

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED TEACHER EMPOWERMENT
AND PRINCIPAL USE OF POWER

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this dissertation is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This dissertation does not include proprietary or classified information.

Jackie Daniel Lintner

Certificate of Approval:

William A. Spencer
Professor
Educational Foundations, Leadership
and Technology

Cynthia J. Reed, Chair
Associate Professor
Educational Foundations, Leadership
and Technology

Frances K. Kochan
Professor
Educational Foundations, Leadership
and Technology

Joe F. Pittman
Interim Dean
Graduate School

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED TEACHER EMPOWERMENT
AND PRINCIPAL USE OF POWER

Jackie Daniel Lintner

A Dissertation

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Doctor of Education

Auburn, Alabama
May 10, 2008

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED TEACHER EMPOWERMENT
AND PRINCIPAL USE OF POWER

Jackie Daniel Lintner

Permission is granted to Auburn University to make copies of this dissertation at its discretion, upon request of individuals or institutions at their expense. The author reserves all publication rights.

Signature of Author

Date of Graduation

VITA

Jackie Daniel Lintner, daughter of Jacqueline Stover Daniel and Melvyn Daniel, was born June 17, 1969, in Columbus Georgia. She graduated from Pacelli High School in 1987. She attended the University of Georgia and graduated in 1992 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Early Childhood Education. After graduation, she moved to Woodland, Georgia and taught first grade at Pine Ridge Elementary School in Ellerslie, Georgia. She then attended Columbus State University and graduated in 1994 with a Master of Education degree in Elementary Education. After teaching for several years, she attended Troy State University and graduated with a Specialist of Education degree in Elementary Education in 1998. In 2001, she began her doctoral studies at Auburn University. She married Chris Lintner on September 4, 2007. She has two daughters, Grace Elizabeth Metsinger and Kathryn Lane Metsinger and one step-son, James Lintner.

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED TEACHER EMPOWERMENT
AND PRINCIPAL USE OF POWER

Jackie Daniel Lintner

Doctor of Education, May 10, 2008
(Ed.S, Troy State University, 1998)
(M.Ed., Columbus State University, 1995)
(B.S., University of Georgia, 1992)

179 Typed Pages

Directed by Cynthia J. Reed

This study addresses the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. The continual cycle of education reform movements suggest that there is a need for principals to evaluate and re-define their leadership roles on a continuous basis. The expanded expectations and responsibilities placed on schools have seemingly created a need for school leadership to be shared or distributed among teachers and principals.

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. The study sought to identify the power bases teachers perceived their principals as operating from. It also sought to identify teachers' perceived levels of empowerment and possible hindrances and facilitators to

their empowerment. The six attributes of teacher empowerment are decision-making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and teacher impact. The five power bases are reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert.

Three school districts in Alabama participated in this study. Three types of data were collected. First, the Rahim Leader Power Inventory was used measure teachers' perceptions of the type of power base used by principals. Second, the School Participant Empowerment Scale was used to measure teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. Third, answers to open-ended questions were used to identify hindrances and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment not addressed on the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory.

The data suggest that most teachers from the participating counties perceive their principals as operating from a legitimate power base. Many teachers reported perceiving that their principals did not operate from a reward power base. Of the six subscales of teacher empowerment, it appears that the principal use of expert power and referent power have the highest relationship with teacher empowerment. Coercive and reward power bases are the least likely power bases to have significant impact on teacher empowerment. Themes that emerged from teacher feedback about empowerment were poor quality of administrative staff, standards, lack of communication, societal issues, and non-teaching duties. Teachers offered many insightful comments about how they view principal use of power. However, there were no themes that surfaced from their responses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to express how thankful I am to my mother, Jacqueline Stover Daniel, who instilled in me the importance of education at a young age. I also thank my dad, Melvyn Daniel and step-mother, Joyce Daniel for being my constant support system. I want my daughters, Grace and Kathryn, to know how grateful I am for their patience while I attended class, completed school assignments, and wrote this manuscript. My children are my inspiration and I hope that by watching me go through this process they too will be encouraged to seek higher education and never give up on reaching their goals.

I offer a special note of appreciation to Dr. Cynthia Reed for serving as my committee chairperson. Without her guidance, time, and constant support I could not have completed this project. I also thank Dr. William Spencer and Dr. Frances Kochan for their time serving on my committee. Their support and kindness made this project one of my best learning experiences. In addition, I wish to thank my outside reader, Dr. Mary Rudisill and Ms. Altamese Stroud-Hill for formatting this manuscript.

In conclusion, I want to thank my husband, Chris Lintner, who has been a constant source of encouragement, help and support. I thank him for helping me feel secure and loved as I worked through a sometimes lonely and isolating process.

Style manual or journal used: Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.)

Computer software used: Microsoft Word 2003,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xv
I. NATURE OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction to the Study	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem.....	10
Research Questions	11
Setting	12
Methodology	12
Significance of the Study	13
Limitations of the Study.....	15
Conceptual/Operational Definitions	16
Summary	17
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	18
Introduction.....	18
Theoretical Framework.....	19
Social Cognitive Theory	19
Motivational Theory	26
Trust and Hope.....	29
Shared Governance	32
School Climate.....	34
School Culture	36
Schools as Communities	39
Schools as Living Systems.....	42
Proposed Models of Educational Leadership	44
Instructional Leadership.....	47
Transformational Leadership.....	50
Moral Leadership.....	55
Participative Leadership.....	57

Site-Based Management	58
Managerial Leadership.....	59
Contingent Leadership	59
Leadership Belief Paradigms	60
Jürgen Habermas’ Three Paradigms	61
Senge’s Four Key Competencies	65
Structural, Human, Political and Symbolic Frames.....	66
The Conceptualization of Power Theory	67
Principals’ Use of Power	70
Empowerment.....	74
Teacher Empowerment	76
Dimensions of Teacher Empowerment.....	79
Decision-Making.....	80
Impact	81
Status.....	81
Autonomy	82
Professional Growth.....	83
Self-Efficacy.....	84
Teacher Leadership.....	84
Reasons for Teacher Empowerment	85
Barriers to Teacher Empowerment	87
Facilitating Factors of Empowerment.....	89
Summary	91
III. METHODOLOGY	93
Introduction.....	93
Ethical Issues	93
Design	94
Theoretical Framework.....	98
Attributes of Empowerment.....	99
Decision-making.....	100
Teacher-Impact	100

	Autonomy	100
	Status.....	101
	Professional Growth.....	101
	Self-Efficacy	101
	Principals' Use of Power	101
	Participants.....	102
	Data Collection Procedures.....	103
	Analysis.....	104
	Summary.....	104
IV.	FINDINGS	106
	Teachers' Perceptions of the Types of Power Used by Their Principals.....	106
	The Relationship between Levels of Principal Power as Perceived by Teachers and Perceived Level of Teacher Empowerment	108
	Teachers' Perceptions about Limitations and Facilitating Factors of Teacher Empowerment.....	110
	Decision-Making.....	110
	Impact	112
	Status.....	112
	Autonomy	113
	Professional Growth.....	115
	Self-Efficacy	116
	Other Dimensions of Teacher Empowerment.....	116
	Poor Quality of Administrative Staff.....	117
	Standards.....	117
	Lack of Communication	118
	Societal Issues.....	118
	Non-Teaching Duties	119
	Lack of Time.....	119
	Appropriate Discipline.....	120
	Coercive Power.....	120
	Reward Power.....	121
	Legitimate Power.....	122
	Expert Power.....	122
	Referent Power.....	123
	Other Dimensions of Principal Power	123
	Fairness	123
	Discipline	124
	Decision-making.....	125
	Consistency.....	125

Summary	126
V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	128
Synthesis of Key Findings	128
Discussion of the Findings.....	130
Implications of the Study	134
Recommendations for Principals, Principal Preparation Programs, and Policy Makers	137
Recommendations for Principals	137
Recommendations for Teachers.....	138
Recommendations for Principal and Teacher Preparation Programs	139
Recommendations for Policy Makers.....	140
Limitations of the Study.....	140
Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study	142
Summary	143
REFERENCES	145
APPENDICES	158
Appendix A: School Participant Empowerment Scale, Rahim Leader Power Inventory, and Open-Ended Questions.....	159
Appendix B: Auburn University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval Letter and Information Sheet	163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Habermas' Cognitive Interests and Educational Applications	63
Table 2	Administration Focus and Habermas' Human Interests	64
Table 3	Recoded Coercive Power Base	107
Table 4	Summary of First Canonical Root for Teacher Empowerment and Principle Power Bases	108

I. NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction to the Study

This study investigates the relationship between principal use of power and perceptions about teacher empowerment. This chapter provides background information about the study and information about the theoretical constructs used to frame the study. The purpose of the study, its significance, and research questions are also presented. A brief description of the methodology used in this study, its limitations, and a list of working definitions is provided.

Background of the Study

Society continually looks to the education system for guidance, answers and solutions to problems that affect the nation (Barth, 1990; Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Ferrandino, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1992). As a result, through the last quarter of the 20th century school systems have increased in complexity (Barth, 1990; Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Ferrandino, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1992). In response to the increased expectations placed on schools, there are two policy stances that have been developed-those that support standardization, accountability, and assessment and policies that support building capacity in educators and enabling good practice (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). Policies aimed at accountability and standardization arrived on the

educational scene with the successful launching of Sputnik in 1957, making school reform a significant concern in the United States (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). Some people feared the nation's public schools were not adequately preparing children to compete in the international marketplace (Briley, 2004; Eisner, 1992; Flynn, 1995; Howey, 1988; Short & Greer, 1997; Zuckerman, 1992). One step toward recovery was a strong commitment to advance the nation's public education system.

Decades later, in the mid 1980s, the country saw a rush to setting standards and implementing high stakes testing when *A Nation at Risk* claimed declining student achievement, decreasing teacher knowledge, and lax academic and behavioral standards as risks to the nation's economy and status in the world (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). The publication of *A Nation at Risk* reemphasized the need for educational reform aimed at winning the war against mediocrity in the nation's school system (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). At the same time *A Nation at Risk* was circulating, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty First Century* argued imposing standards was not enough to transform school; rather, it called for the strengthening of the teaching profession (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). This report summoned teachers to become leaders in curriculum, instruction, school redesign, and professional development. The report emphasized that the real power to improve achievement lay with teachers who needed to be entrusted with the responsibility and accountability for change (Lieberman & Miller, 2004).

The involvement of the federal government expanded greatly with the legislation *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Act of 2001. This legislation provided another widespread reform movement that appeared to exert strong pressure on the states to enforce strict

accountability in the form of standardized test scores and other benchmarks that are used to determine the comparative status of all schools (Keefe & Amenta, 2005).

The aspiration to reform schools has been a recurrent theme in American education (Eisner, 1992) as the nation looks to schools to best prepare students to meet the demands of modern-day society. These top-down types of reforms are among the most powerful influences on the education profession (Leithwood, 2001; Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995).

In the aftermath of school improvement initiatives aimed at “reform, restructuring, and reinvention” there has not been the great wave of school improvement expected (Pellicer, 2003, p. 138-139). Research informs us that there are several reasons for the lack of school improvement (Barth, 1990; Pellicer, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1992). First, in response to the reform movement brought on by *A Nation at Risk* educators and administrators simply did more of what they were already doing which created the same results (Pellicer, 2003). Second, society may be expecting too much from schools (Barth, 1990; Pellicer, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1992). For example, today’s students will need to graduate from high school prepared for a multifaceted world of work and citizenry with a command of modern technology, the ability to think through and solve complex cognitive problems, and a readiness to be flexible and adaptive (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). In addition to rigorous academic standards for graduation from high school, our education system is beleaguered by social problems such as alcohol and drug abuse, teen pregnancy, juvenile violence, adolescent suicide, homelessness, and poverty (Pellicer, 2003). “If one considers the range of social problems facing our youth and then places

them in the context of the academic demands of an increasingly complex, modern society, then the enormity of the task begins to take form” (Pellicer, 2003, p. 142).

Third, Barth (1990) contends that “insufficient attention has been given to the important relationships among the adults within the school and to a consideration of how the abundant untapped energy, inventiveness, and idealism within the schoolhouse might be encouraged” (p. xiv). Only changes originating from within the school are expected to bring about sustained improvement (Barth, 1990). The key to improving schools from within is to build collegial relationships among teachers and between teachers and the principal (Barth, 1990).

The continual cycle of education reform movements have led to the conceptualization of schools as dynamic institutions that must constantly evolve to meet the demands of an ever-changing, complex world, making it necessary for principals to evaluate and re-define their leadership roles on a continuous basis (Archer, 2002; Ferrandino, 2001; Hallinger, 2003; Hager & Scarr, 1983; Senge, 2000; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971; Short, 1998). While the intent of the nation to improve its system of education has been creditable, age-old traditions governing teachers and teaching systems still stand as barriers to substantial reform (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). In many cases, the changing demands of our educational system, as well as new technologies in education, have rendered ineffectual the old and more traditional approaches to education (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Sergiovanni (1992) states, “The standard recipe (for leadership) does not quite work as well as it used to. The times are different, and the people are different” (p. 69). Society has changed drastically over the past 100 years, yet schools, for the most part, are operating on nineteenth-century bureaucratic, mechanistic

models that cast principals in the role of management and teachers in the role of labor (Pellicer, 2003). Bennis (1991) states, “By paying attention to what is changing today, we know what we must do better tomorrow” (p. 22).

Hierarchical, bureaucratic, and authoritative structures of education have been recounted throughout history in scholarly writing. For instance, John Dewey (1940) observed the educational structure was to have “one expert dictating educational methods and subject matter to a body of passive recipient teachers” (p. 64). Dewey describes the general attitude toward teachers of his time period; “It is asserted that the existing corps of teachers is unfit to have a voice in the settlement of educational matters” (p. 67). In addition, Theodore Sizer (1983) notes that school systems are arranged in, “pyramid tiers, with governing boards and administrators at the peaks and the classrooms at the base” (p. 206). The Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession echoes the same points; the bureaucratic management of schools denies teachers the opportunities for their voices to be heard in educational matters (Text of the Carnegie Report, 1986). Teachers are authority figures in the classroom and responsible for student instruction and achievement, yet some believe that in the larger educational hierarchy they are rarely trusted with the selection of teaching texts and programs and remain isolated and powerless (Kreisberg, 1992; Sizer, 1983).

In addition to educational reform movements and increased expectations placed on schools, administrators of the 21st century face complex challenges such as inadequate funding, high drop-out rates, unsafe school environments, student behavior problems, and increasing cultural diversity in schools and communities. Meeting these challenges is even more taxing in an atmosphere of intense pressure created by the need to meet

national and state standards measured typically by standardized test scores (Archer, 2002; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Earl & Fullan, 2003; Ferrandino, 2001; Greenfield, 1995; Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Senge, 2000; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971; Short, 1998). In addition, schools are multifaceted because of the sophistication of their technology and the diversity of their mission (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971). In a study of the changing face of the principalship in Alabama, Kochan, Spencer, and Mathews (1999) found that the role of principals in Alabama has become more complex and stressful mainly due to external pressures, particularly those related to state mandates, the budgeting system, and accountability measures. Research informs us that principals today face increased job complexity, rising standards, and greater demands than those of the industrial-age (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Ferrando, 2001). However, despite reform initiatives, schools in general remain modeled after the industrial, mechanistic way of conducting business (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Senge, 2000).

The expanded expectations and responsibilities placed on schools have created a need for school leadership to shift from a top-down style to shared or distributed leadership (Barth, 2001; Blasé & Blasé, 1994; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Earl & Fullan, 2003; Evans, 1996; Ferrandino, 2001; Kochan & Reed, 2004; Lambert, 2002; Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Short, 1998; Smith, 2001; Wynne, 2001). The expanded job responsibilities of principals today simply are not achievable by one person (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Ferrandino, 2001). Schools need a much different kind of leadership than the autocratic dictatorship of the industrial age (Greenfield, 1995; Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Murphy, 1991; Senge, 1990, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000).

By encouraging the development of the abilities and skills of students, parents, and teachers, principals can begin to build shared leadership (Darling-Hammond, 1993; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Lucas & Valentine, 2001). Kochan, Spencer, and Mathews (1999) state that the stress principals feel may be minimized by reorganizing the tasks and responsibilities within the principalship, lessening the demands principals face so that leaders' energies may be used to improve instruction, enrich learning and teaching environments, and to build support for schools in the larger community. Therefore, a new style of leadership is needed that engages all school participants in problem solving, creating opportunities, and overcoming barriers to student learning (Short, 1998; Smith, 2004). Educational leaders are being asked to both relinquish and allocate power "with" rather than holding power "over" teachers in the belief that power sharing will release the potential of teachers to effect the improvement of schools and student achievement (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996).

In a systematic effort to appropriately frame effective leadership and improve supervisory effectiveness, theories have been proposed that have been combined and related to concepts and ideas from other areas in the social sciences (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971). Dissatisfaction among scholars regarding progress in understanding leadership and in helping practitioners improve leadership ability is legendary (Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984). However, many researchers hold constant that school success is dependent upon a positive relationship between the principal and teachers (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Combs, Miser, & Whitaker, 1999; Hip, 1997; Short & Johnson, 1994).

The sharing of power with teachers is often seen as fundamental to the success of site-based management and shared decision-making. Schools that are successfully restructuring seem to be distinguished by high levels of administrator-teacher collaboration in leadership (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998). As a result, the relationship between principal use of power and teacher empowerment has become part of today's rhetoric in education (Gonzalas & Short, 1996; Lightfoot, 1986; Short & Johnson, 1994).

Teacher empowerment is considered by some to be a basic element of school reform (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996). Ironically, the issue of increased teacher monitoring has surfaced simultaneously with increasing pressure for accountability (Kreisberg, 1992). The National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the United Federation of Teachers support teacher empowerment as a local, state, and national goal (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Principals are being asked to create conditions that will foster the empowerment of teachers to take advantage of the move toward site-based management and shared decision-making structures (Lucas & Valentine, 2001). Research indicates that there is an interest in how principals can foster the empowerment of teachers to assume various leadership roles in the school, thus lessening the burden on themselves to manage all school business (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Lieberman & Miller, 2004). As stated earlier, schools face complex issues requiring leaders to create school environments that enhance the capacity of teachers to take charge of their professional growth and to utilize opportunities for competencies to be developed and demonstrated; thus, lessening the burden on themselves to be "superleaders" (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Short, 1994).

Sergiovanni (1992) states:

In schools, this means that, instead of worrying constantly about setting the direction and then engaging teachers and others in a successful march (often known as planning, organizing, leading, motivating, and controlling), the leader can focus more on removing obstacles, providing material and emotional support, taking care of the management details that make the journey easier, sharing in the comradeship of the march and in the celebration when the journey is completed, and identifying a new, worthwhile destination for the next march. (pp. 43-44)

A key element in understanding how principals can build leadership capacity in teachers is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Short, 1998). Taking an in-depth look at principal power and its relationship to teacher empowerment may lead to a better understanding of how to build successful, empowered, high-performance organizations, where principals share their power and “distribute leadership out to the far reaches of the organization” (Wren, 1995, p. 459). Thus, principals and teachers together, can successfully maneuver the constant change and complexity of the nation’s public education system to bring about improved student achievement and competencies to meet the demands of the 21st century workplace (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Short, 1994).

Without teachers and principals working together in an environment based on trust and respect, it seems that the most dedicated boards of education, restructuring initiatives, and reform movements will fail to improve school performance (Blasé & Blasé, 2003; Brouillette, 1997). According to Senge, “any system of hierarchical control,

even if it has very good people, is subject to abuse” (2000, p. 45). Bureaucratically organized school environments deny teachers autonomy and control, thus negatively affecting principals’ and teachers’ productivity and commitment (Gonzales & Short, 1996). With inappropriate use of administrative power comes a ripple effect that not only impacts teachers’ relationships with colleagues and family, but also their sense of empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2003).

Statement of the Problem

The mysteries of the interactions of power, authority, and teacher empowerment continue to intrigue social scientists (Sergiovanni, Bulingam, Coombs, & Thurston, 1987). A review of the literature indicates that principal use of power influences teacher empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Kreisberg, 1992; Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Therefore, it is important to gain an understanding of the relationship between perceptions about principal use of power and teacher empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Short & Moore, 1996).

A main force driving the empowerment movement in education is teacher effectiveness (Short & Johnson, 1994; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). An important assumption is that teachers who design and control their educational services are more effective than teachers who feel isolated and powerless (Blasé & Blasé, 1994; Kanungo, 1992; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998).

Teacher empowerment encourages teacher effectiveness, which some claim leads to improved student learning (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Karent,

1989). When teachers are more effective, student achievement, responsiveness to student conflict, teacher satisfaction, and the school environment are likely to improve (Short & Johnson, 1994).

In addition, according to some research, the outcomes of teacher empowerment are high energy levels, positive attitudes, high productivity and commitment to education (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Short, 1998). School environments prosper when teachers are active participants in school business and decision-making (Gonzales & Short, 1996). According to McGreal (1983), the relationship between a principal and teachers has a pivotal effect on instructional effectiveness. In their research on teacher empowerment and successful empowering principals, Blasé and Blasé (2001) reported that principal leadership is the largest contributor to teachers' sense of empowerment. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the relationship between principals' use of power and teachers' perceived levels of empowerment (Gonzales & Short, 1996).

Research Questions

The following research questions guide this study:

1. What are teachers' perceptions of their own level of empowerment as measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale?
2. What is the relationship between levels of principal power as perceived by teachers and their perceived level of teacher empowerment as measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory?

3. In addition to what is addressed on the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, what do teachers view as limitations and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment?

Setting

This study was conducted in three school districts in Alabama. The first school system consisted of 2,415 students in 8 schools encompassing grades K–12. The school district had 94% of the student body eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. The second school system consisted of 3,389 students in 6 schools encompassing grades K–12. The school district had 50% of the student body eligible for free and reduced-price lunch. The third school district consisted of 10,213 students in 15 schools including grades PreK–12. The school district had 42% of the student body eligible for free and reduced-price lunch.

Methodology

This study investigated the relationship between principal use of power and teacher empowerment as perceived by teachers. Three school systems in Alabama agreed to participate in this study. The research packet which included the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI), The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), an invitation to participate in focused group interviews, and two open-ended questions were sent to each system's county office. From the county offices the research packets were distributed to each school where they were placed in teachers' mailboxes.

Three types of data were collected. First the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) was used to measure teachers' perceptions of the type of power base used by

principals. Second, the School Participation Empowerment Scale (SPES) was used to measure teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. Third, open-ended questions were included in the survey packet to add richness to the data in the quantitative analysis. These questions asked teachers to further explain any hindrances or facilitators that impacted their perceptions about their levels of teacher empowerment in addition to the items addressed on the RLPI and the SPES.

Significance of the Study

This study adds to the body of research about the relationship between principal use of power and teacher empowerment. Principal use of power and teacher empowerment have been the subjects of considerable educational research in recent years (Gonzales & Short, 1996; Kreisberg, 1992; Lightfoot, 1986; Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995; Short & Johnson, 1994), but the relationship between the two concepts has received limited empirical attention (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). This study explores the relationship between principal use of power and perceived teacher empowerment. In other words, this study identifies dimensions of principal power that are promoters and limiters of perceived teacher empowerment.

Research indicates that principals, when leading in isolation, can no longer handle the demands of school leadership adequately (Barth, 2001; Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Earl & Fullan, 2003; Evans, 1996). As schools continually become more complex, it is apparent that the autocratic, bureaucratic models of schooling may not work effectively over the long term (Gonzales & Short, 1996).

Research informs us that when principals set the stage for teacher empowerment, teachers tend to be more effective and student achievement, responsiveness to student conflict, teacher satisfaction, and the school environment tends to improve (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Short & Johnson, 1994). Furthermore, the schools that are most successful in times of change and complexity are the ones where teachers feel empowered (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Sergiovanni, 2004; Short, 1998). However, the professional literature suggests failures in initiating active teacher involvement in decision making may be because principals lack the specific leadership skills and basic knowledge essential to planning and change in shared governance (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Kreisberg, 1992). It is important to take an in-depth look at the relationship between principal use of power and perceived teacher empowerment in hopes of gaining a better understanding of the principal power bases teachers perceive as empowering.

