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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECONDARY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF EMPOWERMENT AND A PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP STYLE

by

George W. Walker III

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and their impressions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's four organizational frames, selected teacher demographics, and school size. The study used the survey method of data collection. Completed School Participant Empowerment Scales, Leadership Orientations Other Scales, and demographics forms were received from 315 (90%) of the teachers surveyed.

The criterion variable, or dependent variable, was the teachers' scores on the School Participant Empowerment Scale. Teachers' scores on the Leadership Orientations Other Scale, teacher demographics (age, educational level, and teaching experience), and school size were the predictors, or independent variables. Pearson product-moment correlation, Spearman correlation, and multiple regression were used to identify potentially significant patterns or relationships between the variables. The level of significance was set at alpha = .05.

A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' impressions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's structural, human resource, political, and symbolic organizational frames. Additionally, a statistically significant relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' educational level and school size. No statistically significant relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' age and experience. Implications drawn from the major findings were presented along with recommendations for further research on teacher empowerment.
DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Jann, for her patience, my two children, Justin and Lindsey, and to my loving parents George and Mary Ruth Walker, who stood by me through the tough times while I was growing up and taught me that I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Louise MacKay, my advisor and chair, for her expertise, support, encouragement, and most importantly, her friendship. I would also express my gratitude to committee member Dr. Gunapala Edirisooriya for his help with the statistical analysis of the data. In addition, I sincerely appreciate the assistance and guidance provided to me by the other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Russell Mays, and Dr. Lori Marks.

Gratitude is also extended to Dr. Terrence Deal, Dr. Lee Bolman, Dr. Paula Short, and Dr. James Rinehart for allowing me to use their instruments in this study and the 315 secondary teachers who volunteered to participate.

Finally, a special expression of gratitude to Jeff Kinsler and Claudia Seals for their advice, editorial assistance, and constant support during every phase of this dissertation.
CONTENTS

Page

APPROVAL .................................................................. ii
ABSTRACT ...................................................................... iii
DEDICATION .................................................................... iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ..................................................... v
LIST OF TABLES .............................................................. ix

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION ............................................. 1
  Statement of the Problem ............................................. 6
  Purpose of the Study .................................................. 8
  Limitations of the Study ............................................ 9
  Research Questions .................................................. 10
  Significance of the Study ........................................... 10
  Overview of the Study .............................................. 10

Chapter 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ......................... 12
  Teacher Empowerment ............................................. 12
  The Relationship Between Empowerment and Principal Leadership ........................................... 21
  Leadership Theories .................................................. 26
  The Relationship Between Principal Leadership Styles and Bolman and Deal's Four Organizational Frames ........................................... 33
  Summary ..................................................................... 41

Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY ........................................... 44
  Overview ..................................................................... 44
  Participants ................................................................... 44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teacher Educational Level</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teacher Experience</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teacher Age</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Orientations Other &amp; School Participant</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment Scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlational Analysis of the Effects of Principals' Leadership</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frames, Teachers' Age and Experience on Teachers' Perceptions of Their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Beta Weights Obtained in Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Empowerment</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Leadership Frames</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, "empowerment" has emerged as an important theme in business, the women's movement, the youth movement, and various social and political reform efforts. Similarly, the empowerment of teachers is gaining support in current educational paradigms as a means to improve school performance. Under such headings as professional growth, autonomy, decision-making, impact, self-efficacy, or status, current initiatives commonly call for increasing teachers' opportunities to participate in determining school goals and policies and/or to exercise judgments about curricular content and instructional methods (Glickman, 1993; Maeroff, 1988a; Zeichner, 1991).

