INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4865

8116756

WORK, JOE HUGH

DECISION MAKING IN INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN EASTERN AND WESTERN OKLAHOMA

The University of Oklahoma PH.D. 1981

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1981

by

Work, Joe Hugh

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

DECISION MAKING IN INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN EASTERN AND WESTERN OKLAHOMA

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

JOE HUGH WORK

Norman, Oklahoma

1981

DECISION MAKING IN INDIAN

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

IN EASTERN AND WESTERN OKLAHOMA

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to many persons who made the attainment of this goal in education a reality.

To Dr. John J. Seaberg, my committee chairman, who provided professional encouragement and criticism throughout my doctoral program, my deepest thanks. His personal and professional concern facilitated my completion of this dissertation.

To an excellent committee, Dr. Gerald Kidd, Dr. Gene Pingleton, and Dr. Jack Parker, who facilitated my learning of school administration, my appreciation.

To the Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board members, and educational administrators who contributed the data I express my appreciation.

I recognize the school superintendents, State Department of Education officials, and the tribal education coordinators for their help and support during the completion of my survey.

I am grateful to Dr. Jim Casey for his contribution of time and his helpful assistance with the statistical dimensions of this study.

A very special thanks is expressed to Mildred, my wife, and to my daughters, Traci, Carla, and Shari for their encouragement, understanding, patience, and continued support during the time I spent completing this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background of the Problem	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Significance of the Study	4
	Statement of Hypotheses	5
	Limitations of the Study	6
	Definition of Terms	6
	Organization of the Study	8
II.	REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	10
	Related Literature	10
	Recent Legislative Policies	15
	History of Federal Legislation	16
	Johnson O'Malley	23
	Title IV, Part A, PL 92-318	24
	Indian Education Advisory Committees	24
	Summary	26
III.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	28
	Decision Making and Perceptions	31
	Zone of Acceptance	32
	Role of the Administrator	34
	Marginal Participation Areas	34
	Constitutional Arrangements	35
	Summary	38
IV.	METHODOLOGY	39
	Selection of Subjects	39
	Sampling	39
	Data Collection Tools	41
	Pilot Study	45
	Procedure for Collecting Data	46
	Statistical Design and Treatment of Data	47
	Summary	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
V.	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA.	49
	Analysis of the Data	49
	Results of Hypotheses Testing.	51
	Summary.	168
VI.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. .	177
	Summary.	177
	Conclusions.	182
	Recommendations.	189
	Implications for Future Research	192
References		195
APPENDICES		
Appendix A.	Education Program Development Questionnaire	198
Appendix B.	Composition of Population Tables.	201

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	$H_0 1^a$ Statistical Analysis Regarding the Importance of Specific Written Policies for Items A - P	51
2.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	52
3.	$H_0 1^a$ Item A Statistical Analysis "Annual Assessment of Indian Student Learning Needs"	53
4.	$H_0 1^a$ Item B Statistical Analysis "Recommend Program Curricula"	54
5.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Regarding Recommendation of Program Curricula, using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	55
6.	$H_0 1^a$ Item C Statistical Analysis "Recommend Textbooks and Materials"	56
7.	$H_0 1^a$ Item D Statistical Analysis "Recommend Teaching Methods"	57
8.	$H_0 1^a$ Item E Statistical Analysis "Recommend Criteria for Hiring Staff"	58
9.	$H_0 1^a$ Item F Statistical Analysis "Develop List of Qualified Staff for Required Selection by Program Administrator"	59
10.	$H_0 1^a$ Item G Statistical Analysis "Approve Budget Preparation and Execution"	60
11.	$H_0 1^a$ Item H Statistical Analysis "Have Specific Written Policies for Planning and Developing Educational Programs"	61
12.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering the Planning and Development of Educational Programs, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	62

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
13.	$H_0 1^a$ Item I Statistical Analysis "Participate in Negotiations Concerning Contracts". .	63
14.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Participation in Negotiations Concerning Contracts, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	64
15.	$H_0 1^a$ Item J Statistical Analysis "Having Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents" .	65
16.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	66
17.	$H_0 1^a$ Item K Statistical Analysis "Request Periodic Reports and Evaluations"	67
18.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Requests for Periodic Reports and Evaluations, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	68
19.	$H_0 1^a$ Item L Statistical Analysis "Evaluate Staff Performance and Program Results"	69
20.	$H_0 1^a$ Item M Statistical Analysis "Hearing Grievances".	70
21.	$H_0 1^a$ Item N Statistical Analysis "Approving and Disapproving Programs"	71
22.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Approval and Disapproval of Programs, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure . . .	72
23.	$H_0 1^a$ Item O Statistical Analysis "Recommending to Proper Authorities the Cancellation or Suspension of Contract"	73
24.	$H_0 1^a$ Item P Statistical Analysis "Educational Program Implementation and Committee Involvement".	74

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
25.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Educational Program Implementation and Committee Involvement, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	75
26.	$H_0 1^b$ Statistical Analysis Concerning the Importance of Specific Written Policies for Items A - P	76
27.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure. . . .	77
28.	$H_0 1^b$ Item A Statistical Analysis "Annual Assessment of Indian Student Learning Needs . .	78
29.	$H_0 1^b$ Item B Statistical Analysis "Recommend Program Curricula".	79
30.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Regarding Recommendation of Program Curricula, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure. . . .	80
31.	$H_0 1^b$ Item C Statistical Analysis "Recommend Textbooks and Materials".	81
32.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Regarding Recommendation of Textbooks and Manuals To Be Used in the Program, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	82
33.	$H_0 1^b$ Item D Statistical Analysis "Recommend Teaching Methods"	83
34.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Recommendation of Teaching Methods, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure. . . .	84
35.	$H_0 1^b$ Item E Statistical Analysis "Recommend Criteria for Hiring Staff".	85
36.	$H_0 1^b$ Item F Statistical Analysis "Develop List of Qualified Staff for Required Selection by Program Administrator"	86

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
37.	$H_0 1^b$ Item G Statistical Analysis "Approve Budget Preparation and Execution"	87
38.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Approving Budget Preparation and Execution, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	88
39.	$H_0 1^b$ Item H Statistical Analysis "Have Specific Written Policies for Planning and Developing Educational Programs".	89
40.	$H_0 1^b$ Item I Statistical Analysis "Participate in Negotiations Concerning Contracts"	90
41.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Participation in Negotiations Concerning Contracts, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	91
42.	$H_0 1^b$ Item J Statistical Analysis "Having Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents" .	92
43.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	93
44.	$H_0 1^a$ Item K Statistical Analysis "Request Periodic Reports and Evaluations"	94
45.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Requests for Periodic Reports and Evaluations, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	95
46.	$H_0 1^b$ Item L Statistical Analysis "Evaluate Staff Performance and Program Results".	96
47.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Importance of Written Policies Covering Evaluating Staff Performance and Program Results, Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	97

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
48.	$H_0 1^b$ Item M Statistical Analysis "Hearing Grievances"	98
49.	$H_0 1^b$ Item N Statistical Analysis "Approving and Disapproving Programs".	99
50.	$H_0 1^b$ Item O Statistical Analysis "Recommending to Proper Authorities the Cancellation or Suspension of Contract"	100
51.	$H_0 1^b$ Item P Statistical Analysis "Educational Program Implementation and Committee Involvement".	101
52.	$H_0 2^a$ Statistical Analysis Concerning the Degree of Participation in Decision Making for Items A - P	102
53.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Decision Making Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	103
54.	$H_0 2^a$ Item A Statistical Analysis "Annual Assessment of Indian Student Learning Needs". .	104
55.	$H_0 2^a$ Item B Statistical Analysis "Recommend Program Curricula".	105
56.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Decision Making Regarding Recommendation of Program Curricula Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	106
57.	$H_0 2^a$ Item C Statistical Analysis "Recommend Textbooks and Materials".	107
58.	$H_0 2^a$ Item D Statistical Analysis "Recommend Teaching Methods"	108
59.	$H_0 2^a$ Item E Statistical Analysis "Recommend Criteria for Hiring Staff".	109
60.	$H_0 2^a$ Item F Statistical Analysis "Develop List of Qualified Staff for Required Selection by Program Administrator"	110
61.	$H_0 2^a$ Item G Statistical Analysis "Approve Budget Preparation and Execution"	111

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
62.	$H_0 2^a$ Item H Statistical Analysis "Have Specific Written Policies for Planning and Developing Educational Programs"	112
63.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Decision Making Regarding Planning and Developing Educational Programs Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	113
64.	$H_0 2^a$ Item I Statistical Analysis "Participate in Negotiations Concerning Contracts".	114
65.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Decision Making Regarding Participation in Negotiations Concerning Contracts Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	115
66.	$H_0 2^a$ Item J Statistical Analysis "Having Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents". .	116
67.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Decision Making Regarding Having Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	117
68.	$H_0 2^a$ Item K Statistical Analysis "Request Periodic Reports and Evaluations".	118
69.	$H_0 2^a$ Item L Statistical Analysis "Evaluate Staff Performance and Program Results"	119
70.	$H_0 2^a$ Item M Statistical Analysis "Hearing Grievances".	120
71.	$H_0 2^a$ Item N Statistical Analysis "Approving and Disapproving Programs"	121
72.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Approving and Disapproving Programs Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	122

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
73.	$H_0 2^a$ Item O Statistical Analysis "Recommending to Proper Authorities the Cancellation or Suspension of Contract"	123
74.	$H_0 2^a$ Item P Statistical Analysis "Educational Program Implementation and Committee Involvement".	124
75.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Educational Program Implementation and Committee Involvement Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	125
76.	$H_0 2^b$ Statistical Analysis Concerning the Degree of Participation in Decision Making for Items A - P.	126
77.	$H_0 2^b$ Item A Statistical Analysis "Annual Assessment of Indian Student Learning Needs" . .	127
78.	$H_0 2^b$ Item B Statistical Analysis "Recommend Program Curricula"	128
79.	$H_0 2^b$ Item C Statistical Analysis "Recommend Textbooks and Materials"	129
80.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Degree of Participation in Decision Making Regarding Recommending Textbooks and Materials Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure .	130
81.	$H_0 2^b$ Item D Statistical Analysis "Recommend Teaching Methods".	131
82.	$H_0 2^b$ Item E Statistical Analysis "Recommend Criteria for Hiring Staff"	132
83.	$H_0 2^b$ Item F Statistical Analysis "Develop List of Qualified Staff for Required Selection by Program Administrator"	133
84.	$H_0 2^b$ Item G Statistical Analysis "Approve Budget Preparation and Execution".	134
85.	$H_0 2^b$ Item H Statistical Analysis "Have Specific Written Policies for Planning and Developing Educational Programs".	135

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
86.	$H_0 2^b$ Item I Statistical Analysis "Participate in Negotiations Concerning Contracts" .	136
87.	$H_0 2^b$ Item J Statistical Analysis "Having Access to Budgets, Reports, Evaluations, Surveys, and Other Program Related Documents".	137
88.	$H_0 2^b$ Item K Statistical Analysis "Request Periodic Reports and Evaluations".	138
89.	$H_0 2^b$ Item L Statistical Analysis "Evaluate Staff Performance and Program Results"	139
90.	$H_0 2^b$ Item M Statistical Analysis "Hearing Grievances".	140
91.	$H_0 2^b$ Item N Statistical Analysis "Approving and Disapproving Programs"	141
92.	$H_0 2^b$ Item O Statistical Analysis "Recommending to Proper Authorities the Cancellation or Suspension of Contract"	142
93.	$H_0 2^b$ Item P Statistical Analysis "Educational Program Implementation and Committee Involvement".	143
94.	$H_0 3^a$ Statistical Analysis Concerning the Method Indian Education Advisory Committee Members Should Employ To Assure Their Involvement for Items Q - X	144
95.	$H_0 3^a$ Item Q Statistical Analysis "Hold Open Committee Meetings".	145
96.	$H_0 3^a$ Item R Statistical Analysis "Secure Copy of the Negotiated Contract Which Includes Program and Budget".	146
97.	$H_0 3^a$ Item S Statistical Analysis "Meet and Confer with Local School Board".	147
98.	$H_0 3^a$ Item T Statistical Analysis "Meet and Confer with Education Administrator"	148
99.	$H_0 3^a$ Item U Statistical Analysis "Meet Regularly with Professional Staff"	149

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
100.	$H_0 3^a$ Item V Statistical Analysis "Employ Outside Consultant"	150
101.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Method of Employing Outside Consultant To Assure Indian Education Advisory Committee Involvement Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure. . . .	151
102.	$H_0 3^a$ Item W Statistical Analysis "Contact Appropriate Federal Agency"	152
103.	$H_0 3^a$ Item X Statistical Analysis "Consider Starting an Indian School".	153
104.	Composition of Eastern Oklahoma Status Groups on Method of Starting an Indian School To Assure Indian Education Advisory Committee Involvement Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	154
105.	$H_0 3^b$ Statistical Analysis Concerning the Method Indian Education Advisory Committee Members Should Employ To Assure Their Involvement for Items Q - X	155
106.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Method To Assure Involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee Members Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure. . . .	156
107.	$H_0 3^b$ Item Q Statistical Analysis "Hold Open Committee Meetings"	157
108.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Method of Holding Open Committee Meetings To Assure Indian Education Advisory Committee Involvement Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure	158
109.	$H_0 3^b$ Item R Statistical Analysis "Secure Copy of the Negotiated Contract Which Includes Program and Budget"	159
110.	$H_0 3^b$ Item S Statistical Analysis "Meet and Confer with Local School Board"	160

TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
111.	$H_0 3^b$ Item T Statistical Analysis "Meet and Confer with Education Administrator" . . .	161
112.	$H_0 3^b$ Item U Statistical Analysis "Meet Regularly with Professional Staff"	162
113.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Method of Meeting Regularly with Professional Staff To Assure Involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee Members Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	163
114.	$H_0 3^b$ Item V Statistical Analysis "Employ Outside Consultant".	164
115.	$H_0 3^b$ Item W Statistical Analysis "Contact Appropriate Federal Agency".	165
116.	Composition of Western Oklahoma Status Groups on Method of Contacting Appropriate Federal Agency To Assure Indian Education Advisory Committee Involvement Using Multiple Range Test--Tukey HSD Procedure.	166
117.	$H_0 3^b$ Item X Statistical Analysis "Consider Starting an Indian School"	167

DECISION MAKING IN INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN EASTERN AND WESTERN OKLAHOMA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Public schools participate in federal programs in order to supplement their regular budget and to provide more services to their students. Most federal monies received by schools require an advisory committee composed of parents whose children will be served. The federal guidelines governing these monies require the schools to establish committees to insure the development of programs which will serve the target students.

Selecting and applying appropriate administrative procedures to resolve perplexing situations regarding Indian programs is a challenging assignment. The situations encountered in administrating Indian education programs become more difficult when educational administrators, school boards, and Indian Education Advisory Committees attempt to effectively coordinate federal programs into a productive unit which will serve the Indian student and accomplish the goals of the school district.