Short and Johnson (1994) conducted a study that explored the links among teacher empowerment, leader power, and conflict. A multiple regression analysis with Pillai's criterion was conducted to check if the independent variables, the five power bases and three conflict scales, were significantly related to the dependent variable of teacher empowerment. Results from the analysis using a composite empowerment score for the dependent variable showed a significant change when each of the dependent variables (the subscales of teacher empowerment) was added to the equation. A positive Beta coefficient indicated a positive relationship between teacher empowerment and legitimate power. The principal's legitimate power base was a significant predictor in three of the School Participant Empowerment Scale subscales of status, self-efficacy, and impact in the multiple regression analysis.

In addition, Gonzales and Short (1996) conducted a study that investigated the relationship between principal use of power and teacher empowerment in an urban school district in the south. The study consisted of 301 teachers from 6 elementary, 5 middle, and 3 high schools. Using a multiple regression analysis, Gonzales and Short (1996) found that expert, referent, and reward power bases made significant contributions to the variance in teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. Stimson and Appelbaum (1988) found that teachers normally view their principals as relying on personal power rather than positional power. Teachers in their study were more satisfied with principals who relied on personal power. This study which is an extension of the Gonzales and Short (1996) study, may add to the body of research about the relationship between principal power bases and teacher empowerment.

Limitations of the Study

This was an exploratory study limited to three school districts in Alabama. Therefore, conclusions can not be generalized from the target population to other populations (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002). This study also asked open-ended questions; therefore, the reader must consider that reliability is in the credibility of the researcher and the openness and honesty of the respondents when answering the open-ended questions. In addition, all survey data were self-reported with results based on the assumptions that the participants were thoughtful, honest and worked independently when giving responses.

Initially, the research was designed to mail the research packets to each participant. However, there was a concern about giving out personal information to the

researcher. Jaeger (1984) names several disadvantages to surveys. First, respondents may contaminate the study because of their lack of interest in the topic. Second, surveys often have a low return rate. Third, sometimes it is unclear to participants who should answer the survey. Fourth, many times respondents do not open the survey because it appears to be junk mail.

In order to counteract disadvantages of the mailed survey the following precautions were taken:

1. A current list of full time faculty was obtained from the superintendents' offices upon their agreement to participate in the research project.
2. The document was mailed in a high quality envelope. The researcher's name was professionally printed on the return envelope.
3. A short vita about the researcher, a self-addressed, stamped, return envelope, and a personal letter addressed to the respondent explaining the nature of the research was included in the packet along with the required letter of informed consent.

Conceptual/Operational Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are described conceptually followed by operational definitions. Reference books, selected documents, and personal interpretation from the literature serve as the source for these definitions.

Principal Power Bases: Five types of influence and authority available to principals-reward, coercive, legitimate, connection, and expert power (French & Raven, 1958). Principal use of power is operationally defined as the score on the Rahim Leader

Power Inventory (RLPI). The five types of power bases, as conceptualized by French and Raven (1959) and again by Raven (1992) are as follows:

- *Reward Power*: Power based on the perceptions that the leader has the ability to provide tangible or intangible rewards;
- *Coercive Power*: Power based on the perceptions that the leader has the ability to punish;
- *Legitimate Power*: Power based on the perception that the leader has the right to influence compliancy;
- *Referent Power*: Power based on the leader's identification with or desires to be associated with followers;
- *Expert Power*: Power based on the perceptions that the leader can provide special knowledge.

Teacher Empowerment: Process by whereby teachers develop the competence to take charge of their own growth, resolve their own problems, and to be given opportunities to display these competencies within the school (Short, 1994, 1998) in the pursuit of overall improvement in the educational process (Smith & Lotven, 1993).

Teacher empowerment is operationally defined as the score on the School Participation Empowerment Scale (SPES).

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between principal use of power and teacher empowerment. Chapter I presented an overview of the study. Chapter II presents a review of literature on relevant topics informing this study including the

theoretical underpinnings of this study, proposed models of educational leadership, proposed models of principal power bases, belief paradigms, dimensions of teacher empowerment, and facilitating factors and barriers for teacher empowerment.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature that addresses the theoretical foundations of this study. Thus, this literature review is not meant to be an exhaustive examination of the literature related to this study, but rather, is intended to illustrate the research guiding the research design and interpretation of key findings.

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section addresses the theoretical underpinnings of this study. The second section provides a brief description of proposed models for framing leadership practice. Section three addresses leadership belief paradigms. Section four summarizes the models of principal power bases. Section five discusses the dimensions of teacher empowerment. The researcher presents for consideration relevant concepts, theories, belief paradigms, and frameworks from the professional literature that should aid leaders and educators in critically examining approaches taken to promote teacher empowerment. It is believed that principals will improve ways of constructing meaningful teacher empowerment if they reflect critically about their leadership power using a knowledge base directly relevant to this challenge (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

Theoretical Framework

In research there are many theoretical underpinnings for the study of principal power and teacher empowerment. This study builds upon assumptions addressed through social cognitive theory, motivational theory, aspects of trust and hope, shared-governance, school culture and climate, schools as communities, and schools as living systems.

Current research literature confirms that empowerment extends well beyond participation in decision-making. It requires teachers to feel like knowledgeable professionals motivated in an atmosphere of trust and respect where people work together. Having a knowledge base about the following theoretical frameworks may aid educational leaders as they build the foundation for teacher empowerment.

Social Cognitive Theory

This research is theoretically grounded in teacher self-efficacy theory which is a significant part of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. The purpose of this section is to offer a basic explanation of Social Cognitive Theory as it encompasses self-efficacy and its relationship to teacher self-efficacy and empowerment.

Social cognitive theory distinguishes among three intentional influences on peoples' lives that Bandura (2002) refers to as modes of agency. The modes of agency are personal agency which is exercised individually; proxy agency in which people acquire desired outcomes by influencing others to act on their behalf; and collective agency in which people act in concert to shape their future (Bandura, 2002). In personal agency which is exercised individually, people have direct influence on themselves and their environment in managing their lives.

When people do not have direct control over the social conditions and institutional practices that govern their everyday lives, they seek their well-being and desired life outcomes through the exercise of proxy agency. In proxy agency, people who have access to resources, expertise or who have influence and power are sought out when obtaining desired outcomes (Bandura, 2002). Many of the things people want are attainable only through socially interdependent efforts requiring people to pool their knowledge, skills, and resources; provide mutual support; form alliances; and work together to gain what cannot be accomplished independently (Bandura, 2002). Therefore, successful functioning requires a blend of the three different modes of agency (Bandura, 2002).

Self-efficacy is a key construct in social cognitive theory. Among the mechanisms of human agency, none is more central or all-encompassing than the beliefs of self-efficacy (Bandura, 2002). Beliefs of self or personal efficacy play an important role in work-related activities (Bandura, 1997, 2002). Influences and motivators are grounded in the fundamental belief that people have the power to bring about desired results by their actions. Self-efficacy beliefs regulate human performance through cognitive, motivational, affective, and decisional processes (Bandura, 2002). Therefore, self-efficacy beliefs affect whether individuals think in self-enhancing or self-debilitating ways. Self-efficacy beliefs affect how well people motivate themselves and persevere in times of difficulties, as well as the quality of emotional life, and the choices people make that set the direction of their lives (Bandura, 2002).

Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as, “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of

performances” (p. 391). Wood and Bandura (1989) expanded the definition of self-efficacy, stating “self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet situational demands” (p. 408). The fundamental premise of self-efficacy is that behavior is strongly influenced by self-influence (Kanfer & Kanfer, 1991). Task-motivated behavior and level of performance are beneficial correlates related to self-efficacy (Harrison, Rainer & Kelly, 1997; Kruger, 1997). Therefore, the self-efficacy construct has a high degree of importance as a basic element of individual behavior and attitudes in the work environment (Bandura, 1978).

Bandura (1986, 1997) proposes four sources of efficacy expectations: mastery experiences, physiological and emotional states, vicarious experiences, and social persuasion. First, mastery experience has been identified as the most powerful source of efficacy information in that the perception of a successful performance typically raises self-efficacy while the perception of failure lowers self-efficacy (Milner, 2002). Second, emotional arousal, either through excitement or anxiety, adds to the feeling of mastery or incompetence (Milner, 2002). Third, vicarious or secondhand experiences are those in which someone else models the tasks in question. When a person with whom the observer identifies performs well, the efficacy of the observer is often enhanced. When the model performs poorly, the efficacy expectations of the observer decrease. In other words, we learn how to perform certain tasks and the consequences of performing these tasks by watching others. Fourth, social persuasion may involve a “pep talk” or specific performance feedback. The influence of persuasion depends on the credibility, trustworthiness, and expertise of the persuader (Bandura, 1986, 1997; Milner, 2002).

Persuasive influences are those where others persuade a person to perform (Reames, 1997).

In relation to this study, based on the basic premise of self-efficacy, it stands to reason teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy will also perceive themselves as empowered. In addition, teachers who have a positive sense of self-efficacy believe they can have a positive effect on student learning. Therefore, a teacher's sense of efficacy is related to student motivation and achievement, teachers' adoption of new innovations, and classroom management strategies (Armor, 1984; Ashton, 1985; Midgley, Feldlaufer & Eccles, 1989; Woolfolk, Rossoff, & Hoy, 1990). On one level, empowerment is described as a psychological process connected with individuals' feelings of self-worth, self-confidence, and sense of efficacy (Kreisberg, 1992). Beliefs teachers have about their abilities influence their persistence, enthusiasm, and commitment to teaching (Milner, 2002). Moreover, levels of satisfaction, commitment, and efficacy are higher when work is conceived as professional and lower when work is perceived as bureaucratic (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). In addition, research links sense of efficacy with motivation and commitment to work as well as student achievement (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). Combs (1962) states that efficacy is a term all teachers should know because highly successful teachers have a strong sense of efficacy toward their students and themselves; they believe their students are capable of succeeding at an advanced level, and that they are capable of high quality instruction.

Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) view self-efficacy as a multi-dimensional construct, consisting of two carefully specified aspects of general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. Personal teaching efficacy is the perceived ability to motivate even the

most demanding students (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). General teaching efficacy is the perceived ability to overcome the confines of students' home environment and family backgrounds (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). According to these researchers, the dimensions of institutional integrity, principal influence, and academic emphasis are especially important in supporting personal and general teaching efficacy, as well as institutional health.

Newman, Rutter, and Smith (1989) found that teacher efficacy was most strongly affected by the disciplined behavior of students in the school, a sense that innovation and experimentation are encouraged, and a belief that administrators are helpful and understanding. Teachers' sense of self-efficacy was also positively influenced when teachers and administrators share a common goal of encouraging social and academic development in students (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983). Moreover, when teachers work in teams it creates a family-like structure where teachers take a positive approach to their profession (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983). Leaders who are enablers may aid in the development of a spirit of efficacy among teachers and students signifying that teachers, both individually and collectively, believe there is no student beyond their reach and there is no pedagogical problem they cannot solve (Starratt, 2004). As a result, teachers lead students to develop an attitude of efficacy- a belief of "I can do this" or "we can do this" (Starratt, 2004, p. 102).

Fuller, Wood, Rapport, and Dombusch (1982) provide a framework for relating teachers' sense of efficacy to school culture. They distinguish between organizational efficacy and performance efficacy. Organizational efficacy is having a sense of ability to gain rewards by influencing superiors within the school and performance efficacy is

perceived ability to perform one's own work tasks. The Fuller model (1982) suggests that aspects of the school structure may have differing effects on these two kinds of efficacy. Performance efficacy is assumed to be enhanced when (a) the roles and tasks of teachers and administrators are highly differentiated, where teachers can demonstrate and improve their competencies; (b) teachers and administrators are committed to common goals and the means to achieve them; (c) warm, caring relationships between and among teachers and administrators encourage the exchange of necessary school resources; (d) teachers believe the measures which are used to evaluate them are sound; and (e) varied evaluation criteria are applied (Fuller, Wood, Rapport, & Dombusch, 1982). Furthermore, teachers' performance efficacy is supported when teachers are clear about their responsibilities and the means to accomplish them, have access to the resources they need, and are evaluated based on outcomes that seem important to them (Fuller et al., 1982).

In summary, the self-efficacy component of social-cognitive theory serves as a primary determinant of task-motivated behavior and performance (Harrison, Allison, Rainer & Kelly, 1997). Hence, the self-efficacy construct has a high degree of importance as a basic element of individual behavior and attitudes in the work environment (Harrison et al., 1997). Self-efficacy is important in understanding human behavior, thus it is a vital factor in educational leadership as well as in teachers' perceptions of their level of teaching competence (Combs, Miser & Whitaker, 1999). As Arthur Combs (1999) wrote, "A positive sense of self is an enormous resource" (p. 65).

Motivational Theory

Motivation is what provides direction, intensity, and persistence to behavior. Further, motivation determines the chosen activity or task to engage in, establishes the level of effort to put forth, and determines the degree of persistence in completing the task (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1995). According to Bandura (1986), motivation is determined by people's judgments of the efficacy expectations, the competency to carry out a specific course of action, and their outcome expectations, the beliefs about the possible consequences of those actions.

It is important for leaders to become familiar with the major approaches to motivation which offer a variety of perspectives and ideas for influencing followers' decisions to choose, exert effort, or resist an activity (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1995). Many times the motivational strategies leaders choose are based on the belief that the goals of teachers and principals are not the same (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). In bureaucratic structures it is typically assumed teachers do not care as much about school success as do supervisors (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). "Thus, the basis for motivating teachers becomes a series of trades whereby the supervisors give to teachers things that they want in exchange for compliance with the supervisor's requests and requirements" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 294). In rethinking work motivation it is necessary to "rethink the practice of referring to teachers as professionals, yet considering their work as bureaucratic" (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 294). Principals who consider themselves leaders of professionals realize that teachers "create their practice as they practice" by being problem-solvers, researchers, decision-makers, and implementers (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 295).

Theories of motivation can be grouped into three categories (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). The first category relies on extrinsic rewards in return for work completed. In this category it is assumed that teachers have needs that can be met at work and that leaders control the events and circumstances that allow these needs to be met (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). Extrinsic rewards by themselves, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) contend are, “neither powerful enough nor expansive enough to provide the kind of motivational climate needed in schools” (p. 300). Furthermore, relying totally on extrinsic rewards to motivate discourages people being self-managed and self-motivated (Sergiovanni, 1992). The second category relies on teachers finding intrinsic satisfaction in work. Motivational psychologist Frederick Herzberg believed jobs that provide opportunities for experiencing achievement and responsibility, interesting and challenging work, and opportunity for advancement have the greatest capacity to motivate from within (Herzberg, 1966). The importance of intrinsically satisfying work makes sense because it leads to higher levels of commitment and performance (Sergiovanni, 1992). The third category of motivation theory relies on moral judgment—what is considered good and just gets done (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). In summary, the three categories can be communicated in the form of three motivational rules (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002):

1. What gets rewarded gets done.
2. What is rewarding gets done.
3. What is good gets done.

In addition, one of the most referenced frameworks of motivational theory is Maslow’s *Hierarchy of Needs* (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). According to Maslow,

people are motivated to satisfy five basic needs- the need for survival, the need for security, the need for affiliation with other people, the need to feel self-esteem, and the need for self-actualization (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1995). Maslow's conceptualization of needs is usually arranged in a hierarchy. According to Maslow, any person's behavior can be understood primarily as a directed effort to satisfy one particular level of need in the hierarchy. The level which happens to be motivating one's behavior at any time depends on whether the needs below have been satisfied (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1995). Maslow believes lower level needs must be satisfied before the next level becomes relevant (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1995). In other words, higher-order needs, like those of self-esteem and self-actualization, would not be important until lower level needs are satisfied. Thus, leaders may only be successful in motivating follower behavior by taking into account whether the follower's more basic needs are being met (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1995). "At all levels of the hierarchy, the leader should watch for mismatches between his motivational efforts and the followers' lowest unsatisfied needs" (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1995, p. 331).

According to perceptual psychology, motivation is an internal matter of individual wants, desires, needs, fears, and aspirations. People motivate themselves by forming beliefs about what they can do, anticipating likely outcomes, setting goals, and planning courses of action (Bandura, 1997). People's motivation is stronger when they believe they can attain goals. Self-efficacy beliefs determine the goals people set for themselves, how much effort they expend, how long they persevere, and how resilient they are in times of failure and setbacks (Bandura, 1997). It is important for educational leaders to realize that teachers are motivated; however, they may not always be motivated to do the

things others want them to do. The purpose of educational leadership is to facilitate learning and change to successfully achieve the goals of education (Combs, Miser & Whitaker, 1999). Motivation is linked to the views people have about their ability to accomplish a task, thus leaders desiring to create the conditions that will assist teachers to become empowered believe teachers are able and can accept the responsibility of shared decision-making.

Educational leaders should be keenly aware of how important self-concept is to others and help individuals seek ways to gain greater health and fulfillment (Combs, Miser & Whitaker, 1999). When educational leaders build teachers' self-concept in positive ways by trusting them to make decisions without controlling and manipulating them, they build motivation to accomplish school goals (Combs, Miser, & Whitaker, 1997). Teachers need autonomy to make professional decisions affecting their work with students. Imposing controls on and reducing professional autonomy diminishes teachers' feelings of positive self-concept and motivation (Combs, Miser, & Whitaker, 1999). Sergiovanni (1992) states that deep down we know what motivates and inspires, but "to tap these resources of motivation more fully we must embark on a journey to make school life more meaningful" and "we must become more authentic with ourselves and others" (p. 28-29).

Trust and Hope

Trust is the foundation for cooperation and effective communication; two essential aspects of teacher empowerment and shared governance (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Johnson & Johnson, 1987). The combination of respect and dignity, which is only facilitated in a trusting environment, is the essence of empowerment (Blasé & Blasé,

2001). Trust has been defined as the knowledge that one person, deliberately or consciously, will not take unfair advantage of another person, and any harm caused is expected to be repaired (McGregor, 1967). Trust has also been described as the amount of “safeness” we feel with others (Covey, 1989). In an atmosphere of trust, people are able to work together to identify and solve problems (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Covey, 1989). Blasé and Blasé (2001) believe that a trusting environment is one that shared governance oriented principals foster in schools to build teacher empowerment; however, for most members of school communities it is still an ideal, not a reality.

Johnson and Johnson (1987) described cooperative group work, essential to the success of schools, as encompassing both trusting behavior (openness and sharing) and trustworthy behavior (the expression of acceptance, support, and cooperative intentions). Blasé and Blasé (2001) stated that in effective shared governance, people recognize and strive to protect their trusting relationships.

For professionals to reach their full potential in the work place they must feel that they work in an environment of trust (Barth, 1990; Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Pellicer, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1992). Building trust in schools takes effort and sincerity (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Successful shared governance-oriented principals build trust by (a) encouraging openness, (b) facilitating effective communication, and (c) modeling understanding which is the cornerstone of trust (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). As principals strive to build trust, they keep three factors in mind; skills must be practiced, conflict is likely to occur, and teacher leaders must also be learners (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). In addition, Pellicer (2003) stated, “If you care about the right things and demonstrate that caring to those around

you, then they will trust you enough to grant you the permission that you need to lead” (p. 33).

Shared governance-oriented principals consistently provide teachers training in group process skills and regularly involve teachers in democratic, collaborative activities that increase teachers’ abilities and desires to cooperate in fulfilling the educational mission of the school (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Collaboration, engagement in social responsibility and commitment enable teachers to realize the immense possibilities for their schools (Barth, 1990). Such involvement also allows teachers to be creative, to avoid standard solutions or bureaucratic approaches to complex problems, and to achieve personal and social freedom (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

With teacher empowerment there is potential that values and beliefs will be revealed which may lead to the possibility for conflicts to arise (Rinehart, Short, & Johnson, 1994; Blasé & Blasé, 2001). It makes sense that in an open atmosphere characterized by interpersonal respect and trust, differences are naturally going to occur. Conflict is a positive force in schools when it is handled as an opportunity for growth and mutual support among professionals. In a trusting environment, where honest communication flourishes, teachers are able to delve into various solutions to issues to create better schools where all concerns, ideas, and needs are respected and all people strive to be their best (Barth, 1990; Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Pellicer, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1992).

Collegiality flourishes in an atmosphere of trust and hope. Collegiality among teachers is important for promoting exemplary working conditions and improving the practice of teaching (Barth, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992). The more collegiality is

established in schools, the more “natural connections among people become”, and the more people become self-driven and self-led, so that bureaucratic leadership becomes less necessary (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 86). Barth (1990) believed that the secret for a good school setting is collegiality. “Collegiality arises from the trust within a group; and trust is requisite when an institution — a school — depends on the honest expression of trust (Barth, 1990, p. xi).

Shared governance-oriented principals trust teachers to do what is best for children and a school’s success is attributed to the skills and attitudes of the professional staff, not merely the leadership capabilities of the principal (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Kreisberg, 1992). Communicating trust to teachers as true professionals is a fundamental element in the empowering and trust building process (Barth, 1990; Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Kresiberg, 1992). Teachers consistently associate autonomy with professionalism and trust (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). When there is positive rapport, trust, and respect between teachers and the principal, the likelihood of improved pedagogy and increased student achievement is almost assured (Zimmerman, 2003).

Shared-Governance

Shared governance, as it relates to this study, means teachers have control of and influence over events affecting themselves (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). “The impact of principals’ leadership on shared governance structures makes up a powerful and important characteristic of teacher empowerment” (Blasé & Blasé, 2001, p. 61). Through a shared governance structure, some of the major contributors of principals’ leadership on teacher empowerment are as follows:

- **Teacher Reflection** — Teachers become actively involved in considering their actions and the impacts of their actions on student learning and development. Teachers modify their instruction based on student outcomes and needs (Blasé & Blasé).
- **Teacher Motivation** — Teachers in shared governance schools have greater motivation and confidence (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).
- **A Sense of Team** — This refers to teachers' identification with school-based shared governance structures and processes as well as with other faculty and school administrators (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).
- **Ownership** — Ownership, a major component of teacher empowerment, resulted from principals' efforts to build school governance structures and refers to teachers' positive identification with and greater responsibility for shared governance structures and processes as well as the outcomes of these structures (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).
- **Commitment** — In shared governance structures teachers are dedicated and determined in the pursuit of educational improvement through group-level and individual-level empowerment.
- **Sense of Professionalism** — Teacher empowerment is associated with a greater sense of professionalism obtained from working with shared governance principals. Teacher professionalism refers to teachers who are trustworthy, and respectable individuals with the authority and the ability to make independent decisions and to participate responsibly in school wide governance processes (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

The concept of shared-governance fosters a culture in which faculty and others at the school feel empowered to have a voice (Reese, 2004). Effective school leadership is not the responsibility of one individual; rather, it should be a cooperative effort involving a number of individuals (Reese, 2004). The concept of shared governance can foster a culture in which all teachers feel empowered to have a voice (Kresiberg, 1992).

School Climate

An effective principal's most important job may be to ensure superior student instruction but the principal also, to a great extent, shapes the climate of the school (Wendel, Kilgore, & Spurzem, 1991). Successful educational leaders have a responsibility to promote a positive school climate by being open to feedback and knowing how to use their influence and power at appropriate times (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). "Considerate principal behavior motivates solidarity and cooperative expressive standards among teachers" (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993, p. 359). In addition, researchers have noted effective leaders' efforts to establish institutional climates where ethical practices, justice and caring flourish (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Katz, Noddings, & Strike, 1999; Starratt, 1994).

Woolfolk and Hoy (1993) prefer a health metaphor to describe school climate. The concept of health was developed to capture the nature of student, teacher and administrator interactions (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). The idea of a healthy school calls attention to factors that both facilitate and hinder the development of positive interpersonal relationships within schools (Hoy & Forsyth, 1985; Miles, 1969). "A healthy school is one where harmony pervades relationships among students, teachers, and administrators as the organization directs energies toward its mission" (Hoy

& Woolfolk, 1993, p. 356). Warm collegial relations and high academic expectations are also indicators of the health of a school and are associated with student achievement (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Therefore, healthy schools appear to be high-achieving schools. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) suspect that the relationship between efficacy and organization is reciprocal; climate affects a sense of efficacy, and efficacy affects perceptions of climate.