Lightfoot (1986) defined empowerment as the opportunities a person has for power, choice, autonomy, and responsibility. Short (1994) points out that empowered teachers believe they have the skills and knowledge necessary to act on a situation and improve it. She described empowered schools as organizations that create opportunities for competence to be developed and displayed. Rinehart and Short (1994) explain that empowerment invests teachers with the right to participate in the determination
of school goals and policies and to exercise professional judgment about what to teach and how to teach it. Lucas, Brown, and Markus (1991) described teacher empowerment as a function of the readiness of building-level administrators to share their autonomy with those whose commitment is necessary to make the educational program function at the highest degree of efficiency. In addition, Lee (1991) shared this outlook by defining teacher empowerment as the development of an environment in which the teachers act as professionals and are treated as professionals. He further explained that empowerment means that school authorities provide teachers with the authority to make decisions that have traditionally been made for them, a time and place to work and plan together during the school day, and a voice in efforts to deepen their knowledge and improve the functioning of the school. Thus, empowerment is a transformational process by which teachers gain personal control and influence over their own lives and that of their school. Empowerment is the belief that schools are composed of individuals who possess the competencies necessary to improve the educational process for all involved (Harvey & Drolet, 1994).

Cunningham and Gresso (1993) maintain that teacher empowerment is the engine that will move America's schools
successfully into the 21st century. They maintain that empowered teachers are motivated to make continuous improvements because they enjoy the sense of pride they obtain from their accomplishments, thereby improving the quality of life for the students. Empowered teachers see themselves as meaningful, contributing members of the total school program who are respected for their ideas and contributions (Klecker & Loadman, 1998).

Additionally, the empowerment of employees has been linked to both job satisfaction and worker effectiveness. In a recent study conducted by Oehler (1996), it was found that individuals who were empowered and encouraged to give feedback were more satisfied with their jobs and the leadership provided, were more efficient, and tended to be more satisfied with their own career development. Furthermore, the study found that unless individuals are allowed, encouraged, or empowered to take responsibilities for themselves, followers blame those in leadership positions for dissatisfaction with any and all organizational outcomes. Oehler (1996) suggested that the more followers within an organization are encouraged and enabled to act in an empowered fashion, the greater the likelihood of organizational success and the more quickly goals are accomplished.
While the presence of empowerment has been attached to teacher and school success, the absence of empowerment may be attributed to America's educational dilemma. Lack of empowerment may contribute to teachers' becoming increasingly dissatisfied with their careers because of their perception that no one is interested in their ideas about ways to improve education. Glickman (1990) maintains that some of the best and brightest teachers have left public schools because administrators denied them a voice in the decision-making process. He asserts that the empowerment movement has put a light back into the eyes of talented, experienced teachers, a light that is clearly visible to intellectually alive young adults who are contemplating education as a career. Consequently, the empowering of teachers sends the message that teaching no longer has to be routine, isolated, individual, and mindless; rather, teaching can be a career in which educators working on behalf of students can engage in critical thinking and collective dialogue.

The effective schools research identified several characteristics that have great power to renew and increase a school's capacity to solve problems and increase effectiveness over time. Owens (1995) indicated that the major components of effective schools include collaboration
and collegial relationships that promote feelings of unity and the sharing of knowledge and ideas, which serve to unify those in the organization through their common purpose. Many school-improvement plans can be faulted for not seeking to instill the important characteristics of empowerment. In a like manner, Cunningham and Gresso (1993) suggest that to achieve true school improvement, excellent school districts empower their employees. Therefore, they contend that the absence of empowerment will result in schools' not being in a position to address the challenges of the next century.

The empowerment of teachers is directly related to producing empowered and informed students capable of meeting the next century's challenges (Darling-Hammond, 1994). Such relationships produce students who are full of hope and purpose, not despair. Kruse, Louis, and Bryk (1995) reported that teachers with discretionary power to make decisions regarding their work feel more responsible for how well their students learn. Hence, instead of being guided by rules, these teachers are guided by the norms and beliefs of their professional community.

Further, empowering teachers is seen as an essential part of promoting not only intrinsic motivation but also substantial and enduring educational reform. Harvey and Drolet (1994) reported that empowerment endows workers with
a sense of self-worth and potency. They concluded that empowered employees work with their own unique talents and are intrinsically motivated; hence, such motivation allows schools to unleash the creative talents of their staffs. Sergiovanni (1991) echoed that empowered teachers are committed to quality, have pride in their work, and are motivated from the intrinsic satisfaction they derive from their work. In this way, empowerment promotes group ownership along with real and lasting change.