Although educational administrators, school boards, and Indian Education Advisory Committees throughout Oklahoma face challenges in designing programs for Indian students in public schools, the nature of the challenge differs in Eastern and Western Oklahoma. For example, the challenge became so great in some districts that the educational administrator, the school board, and the Indian Education Advisory Committee became frustrated and discouraged. In Western Oklahoma this frustration has caused some Indian Education Advisory Committees to withdraw from the school and incorporate under the laws of the State of Oklahoma as a legal body to administer educational programs on their own without school involvement. When this occurred, communication between the concerned parties stopped, and the Indian students were left out of a supplemental in-school program. Usually, the educational administrator had training which could help the Indian Education Advisory Committee develop programs for Indian students. However, adjustments on the part of each party are necessary in order to lessen conflicts and to develop common educational goals and processes that will benefit the Indian students.

Although a majority of the Indian Education Advisory Committees operated the programs through the school district, disagreement was occurring among educational administrators, school boards, and Indian Education Advisory Committees in the decision making process. The disagreement between the educational administrator, the school board, and the Indian

Education Advisory Committee often was the result of their roles in the development and governance of the program. The Indian Education Advisory Committee saw its role as making all of the decisions regarding Indian programs without the educational administrator or the school board being involved. The educational administrator saw his/her role as insuring that the Indian education programs were managed within the framework of school district policy as established by the school board. Given these role perceptions, any interference by a nonmember party caused disagreement and usually resulted in conflict. The purpose of this research was to determine the level of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee members in Eastern and Western Oklahoma in the development and the governance of Indian education programs in the public schools.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this research was: Is there a relationship among the role perceptions of Indian Education Advisory Committee members, educational administrators, and school board members in Eastern and Western Oklahoma concerning Committee participation in program decisions affecting Indian students?

The research proposed to determine the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the educational process. Three questions were investigated

for both Eastern and Western Oklahoma:

1. With regard to school district decision making, is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board members, and education administrators concerning the areas of importance of specific written policies?

2. With regard to school district decision making, is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board members, and educational administrators concerning the degree of participation by Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

3. With regard to school district decision making, is there a difference among the Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board members, and educational administrators concerning the method Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure their involvement?

Significance of the Study

It was the researcher's intent that this investigation aid in minimizing conflict between the public school administrators, school boards, and Indian Education Advisory Committees in the operation of programs for Indian students. Research results may suggest appropriate roles and responsibilities for the Indian Education Advisory Committee and educational administrators by clarifying the difference between what were the roles of these two groups and what

should be their roles in the governance of programs for Indian students. This research was designed to determine the degree of involvement in decision making that each party perceives the other to want as compared to the actual participation level of the Indian Education Advisory Committee. Since the Indian Community has indicated they are left out of decisions influencing their children's education, this research intended to determine a method whereby their involvement can be assured in the Indian education program. The following hypotheses were formulated and then tested for both Eastern and Western Oklahoma.

Hypotheses

$H_0 1$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups--Indian Education Advisory Committee members, educational administrators, and school board members--regarding the areas of importance of specific written policies as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 2$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups--Indian Education Advisory Committee members, educational administrators, and school board members--regarding the degree of participation by Indian Education Advisory Committee members

in the decision making areas as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 3$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups--Indian Education Advisory Committee members, educational administrators, and school board members--regarding the method to employ to assure participation by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making areas as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to school districts in Oklahoma that had either or both a Johnson O'Malley or Title IV, Part A Indian Education Program serving kindergarten through twelfth grade. This research did not include all federal programs where Indian children were participating in public schools because the study dealt exclusively with Indian participants on advisory committees, and the Title I, Title IV-B, or Title VII programs did not all require the committees to be made up entirely of parents of Indian children.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for this study:

Indian Education Advisory Committee - A number of parents of Indian children who are elected to represent the Indian

Community in programs affecting Indian students.

School Board - An elected body recognized by the State Department of Education as responsible for the total operation of the school district.

Educational Administrators - A school superintendent or a school administrator who is responsible for Indian programs in a school district.

Public Law 92-318, Title IV, Part A - The Indian Education Act of 1972, passed by Congress and signed into law by the President, designed to serve Indian children in kindergarten through grade 12 by providing financial assistance to school districts for developing programs to serve Indian students.

Johnson O'Malley Act - An act passed in 1934 to provide financial support to public schools for Indian children attending public schools from preschool through grade 12.

Public Law 95-561 - An act passed in 1978 to allow greater involvement of parents in public school Indian education programs by amending Title IV, Part A and the Impact Aid Program.

Public Law 93-638 - An act passed in 1975 by Congress which allows Indian people and Indian tribes the right to contract Bureau of Indian Affairs programs.

Impact Aid Program - Federal aid to public schools for children whose parents live or work on federal property.

Western Oklahoma - A division of the State administered by the Anadarko Bureau of Indian Affairs Office which contracts Johnson O'Malley funds to schools and to Indian tribes.

Eastern Oklahoma - A division of the State administered by the Muskogee Bureau of Indian Affairs Office which contracts with the State Department of Education to administer Johnson O'Malley funds to public schools.

Indian Education Programs - School programs that are funded by Title IV, Part A or Johnson O'Malley funds.

Organization of the Study

The study consists of six chapters. Chapter one includes the Statement of the Problem, major divisions describing the study, and the hypotheses to be tested.

The review of selected literature pertinent to the study is included in Chapter two. The review of literature provides two distinct divisions. The first part focuses upon the writings of authors who have written extensively in the area of participative management. The second part focuses upon writers who have demonstrated expertise in the analysis of legislation affecting Indians.

The third chapter provides the theoretical framework for this study. The decision making process is examined in order to determine the level of participation of those being affected in the decisions.

Chapter four provides the methodology employed in the

study. A discussion of the development of the instrument, its validity and reliability, and statistical procedures used are explained in this chapter.

Chapter five includes the results of the data collection and an analysis of the results.

Chapter six contains a summary of the study, conclusions based on the findings, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Related Literature

Demands of interest groups, teachers, and students for input into the educational governing process have led to an increased analysis of policy and decision making. During the 1960's and 70's, it became increasingly clear that educational administrators and school boards had to find new ways to decentralize their authority and to permit more of the people in the community to have a larger voice in school decision making.

Researchers have asserted that participative decision making produces outcomes superior to that of a highly centralized choice process. Coch and French (1948) reported that participation and decision making were positively associated with productivity and reduced resistance to change. Bridges (1969) indicated that there is a direct relationship between participation and increased morale, productivity, and the general effectiveness of organizations. Simon (1955) stated: "Significant changes in human behavior can be brought about rapidly only if persons who are expected to change participate in deciding what the change will be and how it shall be made." (pp. 28-29). Schneider (1955) has reported that group decision making has been proved to be more effective in

changing behavior and attitudes than other techniques previously employed, and that group decision making generates a commitment to the desired goals.

> There are two very basic and sound reasons for using participating in decision making. First, and from a technical standpoint, the manager who employs participation is utilizing the potential of his subordinates to a fuller extent. He is supplementing his own ideas and experience with those of other people and thereby guaranteeing maximum exploration, investigation, and analysis.
>
> A second reason for using participation in all phases of the decision making process is that it fosters commitment on the part of the people who must implement the decision. It is human nature for people to want to have a voice in those things which affect them and when given that opportunity, they are more likely not only to accept the decision, but also work actively and positively toward the desired objectives (Scanlan, 1979, p. 131).

Anyone who is directly or indirectly involved in the decision should receive communication concerning it. If this communication is not done, there is no reasonable amount of assurance that the decision will be accepted or have any support from the subordinates during the implementation process. There are various forms of communication which may be used depending upon the complexity of the decision being made. These may include public meetings, letters, newspaper coverage, committee meetings, and other forms of communication deemed appropriate.

> The bridge between the philosophy of participation and its application is communication. Participative management, before it can be successful, must be built on a day-to-day relationship of mutual trust and respect (Lawrence, p. 51).

Each person involved in the decision making process must be able to communicate without the fear of reprisals and threats. Channels of communication must be provided that will allow the subordinates to take part in the decision making process.

Likert (1964) asserts that primarily two systems of management with different emphases have developed side by side. The "job organization" system relies basically on the economic motives of buying a person's time and then telling him/her precisely what to do, how to do it, and at what level to produce. The "cooperative-motivation" system tends to use the principles and methods of scientific management and related management principles to a degree. This system includes the economic motive and the ego motive. Likert (1967) attempted to include the desirable features of each into an integrating principle of management.

> The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to insure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization each member will, in light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance (p. 47).

Likert's (1964) approach is that of a supportive relationship. He has identified four systems that effect participation. They are 1) exploitative authoritative, 2) benevolent authoritative, 3) consultative, and 4) participative. He concluded that the participative system is the

most desirable because as organizations move toward this system they become more productive and satisfying (pp. 222-234).

Zimmerman, Owen, and Seibert (1977) described decision making quality as follows:

> Good decision making depends on good information. A crucial advantage of group over individual decision making is the potential for pooling information and submitting it to group evaluation. The group must seek, gather, sort, combine, modify, and evaluate information. While insufficient information may lead to faulty decisions, an excess of information can cause difficulties as well. An individual may experience information overload--too much data to process neatly and meaningfully. The same problem may develop in groups, suggesting that one of the most important decisions the group must make is to answer the questions, "When do we have enough information?" and "When will further input simply confuse the issues and delay a decision?" (p. 143).

Zimmerman, Owen, and Seibert (1977) indicated further that the effectiveness of the group decision making relies upon the leadership provided to the group. Certain functions are characteristic of an effective leader during the decision making process. These characteristics are dependent upon the leadership style employed by the leader. Some of the functions of a leader in effective group decision making are presented below:

To initiate discussion of the topic at hand;

To help structure the group decision making process, as through setting an agenda;

To regulate participation, assuring that all can provide input and preventing some from monopolizing;

> To establish an appropriate physical environment through room preparation, chair and table arrangement, and provision of supplies;
>
> To develop appropriate communication climates: positive, cordial, relaxed, task oriented, cooperative;
>
> To help manage or resolve interpersonal conflict;
>
> To restate and clarify ideas of participants;
>
> To keep the discussion relevant and productive;
>
> To provide summaries and closure on group conclusions;
>
> To bring the group to productive achievement of overall objectives;
>
> To develop plans and objectives for further meetings;
>
> To stimulate development of group culture, build rapport, commitment, cooperation;
>
> To distribute rewards and punishments, confirming positive contributions and criticizing negative ones;
>
> To integrate oneself into full-fledged group membership to assure personal as well as leadership input;
>
> To foster group morale and enthusiasm for the task; and
>
> To provide liaison between the group and outside environment by representing group consensus and decisions to outsiders (pp. 145-46).

Zimmerman, Owen, and Seibert (1977) further state that other goals or functions of a leader can be added, if necessary. They indicated that other functions of a leader could be decided by the group itself through discussion and perhaps even negotiation among the group members. Group leadership is the key to effective group process and will result in effective decision making if the appropriate leadership style is employed. Steffens (1976) concluded that Indian Education

Advisory Committee members will become more involved in school programs when given an opportunity to participate in decisions affecting Indian children. Federal policy makers have been acutely aware of the need for participative decision making, particularly in the field of Indian education.

Recent Legislative Policies

An analysis of recent legislative policy indicated that Indians must be involved in program decisions affecting their destination (PL 93-638). Until recently the Indian population had their policies developed for them by the government. Today, policies at the federal level are developed with some Indian participation. Contemporary policy in Indian programs allows Indian people an opportunity to determine their own destiny and permits Indians more participation in program decisions. The Self-Determination Act was passed by Congress in 1975 to reflect the idea that Indian people should be involved in determining their own future (PL 93-638). Other federal agencies that fund Indian programs follow the policy of self-determination as a part of their funding process. Prior to the enactment of this law, Indians and Indian tribes did not have the authority to control their own destination because they were under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Controller General Report, 1978). The Bureau of Indian Affairs had the authority to determine and conduct

the programs for the tribes. The enactment of the Self-Determination Act in 1975 provided Indians and Indian tribes support to develop and operate their own programs through tribal operations, with the Bureau of Indian Affairs providing only technical assistance to the tribe in the developing and governing of all contracted programs (PL 93-638).

History of Federal Legislation

It is necessary at this point to review a history of federal legislation affecting Indian tribes. Congress first attempted to assimilate the Indian into the white culture by providing Indians with allotments of land under the General Allotment Act of 1887. In an attempt to break up tribal governments, each Indian was given a certain amount of land to farm. Under John Collier, as Indian Affairs Commissioner in 1932, the Indian policy underwent a most drastic revision. Congress passed two important pieces of legislation upon Collier's recommendation. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 was passed halting land allotments and restoring tribal governments (Controller General Report, 1978). The Johnson O'Malley Act passed Congress in 1934 providing for attendance of Indian students in the public schools. Its original purpose was to encourage enrollment of Indian children in state-controlled schools by reimbursing states for the cost of educating children who came from tax-exempt Indian lands (Gross, 1978). According to Gross (1978), the real purpose

behind the Johnson O'Malley Act does not appear to have been to encourage Indian involvement in school policy, but to foster assimilation of Indians.

The policy of assimilation thus far has been one of integrating the Indian person into the mainstream of the dominant culture. In the 1950's and 1960's, Congress determined that the best policy would be to terminate the tribes, which meant that tribes would no longer be under federal supervision or protection, but instead would possess all rights and prerogatives pertaining to American citizenship (Watkins, 1957). However, this policy only worsened the condition of the Indian. In a letter written by Kyl (1973) to a House Committee on Interior Affairs, it was stated that many tribes had literally disintegrated, standards of living had declined precipitously, psychological problems had multiplied, and social services had deteriorated under the policy of termination.

In the 1960's and early 1970's, the Indian population began a series of protests regarding government action aimed at termination (Controller General Report, 1978). Furor developed among the Indian population toward the government action. Various incidents occurred, such as the takeover of federal installations and the destruction of federal buildings, in protest of the treatment of Indians. This anti-government sentiment coupled with the findings of a special

Senate Subcommittee in 1969 caused Congress to focus attention on Indian education. The conclusion of the Congressional Senate Subcommittee in 1969 was that public schools were carrying forward a practice of ancient origin, one of attempting to turn Indians into whites. According to Havinghurst (1969) the Committee called this practice "coercive assimilation" and concluded that it had resulted in:

A. The classroom and the school becoming a kind of battlefield where the Indian child attempts to protect his integrity and identity as an individual by defeating the purpose of the school.

B. Schools which fail to understand or adapt to and in fact often denigrate cultural differences.

C. Schools which blame their own failures on the Indian student and thereby reinforce his defensiveness.

D. Schools which fail to recognize the importance and validity of the Indian community. The community and the child retaliate by treating the school as an alien institution.

E. A dismal record of absenteeism, dropouts, negative self-image, low achievement, and ultimately, academic failure for many Indian children.

F. A perpetuation of the cycle of poverty which undermines the success of all federal programs. (p. 21)

This report was labeled "National Tragedy - A National Challenge" (Havinghurst, 1969). The Subcommittee cited the lack of Indian control of Indian education as the principal factor in the dismal results pertaining to Indian education.

This report became the most important contemporary document in Indian education (Gross, 1978). Congress and the President awakened to the crisis in Indian education as a result of these findings.