Woolfolk and Hoy (1993) identified six aspects of climate — three that help the organization meet instrumental needs (institutional integrity, academic emphasis and resource support), two that support expressive or interpersonal relations needs (morale and principal consideration) and principal influence with the dual function of serving both expressive and instrumental needs. The six dimensions of school health (climate) are:

- *Institutional integrity* is a school's ability to cope with its environment in a way that maintains the educational integrity of its programs. Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands.
- *Principal influence* is the principal's ability to influence the actions of superiors. Being able to persuade superiors, get additional consideration, and be unrestricted by the administrative bureaucracy are necessary skills to be effective as a principal.
- *Consideration* is principal behavior that is friendly, supportive, open, caring, and collegial. It represents an authentic concern of the principal for the wellbeing of the teachers.

- *Resource support* refers to a school where adequate classroom supplies and instructional materials are available and extra resources are easily supplied if requested.
- *Morale* is a collective sense of friendliness, openness, enthusiasm, and trust among faculty members. Teachers like each other, like their jobs, and help each other; and they are proud of their school and feel a sense of accomplishment in their jobs.
- *Academic emphasis* is the extent to which a school is driven by a mission for academic excellence. High, but achievable, academic goals are set for students, the learning environment is orderly, teachers believe in their students' ability to achieve; and students work hard and respect those who do well academically.

School Culture

Research informs us that leaders and teachers do not operate apart from the organizational culture (Deal & Peterson, 1999; Drake & Roe, 1999; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). All that happens in schools occurs in a cultural context (Drake & Roe, 1999). A basic understanding of school culture is needed to make sense of the intricate relationship between principal power and teacher empowerment because school culture plays the dominant role in an organization's performance (Deal & Peterson, 1999). Deal and Peterson (1999) state, "highly respected organizations have evolved a shared system of informal folkways and traditions that infuse work with meaning, passion, and purpose" (p. 1).

The concept of schools having distinctive cultures is not new in scholarly literature. School culture is extremely powerful yet undefined and is often left out of discussions about school improvement. Understanding the concept of school culture helps leaders better understand their school's own unwritten rules and traditions, norms, expectations, the way people act, what they talk about, whether they seek out colleagues for help and how teachers feel about their work and students (Deal & Peterson, 1999). Pfeifer and Baker (1986) conclude that effective school leaders are the ones who foster collaboration, shared decision making, and trust. An example of a school with a healthy culture is one where teachers and principals openly discuss classroom practices and pedagogy so that innovations can be embraced (Reames, 1997).

Of the many different conceptions of culture, none is universally accepted as the one best definition (Deal & Peterson, 1999). Schein (1985) provided a widely accepted definition naming culture "a pattern of basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems and that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive" (p. 12). Deal and Kennedy (1982) define it as the "shared beliefs and values that closely interweave a community." Others describe school cultures as "complex webs of traditions", symbols, norms, and rituals that have been built over time as teachers, students, parents, and administrators work together and deal with crises and accomplishments (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Drake & Roe, 1999; Schein, 1985). Deal and Peterson (1999) state, "Cultural patterns are highly enduring, have a powerful impact on performance, and shape the ways people think, act, and feel" (p. 4). Culture is the set of deep beliefs and

assumptions. It is “the story” that develops over time (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994, p. 21).

Numerous studies of school change have identified the organizational culture as critical to the successful improvement of teaching and learning (Fullan, 1998; Rossman, Corbett, & Firestone, 1988). Strong, positive, collaborative cultures have powerful effects on the following features of school:

- Culture fosters school effectiveness and productivity that helps to build motivation among teachers to persevere and improve upon their teaching strategies and abilities (Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Newmann, 1996; Purkey & Smith, 1983).
- Culture enhances collegial and collaborative activities that promote better communication and problem-solving practices (Little, 1982)
- Culture encourages successful change and improvement efforts (Little, 1982; Louis & Miles, 1990).
- Culture builds commitment and identification of staff, students, and administrators (Schein, 1985).
- Culture strengthens the energy, motivation, and vitality of a school staff, students, and community (Schein, 1985).
- Culture increases the focus of daily behavior and attention on what is important and valued (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Schein, 1985).

Goodlad (1984) considered examining school culture an important endeavor because on the surface schools may look the same, but when closely examined they are very

different. These differences, as subtle as they are, can decide the fate of the school (Reames, 1997).

Schools as Communities

Virtually all discussions of empowerment emphasize the importance of community — “of support and shared struggle in the process of empowerment” (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 20). “Community is the social matrix from which empowerment is nurtured and provides a base from which each person acts in the school” (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 122).

Individual empowerment is interwoven with community empowerment (Kreisberg, 1992). “Thus, the empowerment of an individual teacher is tied to the empowerment of all teachers in his or her school community” (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 20). According to Kreisberg, empowerment, “is often described as a process of individual and group transformation in which individuals and groups come to develop mastery of their lives and control of valued resources and to develop skills in interpersonal influence and participatory competence through group problem-solving and collective action” (p. 20). The implications for school leaders are that people within the school community need to be part of a group working toward common goals, sharing a set of common values within the school (Drake & Roe, 1999). Often “sense of community” is used to describe relationships among people and organizations. A school community is defined as a group of people who share common ideas about schooling and learning (Drake & Roe, 1999).

Additionally, Sergiovanni (1992) emphasized that the metaphor for schools should be communities rather than hierarchical bound organizations where principals are thought to know more than teachers. Moreover, he maintained that for teachers to reach

their full potential, efforts must be made to create learning communities where teachers feel respected and driven by a common desire to provide quality education for students. Communities inspire “commitment, devotion, and service that make schools unequaled in society’s institutions” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 16). Communities are defined by their centers, which are, according to Sergiovanni (1992), repositories of values, sentiments, and beliefs that unite people in a common cause. Centers govern the values of the school and provide norms that guide behavior and give meaning to school community life (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Teachers become more committed and self-managed when schools are true communities that free principals from the burden of trying to control people (Sergiovanni, 1992). He emphasized that when schools become communities rather than organizations, replacements for direct leadership are possible. The replacements are collective practice, professionalism, and collegiality (Sergiovanni, 1992). Further, these substitutions for direct leadership provide principals with more time for issues of substance such as finding the resources that teachers need, and ensuring moral, political, and managerial support for the school. As cited in Sergiovanni (1992) one principal states, “My role became acknowledger, supporter, reinforcer, and facilitator” (p. 42).

As schools become communities, the practice of teaching becomes less of an individual effort and more of a collective practice where there is concern for all students, not just “my class” or “my kids” (Sergiovanni, 1992). As the community ideal is established in schools, it is no longer acceptable not to reach out to others who are experiencing difficulty, to have effective teaching strategies and not share them with others, or to define success by what happens in one classroom (Sergiovanni, 1992). Being

a community of learners is, “a question of one for all and all for one” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 56). Further, in communities teachers who work collectively feel intrinsically obligated to do their best to make the school successful. Teachers follow a vision, not a person. Teachers are internally motivated which takes the pressure to motivate and manage off the principal. Bandura (1992) believed that a group operates through the behavior of its members. Bandura (1992) stated “It is people acting in concert on a shared belief, not a disembodied group mind, that is doing the cognizing, aspiring, motivating, and regulating. There is no emergent entity that operates independently of the beliefs and actions of the individuals who make up a social system” (p. 271). People’s shared beliefs in their collective efficacy influence the type of futures they want to achieve through collective effort; how well they use their resources; how much effort they put into their group tasks; their willingness to stay the course when group endeavors fail to produce quick results; and their vulnerability to the discouragement that can be overwhelming when solving difficult social problems (Bandura, 1997, 2002).

A strong sense of personal efficacy is valued in school communities because it is essential for success regardless of whether it is achieved individually or by group members putting their personal capabilities to the best collective use (Bandura, 2002). Bandura suggests group loyalty creates a sense of strong personal obligation to do one’s best in the interest of the group; members are respected for their personal contributions to group accomplishments, and people with resilient efficacy and strong pro-social purpose often subordinate self-interest to the benefit of others.

Empowering schools must be communities united around a core of values guided by a sense of hope and possibility and grounded in the belief of justice and democracy

(Kreisburg, 1992). Kreisburg states, “These communities must nourish the voices of all their members; they must provide contexts in which people can speak and listen, learn and grow, and let go of ideas in order to move on to better ideas” (p. 151).

Schools as Living Systems

According to Peter Senge (2000), schools are not broken and in need of fixing; rather they are institutions under stress that need to evolve to meet the challenges of our ever-changing society. In the book, *Schools That Learn*, Senge states that schools are in need of a new guiding metaphor other than the industrial age, mechanistic way of conducting business; the emerging understanding of living systems can guide the thinking of schools for the future.

The industrial-age, bureaucratic model of schools necessitates the educational system be divided into distinct parts controlled by leaders who view their main job as maintaining control (Senge, 2000; Whitaker & Moses, 1990). One proposed alternative to the industrial-age, mechanistic concept is to frame schools as living systems where people are not merely employees with specific work-related duties, but are well-rounded, capable people who are the sum of their parts (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971; Wren, 1995; Senge, 2000). As such, schools may be viewed as living organisms having a composite of characteristics much as people have a variety of personality traits (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971). Sergiovanni (2004) refers to teachers and administrators working collectively as collegiality, which is possible in schools defined as communities rather than formal organizations. Sergiovanni (2004) states:

The reason for concern is simple: It is organizational competence that makes schools smarter, and such competence is typically found to reside in the

relationships, norms, memories, habits, and collective skills of a network of people. Simply put, organizational competence is the sum of everything that everybody knows and uses that leads to increased learning. This competence is measured not only by what we know but also by how much of it we know, how widely what we know is distributed, how broad its source is, how much of it is applied in a collective manner; and how much of it is generated by cooperation with others. (p. 17)

In addition, schools, like living systems, grow and change over time (Senge, 2000; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971). A living system framework for our education system calls for principals to elicit suggestions and decisions from others, namely teachers, thus fostering an atmosphere of trust and respect (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Senge, 2000).

Schools, framed as living systems, may be considered learning organizations that grow and prosper by adapting and regenerating in the face of change (Senge, 2000; Wren, 1995). In learning organizations, principals have the ability to build shared vision and are responsible for building organizations where teachers can continually expand their capabilities (Wren, 1995). Thus, teachers are empowered to make professional decisions in the pursuit of improved student achievement.

Unlike the industrial-age thinking of schools, living systems-thinking is self-made, continually growing and forming relationships, and has innate goals to exist and to re-create themselves. The living systems framework for schools starts with the assertion that the fundamental nature of reality is relationships, not things (Senge, 2000). When schools are viewed as living systems they are seen as always evolving. In addition,

framing schools as living systems supports teacher empowerment in that teachers are seen as knowledgeable professionals capable of making noteworthy decisions about their profession. Schools as living systems support principals sharing power and decision-making with teachers because this framework encourages variety and embraces multiple and diverse thinking. Treating schools as living systems means constantly exploring the theories-in-use of all involved in the educational process and reintegrating education within the webs of social relationships that link schools to the community (Senge, 2000). In such an environment, schools become learning institutions for everyone. Principals view their job as creating an environment where teachers continually learn and are engaged in their own learning process which inevitably enables them to create optimal learning environments for students (Senge, 2000).

Proposed Models of Educational Leadership

It has been a fundamental tenet of research and practice that principals make significant contributions to school effectiveness and improvement (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Murphy & Hallinger, 1992). Researchers have examined the impact of school administrators, particularly school principals, on school improvement. Hallinger and Heck (1998) conducted an extensive review of empirical research between the years of 1980 and 1995 in hopes of making sense of the pattern of findings on principal effects in schools. As a result, Hallinger and Heck maintain any attempt at concretely suggesting a coherent framework summarizing leadership issues is limited.

They do, however make the following proposals. First, the conceptualization of leadership is rapidly evolving to meet ever-changing societal demands. Second, in studying historical perspectives of leadership, there appears to be no universal theory or paradigm for examining leadership behavior that is valid in all societal constructs (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Third, a variety of frames have been considered for studying school leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 1998).

Pitner (1988) offers a framework for conceptualizing and organizing studies on administrative effects. In conceptualizing the principal's role in school effectiveness, Pitner identified a range of approaches that could be used to study administrator effects: direct-effects, antecedent-effects, mediated-effects, reciprocal-effects, and moderated effects models. These models are identified as a comprehensive set of different perspectives for viewing the effects of the school context on administrative behavior and the influence of administrative behavior on the school and its outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Pitner, 1988).

The direct-effects model proposes that the leader's practices can have effects on school outcomes. Prior to 1987 this approach represented the norm among principal effect studies (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). A mediated-effects framework hypothesizes that leaders achieve their effects on school outcomes through indirect paths. Leadership practices contribute to the outcomes desired by schools, but the contribution is almost always mediated by other people, events, and organizational factors such as teacher commitment, instructional practices, or school culture (Leithwood, 1994). This assumption is consistent with the proposition that leaders achieve their results primarily through other people.

Another model for understanding leadership effects is the reciprocal-effects model. Some researchers have proposed that relationships between the administrator and features of the school and its environment are interactive (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). This framework implies that leaders adapt to the organization in which they work, changing their thinking and behavior over time. Hallinger and Heck (1998) propose that principals establish leadership in the school through a stream of interactions over a period of time addressing important issues of the school such as the current and changing states of student outcomes or staff morale and commitment. Leaders may alternatively initiate changes in the school's curriculum program or instructional practices causing changes in the conditions of the school and, in turn, producing feedback that causes reciprocal effects in leadership.

Although a variety of conceptual models are applied to understand the dynamics of effective leadership, instructional leadership and transformational leadership are two approaches that have predominated the study of principal effects since the early 1980s (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). Since 1990, researchers have begun to shift their attention to leadership models that are more consistent with educational reform such as empowerment, shared leadership, and organizational learning with the understanding that the role of the principal evolves with the changing trends in educational reform (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). Leithwood and Duke (1998) identified school leadership models through analyses of a representative sample of literature about leadership in schools as far back as 1988. All of the leadership styles, qualities, and concepts studied by Leithwood and Duke were assigned to one of six broad categories referred to as models, clustering together leadership concepts along the same primary focus and key

assumptions. The six categories of leadership are instructional, transformational, moral, participative, managerial, and contingency. Below is a description of each of these leadership models.

Instructional Leadership

Studies from the early to late 1980s were dominated by an instructional view of leadership in schools (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). In the area of instructional leadership, all decisions are guided by the necessity to ensure that the quality of instruction is the most important activity occurring in the school (Daresh, 1991). “As an instructional leader, the principal focuses less on doing things right and more on “doing the right things”, the things we know can help improve student achievement” (Andrews, Basom & Basom, 1991, p. 97). Foriska (1994) describes instructional leadership as, “critical to the development and maintenance of an effective school” (p. 33). Principals, as instructional leaders, must influence others to combine appropriate instructional strategies with their knowledge of subject matter (Whitaker, 1997). In addition, instructional leaders are expected to provide the necessary resources teachers need to implement appropriate instructional activities. As a resource provider the principal, “becomes the broker of people with resources that will help provide instruction” (Andrews, Basom & Basom, 1991, p. 98).

Niece (1983) found three major themes in his research on effective instructional leaders. First, effective instructional leaders are accessible and interact with the faculty and staff about day-to-day happenings in the school on a continuous basis (Niece, 1983). They do not stay isolated behind office doors. Second, effective instructional leaders

interact with a network of other principals. Third, they are active in mentoring relationships with other practitioners (Niece, 1983).

Smith and Andrews (1989) proposed a framework for examining instructional leadership consisting of four supervisory activities that are thought to lead to higher levels of student achievement. The activities are presented in four broad areas: the principal as a resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence. The framework described by Smith and Andrews (1989) is explained below:

- **Resource Provider** — The principal must recognize the teachers in the school as its greatest resource in providing exemplary teaching. The principal must know the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers and show genuine concern for their well-being and professional growth. This approach creates willingness in teachers to share exemplary teaching strategies and to learn from one another.
- **Instructional Resource** — The principal is knowledgeable of exemplary teaching practices and therefore can accurately assess teachers' effectiveness based on the criteria of good instruction. As a result, the principal can provide feedback to promote professional growth in order to enhance student achievement. Another important activity of the principal as an instructional resource is to disaggregate standardized test data to assess the schools' ability to meet curriculum goals.
- **Communicator** — An effective communicator must develop the skills needed to evaluate and deal effectively with others. The principal communicates fundamental beliefs about the school's vision and sense of mission to teachers.

Moreover, the principal must communicate to everyone the essential belief that all children can experience success, success builds upon success, schools can enhance student success and student outcomes must be clearly defined to guide instructional programs and decisions.

- Visible Presence — The principal’s presence is felt in every area of the school’s activities. Informal communication is preferred by effective principals as a way to model behaviors consistent with the school’s vision and mission.

Instructional leaders must be able to provide teachers with resources and incentives to keep their focus on student achievement (Whitaker, 1997). Principals must keep teachers up-to-date about educational tools and developments in the teaching profession and be able to critique these tools and teaching practices to determine their applicability to students (Andrews, Basom, & Basom, 1991; Whitaker, 1997).

Caution must be taken with instructional leadership theory in that providing “too much leadership discourages professionalism” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 67). For example, the principal who insists on being a strong instructional leader, even when teachers are capable of implementing exemplary teaching methods and strategies, forces teachers into dependent roles and removes opportunities and incentives for them to be self-guided and motivated. Sergiovanni (1992) stressed, “... the more professionalism is emphasized, the less leadership is needed; the more leadership is emphasized, the less likely professionalism is to develop” (p. 67). Sergiovanni (1992) believed that instructional leadership has its place in schools where teachers are incompetent, indifferent, or disabled by certain circumstances. Acting in an instructional leadership role, principals

may build up the capacities of teachers so that direct leadership will no longer be needed (Sergiovanni, 1992). The point is not to get rid of leadership because leadership can add to the most professional of school settings, but “direct leadership becomes less urgent and less intensive once the wheels of professionalism begin to turn by themselves” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 67).

Transformational Leadership

Many aspects of teacher empowerment are found to be consistent with the ideals of transformative leadership (Melenyzer, 1990). Transformational leadership, a term coined by James MacGregor Burns, calls for principals to elevate and motivate others; define values, offer vision, and creatively and initiate reform and innovative developments, when appropriate, in the face of opportunities and challenges (Adshire, 2001). Transformational leaders know that past achievements can not become a place of rest (Adshire, 2001). The transformational leader sets the stage for followers to reach higher levels of achievement and motivation. The leader-follower relationship is transcending because it fosters heightened feelings of accomplishment and motivation in the workplace (Adshire, 2001). The leader and follower are bound together in a mutual pursuit of a higher purpose (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders motivate subordinates to do more than they originally expected to do by:

- Raising the followers’ levels of consciousness about the importance and value of reaching designated goals;
- Getting followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team or organization;

- Raising followers' need levels to the higher-order needs, such as self-actualization (Burns, 1978).

The transformational leadership framework emphasizes that leaders inspire followers to go beyond self-interest, work toward values-driven and higher-level goals, contribute to shared decision making, and develop school-based solutions (Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1992). Principals who are transformational leaders exhibit more flexible, versatile, and responsive leadership behavior (Duignan & McPherson, 1993; Lucas & Valentine, 2001). Transformational leadership focuses on increasing the organization's capacity to innovate (Adshire, 2001; Burns, 1978). American education in the twentieth century has witnessed a steady flow of changing goals, and desired forms of principal leadership (Beck & Murphy, 1992; Rothberg & Hill, 1992). Therefore, the last twenty years has been a time of rapid transition in the prevalent understanding of principal leadership, moving from managerial to instructional and now transformational forms of leadership (Beck & Murphy, 1992; Rothberg & Hill, 1992). Transformational leadership seeks to transform individuals and consequently build the organization's capacity to select its purposes and goals (Beck & Murphy, 1992; Rothberg & Hill, 1992).

In the transformational model the leader seeks to motivate teachers to formulate new goals for personal and professional development. Leithwood's transformational model (1994) highlights the "people effects" as a cornerstone of the transformational leadership model (p. 17). A major impact of principal efforts is to produce changes in people (Leithwood, 1994). Ogawa and Bossert (1995) suggest that social interaction among people within the school community is a primary building block of leadership. Leadership requires the use of personal resources of responsibility, cooperation, and

commitment (Leithwood, 1994; Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Vision building and fostering commitment to goals are the strongest outcomes of transformational leadership. Silins (1994) characterized transformational leadership as actions aimed at providing support, challenging work, and a sense of vision and mission of the school.

Within the transformational leadership model, Leithwood, Jantzi, Silins, and Dart (1993) found that principal vision, group goals, high expectations, and individual support have effects on goal formulation, school culture, teachers, policy implementation, and organizational change. Vision and goal cohesion are important elements within the school. Leithwood and his colleagues suggested that transformational leadership affects three psychological dispositions of teachers: their perceptions of a variety of school characteristics, their commitment to school change, and their capacity for professional development.

Bennis (1983) in his book, *The Chief*, identified two main components of transformative power. The first component is the leader. Principals, acting in the realm of transformative leadership, view themselves as leaders not merely managers (Bennis, 1983). Leaders are concerned with the organization's basic purposes, why it exists, and its general direction. Thus, acting as leaders, principals are capable of "transforming doubts into the psychological grounds of common purpose" (Bennis, 1983, p. 23). In short, Bennis reminds us that nothing serves an organization better than leadership that is confident in what it wants, communicates those intentions effectively, empowers others, and knows when and how to stay on course and when to change.

In varying degrees, transformative leaders possess the following competencies (Bennis, 1983):

- *Vision*: The capacity to create and communicate a vision that clarifies the current situation and induces commitment to the future.
- *Communication and Alignment*: The capacity to communicate vision in order to gain support of multiple constituencies.
- *Persistence, Consistency, Focus*: The capacity to maintain the organization's direction, especially during difficult times.
- *Empowerment*: The capacity to create environments that can tap and harness the energies and abilities necessary to bring about the desired results.
- *Organizational Learning*: The capacity to find ways and means through which the organization can monitor its own performance, compare results with established objectives, have access to a continuously evolving data base against which to review past actions and base future ones, and decide how, if necessary, the organizational structure and key personnel must be rearranged when faced with new conditions.

In addition, transformational leadership consists of four key components (Bennis, 1983):

- Charisma: Developing a vision, engendering pride, respect and trust;
- Inspiration: Motivating by creating high expectations, modeling appropriate behavior, and using symbols to focus efforts;
- Individualized consideration: Giving personal attention to followers, respect, responsibility; and
- Intellectual stimulation: Continually challenging followers with new ideas and approaches (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

The second component of transformational power is intention (Bennis, 1983). Transformative power implies a transaction between the leader and the followers thus creating a participative response. The expression of an intention is the ability of principals to lead the organization forward into the unknown (Bennis, 1983). The characteristics of intentions that successful leaders employ include (Bennis, 1983):

- *Simplicity*: implies that each assumption in the organization is independent. The word “simple” derives from the notion of oneness or unity.
- *Completeness*: capability to incorporate tasks that need to be performed at the time it is set up should also be capable of adjusting to and assimilating new tasks as they arise.
- *Workability*: requires that organizational goals are met or contributions are made to achieve the goals.
- *Communicability*: requires clear concise understanding by the organization and to keep in mind the organization’s effectiveness is related to the mutual connections of its various contexts.

Hoy and Miskel (1996) state that transformational leaders: 1) Recognize the need for change; 2) Create new visions and commitments; 3) Concentrate on long-term goals; and 4) Inspire others to transcend their interests for organizational goals. Moreover, a transformational leader is one who attempts to: influence others through transmission of a vision to others in the organization, mold organizational members to fit the vision, and finally assume responsibility for building an organization where people continually expand their capabilities (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Senge, 1996).

Kochan (2004) proposed a new dimension to the transformative trait of leadership — transcendent leadership. She claims transcendent leaders are people who have “the perception, wisdom, and desire to lead others; to rise above what is to create what might be” (Kochan, 2004, p. 2). This transformative trait requires critique and open dialogue about policies, culture, children, teaching, and learning.