Although teacher empowerment is a popular term used in current educational discourse, more research is needed in the area. If empowerment is seen as a means to improve teacher, student, and school performance, then the correlates that promote it must be researched.

Statement of the Problem

Seemingly, teacher empowerment has profound implications for the lives of teachers, for students, for administrators, for schools, and for society as a whole. The empowerment of teachers provides them with the long denied opportunities to apply their energies, knowledge, and expertise to the achievement of school goals through the development of their leadership competencies (Rallis, 1988). Cunnningham and Gresso (1993) contend that empowerment
encourages all educators to their fullest potential. Without empowered teachers, schools will not be in a position to face the challenges required to foster continuous improvement of America’s schools. Similarly, Wheatley (1995) asserts that unless organizations are created in which all members are empowered to engage in the work, organizations will not survive into the future. Therefore, a lack of teacher empowerment may produce schools that are unable to meet the challenges of the next century.

However, if empowerment is the vehicle that will transport schools into the next century, principals must adopt a leadership style that successfully promotes the concepts of empowerment. Smylie (1992) reported that the principal-teacher relationship is the single most important variable in the empowerment process. Blase and Blase (1994) note that the principal is the person most likely to be in a position to shape the organizational conditions necessary for teacher empowerment. They suggested that if the principal-teacher relationship can be characterized as helpful, supportive, trusting, and empowering, so, too, will the relationships among teachers, students, and parents.

Potentially, empowerment has profound implications for the lives of teachers, administrators, schools, and society (von Dran, 1993). Nevertheless, in spite of the potential
teacher empowerment holds for education and society, little is known about the factors which promote effective teacher empowerment.

**Purpose of the Study**

Keeping the aforementioned ideas in mind, there are two lines of inquiry in this study. The fundamental purpose is to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' impressions of their principal's leadership style. The second purpose examines the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and selected school and teacher demographics.

Although Rinehart and Short (1994) indicated that teachers who perceive a greater sense of empowerment believe they may significantly impact the work of the organization, teacher empowerment does not just simply happen. Principals need to learn under what conditions teacher empowerment works and how to promote substantive educational reform. If it is found there is a relationship between a principal's leadership style and a teacher's perception of empowerment, this research may offer principals strategies for developing successful leadership styles that encourage the improvement of teaching and learning for all students. Thus, the results of this study may help to satisfy the need to understand the
degree to which principals' leadership styles influence teacher empowerment. Perhaps such a relationship can foster the constant improvements that are necessary for our schools and society to avert the perils that the future might bring.

**Limitations of the Study**

Two limitations exist in this study. First, data presented in this study are limited to the judgments and perceptions of secondary school teachers in Tennessee Secondary Schools Athletic Association (TSSAA) Regions 1 and 2. The use of only secondary school teachers within those regions, thus, excluding other teaching levels (Elementary, Middle School, & Junior High), will limit the ability to generalize the findings.

Secondly, another possible limitation to the study involves the accuracy of information obtained exclusively from teachers who volunteer to participate. There is the possibility that the perceptions of those who volunteered to participate may differ from the perceptions of non-participants.

The assumption is made that the teachers who volunteer to participate in the study will respond to the questions honestly and accurately.
Research Questions
This study proposes to address the following questions:
1. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and a principal's leadership style?
2. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and selected teacher demographics (age, educational level, experience)?
3. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and school size?

Significance of the Study
One of the most formidable tasks confronting school leaders is that of building learning organizations that empower teachers to become meaningful contributors to the educational process. One of the greatest challenges in the completion of this task is the development of a leadership style that promotes the concepts of empowerment. Thus, the results of this study may help to illuminate the degree to which a principal's leadership style impacts teachers' perceptions of empowerment and may aid principals in choosing a leadership style that successfully promotes the correlates of empowerment.

