337431.803	891	378.711		
	Total	345456.459	894			
<b>PM10</b>	Between Groups	10158.231	3	3386.077	9.467	.000*
	Within Groups	318686.080	891	357.672		
	Total	328844.311	894			
<b>PM11</b>	Between Groups	8768.523	3	2922.841	6.385	.000*
	Within Groups	407882.984	891	457.781		
	Total	416651.507	894			
<b>PM12</b>	Between Groups	6387.144	3	2129.048	6.279	.000*
	Within Groups	302108.343	891	339.067		
	Total	308495.487	894			
<b>PM13</b>	Between Groups	4635.462	3	1545.154	3.933	.008*
	Within Groups	350006.335	891	392.824		
	Total	354641.797	894			
<b>PM14</b>	Between Groups	6332.267	3	2110.756	6.521	.000*
	Within Groups	288735.519	892	323.695		
	Total	295067.786	895			
<b>PM15</b>	Between Groups	5029.286	3	1676.429	4.368	.005*
	Within Groups	341549.886	890	383.764		
	Total	346579.172	893			

Note: \* means statistically significant

Appendix G: ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Age Group in Seven Districts

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>I</b>	PM4	Between Groups	2046.095	3	682.032	2.696	.048
		Within Groups	38448.494	152	252.951		
		Total	40494.589	155			
<b>District II</b>	PM10	Between Groups	3427.002	3	1142.334	3.053	.030
		Within Groups	54999.351	147	374.145		
		Total	58426.352	150			
	PM14	Between Groups	3220.013	3	1073.338	2.777	.043
		Within Groups	56817.415	147	386.513		
		Total	60037.428	150			
<b>District III</b>	PM0	Between Groups	3162.955	3	1054.318	3.879	.014
		Within Groups	15493.102	57	271.809		
		Total	18656.057	60			
	PM2	Between Groups	4023.404	3	1341.135	3.340	.025
		Within Groups	22885.917	57	401.507		
		Total	26909.321	60			
	PM3	Between Groups	3196.587	3	1065.529	2.835	.046
		Within Groups	21426.690	57	375.907		
		Total	24623.278	60			
	PM7	Between Groups	3730.440	3	1243.480	3.472	.022
		Within Groups	20415.810	57	358.172		
		Total	24146.250	60			
	PM8	Between Groups	2531.078	3	843.693	3.301	.027
		Within Groups	14313.352	56	255.596		
		Total	16844.430	59			
	PM9	Between Groups	4877.616	3	1625.872	4.723	.005
		Within Groups	19277.697	56	344.245		
		Total	24155.313	59			
	PM10	Between Groups	3242.712	3	1080.904	2.823	.047
		Within Groups	21441.945	56	382.892		
		Total	24684.657	59			
	PM11	Between Groups	5431.237	3	1810.412	3.389	.024
		Within Groups	29913.909	56	534.177		
		Total	35345.146	59			
	PM12	Between Groups	5050.367	3	1683.456	5.342	.003
		Within Groups	17647.003	56	315.125		
		Total	22697.370	59			
	PM13	Between Groups	4500.868	3	1500.289	4.341	.008
		Within Groups	19353.716	56	345.602		
		Total	23854.583	59			
	PM15	Between Groups	5639.575	3	1879.858	4.677	.005
		Within Groups	22908.599	57	401.905		
		Total	28548.174	60			
<b>District V</b>	PM2	Between Groups	3011.559	3	1003.853	2.709	.049
		Within Groups	38161.427	103	370.499		
		Total	41172.987	106			
	PM4	Between Groups	1847.776	3	615.925	2.859	.041
		Within Groups	22191.936	103	215.456		
		Total	24039.712	106			

Appendix G: (countinued)