Moral Leadership

James MacGregor Burns set the stage for those who have come along in the past twenty years to define leadership using terms such as moral, servant, transformational, and even “soulful” (Pellicer, 2003, p. 23). Sergiovanni (1992) contends that moral leadership can transform schools into communities and inspire commitment, devotion, and service that will sustain schools through changing times. Fullan (2002) defines moral leadership as “moral purpose writ large” meaning that principal behavior is connected to something greater than ourselves that relates to human and social development. Fullan (2002) contends that the first order of moral leadership is to make a difference in the lives of students and transforming the working and learning conditions of others so that growth, commitment, engagement, and constant initiation of leadership in others is being encouraged. In addition, moral leadership is defined as “the authority of felt obligations and duties derived from widely shared professional and community values, ideas, and ideals” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 42). Moral leadership is a source of authority that inspires teachers to become followers rather than having leadership imposed on them.

For supervision to be a moral action, “the exchange between the supervisor and teacher must be trusting, open, and flexible in order to allow both persons to speak from their own sense of integrity and to encourage each person to respect the other’s integrity”

(Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 56). Moral leadership answers what, why, and whom questions differently than traditional bureaucratic forms of leadership. In traditional leadership, “whom” means the designated leader, “what” is the leader’s vision, and the “why” is that the principal is able to manipulate compliance through interpersonal skill or clout. In contrast, moral leadership answers “whom” as ourselves as a community of committed people, “what” is the shared values and beliefs that define teachers and principals as a community of professionals, and “why” is answered because it is morally right and community and professional membership are based morally understood duties and obligations (Sergiovanni, 1992). He further asserted that moral leadership is capable of tapping into the full range and depth of human capacity. Intrinsically motivated self-management is the goal of moral leadership where teachers are followers not subordinates. “If we want sustained and committed performance from teachers, then we must think about a leadership practice that helps teachers transcend subordination — one that cultivates followership” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 70).

Moral leadership calls principals to become authentic to those who are inspired to follow them because the things that leaders do reflect what both the leaders and the followers think, feel, and believe. “In this way, a leader’s actions, decisions, and behaviors can more easily be understood, respected, and appreciated by those who follow resulting in a covenantal community that is more sacred in its nature than it is secular” (Pellicer, 2003, pp. 16–17). When a leader fails to show care and concern needed to sustain close contact with followers, the implied contract between the leader and follower is void (Pellicer, 2003). Moral leadership in schools is nurtured and sustained by a

common set of beliefs, values and dreams that create an organization more like a family than a public institution.

Moral leadership is concerned with values as being a central part of all leadership and administrative practice (Bates, 1993; Evers & Lakomski, 1991; Greenfield, 1991). Moral leadership contends that the critical focus of leadership should be on the values and ethics of leaders themselves; leadership should be concerned with right and wrong, not attitudes, styles, or behaviors (Hodgkinson, 1991). Lees (1995) argued that leadership in a democratic society involves a moral imperative to “promote democracy, empowerment, and social justice” (p. 225). Moral leadership places teachers and administrators in service to each other and to others (Sergiovanni, 1992). In addition, “a moral perspective on leadership can help us stop playing school and start living school more authentically (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 27).

The issues of greatest concern to the moral concept of leadership are the nature of the values used by leaders in their decision-making, and how conflicts among values can be resolved (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). In addition, the perspective on moral leadership focuses on the nature of the relationships among those within the organization, and the distribution of power between the stakeholders of the school (Leithwood & Duke, 1998).

Participative Leadership

Participative leadership is a term that encompasses group, shared, and teacher leadership (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). The decision making processes of the group are the central focus of leaders in participative leadership (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). Participative leadership encompasses the belief that group decision making will enhance organizational effectiveness (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). In participative leadership,

authority and influence are available potentially to any legitimate stakeholders in the school based on their expert knowledge, their democratic right to choose, their critical role in implementing decisions, or a combination of the three (Leithwood & Duke, 1998).

Site-Based Management

Site-based management, a centerpiece in the majority of the past decade's school restructuring initiatives, is the most fully developed and widely advocated conception of participatory leadership available (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). Site-based management and empowerment have been two promising outcomes of the education reform movement (Holloway, 2000). The site-based management movement grew out of research suggesting that school autonomy is associated with school effectiveness (Engvall, 1997). Schools are most effective when teachers feel a sense of ownership and responsibility for educational endeavors and decisions.

Site-based management is defined in several different ways but typically incorporate the same components, which are a delegation of authority to individual schools, a shared decision-making model and facilitative leadership (Holloway, 2000). Engvall (1997) referred to decentralized decision-making or site-based management as empowerment in that this approach means to share authority. Site-based management must be a reality in schools in order for teachers to feel empowered (Engvall, 1997). Teachers, in order to practice their "craft", need some degree of autonomy.

Proponents of teacher empowerment assert that school based management has the potential to improve employee morale, encourage employee loyalty, improve educational services, decrease turnover, and reduce absenteeism (Engvall, 1997). A message sent to school stakeholders is teachers, as professionals, are worthy of regard and respect.

Managerial Leadership

Managerial leadership assumes the focus of leaders should be on functions, tasks, or behaviors, and if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated (Leithwood & Duke, 1998). Much of a principal's responsibility is management driven- schools need to comply with laws, establish consistent policies and procedures, and operate efficiently and on budget (Smith & Piele, 1996). However, schools also need "purpose, passion, and imagination" which are the products of leadership (Smith & Piele, 1996, p. 3). Many times principals have the dual responsibility of being leaders and managers. In simple terms, principals have the responsibility to "manage things and lead people" (Smith & Piele, 1996, p. 1). Administrators also must understand change as well as manage it (Smith & Piele, 1996). The complex nature of the principalship requires competency in the area of management. In fact, Bennis (1989) identified four leadership competencies based on the ability to manage.

First, *management of attention* enables people to attract others to them by demonstrating exceptional commitment. The second competency, *management of meaning*, allows leaders to communicate their vision. The third competency, *management of trust*, is fostered when leaders demonstrate reliability and consistency. The *management of self*, is the ability to know one's skills and utilize them effectively (Bennis, 1989).

Contingent Leadership

Contemporary studies in the field of educational leadership highlight the importance of distributed leadership, constructivist leadership, value-centered leadership,

and emotional leadership (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Harris, Day, & Hadfield, 2003). No single style of leadership used in isolation is appropriate for all schools (Smith & Piele, 1996). Effective principals need to find a style of leadership which is most suited for their particular school (Coulon & Quaglia, 2001). Educational leaders need many leadership bases from which to pull. “Leaders may, with good results, use any of a variety of styles and strategies of leadership including transformational and participative, depending on their reading of themselves, their followers, and the organizational context” (Smith & Piele, 1996, p. 3).

Leadership Belief Paradigms

Shared governance sets the stage for teacher empowerment which requires educational leaders who consider their personal philosophy and leadership behaviors. Therefore, it is necessary to include in the literature review a comparison and summary of relevant leadership belief paradigms.

The interaction between values and beliefs and practices of educational leaders has been explored by several researchers (Anderson-Harper, Kochan & Robinson, 1996; Robbins & Alvy, 1995; Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973). Belief systems frame the decisions and actions made by effective leaders (Ackerman, Donaldson, & van de Bogart, 1996; Martin, 2003). Effective leaders have a clear understanding of how their belief systems affect their leadership style and the belief system is evident in their leadership practices (Donaldson & Marnik, 1995). Belief systems determine how information is processed thus determining subsequent actions (Kagan, 1992).

Several highly regarded writers, researchers, and theorists have written about belief systems. Peter Senge (1990) in his book, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, used the term mental models to describe the way many individuals make sense of their world. Schubert (1986), in his book *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*, addressed how beliefs directly impact a leader's decisions and actions. Decisions and actions that are made based upon the beliefs (assumptions) of the leader can affect all aspects of the school environment including the classrooms and the school culture (Martin, 2003).

Many theorists have attempted to frame beliefs by addressing them as paradigms. Paradigms provide a lens for individuals to better understand their origins and beliefs about the world (Martin, 2003). Schubert (1986) suggested that beliefs flow from one's paradigm or view of the world. In addition, in *7 Habits of Highly Effective People*, Covey (1989) defined paradigms as how individuals understand, perceive and interpret the world. Barker (1987) defined a paradigm as "A set of rules and regulations, written, or unwritten, that does two things: (1) establishes or defines boundaries; and (2) tells you how to behave inside the boundaries in order to be successful" (p. 32).

Jurgen Habermas' Three Paradigms

Habermas, in his reconstruction of Critical Theory, distinguishes between two types of human activity: symbolic and communicative, and purposive-rational (Sergiovanni & Cobally, 1984). Purposive-rationality served the needs of what Habermas defines as three basic cognitive interests, the technical, the practical, and the emancipatory (Bernstein, 1976; Sergiovanni & Cobally, 1984). The cognitive interests

are grounded in one of the dimensions of human social existence: work, interaction, or power (Bernstein, 1976; Sergiovanni & Cobally, 1984).

Grundy (1987) used the work of Jurgen Habermas to address belief paradigms. These paradigms were defined as cognitive interests and labeled as technical, practical, and emancipatory. Habermas' cognitive interests are very similar to the three belief paradigms of Schubert (1986) technical, practical inquiry, and critical praxis. Melenyzer (1990) argues that the critical emancipatory perspective promotes strong concern for teacher empowerment.

According to the emancipatory perspective, teachers are expected to confront "oppressive" societal forces through reflective political action. By comparison, the liberal view of teacher empowerment emphasizes the capacity of empowered teachers to improve conditions in their classrooms. Finally, the conservative view equates empowerment with professionalism; teachers are given new respect through the recognition and improvement of their work conditions (Melenyzer, 1990).

The technical interest is reflected in the desire to exert control. The practical interest reflects the need to establish a sense of community, shared communication, and understanding. The emancipatory interest is in the identification of the ideal human situation (Bernstein, 1976; Sergiovanni & Cobally, 1984).

Habermas' cognitive interests have been associated with educational applications. Table 1 outlines these applications as they relate to each cognitive interest (Martin, 2003).

Table 1

Habermas' Cognitive Interests and Educational Applications (Martin, 2003)

Technical	Practical	Emancipatory
Teacher directed	Emphasis on student understanding	Academic freedom of the learner
Predetermined outcomes	Student interaction with their environment	Critical thinking and inquiry to acquire a better understanding
Prescriptive Curriculum	Reflective — teacher acts as guide or advisor	Teachers and students jointly set educational goals and curricular content
External evaluation	Internally evaluation	Teacher and student have input into evaluation process

Kochan (2002) has applied these beliefs to educational leadership. Her analysis is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Administration Focus and Habermas' Human Interests

Aims	Technical Efficiency	Practical Interaction	Emancipatory (Justice/Equity)
Leadership Focus	Management/Control	Shared decision making—Consensus	Community
Task Focus	Immediate/ Crisis/Safety Situations	Short term needs/ Goals	Long-term needs Vision/Mission
Administrative Focus	Operations	Communication, Interaction, Climate	Culture
Curricular Focus	External Curricular constraints, content	Content/ Materials, Process	Teaching learning context
Administrative Structure	Rules and regulation	Shared Governance	Creating and evaluating structures for decision making
Organizational Structure	Hierarchical	Shared	Negotiated

Senge's Four Key Competencies

In the book, *Schools That Learn*, Peter Senge (2000) advocates re-creating schools by taking a learning orientation meaning everyone in the school is involved in expressing their aspirations, building their awareness, and developing their capabilities together resulting in continual school improvement. In schools that learn principals do not lead as dictators but rather serve as facilitators and stewards who recognize the value of each person in the organization. In addition, principals in schools that learn, draw people together to a common purpose by laying the groundwork for teachers to feel empowered (Senge, 2000).

Beginning in 1995, Senge worked with a study group of school superintendents sponsored by the Danforth Foundation to formulate a new leadership model for public education. Senge and the study group focused on four key competencies that allow people to lead without having control which fosters teacher empowerment. The four key competencies are as follows:

- *Engagement*: Engagement has two components. First is the capability to recognize an issue or situation that has no clear definition, no simple cause and no obvious answer (Senge, 2000). Second, is conversing with appropriate people to develop a plan to manage complex situations (Senge, 2000).
- *Systems Thinking*: In learning organizations there is an ability to recognize the hidden dynamics of complex systems (Senge, 2000). In solving and dealing with complex situations, groups look to larger systems that may also be affected by the situation and involve this group in decision-making and problem-solving.

- *Leading Learning:* To lead learning means to model a learner-centered instead of an authority-centered approach to all problems, inside and outside the school (Senge, 2000). Learner-centered leadership means that learning and the acceptance of uncertainty are part of the culture of the system. “Leaders expect themselves and others to be uncertain, inquiring, expectant, of surprise, and perhaps a bit joyful about confronting the unknown” (Senge, 2000, p. 417).
- *Self-awareness:* Leaders must be self-aware. They must know the impact they are having on people and the system and how that impact has changed over time. Self-awareness is a position of strength. To develop self-awareness leaders must take time to personally reflect and develop a trusting relationship with a mentor.

Structural, Human, Political, and Symbolic Frames

Leaders who manage school business using the four frames espoused by Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal (1993) encourage teacher empowerment by reaching beyond office doors to listen to teachers and genuinely involve them in the day-to-day business of the school. By doing this, principals communicate to teachers that they are knowledgeable professionals who have valuable input. Bolman and Deal’s (1993) four frames are described below.

- *Structural Frame:* This frame is important to keep in mind because of the ever-changing nature of the educational system. The structural frame encompasses the formal and informal ways that operations are defined in schools; these include policies, procedures, missions, goals, objectives, roles

and responsibilities as well as methods for measuring success. Groups need to know four things: what they are supposed to do, what authority they have, who they are accountable to, and what they are accountable for.

- *The Human Resource Frame:* This frame highlights the idea that education is human intense; therefore, people's needs and motives must be addressed. Organizations are more apt to run smoothly during challenging times when people feel they are part of a caring, trusting work environment. Concern is shown by enlisting participation in activities and decision-making from everyone not just a select few. The involvement of everyone builds the groundwork for commitment to the school's mission and vision.
- *Political Frame:* Schools are breeding grounds for power struggles. However, if handled properly struggles between groups can lead to new ideas, solutions, and be a source of energy that moves the organization forward. In the political frame, clear, respectful communication and an understanding of the importance of making effective, ethical, and efficient decisions are necessities.
- *Symbolic Frame:* This frame encompasses the culture and climate of the school, the traditions, symbols, rituals, and beliefs that create emotional connections. The organization becomes a way of life not just a place of work.

The Conceptualization of Power Theory

In seeking to conceptualize power it is useful to look at the root meanings of the word. The English word *power* derives from the Latin *posse* which means to be able. The first meaning of *power* in the *Oxford English Dictionary* is “the ability to do or effect

something or anything, or to act upon a person or thing”. In *Webster’s New World Dictionary* power, “denotes the inherent ability or the admitted right to rule, govern, or determine”.

The concept of power; its nature, sources, and functions, has been and remains a central concern of social scientists, social activists, politicians, corporate leaders, and philosophers (Kreisberg, 1992). Different theorists find different dimensions of power interesting and worthy of study but there seems no common terminology. In seeking to understand power, most theorists have looked to its most pervasive and obvious expressions in our society. Most theories of power in the social sciences actually are grounded on theory dated back to Plato, Aristotle, and Thucydides (Kreisberg, 1992). Thomas Hobbes was among the first theorists to attempt an explicit definition of power sparked by thinkers such as Kepler, Galileo, Bacon, and Descartes (Kreisberg, 1992). Hobbes’ conception of power is defined by relations of cause and effect meaning power is the ability to cause those effects that will allow for the fulfillment of individual desires (Kreisberg, 1992). Hobbes argued that since individual desires inevitably conflict with the desires of others, power involves the ability to affect another, to cause another to act, think, or speak in a particular way (Kreisberg, 1992). In summary, power equals cause. Power is conceived as power over others.

Max Weber was another influential theorist on the concept of power. Weber (1945) defined power as, “The chance of a man or of a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action” (p. 180). In Weber’s definition coercion and threat of force are central themes (Kreisberg, 1992) According to Weber power involves conflict and competition

in which there are winners and losers and in which order is maintained through complex mechanisms of domination (Kresiberg, 1992).

An additional theorist mentioned in the literature on power is Bertrand Russell. Russell follows Hobbs and Weber in defining power as “the production of intended effects” (Kresiberg, 1992, p. 40). For Russell, power is apparent in relationships in which humans have control over the world around them; it is defined by relationships of inequality and domination (Kresiberg, 1992; Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Russell identifies three different ways an individual can exert power over another: by direct physical power (coercion), by rewards and punishments (inducement), and by influence over opinion (propaganda).

Lasswell and Kaplan (1950) defined power as participation in decision making. The degree of power is determined by the degree of participation in decision making, values, and the domain over persons who support or suffer from the power. These authors maintain that power is control over one or more of eight social values: power itself, respect, rectitude, affection, well-being, wealth, skill, and enlightenment (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Control over these values in the education system determines, to a great deal, what schools and classrooms will be like (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995).

In addition, Nyberg (1988) maintained that power requires two parties; one claims power and exercises it and the other entity gives consent. Those that claim the power must have the intention to act and a plan of action that requires foresight, organization, and control of information (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Consent involves acceptance of organization, hierarchy, and delegation (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan,

1995). In other words, a leader may delegate tasks or roles to a group, and in return group members delegate, by their consent, power to the leader. In the end to relinquish control by allowing others to make decisions and solve problems actually enhances a principal's power" (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 44).

Principals' Use of Power

Within an empowering setting, power means being heard, having your ideas taken seriously and taken into consideration when decisions are made (Kreisburg, 1992).

Therefore, power is conceived as "participation rather than imposition, as collaboration rather than control" (Kreisburg, 1992, p. 134).

There are several classifications of power, however the bases of power typology suggested by French and Raven (1959) are still widely discussed in the literature and are popular in application in the social sciences (Rahim & Buntzman, 1988). French and Raven's power taxonomy is clearly defined and accepted in fields such as social psychology and management (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998). Because the construct of power is multi-dimensional, French and Raven (1959) proposed a taxonomy of power bases (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998). The bases of power identified by French and Raven (1959) include:

1. Coercive power is based on subordinates' perceptions that a superior has the ability to punish or threaten if there is failure to conform to the leader's demands.
2. Reward power is based on the perception of subordinates that a superior has the ability to reward them for desired behavior.

3. Legitimate power is based on the belief of subordinates that a superior has the authority to influence and control their behavior.
4. Expert power is based on subordinates' belief that a superior has job experience and special knowledge or expertise in a given area.
5. Referent power is based on subordinates' feelings or desires to identify with a superior because of their admiration or personal liking of the superior.

Social psychologists have recognized that the effective use of power and the perceptions of power by subordinates, peers, and supervisors are critical in determining administrator success and organizational advancement (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998).

Credibility is a sixth base that some researchers have incorporated into the French and Raven (1959) power base taxonomy (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998). Credibility is defined as the objectively determined truthfulness, follow-through, and accuracy of a power source (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998). Credibility is often considered an additional power base because researchers have concluded that it enhances a person's ability to influence others (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998). Managers viewed as having high levels of credibility were also seen as having referent, expert, legitimate, and reward power (Agunis, Simonsen & Pierce, 1998).

Drake and Roe (1999) contend that in modern day schools none of the French and Raven's Power Bases provides a full measure of power. For example, few principals have the means to provide tangent rewards for teachers. Reward by special praise and recognition has been the main source of praise used by principals (Drake & Roe, 1999). In addition, coercive power is reduced by tenure and grievance procedures. Legitimate

power is lessened by the professional role of teachers because schools' main functions are carried out in the classroom by the teachers- the chief executives of the classrooms (Drake & Roe, 1999). Therefore, few teachers stand in awe of principals' legitimate power. Teachers, due to collective bargaining procedures in many states with strong unions, do not wish to identify with an autocratic or bureaucratic principal (Drake & Roe, 1999). Drake and Roe do maintain that of all the power bases, expert power holds the greatest promise when leaders realize that the expertise put forth should be to assist others to grow in their professional undertakings. Principals using expert power remove barriers, create opportunities, and provide resources to aid teachers in their endeavors. Furthermore, schools that rate the principal as having expert power received high scores for teacher morale, teacher satisfaction, and teacher performance (Drake & Roe, 1999).

Professional growth for principals involves acquiring the skills needed to perform roles effectively in the transition to shared decision making and in setting the stage for teacher empowerment. Power used by the principal can fall into two broad categories: positional power and personal power (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Stimson and Applebaum (1988) defined these two types of power as:

- Positional power tends to be hierarchical in nature, frequently combative, and to produce winners and losers.
- Personal power is derived from the personal characteristics of individuals. It relies heavily on the relationship between colleagues and it tends to be horizontal in nature and cooperative and sharing in orientation.

Expert power is one type of personal power, which is based on the subordinates' perception of the special expertise or knowledge of the leader (Stimson & Applebaum,

1988). When the principal demonstrates expertise in a given area, teachers tend to cooperate on the basis of their appreciation of his or her skills or knowledge rather than on the basis of position in the hierarchy of power (Stimson & Applebaum, 1988). Principals who use personal power are basing their leadership on discretionary effort (Blanton, 1991). Discretionary effort is not coercion or bossing teachers, but a belief that people are capable and willing to do more than they have been asked (Blanton, 1991).

Kreisberg (1992) examined the concept of power and added to the body of literature on the concept of power by coining the terms “power over” and “power with” (p. xi). “Power over” is seen as domination; coercion, lack of respect and trust, and alienation and fear. “Power with” is the ability to participate in decision making and to take action for change. Kreisberg (1992) claimed that “power with” is the type of power that promotes empowerment.

As principals acquire skills and knowledge and provide support for teachers, they increase their personal power and gain support of teachers (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Principals’ use of personal power enables them to facilitate shared decision making more effectively than they would if they relied on positional power (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995).

For principals desiring to work with empowered teachers, the issue is not of losing decision-making authority, but rather offering initiative to the greatest number of people possible; thus, expanding their authority (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Relinquishing power control to teachers by allowing them to make decisions and solve problems actually enhances a principal’s power (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Facilitative power is the ability to help others achieve a set of ends that may be “shared, negotiated, or complementary” (Blasé & Blasé, 2001, p. 13). Using facilitative power, principals create necessary conditions for teachers to enhance their personal and collective performance (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

Empowerment

Empowerment in education has drawn considerable attention over the past decade (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Empowerment means different things to different people. According to Lontos (1993), empowerment means bringing the responsibility for decision making to the lowest possible level, which specifies that the administrator does not make all the decisions. Leadership, where teacher empowerment exists, looks quite different from traditional bureaucratic, hierarchical conceptions that slot individuals into different, limited functions and that place them in subordinate relationships to one another (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster & Cobb, 1995). Empowerment creates ownership for those responsible for carrying out decisions by involving them directly in the decision-making process (Harrison, Killion, & Mitchell, 1989). Therefore empowerment can be defined as a form of decentralization that places decision making and accountability at the lowest level; thus, teachers are involved in decisions about instruction, curriculum because they are the ones in the classroom, closest to the students (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995).

According to Liebermann and Miller (1990), there are five key aspects involved in empowerment. They are as follows:

1. Empowerment implies a reevaluation of curricular and instructional efforts for students.
2. Empowerment means advocating participatory decision making and more leadership from teachers, students, and the community.
3. Empowerment specifies an appropriate and supportive environment for students and adults.
4. Empowerment involves new partnerships and networks.
5. Empowerment articulates the increased participation of parents and community members.

Empowerment is a process to improve education by increasing the autonomy of teachers, principals, and staff to make school-based decisions (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Empowerment emphasizes increased authority of teachers to make decisions outside of the confines of traditional structures of authority.

The backbone of empowerment is autonomy. Typically school autonomy involves decision-making authority in three areas: budget, staffing, and curriculum (David, 1989). Empowerment is viewed as a way to transform schools into effective learning environments by providing school staff with authority, flexibility, and the resources they need to implement change and to solve the educational problems particular to their schools (David, 1989; Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). The teacher's role undergoes many changes as a result of empowerment. In empowerment situations, teachers are actively encouraged to become involved in leadership roles (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995).

Empowerment should create conditions in schools that facilitate improvement, innovation, and continuous growth for everyone in the school (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Empowerment necessitates administrators and teachers together attempting to share responsibility and power in the governance of schools (Blasé & Anderson, 1995). Empowerment can help teachers and principals respond less randomly, but more cooperatively, to the thousands of decisions made everyday in schools (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995). Therefore, empowerment offers greater flexibility, increased participation in decision making, and the ability to meet the specific needs of students and teachers (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995).