Public school education received by Indian students has been subsidized to some extent by the federal government since the 1890's. The purpose of the subsidizing appears to be two-fold. First, it provides for integrating of Indians into the white culture, thus establishing a goal of assimilation. The public school is lured into being the vehicle for obtaining this goal. Second, it establishes the precedent of providing subsidies to public schools in order to encourage assumption of responsibility for educating the Indian student. The federal subsidy was necessary, because there was a reluctance on the part of Indians to enter public schools and because the public schools were reluctant to assume the extra costs of educating more students (Demmert, 1979).

In 1972, Congress passed the Indian Education Act, Public Law 92-318, otherwise known as Title IV, Part A. This Act was supported by Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota as an amendment to the Impact Aid Program (Gross, 1978). As a result of this Act, a new administrative hierarchy within the Health, Education, and Welfare Department was created which was named the Office of Indian Education and whose purpose it was to administer Title IV, Part A programs. The Title IV, Part A Act required

public schools that participated in Indian Education program funding to plan programs for the special educational and cultural needs of Indian children in the United States.

Another important piece of legislation affecting Indian Education was Public Law 93-638, which was passed in 1975 to be implemented in 1976. This Act contained two parts. Part one, known as Title I of the Act, referred to self-determination without termination of federal support. Indian groups or tribes would be allowed to contract for programs to administer themselves, programs which formerly were operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Part two, commonly known as Title II of the Indian Education Assistance Act of 1975, focused on Johnson O'Malley programs (Controller General Report, 1978). The amendment of the Johnson O'Malley Act in 1975 provides for parental involvement through formation of an Indian Education Advisory Committee and for the public school to develop an educational plan which will show how Indian parents will be involved in the Indian Education programs (Gross, 1978).

Another important education amendment affecting Indian education was signed into law by President Jimmy Carter on November 1, 1978, and is known as Public Law 95-561 (Dean, 1979). This law provides for significant changes in federal funding for the education of Indian children with Title XI of the Act reforming the "Impact Aid" program for Indians by

strengthening the requirements for tribal involvement in the program. The legislation also affects Title IV, Part A of the Indian Education Act of 1972 by strengthening tribal involvement consistently with the fundamental federal policy of Indian self-determination (Demmert, 1979). The Act provides that beginning in fiscal year 1980, public schools will be required to establish procedures for the participation of Indian tribes and the parents of Indian children in the planning, development, and operation of assisted programs (Dean, 1979). The law states that if a school district fails to adopt these procedures, the Indian parents can file a grievance with the Commissioner of the Office of Education. If a tribe is successful in revealing the failure of the school district to comply, then the tribe can contract from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to operate a separate school and the parents have the right to send their children to Bureau of Indian Affairs' schools (Demmert, 1978).

The Congressional mandates to involve Indian parents in the educational process were a result of those who analyzed public school education and found that the Indian student academic achievement level had suffered. The findings suggested that Indian parents have to be involved in the educational process; that curriculum should strengthen the culture of the people served; that Indian teachers and properly trained non-Indian teachers are required; and that the federal government

must accept its responsibility for providing equal educational opportunities for Indian children and adults (Havinghurst, 1970).

In 1978, Congress passed Public Law 95-561 which extended the authorization for the Indian Education Act of 1972, Title IV, Part A for five additional years. However, Title IV, Part A was amended to authorize programs to meet the culturally-related academic needs of Indian students. The House Committee commented that: "It is the intent of the Committee that the Indian Education Committee be consulted as to the type of program that best suits the educational needs of their children" (Dean, 1979, p. 4).

The intent of PL 95-561 is to involve Indian parents in the education of their children. Unlike the past, when assimilation was the prevalent goal, the concept now is self-determination and a culturally-related curriculum with Indian parents involved in the education process (Steffens, 1979).

At the public school level, there is a parallel lack of commitment by school districts to an Indian program in their districts. Parents have often complained about schools discriminating against Indian students. They have also accused the Bureau of Indian Affairs of being a rubber stamp for the schools to use Indian Education dollars for a general education program (Chavers, 1979).

Johnson O'Malley

Oklahoma had two Bureau of Indian Affairs Area Education Offices serving different areas of the State of Oklahoma as of 1980. The Muskogee Bureau of Indian Affairs served eastern Oklahoma Indian tribes, and the Anadarko Offices served western Oklahoma. The Muskogee Area Office administered Johnson O'Malley funds for 184 school districts through the Oklahoma State Department of Education. There were, however, three districts that would not contract with the State Department of Education due to previous conflicts (Butler, 1979). The Committees in these three districts were administered directly by the State Department of Education. The State Department of Education processed payment for student expenses directly to the Indian Education Parent Advisory Committees.

The Anadarko Bureau of Indian Affairs administered 54 contracts to school districts, Indian tribes, and incorporated Indian Education Advisory Committees in 1979-80. This included 23 school districts which contracted directly with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, 28 contracts with incorporated Indian Education Advisory Committees, and three contracts with Indian tribes. The Indian tribes are allowed to contract for all available funds for Indian children within their own tribal jurisdiction. The tribes then become a funding source for school districts and Indian Education Advisory Committees that are within their tribal jurisdiction. The Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribe administered to eight school districts and 12

Indian education committees. The Sac and Fox Tribes administered funds for 11 Indian Education Advisory Committees. The Potawatomi Tribe administered to three school districts and three Indian Education committees (Old Shield, 1980).

Title IV, Part A, PL 92-318

Another program which has impacted education of Indian students has been Title IV, Part A, PL 92-318 which is administered by the Washington Office of Indian Education. This program requires each school district to contract directly with the Office of Indian Education, with the State providing each school district technical assistance in the certification of the number of Indian children in public schools. In Oklahoma, during 1979-80, there were 277 schools that participated in the Title IV, Part A program (Homan, 1979). Johnson O'Malley and Title IV, Part A programs both require that parents of Indian students be involved in the development and governance of these programs.

Indian Education Advisory Committees

Much has been said about involving Indian parents in the development of programs for their children. A study by Demmert (1976) indicated that Indian children have fallen further behind academically primarily because of the lack of parental involvement in the Indian Education programs. Laws have been written in order to allow Indian involvement. Public Law 93-638 was specifically written to allow the Indian people

to determine their own destination through choosing and developing programs of their choice. In the past, Congress attempted to assimilate the Indian people and failed. The failure of previous programs has been attributed to the lack of the Indian population's involvement in the policies which affect them. Increased authority has been given to the Indian Education Advisory Committee members to control the operation of programs to provide Indian children an opportunity to participate in supplemental programs reflecting their needs. Special attention is given to cultural academic programs (Steffens, 1979).

The increased authority granted to Indian Education Advisory Committees by Congress through various laws has caused concern to educational administrators. Various statements and reports have indicated that conflict resulted in districts where the Indian Education Advisory Committee, school board, and/or the educational administrator would not make concessions in the development and governance of Indian programs affecting the student (Old Shield, 1980).

The lack of cooperation between the educational administrators, school boards, and the Indian Education Advisory Committees has caused Indian programs not to expand as they should for Indian children. The reasons for the failure of positive interface between the Indian Education Advisory Committees, educational administrators, and the school boards

have often been given as the cultural difference and the consequential value difference (Steffens, 1976).

Educational administrators have indicated that the Indian Education Advisory Committees wanted total control over the programs without any interface with the school. They further stated that many of the Indian programs would not fit into school district policies formulated by the school Board. Some educational administrators felt that with all the "red tape" the district had to involve itself with in obtaining and operating Indian programs, it was not worth the time, effort, and expense on the part of the district to participate in the funding (Homan, 1979). On the other hand, the Indian Education Advisory Committees indicated that the educational administrators wanted to use Indian Education funds for a general education program. They further stated that education administrators feel threatened by their increased involvement in decision making regarding Indian programs. In many cases the school board is not aware of interactions between the Indian Education Advisory Committee and the educational administrator (Steffens, 1979).

Summary

This chapter has presented information from various sources regarding participative management and federal legislation affecting Indians. The information indicated that participative decision making allows for more satisfaction

among all parties and increases morale and productivity. A review of federal legislation affecting Indians, also presented in this chapter, provides the basis for parents of Indian children to participate in decisions affecting their children. Public Law 93-638, which was passed in 1975, provided Indian parents the authority to approve and disapprove education programs designed for their children. Public Law 95-561, which was passed in 1978, reinforced the concept that parents of Indian children should participate in the decision making process. Johnson O'Malley and Title IV, Part A are two Indian Education programs affecting children in public schools. Both programs adhere to the legislation presented in this chapter. Chapter three presents the theoretical framework for this study, "Decision Making in Indian Education Programs in Eastern and Western Oklahoma."

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The key concept in this discussion is decision making. The position taken is that the central function of educational administrators is that of directing the decision making process. Simon (1947) conceived organizations as primarily decision making structures. According to Simon:

> Effective administration requires rational decision making. Decisions are rational when they are appropriate for accomplishing specific goals. Administrative decisions, however, are often extremely complex, and rationality is limited for a number of reasons.
>
> First of all, the alternatives cannot be considered because there are too many options that do not come to mind. In addition, all the probable consequences for each alternative cannot be anticipated because future events are exceedingly difficult to predict accurately and evaluate realistically. Rationality is limited not only by the extent of an administrator's knowledge, but also by unconscious skills, habits, reflexes, values, and conceptions of purpose that may deviate from the organizational goals (p. 241).

Educational administrators, in recent years, have attempted to involve the Indian Community in the decision making process. This involvement has caused the decision making in public schools to become more complex, since the Indian Education Advisory Committee members are representatives of the Indian Community and therefore should be

involved in program decisions affecting Indian students (Homan, 1979).

There has been considerable debate over the relative effectiveness of individual versus group decision making. As noted by Holloman and Henrick (1972), groups usually take more time to reach a decision than individuals do, but the bringing together of individual specialists and experts results in a better decision being made. Further research by Holloman and Henrick (1972) has shown that consensus decisions by five or more participants are superior to individual decision making, majority vote, or leader decision. Simon (1947) observed that an irrelevant characteristic of human behavior is that members of an organized group tend to identify with that group, and in making decisions their organizational loyalty leads them to evaluate alternative courses of action in terms of consequences for their group. On the other hand, certain decisions, according to Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnelly (1976), appear to be better suited for individual decision making (programmed). The involvement of groups in decision making seems to lead to an active sense of responsibility which, in turn, makes group members more enthusiastic and effective (Homan, 1979). Thus, the involvement of the Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making would allow Committee functions to identify with the school district goals and should bring about a cooperative planned program for students.

As previously noted, decision making is a complex process, and as educational administrators involve representative groups of the community in decision making, it becomes more challenging. Many educational administrators recognize that decision making is the heart of an organization and the process of administration. McCammy (1947) stated this clearly and consistently:

> The making of decisions is at the very center of the process of administration and the discussion of administration will be more systematic if we accept the framework of the analysis of decision making (p. 41).

If the concept of decision making is expanded to be a continuous, dynamic state to include the process by which the decision is derived and the process by which the decision is implemented, then decision making means something quite different than heretofore and becomes the basis for all managerial actions (Livingston, 1953).

According to Griffiths (1967), each decision is a result of a previous decision:

> Practically every decision is one of a series. It is almost impossible to determine which decision on a certain state of affairs was the original decision; furthermore, it is almost impossible to determine which decision of all those made is a unique one since each decision made appears to tie into a previous one. The clearest illustration of sequential decision making is found in the English law. The essence of this judicial process is found in the "precedent." Each decision is based upon one or more previous decisions; and only the introduction of new knowledge of tremendous impact will cause a change in the direction

> which the sequence of decision takes. Decisions are closely interrelated with action. A decision may alter the present course of action, that is, change the direction of action to a noticeable degree. A decision may adjust to a present course of action merely by correcting it, or permit the present course of action to continue. Decisions are totally pragmatic in nature, that is, their value is dependent upon the success of the action which follows. The term decision is to be applied to all judgments which affect a course of action (p. 123).

Decision Making and Perceptions

Decision making is affected by one's perceptions of the situation. A consideration of perception leads to three concepts which are of importance to this study's theoretical configurations. In working toward the definition of perception, Ittelson and Cantrel (1954) identified three major characteristics of human perception. They are:

1. Perceptions can be studied only in terms of transaction. There are concrete individuals with concrete situations.

2. Perceptions came into the transactions from a unique personal behavior center of the receiver.

3. Perceptions occur as the receiver creates his only psychological environment by identifying certain aspects of his own experience to an environment which he believes exists independent of his experiences. This is called externalization (p. 124).

These three major characteristics of perception can be summarized by saying that perceiving is that part of the process of living by which each person from his own particular point of view creates for himself a world within which he has his life

experience and through which he strives to gain his satisfaction (Ittelson and Cantrel, 1954).

According to the writings of Theodore Brameld (1950), man interacts with his environment and will produce changes in his behavior as a result of his experience. Every situation will be perceived differently by each individual, who, in turn, will assume to be real that which he perceives at a given time. He will then behave according to that perception. This perception of the situation will determine the interaction between an individual and his environment. The educational administrator, the school board members, and the Indian Education Advisory Committee members each have different perceptions of programs in the school because of their past experiences. The interaction regarding these three groups depends to some extent upon their perceptions of the situation at the time of the discussion.

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the work of Simon (1947), Bridges (1967), Hoy and Miskel (1978), and Swanson (1959). The concepts expressed by these individuals have laid the foundations for describing administration as decision making. Each has written extensively regarding decision making in organizations through involvement of subordinates.

Zone of Acceptance

The concept of the zone of acceptance was used in this

research because, as both Simon (1947) and Barnard (1938) have indicated, subordinates willingly comply with some administrative directives without question. That is, there is a range of behavior within which the subordinate is ready to accept a decision made for him by his superiors within the administrator's zone of acceptance (Simon, 1947). Simon (1947) indicated that the problem administrators have is determining which decisions fall inside the zone of acceptance and which fall outside the zone of acceptance. Bridges (1967) proposed two tests to identify issues that clearly fall within the subordinate zone of acceptance: 1) the Test of Relevance, and 2) the Test of Expertise.

The Test of Relevance is embodied in the question: "Do the subordinates have a high personal stake in the decision?" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978). When a high personal stake exists, the interest in participation will be high. When there is no personal stake, the subordinates typically will be receptive to the superior's directive.

The Test of Expertise indicates the extent to which the subordinates are qualified to make useful contributions to the identification or solution of the problems presented by the educational administrator. The two questions that can make this determination are: "Are the subordinates capable of making a meaningful contribution?" and "Do they have the expertise?" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978, pp. 212-235).

To involve subordinates in decisions that are outside their scope of experience and sphere of competence is likely to cause them unnecessary frustration. If subordinates have a personal stake (high relevance) in the decisions and have the knowledge to make a useful contribution (high expertise), then the decision should involve the participation of the subordinates (Hoy and Miskel, 1978).

Role of the Administrator

When decisions are being made that affect the Indian Community, the educational administrator's role should be to utilize the resources available, such as the Indian Education Advisory Committees, in making the decision outside his/her zone of acceptance. If the issues are not relevant to the Indian Education Advisory Committee or fall outside their sphere of competence (high expertise), then the decision clearly falls within the educational administrator's zone of acceptance, and involvement of Committee members should be avoided. To involve Committee members in this latter case is likely to produce resentment because they may not want to be involved.