<b>District VII</b>	PM0	Between Groups	7843.021	3	2614.340	10.168	.000
		Within Groups	39080.391	152	257.108		
		Total	46923.413	155			
	PM1	Between Groups	4562.430	3	1520.810	5.402	.001
		Within Groups	42791.326	152	281.522		
		Total	47353.756	155			
	PM2	Between Groups	9776.835	3	3258.945	9.004	.000
		Within Groups	55016.971	152	361.954		
		Total	64793.807	155			
	PM3	Between Groups	10288.802	3	3429.601	11.142	.000
		Within Groups	46788.786	152	307.821		
		Total	57077.588	155			
	PM4	Between Groups	4982.579	3	1660.860	7.811	.000
		Within Groups	32318.392	152	212.621		
		Total	37300.971	155			
	PM5	Between Groups	5478.701	3	1826.234	6.859	.000
		Within Groups	40471.336	152	266.259		
		Total	45950.037	155			
	PM6	Between Groups	9127.527	3	3042.509	9.010	.000
		Within Groups	51330.372	152	337.700		
		Total	60457.899	155			
	PM7	Between Groups	9672.609	3	3224.203	9.627	.000
		Within Groups	50904.790	152	334.900		
		Total	60577.399	155			
	PM8	Between Groups	9522.186	3	3174.062	9.250	.000
		Within Groups	52159.024	152	343.151		
		Total	61681.210	155			
	PM9	Between Groups	8810.355	3	2936.785	8.843	.000
		Within Groups	50477.256	152	332.087		
		Total	59287.611	155			
	PM10	Between Groups	9599.253	3	3199.751	9.132	.000
		Within Groups	53256.846	152	350.374		
		Total	62856.099	155			
	PM11	Between Groups	8907.819	3	2969.273	6.179	.001
		Within Groups	73044.570	152	480.556		
		Total	81952.388	155			
	PM12	Between Groups	7282.335	3	2427.445	6.518	.000
		Within Groups	56607.454	152	372.417		
		Total	63889.788	155			
	PM13	Between Groups	7764.026	3	2588.009	6.300	.000
		Within Groups	62437.655	152	410.774		
		Total	70201.681	155			
	PM14	Between Groups	9224.559	3	3074.853	8.914	.000
		Within Groups	52432.231	152	344.949		
		Total	61656.790	155			
	PM15	Between Groups	6697.075	3	2232.358	5.781	.001
		Within Groups	58699.334	152	386.180		
		Total	65396.409	155			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

Appendix H: *ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Years of Service*

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>PM1</b>	Between Groups	5600.178	3	1866.726	6.129	.000*
	Within Groups	268934.119	883	304.569		
	Total	274534.297	886			
<b>PM2</b>	Between Groups	9981.949	3	3327.316	8.178	.000*
	Within Groups	359237.370	883	406.837		
	Total	369219.319	886			
<b>PM3</b>	Between Groups	9997.440	3	3332.480	8.781	.000*
	Within Groups	335095.745	883	379.497		
	Total	345093.184	886			
<b>PM4</b>	Between Groups	3189.059	3	1063.020	4.150	.006*
	Within Groups	226438.089	884	256.152		
	Total	229627.147	887			
<b>PM5</b>	Between Groups	7293.257	3	2431.086	9.010	.000*
	Within Groups	238529.323	884	269.830		
	Total	245822.581	887			
<b>PM6</b>	Between Groups	7574.521	3	2524.840	6.582	.000*
	Within Groups	339088.753	884	383.585		
	Total	346663.273	887			
<b>PM7</b>	Between Groups	11177.958	3	3725.986	10.790	.000*
	Within Groups	305270.795	884	345.329		
	Total	316448.753	887			
<b>PM8</b>	Between Groups	5256.471	3	1752.157	4.998	.002*
	Within Groups	309553.985	883	350.571		
	Total	314810.456	886			
<b>PM9</b>	Between Groups	8132.610	3	2710.870	7.188	.000*
	Within Groups	333014.060	883	377.139		
	Total	341146.671	886			
<b>PM10</b>	Between Groups	10382.192	3	3460.731	9.696	.000*
	Within Groups	315174.739	883	356.936		
	Total	325556.931	886			
<b>PM11</b>	Between Groups	12368.908	3	4122.969	9.174	.000*
	Within Groups	396818.566	883	449.398		
	Total	409187.474	886			
<b>PM12</b>	Between Groups	10357.860	3	3452.620	10.369	.000*
	Within Groups	294025.533	883	332.985		
	Total	304383.393	886			
<b>PM13</b>	Between Groups	7327.255	3	2442.418	6.223	.000*
	Within Groups	346547.615	883	392.466		
	Total	353874.870	886			
<b>PM14</b>	Between Groups	8217.828	3	2739.276	8.448	.000*
	Within Groups	286641.326	884	324.255		
	Total	294859.154	887			
<b>PM15</b>	Between Groups	7630.740	3	2543.580	6.663	.000*
	Within Groups	336693.131	882	381.738		
	Total	344323.871	885			

Note: \* means statistically significant

*Appendix I: ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Years of Service in Seven Districts*