Overview of the Study
Chapter 1 serves not only as an introduction to this
study but also contains the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, the limitations, and an overview of the study. Chapter 2 includes a review of the literature related to this research topic. The methodology and procedures used to investigate this research topic are presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 contains an analysis of the data and a summary of the study, and Chapter 5 presents the findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is a review of the literature related to teacher empowerment, the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership, leadership theories, and the relationship between principal leadership styles and Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames. Perhaps a better understanding of these areas will help to clarify the degree to which principals' leadership styles influence teacher empowerment. This clarification could foster the improvements that are needed for our schools to meet the challenges that the future might bring.

Teacher Empowerment

The issue of teacher empowerment has emerged as an important issue in current educational practices. Seemingly, not only empowerment, but also teachers' perceptions of their own empowerment, can be important in revitalizing America's schools.

Teachers develop a perception of empowerment when they are allowed to use their professional and collective wisdom (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993). Teachers perceive they are empowered when they are permitted to use their creative talents, are encouraged to assume responsibility for their
professional work life, are allowed authority to make decisions, and are permitted to experience autonomy, choice, control, and responsibility (Glickman, 1990). Furthermore, teachers develop a perception of empowerment when they are allowed to display their existing competencies and are allowed to acquire new competencies which support and strengthen their functioning (Short & Rinehart, 1992a).

A study of 4,084 Ohio public school teachers found that teachers' perceptions of empowerment were highest when they perceived they had status within their schools, their schools provided opportunities for them to grow as professionals, and they perceived that they had an impact on their colleagues and students (Klecker & Loadman, 1998). Another study discovered that teachers who were involved in decision-making built a sense of community and empowerment. As a result, teachers revived motivation, reestablished the value of education, and renewed expectations of success with students (McCarthy & Riner, 1996).

Rappaport (1987) reported that the absence of empowerment is a state of real or imagined powerlessness. Sprague (1992) points out that perceptions of powerlessness among teachers are created by the characteristics of the occupation and by the nature of the work, promotes feelings of isolation, lack of trust, and the inability to
communicate with others on a professional basis. She suggests that perceptions of powerlessness can be decreased by working collaboratively with educational leaders to transform the professional roles of teachers to include increased trust, power, communication, and status. In a study of elementary school teachers, teachers who perceived they were isolated in their teaching and not provided a voice in the decision-making process expressed feelings of powerlessness (Zielenski & Hoy, 1983). Bredeson (1989) submits that empowerment is the process by which teachers reduce their perceptions of instructional and organizational powerlessness by assuming greater responsibility in their work life and thereby obtaining the building blocks necessary to develop strong and powerful organizations.

Identifying and analyzing influences on teachers' perceptions of empowerment have been at the center of Short and Rinehart's (1992a) studies. Their studies identified six empirically derived dimensions of empowerment that significantly influence a teacher's perception of empowerment: decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact. These dimensions convey the individual psychological and social influence constructs of empowerment (Rappaport, 1987).

The first of the six dimensions of empowerment is
decision making, which refers to the participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their worklife. This calls for providing teachers with significant roles in school decision making processes, such as increasing opportunities for teacher participation in the areas of budgetary planning, teacher selection, scheduling, curriculum development, and other areas that directly relate to the operation of the school (Short, 1994).

In 1996 the Kentucky Education Reform Act mandated that teachers be included in the decision-making process through the formation of school councils. In an effort to analyze the positive benefits of including teachers in the decision making process, teachers in 120 Kentucky schools were surveyed, revealing that their perceptions of empowerment increased when they were involved in decision making (Wall & Rinehart, 1997). Another study found that including teachers in the decision making process improved teacher morale, produced better informed teachers, improved communication within the school, raised teacher motivation, and increased incentives to attract and retain quality teachers (White, 1992). Although the involvement of teachers in the decision making process is a complex task, it appears to be a significant part of the process of teacher empowerment, and therefore deserves further study (Perry, Brown, &
McIntire, 1994). The decision making process is enhanced when principals are willing to release the potential of teachers to affect the improvement of schools through collaboration rather than competition (Blase & Blase, 1994).

