A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER EMPOWERMENT AND PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS

David C. Sharp

B.S., Earth/Physical Science, University of Central Missouri
M.A., Education Administration, University of Missouri Kansas City
Ed.S., Education Administration, University of Missouri Kansas City

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty
of the School of Education of Baker University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

April 2009

_____
Major Advisor

_____

_____

_____

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between teachers'

perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness. The

research design included the collection of quantitative data to obtain greater

understanding and detail about the relationships between teacher empowerment and

principal effectiveness as perceived by teachers. The population for this study was taken

from a large Kansas City, Missouri, suburban school district. The sample consisted of

101 teachers in three district high schools. Two independent survey instruments were

used to collect information on the study's two variables. One research question and one

hypothesis were developed for testing. Pearson product moment correlations provided the

statistical data for this study. The findings of this study showed 18 significant

relationships between the scores on the three domains of the Audit of Principal

Effectiveness and the scores on six subscales of the School Participant Empowerment

Scale. The data showed correlations between the domains of organizational development,

organizational environment, educational program, and the subscale of professional

growth as the most statistically significant variables in the study. Correlations between

the domains of organizational development, organizational environment, educational

program, and the subscale of autonomy showed the least or no statistical significance in

this study. Based upon the data, it appears that specific principal skills related to the

domains have an influence on teacher empowerment.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my dissertation advisor, Dr. Brad Tate, for his knowledge, support, and encouragement. To my committee members, Dr. Dennis King, Dr. Bruce Anderson, Dr. Cindy Bateman, and Peg Waterman, my sincere appreciation for their dialogue and technical assistance. Thanks also to Superintendent Dr. David McGehee and the Lee's Summit R-7 School District for this study's data.

A special thank you to my wife, Heather, and to our three children, Ashton, Austin, and Allyson, for their tremendous love and support throughout the entire doctoral process. This would have not been possible without you. Finally, a sincere thank you to Dr. Heather Kenney and Dr. Paul Rutherford for their friendship, guidance, and motivation over the past three years.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

Background of the Study

Persistent change and challenges of the past two decades in the field of education have resulted in an increasing workload for teachers and administrators. As schools work to meet standards to implement reform initiatives, principals and teachers face mounting expectations. Today, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) finds schools that are struggling to meet *adequate yearly progress* (AYP) criteria for all sub-groups of students. Keiser (2007) posited,

> The standards-based, high-stakes testing and accountability era in which
>
> educators are currently entrenched has forced school personnel to incorporate new
>
> methods of thinking and learning that are dependent on the genuine investment
>
> and effort on the part of teachers and other school personnel (p. 1).

Keiser asserted that school reform initiatives have the potential to compel individuals to modify their beliefs and perceptions with respect to norms and values. Ultimately, the implementation of these reform initiatives becomes the responsibility of the school principal. However, site-based management, Professional Learning Communities, High Schools that Work, and shared decision making are examples of collaborative based initiatives of today's effective schools movement in which empowered teachers are critical to successful implementation. Keiser believed that principals cannot isolate themselves from staff in the implementation of school reform. Instead, the principal should develop effective working relationships with staff and encourage a collaborative environment that reinforces quality performance.

Although she doesn't use the term empowerment, Bateman (1999) asserted that leadership within the school shapes the structure of work and belief systems that integrates individuals into the structure of the school. Bateman implied that teacher empowerment creates a dynamic transformational process for principals regarding decision making, enthusiasm, and overall communication. Teacher empowerment is considered by some to be a basic element of school reform and is seen as an element of effective leadership. Lintner (2007) stated, "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 tend to improve" (p. 14).

From a broader perspective, teacher empowerment has become the focus of several educational organizations, as Blasé & Blasé (2001) identified that teacher empowerment as a local, state, and national goal is supported by the National Education Association, The American Federation of Teachers, and The United Federation of Teachers. A teacher's sense of empowerment represents an important variable in comprehensive school improvement efforts of today's effective schools movement. Short and Rinehart (1992) believed that school improvement will occur if teachers are allowed more access to school decision making processes. With that being said, teacher empowerment is a difficult construct and must be clearly defined. Short (1994) defined empowerment as a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems, and "Empowered individuals believe they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve it" (p. 488). Research indicates that teacher empowerment is a positive factor in the organizational

dynamic in schools. The concept of empowered teachers within a school community integrates the use of independence and self-sufficiency to improve the teaching and learning process.

Most often, research describes the building principal as the key person providing leadership to the school. Principals are integral to the success of the school, and principals of more effective schools should be organized instructional leaders who provide strong support structures for teachers. In the early 1980s, Persell and Cookson (1982) reviewed over 75 research studies and reports on principal effectiveness. Results of their research indicated that effective principals create high expectations, are visible, and demonstrate commitment to academic goals. However, today's reform movement calls for a more autonomous environment allowing for increased personal control for teachers. Based upon research of principal effectiveness, this represents a paradigm shift for school principals and requires new ways of thinking.

Effective leadership is much more than building management, as principals today must be able to consult with, and include others effectively. Reitzug (1994) suggested principals are important in the establishment of autonomy, shifting problem solving to teachers, communicating trust, encouraging risk taking, and valuing teachers' input. These principal skills become important mediating variables in the foundation of teacher empowerment. Additionally, current school reform calls for principals and teachers to work together more closely. The relationship between the two is significant in the success of schools and should not be ignored. The principal-teacher relationship regarding empowerment is observed in research, as Pollack and Mills (1997) asserted, "Empirical studies have discovered that principals are primarily responsible for teacher

empowerment, and principals who demonstrate facilitative leadership behaviors contribute significantly to a teacher's sense of empowerment" (p. 30).

<div align="center">Problem Statement</div>

Empowerment is a shared theme in the areas of education, business, and community development. Page and Czuba (1999) described empowerment as a multi-faceted process that allows people control in their own lives over concerns that they identify as important. Keiser (2007) suggested, "Although the concept of empowerment frequented the educational literature through the 1980s and 1990s with the implementation of shared decision making as a component of site based management, the nature of empowerment has changed in recent years" (p. 7).

Teacher empowerment has become an integral part of school reform as teachers become more involved in school improvement initiatives. However, most of these initiatives, such as No Child Left Behind legislation, have caused some teachers to feel disempowered. A possible factor contributing to this could be high-stakes testing that drives curriculum and instruction, rather than the assessment of critical thinking. This lack of autonomy and input could lead to the perception of decreased levels of teacher self-efficacy. Short and Rinehart (1992) asserted that a study reported in the *Teachers College Record* discussed characteristics of schools that have high dropout rates, saying they are overcrowded, and they reveal student apathy as elements of increased teacher disempowerment in schools.

Today, schools and districts across the country struggle to create more collaborative environments in order to be more effective. School districts that envision these empowered environments have turned to teachers as leaders and have encouraged

them to take the initiative to monitor and improve their schools by actively participating in some form of building or district leadership capacity. DuFour (1999) posited that teachers who work in collaborative environments can learn from one another, and students can benefit from the collective strengths of these teachers working together. Keiser and Shen (2000) found, "Empowerment leads to higher teacher self-esteem, increased teacher knowledge of subject matter, improved staff collegiality, enhanced motivation, and higher student achievement" (p. 116).

The demands placed on principals as leaders of schools are numerous. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) believed that leadership is linked to a variety of effective educational practices that address student learning opportunities, teacher effectiveness, organization of curriculum and instruction, school climate, and the establishment of the mission and vision.

Effective leadership is essential to the participatory decision making necessary for successful school reform. King and Kerchner (1991) reasoned, "Principals are witnessing major shifts in who is involved in making decisions, while at the same time they receive mixed messages about what a 'good' principal should do" (p. 2). Research discusses the characteristics of effective principals as early as 1983, when Manasse discovered that effective principals are visionary, model high expectations, build relationships, empower staff, listen, and communicate effectively.

In a national study of 50 effective principals conducted in the 1980s, Valentine (1989) reported that the research "profiled effective principals as 'people persons' in their human relations and communications skills, in their willingness to practice participatory management in decision making, and in their involvement of others in in-service and

developmental activities" (p. 3). Clearly, effective principals are open-minded to the perceptions of others. The unknown element of this study is the direct relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness.

Bateman (1999) found "The principal occupies a unique organizational position for influencing empowerment" (p. 8). Smylie (1992) believed that the principal-teacher relationship is perhaps the most important variable for teacher empowerment. Certain effective principal skills are critical in the attainment of desired levels of teacher participation. Current reform initiatives have identified empowerment as an element of teachers' success; however, bureaucracy that has driven reform in recent years has led to teachers feeling disempowered. Principals who attempt to assume the burden alone and try to manage reform and change from a top-down perspective may create more distance between teachers and administrators, resulting in further disempowerment.

<center>Purpose of the Study</center>

The purpose of the present study was to determine if a relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness. The study focused on teacher perceptions of teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness in three high schools in a suburban Kansas City area school district. The results from this study could help identify effective principal skills that correlate to teacher empowerment. This study addressed the following research question: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness?

Significance of the Study

The role of teachers is changing. Bateman (1999) believed that in addition to completing the myriad of instructional tasks, teachers must be more involved in decisions as they relate to all levels of the school organization. Bateman asserted that teachers will have an impact on an organization if they feel that they have the power to solve problems, institute change, and share responsibility for organizational outcomes. As the pressure for bottom line results increases, principals cannot assume all of the responsibility alone. Teacher empowerment is a difficult concept, and principals should possess certain effective skills in order to achieve maximum teacher participation. The results from this study may help identify specific principal behaviors that relate to teacher empowerment and may expand principals' ability to empower faculty members. Understanding more about empowerment and its relationship to principal effectiveness adds to the body of knowledge related to current best practices in high performing secondary schools.

Delimitations

This study includes only data collected from teachers at three high schools in a suburban school district of Kansas City during the 2007-2008 school year. It was assumed that teachers honestly responded to the survey and that the responses accurately reflected their professional opinions.

Definition of Terms

Effectiveness. A group of people working collectively toward a common goal that focuses on results. "To me, success means effectiveness in the world, that I am able to

carry my ideas and values into the world—that I am able to change it in positive ways" (Kingston, n.d.).

Empowerment. Chamberlin (2008) described empowerment as a process in which people have decision making power, access to resources and information, choice, a feeling that individuals can make a difference, self-initiated growth, and a capacity to act.

Principal effectiveness. Valentine and Bowman (1989) defined principal effectiveness as the building administrator's abilities to provide organizational direction, to be a leader of change, to foster and promote relationships, to facilitate instructional improvement and leadership, and to guide the interactive/affective processes of the school, including clear communication and shared decision making.