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>District I</b>	PM0	Between Groups	2038.263	3	679.421	3.087	.029
		Within Groups	32571.085	148	220.075		
		Total	34609.348	151			
	PM6	Between Groups	3458.684	3	1152.895	3.319	.022
		Within Groups	51413.078	148	347.386		
		Total	54871.762	151			
	PM7	Between Groups	3499.126	3	1166.375	3.646	.014
		Within Groups	47339.582	148	319.862		
		Total	50838.708	151			
	PM8	Between Groups	3070.642	3	1023.547	3.659	.014
		Within Groups	41396.483	148	279.706		
		Total	44467.125	151			
	PM9	Between Groups	3689.558	3	1229.853	4.112	.008
		Within Groups	44260.169	148	299.055		
		Total	47949.727	151			
	PM10	Between Groups	3525.912	3	1175.304	3.717	.013
		Within Groups	46798.760	148	316.208		
		Total	50324.672	151			
	PM11	Between Groups	4681.686	3	1560.562	4.568	.004
		Within Groups	50558.019	148	341.608		
		Total	55239.705	151			
<b>District II</b>	PM3	Between Groups	3311.857	3	1103.952	3.039	.031
		Within Groups	52667.304	145	363.223		
		Total	55979.160	148			
	PM10	Between Groups	3376.388	3	1125.463	3.005	.032
		Within Groups	54677.432	146	374.503		
		Total	58053.820	149			
<b>District III</b>	PM10	Between Groups	4737.319	3	1579.106	4.507	.007
		Within Groups	19969.128	57	350.336		
		Total	24706.447	60			
	PM11	Between Groups	6560.382	3	2186.794	4.324	.008
		Within Groups	28828.524	57	505.764		
		Total	35388.906	60			
	PM12	Between Groups	4002.741	3	1334.247	4.067	.011
		Within Groups	18698.636	57	328.046		
		Total	22701.377	60			
	PM13	Between Groups	3487.293	3	1162.431	3.250	.028
		Within Groups	20386.477	57	357.657		
		Total	23873.770	60			
<b>District IV</b>	PM14	Between Groups	2654.054	3	884.685	3.127	.033
		Within Groups	16409.128	58	282.916		
		Total	19063.182	61			
	PM15	Between Groups	4016.231	3	1338.744	3.159	.031
		Within Groups	24575.980	58	423.724		
		Total	28592.210	61			
<b>District V</b>	PM0	Between Groups	2352.717	3	784.239	3.945	.010
		Within Groups	29221.521	147	198.786		
		Total	31574.237	150			
	PM1	Between Groups	2110.463	3	703.488	2.776	.043
		Within Groups	37258.058	147	253.456		
		Total	39368.522	150			

Appendix I: (countinued)

<b>District IV</b>	PM2	Between Groups	4929.224	3	1643.075	4.949	.003
		Within Groups	48806.075	147	332.014		
		Total	53735.299	150			
	PM3	Between Groups	4228.907	3	1409.636	3.819	.011
		Within Groups	54259.922	147	369.115		
		Total	58488.829	150			
	PM4	Between Groups	2038.021	3	679.340	2.732	.046
		Within Groups	36552.718	147	248.658		
		Total	38590.739	150			
	PM5	Between Groups	2952.889	3	984.296	4.547	.004
		Within Groups	31824.270	147	216.492		
		Total	34777.159	150			
	PM6	Between Groups	2686.866	3	895.622	2.808	.042
		Within Groups	46886.977	147	318.959		
		Total	49573.843	150			
	PM7	Between Groups	2438.141	3	812.714	2.937	.035
		Within Groups	40677.433	147	276.717		
		Total	43115.574	150			
	PM10	Between Groups	2596.659	3	865.553	3.187	.026
		Within Groups	39924.114	147	271.593		
		Total	42520.774	150			
	PM11	Between Groups	3643.902	3	1214.634	3.514	.017
		Within Groups	50806.785	147	345.624		
		Total	54450.687	150			
	PM12	Between Groups	3391.105	3	1130.368	4.268	.006
		Within Groups	38928.350	147	264.819		
		Total	42319.454	150			
<b>VI</b>	PM1	Between Groups	3662.558	3	1220.853	3.458	.019
		Within Groups	38132.107	108	353.075		
		Total	41794.664	111			
<b>District VII</b>	PM0	Between Groups	4894.309	3	1631.436	5.810	.001
		Within Groups	42679.253	152	280.785		
		Total	47573.562	155			
	PM1	Between Groups	2458.651	3	819.550	2.762	.044
		Within Groups	45101.131	152	296.718		
		Total	47559.782	155			
	PM2	Between Groups	6039.344	3	2013.115	5.222	.002
		Within Groups	58598.424	152	385.516		
		Total	64637.768	155			
	PM3	Between Groups	4054.160	3	1351.387	3.633	.014
		Within Groups	56542.411	152	371.990		
		Total	60596.571	155			
	PM4	Between Groups	2198.692	3	732.897	3.125	.028
		Within Groups	35642.728	152	234.492		
		Total	37841.420	155			
	PM5	Between Groups	4295.326	3	1431.775	5.182	.002
		Within Groups	42000.081	152	276.316		
		Total	46295.407	155			
	PM6	Between Groups	5305.927	3	1768.642	4.839	.003
		Within Groups	55554.860	152	365.492		
		Total	60860.787	155			