A second component of empowerment is professional growth, which refers to a teacher's perception that the school is providing him/her with the opportunities, support, time, and resources necessary to grow professionally. The driving force behind teacher empowerment is their authority derived from command of the subject matter and essential teaching skills (Glenn, 1990). Since making teachers more knowledgeable is an obvious step in enhancing their power, they stride toward empowerment when professional growth is targeted at improving instructional techniques, increasing their knowledge in their disciplines, and directing them where to go and how to fill the gaps of their knowledge (Maeroff, 1988b). In a study conducted by Rallis (1988), it was found that professional growth and training are linked to teachers' perceptions of empowerment. She concluded that school leaders must develop a culture that encourages professional growth and sharing. However, she contends that such a culture must begin as a parallel effort between administrators and teachers.

Another integral part of empowerment is status,
referring to teachers' perceptions of being respected and supported professionally as well as being admired by their colleagues for their knowledge and expertise. Low salaries and other disenfranchising circumstances have altered teachers' perceptions of their status (Short, 1994). Additionally, the public's declining faith in education, poor working conditions, inadequate parental support, activities unrelated to teaching (bus and cafeteria duty, etc.), heavy paperwork unrelated to instruction, and inadequate support from administrators and school boards have eroded teachers' self respect as well as their respect for fellow teachers (Maeroff, 1988b).

Murphy's (1993) examination of schools revealed that teachers often feel they are not accorded the sort of professional status other professions enjoy. In many school settings, teachers reported they must schedule all breaks (lunch and bathroom), must sign in and out of the workplace, must perform bus, playground, hall, and lunchroom duty, yet they do not have access to the school building unless children are present. When surveyed, 602 teachers in Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, and Arizona maintained that educators are leaving the profession because they are not accorded the sort of professional status enjoyed by
other professions such as medicine and law. Two-thirds of those teachers leaving the profession stated that the professional prestige of the education profession is not as high as they were lead to believe. Additionally, one-tenth of the respondents indicated that they taught in an environment in which the principal was consistently unsupportive and promoted conformity.

A fourth component of empowerment is self-efficacy, which refers to the way teachers perceive their professional skills and abilities necessary to help students learn, the expertise necessary to build effective programs for students, and the belief that they can affect changes in student learning (Short & Johnson, 1994). Efficacious teachers believe that they have the power and ability to produce a desired effect. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) suggested that efficacy has to do with personal effectiveness, which is a feeling that one can control effects and produce outcomes. They concluded that low efficacy deprives teachers of their motivation, damages their professional self-esteem, and results in low job satisfaction, as well as lower student achievement levels.

In a study conducted by Marlow, Inman, and Smith (1997), researchers found that teachers who were allowed to share ideas, gain knowledge, and secure administrative
support gained a greater sense of self-esteem and efficacy. In another study conducted by Short and Greer (1994), teacher empowerment and teacher efficacy emerged as powerful variables in student learning. They found that key variables in schools that were the most successful in creating empowered students included teacher self-efficacy, the flexibility and resourcefulness necessary for meeting the needs and developing the skills of students, and a school environment supportive of risk taking and experimentation.

Just as the aforementioned dimensions are important parts of empowerment, autonomy is equally important. Autonomy is facilitated when individuals have access to the primary elements of empowerment: knowledge, skill, desire, and opportunity (Covey, 1990). If teachers believe they have the autonomy and skills necessary to control their work life, their self-esteem, confidence, professional satisfaction, creativity, sense of classroom efficacy, and the ability to react to educational issues are increased dramatically (Blase & Blase, 1994).

In a study conducted by Lightfoot (1986), researchers found that empowerment refers to the opportunities a person has for autonomy, responsibility, choice, and authority. The research team found that teachers seemed empowered by a
school culture that supported risk taking and experimentation. In these empowering school cultures teachers wanted to pursue intellectual adventures, believed they were given space for autonomous expression, and believed they worked in a community of colleagues who offered constructive support and criticism. Additionally, the researchers found that in the schools that exhibited empowerment, teachers perceived themselves as knowledgeable and discerning school actors who were the primary shapers of the educational environment. Hence, these teachers were given a great deal of authority in defining the school's intellectual agenda.