Marginal Participation Areas

The test proposed for identification of issues with respect to zone of acceptance produces two other marginal situations for which the answers are less clear. First, it

is possible for subordinates to have a high personal stake in the issue while having little expertise. Should they be involved in this case? To do so frequently asks for trouble. If they really have nothing substantive to contribute, decisions ultimately will be made by those with the expertise needed, and a sense of frustration and hostility may be generated by attempts to involve the subordinates. They may perceive the experience as an empty exercise in which the decisions have already been made. On the other hand, occasionally it may be useful to involve subordinates in a limited way. When involvement is sought under these circumstances, it must be done skillfully, having as its major objective, open communication (Hoy and Miskel, 1978).

A second marginal situation results when subordinates have no personal stake in the situation, but do have the knowledge to make a useful contribution. To involve subordinates indiscriminately in a decision of this type increases the likelihood of alienating the subordinates. Although their involvement under these circumstances increases the educational administrator's chance of reaching a high quality decision, subordinates too often are likely to wonder "what the educational administrator gets paid for" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978).

Constitutional Arrangements

Once the educational administrator has determined that subordinates will be involved, a decision must be made on the

constitutional arrangements of the decision making group. Three major types of constitutional arrangements have been identified by Swanson (1959) in terms of how the group is to arrive at a decision. They are democratic centralist, parliamentarian, and participants determining.

Democratic centralist is probably the most frequently used. The leader presents a problem to his/her subordinates and asks for comments, suggestions, reactions, and ideas. The decision is clearly the administrator's, but s/he tries to reflect the subordinates' participation and feelings in the final act. The administrator, employing a parliamentarian mode, is bound by whatever the group agrees is a given course of action. All members of the group, including the leader, have an equal vote.

The participants determining mode requires a total consensus of a group on the appropriate action to be taken. Like the parliamentarian mode, all members of the group have an equal vote. For each decision making situation, there is a corresponding and appropriate constitutional arrangement (Swanson, 1959). When the decision issue falls clearly outside the zone of acceptance, the educational administrator should maximize participation in decision making by employing the appropriate constitutional arrangement.

The following generalizations (Hoy and Miskel, 1978) summarize much of the research and theoretical literature on teacher participation in decision making:

1. The opportunity to share in formulating policies is an important factor in the morale of teachers and in their enthusiasm for the school organization.

2. Participation in decision making is positively related to the individual teacher's satisfaction with the profession of teaching.

3. Teachers prefer principals who involve them in decision making.

4. Teachers neither expect nor want to be involved in every decision; in fact, "too much" involvement can produce negative results.

5. The roles and functions of both teachers and administrators in decision making need to be varied according to the nature of the problem.

6. Both internal and external factors affect the degree of participation in decision making by teachers.

7. In order to maximize the positive contributions of shared decision making and to minimize the negative consequences, the administrator needs to answer the following questions:

    a. Under what conditions should teachers be involved in decision making?

    b. To what extent and how should teachers be involved?

    c. How should the decision making group be involved?

    d. What role is the most effective for the principal? (p. 228)

The concepts previously expressed on teacher participation have implications for the Indian Education Advisory Committee in the decision making affecting Indian students.

School boards and educational administrators need to determine their sphere of competency, and if decisions are needed outside their sphere or zone of acceptance, then the Indian Education Advisory Committee participation should be maximized. On the other hand, the Indian Education Advisory Committee may not want to be involved in certain decisions and is satisfied with the educational administrator and the school board making the decisions. The Indian Education Advisory Committee's level of participation in the decision making areas will be examined in Chapters five and six.

Summary

This chapter has provided a theoretical framework for the study. The researcher has presented information from authors who have written extensively in the areas of decision making using group involvement. Information on perceptions was presented as further basis for explaining decision making. The constitutional arrangement section was presented to show the different leadership approaches employed to gain group involvement in decision making. The teacher participation section presented several ideas on the involvement of teachers in decision making. This section has implication for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members, as noted in the last paragraph. Chapter four presents the methodology employed in this study.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Selection of Subjects

Population

The population for the study was the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, educational administrators, and school board presidents from the school districts in Oklahoma which have a Johnson O'Malley and/or a Title IV, Part A Indian Education program. The educational administrators and the school board presidents were selected because the level of involvement of the Indian Education Advisory Committee is dependent upon the perceptions of the educational administrator and the school board president. The school districts included in the sample had school-based programs utilizing an Indian Education Advisory Committee that works with the school superintendent and/or his/her designee, referred to as the educational administrator throughout this study.

Sampling

Because of the nature of the differences between Eastern and Western Oklahoma, the researcher made a decision to utilize the stratified random sampling method. To facilitate the

sampling procedure the researcher used the Bureau of Indian Affairs service area division for eastern and western Oklahoma. In simple stratified random sampling, the population is divided into two or more components based on pre-set criteria. From these strata, it is assumed that each stratum is internally homogeneous (Selltiz, et al., 1976).

A list of school districts in Oklahoma having Title IV, Part A Indian Education programs and/or Johnson O'Malley Indian Education programs was obtained from the Office of Indian Education in Washington, D. C., from the Oklahoma State Department of Education, Johnson O'Malley Division, and from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Johnson O'Malley Division. Each list was checked to insure that a school district did not appear twice before beginning the selection process. The school districts were stratified according to their location within the State. Names of the school districts having a Title IV, Part A or Johnson O'Malley Indian Education program were placed on cards which were placed into two closed containers, one for eastern Oklahoma and one for western Oklahoma.

After a thorough mixing, cards were selected one at a time using the replacement method for selecting Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, educational administrators, and school board presidents. From each stratum 120 subjects were randomly selected. The sample of the population

included a total of 240 subjects. From western Oklahoma the breakdown was as follows: 40 school board presidents, 40 educational administrators, and 40 Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons. Likewise, 40 school board presidents, 40 educational administrators, and 40 Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons were selected representing eastern Oklahoma using the stratified random sampling method. These individuals were selected because they influence the level of participation of decision making in their school systems. Since Indian Education programs exist across the State of Oklahoma, it was assumed that these individuals would support this study in order to provide Indian students a better educational opportunity through the identification of barriers between the school and the Indian Community. It was decided to sample a total of 30 educational administrators, 30 Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, and 30 school board presidents from both the eastern and western divisions of Oklahoma. However, when the subjects were selected, 40 subjects from each category were chosen to ensure that 30 survey forms would be completed by individuals representing each category. This precaution was necessary because it was felt that some persons might not wish to participate in the survey.

Data Collection Tools

Instrument

A thorough review of instruments was made in order to

test the study's hypotheses. Since no appropriate instrument was found, the researcher designed an instrument which would yield the data needed for this study. The Education Program Development Instrument was developed using the Johnson O'Malley and the Title IV, Part A federal regulations. These regulations contained decision making areas that the Indian Education Advisory Committee members are to be participating in during program development and implementation of Indian Education programs. The instrument contained 24 statements which covered the areas that affect Indian Education Advisory Committee participation. For instrument development purposes, the regulations were divided into three areas as follows: Planning and Development, Evaluating Programs, and Implementing and Special Methods of Involvement. Planning and Development, and Evaluating Program areas were designed to assess the importance of specific written policies for the Indian Education Advisory Committee by each group in eastern and western Oklahoma. This includes items A-P on the left side of the questionnaire. The Implementing area was designed to determine the perceptions that each respondent had in each category and the manner in which Indian Education Advisory Committees could become more involved. This includes items Q-X on the left side of the instrument. The Planning and Development, and Evaluating Programs, items A-P on the right side of the instrument, were designed to determine the

degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee by each group in eastern and western Oklahoma. The total instrument was designed to determine the importance of the 24 areas of decision making by the Indian Education Advisory Committees and to assess the efforts made by the Indian Education Advisory Committees in the Indian Education program as perceived by the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, educational administrators, and school board presidents.

An ordinal scale was used in order to rank the subjects' responses. "This type of scale placed entities in a clearly defined rank order, but the distance between the intervals on the scale is unknown and not necessarily equal. The ordinal scale allowed the researcher to determine whether the entities vary in degree" (Van Dalen, 1973, p. 205). The numerical code for each response indicated the respondent's assessment of the degree of importance and effort of each item. A summation of the scores for each individual's responses to all items for each hypothesis gives his/her total score. This total score was interpreted as representing his/her position on a scale of little to great response toward the items.

The Likert-type scale was used because of certain advantages, as noted by Selltiz, Johoda, Deutsch, and Cook (1959):

1. It permits the use of items that are not manifestly related to the attitude being studied.
2. It is generally relatively simple to construct.

3. It is likely to be more reliable than other scales of the same number of items.

4. The range of responses permitted to an item given in a Likert-type scale provides, in effect, more precise information about the individual's opinion on the issue referred to by the given item (p. 368).

The subjects were provided a four-point Likert-type scale ranging from little to great to select their appropriate responses. By using a four-point Likert-type scale, the respondents could not choose the middle ground response on each item.

Following the first draft of the instrument, a panel of nine experts from the field of educational administration and Indian education was assembled at the University of Oklahoma to evaluate the instrument for content and ambiguity. The panel consisted of State Department of Education personnel, Bureau of Indian Affairs officials, Regional Office of Education personnel, tribal officials, and school superintendents. One suggestion was made as to the construction of the instrument. The response from the panel included a recommendation that the cover sheet for the instrument be designed to gather the following information: the total school district enrollment, the total enrollment of Indian students, and the County of the State in which the school district was located. It was felt that this additional information would help in the analysis of the data that were collected.

The instrument was again presented to the panel of

experts to be examined for content validity. The general consensus of the panel was that it was an accurate representation of the regulations which govern Title IV, Part A and Johnson O'Malley programs.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to disclose problems related to instrument construction and completion time and to determine instrument reliability. During a Title IV, Part A training session held on the University of Oklahoma campus and conducted by the State Department of Education the researcher presented the instrument to eight school superintendents and eight Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons for completion. The researcher then visited eight school districts and presented the instrument to eight school board presidents for completion. The results of this pilot study provided the researcher the following information. The average time for administration and respondent completion of the instrument was ten minutes. There were no problems encountered in the administration of the instrument.

The reliability was calculated at +.95 on the importance area and +.89 on the effort area. This was determined using the Spearman-Brown formula for determining the correlation. Such correlations were significant to the .05 level of confidence.

To establish the instrument reliability, the split-half

method was used. Selltiz, Wrightman, and Cook (1976) stated that in this procedure a single form of a test is administered once to a group of individuals. The items on the test are then divided into two halves and the scores of the two halves are correlated to provide an estimate of the extent to which they are equivalent. In other words, the two halves are treated as alternate forms of the same test. The resulting coefficient is an indication of the internal consistency of the test; again, a high coefficient of equivalence is taken as indicating that the individual's position is not affected by the particular sampling of items in either half of the test (p. 190).

The method employed in this study to determine the reliability was the split-half method. The even-numbered items were assigned to one half and the odd-numbered items were assigned to the other half. From this, the split-half reliability was computed using the Spearman-Brown formula. Because content validity and a high level of reliability were established for the instrument, it was judged to be adequate to collect the data for this study.

Procedure

The stratified random sampling method employed resulted in a large number of subjects to be selected from throughout the State of Oklahoma as a part of this study. Because of the geographical location involved, the researcher enlisted

the help of the State Department of Education personnel and school administrators throughout the State to help administer the Education Program Development Instrument.

The researcher met with each individual chosen to administer the instrument and provided instruction on the administration of the instrument. A list of names of school districts was provided to each interviewer, along with the names of the educational administrators, school board presidents, and Title IV, Part A or Johnson O'Malley chairpersons within the interviewer's area. The interviewer did not travel more than 25 miles to contact each subject who was interviewed. The interviewer was instructed to stay at each district site until all items on the instrument were completed by the respondent. Instructions were provided to each interviewer as to those subjects who did not wish to participate. When this occurred, the interviewer was to go to the next name on the list. There were allowances made for those choosing not to participate by pre-choosing additional districts to participate in the sample.

Statistical Design and Treatment of the Data

A parametric statistical test was chosen because the researcher assumed the samples came from populations which were normally distributed, and that variances within groups would be the same. The one-way analysis of variance was used in order to compare the three groups in terms of the mean

scores. The ANOVA was used to detect differences at the .05 level of confidence between sample means in order to determine if these differences were statistically significant or due to chance. The ANOVA computes an F value which allows the researcher to decide whether there are significant differences between the means of the groups being compared. The interpretation of the calculated F value is determined by a table which reveals the statistical significance of the F value at the .05 level. This significant F value tells only that at least one of the group means was significantly different from one of the other group means. In order to locate the cause of the significant F, a post-hoc test was applied. The test used to locate the significant difference between the means was Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD).

Summary

This chapter described the population to be sampled using the simple stratified sampling method. The procedures for obtaining these samples were explained, and a description of the data collection tools and the data collection method was given. The validity and reliability for the data collecting instrument were explained, and the statistical tools to be used were described. Chapter five presents the data and the statistical analysis results of the study.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present a statistical analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaire.

Analysis of the Data

The analysis of data is presented in table form. Computations were made from a 75 percent questionnaire return. The 75 percent return was determined by obtaining 30 questionnaire responses from the 40 randomly selected Indian Education program sites. A sample size of 30 for each group for eastern and western Oklahoma assured adequate participation for data analysis. This also provided an equal number of cases from each group for statistical treatment purposes. Returns were as follows: Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson, 30 of 40--75 percent; School Board President, 30 of 40--75 percent; Educational Administrator, 30 of 40--75 percent.

In order to determine if there were significant statistical differences among the three groups, the analysis of variance technique was applied to the raw score data derived from the scoring of the Indian Education Program Development questionnaire. The F Ratios were calculated and compared for

probability significance at the .05 alpha level.

After each analysis which had a significant difference at the alpha .05 level, another test was made to assess the differences among the three subject groups and to determine the group that was different from the other two groups. The Tukey Honestly Significant Difference Procedure (HSD), a post-hoc test, was applied to the data. For the Tukey (HSD) Procedure the heterogeneous group was determined at the alpha .05 level.

In discussing the hypotheses the superscripts "a" and "b" refer to Eastern and Western Oklahoma, respectively. The analysis of data from the stratified random sample will be presented in table form for Eastern and Western Oklahoma for each hypothesis as follows: the hypothesis for Eastern Oklahoma (a) will always be first and the hypothesis for Western Oklahoma (b) will always follow. All items are provided in table form for analytical purposes even though not all items had a significant F. A summary of the findings will be presented at the end of the tables.

TABLE 1

$H_0 1^a$ STATISTICAL ANALYSIS REGARDING THE

IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN POLICIES

FOR ITEMS A - P

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the areas of planning, development, and evaluation of programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
41.4330	9.1149	36.8000	5.1555	42.9667	10.0361	4.4090*	0.0150

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.4090, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. Therefore $H_0 1^a$ was rejected. Table 2 shows the groups that differed in the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons.

TABLE 2

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	41.4330	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	36.8000	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	42.9667	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board Presidents and the Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 3

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INDIAN STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.2000	0.8052	3.3667	0.7184	3.4667	0.6814	1.0030	0.3711

$H_0 1^a$ Item A was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.0030, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.