Appendix I: (continued)

<b>District VII</b>	PM7	Between Groups	6247.506	3	2082.502	5.752	.001
		Within Groups	55035.654	152	362.077		
		Total	61283.160	155			
	PM8	Between Groups	6652.003	3	2217.334	6.136	.001
		Within Groups	54926.002	152	361.355		
		Total	61578.005	155			
	PM9	Between Groups	5216.675	3	1738.892	4.839	.003
		Within Groups	54624.562	152	359.372		
		Total	59841.237	155			
	PM10	Between Groups	7048.679	3	2349.560	6.245	.001
		Within Groups	57188.944	152	376.243		
		Total	64237.623	155			
	PM11	Between Groups	5505.445	3	1835.148	3.643	.014
		Within Groups	76565.518	152	503.721		
		Total	82070.962	155			
	PM12	Between Groups	4778.194	3	1592.731	4.059	.008
		Within Groups	59638.149	152	392.356		
		Total	64416.344	155			
	PM13	Between Groups	4740.624	3	1580.208	3.645	.014
		Within Groups	65889.040	152	433.481		
		Total	70629.664	155			
	PM14	Between Groups	6559.178	3	2186.393	5.989	.001
		Within Groups	55487.876	152	365.052		
		Total	62047.054	155			
	PM15	Between Groups	5683.201	3	1894.400	4.785	.003
		Within Groups	60183.646	152	395.945		
		Total	65866.847	155			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences



*Appendix J: ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Years of Service in School*

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
PM1	Between Groups	1679.457	3	559.819	1.826	.141
	Within Groups	272499.632	889	306.524		
	Total	274179.088	892			
PM2	Between Groups	645.509	3	215.170	.525	.665
	Within Groups	364511.337	889	410.024		
	Total	365156.846	892			
PM3	Between Groups	1202.869	3	400.956	1.038	.375
	Within Groups	343401.283	889	386.278		
	Total	344604.152	892			
PM4	Between Groups	1051.902	3	350.634	1.370	.251
	Within Groups	227780.370	890	255.933		
	Total	228832.272	893			
PM5	Between Groups	1273.850	3	424.617	1.562	.197
	Within Groups	241995.562	890	271.905		
	Total	243269.412	893			
PM6	Between Groups	891.896	3	297.299	.774	.509
	Within Groups	341880.664	890	384.136		
	Total	342772.559	893			
PM7	Between Groups	813.398	3	271.133	.770	.511
	Within Groups	313339.522	890	352.067		
	Total	314152.920	893			
PM8	Between Groups	3277.127	3	1092.376	3.154	.024*
	Within Groups	307890.473	889	346.333		
	Total	311167.601	892			
PM9	Between Groups	754.312	3	251.437	.656	.579
	Within Groups	340750.959	889	383.297		
	Total	341505.271	892			
PM10	Between Groups	235.789	3	78.596	.216	.886
	Within Groups	323896.546	889	364.338		
	Total	324132.334	892			
PM11	Between Groups	581.200	3	193.733	.420	.739
	Within Groups	410067.849	889	461.269		
	Total	410649.048	892			
PM12	Between Groups	412.256	3	137.419	.408	.747
	Within Groups	299363.568	889	336.742		
	Total	299775.824	892			
PM13	Between Groups	1193.711	3	397.904	1.014	.386
	Within Groups	348757.081	889	392.303		
	Total	349950.792	892			
<b>PM14</b>	Between Groups	1395.828	3	465.276	1.438	.230
	Within Groups	287898.320	890	323.481		
	Total	289294.148	893			
PM15	Between Groups	2564.565	3	854.855	2.246	.081
	Within Groups	337932.259	888	380.554		
	Total	340496.824	891			

*Note:* \* means statistically significant

*Appendix K: ANOVA Comparing PM Component and Years of Service in School in Seven Districts*

			Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>—</b>	PM15	Between Groups	1978.794	2	989.397	3.115	.047
		Within Groups	48274.220	152	317.594		
		Total	50253.014	154			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

*Appendix L: ANOVA Comparing PM Components by Teachers' Teaching Experience in Seven Districts*

			Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>—</b>	PM13	Between Groups	2159.771	2	1079.886	3.146	.046
		Within Groups	49776.247	145	343.284		
		Total	51936.018	147			
<b>=</b>	PM8	Between Groups	4227.879	2	2113.939	5.212	.007
		Within Groups	58814.011	145	405.614		
		Total	63041.889	147			
	PM9	Between Groups	3369.582	2	1684.791	3.924	.022
		Within Groups	62255.245	145	429.347		
		Total	65624.827	147			
	PM12	Between Groups	3610.127	2	1805.064	5.754	.004
		Within Groups	45485.118	145	313.690		
		Total	49095.246	147			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