Teacher empowerment: Short (1994) defined empowerment as a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems. "Empowered individuals believe they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve it" (p. 488).

<div align="center">Summary</div>

The purpose of this study was to examine if a relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness. The research was designed to examine teacher perceptions of empowerment and teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness. The participants in this study were teachers from three high schools in a large suburb of Kansas City, Missouri. Chapter 1 presented background information that formed the problem statement and the purpose of the study. This study was a correlational study between two variables;

therefore, only one research question was stated. The rest of the chapter acknowledged the significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, and definition of terms.

<center>Organization of the Study</center>

The remainder of the study is organized into four chapters, a references section, and appendixes. Chapter Two is a review of related literature associated with teacher empowerment, leadership, and principal effectiveness. Chapter Three outlines the methodology and research design of the study. The chapter includes descriptions of the two instruments used to collect the data, reliability, and validity of the two instruments, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter Four analyzes and presents the results of the data collected. Chapter Five contains the summary, review of methodology, major findings, conclusions, implications, recommendations for further research, and concluding remarks.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Teacher Empowerment

Teacher empowerment has become increasingly visible within current trends related to educational best practices. The empowerment of employees serves as a significant factor in the success of the schools, businesses, or other organizations in which people are working toward a common goal. Teacher empowerment and teachers' sense of empowerment represent important variables in comprehensive school improvement efforts of today's effective schools movement.

Short and Rinehart (1992) stated that school improvement is dependent upon increased opportunities for staff to participate in the decision making process in vital areas within an organization. Short (1994) defined teacher empowerment as "a process whereby participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth, resolve their own problems, and believe they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve it" (p. 488). Notably, differences exist between perceptions of empowerment and the reality of empowerment. Perceptively, empowered schools create opportunities for teachers to develop competence. Historically, the bureaucratic structure of schools has not allowed teachers to be particularly involved in decisions made outside of the classroom.

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) finds schools striving to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) and searching for answers. Short and Johnson (1994) suggested that the era of accountability has found its way into public education from business and industry. Today's results-oriented and bottom-line culture has leaders viewing worker

efficacy as the most significant factor of the empowerment movement. Short and Johnson concluded, "Teacher empowerment has become a focus of educational reform, leadership models, and teaching effectiveness as educational leaders faced with similar productivity concerns and constraints are also exploring empowerment strategies for their personnel" (p. 3).

Short and Rinehart (1992) maintained that the concept of empowerment exists on three levels. The first level is the foundation level, in which empowerment represents teachers thinking critically to solve problems, as well as school leaders assertively seeking out teacher leaders to become a part of school decision making processes. "At the second level, empowerment may develop through specialized programs as teachers gain knowledge and skill and develop a sense of self-efficacy, impact, or empowerment" (p. 3). Short and Rinehart believed the last level of empowerment suggests that inconsistencies exist in how teachers are made a part of the decision making process, and that top-down forced empowerment is undesirable, as inadequate training stonewalls teacher leadership. This leads to confusion and a lack of trust within the school culture.

Creating an empowered culture is a challenge for school leaders. Most schools have formal and informal teacher power structures that are influential in the creation of empowered cultures. DuFour, DuFour, and Eaker (2008) suggested,

> Cultural norms exert a powerful influence on how people think, feel, and act, and because educators are so immersed in their cultures, they often find it difficult to step outside of their traditions and assumptions to examine their conventional practices from a critical perspective. (pp. 90-91)

Each school has a culture: it may foster a collaborative environment or have teachers teaching in isolation. Educational literature indicates that collaborative environments increase teacher buy-in regarding vision, assessment, and current best instructional practices. Short (1992) noted, "The isolation that results from teachers working alone results in competition, feelings of inadequacy, and insecurity, and discourages sharing information" (p. 5). Short concluded that literature summarizing current problems associated with a teacher's work life presented three key issues associated with teachers' current work reality: teachers teach in isolation, view themselves as separated, and are not involved in school-wide, systemic decision making processes.

Increased student achievement represents the single most important factor in people's perceptions of public education in the United States today. DuFour and Eaker (1998) found that the American public cites education as a national problem; however, DuFour and Eaker further asserted that Gallup Polls reported that people are satisfied with their community schools. A lack of clarity focused on results may exist, as many schools have vision statements asserting where they want to go; however, little mention is made of how they will get there. Keiser and Shen (2000) stated, "The benefits of teacher empowerment includes increased teacher job performance, productivity, improved teacher morale, increased teacher knowledge of subject matter and pedagogy, and in the end, higher student motivation and achievement" (p. 119).

The power of a school's vision should never be overlooked, and numerous school personnel should be involved in the desired direction of the organization. Short and Greer (1993) reasoned that until recently, teachers have not been allowed much responsibility

outside the classroom. The progression from autonomous cultures has been slow, as teachers in the past have not been engaged in staff interviews, school scheduling processes, and fiscal responsibilities. Shared understandings and common values are important in the creation of effective schools. "Studies in participative decision making in business and industry today have revealed increased worker productivity and sense of ownership in empowering environments where increased worker involvement in key decisions takes place" (Short & Greer, p. 4).

Paradigm shifts toward creating empowered cultures began with the Empowered School District Project (Short, Greer, & Michael, 1991); this was a Danforth Foundation grant study conducted in nine school districts–five elementary schools and four high schools—across the United States from 1989 to 1992. Six dimensions of empowerment resulted from the study, which included "involvement in decision making, teacher impact, teacher status, autonomy, opportunities for professional growth, and teacher self-efficacy" (Short, 1994, p. 489).

Decision making, as a factor of empowerment, refers to the "participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their work, such as budgets, teacher selection, scheduling, curriculum, and other programmatic areas" (p. 489). Decision making is significant, as teachers want to be in control of their educational lives and classrooms and feel that they are valued and contributing members of their staffs. Correa and Bauch (1999), in a study of teacher perceptions of their own autonomy, parent participation, and administrative involvement, reported that involved teachers are more encouraged by the shared decision making processes in their respective schools than those teachers who perceived themselves as not a part of their school leadership teams.

Earlier, Short posited: "For teacher involvement in decision making to happen, teachers must believe that their involvement is genuine and that their opinion has critical impact in the outcome of the decision" (1992, p. 9).

Professional growth as an element of empowerment "refers to teachers' perceptions 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, 1994, p. 489). Professional growth coincides with meaningful professional development and refers to teachers' perceptions that the school district in which they are employed provides them with opportunities to continue to grow personally and professionally. DuFour and Eaker (1998) commented, "The purpose of staff development is to help personnel become more individually and collectively effective in helping all students achieve the intended results" (p. 276).

A third aspect of empowerment, status, alludes to teacher perceptions of support, respect, and admiration of their colleagues (Short, 1994). Negative media coverage, increasing expectations, and poor public perceptions of achievement may also serve as factors that affect a teacher's status. Maeroff (1988) suggested that poor compensation, inadequate facilities, interrupted instructional time, and lack of parental support are other factors related to teacher perceptions of status. A 2000-2001 study conducted by the National Education Association, "Status of the American Public School Teacher," reported that 44% of the teachers surveyed chose the teaching profession because of the significant role teachers play in American society (National Education Association, 2003).

Short (1994) referred to self-efficacy as a fourth feature of empowerment, in which teachers perceive they have the competence to enhance student learning, possess the ability to build and sustain meaningful and effective programs to assist students, and have the power to be agents of change in reference to student achievement. Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) defined teacher self-efficacy as "teachers succeeding in continually enhancing students' achievements, in setting high goals for themselves, and in pursuing these goals persistently" (p. 154). Tucker and Stronge (2005) declared, "A highly qualified teacher is a good starting point, but most of us would want our child to have a highly effective teacher whose teaching effort yields high rates of student learning" (p. 6). Short (1992) asserted, "Little assurance that teachers' decisions about instruction are effective or that their actions relate directly to student success feeds this sense of teachers' uncertainty about their competence" (p. 13).

Autonomy, as a fifth facet of empowerment, "Refers to teachers' beliefs that they can control certain aspects of their work life in areas such as scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning, and the hallmark of autonomy is the sense of freedom to make certain decisions" (Short, 1994, p. 493). Discussions by DuFour (1999) suggested,

> Teachers need the autonomy to respond to the highly individualized dynamics of the classroom, to re-teach using different strategies when students struggle, and to divert from the lesson plan during those magic moments when student interest takes an idea in a new direction. (p. 1)

Short (1994) described impact, a sixth component of empowerment, as alluding to teachers' perceptions that they are a major influence in the lives of their students. A

primary function of teaching is student learning and impacting student lives through creativity, relationships, and quality instruction. Berry, Johnson, and Montgomery (2005) posited that numerous district leaders have taken notice of the ability of expert teachers to improve student achievement and have recognized the numerous roles they play in schools. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996, p. 9, as cited in DuFour & Eaker, 1998, p. 205) stated:

> The bottom line is that there is no way to create good schools without good teachers. Those who have worked to improve education over the last decade have learned that school reform cannot be "teacher-proofed." Success in any aspect of reform, whether it is creating standards, developing more challenging curriculum and assessments, implementing school based management, or inventing new model schools and programs, depends on highly skilled teachers working in supportive schools that engender collaboration with families and communities.

Themes surfacing in the literature regarding teacher empowerment reinforce Short and Rinehart's six dimensions of empowerment. For example, a study of 4,091 Ohio public school teachers discovered that teachers' perceptions of empowerment were at the highest when teachers felt that they had achieved a certain level of status, their schools allowed flexibility for personal development, and they perceived that they profoundly influenced their colleagues and students (Klecker & Loadman, 1996). Klecker and Loadman focused on student empowerment and on what the schools did or did not do to promote student buy-in. Further review found additional connections with the dimensions of empowerment, as Husband and Short (1994) reported that empowerment and its relationship with school reform is promising for teachers seeking to improve their career

self-efficacy, sustainability, and ability to reap the rewards that the teaching career promises. A study of 309 teachers from middle level programs found that when teachers "work in an organization where norms for collegiality exist, and a collaborative work environment is facilitated through the inter-disciplinary team approach, teachers experience greater decision making ability, self-efficacy, and confidence" (Husband & Short, abstract).

Deepening the discussion, Short and Rinehart (1992) examined a study of 257 teachers' perceptions of empowerment and discovered, "Teachers who perceive a greater sense of empowerment believe that they can impact the work of the organization and recognize that they have the power to identify problems, institute change efforts, and ultimately, be responsible for organizational outcomes" (p. 13). On a national level, Shen (1998) discussed a study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education regarding survey responses from the perceptions of 50,000 teachers of their own levels of empowerment. Shen reported, "Teachers perceive their own influence to have remained the same over the past few years and to be primarily confined to the classroom" (p. 2). In the study, 55% of the teachers reported that the decisions they had the most say in were classroom issues such as books and supplies, 61% believed their greatest influence was in class curriculum and policy, and 69% reported it was in instructional strategies. This led to the conclusion that teachers feel much less empowered than principals perceive; thus, further inquiry on the topic is warranted.