TABLE 4

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM B STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND PROGRAM CURRICULA"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending program curricula?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.1000	0.5477	2.3667	0.5561	3.0000	0.8710	10.4060*	0.0001

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 10.4060, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item B. supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 5 shows the groups that differ concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee members involvement in recommending program curricula.

TABLE 5

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES REGARDING RECOMMENDATION OF PROGRAM CURRICULA, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.1000	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board President	2.3667	----	----
3. Educational Administrator	3.0000	3, 1	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board Presidents, and both the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in recommending program curricula.

TABLE 6

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM C STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.1000	0.9595	2.0000	0.7428	2.4333	1.1943	1.5980	0.2081

$H_0 1^a$ Item C was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.5980, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program.

TABLE 7

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM D STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEACHING METHODS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending teaching methods to be used?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.0667	0.6397	1.9000	0.5477	2.2000	1.3235	0.8260	0.4411

$H_0 1^a$ Item D was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.8260, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in recommending teaching methods to be used.

TABLE 8

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM E, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND CRITERIA FOR HIRING STAFF"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending criteria for hiring staff?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8000	1.1265	2.2000	0.6103	2.5333	1.1666	2.7090	0.0722

$H_0 1^a$ Item E was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.7090, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in recommending criteria for hiring staff.

TABLE 9

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM F STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "DEVELOP LIST OF QUALIFIED STAFF FOR REQUIRED SELECTION BY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.6000	1.0034	2.1667	0.6477	2.7000	1.1788	2.5690	0.824

$H_0 1^a$ Item F was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.5690, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.

TABLE 10

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM G STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVE BUDGET PREPARATION AND EXECUTION"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of approving budget preparation and execution?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.2667	1.0148	3.0667	0.5208	3.3333	0.9589	0.7810	0.4613

$H_0 1^a$ Item G was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.7810, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in approving budget preparation and execution.

TABLE 11

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM H STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVE SPECIFIC WRITTEN POLICIES FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of planning and developing education programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.5333	0.7761	2.9333	0.9072	3.1000	1.0289	3.4760*	0.0353

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 3.4760, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item H supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 12 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in planning and developing educational programs.

TABLE 12

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.5333	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.9333	----	2, 1*
3. Educational Administrator	3.1000	3, 2	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board President and the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 13

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM I STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "PARTICIPATE IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of participating in negotiations concerning contracts?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.5333	1.1666	1.5333	0.7761	1.9333	1.0483	7.4660*	0.0010

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 7.4660, indicated significant differences among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item I supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 14 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in participating in negotiations concerning contracts.

TABLE 14

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING PARTICIPATION IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.5333	----	1, 2*
2. School Board President	1.5333	2, 3	----
3. Educational Administrator	1.9333	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson and the School Board President concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 15

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM J STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.1333	0.9732	2.7333	0.5833	3.6333	0.6149	10.9880*	0.0001

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 10.9880, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item J supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 16 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys and other program related documents.

TABLE 16

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS, EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.1333	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.7333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	3.6333	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board President and the Educational Administrator concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 17

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM K STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "REQUEST PERIODIC REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of requesting periodic reports and evaluations?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.7333	0.8683	2.4000	0.6747	3.2000	0.8052	7.8240*	0.0008

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 7.8240, indicated significant differences among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item K supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 18 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in requesting periodic reports and evaluations.

TABLE 18

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING REQUESTS FOR PERIODIC REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.7333	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.4000	2, 1	----
3. Educational Administrators	3.2000	----	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 19

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM L STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EVALUATE STAFF PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM RESULTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Education Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of evaluating staff performance and program results?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.7333	0.9072	2.9000	0.5477	2.8000	1.0306	0.2900	0.7491

$H_0 1^a$ Item L was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.2900, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in evaluating staff performance and program results.

TABLE 20

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM M STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HEARING GRIEVANCES"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of hearing grievances?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.2000	1.0954	2.1667	0.5307	2.4667	1.0743	0.9230	0.4011

$H_0 1^a$ Item M was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.9230, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in hearing grievances.

TABLE 21

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM N STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of approving and disapproving programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8667	0.8604	2.6333	0.8899	3.2333	0.8584	3.6290*	0.0306

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 3.6290, indicated significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item N. supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 22 shows the groups that differ concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee members' involvement in approving and disapproving programs.

TABLE 22

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF PROGRAMS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST-- TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.8667	1, 2	----
2. School Board President	2.6333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	3.2333	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 23

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM 0 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMENDING TO PROPER AUTHORITIES THE CANCELLATION OR SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.1000	1.1249	1.8667	0.8996	2.2667	1.1725	1.0530	0.3532

$H_0 1^a$ Item 0 was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.0530, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.

TABLE 24

$H_0 1^a$ ITEM P STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of educational program implementation and committee involvement?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0667	0.9444	2.7333	1.0148	3.3667	0.9279	3.2460*	0.0437

*Significant. The F. Ratio obtained, 3.2460, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item P. supported rejection of $H_0 1^a$ of this study. Table 25 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in educational program implementation and committee involvement.

TABLE 25

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.0667	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.7333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	3.3667	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 26

H_01^b STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN POLICIES FOR ITEM A - P

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the areas of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
48.3333	8.4009	38.3333	9.8448	46.6000	9.4307	10.0230*	0.0001

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 10.0230, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that H_01^b was rejected. Table 27 shows the groups that differed on the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 27

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	48.3333	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	38.3333	----	2, 1*
3. Educational Administrator	46.6000	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and School Board Presidents concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 28

H_01^b ITEM A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INDIAN STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.5000	0.7768	3.1667	0.6477	3.4000	0.7240	1.7020	0.1883

H_01^b Item A was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.7020, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.

TABLE 29

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM B STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND PROGRAM CURRICULA"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending program curricula?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0667	0.6915	2.3333	0.6065	3.1667	0.8743	11.5710*	0.0000

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 11.5710, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item B supported rejection of $H_0 1^b$ of this study. Table 30 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Committee involvement in recommending program curricula.

TABLE 30

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES REGARDING RECOMMENDATION OF PROGRAM CURRICULA, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.0667	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.3333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	3.1667	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 31

H_01^b ITEM C STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.7667	0.8976	1.9000	0.8847	2.9333	1.0483	10.3080*	0.0001

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 10.3080, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item C supported rejection of H_01^b of this study. Table 32 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in recommending textbooks and materials.

TABLE 32

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES REGARDING RECOMMENDATION OF TEXTBOOKS AND MANUALS TO BE USED IN THE PROGRAM, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.7667	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	1.9000	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	2.9333	3, 1	----

* Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 33

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM D STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEACHING METHODS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending teaching methods to be used?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0667	0.9072	1.6333	0.9279	2.4000	1.2205	14.5890*	0.0000

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 14.5890, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item D supported rejection of $H_0 1^b$ of this study. Table 34 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee members' involvement in recommending teaching methods.

TABLE 34

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING RECOMMENDATION OF TEACHING METHODS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.0667	----	1*
2. School Board President	1.6333	----	2*
3. Educational Administrator	2.4000	----	3*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted for all three groups concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in recommendation of teaching methods.

TABLE 35

H_01^b ITEM E STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND CRITERIA FOR HIRING STAFF"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending criteria for hiring staff?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.1333	1.0743	2.5000	1.2526	3.0000	1.0171	2.6700	0.0749

H_01^b Item E was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.6700, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in recommending criteria for hiring staff.

TABLE 36

H_01^b ITEM F STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "DEVELOP LIST OF QUALIFIED STAFF FOR REQUIRED SELECTION BY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8667	1.0417	2.3000	1.1188	2.7333	1.1427	2.1690	0.1205

H_01^b Item F was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.1690, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.

TABLE 37

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM G STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVE BUDGET PREPARATION AND EXECUTION"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of approving budget preparation and execution?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.6000	0.8550	2.8000	1.1265	3.3333	0.7112	5.9600*	0.0038

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 5.9600, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item G supported rejection of $H_0 1^b$ of this study. Table 38 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee members' involvement in approving budget preparation and execution.

TABLE 38

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING APPROVING BUDGET PREPARATION AND EXECUTION, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.6000	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.8000	----	2, 1*
3. Educational Administrator	3.3333	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 39

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM H STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVE SPECIFIC WRITTEN POLICIES FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of planning and developing educational programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0000	0.9154	3.1000	0.8847	3.3667	0.8503	0.7400	0.4803

$H_0 1^b$ Item H was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.7400, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in planning and developing educational programs.

TABLE 40

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM I STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "PARTICIPATE IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of participating in negotiations concerning contracts?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.9333	1.1725	2.2000	1.2148	2.2333	1.1043	3.7920*	0.0294

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 3.7920, indicated significant differences among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item I supported rejection of $H_0 1^b$ of this study. Table 41 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee members' involvement in participating in negotiations concerning contracts.

TABLE 41

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING PARTICIPATION IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.9333	----	1, 3*
2. School Board President	2.2000	2, 3	2, 1*
3. Educational Administrator	2.2333	3, 2	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and both School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 42

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM J STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS, EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.5333	0.8604	3.000	0.9097	3.6667	0.7581	5.2270*	0.0072

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 5.2270, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item J supported rejection of $H_0 1^b$ of this study. Table 43 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.

TABLE 43

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS, EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.5333	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board President	3.0000	----	----
3. Educational Administrator	3.6667	3, 1	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and both Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 44

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM K STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "REQUEST PERIODIC REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of requesting periodic reports and evaluations?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.4333	0.7739	2.5333	0.8193	3.2333	0.9714	9.0790*	0.0003

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 9.0790, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item K supported rejection of $H_0 1^b$ of this study. Table 45 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement in requesting periodic reports and evaluations.

TABLE 45

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING REQUESTS FOR PERIODIC REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.4333	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board President	2.5333	----	----
3. Educational Administrator	3.2333	3, 1	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board Presidents and both the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and the Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 46

H_01^b ITEM L STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EVALUATE STAFF PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM RESULTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of evaluating staff performance and program results?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.2667	0.9444	2.3667	0.9643	3.2000	0.9965	8.0410*	0.0006

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 8.0410, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item L supported rejection of H_01^b of this study. Table 47 shows the groups that differed concerning the importance of specific written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee members' involvement in evaluating staff performance and program results.

TABLE 47

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON IMPORTANCE OF WRITTEN POLICIES COVERING EVALUATING STAFF PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM RESULTS, USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.2667	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board President	2.3667	----	----
3. Educational Administrator	3.2000	3, 1	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board Presidents and both the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and the Educational Administrators concerning the importance of written policies for Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement.

TABLE 48

H_01^b ITEM M STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HEARING GRIEVANCES"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of hearing grievances?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0667	1.0807	2.6000	1.1626	3.1000	1.0619	1.9280	0.1515

H_01^b Item M was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.9280, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in hearing grievances.

TABLE 49

H_01^b ITEM N STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of approving and disapproving programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.2667	0.7849	2.7000	1.1788	3.2667	1.0148	3.1740	0.0467

H_01^b Item N was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 3.1740, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving and disapproving programs.

TABLE 50

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM 0 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMENDING TO PROPER AUTHORITIES THE CANCELLATION OR SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.9667	0.9994	2.4667	1.2794	2.9667	1.0662	1.9880	0.1431

$H_0 1^b$ Item 0 was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.9880, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.

TABLE 51

$H_0 1^b$ ITEM P STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the importance of specific written policies in the area of educational program implementation and committee involvement?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.4333	0.6261	3.0333	1.1290	3.3333	0.8442	1.6390	0.2001

$H_0 1^b$ was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.6390, indicated no significant differences among the three groups concerning the importance of specific written policies for the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in educational program implementation and committee involvement.

TABLE 52

$H_0 2^a$ STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING FOR ITEMS A - P

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
40.5000	11.5870	33.4667	5.2308	37.4333	11.4159	3.8330*	0.0254

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 3.8330, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. Therefore $H_0 2^a$ was rejected. Table 53 shows the groups that differed on the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 53

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	40.5000	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	33.4667	----	2, 1*
3. Educational Administrator	37.4333	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and School Board Presidents concerning the degree of participation in decision making.

TABLE 54

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INDIAN STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of annual assessment of Indian student learning needs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8667	1.0417	2.7000	0.6513	2.5667	0.9353	0.8530	0.4297

$H_0 2^a$ Item A was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.8530, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.

TABLE 55

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM B STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND PROGRAM CURRICULA"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending program curricula?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8333	0.6477	2.3667	0.6687	2.4333	0.8976	3.4280*	0.0369

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 3.4280, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item B supported rejection of $H_0 2^a$ of this study. Table 56 shows the groups that differed concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending program curricula.

TABLE 56

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING REGARDING RECOMMENDATION OF PROGRAM CURRICULA USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.8333	----	1, 2*
2. School Board President	2.3667	2, 3	----
3. Educational Administrator	2.4333	----	3, 1*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and both School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommendation of program curricula.

TABLE 57

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM C STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending textbooks and materials?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.8667	0.7761	1.7000	0.5960	1.8667	0.8604	0.4910	0.6138

$H_0 2^a$ Item C was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.4910, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending textbooks and materials.

TABLE 58

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM D STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEACHING METHODS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending teaching methods?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.6667	0.6609	1.8333	0.6989	1.6333	0.8503	0.6270	0.5367

$H_0 2^a$ Item D was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.6270, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending teaching methods.

TABLE 59

H_o2^a ITEM E STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND CRITERIA FOR HIRING STAFF"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending criteria for hiring staff?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.5000	0.9377	2.0000	0.6948	2.2000	0.9613	2.4930	0.0885

H_02^a Item E was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.4930, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending criteria for hiring staff.

TABLE 60

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM F STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "DEVELOP LIST OF QUALIFIED STAFF FOR REQUIRED SELECTION BY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.2333	1.1351	1.9333	0.6397	2.0667	0.9444	0.7850	0.0474

$H_0 2^a$ Item F was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.7850, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.

TABLE 61

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM G STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVE BUDGET PREPARATION AND EXECUTION"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving budget preparation and execution?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.3000	1.0554	2.8000	0.7144	2.7000	1.1492	3.1580	0.0474

$H_0 2^a$ Item G was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 3.1580, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving budget preparation and execution.

TABLE 62

H_o2^a ITEM H STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVE SPECIFIC WRITTEN POLICIES FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having specific written policies for the planning and development of educational programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0000	0.9469	2.4000	0.8550	2.3000	0.1788	4.2750*	0.0169

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.2750, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item H supported rejection of H_02^a of this study. Table 63 shows the groups that differed concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having specific written policies for the planning and development of educational programs.

TABLE 63

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING REGARDING PLANNING AND DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.0000	----	1, 2*
2. School Board President	2.4000	2, 3	----
3. Educational Administrator	2.3000	----	3, 1*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of planning and developing educational programs.

TABLE 64

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM I STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "PARTICIPATE IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of participating in negotiations concerning contracts?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.2667	1.3373	1.4333	0.7279	1.8000	0.8867	5.0570*	0.0084

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 5.0570, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item I supported rejection of $H_0 2^a$ of this study. Table 65 shows the groups that differed concerning the degree of participation by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of participating in negotiations concerning contracts.