In another study conducted by Larson (1991), researchers found that autonomy encourages teachers to seek solutions to complex educational issues. The research indicated that information and the autonomy to use it are important variables in teachers' perceptions of empowerment. The researchers concluded that autonomy is an important form of power and vital to successful changes in schools.

Lastly, in relation to empowerment, impact refers to the ability teachers have to directly influence life in a school. It is the perception that their skills and abilities will affect the daily functioning of the school (Klecker & Loadman, 1998). The perception of possessing the ability to
directly influence the functioning of a school impacts teachers by improving their morale and self-esteem (White, 1992).

In a study conducted by Goodlad (1984), researchers produced an extensive body of information on schools in order to ascertain why some schools were more satisfying and some were less satisfying to the teachers, administrators, students, and parents than others. The research indicated that teachers' satisfaction increased when they perceived themselves in control of what they taught and how it was taught. Furthermore, 76% of the satisfied teachers reported that they had the right amount of control in carrying out their jobs. The research suggests that empowered educators have developed themselves to the degree where they contribute and use their abilities and energies to impact the organization daily. Effective schools recognize that empowerment "awakens all the power that is within an individual, and within an organization, so that each can fully contribute" (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993, p. 225).

The Relationship Between Empowerment and Principal Leadership

Although the principal's role has been traditionally looked upon as bureaucratic in nature, the dimensions of
empowerment, decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact, suggest that a new style of leadership may be more effective. After years of trying to make schools more effective, educators have learned at last that they must begin with bright, dynamic, and persuasive school leaders who promote the dimensions of empowerment (Bell, 1993). Current views of leadership propose that the principal is not to direct others, but is to create an environment in which decisions are made collaboratively. Principals should exercise power through others, not over them (Barth, 1988). Thus, collaboration ultimately leads to teachers and administrators working together as partners. Empowerment of teachers does not mean that principals cease to be in charge, but it does mean that principals engage in more consultation and collaboration. Principals must learn that empowering teachers is in the administrators' best interest and, more importantly, in the best interest of students (Maeroff, 1988b). Principals are learning that 50 empowered people working together are more likely to discover responsive schooling mechanisms than a few talented administrators working alone (Synder, Anderson, & Johnson, 1992).

In an effort to explore teachers' perceptions of principals, Blase (1990) analyzed data collected from 902
teachers. The surveys indicated that principals were not seen as respectful, caring, or popular among the teachers they lead. The researchers found that the use of control and protective strategies by principals had a negative impact on the fundamental aspects of teachers' work in schools. Control and protective strategies employed by principals included the manipulation of resources, work factors within the classroom (class loads, class size, and homeroom assignments), work factors outside the classroom (strict rule enforcement and unwillingness to bend rules), opportunities for input in decisions (extra curricular and curricular), support, and opportunities for advancement. The data indicated that the negative effects of such tactics were noted in teacher classroom performances in terms of morale, decisional discretion, instruction, and classroom resources. Likewise, school-wide performance was negatively affected in terms of morale, involvement, and expression. As a result of the use of these tactics, relationships among teachers, between teachers and students, and between teachers and parents also suffered, as did school pride. The research team concluded that the data call attention to the problematic nature of administrative practices and indicate a need for administrative leadership that relies on participatory practices and open governance processes that
promote teacher empathy, creativity, advocacy, commitment to professional growth, and zest for teaching.

Traditionally, principals have not demonstrated wise use of power by constantly instructing subordinates how to act. Teachers have had little voice in the workplace concerning issues such as the choice of curriculum material, the types of tests used to evaluate instruction, the scheduling of classes, and the allocation of instructional resources (Reitzerg, 1991). Consequently, this lack of autonomy and control affects productivity, commitment, and teacher leadership capabilities. People who feel empowered tend to have higher morale, and by treating teachers in an empowered fashion, such as involving them in decisions about policies and practices and acknowledging their expertise, administrators can help sustain teacher morale and promote the dimensions of empowerment (Blase & Kirby, 1992).