Wall and Reinhart (1998, as cited in Leech & Fulton, 2008) believed teacher empowerment is perceived as a critical factor in the effective schools movement. Short

and Rinehart (1992) stated, "It appears that school participants who influence the work of the organization feel a greater commitment to creatively and effectively address the problems and opportunities teachers face each day educating young people" (p. 4). Collective participation in meaningful decisions provides focus on organizational goals. Terry (1999-2000) stated, "Empowerment translates into teacher leadership and exemplifies a paradigm shift, with the decisions made by those working most closely with students, rather than those at the top of the pyramid" (p. 1).

Lambert (2003) expressed that teacher leadership is at the core of empowered schools. "Because teachers represent that largest and most constant group of professionals in schools and districts, the full participation in the work of leadership is necessary for high leadership capacity" (p. 32). Lambert also reported that teacher leaders are empowered individuals who channel their energy into the mission of the school, consistently research best practices, and accept the challenges of accountability. Blankenstein (2004) wrote:

Districts that work with teachers to define various leadership roles have begun to systematically invite new teachers to select one of these roles to pursue once hired, and then provide support throughout the process of new teachers taking on leadership roles, and these districts are on their way to building vital leadership capacity. (p. 196)

In a similar study conducted in a Kansas City area suburban school district by Bateman (1999), the researcher found that principal influence affects teacher perceptions of empowerment opportunities in areas such as status, impact, decision making, professional growth, and autonomy and concluded, "The principal's ability to promote

positive working relationships between the school, the community, and other educators

and agencies which work with the school will predict teacher empowerment" (p. 102).

The aforementioned studies emphasize the relationship between principal

leadership and teachers' perceptions of empowerment. Danielson (2006) pointed out that

schools and school districts are under tremendous pressure to achieve at high levels.

NCLB has created a results-oriented bottom line, and principals are the technical leaders

of schools; however, they recognize that they cannot improve schools by themselves as

the sole leaders of their schools.

Teacher empowerment is an important variable in current school improvement

efforts. As schools strive to meet today's accountability standards as set forth by NCLB,

teacher leaders, empowered to make decisions to better themselves and the lives of their

students, play a significant role in meeting those standards. Teachers today are held to

higher accountability standards than ever before in the history of public education.

School districts have become a combination of big business and people development.

Principals cannot shoulder the responsibility alone; therefore, the empowerment of staff

to make autonomous decisions might increase the overall effectiveness of the school, as

teachers might feel a stronger connection to the school in which they work.

Empowerment is a complex idea, and traditional leaders must possess certain

characteristics and behave in ways much different from how most principals have been

trained. In the next section of this literature review, principal leadership is examined as

leadership style, characteristics of effectiveness, and the relationship between leadership

and empowerment. Research on the topic of principal leadership related to teacher

empowerment is limited and further study is warranted, especially as the effective schools movement seeks results via an inclusive school community.

<div align="center">Leadership, Empowerment, and Principal Effectiveness</div>

Throughout the years, leadership has been a recurring theme in educational literature and it has been analyzed extensively in quantitative and qualitative studies. Numerous definitions of leadership exist in educational texts. Bass and Stogdill (1990) estimated that over 3000 empirical investigations have been conducted examining leadership. Collins (2001) described the highest level of leadership as "Level 5 leadership, and level five leaders are a study in duality: modest and willful, humble and fearless leaders that build enduring greatness through a paradoxical blend of personal humility and professional will" (pp. 20-21). Leithwood and Duke's 1999 work in "A Century's Quest to Understand School Leadership" resulted in six important classes of leadership that are visible in recent literature: instructional leadership, transformational leadership, moral leadership, participative leadership, contingency leadership, and managerial leadership.

Instructional leadership typically focuses on teacher behavior associated with student achievement (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Conceptually, instructional leadership is a role that is assumed by teachers, principals, and district leadership. Lunenburg and Ornstein advanced that effective leadership behaviors influence student achievement in most contemporary models of instructional leadership. Principals, as instructional leaders, have become increasingly important as the nation expects results; therefore, a keen understanding of instructional best practices and assessment strategies are of utmost importance for principals.

Transformational leaders "raise organizational members' levels of commitment to achieve organizational goals, resulting in greater productivity, and transformational leaders are viewed as charismatic, visionary, cultural, and empowering" (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004, p. 136). Transformational leadership focuses upon collective commitments of people within the organization, as well as on the group achievement as a whole.

Moral leadership focuses mainly on the values of an organization, which represents the third pillar of a Professional Learning Community. Values can be beliefs or behaviors; however, recently, a number of organizations have paralleled values with collective commitments. Lunenburg and Ornstein (2004) posited, "Leadership in a democratic society entails a moral imperative to promote equity, democratic community, and social justice" (p. 136).

Participative leadership, team leadership, common, or staff leadership are all symbols of empowered cultures (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2004). "A majority of the research associated participative leadership with increased organizational effectiveness, with site based management as the vehicle for achieving such goals" (p. 136).

Contingency leadership is leadership dependent upon the current reality of the organization, adjusting one's leadership style to the situation. Lunenberg and Ornstein (2004) asserted that variations exist in facets of leadership; therefore, it alludes to multiple styles that are applicable to situations.

Managerial leadership focuses on the day-to-day operations of leaders. "The distinction between leadership and management usually entails allocation management with responsibilities for policy implementation, organizational stability, maintaining

effective communications with stakeholders, day-to-day routines, and leadership, in contrast, entails policy making, organizational change, and other more dynamic processes of work" (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2004, p. 137).

Empowered staffs feel that they have influence over the circumstances and participate in the decisions that most affect them. Facilitating this level of individual personal control for teachers is challenging for school principals. Ubben, Hughes, and Norris (2001) suggested there are certain principal behaviors that create empowered school cultures and more effective organizational production, based upon three theories from Raths's *Values and Teaching.* The first theory poses the importance of recognizing individual needs. Ubben et al. stated, "Effective schools research is but one example of the bulk of literature supporting the need for a positive climate that allows for freedom of expression, risk taking, and exploration" (p. 32).

The second theory that supports empowerment is the values theory. Providing teachers with opportunities to clarify values and collective commitments is important for the development of the mission and vision of the school. Ubben et al. (2001, p. 33) wrote, "Without a clear purpose and clarification of one's values, it is difficult to lead with credibility and to have the vision required for leadership." Furthermore, the theory of thinking has significant impact in the creation of empowered environments. Ubben et al. (p. 33) stated, "The thinking/learning organization provides an atmosphere for free exchange of ideas facilitated through critical analysis of issues." Ubben et al. (p. 229) quoted Mareoff's 1988 work:

> What are desired are fine balances that can adequately empower teachers to
>
> exercise appropriate professional judgment while still ensuring the coordination

of the curriculum and supervision and instruction. The appropriate empowerment of teachers must lay the amount of authority granted, methods of accountability used to ensure responsibility, and the organizational structures created to maintain the proper communication flow necessary to carry out these tasks.

Principals should consider that their significance of relationships with staff is paramount to building collaborative and empowered cultures. When and how much power is granted to teachers must be carefully examined, as principals themselves are held accountable in the end. Principals should assume that the teachers working for them have the students' best interests in mind and should support an empowered guiding coalition in the school. Marzano et al. (2005) reported, "Relationships refer to the extent to which the school leader demonstrates awareness of the personal lives of teachers and staff" (p. 58).

Whitaker (2003) wrote, "One of the hallmarks of effective principals is how they treat people" (p. 21). Honest, sincere relationships with staff ease tension between administration and the faculty and create an atmosphere that is results-oriented. Covey (1990) stated, "If the desired results are for individuals to work together effectively in a high-trust, win-win culture, helpful systems and structures must be created that will enforce those results" (p. 214).

Bredeson (1989) reported that principal leadership represents an important variable in the success of current school reform movements. "The principal is responsible for creating, nurturing, and shaping a school environment in which professional responsibilities are accepted and shared among the staff" (p. 3). The visible principal, clearly communicating high expectations for staff and demonstrating a commitment to

continuous improvement is important in the creation of an empowered staff. Secondly, "The positive effects of empowerment are most evident in the areas of teachers' attitudes about their professional work and workplace, in their work behaviors, in benefits to schools themselves, and in benefits to the principal" (p. 14).

Terry (1999-2000) asserted that the principal is the central figure in the creation of empowered schools, and wrote, "It is essential that a principal create an environment conducive to empowerment, demonstrate empowerment ideals, encourage all endeavors toward empowerment, and applaud all empowerment successes" (p. 1). The empowered principal is perceptive of teacher needs and provides the necessary support for teachers to feel effective. Short and Johnson (1994) suggested, "Constructive consequences occur when members of the organization feel competent as professionals and human beings, and subordinate satisfaction with leadership is high" (p. 7). Teachers being comfortable in the presence of the principal and having the autonomous feeling of being able to share ideas and concerns freely will bring about the change that is desired.

Research on the subject points to a significant 1990 Michigan State study conducted by Blasé, in which he discovered that 92% of staff surveyed were affected by their principal's behavior. Low motivation, negative self-esteem, and reduced teacher morale are factors that negatively influence teacher leadership. Blasé (2004) wrote:

> Now more than ever, school reform efforts require that principals and teachers work together collaboratively to solve educational problems. Such collaboration is successful when school principals build trust in their schools; trust, in turn, serves as a foundation for open, honest, and reflective professional dialogue; problem solving; innovative initiatives; and more directly, the development of the school

as a powerful community of learners willing to take responsibility for and capable of success. All principals need to work toward these ends, and all individuals and organizations associated with public education should willingly confront the kinds of administrative mistreatment that undermine such possibilities. (p. 5)

Polarity differences exist in administrative perceptions vs. teacher perceptions of empowerment. Research conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics examined data that was collected in a 1993-94 national study of 47,105 teachers and 9098 principals. The study focused on teacher perceptions of teacher empowerment and principal perceptions of teacher empowerment. As reported by Keiser and Shen (2000):

The findings of the study clearly indicate that principals perceive that teachers are much more empowered than the teachers themselves feel, and that teachers still have little influence on school-wide issues such as deciding school budget, hiring new teachers, and evaluating teachers. … Specifically, awareness of the findings from this study could assist principals in regard to their responsibilities for and in maximizing teacher empowerment, as principals may need to adopt leadership behaviors and or policies that maximize teacher empowerment. (p. 119)

Shaver (2004) reported that teacher empowerment is associated with a principal's willingness to give up some control and allow for shared decision making. Trust, communication, and planning are mediating variables in the creation of empowered schools. Bateman (1999) suggested, "If teachers perceive they are engaged in meaningless work with no authority to change rigid bureaucratic policies, then productivity and commitment will be adversely affected, and the teachers' leadership capabilities will be ignored" (p. 33). Previously, a 1998 study by Wall and Rinehart (as

cited by Leech & Fulton, 2008) noted, "A principal's willingness to empower teachers is contingent upon the principal's training to facilitate participatory decision making" (p. 4). Shaver observed trust as a major variable for teacher empowerment, as it requires leaders to share the power as well as be supportive of teachers by increasing their leadership capacity within the school.