TABLE 65

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING REGARDING PARTICIPATION IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.2667	----	1, 2*
2. School Board President	1.4333	2, 3	----
3. Educational Administrator	1.8000	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and School Board Presidents concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of negotiations concerning contracts.

TABLE 66

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM J STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS, EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0667	0.9803	2.1667	0.6989	2.9000	1.0939	7.7980*	0.0008

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 7.7980, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item J supported rejection of $H_0 2^a$ of this study. Table 67 shows the groups that differed concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.

TABLE 67

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING REGARDING HAVING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS, EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons	3.0667	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board Presidents	2.1667	----	----
3. Educational Administrators	2.9000	3, 1	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and both Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making regarding having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.

TABLE 68

H_02^a ITEM K STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "REQUEST PERIODIC REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of requesting periodic reports and evaluations?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.4000	1.2205	2.3000	0.7944	2.6000	1.0034	0.6710	0.5136

H_02^a Item K was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.6710, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of requesting periodic reports and evaluations.

TABLE 69

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM L STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EVALUATE STAFF PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM RESULTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the evaluation of staff performance and program results?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.7667	1.1043	2.2333	0.8172	2.5000	0.9738	3.3570	0.1108

$H_0 2^a$ Item L was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 3.3570, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the evaluation of staff performance and program results.

TABLE 70

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM M STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HEARING GRIEVANCES"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons in hearing grievances?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N - 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.2667	1.0148	2.0000	0.5252	2.1000	0.9948	0.7120	0.4937

$H_0 2^a$ Item M was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.7120, indicated no significant differences among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in hearing grievances.

TABLE 71

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM N STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving and disapproving programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.6000	0.8944	1.7000	0.9523	2.9667	1.2172	11.9910*	0.0000

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 11.9910, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item N supported rejection of $H_0 2^a$ of this study. Table 72 shows the groups that differed concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving and disapproving programs.

TABLE 72

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING PROGRAMS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.6000	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board President	1.7000	----	----
3. Educational Administrator	2.9667	3, 1	2, 3*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and both Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving and disapproving programs.

TABLE 73

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM 0 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMENDING TO PROPER AUTHORITIES THE CANCELLATION OR SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.0667	1.1725	1.7333	0.7849	1.8667	0.9732	0.8620	0.4258

$H_0 2^a$ Item 0 was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.8620, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.

TABLE 74

$H_0 2^a$ ITEM P STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of educational program implementation and committee involvement?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator M = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8000	1.0954	2.1667	0.9499	2.9333	1.1427	4.4310*	0.0147

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.4310, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item P supported rejection of $H_0 2^a$ of this study. Table 75 shows the groups that differed concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of educational program implementation and committee involvement.

TABLE 75

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.8000	1, 3	1, 2*
2. School Board President	2.1667	----	----
3. Educational Administrator	2.9333	3, 1	2, 3*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and both Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of participation in educational program implementation and committee involvement.

TABLE 76

$H_0 2^b$ STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING FOR ITEMS A - P

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
34.3000	10.3429	33.8000	10.1179	35.7333	10.0924	0.2910	0.7481

$H_0 2^b$ was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.2910, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 77

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF INDIAN STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of annual assessment of Indian student learning needs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.3333	0.8841	2.5333	1.0743	2.3667	0.9279	0.3690	0.6922

$H_0 2^b$ Item A was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.3690, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.

TABLE 78

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM B STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND PROGRAM CURRICULA"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending program curricula?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.9000	2.0289	1.8667	0.7303	2.2667	0.9072	1.8360	0.1656

$H_0 2^b$ Item B was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.8360, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending program curricula.

TABLE 79

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM C STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending textbooks and materials?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.5333	0.6288	1.3667	0.6687	2.0000	0.9097	5.8080*	0.0043

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 5.8080, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item C supported rejection of $H_0 2^b$ of this study. Table 80 will show the groups that differ concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending textbooks and materials.

TABLE 80

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING REGARDING RECOMMENDING TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	1.5333	1, 2	1, 3*
2. School Board President	1.3667	2, 1	----
3. Educational Administrator	2.0000	----	2, 3*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the Educational Administrators, and both Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and School Board Presidents concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending textbooks and materials.

TABLE 81

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM D STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND TEACHING METHODS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending teaching methods?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.6000	0.7701	1.3667	0.7184	1.7333	0.8683	1.6640	0.1954

$H_0 2^b$ Item D was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.6640, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending teaching methods.

TABLE 82

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM E STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMEND CRITERIA FOR HIRING STAFF"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending criteria for hiring staff?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.0333	1.0901	2.2333	1.2057	2.0000	0.9738	1.3270	0.2701

$H_0 2^b$ Item E was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.3270, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending criteria for hiring staff.

TABLE 83

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM F STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "DEVELOP LIST OF QUALIFIED STAFF FOR REQUIRED SELECTION BY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.8000	1.0306	1.8667	0.8996	2.0333	0.8899	0.4880	0.6155

$H_0 2^b$ Item F was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.4880, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Committee members in the area of developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.

TABLE 84

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM G STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVE BUDGET PREPARATION AND EXECUTION"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving budget preparation and execution?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0000	1.1142	2.6667	1.2411	2.7333	0.9803	0.7480	0.4762

$H_0 2^b$ Item G was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.7480, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving budget preparation and execution.

TABLE 85

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM H STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVE SPECIFIC WRITTEN POLICIES FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having specific written policies for the planning and development of educational programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.3667	1.0981	1.8333	0.9855	2.3000	0.9879	2.4110	0.0957

$H_0 2^b$ Item H was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.4110, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having specific written policies for planning and developing educational programs.

TABLE 86

H_02^b ITEM I STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "PARTICIPATE IN NEGOTIATIONS CONCERNING CONTRACTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of participating in negotiations concerning contracts?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.9667	1.0662	1.8333	0.7466	1.7000	0.9879	0.5990	0.5515

H_02^b Item I was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.5990, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of participating in negotiations concerning contracts.

TABLE 87

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM J STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HAVING ACCESS TO BUDGETS, REPORTS, EVALUATIONS, SURVEYS, AND OTHER PROGRAM RELATED DOCUMENTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.6667	1.0283	2.6667	1.0283	2.6667	1.0613	0.0000	1.0000

$H_0 2^b$ Item J was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.0000, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.

TABLE 88

H_02^b ITEM K STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "REQUEST PERIODIC REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of requesting periodic reports and evaluations?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.3333	0.8841	2.2333	0.6789	2.4333	1.0063	0.3990	0.6722

H_02^b Item K was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.3990, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of requesting periodic reports and evaluations?

TABLE 89

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM L STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EVALUATE STAFF PERFORMANCE AND PROGRAM RESULTS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making in the evaluation of staff performance and program results?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.9333	0.8277	2.0667	0.7397	2.0667	0.9072	0.2600	0.7720

$H_0 2^b$ Item L was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.2600, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making in the evaluation of staff performance and program results by Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 90

H_02^b ITEM M STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HEARING GRIEVANCES"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by the Indian Advisory Committee members in hearing grievances?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.2000	1.0954	2.0667	0.8683	2.1000	0.9948	0.1470	0.8633

H_02^b Item M was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.1470, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in hearing grievances.

TABLE 91

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM N STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "APPROVING AND DISAPPROVING PROGRAMS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving and disapproving programs?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.4667	0.8996	2.6000	1.1626	2.4000	1.1326	0.2710	0.7633

$H_0 2^b$ Item N was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.2710, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of approving and disapproving programs.

TABLE 92

H_02^b ITEM 0 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "RECOMMENDING TO PROPER AUTHORITIES THE CANCELLATION OR SUSPENSION OF CONTRACT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.9333	1.0483	2.2000	1.2507	1.9000	1.0289	0.8150	0.4460

H_02^b Item 0 was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.8150, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.

TABLE 93

$H_0 2^b$ ITEM P STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of educational program implementation and committee involvement?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.2333	0.9714	2.3667	0.9994	2.5333	0.9732	0.7040	0.4976

$H_0 2^b$ Item P was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.7040, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the degree of participation in decision making by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the area of educational program implementation and committee involvement.

TABLE 94

$H_0 3^a$ STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE METHOD INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS SHOULD EMPLOY TO ASSURE THEIR INVOLVEMENT FOR ITEMS Q - X

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure their involvement?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
21.4667	4.8760	20.8000	2.2499	22.5000	5.8531	1.0510	0.3539

$H_0 3^a$ was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.0510, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure their involvement.

TABLE 95

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM Q STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HOLD OPEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of holding open committee meetings to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.8333	0.8339	3.8000	0.4068	3.5000	0.8610	1.8930	0.1568

$H_0 3^a$ Item Q was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.8930, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of holding open committee meetings to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 96

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM R STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "SECURE COPY OF THE NEGOTIATED CONTRACT WHICH INCLUDES PROGRAM AND BUDGET"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of securing a copy of the negotiated contract which included program and budget to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.5000	0.9377	3.2333	0.6789	3.2333	0.8584	1.0270	0.3623

$H_0 3^a$ Item R was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.0270, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of securing a copy of the negotiated contract which included program and budget to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 97

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM S STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "MEET AND CONFER WITH LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of meeting and conferring with the local school board to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.9333	0.9072	3.1333	0.6814	3.0667	0.9803	0.4150	0.6616

$H_0 3^a$ Item S was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.4150, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of meeting and conferring with the local school board to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 98

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM T STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "MEET AND CONFER WITH EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of meeting and conferring with education administrator to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.3000	0.8769	3.3000	0.4661	3.5333	0.7761	1.0280	0.3619

$H_0 3^a$ Item T was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.0280, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of meeting and conferring with education administrator to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 99

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM U STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "MEET REGULARLY WITH PROFESSIONAL STAFF"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of meeting regularly with professional staff to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.7333	0.8683	2.5667	0.6261	2.8667	0.0080	0.9410	0.3944

$H_0 3^a$ Item U was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.9410, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of meeting regularly with professional staff to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 100

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM V STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EMPLOY OUTSIDE CONSULTANT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of employing an outside consultant to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.6667	0.9589	1.4333	0.7279	2.2000	1.2972	4.4380*	0.0146

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.4380, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item V supported rejection of $H_0 3^a$ of this study. Table 101 shows the groups that differed concerning the method of employing an outside consultant to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 101

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON METHOD OF EMPLOYING OUTSIDE CONSULTANT TO ASSURE INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST --TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	1.6667	1, 2	----
2. School Board President	1.4333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	2.2000	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the method of involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 102

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM W STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "CONTACT APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCY"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of contacting appropriate federal agency to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.3333	1.0283	2.3000	0.7022	2.5333	1.2243	0.4700	0.6266

$H_0 3^a$ Item W is accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.4700, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of contacting appropriate federal agency to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 103

$H_0 3^a$ ITEM X STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "CONSIDER STARTING AN INDIAN SCHOOL"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of starting an Indian School to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.1667	0.4611	1.0333	0.1826	1.5667	1.0400	5.2230*	0.0072

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 5.2230, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item X supported rejection of $H_0 3^a$ of this study. Table 104 shows the groups that differ concerning the method of starting an Indian school to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 104

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON METHOD OF STARTING AN INDIAN SCHOOL TO ASSURE INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST --TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	1.1667	1, 2	----
2. School Board President	1.0333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	1.5667	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the method of involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 105

$H_0 3^b$ STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONCERNING THE METHOD INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS SHOULD EMPLOY TO ASSURE THEIR INVOLVEMENT FOR ITEMS Q - X

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure their involvement?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
23.2667	5.2255	19.6667	6.3045	23.4333	4.5004	4.6690*	0.0119

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.6690, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. Therefore $H_0 3^b$ was rejected. Table 106 shows the groups that differ on the method Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure their involvement.

TABLE 106

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON METHOD TO ASSURE INVOLVEMENT OF INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	23.2667	----	1, 2*
2. School Board President	19.6667	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	23.4333	3, 1	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents, and both Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and Educational Administrators concerning the method to assure involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 107

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM Q STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "HOLD OPEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of holding open committee meetings to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.6333	0.6687	3.4333	0.8172	3.9000	0.3052	4.0840*	0.0202

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.0840, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item Q supported rejection of $H_0 3^b$ of this study. Table 108 shows the groups that differed concerning the method of holding open committee meetings to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 108

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON METHOD OF HOLDING OPEN COMMITTEE MEETINGS TO ASSURE INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	3.6333	1, 2	----
2. School Board President	3.4333	----	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	3.9000	1, 3	----

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Education Administrators concerning the method of involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 109

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM R STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "SECURE COPY OF THE NEGOTIATED CONTRACT WHICH INCLUDES PROGRAM AND BUDGET"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of securing a copy of the negotiated contract which includes program and budget to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.3667	0.8503	2.7667	1.1351	3.2667	0.9444	3.2030	0.4550

$H_0 3^b$ Item R was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 3.2030, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of securing a copy of the negotiated contract which includes program and budget to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 110

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM S STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "MEET AND CONFER WITH LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of meeting and conferring with the local school board to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.0667	0.9803	2.5000	1.2798	3.0000	1.1744	2.1700	0.1203

$H_0 3^b$ Item S was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 2.1700, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of meeting and conferring with the local school board to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 111

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM T STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "MEET AND CONFER WITH EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of meeting and conferring with education administrator to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
3.3333	0.8841	3.1333	0.8604	3.5333	0.7761	1.6950	0.1896

$H_0 3^b$ Item T was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.6950, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of meeting and conferring with education administrator to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 112

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM U STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "MEET REGULARLY WITH PROFESSIONAL STAFF"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of meeting regularly with professional staff to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8667	1.0417	2.2333	1.1351	3.0000	1.0504	4.3430*	0.0159

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.3430, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item U supported rejection of $H_0 3^b$ of this study for Western Oklahoma. Table 113 shows the groups that differed concerning the method of meeting regularly with professional staff to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 113

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON METHOD OF MEETING REGULARLY WITH PROFESSIONAL STAFF TO ASSURE INVOLVEMENT OF INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.8667	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.2333	2, 1	2, 3*
3. Educational Administrator	3.0000	----	3, 2*

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between School Board Presidents and Educational Administrators concerning the method of involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 114

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM V STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "EMPLOY OUTSIDE CONSULTANT"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of employing an outside consultant to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.4333	1.0726	2.0667	1.1121	2.4000	1.0700	1.0480	0.3552

$H_0 3^b$ Item V was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 1.0480, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of employing an outside consultant to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 115

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM W STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "CONTACT APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCY"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of contacting appropriate federal agency to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
2.8667	1.0743	2.1000	1.1847	2.8667	1.1366	4.5810*	0.0128

*Significant. The F Ratio obtained, 4.5810, indicated a significant difference among the three groups at the 0.05 level of confidence. This means that Item W supported rejection of $H_0 3^b$ of this study. Table 116 shows the groups that differed concerning the method of contacting appropriate federal agency to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 116

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS ON METHOD OF CONTACTING APPROPRIATE FEDERAL AGENCY TO ASSURE INDIAN EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT USING MULTIPLE RANGE TEST--TUKEY HSD PROCEDURE

	Mean	Groups	
		Homogeneous	Heterogeneous
1. Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson	2.8667	1, 3	----
2. School Board President	2.1000	----	2, 1*
3. Educational Administrator	2.8667	3, 1	3, 2

*Significant. Significant differences were noted between the School Board Presidents, and both the Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons and the Educational Administrators concerning the method of involvement for Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

TABLE 117

$H_0 3^b$ ITEM X STATISTICAL ANALYSIS "CONSIDER STARTING AN INDIAN SCHOOL"

With regard to school district decision making is there a difference among Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairpersons, School Board Presidents, and Educational Administrators concerning the method of starting an Indian School to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members?