Hoerr (1996) indicated that the complexities of society and schools necessitate that principals adopt a leadership style that emphasizes collegiality and the empowerment of teachers. Lumenberg (1996) suggested that although the "new" principals vary in personal style, gender, and ethnicity, they share a similar management style. They empower the people with whom they work, use hands-on approaches, are educational entrepreneurs, gather and redistribute
resources, and encourage others to do so, believing that a principal leads best by developing the talents of others.

Stimson and Applebaum (1988) found that principals who promote power sharing through collaboration and participative decision making give teachers a sense of ownership, enhanced self-esteem, and increased perceptions of empowerment. They reported that the most effective principals are those who create a climate where collaboration and teachers' satisfaction go hand in hand. Their empowering leadership style reflects the correlates of empowerment which in turn affects the entire school environment. Goldman (1998) suggested that empowering principals encourage responsibility and interdependence, provide opportunities for professional growth, and welcome changes in their leadership styles to better address the needs of teachers and schools.

Principals should structure school organizations in such a way that hierarchical differences are diminished and teachers have professional autonomy and genuine collegial involvement in decisions (Erlandson & Bifano, 1987). They suggested that such a shift in the hierarchical pyramid mandates new ways of thinking for school administrators, moving the role of principals from one of being the sole decision makers in control of everything to one of an
instructional leader who promotes a school environment of shared governance. Klecker and Loadman (1998) suggested the development of teacher empowerment will happen only if building administrators are willing to involve teachers in professional decisions regarding their schools. The empowerment process is either enhanced or impeded due to the principal’s experience and comfort with participative decision making and the principal's experience with and the ability to conceptualize a shared approach to problem solving (Kirby, Wimpelbert, & Keaster, 1992).

Leadership Theories

Although there is vast disagreement about the exact definition of effective leadership, there is a certain level of agreement among many scholars regarding the impact it can make in organizations. However, it is difficult to generalize about leadership because the conditions, styles, theories, and models vary from situation to situation and from one historical period to another. Looking for one encompassing model or theory of leadership is futile, but there are certain leadership paradigms that have emerged since the beginning stages of study in the 1900s.

Hollander (1978) points out that early studies of leadership attempted to identify traits that distinguished
leaders from followers or attempted to distinguish effective leaders from ineffective leaders. Mann's (1959) review of 125 leadership and personality studies found that the greatest number of those studies showed a positive relationship between intelligence and leadership status. Additionally, Stogdill (1974) reviewed leadership studies that investigated the relationship between leadership and individual traits such as chronological age, height and weight, physique, energy level, health, fluency, economic status, and intelligence. He reported that there was a relatively high consistency in the relationship between intelligence and being a leader.

In an effort to identify the traits that subordinates were looking for in their superiors, Kousnes and Posner (1987) surveyed more than 1500 managers. They reported that effective managers were seen as honest, visionary, inspiring, and competent. Boles and Davenport (1983) reported that the success of a leader, as perceived by others in the group, was related to the leader's intelligence, self-concept, time management, and authenticity as well as the amount of behavior exhibited by the leader seen as acceptable by the group. Parkinson (1970) reported that the average person who occupies a position of
leadership exceeds the average member of his or her group in the following respects: imagination, knowledge, determination, and confidence. Bennis and Nanus (1985) concluded from in-depth interviews with 90 top directors and executives that effective leaders had a vision for the organization’s future, were able to communicate that vision to others in the organization, were able to gain the trust of other organizational members, and possessed an understanding of their own and other organizational members’ skills and abilities.

Situational leadership paradigms followed the trait investigations and sought to determine the role the situation had on effective leadership. Hollander (1978) suggests that the situational approach maintains that leadership is determined not so much by the traits of the individual as by the factors of the situation. Hoy and Miskel (1987) identified four factors in a situation that can affect leadership style: the structural properties of the organization, the organizational climate, the role characteristics, and the subordinate characteristics. They suggest that these four factors enable leaders to assess the situational demands and choose either a supportive or directive leadership style. Hersey and Blanchard’s (1977) situational leadership model advocates that the best
leadership style is one that matches the maturity level of the follower and the situation. They postulated four leadership styles: directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating. They concluded that the prescribed leadership style is dependent on follower maturity and situational demands.