Teacher Empowerment

Research supports the assumption that teacher empowerment relates to greater organizational effectiveness (Barth, 1990; Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Kreisberg, 1992; Lawler, 1986; Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994). Empowerment has been defined as a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth, resolve their own problems, and fulfill their needs to effectively participate in the workplace (Kreisberg, 1992; Short, 1994). Teacher empowerment has also been defined as the possession and exercise of power in the pursuit of occupational improvement, professional autonomy, and the overall improvement of the educational process (Smith & Lotven, 1993). Empowerment also means simply to be able to effect change (Kreisberg, 1992). In the above definitions, empowerment is both the knowledge that one can make a difference and the actual ability to act (Kreisberg, 1992).

Dunst (1991) suggested that empowerment consists of two issues 1) enabling experiences, provided within an organization that fosters autonomy, choice, control, and responsibility, which 2) allow the individual to display existing competencies that support and strengthen functioning. Starratt (2004) conveyed that a leader's "enabling presence" may empower teachers to participate in addressing school issues, own their professional development, and bring to the effort of school improvement their talents and creativity (p. 103).

The interest in empowerment in education was initiated from business and industrial efforts to improve productivity. Alienation at work is cited as the most pervasive phenomenon of the post-industrial society and management in both the private and the public sectors are engaged in a constant struggle against it for their own survival (Kanungo, 1992). Alienated workers are apathetic, frustrated, and uninvolved with their jobs. Businesses that can counter worker alienation with empowerment plans will improve their position to compete with businesses that have solved this problem. The main strategy is to replace authority based management with participative management (Kanungo, 1992). Contemporary educational trends have incorporated empowerment strategies as a means to improve school effectiveness (Short & Johnson, 1994). Empowerment is a way to lift the burden from individuals and provide the criteria for distributing the professional work of leadership throughout the teaching force (Lieberman & Miller, 2004).

Principals who feel a burden to have total responsibility and control over subordinates' and school success described feeling anxiety, fear, and isolation but when empowering others in the school reported feeling relaxed and able to enjoy the workplace

(Beatty, 2000). In addition, some principals revealed feeling isolated when they neglected to empower others and share the burden and success of the educational process (Beatty, 2000). Principals, as the designated formal leaders of schools, are recognizing that a likely avenue for more effective leadership may lie in enabling teachers to assume and carry-out leadership roles within the school organization (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Fennell, 2002; Greenfield, 1995; Lucas & Valentine, 2001 Short, 1998). The principal's role must change from a dictator to a "leader of leaders" (Hallinger & Murphy, 1991, p. 515). Teacher empowerment has less to do with the ability to boss others but more to do with teacher professionalism (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). It is the ability to exercise one's professional ability with quiet confidence and to help shape the way the job is done by having meaningful input into the decision-making process and policy development (Maeroff, 1988). In addition, teachers who perceive themselves as empowered have improved motivation, self-esteem, confidence, commitment, innovation, autonomy, and reflection (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Bolin (1989) stated that teacher empowerment requires, "investing in teachers the right to participate in the determination of school goals and policies and the right to exercise professional judgment about the content of the curriculum and means on instruction" (p. 83).

Two obstacles are identified in research as significant problems in traditional American schools: teachers are isolated from colleagues in most of their work; and teachers are not extensively involved in the decisions that affect their work (Short, 1994). In solving the two major problems that teachers face in the workplace, it is important to take an in-depth look at what happens in schools when teachers stop functioning in isolation and start collectively solving problems related to student achievement (Short,

1994). Teacher empowerment provides teachers the opportunities for choice and autonomy in the workplace to demonstrate their competencies as educators (Short, 1994; Zimmerman & Rappaprt, 1988).

According to Kirby (1991), three key elements in teacher empowerment are the ability to act, the opportunity to act, and the desire to act. Empowerment involves both personal and organizational issues. Empowerment focuses on the development of personal competence, as well as the opportunities a person has within the organization to demonstrate competence (Short, 1998). In other words, empowered teachers are highly competent and work in schools that provide opportunities to show competence (Short, 1998). A school that values empowerment of teachers and students will be better at finding and developing resources than a school that does not support or hold an empowerment philosophy (Short, 1998).

Glenn (1990) suggested that the real power behind the construct of teacher empowerment is authority derived from teacher command of the subject matter and essential skills necessary to successfully teach students. Empowered teachers believe they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve it (Short, 1994). The foundation for teacher empowerment consists of enabling experiences, provided within the organization that fosters autonomy, choice, control, and responsibility, that allows teachers to display expertise that support and strengthen school functioning (Short, 1994).

Dimensions of Teacher Empowerment

Short and Rhinehart (1992) and Short and Greer (1997) identified six dimensions of empowerment. The teacher empowerment attributes are decision-making, teacher impact, teacher status, autonomy, opportunities for professional development, and teacher

self-efficacy. The six attributes provide a theoretical foundation for examining teacher leadership. Each of the six attributes is discussed in the following pages.

Decision-making. The decision-making dimension of empowerment involves teachers' participation in critical decisions that directly affect their work. Research informs us it is necessary for teachers to be part of the decision-making process because they impact what happens in school (Barth, 2001; Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

A key element in empowerment is providing teachers with a significant, genuine role in school decision-making (Short & Greer, 1989). Teachers have increased control over their work environment when their opinions influence the outcome of the decision-making process. Teachers are less willing to participate in decision-making if they perceive that their opinions are not taken in to consideration by the principal when the final decision is made (Short, Miller-Wood & Johnson, 1991). Moreover, Ashton and Webb (1986) found that teachers are dismayed and frustrated when they are unable to influence the process of decision-making. Teachers feel validated in their ideas when they are given responsibility to make final decisions (Short, Miller-Wood & Johnson, 1991).

A school climate that promotes involvement in decision making is characterized by openness and risk taking which encourages teachers to try new ideas and take different approaches (Short, 1994). The problem solving capacity of teachers is strengthened when shared decision-making is utilized in schools (Short, 1994). Teachers who are decision makers feel ownership and commitment to the process (Short, 1994). Teachers who feel responsible for student learning and accountable for their work have a greater interest and willingness to participate in decision-making (Short, 1994).

Impact. The attribute of impact refers to teachers' perceptions that they have an effect and influence on school life (Short, 1994). Teachers' self-esteem and confidence grow when they feel they are doing something worthwhile and are recognized for their accomplishments (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Lightfoot (1986) added that teachers in good schools advanced in the practice of teaching by receiving respect from parents and community members.

Teacher impact is one of the characteristics of transformational teacher-leaders (Briley, 2004). Teacher impact means that teachers influence other faculty members to take part in reform efforts and school improvement initiatives (Harris, 2002; Howey, 1988; Maeroff, 1988; Short, 1994; Wasley, 1991). Teacher-leaders use their influence to make a difference on significant issues within the school by utilizing others in making changes (Gonzales & Lambert, 2001; Hoerr, 1996). Teacher-leaders can influence what (Evans, 1996) referred to as "unfreezables" — teachers who become complacent and resist change. Empowered and transformational teacher-leaders, when viewed as peers, may be able to influence the "unfreezables" to take risks in an attempt to take part in school reform (Briley, 2004).

Status. The status attribute of empowerment refers to the sense of esteem, respect, and admiration attributed by students, parents, community members, peers, and superiors to the profession of teaching (Short & Johnson, 1994). Recognition of teacher status can be found in comments and attitudes from the various constituents of the school environment and student response to the teacher's instructions (Short & Johnson, 1994). In contrast, a combination of high public expectations and poor working conditions, as

perceived by teachers, creates tension that reduces the status that teachers may feel (Short, 1994).

Another important aspect of the status attribute of empowerment is having the ability to overcome the fear of resistance from faculty members (Barth, 2001; Gonzales & Lambert, 2001). Resistance may become evident through an attitude of jealousy and a view that the teacher-leader was chosen for various roles because of favoritism on behalf of the principal (Briley, 2004).

On the other hand, there are teachers who look to teacher-leaders for support and encouragement which often leads to teacher-leaders' perceptions that colleagues respect the knowledge and expertise they have displayed in decision-making (Briley, 2004; Patterson & Patterson, 2004; Short, 1994). Many times teacher-leaders have proven themselves competent in decision-making; therefore faculty members are more likely to accept changes suggested by teacher-leaders than they would from outsiders (Patterson & Patterson, 2004; Sherrill, 1999). As a result of their contributions to the school, lead teachers receive recognition from the administration for their efforts enhancing their status among faculty members (Briley, 2004; Rinehart & Short, 1994).

Autonomy. Autonomy is the dimension of teacher empowerment that refers to teachers' beliefs that they can control certain aspects of their work life such as scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning (Gonzales & Lambert, 2001; Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994; Short & Rinehart, 1992). The foundation for autonomy is the sense of freedom to make certain decisions (Short, 1994) and the confidence to express opinions while also learning from and engaging with others in

learning (Briley, 2004). Autonomy is fostered when school environments support risk taking and experimentation by teachers (Short, 1994).

Autonomous individuals will generally have an attitude of collegiality, risk-taking, and on-going learning (Henderson & Hawthorne, 2000). They also tend to experience greater satisfaction in the workplace as autonomy increases (Lumsden, 1998). As a result, autonomous people will willingly participate with, learn from, and share with others and believe they have a positive impact on school business (Briley, 2004).

Administrators are unsuccessful in promoting teacher autonomy when they do not take seriously the adverse impact on educational collaboration that a hierarchical system has on the growth of teachers (Barth, 2001). Moreover, Rosenholtz (1987) believed that the traditional bureaucratic organizational structure of schools prevents teacher autonomy and leads to teachers' leaving the teaching profession. Collegiality between administrators and teachers is gained through sharing information in the process of decision-making (Barth, 1990; Briley, 2004). As a result, an atmosphere of trust and interaction is built that promotes autonomy and increased competence (Briley, 2004) which translates into self-satisfaction for teachers (Koehler, 1990). Thus, in a climate where teachers have a greater sense of self-satisfaction and control over what happens in the workplace, mutual trust has been established and a climate has been created where autonomy can flourish (Koehler, 1990).

Professional growth. Professional growth refers to teachers' perception that the school in which they work provides them with opportunities to grow and develop professionally, to learn continuously, and to expand one's own skills through the work life of the school (Short & Johnson, 1994).

Self-Efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to teachers' perceptions that they have the skills and ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning. Self-efficacy develops as individuals acquire self-knowledge and the belief that they are personally competent and have mastered skills necessary to affect desired outcomes (Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994). Roseholtz (1985) stated that teachers' sense of self-efficacy and professional certainty relates to teachers' decisions to remain in teaching. Teacher certainty about professional abilities and skills is highly correlated to student achievement (Roseholtz, 1985).

An understanding of the six dimensions of teacher empowerment should provide the bases for developing strategies to help teachers become more empowered in their work lives (Short, 1994). Further, the six dimensions constitute a construct vital to the redesign of teachers' work life and the growth and renewal of schools.

Teacher Leadership

Originally conceived as teacher empowerment (Lieberman & Miller, 2004), teacher leadership has earned a place in the professional literature. Lieberman and Miller (2004) divided the scholarly research and literature about teacher leadership into three main categories:

1. Individual teacher leader roles and organizational realities: In order for teacher leadership to become a reality, teachers must be given support for their work, as well as a clear understanding of the roles they play within the schools in gaining legitimacy within the school organization (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). Furthermore, teachers as leaders have to

learn new skills including building trust and rapport, using resources, managing the work, and building skill and confidence with others (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). Teacher leaders realize that the bureaucratic, hierarchical nature of schools often are in conflict with the collegial nature of the reforms that teacher leadership was designed to bring about.

2. Learning in practice: Although teacher leaders are taught theories and skills in preparation for their work, teacher leaders learn to become leaders through experience and practice much like the surgeon learns to perform surgeries by performing operations (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). Schon (1983) coined the term *reflective practice* which means learning takes place on the job when practitioners develop “theories in use” from their own experience in practicing their profession (Lieberman & Miller, 2004).
3. Teacher leadership and reshaping school culture: Teacher leaders have the potential to reshape culture by the roles they play in the reconstruction of relationships and meaning, the transformation of conditions for learning and teaching, and the development of a new way to view the teaching profession (Lieberman & Miller, 2004). For example, by promoting working together in a community of learners rather than in isolation, teacher leaders can begin to build a new collaborative culture.

Reasons for Teacher Empowerment

Empowerment brings about constructive school change (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). The empowerment of teachers is necessary for schools to reach their full potential

(Barth, 1990). Teacher empowerment gives decision making power to those closest to the students — the teachers. Teachers' sense of empowerment grows as they have opportunities to grow and develop professionally, become life-long learners, believe they have an impact on student learning, have decision-making opportunities, trust they will be taken seriously, and have a sense of status (Briley, 2004; Short, 1998). Whitaker and Moses (1990) proposed five reasons why teachers should be empowered.

The first reason given is empowerment creates a sense of ownership in teachers' work environments and provides teachers with the opportunities to perform to their fullest capabilities (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). Empowerment builds greater ownership, and greater ownership results in more ingenuity and productivity (Richardson, Lane & Flanigan, 1995; Whitaker & Moses, 1990).

A second reason Whitaker and Moses (1990) gave for empowering teachers is that empowerment enfranchises teachers. Although teachers are often asked their opinions, it seldom makes a difference in the decisions that are made. When teachers feel they are left out of the decision making process, they are likely to develop a sense of powerlessness, which often leads to them leaving the teaching profession (Whitaker & Moses, 1990).

Third, Whitaker and Moses (1990) believed that teacher empowerment prevents mindless bureaucracy. Many schools still remain modeled after the industrial-age school where orders are given from the principal and conformity is expected. Empowered teachers want to create action that will benefit students and successful school restructuring depends on bringing out the full potential of teachers to make decisions that effect students (Whitaker & Moses, 1990).

Whitaker and Moses stated that the fourth reason for teachers to be empowered is the inspiration to grow as professionals. Growth and creativity are most likely to occur when teachers have autonomy to think, interact, and innovate. Teacher empowerment is the foundation for growth, conscious decision making and reflection. The development of a conscious educational belief system is the cornerstone of professionalism which requires teachers to be empowered. Top-down school reform is reactive, whereas internally motivated change stemming from teacher empowerment is creative and reflective which generates higher levels of professional growth, commitment, and performance (Whitaker & Moses, 1990).

The fifth reason given by Whitaker and Moses is that empowerment inspires collaboration among educators. Collaboration is based on empowerment (Barth, 1990; Whitaker & Moses, 1990). Rosenholtz (1988) found that teachers working in a collaborative environment seek each other out for assistance and take responsibility for helping colleagues.

In the book, *School Empowerment*, Richardson, Lane, and Flanigan (1995) stated two additional purposes for empowering teachers that have received little attention: 1) if students are to become problem-solving decision makers, they must be surrounded by adults who model that behavior, and 2) teachers, like many other professionals, are more committed to and feel more responsible for decisions they make.

Barriers to Teacher Empowerment

In order to successfully implement teacher empowerment, school personnel must avoid the mistakes often associated with empowerment efforts. The mistakes are:

1. The first error principals should avoid is the tendency to focus on the “here and now” rather than on the future. Therefore, a clearly stated end result must be communicated so that all parties understand the vision and mission of the school (Phillips, 1989; Romanish, 1991).
2. A second common mistake is not adequately addressing the role changes of teachers and administrators (White, 1992).
3. A third mistake involves the failure to provide training for all school personnel (Foster, 1990).
4. A fourth mistake concerns the lack of preparation for the realities of change (Fullan, 1991).

On occasion, teachers who are given opportunities to involve themselves in school wide decisions invest time and energy in trivial decisions and minor issues (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Weiss (1990) believed this occurs when teachers do not want to be involved in administrative decisions that they view as detractors from their classroom work and because they view empowerment not as a genuine endeavor, but as a false pretense of allowing teachers to vent their frustrations without making a real impact on decision outcomes.

Other barriers to teacher empowerment have been cited in research, such as lack of definition and clarity regarding change efforts; inadequate or inappropriate resources; lack of hierarchical support; sources of resistance from school personnel, including the school, the principal’s or central office staff members’ fear of losing power; and forms of teacher resistance, such as reluctance to change roles and responsibilities, lack of skills, and lack of trust (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Administrators’ fears of losing control and

teacher resistance appear to be especially compelling and obstructing factors (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). State and federal policies and collective bargaining agreements often restrict a school's flexibility and autonomy which may force schools to conform to standards and practices that restrict teacher empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

Facilitating Factors of Empowerment

For empowerment of teachers to be successful Smith and Lotven (1993) declared that four conditions must be in place; both teachers and administrators must: 1) understand and theoretically accept the benefits of empowerment and shared decision-making; 2) know what roles both will play; 3) recognize the existence of a discrepancy gap between what currently is and what could be; and finally must 4) take the risk of commitment to change. Teachers believe that they are more empowered when the school in which they work provides them with opportunities to grow and develop professionally (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Short, 1998). Teachers feel further empowerment when they are confident in their skills and abilities to help students learn, competent in building effective programs for students, and have command of the subject matter (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Short, 1998). Teachers are more empowered when they have greater involvement in decision making on issues of critical concern to them and to their work (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Short, 1998).

Schools where teachers perceive themselves to be empowered have a high trust level among teachers, principal, and district office leaders; an intense focus on students as the primary driver for all decision making; a zeal for successfully tackling the tough problems that hinder student learning; and a strong belief among teachers that they are

highly competent (Short, 1998). Empowered teachers work intensely to increase professional competency through study, reflection, and other growth opportunities (Short, 1998).

Variables critical in creating empowered schools identified by the “Empowered School District Project” (Short, Miller-Wood & Johnson, 1991) include: 1) the need for the process of empowerment to be evolutionary, 2) the necessity for a knowledge base and specific school structures for empowerment to evolve, 3) an environment supportive of risk taking and innovation, 4) the need for trust building at a number of levels, 5) the powerful impact of an outside facilitator and contact with other schools involved in empowerment to help in the change process, 6) the restructuring of the role of the principal to enabler and “conscious” and 7) the role of critical incidents in the creation of evolutionary shifts in the empowerment process. In addition, there are principal behaviors which are fundamental to teacher empowerment. Goldman, Dunlap, and Conley (1993) suggested that principals must: 1) manifest a clear sense of purpose linked to a vision for the school, 2) use data to inform their decisions, 3) allocate resources consistent with the school’s vision and goals, 4) help create new decision-making structures where they are needed, and 5) become more involved in indirect supporting roles for teachers and less involved in direct leadership activities.

In a study conducted by Bredeson (1989) it was found that in schools with empowered teachers the principals supported and positively affected the teachers’ professional work in the following ways:

- Providing time, space and money to implement ideas
- Reassuring people that ideas and plans are valued

- Modeling an acceptance of problems as opportunities for improvement
- Being informed
- Being available
- Providing an open, friendly and supportive environment

Summary

Schools are bombarded with educational reform initiatives focused on improved student performance to answer society's changing and complex nature. However, upon entering the 21st century there appears to be no public resolve that schools are adequately preparing our nation's youth to enter the workforce. Barth (1990) maintains that the reason for the mediocre results is that school restructuring and reform movements have been initiated from *without* schools therefore, making no substantial gains in school improvement. Rather, Barth (1990) contends the key to improvement lies *within* schools and begins with collegial professional relationships between principals and teachers. What seems clear is that little has changed in the basic structure of decision making within schools; therefore, there remains much untapped professional knowledge and talent in schools (Kreisberg, 1992).

When looking to improve schools from *within*, it appears that the authoritarian, bureaucratic structure controlling the relationships between teachers and principals may need to be transformed to a shared distributed model of leadership. The complexities and challenges of modern day schooling can no longer be totally controlled and directed by the principal acting in isolation (Blasé & Anderson, 1995). Instead, a school culture that is open to hearing the voices of all people in making decisions and formulating ideas and

solutions to challenges facing the world of education is needed. Teacher empowerment is more about transcending power than the possession of power (Combs, Miser & Whitaker, 1999). The sharing of power between principals and teachers is often seen as the foundation to the success of modern-day schools (Leithwood & Meenzies, 1998). Many principals are discovering the importance of fostering teacher empowerment to improve site-based management and shared-decision making (Lucas & Valentine, 2001). Therefore, continuing to take an in-depth look at principal power and its relationship to teacher empowerment may lead to a greater understanding of how to establish successful, high-performance schools that meet the demands of an ever-changing society.

Teacher empowerment necessitates collaboration between principals and teachers to solve problems, make decisions, create innovative solutions, and decide on the mission and vision of the school. Barth (1990) stated, “School is not a place for important people who do not need to learn and unimportant people who do. Instead, school is a place where students discover, and adults rediscover, the joys, the difficulties, and the satisfactions of learning together” (p. 43).

III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter addresses the methodology used in this study. It contains nine sections. The first section offers a brief discussion of the ethical issues encountered while conducting this study. The second section presents the research design used in this study. The theoretical framework is discussed in section three of this chapter; followed by discussions about principals' use of power, participants, data collection procedures, analysis, and concluding with section nine that presents a brief summary of this research.

Ethical Issues

Due to the highly political nature of this study, the researcher found it challenging to find school districts that were willing to participate. One area of sensitivity was guaranteeing the complete anonymity of the study participants. All the superintendents expressed concern that teachers might not want to participate in this study if they had negative feedback to give, for fear it would get back to the principals. One superintendent was also concerned about the effect negative feedback might have on his/her position because the superintendents were elected in that particular county. There was concern that teachers who did not want the current superintendent in office might use the research as an outlet to show that they were discontented.

Design

This study investigated the relationship between principal use of power and teacher empowerment as perceived by teachers. The primary method of analysis was quantitative, with survey analysis being used to determine if any direct relationship exists between principal use of power and teacher empowerment. Three types of data were collected. First, the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) was used to measure teachers' perceptions of the type of power base used by principals. This multi-item instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale to measure the perception of subordinates regarding supervisors' basis of power (Rahim & Buntzman, 1988). The Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) was developed on the basis of feedback from students and faculty and an iterative process of factor analysis from six successive convenience samples and a random sample of public administrators ($N = 1,256$). The final instrument was constructed on the basis of a factor analysis from a national sample of managers ($N = 476$), respectively (Rahim & Buntzman, 1988).

Second, the School Participation Empowerment Scale (SPES) (Short & Rinehart, 1992) was used to measure teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. It contains 38 statements requiring a neutral, agree, or strongly agree response. This instrument contains six subscales: (1) decision making, (2) professional growth, (3) status, (4) self-efficacy, (5) autonomy, and (6) impact. It was reported that Coefficient alpha for the total scale was .94 and those for the six factor scales ranged from .81 to .89. The split-half reliability of this instrument is .75 (Short & Rhinehart, 1992). A Canonical Correlation was employed to take into account the multivariate nature of principal power

bases and teacher empowerment. The Canonical correlation is a multivariate extension of multiple correlation and regression.

Third, answers to open-ended questions were used to enrich the findings of the quantitative analysis. The open-ended questions were researcher-designed. They were, “Other than what was addressed on the School Participant Empowerment Scale, what do you view as limitations and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment” and “Other than what was addressed on the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, what do you see your principal doing that limits or promotes teacher empowerment?” The questions were constructed in order to get additional feedback from teachers about teacher empowerment and principal use of power. The researcher was interested in hearing what teachers had to say in their own words, in addition to what was addressed on the SPLI and the RLPI. The open-ended questions took on a greater importance because although they were invited to do so, no teachers were willing to participate in focus group interviews. The researcher wanted to give teachers an outlet for feedback instead of being limited to responses on the SPES and the RLPI.

Data from the surveys were analyzed using several statistical procedures and an emergent theme approach for the responses to open-ended questions on one survey. The data from the RLPI and the SPES were entered into Excel and then imported into SPSS. A descriptive statistics analysis was used to determine teachers’ perceptions of the types of power used by their principals. A multivariate analysis, the canonical correlation, of the results of the RLPI and the SPES was conducted to determine the relationship between levels of principal power as perceived by teachers and perceived levels of teacher empowerment. A qualitative analysis of the responses teachers offered on the

open-ended questions was employed to determine other limitations and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment not addressed on the RLPI and the SPES.