Indian Education Advisory Committee Chairperson N = 30		School Board President N = 30		Educational Administrator N = 30		ANOVA	
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F Ratio	F Prob
1.7000	1.0222	1.4333	0.9353	1.4667	0.9371	0.6790	0.5097

$H_0 3^b$ Item X was accepted. The F Ratio obtained, 0.6790, indicated no significant difference among the three groups concerning the method of considering starting an Indian School to assure the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committee members.

Summary of Findings

The following is a summary of the findings from the tables presented in this chapter. Table 1 showed the significant F for Eastern Oklahoma on $H_0 1^a$. The Tables 4, 11, 13, 15, 17, 21, and 24 showed the questionnaire items which had a significant F from Eastern Oklahoma. Table 26 showed the significant F for Western Oklahoma on $H_0 1^b$, and Tables 29, 31, 33, 37, 40, 42, 44, and 46 showed the questionnaire items which had a significant F from Western Oklahoma.

The significant F for $H_0 2^a$ for Eastern Oklahoma was shown in Table 52 and Tables 55, 62, 64, 66, 71, and 74 showed the questionnaire items which had a significant F from Eastern Oklahoma. Table 76 showed $H_0 2^b$ for Western Oklahoma and Table 79 showed the item from the questionnaire which had a significant F for Western Oklahoma.

$H_0 3^a$ for Eastern Oklahoma was shown in Table 94 and Tables 100 and 103 showed the items from the questionnaire which had a significant F. Table 105 showed the significant F for $H_0 3^b$ for Western Oklahoma, and Tables 107, 112, and 115 showed items from the questionnaire which had a significant F from Western Oklahoma.

The following information describes the extent of agreement among the subjects regarding the decision making items on the instrument. The results are presented as collected

by the instrument. The alphabetical letters correspond to the items on the instrument.

The decision making items from $H_0 1^a$ that were the most important to the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma and that showed much to great agreement between Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (A) Making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.
2. (G) Approving budget preparation and execution.
3. (H) Having specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.
4. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.
5. (P) Having specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.

The decision making items that were important to the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma and that showed some to much agreement in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (B) Recommending program curricula.
2. (C) Recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program.

3. (D) Recommending teaching methods to be used.
4. (E) Recommending criteria for hiring staff.
5. (F) Developing list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.
6. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.
7. (K) Requesting periodic reports and evaluations.
8. (L) Evaluating staff performance and program results.
9. (M) Hearing grievances.
10. (N) Approving and disapproving programs.
11. (O) Recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contracts.

The decision making items for $H_0 1^b$ that were the most important to the three groups in Western Oklahoma and that showed much to great agreement between Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (A) Making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.
2. (G) Approving budget preparation and execution.
3. (H) Having specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.
4. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.

5. (K) Requesting periodic reports and evaluations.
6. (N) Approving and disapproving programs.
7. (P) Having specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.

The decision making items that were important to the three groups in Western Oklahoma and that showed some to much agreement in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (B) Recommending program curricula.
2. (C) Recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program.
3. (D) Recommending teaching methods to be used.
4. (E) Recommending criteria for hiring staff.
5. (F) Developing list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.
6. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.
7. (L) Evaluating staff performance and program results.
8. (M) Hearing grievances.
9. (O) Recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.

The decision making items for $H_0 2^b$ that showed the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee members for Eastern Oklahoma as perceived by Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and

educational administrators and that showed some to much effort in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (A) Making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.
2. (B) Recommending program curricula.
3. (E) Recommending criteria for hiring staff.
4. (F) Developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.
5. (G) Approving budget preparation and execution.
6. (H) Having specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.
7. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.
8. (K) Requesting periodic reports and evaluations.
9. (L) Evaluating staff performance and program results.
10. (M) Hearing grievances.
11. (N) Approving and disapproving programs.
12. (P) Having specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.

The decision making items for Eastern Oklahoma showing the degree of participation of Indian Education Advisory Committee members as perceived by the three groups and that showed little to some effort in the planning, development,

and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (C) Recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program.
2. (D) Recommending teaching methods to be used.
3. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.
4. (O) Recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.

The decision making areas for $H_0 2^b$ that showed the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee members for Western Oklahoma as perceived by Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board presidents, and educational administrators and that showed some to much effort in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (A) Making an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.
2. (B) Recommending program curricula.
3. (E) Recommending criteria for hiring staff.
4. (G) Approving budget preparation and execution.
5. (H) Having specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.
6. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.
7. (K) Requesting periodic reports and evaluations.

8. (L) Evaluating staff performance and program results.
9. (M) Hearing grievances.
10. (N) Approving and disapproving programs.
11. (O) Recommending to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.
12. (P) Having specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.

The decision making items that showed the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee members for Western Oklahoma as perceived by the three groups and that showed some to little effort in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs were as follows:

1. (C) Recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program.
2. (D) Recommending teaching methods to be used.
3. (F) Developing a list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrators.
4. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.

The methods for $H_0 3^a$ that Eastern Oklahoma Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure committee involvement in the decision making area as perceived by Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators that showed much to great agreement were as follows:

1. (Q) Hold open committee meetings.
2. (R) Secure a copy of the negotiated contract which includes program and budget.
3. (S) Meet and confer with local school board.
4. (T) Meet and confer with educational administrator.

The methods that Eastern Oklahoma Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure committee participation in the decision making areas as perceived by the three groups and that showed some to much agreement were as follows:

1. (U) Meet regularly with professional staff.
2. (W) Contact appropriate federal agency.

The methods Eastern Oklahoma Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure committee participation in the decision making areas as perceived by the three groups and that showed little to some agreement were as follows:

1. (V) Employ an outside consultant.
2. (X) Consider starting an Indian school.

The methods for $H_0 3^b$ that Western Oklahoma Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure committee involvement in the decision making areas as perceived by Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators and that showed much to great agreement were as follows:

1. (Q) Holding open meetings.
2. (R) Secure a copy of the negotiated contract which includes program and budget.
3. (T) Meet and confer with educational administrator.

The methods that Western Oklahoma Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure committee involvement in the decision making areas as perceived by the three groups and that showed some to much agreement were as follows:

1. (S) Meet and confer with the local school board.
2. (U) Meet regularly with professional staff.
3. (V) Employ an outside consultant.
4. (W) Contact appropriate federal agency.

The method that Western Oklahoma Indian Education Advisory Committee members should employ to assure committee involvement in the decision making areas as perceived by the three groups and that showed little to some agreement were as follows:

1. (X) Consider starting an Indian school.

The responses of the subjects have been presented to reflect the statistical tables. This information was determined by using the mean for the three groups. In Chapter VI a summary, conclusions, and recommendations will be presented.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted for the purpose of assessing the conflict in Indian education programs in public schools across the State of Oklahoma. Since distinct differences exist between Eastern and Western Oklahoma in the administration of Indian education programs in public schools, a stratified random sampling method was employed to test the hypotheses for Eastern and Western Oklahoma.

Because of the increased federal funding for Indian education and the passage of laws and Congressional mandates which provide Indian Education Advisory Committees with more power and authority over the development, implementation, and evaluation of Indian education programs, the public school educational administrators, school board members, and the Indian Education Advisory Committee members are not certain of their roles and responsibilities concerning Indian education programs. Research cited in this study demonstrates that Indian people have a special and unique relationship with the federal government as a result of past treaties between Indian tribes and the United States government. This

study also presented an overview of federal legislation related to Indian education and parent participation in the decision making process regarding Indian programs. Title IV-A and Johnson O'Malley are two Indian education programs for which school districts are eligible to participate in making applications for federal funding. These two Indian education programs require that an Indian parental committee be elected from the Indian Community to act in an advisory capacity for the development and governance of Indian education programs.

Since school districts have in some cases two separate Indian Education Advisory Committees governing Title IV-A and Johnson O'Malley programs, conflict develops between the Indian Education Advisory Committees and the educational administrator. This conflict is a result of too much involvement or lack of involvement of both parties in the decision making process.

This study used as a theoretical foundation the zone of acceptance which describes a level of participation of each party in the decision making process. The theory purports that often groups do not want to be involved in decision making. If a group does not have the expertise or the decision is not relevant to it, then it should not be involved in the decision making. If the decision is relevant to the group and the group had the expertise to make the decision, it should be involved. This theory suggests that this type

of involvement be employed by the educational administrator using the participative management approach to decision making. The review of literature on participative management suggests that if people are involved in decisions that affect them, then they tend to become supportive of the decisions.

Using a representative stratified random sampling method, 240 subjects were selected from the school districts in the state that had an Indian education program. The sample was divided into 120 subjects each for Eastern and Western Oklahoma. There were 40 subjects drawn from each of the three groups--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--for both Eastern and Western Oklahoma. The return for the questionnaires was 75 percent, or 30 from each group for both Eastern and Western Oklahoma. The instrument was developed by the researcher using the federal regulations governing both Johnson O'Malley and Title IV-A programs. Prior to the administration of the instrument, the researcher provided instructions to school superintendents, school principals, tribal education directors, and State Department of Education officials, who administered the instrument to the subjects.

The hypotheses for this study were tested using the analysis of variance statistical method, and if a significant difference was determined, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference Procedure was applied to determine homogeneous and

heterogeneous groups. The following hypotheses were tested for this study:

$H_0 1^a$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the areas of importance of specific written policies as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 1^b$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups in Western Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the areas of importance of specific written policies as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 2^a$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the degree of participation of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making

process as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 2^b$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups in Western Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the degree of participation of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making process as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 3^a$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the method to employ to assure participation by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making areas as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

$H_0 3^b$ There is no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level among the three groups in Western Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the

method to employ to assure participation by Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making areas as measured by the Education Program Development Questionnaire.

Conclusions

The statistical treatment of the data yielded the following results for $H_0 1^a$: $H_0 1^a$ was rejected on the basis of significant differences noted among the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the importance of written policies for the following decision making items:

1. (B) Recommending program curricula.
2. (H) Having specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.
3. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.
4. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.
5. (K) Request periodic reports and evaluations.
6. (N) Approving and disapproving programs.
7. (P) Having specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.

It can be concluded that all groups in Eastern Oklahoma differed in their idea of the importance of specific written

policies for program development and governance of Indian education programs. The above items which supported rejection of this hypothesis are in the area of policy formulation, a role that is accepted for advisory groups. Those items which indicated no difference and did not contribute to rejection of the hypothesis dealt with professional tasks of administration and teachers. It could be concluded that a definite need exists for written policies in the program policy area.

Significant differences within the groups were produced between the school board presidents and the educational administrators in 5 out of 16 comparisons, and between the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons and the school board presidents in 3 out of 16 comparisons. General agreement was found between Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons and educational administrators. A conclusion from this finding is that school board presidents have not been involved in the program development and program decision making of Indian education programs.

$H_0 1^b$ was rejected on the basis of significant differences noted among the three groups in Western Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the importance of specific written policies for the following decision making items:

1. (B) Recommend program curricula.
2. (C) Recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program.
3. (D) Recommending teaching methods to be used.
4. (G) Approving budget preparation and execution.
5. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.
6. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.
7. (K) Requesting periodic reports and evaluations.
8. (L) Evaluating staff performance and program results.

The significant difference occurred each time between the school board presidents, and both the educational administrators and the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons. For the most part the educational administrators and the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons were in agreement on each of the decision making items.

It can be concluded that all the groups in Western Oklahoma differed on the idea of the importance of specific written policies for program development and governance of Indian education programs. Some of the above items which supported rejection of this hypothesis are in the area of supervisory functions, a role delegated to administrators

and instructional staff. Those items which indicated no difference and did not contribute to the rejection of the hypothesis dealt primarily with general policy formulation. A conclusion is that there is a definite need for written policies to clarify the role and functions of each group involved in the decision making process.

Significant differences within the Western Oklahoma groups were produced between the Indian Education Advisory Committee and the school board presidents in 7 out of 16 comparisons and between the school board presidents and the educational administrators in 6 out of 16 comparisons. Little disagreement was found between Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons and educational administrators. This prompts a like conclusion previously stated that school board presidents have not been sufficiently involved in matters addressed by the regulations in Indian education programs.

$H_0 2^a$ was rejected on the basis of significant differences noted among the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee in the decision making areas for the following items:

1. (B) Recommending program curricula.

2. (H) Having specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.
3. (I) Participating in negotiations concerning contracts.
4. (J) Having access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.
5. (N) Approving and disapproving programs.
6. (P) Having specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.

It can be concluded that all groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--differed in their idea of the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee in the decision making areas of program development and governance of Indian education programs. The above items which supported rejection of this hypothesis are in the areas that are normally accepted participation areas for advisory committees, but none of the groups perceived much or great effort of involvement on the part of the Indian Education Advisory Committees.

Significant differences in $H_0 2^a$ with the Eastern Oklahoma groups were produced between the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons and the school board presidents in 5 out of 16 comparisons. Minor differences were noted in 3 out of 16 comparisons between the Indian Education Advisory

Committee chairpersons and the educational administrators. A conclusion which can be drawn is that school board presidents are not aware of the participation and role of the Indian Education Advisory Committees in decision making areas of program development and governance of Indian education programs.

$H_0 2^b$ was accepted among the three groups in Western Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the degree of participation of the Indian Education Advisory Committee in the decision making areas. For $H_0 2^b$ there was no statistically significant difference found. Only one item (Item C "Recommending textbooks and materials to be used in the program") produced a statistical difference which could have contributed toward rejection of $H_0 2^b$ on participation of Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making areas of program development and governance of Indian education programs. It can be concluded that each group has the same perception concerning Indian Education Advisory Committee participation level in program development and governance of Indian education programs.

$H_0 3^a$ was accepted among the three groups in Eastern Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the method to employ to assure participation by

Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the decision making areas of program development and governance of Indian education programs. Only two items produced a statistically significant difference which could have contributed to the rejection of $H_0 3^a$ on the method to employ to assure the Committee participation. These items were:

1. (V) Employ an outside consultant.
2. (X) Consider starting an Indian school.

Significant differences within the groups were produced between the school board presidents and the educational administrators in 2 out of 8 comparisons, and between the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons and the school board presidents in 0 out of 8 comparisons. The conclusion can be drawn that the three groups agree that all mechanisms to assure Indian Education Advisory Committee involvement already exist within the present administrative framework of the school district, so that employing outside consultants and/or starting Indian schools are not necessary.