> The traditional administrator role put a leader in the position of always being in control, but as the administrator role shifted to encompass a greater span of duties, the necessity for empowerment of others emerged. In today's educational arena, empowerment is a key to survival of administrators. The ability to extend support to those empowered is a crucial element, and the support can take on many different shapes and sizes, depending upon the group and the task or project assigned. (Shaver, 2004, p. 93)

The complexity of today's principalship, by default, negates the top-down method of leadership. Current school principals report that their job is surrounded by profound ambiguity, relentless expectations, and a myriad of responsibilities. Leading today's large metropolitan high school would be foolish to attempt alone without an empowerment structure in place to improve steadily upon those expectations and achieve desired results.

A study by Bogler and Somech (2004) indicated that teachers who have a positive self-image and perceive themselves as professionals with opportunities for professional growth contribute more to the school as their commitment to the school and the teaching profession increases. "Principals need to recognize that the feelings and perceptions of teachers about their schools, and their desire to attain opportunities for professional growth, are beneficial to the organization itself" (p. 286). Principal improvement is a key

to school improvement. Since teachers work more closely with principals than anyone else, teacher perceptions are especially important for principals to candidly examine their own ability to meet the needs of their teaching staffs.

Leech and Fulton (2008) posited: "Studies have revealed that successful schools have principals who exhibit common attributes: a clear sense of mission, well defined goals, self-confidence, a commitment to high standards, a participating leader, and active involvement in the change process" (p. 4). Short and Greer's 1994 study (as cited by Leech & Fulton, 2008) found "teacher participation in decision making exists only in schools where principals desire to have teacher participation" (p. 4).

Reitzug's (1994) study of principal behavior (as cited by Leech & Fulton, 2008) analyzed data from 41 teachers working in a school where the principal valued teacher empowerment. From the study, three types of teacher empowering behaviors were identified: (a) creating a supportive environment, (b) facilitation developing the ability for the staff to perform self-critiquing of the schools, and (c) possibly providing the resources to bring action to their critique. (p. 5)

Valentine and Bowman (1989) analyzed a study of the National Recognition Schools project with data gathered about principal effectiveness that was analyzed from responses from 375 "exemplary" schools. The researchers discovered, "The highest scoring items for the principals of the recognized schools imply that principals are perceived as skillful in working with staff and community to plot a course for the school, and sail the ship on that course" (p. 6). Valentine and Bowman also found that principal behavior plays a role in the affective processes of the school, as the teachers in the study reported that principals may involve a staff member in the decision making who

otherwise might not have engaged. Finally, Valentine and Bowman posited that principals are instrumental in the empowerment of staff in the midst of bringing about successful change.

Hoerr (2005) suggested collegiality as an important descriptor of the overall health of a school. "The premise of collegiality is simple yet powerful: If students are to grow and learn, the adults must grow and learn too" (p. 20). Hoerr advanced the idea that collaboration and collegiality are synonymous, as staffs should work together to form one single unit, and principals must work hard to develop this level of trust in a school. "The job of the principal is to create a school culture that transcends personality, even his or her own" (p. 20). Gruenert (2003) posited, "Culture may be a nebulous concept in a world where principals need concrete results in student achievement. Linking culture and student achievement may allow principals to re-center their energies on more human aspects of school leadership" (p. 43).

Blankenstein (2004) summarized successful leadership as the ability to "collaboratively create and sustain changes that continually enhance student achievement" (p. 194). Blankenstein suggested that leaders who demonstrate that they are focused on continued success for all students, work united with staff, and are visionary considering the long-term health of schools are the most valuable to the teachers and students that they serve.

> To have the greatest impact, principals must define their job as helping create a
> professional learning community in which teachers can continually collaborate
> and learn how to become more effective, as this task demands less command and
> control and more learning and leading. (DuFour & Eaker, 1998, p. 184)

Hickman, Moore, and Torek (2008) discussed the importance of principal support in transforming normal classroom practitioners into school leaders making decisions collectively. "Principals who are dedicated to distributed leadership must foster an environment of trust at all levels, starting by trusting teachers to make sound, well informed decisions about what is best for their students" (p. 30). Teacher effectiveness is at the core of teacher empowerment, and the empowerment by invitation will not be successful if teachers perceive the principal as demanding, top-down, and unsupportive. "One of the most important things that any principal can do to encourage the spirit of empowerment throughout the school is to practice servant leadership" (p. 30).

Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith (1994) examined leadership from multiple perspectives. Teamwork and the sharing of responsibilities have developed into a current trend of successful organizations. Visionary leadership as a recurring theme also presented itself numerous times throughout current educational literature. "While any team must develop shared intent within itself, you must master a process that appropriately involves a whole organization in what amounts to a collective creation" (Senge et al., p. 437).

Empowering people is a complex concept and requires the necessary skills to achieve maximum results. In *The Empowered Manager,* Block (1991) shared his personal strategies with people with low views of their own self-efficacy:

Suppose you had a vision of greatness: what would it be? A vision exists within each of us, even if we have not made it explicit or put into words. Our reluctance to articulate our vision is a measure of our despair and a reluctance to take responsibility for our own lives, our own unit, and our own organization. A vision

statement is an expression of hope, and if we have no hope, it is hard to create a vision. (p. 113)

Manasse (1983) suggested that effective principals are visionary leaders who possess extreme clarity in organizational direction and have the wherewithal to make it happen. "Though they exhibit a wide range of personal leadership styles, effective principals are likely to have a clear sense of their own strengths and weaknesses, high energy levels, strong communication, analytic human relation skills, and a high tolerance for stress" (p. 10). Communication is an integral piece, as principals model high expectations for staff and students through commitment to continuous improvement.

The empowerment of staff will assist in the prevention of principal burnout. The days of old, when the principal served as the building manager and shouldered all of the responsibility, are long gone. The principalship has become too complex for principals to handle it all alone. Fleck (2005) asserted, "Leaders have to trust that their employees will make good decisions, and administrators must be careful not to create a leader-decision dependency with the staff" (p. 28). Huffman (2003) stated, "To be successful, leaders must thoughtfully engage internal and external stakeholders in crafting a shared vision, and these stakeholders include teachers, students, parents, and community members" (p. 25). Lapointe and Davis (2006) asserted, "Public demands for more effective schools have placed growing attention on the crucial role of school leadership and its strong effects on student learning" (p. 16). Principals who work collaboratively with teacher leaders can improve their knowledge of effective instructional practices, curriculum, and assessment. "In most shared decision-making schools that are working well, teachers and the principal have mutually agreed on the boundaries separating decisions requiring

teacher consultation from those that can be made by the principal unilaterally" (King, 1991, p. 12).

Principals today face a myriad of challenges that almost certainly make the job nearly impossible to do alone. In the face of profound ambiguity, uncertainty, and accountability, principals must rethink their roles and entrust the staff they have assembled to assist in the decision making process of the school. Tucker and Codding (2002) stated, "As the multiple demands proliferate and intensify—building manager, instructional leader, buffer to the external environment, central office subordinate, policy implementer, and community organizer, it may be that role restructuring will be necessary" (p. 146).

Numerous studies exist concerning principal effectiveness; however, little data has been gathered concerning the relationship between teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness and teacher empowerment. One might suggest that the two go hand in hand; however, as the literature points out, certain behaviors of principals have been found to create empowered schools. The data gathered in this study might support past research concerning empowerment, as well as ignite future studies that could assist current school principals in actualizing those effective practices that facilitate teacher empowerment and high performing schools.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This chapter addresses the methodology used in this study. It is organized into
five major sections: (a) research design which includes population and sample, (b)
instrumentation which includes the reliability and validity of the Audit of Principal
Effectiveness and the reliability and validity of the School Participant Empowerment
Scale, (c) data collection, (d) data analysis, and (e) limitations. The purpose of this study
was to examine the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal
effectiveness as perceived by teachers. The research question formulated for this study
was: Does a relationship exist between teacher perceived levels of teacher empowerment
and teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness?

Research Design

This was a correlational research study examining if a relationship exists between
teacher perceptions of teacher empowerment and perceptions of principal effectiveness.
Gall, Gall, and Borg (2005) stated, "Correlational research allows researchers to
determine not only whether a relationship between variables exists, but also the extent of
the relationship between them" (p. 219). Correlation coefficients were calculated to
evaluate potential positive or negative relationships between the two constructs.

Population and Sample

The participants in this study were teachers from three high schools in a large
suburb of Kansas City Missouri. Student enrollment at each high school was roughly
1700 students, and each school had no fewer than 110 teachers. Criterion for inclusion in
the study was that the participants had to be teachers. Administrators, para-educators, and

teacher assistants were not eligible to participate in the study. The participants were appropriate for this study because they were certified full time teachers with immediate supervisors. The names of the teachers who participated in this study were not identified to the researcher.

<div align="center">Instrumentation</div>

Based upon the research question and hypothesis identified in this study, only two variables were analyzed. The two variables are principal effectiveness and teacher empowerment. Two independent survey instruments were utilized to collect data for measurement of the two variables.

The Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE) (see Appendix A) was utilized to measure principal effectiveness. Valentine and Bowman (1989) developed the Audit of Principal Effectiveness based on literature and research as discussed in chapter two. Initially, 162 items forming 12 theoretical factors describing principal behavior were identified and codified in two separate documents. Each document of 81 questions was distributed to 3,660 teachers across the United States, seeking their insight. The original two documents took too long to complete; therefore, the authors selected another random sample of 3,300 teachers to participate in a second study. The resulting second refinement yielded one form divided into three domains with nine associated factors and 80 items.

The 80-item instrument was utilized in this study. Because teachers work more closely with principals than does any other group, teachers' perceptions were the focus of the audit. All responses on the scale had a numerical value of 1-9, which represented

responses from *not effective* to *very effective*. Participants were asked to select a response that described how effectively their principal performed each task.