The original design for the study called for identifying background knowledge of teachers such as gender, age, race, academic degrees held, years of teaching experience, and level of teaching experience. These variables were of interest to determine if there was any relationship between these demographic subgroups and perceived teacher empowerment. For example, it would have been of interest to see if teachers' years of experience influenced their perceived level of teacher empowerment. However, the superintendents and many of the principals in each county expressed concern about asking for this information from teachers. It appeared that they were concerned about revealing information that could potentially identify participants. One of the superintendents stated that some of the teachers may be uncomfortable in filling out a survey about their principals for fear that they may be identified in some way so there data were not collected.

There has been a trend in educational research for researchers use both qualitative and quantitative approaches in the same study (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002). Researchers can combine the two approaches in three ways: using one approach to verify the findings of the other; using one approach as the groundwork for the other; and using both approaches in complimentary fashion to explore different aspects of the same research questions (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002). This study used the answers given by teachers to the open-ended questions to further explore the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. It was hoped that the teacher

input would give further insight into the limitations and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment.

The study was conducted in three school districts in Alabama. Several research procedures were used to evaluate each research question as follows:

Research Questions	Research Procedures
<p>What are teachers' perceptions of the types of power used by their principals?</p>	<p>The Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) was used to measure teachers' perceptions of the type of power base used by principals.</p>
<p>What is the relationship between levels of principal power as perceived by teachers and perceived level of teacher empowerment?</p>	<p>The School Participation Empowerment Scale was used to measure teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. This measure, along with the RLPI was studied to gain a better understanding of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal use of power.</p>
<p>What are important aspects that influence teacher perceptions of their level of empowerment?</p>	<p>Researcher-designed open-ended questions were sent to teachers in the survey packet. The questions were designed to provide teachers with additional opportunities to voice their perceptions of teacher empowerment and principal use of power.</p>

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework grounding this study is based on Kreisberg's (1992) perception of "power over" versus "power with". He examined the nature of power and its relationship to empowerment and found that "power with" facilitated empowerment whereas "power over" was a barrier to creating cultures that fostered a spirit of empowerment. The essence of "power with" is having equal power relationships in schools rather than domination; meaning teachers become more active participants in school decisions and have shared rights and responsibilities with the principal. "Power over" is seen as domination in the forms of coercion, lack of respect and trust, and alienation and fear. For schools to move from traditional stances of "power over" to "power with", educators and principals must be willing to examine how they view leadership roles and how schools are structured (Kreisberg, 1992).

The traditional bureaucratic model of leadership seemingly is no longer sufficient for meeting the demands of our ever-changing society. Because of the complex nature of modern-day schools, principals can no longer act in isolation as they manage and lead schools in the 21st century. Therefore, in some instances, principals are being asked to create conditions that will foster the empowerment of teachers, thus lessening the burden on themselves to manage all school business while creating leadership cultures (Lambert, 2005) that are large and flexible enough to better address the many issues facing today's schools. "Power with" encourages dialogue and collaboration among principals and teachers. Principals who share leadership with teachers focus on developing the skills teacher leaders need to have and provide opportunities for teachers to utilize those skills

in meaningful ways in the school, particularly as issues affect the teaching and learning process.

“Power over” remains the norm in most schools simply because there is a lack of knowledge about the alternatives (Kreisberg, 1992). Obtaining information about the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power may add to the knowledge needed for “power with” to be valued and better developed and utilized in schools.

This research utilizes the concept of “power with,” the six dimensions of teacher empowerment, and the five dimensions of principal power bases to provide a comprehensive lens to examine the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power.

Attributes of Empowerment

A review of the literature revealed that empowerment in education has drawn considerable attention over the past decade (Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995). Further, research suggests that in order for teachers to take a leadership role in schools they need to be empowered to do so (Berry & Ginsberg, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Glickman, 1991; Harris, 2003; Lieberman et al., 1988; Wynne, 2001). Short and Rinehart (1992) identified six attributes of teacher empowerment. These six attributes were decision-making, teacher impact, autonomy, status, professional growth, and self-efficacy. Each of these attributes is defined in the following paragraphs. These attributes also operationally defined by the score on the School Participant Empowerment Scale.

Decision-making

Decision-making is defined as active participation in solving problems encountered in the school setting and having an impact on decisions pertaining to reform efforts. Teachers gain a sense of control over the work environment through participation in decision-making that directly affect their work (Barth, 2002; Lambert, 2003; Maeroff, 1988; Short & Rinehart, 1992). Teachers feel endorsed in their ideas when they are given responsibility to make decisions (Short, Miller-Wood, & Johnson, 1991).

Teacher Impact

Teacher impact is the degree to which someone influences others, helps others achieve, and learns from others (Henderson & Hawthorne, 2000). Teachers' self-esteem and confidence strengthens when they feel they are doing something meaningful and therefore will be recognized for their accomplishments (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Teacher impact differs from status in that teacher impact is something the teacher does while status is something the teacher receives based on what the teacher has done to achieve school goals (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Autonomy

Autonomy refers to teachers' beliefs that they can control certain features of their work life such as scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning (Gonzales & Lambert, 2001; Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994; Short & Rinehart, 1992).

Autonomy is also characterized by risk-taking, on-going learning, and an attitude of collegiality (Henderson & Hawthorne, 2000).

Status

Status refers to sense of esteem, respect, and admiration teachers feel from students, parents, community members, peers, and superiors (Short & Johnson, 1994). Status can also be characterized by the degree to which a teacher supports and encourages others (Patterson & Patterson, 2004; Short, 1994).

Professional Growth

Professional growth refers to a teacher's personal efforts at continuous learning and efforts to influence others to grow professionally (Short & Johnson, 1994). Professional growth includes inquiry, feedback, and reflection about educational issues (Gonzales & Lambert, 2001; Henderson & Hawthorne, 2000).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to teachers' perceptions that they have the skills and ability to learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning. Self-efficacy is marked by feelings of competency, the need for self-improvement, and a readiness to try and fail many times (Bandura, 1986; Enderlin-Lampe, 2002).

Principals' Use of Power

For the purposes of this study the power typology proposed by French and Raven (1959) is used to classify principal use of power. The bases of power suggested by French and Raven are widely discussed in the literature and are popular in application in the social sciences (Rahim & Buntzman, 1988). The five principal power bases are

operationally defined by the score on the the Rahim Leader Power Inventory. The five bases of power identified by French and Raven (1959) follow.

1. *Coercive Power* — Coercive power is based on subordinates' perceptions that a superior has the ability to punish or threaten if there is a failure to confirm to the leaders demands.
2. *Reward Power* — Reward power is based on the perceptions of subordinates that a superior has the ability to reward them for desired behavior.
3. *Legitimate Power* — Legitimate power is based on the belief of subordinates that a superior has the authority to influence and control their behavior.
4. *Expert Power* — Expert power is based on the subordinates' beliefs that a superior has job experience and special knowledge or expertise in a given area.
5. *Referent Power* — Referent power is based on subordinates' feelings or desires to identify with a superior because of admiration or personal liking of the superior.

Participants

The participants in this study were K–12 teachers from three school districts in Alabama. The first school system had 2,415 students and 140 teachers in 8 schools encompassing grades K–12. The second school system consisted of 3,389 students and 301 teachers in 6 schools encompassing grades K–12. The third school system consisted

of 10,213 students and 702 teachers in 15 schools encompassing grades PreK–12. A total of 1143 surveys were distributed to teachers. Each county allowed the researcher to send the survey to teachers one time with no additional reminders and 173 teachers returned the survey packet.

The participants were appropriate for this study because they were certified full time teachers with immediate supervisors; therefore, able to give feedback about perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. A total of 1143 surveys were distributed on time to teachers. Each county allowed me to send the survey to teachers one time with no additional reminders and 173 teachers returned the survey packet.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission was given by the principals and school superintendents in each school district to conduct the study. Each personnel director provided the researcher with the names of the schools and number of certified full-time teachers in each school. A survey packet for every teacher was mailed to each personnel director who in turn mailed the survey packets to each school where one packet was placed in each teacher's mailbox. Included in each survey packet was a self-addressed return envelope, an invitation to participate in the study, the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, the School Participant Empowerment Scale, a page with two open-ended questions, and an invitation to participate in focus group interviews.

The surveys were put in sealed envelopes addressed to a teacher at each school. The participants' identification was not retrievable. Teachers were asked to indicate whether they would be willing to participate in a focus group interview. The teachers had

the option of e-mailing or including in the survey packet their desire to participate in focus group interviews. None of the participants offered to participate in the study; therefore, this part had to be eliminated from the study.

Analysis

Data from the surveys were analyzed using a multiple regression analysis and an emergent theme approach to the responses of the open-ended questions. The data from the RLPI and the SPES were entered in Excel and then imported into SPSS. Any out of range values were then examined and corrected. There were a few cases in which there were missing values for numerous variables and those cases were deleted from the data set. None of the remaining cases had no more than four variables with missing values so those missing values were replaced with the mean of the non-missing cases on the same variable

Once all corrections were made there were 173 useable cases. There were five variables that needed recoding on the RLPI. New variables were created for each recorded variable. Individual items were computed that made up each scale.

Summary

The methodology of this study focused on obtaining data from K-12 teachers in three school districts in Alabama that would assist the researcher in determining teachers' perceptions of the types of power used by their principals, the relationship between levels of principal power as perceived by teachers and perceived level of teacher empowerment,

and other important aspects that influence teacher perceptions of their level of empowerment. An analysis of the data is presented in Chapter IV.

IV. FINDINGS

The results of the study are presented in three sections of this chapter. Each section addresses one of the research questions proposed in this study. The first section is a descriptive analysis of the results of the RLPI as they relate to teachers' perceptions of the types of power used by their principals. The second section is a multivariate analysis of the results of the RLPI and the SPES as they relate to the relationship between levels of principal power as perceived by teachers and perceived levels of teacher empowerment. The third section is a qualitative analysis of the responses teachers gave to the open-ended questions component of the survey packet. The themes of the teachers' responses are identified.

Teachers' Perceptions of the Types of Power Used by Their Principals

This research sought to identify teachers' general perceptions of the types of power used by their principals. Table 3 reports the scaled score on each type of power base used by principals and the distribution of the cases reported by teachers in this study.

Table 3

Recoded Coercive Power Base

Score on RLPI	1-1.99 strongly disagree	2-2.99 disagree	3-3.99 neutral	4-4.99 agree	5 strongly agree	Total
Coercive Power Base	8	33	81	46	5	173
Reward Power Base	50	79	36	7	1	173
Legitimate Power Base	0	4	60	97	12	173
Expert Power Base	5	21	64	69	14	173
Referent Power Base	5	23	53	64	28	173

An examination of the 173 returned surveys reveals that, 81% of teachers expressed neutral feelings about their principals' use of coercive power, 79% of teachers responded that they do not feel their principals use reward power, 97% of teachers responded that their principals operate from a legitimate power base, 69% of teachers reported that their principals use expert power, and 64% of teachers claim their principals use referent power. Therefore, from the 173 returned surveys, most teachers perceive that their principals operate from a legitimate power base followed by the use of expert and referent power.

The Relationship between Levels of Principal Power as Perceived by Teachers and Perceived Level of Teacher Empowerment

The canonical analysis technique was selected to analyze the relationships among the multiple independent variables (principal power bases) and the multiple dependent variables (teacher empowerment). Canonical analysis of the five principal power bases and the six teacher empowerment dimensions resulted in one root that was statistically significant ($p < .001$). Of the other roots, none are significantly correlated. Following the table is an explanation of the information that is included.

Table 4

Summary of First Canonical Root for Teacher Empowerment and Principle Power Bases

Variable	Raw Weight	Standardized Weight	Structure Coefficient	Proportion of Variance	Redundancy
Teacher Empowerment					
Decision Making	.038	.288	.750		
Professional Growth	.227	.988	.942		
Status	.014	.041	.477		
Self Efficacy	.094	.301	.421		
Autonomy	.008	.033	.623		
Impact	.041	.132	.452	.408	.200
Principal Power Bases					
Coercive	.019	.076	.213		
Reward	.034	.162	.426		
Legitimacy	.048	.151	.515		
Expert	.151	.764	.964		
Referent	.063	.335	.860	.432	.212

Table 4 (continued)

Eigenvalue = .965	Canonical Correlation = .701	Squared Canonical Correlation = .491
Wilks Lambda = .426	$F(30, 650) = 5.152$	Significance of $F = .001$

*Results reported for the first canonical root only. Canonical roots 2 through 5 were not statistically significant.

The Canonical Correlation suggested that there is the strongest relationship between the principal power bases of expert (-.964), referent (-.860), decision-making (-.750), and professional growth (-.942) dimensions of teacher empowerment. To a lesser extent the principal power bases of legitimacy (-.515) and reward (-.426) are related to the status (-.477), self-efficacy (-.421), and impact (-.452) dimensions of teacher empowerment. On the whole, coercive power (-.213) does not seem to be linked to any aspects of teacher empowerment. Overall principal power bases account for about 21% of the raw score variance on the six dimensions of teacher empowerment.

The data show expert and referent power as having the highest significant relationship to teachers' decision making and professional growth. Of the five subscales of principal power bases, coercive power has the lowest relationship to decision-making ability.

It appears that principal use of expert and referent power bases have the strongest influence on teacher empowerment. Coercive and reward power bases are the least likely power bases to have significant impact on the six subscales of teacher empowerment.

Expert and referent power appear to be more closely interrelated power bases that influence teacher empowerment. The computed Pearson Correlation suggests that

teachers who perceive principals as operating from expert (.964) and referent (.860) power bases are more likely to feel empowered.

Teachers' Perceptions about Limitations and Facilitating Factors of Teacher Empowerment

Teachers were asked to answer two open-ended questions in addition to completing the RLPI and the SPES. The questions were, "Other than what was addressed on the School Participant Empowerment Scale, what do you view as limitations and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment?" and "Other than what was addressed on the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, what do you see your principal doing that limits or promotes teacher empowerment?" The constant comparative method (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002) of categorizing the teacher responses was used to compare teacher responses and group them with the six teacher empowerment themes set forth by Short and Rhinehart (1992) and Short and Greer (1997) and the five principal power bases proposed by French and Raven (1959).

The six teacher empowerment dimensions are decision-making, impact, status, autonomy, professional growth, and self-efficacy. There were 92 questionnaires returned with responses to the open-ended questions about teacher empowerment. Qualitative findings related to each teacher empowerment dimension are discussed below.

Decision-making

The decision-making dimension of empowerment includes teachers' participation in critical decisions that directly affect their work. At the school level teachers are responsible for implementing the decisions that are made; therefore it is beneficial to have teacher input in the decision-making process. In this way, teachers may feel a sense

of ownership and control over their work which could lead to a greater sense of responsibility for school improvement. Repeated research studies show the benefit to organizations when those implementing the decisions have input in problem-solving and decision-making (Howey, 1988). However, 14 teachers who participated in this study reported having very little opportunity to make decisions. Several illustrative comments made by teachers were, “The principal is a micromanager and doesn’t take teacher suggestions to heart. He says he welcomes our suggestions, but few, if any, of them are acted upon”; “Our ideas are quickly dismissed” and “There is very little opportunity to make decisions about what is taught and other decisions.” In addition two teachers wrote, “Teachers do not determine the pace of instruction in the classroom” and “I feel my principal thinks that decision-making is her job and therefore would show weakness if she took the advice or request of teachers.”

Moreover, one teacher stated she felt that only a select group of teachers were involved in decision making about the curriculum, budget, hiring, testing and scheduling. One teacher reported that even when they are asked to be involved in the decision-making process, their ideas were not taken seriously. One teacher wrote, “Many times I have served on textbook committees and it always seems to me that the county already knows what they want to adopt, therefore our input is useless.” Other teachers stated that they felt the same way and resented the time taken away from their classrooms to give their input when it was not taken into consideration.

Some teachers wrote about factors other than leadership that hindered their input in the decision-making process. For example, “The classroom sizes make it very difficult for teachers to decide for themselves what type of schedule would best suit them and

their students. This type of empowerment would greatly benefit teachers and students.”

Along the same lines, one teacher expressed that decision-making was far removed from her school system in that, “There is considerable micro-management from the top-down, beginning at the federal level and following through to the district and local level. This occurs in all aspects of my job from behavior management to curriculum.”

Impact

The attribute of impact refers to teachers’ perceptions that they have an effect and influence on school life (Short, 1994). Teachers’ self-esteem and confidence grow when they feel they are doing something worthwhile and are recognized for their accomplishments (Ashton & Webb, 1986). In addition, teacher impact is one of the characteristics of transformational teacher-leaders. Teacher-leaders can often influence other faculty members to take part in reform efforts and initiatives (Howey, 1988; Maeroff, 1988).

There were two comments made by teachers that fit the impact dimension of teacher empowerment and both were negative. One teacher stated, “Administrative discouragement of creative hands-on learning makes it difficult for me to feel like I am providing meaningful learning experiences for my students.” Another teacher wrote, “There is fear that if too much is left to the individual teacher, all standards will not be addressed, covered and mastered.”

Status

The status attribute of empowerment refers to the sense of esteem, respect, and admiration attributed by students, parents, community members, peers, and superiors to the profession of teaching (Short & Johnson, 1994). Recognition of teacher status can be

found in comments and attitudes from the various stakeholders of the school environment and student response to the teacher's instructions (Short & Johnson, 1994). Teacher-leaders may feel a sense of status when other teachers look to them for support and encouragement. This could possibly encourage these teachers to feel respected and admired by colleagues, as well as others in the school community.

There were six comments made by teachers about their feelings of status and all were negative. Four descriptive comments were, "There is a perception that the classroom teacher is the low man on the totem pole and if you are good enough you will get out of the classroom to be a reading coach, Title One teacher or an administrator"; "I have noticed a lack of respect among colleagues for the jobs of other teachers as well as administration"; "Would be nice to be praised sometimes instead of criticized for student performance" and "I am not treated as an intelligent professional." In addition, one teacher wrote, "Teachers at my school are not allowed to exercise professional judgment. We must ask for permission before even so much as sending a note home to parents."

Autonomy

Autonomy is the dimension of teacher empowerment that refers to teachers' beliefs that they can control certain aspects of their work life such as scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning (Gonzales & Lambert, 2001; Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994; Short & Rinehart, 1992). The foundation for autonomy is the sense of freedom to make certain decisions (Short, 1994) and the confidence to express opinions while also learning from and engaging with others in learning (Briley, 2004). There were eight teacher responses that fit in the area of autonomy. Teacher

responses were broken down into themes; curriculum, scheduling, and professional judgment.

Several teachers wrote that they have no control over the curriculum; they feel as if it is simply a mandated document dictated by the state. Teachers wrote comments such as, “Curriculum is dictated by the county and state. Our curriculum is too cumbersome. We never drop anything, we add new stuff and there are just not enough hours in the day to teach it all”; “Having a choice or being able to vote for curriculum changes would make teachers feel empowered” and “Following a set curriculum guide does not allow teachers the opportunity to teach at a pace necessary for student learning.”

In addition, many teachers wrote about how mandated scheduling lessens their feelings of empowerment. One teacher wrote, “I believe that being bound to class schedules limits me. There are times when I feel my students need more instruction on a concept but I must hurry along in order to give a monthly benchmark assessment by the last day of the month. There are also days when I feel that math, science, and social studies need to be taught in the morning but school policy says that reading must be done in the morning.” Some teachers voiced concern about the lack of time given to math in their mandated schedules. One teacher noted, “I feel that teachers are the ones in the classrooms daily and see what changes need to be made. We know how, what, and how well our students are learning. We should have more say in schedules.” Another teacher conveyed, “Many other professionals have a much more flexible schedule; they get to choose when they go to the bathroom and when they eat lunch.”

Professional judgment was a third theme in teacher commentary related to autonomy. One of the main points made by teachers was teachers are professionals,

therefore they should have freedom over certain aspects of their work. For example, one teacher shared, “Teachers are not given enough credit for their own knowledge. They need to be given more freedom to produce learning activities other than another salesman’s program. What happened to common sense and trust in teachers?” It was also written that, “teachers are not allowed to exercise professional judgment and must ask permission before even so much as sending notes home to parents”. Another teacher reported feeling like “an underpaid robot expected to dramatically shape the future.”

There was also some positive feedback from teachers about autonomy. One teacher conveyed, “I am free to use materials and resources that I choose.” Another teacher wrote, “Our principal has the confidence that his teachers know their subject, the student handbook, and the code of conduct for teachers. He treats us as professionals and gives us the opportunity to be the authority in our classroom. We know it and the students know it”. Related to autonomy were other positive comments such as, “I have freedom to voice my opinions” and “I am free to carry out my duties to state and county guidelines.”

Professional Growth

Professional growth refers to teachers’ perceptions that the school in which they work provide them with opportunities to grow and develop professionally, to learn continuously, and to expand one’s own skills through the work life of the school (Short & Johnson, 1994). There were only three responses about professional development from teachers and both were negative. They were as follows, “there are no opportunities in our system or state for performance promotions”; “there is a fairly low ceiling when it comes to promotions or pay raises” and “our in-service activities limit us severely because they seldom have any real world applications.”

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to teachers' perceptions that they have the ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning (Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994). Self-efficacy develops as individuals acquire self-knowledge and the belief that they are personally competent and have mastered skills necessary to affect desired outcomes (Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994).

Teachers wrote numerous comments related to self-efficacy, all of which were negative. One teacher wrote, "Teachers, though well-trained and competent, are told what to do, how to do it, and when to do it rather than being given opportunity to use their talents, experience, and knowledge to help students". It appears that some teachers, though they feel competent as skillful teachers, are not given the opportunities to display their knowledge and expertise because there are so many "state and federal requirements such as No Child Left Behind" that they do not have the "flexibility to do what is best for students". In addition, several teachers stated that because of their age and lack of experience they felt unimportant. For example, one teacher wrote, "Young or less experienced teachers often get left out of decision-making processes and are made to feel their opinions are insignificant." It seems that some teachers come to the profession with feelings of self-efficacy but when surrounded by teachers that are older and with more experience they can begin to feel their knowledge is not valued.

Other Dimensions of Teacher Empowerment

Of the 173 returned survey packets, the researcher received 127 responses about limitations and facilitating factors of perceived teacher empowerment. Additional themes

that emerged from teacher feedback about empowerment can be divided into the following themes: poor quality of administrative staff, standards, lack of communication, societal issues, non-teaching duties, lack of time, and appropriate discipline. These themes are included in a separate section because they do not appear to fit in the teacher empowerment categories set forth by Short and Rinehart (1992) and Short and Greer (1997).

Poor Quality of Administrative Staff

Teachers expressed concern about inadequate administration. Several teachers wrote about the “poor administrators in the county”, there are “too many administrators” and that many of the administrators “lack effective disciplinary procedures.” One response read, “Principals should be open to their faculty. They should have the necessary qualities that go along with their profession like honesty, confidentiality, and good communication skills.” It appears that several teachers lack confidence and trust in their administrators.

Standards

Much of the feedback from teachers focused on the vast amount of time that is given to complying and meeting various standards. The researcher received 27 responses about the hindrance of complying with standards to their perceived level of teacher empowerment. For example, a teacher wrote, “The focus on students has been lost and replaced with successful completion of data to show we have met some mandated standard. There is not time for watching children learn. The teachable moment is no longer recognizable with all the push to stick to tasks so timelines can be met.” Another teacher commented, “Sometimes it feels that a classroom is a dumping ground for any

new idea which comes along to solve society's problems." Teachers expressed many concerns about *No Child Left Behind* because it has "put too much emphasis on testing instead of teaching". A teacher commented, "I see our school as more focused on test scores than on students and their needs." In addition, a teacher expressed, "Constant testing limits what I can do in the classroom. It is hard to even find the time to reward the students for a job well done because of constantly preparing them for a test."

Lack of Communication

To continue, four teachers felt that lack of communication lessened their feeling of empowerment. Teachers wrote about decisions being made that took away from instructional time simply because there was not communication between the faculty and principals when the decisions were made. For example, "There are often unplanned and off task assembly programs that take away from instruction." Another teacher wrote, "The most crippling factor to sense of empowerment is lack of communication." Still another teacher stated that, "there was lack of communication all the way from the federal government to teachers."