$H_0 3^b$ was rejected on the basis of significant differences noted among the three groups in Western Oklahoma--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--regarding the methods to employ to assure participation. These differences were identified in the following items:

1. (Q) Holding open committee meetings.

2. (U) Meeting regularly with professional staff.

3. (W) Contacting appropriate federal agency.

Disagreement in these areas was most prevalent between the school board presidents and the educational administrators (3 out of 8 comparisons). Since only one of the items dealt with an outside solution (Item W) the conclusion can be drawn that appropriate methods of participation are known but are not employed within the schools. There was general agreement among the three groups that the appropriate method to employ to assure Indian Education Advisory Committee participation was to meet regularly with educational administrators.

The findings of this study indicate that differences among the three groups--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators--exist but that the differences may not preclude the three groups being able to work together successfully within each local school district. Successful interaction between the groups could be facilitated, however, and the following recommendations are offered toward that end.

Recommendations

This study suggests that Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board presidents, and educational administrators need to re-examine their roles in relation to Indian education programs in public schools. Based upon

the findings of this study, recommendations regarding role clarification and preparation are as follows:

1. Institutions which prepare school administrators should prepare units or courses on federal Indian policy as part of the certification qualification process.

2. School administrators should be provided opportunities for group process or human relations training as part of the certification process for school administrators.

3. The State School Board Association should provide a workshop for local school board members in Indian policy and law.

4. The State School Board Association should invite the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons of each district to attend the annual State School Board Association meeting.

5. Each local school district should incorporate into their school district policy the functions, roles, and limitations of Indian Education Advisory Committees.

6. The school board of each school district with Indian education programs should extend an invitation to the Indian Education Advisory Committee chairperson to sit on the board as an ex officio, nonvoting member.

7. The State Board of Education should adopt a philosophy to encourage the involvement of the Indian Education Advisory Committee in program development and governance of Indian education programs.

8. The State Department of Education should provide training opportunities to the Indian Community in State school law, finance, teacher certification requirements, and State Board regulations.

9. The State Department of Education should provide teachers in public schools with training in Native American studies.

10. Local school districts should involve the Indian Community in developing their local school board policies.

11. The local Indian Education Advisory Committee chairperson should be included on screening committees to select administrative personnel.

12. Each Indian Education Advisory Committee should host a series of meetings for the Indian Education Advisory Committee members, school board members, teachers, and educational administrators to get acquainted and exchange ideas, either prior to or immediately following the beginning of the school term.

13. Indian Education Advisory Committee members should not limit themselves to participation in Indian programs, but should seek involvement in the total school program.

14. Indian Education Advisory Committees and educational administrators should strive to have only one elected Indian Education Advisory Committee that governs all Indian education programs in the school.

15. Each group should develop their roles in relation to the zone of acceptance concept. Each should recognize their areas of expertise and should determine which decision making areas are most relevant to them. The educational administrator should then employ the participative management approach to involve the Indian Education Advisory Committee members in the total school program.

Implications for Future Research

The findings of the research indicate that mere publication of federal regulations about Indian education programs does not guarantee that the educational personnel responsible for implementing those regulations will become informed about them or will be accountable regarding implementing the regulations. The findings of this study indicate that the three groups surveyed--Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, school board presidents, and educational administrators --appear to differ in their perception of the extent to which each of them should be involved in the various aspects of information dissemination and implementation of these federal regulations. A general observation is that school board presidents and Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons, whose function is to become informed about these regulations and to advise educational personnel about the

implementation of these regulations, perceive school board presidents as somewhat obstructionist in the area of Indian education program regulation implementation. However, this perception of Indian Education Advisory Committee chairpersons may be inaccurate, in that school board presidents may not be informed about federal regulations concerning Indian education programs, and their inexperience is therefore interpreted as (1) disinterest in Indian education programs, and (2) desire to retain total control of school district policy in this area. The influence of ethnicity may or may not be applicable here. The implications for future research can be framed as follows:

1. What is the level of knowledge school board presidents have concerning Indian education program regulations as compared to the level of knowledge of Indian Education Advisory Committees about the same regulations?
2. What is the level of knowledge of Indian Education Advisory Committees concerning the factors influencing school board policy in areas not related to Indian education programs but which might impinge upon the implementation of federal regulations about Indian education?
3. Is ethnicity a factor of any importance in the interactions of school boards and Indian Education

Advisory Committees when:

(a) the school board president is non-Indian;

(b) the school board president is Indian.

Differences were noted among the three groups concerning the importance of written policies governing the involvement of Indian Education Advisory Committees, and the degree of actual involvement of the Committees. This suggests that each of the three groups had different perceptions of the role definition, content, and function of the Indian Education Advisory Committee. The implication for future research is in the area of federal regulation implementation. A research question can be framed as follows:

1. What should be the involvement of each of the three groups in the development and application of implementation guidelines for federal regulations regarding Indian education programs in the areas of:

   (a) school district policy formulation;

   (b) program development;

   (c) curriculum content.

References

Barnard, C. I. The Function of the Executive. Cambridge: Howard University Press, 1938, 190-191.

Brameld, T. Philosophies of Education on Cultural Perspective. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1950, 102-103.

Bridges, E. M. "A Model for Shared Decision-Making in the School Principalship." Education Administration Quarterly, 1967, 3, 45-61.

Bridges, E. M. "Subjective and Objective Aspects of Demands for Involvement." Administrators Notebook, 1969, 17, No. 6.

Butler, B. Personal Interview. Oklahoma State Department of Education, Johnson O'Malley Department. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, December 11, 1979.

Chavers, Dean. "The Revolution in Indian Education." Presented at the Seventh Annual Symposium on the American Indian. Tahlequah: Northeastern Oklahoma State University, April 5, 1979, 15.

Coch, L., and French, J. P., Jr. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." Human Relations, 1948, No. 4, 512-532.

Controller General Report to the Congress of the United States, The Indian Self-Determination Act--Many Obstacles Remain. March 1, 1978, 1, 2-36.

Dean, S. B. Indian Education Amendments of 1978. The Coalition News, January-February, 1979, No. 1 and 2, 1-2, 3, 1, and 4.

Demmert, W. G., Jr., Ed.D. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Education Programs for Indian Students. A report to the Symposium on Indian Education, 1979, 31.

Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., and Donnelly, J. H., Jr. Organization Behavior, Structural Processes. Dallas, Texas: Business Publication, Inc., 1976, 357-358.

Griffiths, D. E. "Administration As Decision Making." Administrative Theory in Education. New York: MacMillan Company, 1967, 123.

Gross, M. P. Texas Law Review. August, 1978, 56, Number 7, 1204, 1205, and 1212.

Havinghurst, R., Jr., Director of Meeting. A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. Special Senate Sub-Committee Report on Indian Education, S. Rep. No. 501, 91st Congress, 1st Session, 1969, 21, 30.

Holloman, C., and Henrick, C. "Adequacy of Group Decisions As a Function of the Decision Making Process." Academy of Management Journal, June, 1972, 175-184, 178.

Homan, S. Personal Interview. Oklahoma State Department of Education, Title IV, Part A, Technical Assistance Department. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, December 11, 1979.

Hoy, W. K., and Miskel, C. G. Educational Administration Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978, 212-235.

Ittelson, W. H., and Cantrel, H. Perceptions. New York: Random House, 1954, 124.

Kyl, J. Letter from John Kyl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior to James A. Haley, Chairman of the Committee. Hearing on House Resolution 7421 before Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and Insular Affairs, June 27, 1973, 93rd Congress.

Lawrence, Paul R. "How To Deal with Resistance to Change." Howard Business Review, XXXII (July-August, 1954), 51.

Likert, R. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964, 224-234.

Likert, R. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967, 47.

Livingston, R. T. "The Theory of Organization and Management." Transactions of the ASME, May, 1953, 659.

McCammy, J. L. "Analysis of the Process of Decision Making." Public Administration Review, 1947, VII, No. 1, 41.

Old Shield, E. O. Personal Interview. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Johnson O'Malley Office, Anadarko, Oklahoma, February 1, 1980.

Public Law 93-638 (Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act). 93rd Congress, S. 1017, 25 USC 450, January 4, 1975, Vol. II, No. 2, 1-15, 6-8.

Scanlan, Burt K. Principles of Management and Organizational Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973, 131.

Schneider, L. I. "A Proposed Conceptual Integration of Group Dynamics and Group Therapy." Journal of Social Psychology, 1955, 42, 173-187.

Selltiz, Claire, Johoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1959, 366, 368.

Selltiz, Claire, Wrightman, Lawrence S., and Cook, Stuart. Research Methods in Social Relations. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976, 190.

Simon, H. A. Administrative Behavior. New York: MacMillan Company, 1947, 1-78, 133, 134, 135, 241.

Simon, H. A. "Recent Advances in Organization Theory.: In Brooklyn lecture Research Frontiers in Politics and Government. Washington, D. C.: Brookinger, 1955, 28-29.

Steffens, J. Educational Values and School Boundary Permeability. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1976, 93.

Steffens, J. Personal Interview. American Indian Institute, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, December 11, 1979.

Swanson, G. E. "The Effectiveness of Decision Making Groups." Adult Leadership, 1959, 18, 48-52, 232.

Van Dalen, Deobald B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973, 205.

Watkins. "Termination of Federal Supervision: The Removal of Restrictions on Indian Property and Person." Texas Law Review, 1957, 311, Annals, 47, 55, 1208.

Zimmerman, Gordon I., Owen, James L., and Seibert, David R. Speech Communications. New York: West Publishing Company, 1977, 143, 145-146.

Appendix

A

EDUCATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Educational Administrator/Board of Education/Advisory Committee Participation

According to the regulations for Indian Education Programs, Indian Education Advisory Committee members are to be fully involved in policy and decision making concerning all aspects of the Indian Education Program at the local level. This questionnaire is designed to allow you to express your opinion regarding how you or the members of the local Indian Education Advisory Committee feel about their participation in the local decision making for Indian students in your school.

Your answers are needed. Your answers to this questionnaire will not be seen by anyone other than the researcher, and no names are to be used. Do not sign your name, but do provide the following information:

A. STATUS

[ ] Indian Education Advisory Committee Member

[ ] School Board Member

[ ] Educational Administrator

B. SCHOOL SIZE (total) ENROLLMENT

[ ] Less than 249

[ ] 250-999

[ ] 1000 +

C. AGE

[ ] Under 35

[ ] 35 and Older

D. SEX

Male [ ]

Female [ ]

E. COUNTY_____

F. INDIAN ENROLLMENT

Less than 200 [ ]

201-499 [ ]

500 + [ ]

EDUCATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Educational Administrator/Board of Education/Advisory Committee Participation

How important is this area to the Indian Education Advisory Committee? Circle one number for each statement.

The following are areas in which Indian Education Committee members may be involved. Read each statement item, then circle a number in the left column which tells how important you think involvement in that area is and then circle a number in the right column which shows how active the Committee has been in that area. Continue until each statement has two circles.

How much effort or participation has the Indian Education Advisory Committee made in this area? Circle one number for each statement.

IMPORTANCE					EFFORT			
Little	Some	Much	Great	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS	Little	Some	Much	Great
1	2	3	4	A. Make an annual assessment of Indian student learning needs.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	B. Recommend program curricula.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	C. Recommend textbooks and materials to be used in the program.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	D. Recommend teaching methods to be used.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	E. Recommend criteria for hiring staff.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	F. Develop list of qualified staff for required selection by program administrator.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	G. Approve budget preparation and execution.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	H. Have specific written policies covering the planning and development of educational programs.	1	2	3	4

IMPORTANCE					EFFORT			
1 Little	2 Some	3 Much	4 Great	EVALUATING PROGRAMS	1 Little	2 Some	3 Much	4 Great
				I. Participate in negotiations concerning contracts.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	J. Have access to budgets, reports, evaluations, surveys, and other program related documents.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	K. Request periodic reports and evaluations.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	L. Evaluate staff performance and program results.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	M. Hear grievances.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	N. Approve and disapprove programs.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	O. Recommend to proper authorities the cancellation or suspension of contract.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	P. Have specific written policies covering educational program implementation and committee involvement.	1	2	3	4
				IMPLEMENTING AND SPECIAL METHODS OF INVOLVEMENT				
1	2	3	4	Q. Hold open committee meetings.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	R. Secure a copy of the negotiated contract which includes program and budget.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	S. Meet and confer with local school board.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	T. Meet and confer with education administrator.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	U. Meet regularly with professional staff.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	V. Employ an outside consultant.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	W. Contact appropriate federal agency.	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	X. Consider starting an Indian school.	1	2	3	4

Appendix B

TABLE A

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REPRESENTED

Size of School District	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Less than 249	12 (13.3%)	4 (4.4%)	10 (11.1%)	26 (28.9%)
250 - 999	6 (6.7%)	23 (25.6%)	11 (12.2%)	40 (44.4%)
1000 +	12 (13.3%)	3 (3.3%)	9 (10.0%)	24 (26.7%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)

TABLE B

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY TOTAL INDIAN STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPRESENTED

Total Indian Enrollment	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Less than 200	17 (18.9%)	11 (12.2%)	19 (21.1%)	47 (52.2%)
201 - 499	4 (4.4%)	10 (11.1%)	7 (7.8%)	21 (23.3%)
500 +	9 (10.0%)	9 (10.0%)	4 (4.4%)	22 (24.4%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)

TABLE C

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY AGE

Age	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Under 35	5 (5.6%)	2 (2.2%)	8 (8.9%)	15 (16.7%)
35 and Older	25 (27.8%)	28 (31.1%)	22 (24.4%)	75 (83.3%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)

TABLE D

COMPOSITION OF EASTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY GENDER

Gender	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Male	7 (7.8%)	30 (33.3%)	28 (31.1%)	65 (72.2%)
Female	23 (25.6%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.2%)	25 (27.8%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)

TABLE E

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REPRESENTED

Size of School District	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Less than 249	2 (2.2%)	12 (13.3%)	7 (7.8%)	21 (23.3%)
250 - 999	17 (18.9%)	14 (15.6%)	12 (13.3%)	43 (47.8%)
1000 +	11 (12.2%)	4 (4.4%)	11 (12.2%)	26 (28.9%)
Column Total	30 (13.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90(100.0%)

TABLE F

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY TOTAL INDIAN STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPRESENTED

Total Indian Enrollment	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Less than 200	22 (24.4%)	27 (30.0%)	15 (16.7%)	64 (71.1%)
201 - 499	6 (6.7%)	3 (3.3%)	11 (12.2%)	20 (22.2%)
500+	2 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.4%)	6 (6.7%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)

TABLE G

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY AGE

Age	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Under 35	9 (10.0%)	5 (5.6%)	2 (2.2%)	16 (17.8%)
35 and Older	21 (23.3%)	25 (27.8%)	28 (31.1%)	74 (82.2%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)

TABLE H

COMPOSITION OF WESTERN OKLAHOMA STATUS GROUPS BY GENDER

Gender	Indian Educational Advisory Committee Chairperson	School Board Member	Educational Administrator	Row Total
Male	7 (7.8%)	28 (31.1%)	27 (30.0%)	62 (68.9%)
Female	23 (25.6%)	2 (2.2%)	3 (3.3%)	28 (31.1%)
Column Total	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	30 (33.3%)	90 (100.0%)