The first domain of the APE is organizational development. Valentine and Bowman (1989) described organizational development as a principal's ability to have vision, build positive relationships, and utilize effective practices to bring about successful change. The domain of organizational development is composed of three factors: organizational direction, organizational linkage, and organizational procedures. The second domain of the APE is organizational environment and contains teacher relations, student relations, interactive processes, and affective processes. Valentine and Bowman believed that an effective principal should communicate effectively with staff, maintain visibility and relations with students, and be organized. The third domain of the APE is educational program, which contains the two factors of instructional improvement and curriculum improvement. Valentine and Bowman (1989) posited that the principal, as the educational leader, should demonstrate knowledge of best practices related to teaching, learning, and curriculum.

The instrument used to assess teacher level of empowerment was the School Participant Empowerment Scale SPES (see Appendix B). This instrument developed by Short and Rinehart (1992) was the result of two separate studies conducted by the authors to assess school participant empowerment. Originally, 79 participants were asked to list ways in which they felt empowered in their schools. The initial list generated over 110 items, and of those items, 75 were judged by the authors to represent empowerment components from past research. Short and Rinehart reported that "Components of empowerment represented in the item's content included: knowledge base, competence,

status, influence, autonomy, control, responsibility, collaboration, involvement in decision making, impact, and choice" (p. 954). Using rating differences on no more than one-digit across all judges, 68 statements were generated for the authors' first study.

In the second study, 211 teachers from three high schools in three states responded to the 68-item questionnaire, which resulted in the six dimensions or subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale. The six subscales are identified as decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact. The instrument contained 38 total items that asked participants to describe how they felt about responsibility, participation, teacher selection, fiscal involvement, professionalism, student learning, empowerment, difference making, control, innovation, and collaboration in their schools. The instrument required a *strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree*, or *strongly agree* response from participants.

<div align="center">Reliability of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness</div>

Gall et al (2005) stated that the creation of a perfectly reliable instrument is not possible. Sources of error will be present, and virtually all error cannot be eliminated. Correlation coefficients range from -1.00 to 1.00, with numerical values closer to one being more reliable. However, according to Gall et al. (2005), "A measure is considered reliable for most research and practical purposes if its reliability coefficient is .80 or higher, and in a Cronbach's alpha, a value of .70 or higher is usually sufficient" (p. 140). Valentine and Bowman (1989) stated that APE has total instrument reliability of .9698, which is close to 1.00; therefore, based upon the Gall et al. statement, the APE is a reliable instrument to be used for research (see Table 1).

Table 1

Reliability of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness

Domain	Factor	Coefficient Alpha
Organizational Development		0.9253
	Organizational Direction	0.8259
	Organizational Linkage	0.9037
	Organizational Procedures	0.8145
Organizational Environment		0.9443
	Teacher Relations	0.9389
	Student Relations	0.8977
	Interactive Processes	0.8551
	Affective Processes	0.7920
Educational Program		0.8894
	Instructional Improvement	0.8506
	Curriculum Improvement	0.8432
Total Instrument Reliability		0.9698

Note. From *Principal Effectiveness in "National Recognition" Schools,* (Report No. EA021323), 1989, by J. W. Valentine & M. L. Bowman, University of Missouri, Columbia, Department of Educational Administration. Adapted with permission.

Validity of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness

Valentine and Bowman (1989) designed the Audit of Principal Effectiveness to provide useful insight to principals about their own administrative skills and to function as a valid, reliable instrument for administrator research. The authors analyzed numerous studies and reports on principal effectiveness conducted during the 1970s and 1980s.

Valentine and Bowman reported that from 1979 to 1981, the National Association of Secondary School Principals teamed with the American Psychological Association to aid school districts in attracting and retaining future building level administrators. The process became a 3-year validity study of the process and skill dimensions of principal effectiveness.

<div align="center">Reliability of the School Participant Empowerment Scale</div>

Short and Rinehart (1992) felt, "Because participant level of empowerment may fluctuate and not remain stable, a test-retest index of stability was deemed inappropriate for measures of reliability" (p. 956). The 38-item instrument, School Participant Empowerment Scale, SPES has a total Chronbach's alpha of 0.94. As stated earlier in the previous section, Chronbach's alpha numerical values that are .70 and higher are considered reliable in judging instruments for research. In addition to the alpha that was calculated for the entire survey each of the six subscales were analyzed for reliability. The coefficient alphas for the six subscales are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Reliability of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Subscale	Coefficient Alpha
Decision Making	0.89
Professional Growth	0.83
Status	0.86
Self-Efficacy	0.84
Autonomy	0.81
Impact	0.82
Total Reliability	0.94

Note. From *Teacher empowerment and school climate,* April 1992, by P. M. Short & J. S. Rinehart, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. Adapted with permission.

Validity of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Short and Rinehart (1992) stated that numerous steps were taken to establish content validity in the development of the School Participant Empowerment Scale. In an evaluation of the initial 75-item empowerment characteristics list, a panel of experts rated each of the items on the degree to which empowerment was represented in the schools researched. According to Short and Rinehart (1992), "Each item was rated on a 5-point continuum from *highly representative* (1) to *highly unrepresentative* (5)" (p. 954). For the final 38-item instrument, content validity was not established. Short and Rinehart (1992) reported that evidence of discriminant validity was established for the 38-item instrument by comparing teacher ratings from two schools that participated in a project designed to empower teachers with ratings from a school that did not employ empowerment interventions. Salkind (2007) stated, "Discriminant validity is the extent to which measures designed to assess different constructs are, in fact, distinct from one another" (p. 666).

Data Collection Procedures

In September of 2007, the researcher submitted a proposal for research to the Baker University Institutional Review Board. In November of 2007, the project was approved for study (see Appendix C). The superintendent of the participating school district was sent a letter requesting permission to survey the teaching staffs at the three district high schools. The superintendent's operating team met to discuss the study, and

permission was granted to conduct research in the school district. A letter describing the

purpose of the study was also sent to each building principal. Because a face-to-face

meeting would establish trust, meetings were held individually with the three high school

principals to inform them of the purpose and design of the study. The researcher asked

for permission from building principals to attend their staff meetings and present the

purpose of the study and to distribute the two survey instruments. With the cooperation of

each principal, presentations were then made to each faculty. Participants were instructed

to fill out the two instruments and place them in a sealed envelope. A collection point

was established at each school, and the envelopes containing the two instruments were

picked up by the researcher. The entire process was completed during the week of March

3-10, 2008. A total of 330 surveys were distributed to teachers. Each school allowed the

researcher to distribute the surveys to teachers one time with no additional reminders and

101 teachers returned the survey packet.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

The research question for this study focused on the relationship between teacher

perceptions of teacher empowerment and teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness.

Data describing the teachers' responses on the two survey instruments are presented in

Chapter Four. The null hypothesis stated, "There is no statistically significant relationship

between high school teacher perceptions of empowerment and their perceptions of

principal effectiveness in the three high schools that participated in this study." The

primary statistic utilized in this study was the Pearson product moment correlation. Gall

et al. (2005) stated that correlational statistics are used in educational research "to explore

the nature of the relationship between the variables of interest to educators" (p. 226). A

correlation indicates the strength and direction of the relationship between two numerical variables. The interpretations of correlation coefficient strength are in Table 3.

Table 3

Strength of Correlation Coefficients

Interpretation	Correlation
Very strong relationship	0.8-1.0
Strong relationship	0.6-0.8
Moderate relationship	0.4-0.6
Weak relationship	0.2-0.4
Weak or no relationship	0.0-0.2

Note. From Statistics for People Who Think They Hate Statistics, 2004, by Neil J.Salkind, Adapted with permission.

Overall, 20 correlations were examined in this study. The three domains of the APE were correlated with the six subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale, forming 18 correlations. There were two measures of overall effectiveness. A factor 80 and an average of all survey items. The final two correlations measured the relationship between factor 80 and empowerment, and the relationship between the average effectiveness and empowerment.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter restated the purpose of this study and presented the research question. The research design utilized correlation coefficients to examine teacher perceptions of empowerment and teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness. The

participants in this study were teachers from three high schools in a large suburb of

Kansas City, Missouri. Two independent survey instruments were used in this study. The

Audit of Principal Effectiveness, (APE) was utilized to measure principal effectiveness.

The School Participant Empowerment Scale, (SPES) was used to assess teacher levels of

empowerment. In addition, the reliability and validity of both instruments was presented.

Finally, the data collection procedures and the data analysis were also discussed in this

chapter. Results of the data analysis are presented in the Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The results of this study are presented in three sections of this chapter: (a)

introduction, (b) data analysis, which includes descriptive statistics and the correlations to

test the hypothesis, and (c) summary. Overall, 20 correlations were examined in the

study. The three domains of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE) were correlated

with the six subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), forming 18

correlations. There were two measures of overall effectiveness: a factor 80 and an

average of all survey items. The final two correlations measured the relationship between

factor 80 and empowerment, and the relationship between the average effectiveness score

and empowerment. The sample size for the data reported in this chapter was ($N = 101$).

Data Analysis

Organizational Development

Valentine and Bowman (1987) described the domain of organizational

development as the principal's ability to work with staff to set goals, define expectations,

and institute change. Additionally, this domain describes the principal's ability to relate

to the community, teachers, and other administrators, and to involve teachers in the

decision making process. The following paragraph describes correlations between the

APE domain of organizational development and the six subscales of the SPES: decision

making, professional growth, status, self efficacy, autonomy, and impact.

The correlation between the variables of organizational development and decision

making was .332 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .001, reflecting statistical significance at

the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational development and professional growth was .514 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .000, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variable of organizational development and status was .240 with a *p*-value of .015, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.05 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational development and self-efficacy was .222 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .026, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.05 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational development and autonomy was .219 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .027, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.05 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational development and impact was .280 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .005, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The data showed the domain of organizational development and the subscale of professional growth as having the strongest positive relationship. The correlation between the domain of organizational development and the subscale of decision making showed a weak to moderate relationship. The domain of organizational development and the subscale of autonomy showed the weakest relationship.

Organizational Environment

Valentine & Bowman (1987) described the domain of organizational environment as the principal's ability to manage the school effectively, focusing on daily interaction with staff and nurturing a positive climate. The following paragraph describes correlations between the APE domain of organizational environment and the six subscales of the SPES.

The correlation between the variables of organizational environment and decision making was .347 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .000, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational environment and professional growth was .595 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .000, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational environment and status was .296 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .003, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational environment and self-efficacy was .274 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .006, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of organizational environment and autonomy was .196 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .050 and was not statistically significant. The correlation between the variables of organizational environment and impact was .296 with a two-tailed *p*-value of .003, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The data showed the relationship between the domain of organizational environment and the subscale of professional growth as having the strongest relationship. The correlation between the domain of organizational environment and the subscale of status showed a weak to moderate relationship. The domain of organizational environment and the subscale of autonomy showed no statistically significant relationship.