Societal Issues

Societal issues such as pressure from parents and lack of parental support appear to play a part in teachers' lack of feeling empowered. "Pressure from parents may limit a teacher's empowerment. Some parents expect teachers to give grades because of who a child is, not because of what a child has earned. Parents may also limit a teacher's effectiveness as a disciplinarian if they do not agree with the teacher's decision to punish their child." Many teachers feel they do not have parental support. In addition, one teacher stated that teachers are often criticized for those things for which parents should

be responsible. To clarify the teacher wrote, “Teachers are expected to teach children who are raised by absent parents and teachers are expected to motivate students who don’t value education. Teachers are held accountable for their failure.”

Non-Teaching Duties

Teachers also communicated that additional teaching duties got in the way of feeling empowered. A teacher wrote, “Teacher empowerment will continue to be limited as long as additional duties are assigned with no time allotted to complete these duties. These duties require teachers to work well over 40 hours per week with no additional compensation.” In addition, “developing, executing, and assessing dynamic learning opportunities are hindered by our responsibilities to be nurse, counselor, attendance secretary and administrator.” Also one teacher wrote, “Lack of subs and having to give up our planning time to watch other classes inhibit our abilities to prepare for students and to get a needed break time.”

Lack of Time

A lack of time was also reported as a hindrance to teacher empowerment. Several illustrative comments made were, “Our curriculum is too cumbersome. We never drop anything, we add new stuff and there just aren’t enough hours in the day.” Teachers reported feeling that there were not enough hours in the day to re-enforce skills that some students miss while adhering to strict timelines. A teacher wrote, “Teachers who are effective, work long hours under a large amount of stress. Time to do the work we have before us is constantly taken for meetings and more training and more meetings.” In addition a teacher wrote, “Limiting factors of teacher empowerment include lack of planning time and a rush through curriculum due to the 7 month plan.”

Appropriate Discipline

Appropriate and consistent discipline was noted by seven teachers as a contributing factor to their sense of empowerment. Teachers conveyed that when they are supported by the principal in discipline decisions they feel empowered. One teacher wrote, "If the student knows what a teacher says goes, and the principal will back it up, then the students are more likely to listen to the teacher." Another teacher wrote that effective discipline procedures are a major factor in her sense of empowerment. The teacher wrote, "When effective disciplinary procedures are repeated then I feel empowered." A teacher wrote, "We are limited in discipline because of the principal."

In addition to commentary about teacher empowerment, qualitative data were collected that relate to the principal power bases set forth by French and Raven (1959). Eighty-seven teachers responded to the questionnaire about principal use of power. The power bases are widely used and accepted in social science research (Rahim & Buntzman, 1988). The power bases are coercive, reward, legitimate, expert, and referent power.

Coercive Power

Coercive power is based on subordinates' perceptions that a superior has the ability to punish or threaten if there is failure to conform to the leader's demands. The four comments teachers made about coercive power were negative. One teacher expressed, "Principals seem to undermine teachers by making them feel as though they must participate in extracurricular activities done by the school. We are told to do this or we must fear for our job." Another teacher answered, "In our situation, our principal tries too hard to micro-manage every facet of our school day. Teachers feel that they are

expected to be robots performing exactly as the principal want.” Another relevant comment made was, “My principal has a do it my way attitude even though he’s only been a principal for one and a half years. He will make us do something just to prove a point; not because it is what’s best for our school.” It was reported that one principal acted like a “bulldozer” instead of “building good relationships with staff.”

Reward Power

Reward power is based on the perception of subordinates that a superior has the ability to reward them for desired behavior. Nine teachers wrote comments about reward power. Several teachers wrote that the educational system is not designed to give principals the resources to reward teachers. One teacher replied, “Principals have no way to reward effective teaching- money or otherwise”. Moreover, “Principals do not have the authority to promote teachers and have little input as to who will be hired.” It seems that some teachers feel discouraged because “regardless of performance, teachers with similar education and experience receive the same pay.”

Teachers revealed that rewards do not have to be tangible to be empowering. An illustrative comment was, “While a principal cannot give any one teacher a pay raise, he can recognize the teachers’ performance in other meaningful ways, such as a note, duty-free lunch, or any number of small recognitions can promote teacher empowerment.” Along the same lines another teacher wrote, “Everyone likes to be patted on the back or to know that his/her superior has noted the amount of effort being put forth.” Teachers want the principal to, “notice the good things they do instead of looking for the negative.” Several teachers communicated that praise empowers them.

In addition to praise, teachers responded that principals have no way to promote or give monetary incentives. A teacher wrote, “The way teachers’ salaries are determined prevents excellent, hard-working teachers from being monetarily rewarded. Regardless of performance, teachers with similar education and experience receive the same pay.” In addition a teacher stated, “It would be nice for principals to consider individuals for pay raises according to their commitment to work. If we were paid according to performance you would see teacher empowerment.”

Legitimate Power

Legitimate power is based on the belief of subordinates that a superior has the authority to influence and control their behavior. One teacher addressed this type of power by writing, “Some administrators do not have authority or funding to promote teachers. This is handled by the central office. Some principals have little say so as to which teachers they will hire.”

Expert Power

Expert power is based on subordinates’ belief that a superior has job experience and special knowledge or expertise in a given area. Teacher comments in the area of expert power were mostly positive. As one teacher wrote, “Principals who follow through with their instructions, but also question policies regarding their schools that are not in the best interest of students empower me.” Moreover a teacher communicated, “Principals who model effective teaching empower me.” Two negative comments made were, “Becoming a principal of an unfamiliar age group is unfair to the students and teachers” and “Principals should be placed within his background or age group to be able

to better understand the workings of the school. Becoming principal of an unfamiliar age group is unfair to the students and to the teachers.”

Referent Power

Referent power is based on subordinates’ feelings or desires to identify with a superior because of their admiration for the superior. One teacher wrote, “Effective administrators build strong trusting relationships and great rapport with their teachers”. Another comment made was, “Administrators promote teacher empowerment by facilitating a collaborative environment. Effective administrators lead by example and build strong trusting relationships and great rapport with their teachers.” Teachers reported feeling empowered when, “principals have positive attitudes and create positive environments that put teachers first. This provides us with great empowerment. We feel important because she tells us we are doing well on a regular basis.”

Other Dimensions of Principal Power

Teachers offered many insightful comments about how they view principal power. Of the 173 returned surveys, the researcher received 87 comments about perceived principal power that produced several additional themes about principal use of power. The themes that surfaced from the responses given by teachers other than those already presented on the Rahim Leader Power Inventory were fairness, discipline, decision-making, and consistency. Teachers also noted that many of the decisions and actions taken by principals are beyond their control.

Fairness

Teachers reported that equal treatment in school builds their sense of empowerment. Some illustrative comments were, “Principals choose their bubbly teachers

for specialty workshops and for the academic grant opportunities”; “They fail to disclose pertinent information to all faculty” and “Principals are not fair in choosing classes taught by teachers.” Principals who, “unfairly assign duties based on personal liking or disliking of the faculty do not empower me.”

One teacher wrote that she felt it was unfair when her principal addressed the entire faculty about a problem. She wrote, “Making generalized statements of which no one is sure who he is referring to all the teachers excuses the guilty ones because they don’t think it’s for them or aren’t there to hear it.” In addition, “Principals do not document and discipline teachers who fail to meet standards. When extra duty assignments are made, these teachers are never asked to work on them. Some teachers are over-worked while others are allowed to be sub-standard.”

Two teachers reported that their principals showed favoritism based on a teacher’s level of experience. One teacher wrote, “Some teacher’s experience levels are not valued and utilized while those with less experience but fresh out of school are placed in higher esteem.” A second teacher wrote, “Principals show too much favoritism to some teachers because of their years of teaching experience.”

Discipline

Principals who are consistent disciplinarians empower teachers. Teachers are empowered when the principal supports the teacher’s method of discipline. A teacher stated, “If a principal does not stand behind a teacher in reference to student behavior problems, the principal limits teacher empowerment.” Moreover, a teacher wrote, “The limiting factor of my empowerment is that principals don’t always follow through with discipline consistently.” Three teachers wrote about the negative impact that lack of

discipline has with students. One of the teachers expressed, “In my school, the principal does not always back the teacher in discipline issues. The students know this and it makes behavior problems worse. Also punishment is not consistent with the school’s code of conduct.”

Decision-Making

Lack of being able to make decisions was identified by eleven teachers as being a hindrance to their level of empowerment. One teacher conveyed, “In our system, data drives decision-making, as it does in most places. However, if the central office wants teachers to do something, we are told, not asked our opinions. The central office also takes this approach with the principals.” Another response read, “At times my principal refuses to hear the viewpoint of the teachers in scheduling and other decision-making situations.” A teacher wrote, “A principal can give empowerment to teachers by letting them decide the times and responsibilities of duties that go on throughout the day.” In addition, one teacher stated that she thought giving teachers opportunities to make decisions was an imposition for the principal.

Consistency

Teachers reported principals who follow set standards and procedures empower them. A teacher wrote, “Principals who follow through with their instructions, but also question policies regarding their schools most empower me.” Another teacher stated, “Our principal is awesome. She consistently listens to our concerns and responds accordingly.” It appears that teachers want a vision and mission to guide their decisions, and teaching.

In addition, teachers reported perceiving that many of the actions taken by principals are beyond their control. For example, one teacher stated, “Principals limit teacher empowerment simply because they are governed by *No Child Left Behind*”. Therefore, “principals listen to our ideas and try to implement them when possible.” Furthermore, “principals are asked to address county-wide or regional concerns often at the expense of their own schools.” Teachers wrote that they felt demands from outside of the school that were made on principals hindered their leadership ability. A teacher wrote, “Administrators are stretched too thin with job responsibilities that they can’t do it all but are expected to.” In addition, another teacher stated, “The business administration part of their job has become predominant and the people part has become secondary.”

Several teachers wrote that principal support empowered them to a great extent. One teacher wrote, “A principal must stand behind a teacher in reference to student behavior or the principal limits teacher empowerment”. In relation to this statement, another teacher wrote, “principals can support teachers when they have proper documentation therefore teachers feel empowered.” Two teachers expressed feeling empowered when their principals addressed discipline problems. One of these teachers stated, “I feel that most of the time my principal takes care of discipline problems so that they do not continue to interfere with instruction. I feel empowered when my principal stands behind me in discipline issues.”

Summary

When surveyed about the type of power used by their principals, most teachers reported that their principals operate from a legitimate power base followed by expert and

referent power. Furthermore, teachers reported that expert and referent power are more likely to influence their sense of empowerment in a positive way. To a lesser extent the principal power bases of legitimacy and reward power are related to the status, self-efficacy, and impact dimensions of teacher empowerment. As a whole, coercive power does not appear to be linked to any aspects of teacher empowerment.

In addition to what was addressed on the School Participant Empowerment Scale, teachers felt that the following has a negative impact on their sense of empowerment: poor administrative staff, standards, lack of communication, societal issues, and non-teaching duties. In addition to what was addressed on the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, teachers felt empowered when they perceive their principals as consistent and fair. Moreover, teachers feel empowered when principals are supportive in discipline issues and involve them in meaningful decision-making.

V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of chapter five is to discuss and reflect upon the findings of this study. There are six parts to this chapter: a brief synthesis of the key findings, a discussion of the findings, implications of the study, recommendations for principals, teachers, principal preparation programs, and policy makers, limitations of the study, recommendations for further study and summary.

Synthesis of Key Findings

The primary purposes of this study were to gain knowledge about teachers' perceptions of the types of power used by their principals and to determine the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and perceived use of principal power. Two surveys were used to collect data; the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory. Moreover, the study sought to gain insight into other limitations and facilitating factors for teacher empowerment beyond those addressed on the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) and the School Participation Empowerment Scale (SPES) through open-ended questions.

The research objectives included addressing the following questions: (a) What are teachers' perceptions of their own level of empowerment as measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale?, (b) What is the relationship between levels of principal

power as perceived by teachers and perceived level of teacher empowerment as measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Rahim Leader Power Inventory?, and (c) What are other important aspects that influence teacher perceptions of their level of empowerment?

To answer the research questions survey packets were distributed to teachers in three Alabama school systems. Each packet contained a self-addressed return envelop, an invitation to participate in the study, the Rahim Leader Power Inventory, the School Participant Empowerment Scale, a page with two open-ended questions, and an invitation to participate in focus group interviews. No teachers volunteered to participate in focus group interviews, so that part of the original research design was discarded.

Data from the surveys were analyzed using several statistical procedures and an emergent theme approach for the responses to open-ended questions on one survey. The data from the RLPI and the SPES were entered into Excel and then imported into SPSS. A descriptive statistics analysis was used to determine teachers' perceptions of the types of power used by their principals. A multivariate analysis, the Canonical correlation, of the results of the RLPI and the SPES was conducted to determine the relationship between levels of principal power as perceived by teachers and perceived levels of teacher empowerment. A qualitative analysis of the responses teachers offered on the open-ended questions was employed to determine other limitations and facilitating factors of teacher empowerment not addressed on the RLPI and the SPES.

The original design for the study called for identifying background knowledge of teachers such as gender, age, race, academic degrees held, years of teaching experience, and level of teaching experience. These variables were of interest to determine if there

was any relationship between these demographic subgroups and perceived teacher empowerment. For example, it would have been of interest to see if teachers' years of experience influenced their perceived level of teacher empowerment. However, the superintendents and many of the principals in each county expressed concern about asking for this information from teachers. It appeared that they were concerned about revealing information that could potentially identify participants. One of the superintendents stated that some of the teachers may be uncomfortable in filling out a survey about their principals for fear that they may be identified in some way so there data were not collected.

Discussion of the Findings

Results from the distribution of means of the responses given on the RLPI and the scaled scores, 81% of the respondents indicated they are neutral about their principals' use of coercive power and 79% of the respondents strongly disagree that principals operate from a reward power base. Of the 173 returned teacher surveys, 97% of the teachers reported perceiving their principals as operating from a legitimate power base. In addition, 69% of the respondents agree that their principals operate from an expert power base and 64% of the respondents agree that their principals operate from a referent power base.

It appears more teachers in the three counties perceive their principals as operating from a legitimate power base; yet no feedback from teachers was about principals' use of legitimate power. Some teachers who reported their principals as operating mainly from a legitimate power base may think it is reasonable for principals to

decide what is to be done in the school. Moreover, these teachers may think that because of the position, principals have the right to expect teachers to follow their instructions, support their policies, and cooperate with them in work-related items.

About the same number of teachers reported feeling that their principals have experience and special knowledge or expertise and that their principals identify with them because of mutual feelings of respect. These teachers are likely to view their principals as treating everyone fairly, having a pleasing personality, and having considerable professional knowledge.

In addition, 81% of the teachers responded that they feel neutral about their principals operating from the coercive power base. This may mean that these teachers have not encountered their principals having to use disciplinary actions such as suspension, written warnings or being fired. Moreover, 79% of the teachers perceive their principals as not operating from a reward base. This may mean that these teachers do not believe that their principals have the ability or opportunity to provide tangible rewards such as pay raises, merit pay, promotions or bonuses.

Of the six subscales of teacher empowerment it appears that principal use of expert power and referent power have the highest relationship with teacher empowerment. Coercive and reward power bases are the least likely power bases to have a positive significant impact on the six subscales of teacher empowerment. It appears that the teachers who responded to the survey are more likely to feel empowered when they like their principals and feel that the principals have knowledge and expertise in leadership. It can also be said that the same teachers are less likely to feel empowered when they view their principals as having the ability to punish, threaten, or reward them

for desired behavior. This finding appears reasonable because in many cases, principals have no power to reward teachers and because of tenure and grievance procedures, principals have little opportunity to punish teachers.

Referent power is based on the subordinates' feelings or desires to identify with a superior because of respect for the superior. Referent power also refers to a leader's willingness to be associated with followers. When leaders associate themselves with their followers, they involve teachers in democratic, collaborative activities that increase teachers' abilities and desires to cooperate in fulfilling the educational mission of the school (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Collaboration sets the stage for teachers to be creative and to achieve personal and social goals (Barth, 1990)

An important part of referent power is trust. Trust is the foundation for cooperation and effective communication which are two essential aspects of teacher empowerment and shared governance (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Johnson & Johnson, 1987). In an atmosphere of trust, people work together to identify and solve problems (Covey, 1989; Blasé & Blasé, 2001). The nature of referent power lends itself to shared-governance. Successful shared-governance principals build trust by encouraging openness and facilitating effective communication, and modeling understanding. These behaviors are the cornerstone of trust (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). Furthermore, an environment of trust sets the stage for professionals to reach their full potential in the work place. When a principal operates from a referent power base there is opportunity for positive rapport, trust, and respect to be built among teachers and principals which increases the likelihood of improved pedagogy and enhanced student achievement. Therefore, it makes sense to conclude that principals operating from the referent power

base would openly discuss classroom practices and pedagogy with teachers to ensure that innovations in teaching practice can be made.

Drake and Roe (1999) maintain that of all the power bases, expert power holds the greatest promise for when leaders realize that the expertise they share with others should be focused on assisting others to grow in their profession. Principals using expert power remove barriers, create opportunities, and provide resources to aid teachers in their endeavor. It is also clear that schools where principals work from an expert power base receive high scores for teacher morale, approval, and performance (Drake & Roe, 1999).

Expert and referent power, by their very nature, fall into the personal power category set forth by Stimsom and Applebaum (1988). As principals acquire skills and knowledge and provide support for teachers, they increase their personal power and gain support from teachers (Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995). Principals' use of personal power enables them to facilitate shared decision making more effectively than they would if they relied on positional power (Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995). Bredeson (1989) found that in schools with empowered teachers, principals positively affected teachers by being informed (expert power) and providing an open, friendly, and supportive environment (referent power).

In contrast, reward power and coercive power bases were seen by the participants in this study as having the least relationship to the six dimensions of teacher empowerment. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) found that extrinsic rewards are not powerful enough to increase teachers' motivation. In addition, Drake and Roe (1999) contend that in modern day schools, few principals have the ability to provide teachers with tangible rewards. Coercive power is reduced by teachers' tenure and grievance

procedures. Also, due to collective bargaining procedures in many states with strong teacher unions, teachers are less likely to feel threatened by principals who use coercion to intimidate them.

Implications of the Study

It was indicated at the beginning of this study that schools are expected to best prepare students to meet the demands of a modern-day, ever-changing society. Because of this, researchers continue to investigate the characteristics of high performance schools where students seemingly are prepared to meet the demands of our society. In the quest to improve schools there have been many top-down types of reforms and school improvement initiatives, yet there has not been the great wave of school improvement expected (Pellicer, 2003). The attempt to improve schools has been worthy, yet schools seemingly are still governed by age-old traditions that stand as barriers to substantial school reform (Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995). Another reason for the lack of improvement is the often insufficient attention given to the importance of positive relationships among adults in the school (Barth, 1990).

Literature suggests to meet the expectations, demands and responsibilities placed on schools there is a need for school leadership to shift from a top-down style to a shared leadership approach (Blasé & Blasé, 1994, 2001; Dipaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Earl & Fullan, 2003; Evans, 1996; Ferrandino, 2001; Kochan & Reed, 2004; Lambert, 2002; Lucas & Valentine, 2001; Short, 1998; Smith, 2001; Wynn, 2001). By encouraging the development of the abilities and skills of teachers, principals can begin to build shared leadership, which Kreisberg (1992) refers to “power with,” Principals who

encourage teachers to become active participants in school decisions and share rights and responsibilities with teachers are practicing “power with” Leadership.

Some research has explored the ways principals can foster the empowerment of teachers to assume various leadership roles in schools (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Harrison, Killion, & Mitchell, 1989; Richardson, Lane, & Flanigan, 1995; Starratt, 2004). A key element in understanding how principals can build leadership skills in teachers is to gain a better understanding of the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Short, 1998). An enhanced understanding of the dynamics between perceived teacher empowerment principal use of power may lead to a better understanding of how to build successful, high-performing schools where principals share power with teachers.

Research suggests that for teachers to be prepared to accept shared leadership they must feel a sense of empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Therefore, one implication suggested by the findings of this study is that there is a relationship between principal use of power and perceived levels of teacher empowerment. This implication supports the premise of other researchers such as Kreisberg (1992), Richardson, Lane, and Flanigan (1995), Gonzales and Short (1996), Sergiovanni and Starratt (1998), and Blasé and Blasé (2001) who claim there is a relationship between teacher empowerment and principal use of power. These researchers state that it is important to gain an understanding of this relationship in hopes that all teachers will have a voice in school matters. Moreover, by sharing responsibility and decision-making with teachers, principals may lesson their load, allowing them to address

the complexity of today's schools, while not having to feel as if they have to be "super leaders."

The results of the study indicate that expert and referent power bases have the greatest relationship to the professional growth and decision making dimensions of teacher empowerment. Principals who have expertise and are well-liked empower teachers to be active in decision-making and problem-solving. Teachers feel that their ideas matter when given the responsibility for making decisions that directly affect their work. In addition, teachers are more motivated in their personal efforts to be involved in continuous learning to improve their craft by asking questions, trying new things, reflecting and implementing improvements they helped to identify.

The coercive and reward power bases reflect the least relationship to teacher empowerment. Therefore, the study implies that teacher empowerment is not affected by a principal's ability to punish or threaten if there is a failure to meet the leader's demands or provide rewards for desired behavior. This finding is supported by the Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) who found that extrinsic rewards are not powerful enough to increase teachers' motivation. In addition, Drake and Roe (1999) maintain that today's schools few principals have the ability to provide tangible rewards for teachers. Furthermore, the use of coercive power is reduced by policies such as tenure and grievance procedures utilized by teachers' unions.

The responses to the open-ended survey questions suggest that in addition to what was asked on the RLPI and the SPES, teachers feel a lack of empowerment due to time restraints, standardized testing, state and federal regulations, and pressure from parents, and lack of parental support. Teachers also feel less empowered when their principals do

not adequately address discipline problems, are not supportive, being stretched too thin, are governed by the No Child Left Behind Act and test scores. Teachers noted that principals who facilitate a collaborative environment, listen and make changes accordingly contribute to their feelings of empowerment.

Recommendations for Principals, Teachers, Principal Preparation Programs,
and Policy Makers

Recommendations for Principals

This study revealed that principal use of power does play a role in the way teachers perceive their level of empowerment. Teachers in this study reported that of the five power bases used by principals, expert and referent powers have the greatest influence on their feelings of empowerment. Drake and Roe (1999) claim that when principals demonstrate their expertise and model collaborative leadership practices, they help teachers grow professionally and therefore it is likely that feelings of empowerment increase. The research reviewed for this study indicates that to have schools that are prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century, principals must lay the foundation for teachers to feel empowered. Teachers must feel a sense of authentic involvement in school business; it is important for teachers to feel that their input is listened to, taken into consideration, and makes an impact on decisions impacting teachers and learning.

Also, this study suggests that teachers are more likely to feel empowered when they have respect for their principals. This suggests that a principal's personal belief system and work ethic make a difference in how teachers respond to them in the school setting. Teachers who respect and like their principals may be more likely to support the

vision and mission of the school, trust and feel trusted, and have a strong sense of empowerment.

Feedback from teachers suggests that it would benefit principals to monitor the non-teaching duties for which teachers are responsible. Often with change come new mandates and regulations that demand a great deal of time from teachers. In other words, teachers are likely to feel over-whelmed when items are continually added to their list of duties, yet nothing is removed. Teachers reported feeling less empowered when they felt stressed and overwhelmed.

Principals can build teacher empowerment by developing “empowering spaces” where collegiality and professionalism are expected. In “empowering spaces” teachers are more likely to have their talents and expertise recognized by others and utilized for the betterment of the school. Principals who aware of teachers’ strengths are likely to call teachers to their “highest level of performance”. In addition, collaborative action research with teachers would also increase a sense of teacher empowerment. By conducting research with teachers, concerns and goals may be identified that are meaningful for principals and teachers. Developing a vision statement and mission statements assists principals in building the foundation on which to base all actions of the school. Teachers are empowered when principals are consistent with the goals, vision, and mission of the school. Consistent behavior encourages teachers’ trust and respect.

Recommendations for Teachers

Other recommendations for teachers are to form action research teams, take professional development classes, take responsibility for empowerment, and be proactive. Many teachers need encouragement to shift from their perception of isolation into

recognition of themselves as active contributors to their profession by building collaboration with colleagues, parents, principals, businesses, and community members. Professional development should be on-going rather than a side-line activity. This research suggests that professional development in the areas of decision-making, conflict resolution, working cooperatively, and team building may increase teachers' sense of empowerment.