Appendix M: ANOVA Comparing PM Components and Teaching Experience

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
PM0	Between Groups	594.910	2	297.455	1.279	.282
	Within Groups	33734.609	145	232.652		
	Total	34329.519	147			
PM1	Between Groups	1282.307	2	641.153	2.017	.137
	Within Groups	46092.500	145	317.879		
	Total	47374.807	147			
PM2	Between Groups	1140.915	2	570.457	1.404	.249
	Within Groups	58894.491	145	406.169		
	Total	60035.406	147			
PM3	Between Groups	1570.766	2	785.383	2.316	.102
	Within Groups	49165.173	145	339.070		
	Total	50735.939	147			
PM4	Between Groups	922.812	2	461.406	1.718	.183
	Within Groups	38952.201	145	268.636		
	Total	39875.013	147			
PM5	Between Groups	189.812	2	94.906	.370	.692
	Within Groups	37233.789	145	256.785		
	Total	37423.602	147			
PM6	Between Groups	807.677	2	403.838	1.088	.339
	Within Groups	53801.720	145	371.046		
	Total	54609.396	147			
PM7	Between Groups	394.160	2	197.080	.571	.566
	Within Groups	50066.058	145	345.283		
	Total	50460.219	147			
PM8	Between Groups	1436.147	2	718.073	2.426	.092
	Within Groups	42920.816	145	296.006		
	Total	44356.963	147			
PM9	Between Groups	258.007	2	129.003	.394	.675
	Within Groups	47458.365	145	327.299		
	Total	47716.372	147			
PM10	Between Groups	390.184	2	195.092	.570	.567
	Within Groups	49602.296	145	342.085		
	Total	49992.480	147			
PM11	Between Groups	601.802	2	300.901	.804	.450
	Within Groups	54273.435	145	374.300		
	Total	54875.238	147			
PM12	Between Groups	311.683	2	155.842	.533	.588
	Within Groups	42401.232	145	292.422		
	Total	42712.915	147			
PM13	Between Groups	2159.771	2	1079.886	3.146	.046*
	Within Groups	49776.247	145	343.284		
	Total	51936.018	147			
PM14	Between Groups	423.929	2	211.965	.805	.449
	Within Groups	38180.338	145	263.313		
	Total	38604.267	147			
PM15	Between Groups	916.465	2	458.233	1.366	.258
	Within Groups	48292.605	144	335.365		
	Total	49209.070	146			

Note: \* means statistically significant

Appendix N: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Educational Level

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>OC1</b>	Between Groups	6521.376	3	2173.792	4.105	.007*
	Within Groups	469728.194	887	529.570		
	Total	476249.571	890			
<b>OC2</b>	Between Groups	9014.012	3	3004.671	5.518	.001*
	Within Groups	484638.729	890	544.538		
	Total	493652.741	893			
<b>OC3</b>	Between Groups	5260.006	3	1753.335	3.536	.014*
	Within Groups	441357.073	890	495.907		
	Total	446617.079	893			
<b>OC4</b>	Between Groups	7428.385	3	2476.128	4.138	.006*
	Within Groups	532627.760	890	598.458		
	Total	540056.145	893			
<b>OC5</b>	Between Groups	9509.992	3	3169.997	4.767	.003*
	Within Groups	591859.302	890	665.010		
	Total	601369.294	893			
<b>OC6</b>	Between Groups	5837.820	3	1945.940	4.995	.002*
	Within Groups	346702.096	890	389.553		
	Total	352539.915	893			
<b>OC7</b>	Between Groups	6702.653	3	2234.218	5.690	.001*
	Within Groups	349449.867	890	392.640		
	Total	356152.520	893			
<b>OC8</b>	Between Groups	3104.170	3	1034.723	2.617	.050*
	Within Groups	351885.717	890	395.377		
	Total	354989.887	893			
<b>OC9</b>	Between Groups	3041.844	3	1013.948	3.730	.011*
	Within Groups	241916.687	890	271.817		
	Total	244958.531	893			

Appendix O: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Educational Level in Seven Districts