Educational Program

Valentine and Bowman (1987) described the domain of the educational program as the principal's ability to facilitate instructional leadership, methodology, and curriculum development through active involvement with stakeholders. The following

paragraph describes correlations between the APE domain of the educational program and the six subscales of the SPES.

The correlation between the variables of educational program and decision making measured .290 with a two-tailed p-value of .003, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of educational program and professional growth measured .513 with a two-tailed p-value of .000, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of educational program and status measured .308 with a two-tailed p-value of .002, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of educational program and self-efficacy measured .316 with a two-tailed p-value of .001, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The correlation between the variables of educational program and autonomy measured .162 with a two-tailed p-value of .105, and was not statistically significant. The correlation between the variables of educational program and impact measured .393 with a two-tailed p-value of .000, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The data showed the relationship between the domain of the educational program and the subscale of professional growth as the strongest. The correlation between the domain educational program and the subscale of impact showed a moderate relationship. The domain of educational program and the subscale of autonomy showed no statistically significant relationship.

Average Overall Effectiveness and Average Overall Empowerment

The final two correlations measured the relationship between average overall effectiveness and average overall empowerment. The average overall effectiveness variable measured .511 with a two-tailed p-value at .000, reflecting statistical significance

at the 0.01 level. The relationship between average overall effectiveness and average overall empowerment was .424 with a two-tailed *p*-value at .000, reflecting statistical significance at the 0.01 level. The data showed that overall effectiveness had a moderate to strong relationship with the six SPES subscales. Overall empowerment showed a moderate relationship with the three domains of the APE.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics showed the mean and standard deviation for all of the domains, factor 80, and average overall effectiveness. The mean for each of the domains and the average overall effectiveness was calculated for each of the domains based upon the sum of the items within the domains. Factor 80 represents one item on the APE as to the participants' overall perception of principal effectiveness on a scale between 1 and 9. The descriptive statistics are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Overall Principal Effectiveness

APE Domains	*M*	*SD*
Organizational Development	61.4	12.95
Organizational Environment	62.6	14.8
Educational Program	53.6	10.4
Factor 80 Overall	6.76	1.8
Average Overall Effectiveness	59.1	12.3

Note. N = 101

The descriptive statistics showed the mean and standard deviation for all six of the SPES subscales, and average overall empowerment. The mean represents the sum of all items added together representing each subscale. The sum is an average of the subscale score. The descriptive statistics for average overall empowerment and the six subscales are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Six SPES Subscales and Average Overall Empowerment

SPES Subscale	*M*	*SD*
Decision Making	31.2	9.2
Professional Growth	24.3	3.8
Status	26.3	3.2
Self Efficacy	26.3	2.9
Autonomy	13.8	3.3
Impact	24.9	3.6
Average Overall Empowerment	24.4	2.9

Note. N = 101

Summary

Chapter Four presented the results obtained from (N = 101) teacher's responses to the two independent survey instruments presented in Chapter Three. The results were presented in narrative form. The findings of this study showed 18 significant relationships between the scores on the three domains of the Audit of Principal

Effectiveness and the scores on six subscales of the School Participant Empowerment

Scale. The data showed correlations between the domains of organizational development,

organizational environment, educational program, and the subscale of professional

growth as the most statistically significant variables in this study. Correlations between

the domains of organizational development, organizational environment, educational

program and the subscale of autonomy showed the least or no statistical significance in

this study. Based upon the data, it appears that specific principal skills related to the

domains have an influence on teacher empowerment. Significant relationships were

observed in this study; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Chapter Five presents

conclusions, interpretations, implications, and recommendations that are derived from the

results presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding chapter presented and analyzed data regarding teacher perceptions of empowerment and principal effectiveness. Chapter Five is organized into three parts: (a) a brief summary of the study, (b) a summary of the findings to include findings related to the literature and, (c) conclusions, which include implications, recommendations, and concluding remarks.

Study Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness. The study was conducted in three high schools in a suburban Kansas City area school district. The research question for this study was "Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness?" The Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE) (see Appendix A) was utilized to measure principal effectiveness, and it provided 80 items to participating teachers. All responses on the scale had a numerical value of 1-9, which represented responses from *not effective* to *very effective*. Participants were asked to select a response that described how effectively their principal performed each skill.

The instrument used to assess teacher level of empowerment was the School Participant Empowerment Scale SPES (see Appendix B). The instrument contained 38 total items that asked participants to describe how they felt about responsibility, participation, teacher selection, fiscal involvement, professionalism, student learning, empowerment, difference making, control, innovation, and collaboration in their schools.

The instrument required a *strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree*, or *strongly agree* response from participants.

The researcher requested permission from building principals to attend their staff meetings, present the purpose of the study, and distribute the two survey instruments. With the cooperation of each principal, presentations were then made to each faculty. Participants were instructed to fill out the two instruments and place them in a sealed envelope. A collection point was established at each school, and the envelopes containing the two instruments were picked up by the researcher. The entire process was completed during the week of March 3-10, 2008. A total of 330 surveys were distributed to teachers. Each school allowed the researcher to distribute the surveys to teachers one time with no additional reminders; 101 teachers returned the survey packet.

Summary of the Findings

Overall, 20 correlations were examined in this study. The three domains of the APE were correlated with the six subscales of the SPES, forming 18 correlations. There were two measures of overall effectiveness. The final two correlations measured the relationship between empowerment, factor 80, and the relationship between the average effectiveness score and empowerment.

The findings of this study indicated 18 significant relationships between the scores on the three domains of the APE and the scores on six subscales of the SPES. The data revealed that the strongest relationships occurred between the APE domains of organizational development, organizational environment, educational program, and the SPES subscale of professional growth. The data indicated a moderate relationship between the APE domain of educational program and the SPES subscale of impact. The

data indicated a moderate relationship between the APE domain of organizational environment and decision making.

The data indicated that the weakest relationships existed between the domains of organizational environment, educational program, and the sub scale of autonomy. The data also indicated that a weak to moderate relationship existed between the domain of organizational development and the subscale of autonomy. Descriptive data indicated that, overall, teachers perceived the principals in this study to be moderately to very effective, according to the 9-point scale used in the APE as the measure of effectiveness. A moderate relationship existed between the average effectiveness (for both the overall effectiveness and factor 80) and average overall empowerment.

Findings Related to the Literature

In review of the literature, research was shared on teacher empowerment, leadership, and principal effectiveness. As discussed in the literature review and Chapter Three, teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness were assessed according to the perceptions of teachers. The SPES and the APE were chosen for this study because they have been utilized in other studies investigating the perceptions of individual teachers.

In 1996, Lumpa studied correlations between teacher and student satisfaction in 60 Missouri elementary and middle schools. One purpose of the study was to determine the relationships among principal effectiveness, school climate, teacher empowerment, and teacher satisfaction. Lumpa utilized four surveys, including the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and the Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE). Lumpa concluded that significant correlations were found between the variables of principal effectiveness and teacher empowerment. Specifically, teachers in the study who

perceived their principals to be more effective reported higher scores of empowerment. Additionally, Lumpa reported that principal effectiveness was a significant factor in teacher satisfaction; however, teacher empowerment was not significant. Interestingly, based upon Lumpa's research, it appears that more responsibility given to teachers does not necessarily reflect higher levels of teacher satisfaction.

In a study conducted by Bateman in 1998, the researcher examined teacher perceptions of empowerment, principal effectiveness, and organizational health in two high schools located in a suburban school district of Kansas City, Missouri. The researcher reported that 112 teachers participated, and she concluded that principal influence was related to the six SPES subscales of status, impact, decision making, professional growth, and autonomy. However, the researcher noted more variability in the types of relationships that existed among the six subscales of the SPES and the three domains of the APE. Bateman reported the domain of educational program had no significant relationships with the six SPES sub scales. During the March 2008 administration of the current study, significant relationships were found between the domain of the educational program and five of the six subscales, as well as stronger relationships between all three of the domains of the APE and the six subscales of the SPES. This change in the relationships could be because teachers' and principals' roles have changed significantly in the past decade.

Other studies identified in Chapter Two of the current study spoke specifically to teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness as potentially related variables (Short & Rinehart, 1992, Klecker & Loadman 1998); however, research studying the relationships between the two is limited. Although consistent themes throughout the

literature assert that the principal is the central figure in the creation of empowered schools (Mareoff 1988; Shaver, 2004; Terry 1999), further study of the relationship between the two variables is warranted.

Conclusions

Based on the findings from the current study, conclusions can be drawn. In general, teachers' perceptions of empowerment and principal effectiveness are related to each other. Data in this study revealed that the strongest relationships occurred between each of the three domains of the APE and the SPES subscale of professional growth. Teachers in this study who rated their principals high on the domains of organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program reported strong feelings of empowerment in respect to professional growth.

The data indicated a moderate relationship between the APE domain of educational program and the SPES subscale of impact. It appears that teachers in this study perceived that principals positively influence the instructional skills present in the school through clinical supervision and knowledge of effective instruction. It appears that teachers who rated principals high on the domain of educational program perceived that they themselves were making a difference in their schools. Seemingly, teachers' perceptions of principals who regularly visit their classes and who provide strategies for improvement positively influence how teachers perceive themselves as professionals.

The data indicated a moderate relationship between the APE domain of organizational environment and the SPES subscale of decision making. It appears that teachers in this study perceived that principals who effectively organize activities, tasks, and people are effective in empowering others through participative decision making.

The data also showed that the weakest relationships existed between the APE domains of organizational environment and educational program, and the SPES subscale of autonomy. Teachers in the current study reported that no matter how effective they perceive the principals to be in any areas of the organizational areas studied, it has minimal impact on the belief that they can control certain aspects of their work life. However, it should be noted that the data indicated a weak relationship between the domain of organizational development and the subscale of autonomy. Teachers in this study reported that principals who set high expectations and encourage change have little impact on the belief that they possess the capacity to make informed, un-coerced decisions. Although it is a weak relationship, teachers in this study perceived that effective principals involve staff in decision making processes. Overall, it appears that based on the data, teacher perception of principal effectiveness is a predictor of teacher perceived levels of empowerment, since correlations were observed across the three domains of the APE and the six subscales of the SPES.

<div align="center">Implications for Action</div>

Findings from this study have implications for teachers and administrators. The study has contributed to the scholarly literature and to the profession by revealing teachers' perceptions of teacher empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness. Data from this study showed that levels of teacher empowerment are related to principal effectiveness. The six subscales of the SPES and the three domains of the APE would be beneficial tools for principals and school organizations attempting to improve the structures that support teacher empowerment. The data revealed that the strongest relationship occurred between the three domains of the APE and the SPES

subscale of professional growth. One implication might be that considerable attention should be given to professional growth and development of teachers. Principals might conduct needs assessments to focus more closely on professional growth activities. Other practical implications might include the importance of allocating adequate funding for professional development opportunities for staff.