Moreover, this study suggests that teachers should take responsibility for their own sense of empowerment. Teachers can begin by believing that education is a profession as noble as any other profession. Teachers should also recognize and celebrate the accomplishments of their colleagues, such as advanced degrees, additional certifications, research published, grants, and published articles. This recognition would ripple throughout the community and beyond.

Teachers should also be proactive in their pursuit of empowerment by being life-long learners, building partnerships with colleagues, parents, administrators, and community members. Teachers should involve themselves in active reflection, trust the processes of school and embrace technology.

Recommendations for Principal and Teacher Preparation Programs

This study also suggests that principal preparation programs could benefit from offering classes on collaboration among teachers, systems thinking, teacher empowerment, and the concept of “power with” leadership. In addition, principal preparation programs should continue to educate administrators on different types of leadership other than the traditional top-down model of school leadership.

In addition, collaborative action research between universities and school systems would be a way to investigate and solve school and classroom challenges. It would be of benefit to preparation programs to have input from practitioners. This could lead to mentorships between administrators. Principal preparation programs would also benefit from providing more practicum experience in addition to academia to aspiring administrators.

Recommendations for Policy-Makers

This research suggests that policy-makers may want to be keenly aware of teachers' needs and the environment in which they work when making educational decisions. Teachers reported feeling that people who are not in the classroom make decisions without thinking about the ramifications. It appears that policy makers could benefit from more input from teachers. Those closest to the instruction need to have their voices heard. Teachers who are listened to by policy makers are more likely to feel like respected and empowered professionals.

Policy-makers need to be responsible for adequate resource allocation. Monies should be earmarked for professional development. Policy-makers could also benefit from allocating time and resources for collaborative action research with colleges, universities, and schools. In addition, study circles may help bridge the gap between community members, parents, teachers, and policy-makers.

Limitations of the Study

This study examined the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and the perceived use of principal power. The experiences and environment of every

school is different. Therefore, the factors that facilitated or hindered teachers' perceptions of their empowerment appear to be dependent upon the personal experiences of each participant and the context and environment in which the experiences occurred. This study took a closer look at a highly political topic; the use and abuse of principal power and because of the nature of the study, some participants may have been reluctant to openly share their views.

This was an exploratory study limited to three school districts in Alabama. Therefore, conclusions can not be generalized from the target population to other populations (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002). In addition, all survey data were self-reported with results based on the assumptions that the participants were thoughtful, honest and worked independently when giving responses.

Another limitation to this study was that the researcher was not contacted by any teachers willing to participate in focus group interviews. The qualitative analysis was limited to the answers teachers gave to the open-ended questions included in the survey packet. Therefore there were no opportunities to have teachers clarify or further elaborate on their responses. In addition, the researcher could not do analysis by schools.

One superintendent who originally gave permission for the county to participate in the study, left the position and the new superintendent requested that a change be made in how the surveys were sent to teachers; therefore, a change had to be made in the design of the research. The new superintendent along with the new personnel director did not give permission to mail the surveys directly to each teacher. The researcher initially intended on mailing a total of 300 survey packets that would be distributed among the three school districts depending on the population. The new superintendent requested that

the survey packets be mailed to the personnel director who in turn delivered them to each school. The secretaries at each school put one survey packet in each teacher's box.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study examined the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power within three school districts. Much of what was revealed on the surveys and open-ended questions is supported by other research done in the area of teacher empowerment as it relates to principal use of power. Nine recommendations are offered for further study.

The first recommendation is to collect more background information about teachers such as years of teaching experience, grade taught, race, gender, age, tenure status and degree level of principals and teachers. The data from this research study did not provide any information about the differences in teacher demographics and how they related to perceived teacher empowerment and its relationship to principal use of power. Collecting demographic information about teachers might enrich the findings about the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. Demographic information and its relationship to empowerment may uncover differences and similarities between and among various subgroups and how they view leadership.

A second recommendation is to conduct focus group interviews or phone interviews to gain additional understandings about the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. Because teachers completing the survey were not willing to participate in focus group interviews, the researcher may only have received "surface" level information.

A third recommendation is to visit each research site to distribute the research packets instead of mailing the surveys. This would allow an opportunity to explain the purpose of the research and may result in a greater return rate as well as an opportunity to answer questions participants might have.

A fourth recommendation is to conduct an in-depth study of a school or school system that report high levels of teacher empowerment. Fifth, recommendation is to study the impact between teacher empowerment and student achievement. The sixth suggestion for further study is to conduct the research in more than one state. The seventh recommendation is to research teacher leaders and equity issues. Unless issues of power, race, and class are addressed in school communities, the achievement level of African students will not be affected by the empowerment of teachers (Wynne, 2001). The eighth recommendation for further study is to study schools that have successfully re-structured the school day to allow teachers to have more planning, research, and collaborative time. The ninth recommendation is to study the relationship between perceived teacher empower and principal use of power at the elementary level, the middle school level, and the high school level.

Summary

This research was conducted to gain additional information about the relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power. The research suggests that principals and teachers alike need to pay more attention to the relational aspects of schools and leadership. Principals and teachers need to develop a better understanding of the constraints and challenges facing others. By interacting regularly,

engaging in open communications and working side-by-side to resolve issues pertaining to teaching and learning, principals and teachers alike will gain a deeper respect for one another. Treating others as professionals is the foundation for empowering relationships in schools.

In addition, an enhanced understanding of the dynamics between teacher empowerment and principal use of power may lead to a better understanding of how to build successful, high-performing schools that are capable of meeting the demands of the 21st century. Principals can not longer be the sole decision-makers in ever-changing complex school environments; empowering teachers may lead to shared power and therefore schools become more efficient and successful. Research suggests that for teachers to be prepared to accept shared leadership they must feel a sense of empowerment (Blasé & Blasé, 2001; Sergiovanni & Starratt). It is essential to continue to explore the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal use of power so that schools successfully prepare students to meet the demands of modern-day society.

REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., Nesler, M. S., Quigley B. M., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1994). Perceptions of power: A cognitive perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality, 22*(4), 377–384.
- Aguinis, H., Simonsen, M. M., & Pierce, C. A. (1998). Effects of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of power bases. *Journal of Social Psychology, 138*(4), 455–465.
- Anderson, L., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*, 452–511.
- Andrews, R. L., Basom, M. R., & Basom, M. (1991). Instructional leadership: Supervision that makes a difference. *Theory Into Practice, 30*(2), 97–101.
- Archer, J. (2002). Principals: So much to do so little time. *Education Week, 21*(31), 2–6.
- Ashton, P. T., Webb, R. B., & Doda, N. (1983). A study of teachers' sense of efficacy (Final Report, National Institute of Education Contract No. 400-79-0075).
Gainesville, FL: University of Florida. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 834)
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*(2).
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barth, R. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*, 443–449.

- Bennis, W. (1991). Managing the dream: Leadership in the 21st century. *Antioch Review*, 9(1) 22–29.
- Bennis, W. (1989). Why leaders can't lead. *Training and Development Journal*, p. 35–39.
- Blasé, J., & Anderson, G. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blasé, J. R., & Blasé, J. (2003). *Breaking the silence overcoming the problem of principal mistreatment of teachers*. California: Corwin Press.
- Blasé, J. R., & Blasé, J. (2001). *Empowering principals what successful principals do*. California: Corwin Press.
- Brewster, C., & Railsback, J. (2003). *Building trusting relationships for school improvement: Implications for principals and teachers*. Portland, OR: Northeast Regional Educational Lab.
- Briley, B. (2004). *Teachers as leaders: A case study of teacher leadership development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn.
- Brouillette, L. (1997). Who defines “democratic leadership”? Three high school principals respect to site-based reforms. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7(6), 569–591.
- Carmin, T. (2002). *Love ‘em and lead ‘em leadership strategies that work for reluctant leaders*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Combs, A. W., Miser, A. B., & Whitaker, K. S. (1999). *On becoming a school leader: A person-centered challenge*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Coulon, S. C., & Quaglia, R. J. (1989). A comparison between the behavior of effective principals and effective teachers. *Education*, 1(110), 130–136.
- Curry, B. K. (2000). *Women in power pathways to leadership in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dareh, J. C. (1991). Instructional leadership as a proactive administrative process. *Theory Into Practice*, 30(2), 109–112.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74(10), 752–761.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Bullmaster, M. L., & Cobb, V. L. (1995). Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(1), 87–106.
- David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 46(8), 45–52.
- Davies, E. (1996). How violence at work can hit employees hard. *People Management*, 2(18), 50–52.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). *Shaping school culture the heart of leadership*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Dipaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 43–62.
- Drake, T. L., & Roe, W. H. R. (1999). *The principalship* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Earl, L., & Fullan, M. (2003). Using data in leadership for learning. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 383–394.
- Ebmeier, H. (2003). How supervision influences teacher efficacy and commitment: An investigation of a path model. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 18(2), 110–141.
- Eisner, E. (1992). Educational reform and the ecology of schooling. *Teachers College Record*, 93, 610–627.
- Engvall, R. P. (1997). *The professionalization of teaching*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Ferrandino, V. L. (2001). Challenges for the 21st-century elementary school principals. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 440–442.
- Flynn, P. (1995). Global competition and education: Another *Sputnik*? *Social Studies*, 86(2), 53–55.
- Foriska, T. J. (1994). The principal as instructional leader: Teaming with teachers for student success. *Schools in the Middle*, 3(3), 31–34.
- Foster, K. (1990). Small steps on the way to teacher empowerment. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 38–40.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Fullan, M. (2002). Moral purpose writ large. *The School Administrator Web Edition*.
- Fuller, B., Wood, K., Rapport, T., & Dornbusch, S. (1982). The organizational context of individual efficacy. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(1), 7–30.

- Glendinning, P. M. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Personnel Management, 30*(3), 269–287.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school—Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gonzales, E., & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of teacher empowerment and principal power bases. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 23*(3), 210–216.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(1), 61–85.
- Groff, F. (2001). Who will lead? The principal shortage. *State Legislatures, 27*(9), 16–19.
- Hager, J. L., & Scarr, L. E. (1983). Effective schools- effective principals: How to develop both. *Educational Leadership, 40*(5), 38–41.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*, 329–351.
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1991). Developing leaders for tomorrow's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*(7), 514–517.
- Harrison, C. R., Killion, J. P., & Mitchell, J. E. (1989). Site-based management: The realities of implementation. *Educational Leadership, 46*(8), 55–58.
- Herlihy, B., & Herlihy, D. (1985). Improving the principal-teacher relationships by understanding the concept of power. *NAASP Bulletin, 69*, 95–102.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and nature of man*. New York: World Publishing.
- Holloway, J. H. (2000). The promise and pitfalls of site-based management. *Educational Leadership, 57*(1), 7–30.

- Howey, K. R. (1988). Why teacher leadership? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 28–31.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Cyurphy, G. J. (1995). Understanding and influencing follower motivation. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 327–338). New York: The Free Press.
- Jaeger, R. (1984). *Sampling in education and the social sciences*. New York: Longman.
- Johnson, P. (1998). *Conflict and the school principal: Expert or novice*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut, Department of Educational Research.
- Kanfer, R., & Kanfer, F. H. (1991). Goals and self-regulation: Applications of theory to work settings. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 7, 287–326.
- Karant, V. (1989). Supervision in the age of teacher empowerment. *Educational Leadership*, 46(8), 27–29.
- Keefe, K. W., & Amenta, R. B. (2005). Whatever happened to the model schools project? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(7), 536–544.
- Kochan, F. K. (2004). Leading, learning, and becoming in a kaleidoscopic universe. *UCEA Review*, XLVI(1), 1–32.
- Kochan, F. K., & Reed, C. J. (2004). Collaborative leadership, community building, and democracy in public education. In F. English (Ed.), *The new handbook of educational leadership* (pp. 1–35). New York: Sage Publications.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). What leaders really do. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion insights on leadership through the ages* (pp. 114–123). New York: The Free Press
- Kreisber, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment and education*. New York: State University of New York Press.

- Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 37–40.
- Lasswell, T. J., & Kaplan, A. (1950). *Power and society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Leithwood, K. A. (2001). School leadership in the context of accountability policies. *Leadership in Education*, 4(3), 217–235.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1992). Transformational leadership: Where does it stand? *Education Digest*, 58(3), 17–20.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1987). Using the principal profile to assess performance. *Educational Leadership*, 21(4), 63–66.
- Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). A review of research concerning the implementation of site-based management. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(3), 233–286.
- Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice*. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2004). *Teacher leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, K. E. (1990). Restructuring school: What matters and what works. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 7(10), 759–764.
- Lightfoot, S. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(3), 9–28.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(3), 325–340.

- Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lucas, S. E., & Valentine, J. W. (2001). Transformational leadership: Principals, leadership teams, and school culture. Proposal submitted Division A: Section 5: Leadership, School Organization, and Governance.
- McGreal, T. (1983). *Successful teacher evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Milner, R. H. (2002). A case study of an experienced English teacher's self-efficacy and persistence through crisis situations: Theoretical and practical considerations. *High School Journal*, 86(1), 28–36.
- Murphy, P. J. (1991). School management tomorrow: Collaboration—collaboration—collaboration. *School Organization*, 11(1), 65–70.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Newmann, F. M. (1996). *Authentic instruction: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Newmann, F. M., Rutter, R. A., & Smith, M. S. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations. *Sociology of Education*, 62, 221–238.
- Niece, R. (1993). The principal as instructional leader: Past influences and current resources. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 12–18.
- Nyberg, D. (1988). *Power over power*. Ithaca: Cornell Paperbacks.

- Pawlas, G. E. (2003). Breaking the silence. *School Administrator*, 60(1), 41–42.
- Pfeifer, R., & Baker, (1986). *Enabling teacher effectiveness: Teachers' perspectives on instructional management*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, San Francisco, CA
- Phillips, P. R. (1989). Shared decision making in an age of reform. *Update*, 20(3), 30–37.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427–452.
- Rahim, M. A., & Buntzman, G. F. (1988). Supervisory power bases, styles of handling conflict with subordinates, and subordinate compliance and satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 123(3), 195–210.
- Raven, B. H. (1992, August). *The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. A presentation in honor of John R. P. French on the occasion of his receiving the Kurt Lewin Award*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Reames, E. H. (1997). *A study of the relationships between school work culture and teacher beliefs of efficacy and commitment in middle schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn.
- Reese, S. (2004). Effective school leadership. *Techniques: Connecting Education and Careers*, 79(6), 18–21.
- Richardson, M. D., Lane, K. E., & Flanigan, J. L. (Eds.). (1995). *School empowerment*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behavior a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3, 555–573.

- Romanish, B. (1991). Teacher empowerment: The litmus test of school restructuring. *Social Science Record*, 28(1), 55–69.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1991). *Teacher's workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schulz, I. L., & Teddlie, C. (1990). The relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and their perceptions of principals' use of power and school effectiveness. *Education*, 109(4), 461–468.
- Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000). *Schools that learn*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2004). Balance individual autonomy and collaboration to center on students. *Education Digest*, 70(3), 17–23.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 41–45.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. S., Thurston, P. W. (1987). *Educational governance and administration*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Corbally, J. E. (Eds.). (1984). *Leadership and organizational culture*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision a redefinition* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). *Supervision human perspectives* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1971). *Emerging patterns of supervision: Human perspectives*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Sernal, K. (1998). *School leadership — Balancing power with caring*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Short, P. M. (1998). Empowering leadership. *Contemporary Leadership*, 69(2), 70–73.
- Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment. *Education*, 114(4), 488–492.
- Short, P., & Johnson, P. (1994). Exploring the links among teacher empowerment, leader power, and conflict. *Education*, 114, 581–592.
- Short, P., & Rinehart, J. (1994). Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers and regular classroom teachers. *Education*, 94(114), 570–581.
- Short, P., & Rinehart, J. (1993). Teacher empowerment and school climate. *Education*, 93(113), 592–597.
- Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

- Smith, W. (2001). *Teacher efficacy, administrator efficacy, school culture, and leadership density*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, Louisiana.
- Smith, W., & Andrews, R. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Press.
- Smith, J. M., & Lotven, B. A. (1993). Teacher empowerment in a rural setting: Fact versus fantasy. *Education*, 93(113), 457–464.
- Swanwick, D. (2004). How to beat the workplace bully. *New Zealand Management*, 51(5), 45–47.
- Text of the Carnegie Report. (1986). *Education Week*, p. 11–18.
- Weber, M. (1945). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whitaker, B. (1997). Instructional leadership and principal visibility. *Clearing House*, 70(70), 155–156.
- Whitaker, K., & Moses, M. (1990). Teacher empowerment: A key to restructuring. *The Clearing House*, 64, 127–130.
- White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under “ideal” school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(91), 69–82.
- Wren, J. T. (Ed.). (1995). *The leader’s companion insights on leadership through the ages*. New York: The Free Press.

Wynne, J. (2001). Teachers as leaders in education reform [Electronic version]. (Report No. EDO-SP-2001). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 462 376)

Zuckerman, M. B. (1992). The case for school choice. *U.S. News & World Report*, 113(24), 102.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
SCHOOL PARTICIPANT EMPOWERMENT SCALE
RAHIM LEADER POWER INVENTORY
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

School Participant Empowerment Scale

(Developed by Paula M. Short and James S. Rinehart)

Please rate the following statements in terms of how well they describe how you feel.

Rate each statement on the following scale:

1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neutral 4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree

1.	I am given the responsibility to monitor programs.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I function in a professional environment.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I believe that I have earned respect.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I have control over daily schedules.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I believe that I have the ability to get things done.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in the school.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I am treated as a professional.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I believe that I am very effective.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I believe that I am empowering students.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I am able to teach as I choose.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I participate in staff development.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I have the opportunity for professional growth.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I have the respect of my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I have the freedom to make decisions on what is taught.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I believe that I am having an impact.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I am involved in school budget decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I work at a school where kids come first.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I have the support and respect of my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I see students learn.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I make decisions about curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I am a decision maker.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I am given the opportunity to continue learning.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with students.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	I can determine my own schedule.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	I perceive that I make a difference.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Principals, other teachers, and school personnel solicit my advice.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I believe that I am good at what I do.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	I can plan my own schedule.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I perceive that I have an impact on other teachers and students.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	My advice is solicited by others.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas.	1	2	3	4	5

Please go to next page

Rahim Leader Power Inventory

I am interested in your *opinion* about your immediate supervisor and your relationship with him or her. Please indicate, by circling a number on the scale provided, the extent to which each of the following statements describes your opinion. Your responses will be held in *strict confidence*.

1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neutral 4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree

1.	My superior has a pleasing personality.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My superior can take disciplinary action against me for insubordination.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I approach my superior for advice on work-related problems because he (she) is usually right.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	My superior can recommend me for a merit recognition if my performance is especially good.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	When a tough job comes up my superior has the technical "know how" to get it done.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	It is reasonable for my superior to decide what he (she) wants me to do.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	My superior has specialized training in his (her) field.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	My superior is justified in expecting cooperation from me in work-related matters.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	My superior can fire me if my performance is consistently below standards.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	My superior does <i>not</i> have the expert knowledge I need to perform my job.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	My superior can provide opportunities for my advancement if my work is outstanding.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I <i>don't</i> want to identify myself with my superior.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	My superior's position entitles him (her) to expect support of her (his) policies from me.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	My superior can suspend me if I am habitually late in coming to work.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	My superior <i>cannot</i> get me a pay raise even if I do my job well.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	My superior can see to it that I get no pay raise if my work is unsatisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I prefer to do what my superior suggests because he (she) has high professional expertise.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	My superior has considerable professional experience to draw from in helping me to do my work.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I admire my superior because she (he) treats every person fairly.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	My superior can fire me if I neglect my duties.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I like the personal qualities of my superior.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	If I put forth extra effort, my superior can take it into consideration to determine my pay raise.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	My superior's position does <i>not</i> give him (her) the authority to change the procedures of my work.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I want to develop a good interpersonal relationship with my superior.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	My superior is <i>not</i> the type of person I enjoy working with.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I should do what my superior wants because he (she) is my superior.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	My superior can get me a bonus for earning a good performance rating.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	My superior can recommend a promotion for me if my performance is consistently above average.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	My superior has the right to expect me to carry out her (his) instructions.	1	2	3	4	5

Please go to next page

APPENDIX B

AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

APPROVAL LETTER AND INFORMATION SHEET

Auburn University

Auburn University, Alabama 36849



Office of Human Subjects Research
307 Samford Hall
hsubjec@auburn.edu

Telephone: 334-844-5966
Fax: 334-844-4391

October 23, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Ms. Jackie Metsinger
EFLT

PROTOCOL TITLE: "The Relationship Between Principal Use of Power and Perceived Teacher Empowerment"

IRB AUTHORIZATION: #06-092 MR 0606

APPROVAL DATE: June 21, 2006

EXPIRATION DATE: June 20, 2007

The referenced protocol was approved "Minimum Risk" at the IRB Meeting on June 21, 2006, pending revisions. (Final revisions were received on October 11, 2006.) Please reference the IRB authorization number in any correspondence regarding your project.

Please remember that any anticipated change in the approved procedures must be submitted to and approved by the IRB prior to implementation of the planned activity. Any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or others requires immediate suspension of the activity and an immediate written report of the occurrence to the IRB.

If you will be unable to file a Final Report on your project before June 20, 2007, you must submit a request for an extension of approval to the IRB no later than May 30, 2007 (so that your request can be added to the agenda for the July IRB meeting). If your IRB authorization expires and/or you have not received written notice that a request for an extension has been approved prior to June 20, 2007, you must suspend the project immediately and contact the Office of Human Subjects Research.

A Final Report will be required to close your IRB project file

If you have any questions concerning IRB procedures or this Board action, please contact the OHSR at 844-5966.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Peter W. Grandjean.

Peter W. Grandjean, Chair
Institutional Review Board for the Use of
Human Subjects in Research

cc: Dr. José Llanes
Dr. Cynthia Reed



EDUCATIONAL
FOUNDATIONS

LEADERSHIP AND
TECHNOLOGY

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

Sesquicentennial

INFORMATION SHEET
for a Research Study Entitled
The Relationship Between Principal Use of Power and
Perceived Teacher Empowerment

You are invited to participate in a research study that explores the relationship between principal use of power and perceived teacher empowerment. This study is being conducted by Jackie Metsinger, a doctoral student in the College of Education at Auburn University under the direction of Dr. Cynthia Reed, Director of the Truman Pierce Institute. We hope to learn about teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and its relationship to principal use of power. You were selected from a list of teachers as a possible participant because you are a teacher in one of the school systems that agreed to participate in the study. The lists of teachers' names and school addresses were obtained from each personnel department in the participating school systems.

If you decide to participate, I will ask you to complete two surveys- one about your perceptions of your level of teacher empowerment and one about your perceptions of the type of power used by any (or a) principal. You will also be asked two open-ended questions about your perception of teacher empowerment and your perception of how principals in general use power. The survey packet should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. I am also asking for teachers who are willing to participate in a focused group interview on the topic of teacher empowerment and principal use of power to e-mail me at metsijd@auburn.edu. Teachers willing to participate will be asked to provide me with contact information, and a convenient time and place to conduct the interview.

There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study. Your comments will not be attributed to you in any way. There is a slight risk of breach of confidentiality but precautions will be taken to lessen the possibility of this occurring. For example, after completing the survey you are asked to put the survey in the supplied self-addressed, stamped envelope and return it sealed to the researcher. If you decide to participate in the focused group interview, participants will be instructed not to discuss the interview with others, however the researcher cannot control what is said after the interview is completed. Focus group interviews will be conducted in a quiet place requested by the teachers. All identifying information will be eliminated from the notes taken during the interview.

HUMAN SUBJECTS
OFFICE OF RESEARCH
PROJECT # 06-092 MR 0606
APPROVED 6-21-06 TO 6-20-07

Page 1 of 2

Owing much to the past, Auburn's greater debt is ever to the future.

4036 Haley Center, Auburn, Alabama 36849 5221; Telephone: 334 844-4460; FAX: 334 844 3072

w w w . a u b u r n . e d u