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>I</b>	OC5	Between Groups	6257.552	3	2085.851	2.793	.042
		Within Groups	112036.800	150	746.912		
		Total	118294.352	153			
<b>II</b>	OC6	Between Groups	2906.199	3	968.733	3.052	.030
		Within Groups	46664.284	147	317.444		
		Total	49570.484	150			
<b>III</b>	OC3	Between Groups	2663.010	3	887.670	3.358	.025
		Within Groups	15068.128	57	264.353		
		Total	17731.137	60			
<b>VII</b>	OC7	Between Groups	3519.843	3	1173.281	3.121	.028
		Within Groups	57518.989	153	375.941		
		Total	61038.832	156			

Note: Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

Appendix P: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Age Group

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>OC1</b>	Between Groups	11148.573	3	3716.191	7.076	.000*
	Within Groups	466863.436	889	525.156		
	Total	478012.009	892			
<b>OC2</b>	Between Groups	6118.663	3	2039.554	3.704	.011*
	Within Groups	491139.322	892	550.605		
	Total	497257.985	895			
<b>OC3</b>	Between Groups	9115.590	3	3038.530	6.141	.000*
	Within Groups	441340.761	892	494.777		
	Total	450456.351	895			
<b>OC4</b>	Between Groups	12496.890	3	4165.630	6.989	.000*
	Within Groups	531660.649	892	596.032		
	Total	544157.539	895			
<b>OC5</b>	Between Groups	14277.690	3	4759.230	7.216	.000*
	Within Groups	588281.986	892	659.509		
	Total	602559.675	895			
<b>OC6</b>	Between Groups	6023.241	3	2007.747	5.152	.002*
	Within Groups	347605.428	892	389.692		
	Total	353628.669	895			
<b>OC7</b>	Between Groups	3048.300	3	1016.100	2.569	.053
	Within Groups	352804.733	892	395.521		
	Total	355853.032	895			
<b>OC8</b>	Between Groups	1718.163	3	572.721	1.447	.228
	Within Groups	353008.267	892	395.749		
	Total	354726.430	895			
<b>OC9</b>	Between Groups	3887.842	3	1295.947	4.779	.003*
	Within Groups	241889.277	892	271.176		
	Total	245777.119	895			

Note: \* means statistically significant

Appendix Q: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Age Group in Seven Districts

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>District II</b>	OC8	Between Groups	3277.546	3	1092.515	3.102	.029
		Within Groups	51764.870	147	352.142		
		Total	55042.416	150			
	OC9	Between Groups	2215.449	3	738.483	2.817	.041
		Within Groups	38539.187	147	262.171		
		Total	40754.636	150			
<b>District III</b>	OC0	Between Groups	4004.612	3	1334.871	6.365	.001
		Within Groups	11953.818	57	209.716		
		Total	15958.430	60			
	OC1	Between Groups	6992.188	3	2330.729	5.877	.001
		Within Groups	22607.146	57	396.617		
		Total	29599.334	60			

Appendix Q: (continued)

			Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>District III</b>	OC2	Between Groups	3588.839	3	1196.280	3.244	.028
		Within Groups	21020.849	57	368.787		
		Total	24609.689	60			
	OC3	Between Groups	3512.571	3	1170.857	4.525	.006
		Within Groups	14747.747	57	258.732		
		Total	18260.318	60			
	OC4	Between Groups	5147.420	3	1715.807	3.675	.017
		Within Groups	26613.997	57	466.912		
		Total	31761.416	60			
	OC5	Between Groups	5375.121	3	1791.707	3.338	.025
		Within Groups	30592.389	57	536.709		
		Total	35967.510	60			
	OC6	Between Groups	4762.273	3	1587.424	8.612	.000
		Within Groups	10506.411	57	184.323		
		Total	15268.684	60			
	OC7	Between Groups	4645.561	3	1548.520	6.817	.001
		Within Groups	12948.292	57	227.163		
		Total	17593.852	60			
	OC8	Between Groups	4122.171	3	1374.057	5.197	.003
		Within Groups	15070.042	57	264.387		
		Total	19192.213	60			
	OC9	Between Groups	2591.383	3	863.794	3.435	.023
		Within Groups	14335.667	57	251.503		
		Total	16927.049	60			
<b>District VII</b>	OC0	Between Groups	5093.903	3	1697.968	4.614	.004
		Within Groups	55933.493	152	367.984		
		Total	61027.396	155			
	OC1	Between Groups	9443.316	3	3147.772	6.103	.001
		Within Groups	78391.947	152	515.736		
		Total	87835.263	155			
	OC3	Between Groups	9376.965	3	3125.655	5.315	.002
		Within Groups	89396.205	152	588.133		
		Total	98773.170	155			
	OC4	Between Groups	7685.490	3	2561.830	4.428	.005
		Within Groups	87949.718	152	578.617		
		Total	95635.208	155			
	OC5	Between Groups	9197.290	3	3065.763	4.542	.004
		Within Groups	102599.379	152	674.996		
		Total	111796.669	155			
	OC6	Between Groups	4427.912	3	1475.971	3.622	.015
		Within Groups	61948.137	152	407.554		
		Total	66376.049	155			