Another implication might be that universities responsible for the preparation and development of school leaders should consider the importance of the analysis of the three domains of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness as they work with the pre- and in-service needs of school principals. The APE was designed to provide beneficial feedback to principals concerning their administrative skills. Convincingly, strong leadership of the principal is integral to effective schools. Teachers have high expectations of school leaders, and the data would be valuable to principals in understanding the needs, beliefs, and attitudes of teachers better, as well as serving as a model for self-improvement. In the spirit of collegiality, principals should strongly consider the perceptions of teachers as the information provided by the SPES and the APE revealed the significance of the principal-teacher relationship in this study. This supports the notion that analyzing relationships between teachers and principals is of administrative value.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

This study could be replicated with the addition of variables that address a more in-depth analysis of the nine associated factors of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness. The nine associated factors are organizational direction, organizational linkage, organizational procedure, teacher relations, student relations, interactive processes, affective processes, instructional improvement, and curriculum improvement. Further

analysis of the factors could provide principals with additional teacher insight concerning the principal's ability to perform certain tasks effectively. Additionally, further analysis of the factors could provide principals with a better understanding of their administrative skills beyond the scope of each item of the instrument. A closer look at key competencies indicated by the factors could improve a principal's managerial leadership style.

Comparable studies could be performed utilizing the School Participant Empowerment Scale. As schools restructure, the significance of teacher participation is important and the SPES could provide additional insight as to the overall effectiveness of the school in regard to teacher perceptions of empowerment. The SPES could be utilized to study possible relationships among teacher empowerment, school climate, and organizational commitment. As current reform movements require collaborative school environments, principal managerial style in relation to teacher perceptions of empowerment could also be examined.

Increasing the number of schools participating would broaden replication of the current study to include an expanded view of school, principal, and teacher demography. The current study was limited to high school teachers and did not provide insight into elementary or middle level teacher perceptions. Comparing the results from elementary, middle, and secondary teachers' perceptions might provide additional insight into teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness. Other forms of statistical analysis might provide an extended examination of the relationship among the variables.

Concluding Remarks

Teachers and administrators are under tremendous pressure to perform at high levels. Today's results-oriented, bottom-line culture has forced principals to recognize

that they cannot improve their schools alone. Research has shown that teacher

empowerment is an element of school reform. Common themes of empowerment are

structures for involvement, teacher efficacy, and professionalism. Empowerment is a

complex idea, and principals must possess certain characteristics and behave in ways

much different from the ways they were trained. In the face of ambiguity, uncertainty,

and accountability, principals must rethink their roles and entrust staff in the decision

making processes of the school. As the demands on principals intensify, role restructuring

will certainly be necessary. The data gathered in this study could assist principals in

actualizing effective practices that facilitate teacher empowerment and result in high

performing schools.

REFERENCES

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bateman, C. (1999). *Relationships among empowerment, organizational health, and principal effectiveness*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1999).

Berry, B., Johnson, D., & Montgomery, D. (2005). The power of teacher leadership. *Educational Leadership, 62*(5), 57-60.

Blankenstein, A. M. (2004). *Failure is not an option: Six principles that guide student achievement in high performing schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blasé, J. J. (1990). Some negative effects of principals' control-oriented and protective behavior. *American Education Research Journal*, *27*, 727-753.

Blasé, J. J. (2004, Winter). Implications of the dark side of school leadership for administrator preparation and research. *AERA-A Newsletter, 6*, 3-5.

Blasé, J. R., & Blasé, J. (2001) *Empowering principals: What successful principals do.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Block, P. (1991) *The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 277-289.

Bredeson, P. V. (1989, March). *Redefining leadership and the roles of school principals: Responses to changes in the professional worklife of teachers*. Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San
Francisco, CA.

Chamberlin, J. (2008). A working definition of empowerment. *National Empowerment Center.* Retrieved January 7, 2009, from
http://www.power2u.org/articles/empower/working_def.html

Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great.* New York: Harper Collins.

Correa, J., & Bauch, P. A. (1999). *Teacher perceptions of parent and teacher participation in shared decision making.* Abstract. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from ERIC database.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle centered leadership.* New York: Fireside.

DuFour, R. (1999). Autonomy*:* In the midst of community, there's room for the individual [Electronic version]. *Journal of Staff Development, 20*(3), 1-3.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008) *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work.* Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Fleck, F. (2005). *What successful principals do.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. M. (2005). *Applying educational research: A practical guide.* Boston: Pearson.

Hickman, W. A., Moore, L. C., & Torek, T. J. (2008). Voluntary teacher leadership: Key to sustainable improvement. *Principal Leadership, 9*(2), 30-33.

Hoerr, T. R. (2005). *The art of school leadership.* Alexandria, VA: Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Husband, R. E., & Short, P. M. (1994). Middle school interdisciplinary teams: An avenue
to greater teacher empowerment. *Middle School Journal, 26*(2), 58-60. (Report
No. SP-035-329). State College: Pennsylvania State University. (ERIC Document
Reproduction Service No. ED372043).

Keiser, C. M. (2007). *The relationship between teacher empowerment and organizational
commitment.* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2007).

Keiser, N., & Shen, J. (2000). Principals' and teachers' perceptions of teacher
empowerment. *The Journal of Leadership Studies* 7(3), 115-121.

King, B., & Kerchner, T. (1991, April). *Defining principal leadership in an era of
teacher empowerment.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research
Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Kingston, M. H. (n.d.). *Effectiveness*. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from
http://www.brainyquote.com/words/ef/effectiveness158452.html

Klecker, B., & Loadman, W. E. (1996, April). *An analysis of the School Participant
Empowerment Scale.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American
Educational Research Association, New York.

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement* Alexandria, VA:
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

LaPointe, M., & Davis, S. H. (2006). Effective schools require effective principals.
Leadership, 36(1), 16+.

Leech, D., & Fulton, C. R. (2008). *Faculty perceptions of shared decision making and the principal's leadership behaviors in secondary schools in a large urban district.* Retrieved September 25, 2008, from http://www.redorbit.com/news/education/1459747.html

Leithwood**,** K., & Duke, D. (1999). A century**'**s quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy & K. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (2nd ed., pp. 45-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lintner, J., D. (2007). *The relationship between perceived teacher empowerment and principal use of power.* (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 2007).

Lumpa, D. (1997). *Correlates with teacher and student satisfaction in elementary and middle schools.* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1997).

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Manasse, L. A. (1983, June*). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research on effective principals.* Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education Conference of State and Local Policy Implications of Effective School Research, Washington, DC.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

National Educational Association. (2003). *Status of the American public school teacher.* Available at http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Status_of_the_American_ Public_School_Teacher_2000-2001.pdf

Page, N., & Czuba, C. E. (1999). Empowerment: What is it? [Electronic version].

    Journal of Extension, 37(5), 1-7.

Pollack, J., & Mills, R. (1997). True collaboration: Building and maintaining successful

    teams. *Schools in the Middle, 6*(5), 28-32.

Persell, C. H., & Cookson, P. W. (1982) The effective principal in action: In *The effective*

    principal: A research summary (pp.22-29). Reston, VA: National Association of

    Secondary School Principals.

Reitzug, U. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. *American*

    Educational Research Journal, 3, 283-307.

Salkind, N. J. (2004). *Statistics for people who think they hate statistics*. Thousand Oaks,

    CA: Sage.

Salkind, N. J. (2007). *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics.* Thousand Oaks, CA:

    Sage.

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job

    stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology, 57,* 152-171.

Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R. B., & Smith, B. J. (1994). *The fifth*

    discipline field book. New York: Doubleday.

Shaver, H. (2004). *Organize, communicate, empower! How principals can make time for*

    leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Shen, J. (1998). Do teachers feel empowered? [Electronic version]. *Educational*

    Leadership, 55, 35-37.

Short, P. M. (1992). *Dimensions of teacher empowerment* (Report No. SP-035-133). State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED368701)

Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment [Electronic version]. *Education, 114,* 488-493.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1993, October). *Empowering students: Impacting the effort.* Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Annual Meeting, Houston, TX.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1994). Empowering students: Variables impacting the effort. *Education, 114,* 503-518.

Short, P. M., Greer, J. T., & Michael, R. (1991). Restructuring schools through empowerment: Facilitating the process. *Journal of School Leadership*, *1*(2), 5-25.

Short, P. M., & Johnson, P. E. (1994). Exploring the links among teacher empowerment, leader power, and conflict. *Education, 114*, 581-593. (Report No. SPO35330). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED372044).

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S., (1992, April). *Teacher empowerment and school climate.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *14*(1), 56-67.

Terry, P. M. (1999-2000). Empowering teachers as leaders. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, 10*(3*).* Retrieved October 1, 2008, from http://www.nationalforum.com/TERRYte8e3.html

Tucker, M. S., & Codding, J. B. (2002). *The principal challenge: Leading and managing schools in an era of accountability.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ubben, G., Hughes, L., & Norris, C. (2001). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Valentine, J. W., & Bowman, M. L. (1987). *Audit of principal effectiveness: A user's technical manual. Designed and tested for principal assessment in elementary, middle, and secondary schools* (Rev.). Retrieved from ERIC database. (Doc. no. ED281319)

Valentine, J. W. (1989, April). *The audit of principal effectiveness: A process for self-improvement.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Association, Chicago.

Valentine, J. W., & Bowman, M. L. (1989). *Principal effectiveness in "National Recognition" schools.* (Report No. EA021323). University of Missouri, Columbia: Department of Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED311552)

Wall, R., & Rinehart, J. S. (1998). School-based decision making and the empowerment of secondary school teachers. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*, 49-64.

Whitaker, T. (2003). *What great principals do differently: Fifteen things that matter most.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

APPENDIX A

AUDIT OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS

AUDIT of PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS

Teacher Form 1-88

Directions: There are 80 statements in this instrument. The statements describe specific

principalship skills. Because teachers work more closely with principals than any other

professional group, teachers' perceptions are particularly important. Please take a few

minutes to read each statement and select the response that most appropriately describes

your assessment of your principal's ability for each item. DO NOT record your name. All

responses will be reported as a group, not individual data. Please be honest and candid

with your responses.

For each item, select the response that describes HOW EFFECTIVELY YOUR

PRINCIPAL PERFORMS EACH SKILL. Please use the following nine-point scale as

the measure of effectiveness.