Note: Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

Appendix R: *ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Years of Service*

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>OC1</b>	Between Groups	8347.618	3	2782.539	5.319	.001*
	Within Groups	460866.132	881	523.117		
	Total	469213.750	884			
<b>OC2</b>	Between Groups	4152.880	3	1384.293	2.507	.058
	Within Groups	488062.171	884	552.107		
	Total	492215.051	887			
<b>OC3</b>	Between Groups	7473.053	3	2491.018	5.107	.002*
	Within Groups	431158.780	884	487.736		
	Total	438631.833	887			
<b>OC4</b>	Between Groups	15382.057	3	5127.352	8.652	.000*
	Within Groups	523875.186	884	592.619		
	Total	539257.244	887			
<b>OC5</b>	Between Groups	10102.378	3	3367.459	5.166	.002*
	Within Groups	576201.115	884	651.811		
	Total	586303.493	887			
<b>OC6</b>	Between Groups	7311.578	3	2437.193	6.323	.000*
	Within Groups	340735.377	884	385.447		
	Total	348046.955	887			
<b>OC7</b>	Between Groups	3611.255	3	1203.752	3.040	.028*
	Within Groups	350071.007	884	396.008		
	Total	353682.263	887			
<b>OC8</b>	Between Groups	3887.003	3	1295.668	3.280	.020*
	Within Groups	349193.265	884	395.015		
	Total	353080.268	887			
<b>OC9</b>	Between Groups	3529.222	3	1176.407	4.324	.005*
	Within Groups	240502.896	884	272.062		
	Total	244032.119	887			

Appendix S: *ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Years of Service in Seven Districts*

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>III</b>	OC8	Between Groups	2597.662	3	865.887	3.024
		Within Groups	16610.100	58	286.381	
		Total	19207.762	61		.037
<b>VI</b>	OC4	Between Groups	4706.802	3	1568.934	2.808
		Within Groups	60333.205	108	558.641	
		Total	65040.007	111		.043
<b>District VII</b>	OC0	Between Groups	4145.581	3	1381.860	3.680
		Within Groups	57072.628	152	375.478	
		Total	61218.208	155		.014
	OC1	Between Groups	7148.654	3	2382.885	4.536
		Within Groups	79852.738	152	525.347	
		Total	87001.391	155		.004

Appendix S: (countinued)

			Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>District VII</b>	OC3	Between Groups	6104.047	3	2034.682	3.333	.021
		Within Groups	92803.450	152	610.549		
		Total	98907.497	155			
	OC4	Between Groups	6943.921	3	2314.640	3.967	.009
		Within Groups	88691.287	152	583.495		
		Total	95635.208	155			
	OC5	Between Groups	6954.191	3	2318.064	3.393	.020
		Within Groups	103852.069	152	683.237		
		Total	110806.259	155			
	OC6	Between Groups	4923.507	3	1641.169	4.055	.008
		Within Groups	61521.220	152	404.745		
		Total	66444.727	155			
	OC9	Between Groups	2409.369	3	803.123	3.203	.025
		Within Groups	38108.740	152	250.715		
		Total	40518.109	155			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

Appendix T: ANOVA comparing OC Components and Years of Service in School

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
OC1	Between Groups	1669.053	3	556.351	1.060	.365
	Within Groups	465391.838	887	524.681		
	Total	467060.892	890			
OC2	Between Groups	824.867	3	274.956	.499	.683
	Within Groups	489971.336	890	550.530		
	Total	490796.203	893			
OC3	Between Groups	693.705	3	231.235	.470	.703
	Within Groups	437896.461	890	492.018		
	Total	438590.166	893			
OC4	Between Groups	1415.971	3	471.990	.788	.501
	Within Groups	533296.147	890	599.209		
	Total	534712.119	893			
OC5	Between Groups	2722.649	3	907.550	1.372	.250
	Within Groups	588589.367	890	661.336		
	Total	591312.017	893			
OC6	Between Groups	625.502	3	208.501	.539	.656
	Within Groups	344352.026	890	386.912		
	Total	344977.528	893			
OC7	Between Groups	562.102	3	187.367	.475	.700
	Within Groups	350893.410	890	394.262		
	Total	351455.512	893			
OC8	Between Groups	2456.399	3	818.800	2.074	.102
	Within Groups	351378.163	890	394.807		
	Total	353834.563	893			
OC9	Between Groups	2477.617	3	825.872	3.024	.029*
	Within Groups	243038.252	890	273.077		
	Total	245515.869	893			

*Note:* \* means statistically significant



*Appendix U: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Years of Service in School in Seven Districts*

			Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>II</b>	OC7	Between Groups	3181.768	3	1060.589	2.663	.050
		Within Groups	58550.819	147	398.305		
		Total	61732.588	150			
<b>IV</b>	OC7	Between Groups	3286.038	3	1095.346	3.095	.029
		Within Groups	52373.565	148	353.875		
		Total	55659.604	151			
	OC0	Between Groups	4145.376	3	1381.792	3.861	.011
		Within Groups	52966.859	148	357.884		
		Total	57112.235	151			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences

*Appendix V: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Teaching Experience*

		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.
<b>OC1</b>	Between Groups	1501.355	2	750.678	1.406	.246
	Within Groups	462375.496	866	533.921		
	Total	463876.852	868			
<b>OC2</b>	Between Groups	3720.066	3	1240.022	2.260	.080
	Within Groups	476350.809	868	548.791		
	Total	480070.875	871			
<b>OC3</b>	Between Groups	2245.813	3	748.604	1.510	.210
	Within Groups	430240.157	868	495.668		
	Total	432485.970	871			
<b>OC4</b>	Between Groups	1243.954	3	414.651	.677	.566
	Within Groups	531951.598	868	612.847		
	Total	533195.551	871			
<b>OC5</b>	Between Groups	3297.237	3	1099.079	1.656	.175
	Within Groups	576053.201	868	663.656		
	Total	579350.438	871			
<b>OC6</b>	Between Groups	3699.006	3	1233.002	3.169	.024*
	Within Groups	337764.154	868	389.129		
	Total	341463.160	871			
<b>OC7</b>	Between Groups	2490.286	3	830.095	2.087	.100
	Within Groups	345241.445	868	397.744		
	Total	347731.731	871			
<b>OC8</b>	Between Groups	7560.222	3	2520.074	6.395	.000*
	Within Groups	342058.889	868	394.077		
	Total	349619.110	871			
<b>OC9</b>	Between Groups	3125.943	3	1041.981	3.796	.010*
	Within Groups	238235.394	868	274.465		
	Total	241361.337	871			

*Note:* \* means statistically significant

*Appendix W: ANOVA Comparing OC Components and Teaching Experience in Seven Districts*

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
II	OC2	Between Groups	4413.513	2	2206.756	3.856	.023
		Within Groups	82972.677	145	572.225		
		Total	87386.190	147			
	OC8	Between Groups	3230.715	2	1615.357	4.470	.013
		Within Groups	52398.665	145	361.370		
		Total	55629.380	147			
	OC9	Between Groups	5068.515	2	2534.257	10.381	.000
		Within Groups	35399.053	145	244.131		
		Total	40467.568	147			
III	OC0	Between Groups	2898.151	2	1449.076	4.589	.012
		Within Groups	45785.739	145	315.764		
		Total	48683.890	147			
IV	OC8	Between Groups	2404.338	2	1202.169	3.202	.044
		Within Groups	54061.223	144	375.425		
		Total	56465.562	146			
	OC9	Between Groups	1730.235	2	865.118	3.094	.048
		Within Groups	40269.586	144	279.650		
		Total	41999.821	146			
V	OC6	Between Groups	3647.310	3	1215.770	3.616	.016
		Within Groups	33618.052	100	336.181		
		Total	37265.362	103			
VI	OC0	Between Groups	2980.233	2	1490.117	4.512	.013
		Within Groups	35668.694	108	330.266		
		Total	38648.928	110			
	OC1	Between Groups	5024.480	2	2512.240	4.125	.019
		Within Groups	65159.174	107	608.964		
		Total	70183.655	109			
	OC2	Between Groups	4239.002	2	2119.501	4.160	.018
		Within Groups	55028.431	108	509.523		
		Total	59267.433	110			
	OC3	Between Groups	3639.553	2	1819.777	4.356	.015
		Within Groups	45120.922	108	417.786		
		Total	48760.476	110			
	OC5	Between Groups	3990.330	2	1995.165	3.252	.043
		Within Groups	66259.197	108	613.511		
		Total	70249.528	110			
	OC6	Between Groups	3036.213	2	1518.106	3.298	.041
		Within Groups	49716.566	108	460.339		
		Total	52752.779	110			
	OC7	Between Groups	2853.781	2	1426.890	3.176	.046
		Within Groups	48523.430	108	449.291		
		Total	51377.211	110			
	OC8	Between Groups	2616.553	2	1308.276	3.216	.044
		Within Groups	43930.335	108	406.762		
		Total	46546.888	110			

*Note:* Other districts and other components did not have statistically significant differences