1-----------2-----------3-----------4-----------5-----------6-----------7-----------8-----------9

(Not Effective)   (Moderately Effective)   (Very Effective)

1. The principal assists the faculty in developing an understanding of, and support

   for, the beliefs and attitudes that form the basis of the educational value system of

   the school.

2. The principal provides for the identification of, and the reaching of consensus on, the educational goals of the school.

3. The principal has high, professional expectations and standards for self, faculty, and school.

4. The principal helps the faculty develop high, professional expectations and standards for themselves and the school.

5. The principal envisions future goals and directions for the school.

6. The principal encourages changes in school programs that lead to a better school for the students.

7. The principal communicates to teachers the directions the school's programs need to take for growth.

8. The principal develops plans for the cooperation and involvement of the community, individuals, and agencies of the school.

9. The principal utilizes resources from outside the school to assist in the study, development, implementation, and/or evaluation of the school.

10. The principal provides for the gathering of information and feedback from individuals and agencies in the community.

11. The principal provides for the dissemination of information to individuals and agencies in the community.

12. The principal is supportive of, and operates within, the policies of the district.

13. The principal maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with other administrators of the district.

14. The principal invests time with the district office and other external agencies to obtain support and resources from the agencies.

15. The principal strives to achieve autonomy for the school.

16. The principal develops and implements school practices and policies that synthesize educational mandates, requirements and theories, e.g. legal requirements, social expectations, theoretical premises.

17. The principal understands and analyzes the political aspects of education and effectively interacts with various communities, e.g. local, state, national, and/or various subcultures within the local community.

18. The principal informs the staff of new developments and ideas in education.

19. During the identification of needed change, the principal's style is more supportive and participative than directive and authoritative.

20. During evaluation of change, the principal's style is more supportive and participative than directive and authoritative.

21. The principal anticipates the effects of decisions.

22. The principal fairly and effectively evaluates school personnel.

23. The principal employs new staff who enhance the overall effectiveness of the school and complement the existing staff.

24. Through discussion with teachers about concerns and problems that affect the school, the principal involves teachers in the decision-making process.

25. The principal discusses school-related problems with teachers, seeking their opinions and feelings about the problem.

26. The principal utilizes a systematic process for change that is known and understood by the faculty.

27. The principal has the patience to wait to resolve a problem if the best solution to that problem is not yet readily evident.

28. The principal is willing to admit to making an incorrect decision and corrects the decision if feasible.

29. The principal is perceptive of teacher needs.

30. The principal gives teachers the support they need to be effective.

31. The principal diagnoses the causes of conflict and successfully mediates or arbitrates conflict situations.

32. Teachers feel at ease in the presence of the principal.

33. When deserving, teachers are complimented by the principal in a sincere and honest manner.

34. The principal is receptive to suggestions.

35. The principal is accessible when needed.

36. The principal takes time to listen.

37. Teachers feel free to share ideas and concerns about school with the principal.

38. When teachers discuss a problem with the principal, the principal demonstrates an understanding and appreciation of how teachers feel about the problem.

39. When talking to the principal, teachers have the feeling the principal is sincerely interested in what they are saying.

40. Through effective management of the day-by-day operation of the school, the principal promotes among staff, parents, and community a feeling of confidence in the school.

41. The principal finds the time to interact with students.

42. Students feel free to initiate communication with the principal.

43. Students in the school view the principal as a leader of school spirit.

44. The principal encourages student leadership.

45. The principal helps develop student responsibility.

46. The principal is highly visible to the student body.

47. The principal positively reinforces students.

48. The principal enjoys working with students.

49. The principal keeps teachers informed about those aspects of the school program of which they should be aware.

50. When the principal provides teachers with the information about school operations, the information is clear and easily understood.

51. When teachers are informed of administrative decisions, they are aware of what the principal expects of them as it relates to the decision.

52. The principal is able to organize activities, tasks, and people.

53. The principal develops appropriate rules and procedures.

54. The principal uses systematic procedures for staff appraisal, e.g. retention, dismissal, promotion procedures.

55. The principal establishes the overall tone for discipline in the school.

56. The principal establishes a process by which students are made aware of school rules and policies.

57. The principal communicates to teachers the reasons for administrative practices used in the school.

58. The principal works with other leaders of the school in the implementation of a team approach to managing the school.

59. The principal encourages faculty to be sensitive to the needs and values of other faculty in the school.

60. The principal helps teachers clarify or explain their thoughts by discussing those thoughts with them.

61. During meetings, the principal involves persons in the discussion who might otherwise not participate.

62. The principal shares personal feelings and opinions about school issues with teachers.

63. Humor used by the principal helps to improve the school environment by creating a more congenial working climate.

64. Personal thoughts shared by the principal about school help teachers develop a sense of pride and loyalty as members of the school.

65. The principal is knowledgeable of the general goals and objectives of the curricular areas.

66. The principal is knowledgeable of the varied teaching strategies teachers might appropriately utilize during instruction.

67. The principal possesses instructional observation skills that provide the basis for accurate assessment of the teaching process in the classroom.

68. The principal actively and regularly participates in the observations and assessment of classroom instruction, including teaching strategies and student learning.

69. The principal has effective techniques for helping ineffective teachers.

70. The principal maintains an awareness and knowledge of recent research about the learning process.

71. When criticizing poor practices, the principal provides suggestions for improvement.

72. The principal is committed to instructional improvement.

73. The principal promotes the development of educational goals and objectives that reflect societal needs and trends.

74. The principal promotes the diagnosis of individual and group learning needs of student and application of appropriate instruction to meet those needs.

75. The principal administers a school-wide curricular program based upon identification of content goals and objectives and the monitoring of student achievement toward those goals and objectives.

76. The principal participates in instructional improvement activities such as program and curriculum planning and monitoring of student learning outcomes.

77. The principal uses objective data such as test scores to make changes in curriculum and staffing.

78. The principal has a systematic process for program review and change.

79. The principal encourages articulation of the curricular program.

80. Using the nine-point scale, give your rating of your principal's overall

effectiveness.

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL PARTICIPANT EMPOWERMENT SCALE

School Participant Empowerment Scale 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 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 am making 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 the opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas.   1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX C

PROPOSAL APPLICATION

BAKER

UNIVERSITY   **August 24, 2007**
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
GRADUATE DEPARTMENT
                    Proposal for Research
        Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I.   Research Investigators: David Sharp

Department: School of Education: Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Name		**Signature**	**(Note: X=Faculty Sponsor)**
1. Dr. Brad Tate	Advisor	_____	X
2. Dr. Dennis King	Advisor	_____	X

Principal investigator or faculty sponsor contact information:

1.   David Sharp   Phone: 816 373-4220
        Principal Investigator   Email: david.sharp@leesummit.k12.mo.us
        5905 N.E. Pearl Circle
        Lee's Summit, Mo. 64064   _____

2.   Dr. Brad Tate Ed.D.   Phone: 913.491.4432
        Assistant Professor of Education   Email: btate@bakeru.edu
        Baker University
        8001 College Blvd
        Overland Park, KS 66210

3.   Dr. Karl Krawitz Ed.D.   Phone: 913.491.4432
        Assistant Professor of Education   Email: kkrawitz@bakeru.edu
        Baker University
        8001 College Blvd
        Overland Park, KS 66210

4.   Dr. R. Bruce Anderson, Ph.D.   Phone: 785.594.8438
        Associate Professor of Political Science Email: bruce.anderson@bakeru.edu
        Baker University
        Mabee 207
        Baldwin, Kansas 66006

5.   Dr. Cindy Bateman Ed.D.   Phone: 816.986.4005
        Principal   Email: cindy.bateman@leesummit.k12.mo.us

Lee's Summit West High School
2600 SW Ward Road
Lee's Summit, Mo. 64083

Expected Category of Review: _X_ Exempt   __Expedited   __Full

II. Protocol Title:

A study of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness at three suburban high schools in the Kansas City area.

Summary:

The following summary must accompany the proposal. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm. Careful attention to the following may help facilitate the review process:

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

The purpose of this study is to determine if a relationship exists between teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness. The study focuses on teacher perceptions of teacher empowerment and building principal effectiveness in the three Lee's Summit high schools. The results from this study can help identify specific principal skills that relate to teacher empowerment. Increased teacher empowerment can result in improved teacher performance, improved morale, and higher student achievement.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

The condition/design of this study will be a correlation case study design. The researcher will quantitatively evaluate responses from two independent test instruments given exclusively to the teachers of three high schools located within the Lee's Summit R-7 School District. The high schools selected are Lee's Summit West, Lee's Summit, and Lee's Summit North.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy

Teachers from the three Lee's Summit high schools will be asked to participate in two independent surveys. The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) developed by Paula Short and James Reinhart in 1992 will be used to measure teacher perceptions of teacher empowerment. The SPES instrument is composed of 38 questions answered on a Likert-Scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE), developed by Jerry Valentine, is an eighty question instrument that describes specific principal skills. The APE will be used to measure teacher perceptions of how their principal performs the specific skills.

Will the subjects encounter risk of the psychological, social, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

No risks are perceived to be encountered by any participant in the study. All teachers participating in this study will do so anonymously. There will be no stress placed upon participants in this study.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of debriefing.

It is not the intent to deceive or mislead the participants of this study in any way; therefore, no debriefing is planned or deemed necessary.

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

No request for information of a personal or sensitive nature is planned in this study.

Will the subject be presented with material which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please include a description.

No material will be presented which might be considered offensive, threatening, or degrading by participants in this study.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of the subjects?

Completion of the two survey instruments will take approximately 20 minutes.

Who will be the subjects of the study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to the subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

Teachers, as the unit of study, will be surveyed on two existing survey instruments. The researcher will contact each building principal by a form letter and request to present the study's purpose at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. (See attached documents).

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for the participation?

Approval from district leadership as well as building principals will be obtained before solicitation of participation will be performed. All participants will be given the study's purpose and will be notified that their participation will be voluntary. There are no inducements planned for this study.

How will you ensure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

Teachers participating in this study are consenting professionals and are free to make the choice if they wish to participate or not. This will be validated by their perspective building leadership as well at the time of the study. Since no students will be involved in this study, no written consent forms are necessary.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No aspect of the data will be made a part of a permanent record that will individually identify any subject participating in this study.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer? If so, explain.

No information pertaining to a subject's participation, or lack thereof, will be made a part of any permanent record that will be available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data?

The names of the teachers participating in this study will never be identified to the researcher, any other individual, or identifying aspect that reveals the privacy of the participants involved.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

No risks have been identified within the study pertaining to any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No archival data or files will be used in this study. All data obtained will be information received from responses on the two independent survey instruments.

Respectively submitted for your review this 14th day of June, 2007 by:

David Sharp
Doctoral Student
Baker University
School Of Education
Graduate Department