An extension of the situational leadership approach was the development of contingency models. Contingency theory suggests that appropriate leadership behavior in a given situation is dependent upon a wide variety of variables and that each situation is different (Hollander, 1978).

Fielder's Contingency Model (1967) suggests that the effectiveness of the leader is contingent upon the demands imposed by the situation and that both task-oriented leaders and relationship-oriented leaders are able to perform effectively if conditions are appropriate to and supportive of the leadership style. The theory accepts the style of the leader as a given, and, therefore, recommends that the arrangements of tasks and situations accommodate leader styles rather than styles being changed to fit situations (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) focused on the degree to which leaders should encourage follower participation in decision making. They described seven decision-making
methods which they considered to have different outcomes in different situations. These methods ranged from autocratic to democratic decision-making processes. They concluded that the choice of method is contingent upon such situational factors as the time available to reach a decision, the importance of decision quality, the information followers possess, the clarity of the problem, and how much follower acceptance is necessary to implement the decision.

House’s (1971) contingency leadership model is based on the leader’s effectiveness in increasing followers’ motivation along a path leading to a goal. He explained that there are three contingencies facing the leader when leading the group toward organizational goals. They are the task, the characteristics of the followers, and the nature of the group. He concluded that the leader can affect the performance, satisfaction, and motivation of the group by offering rewards for the achievement of goals, by clarifying paths toward goals, and by removing obstacles in reaching goals.

A major paradigm shift in leadership occurred in the mid 1970s. Prominent theories of this period include the transformational leadership theory suggested by Burns (1978), Barnes and Kriger’s (1986) organizational leadership concept, Slater and Doig’s (1988) shared
leadership, and Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames. Bryman (1993) refers to this class of theories, which share several common characteristics, as the "new" leadership theories.

House and Aditya (1997) point out that the "new" leadership theories share several common characteristics. First, they attempt to explain how leaders are able to lead organizations to attain outstanding accomplishments despite great challenges. Second, they attempt to explain how certain leaders are able to achieve extraordinary levels of follower motivation, admiration, respect, trust, commitment, dedication, loyalty, and performance. Third, they stress symbolic and emotionally appealing behaviors such as vision, frame alignment, empowerment, role modeling, image building, risk taking, and supportive behaviors. Finally, they attempt to explain how leaders can affect follower self-esteem, motive, arousal, satisfaction and performance, and identification with the leader's vision.

Burns (1978) described transformational leadership not as a set of specific behaviors but rather as a process by which leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation. Thus, transformational leaders lead through insight and a shared vision of the future. They strive to transform the organization by
fostering a vision of the future and by guiding the organization toward that purpose.

Barnes and Kriger (1986) suggested that previous theories of leadership were insufficient because they dealt only with the single leader and multi-follower concept rather than with organizational leadership in a pluralistic sense. They contended that leadership is not found in one individual's traits or skills but is a characteristic of the entire organization, in which leaders' roles overlap, complement each other, and shift from time to time and from person to person.

An extension of organizational leadership is the concept of shared leadership. Slater and Doig (1988) refuted the assumption that leadership is a possession of one individual and stated that such a supposition ignores the possibility that leadership may also be provided by a team of individuals.

Bolman and Deal (1991) suggested that organizations and leaders can be put into four categories or frames that represent a way to view and organize the large and complex body of research on leadership. The structural frame focuses on the formal demands of the system, such as goals, policies, and constraints. The human resource frame considers the human needs of participants. The symbolic
frame addresses the values, rites, and rituals that provide members with a sense of community. Lastly, the political frame considers the way that participants pursue their own interests. Bolman and Deal (1991) assert that these frames do not offer solutions to problems, but rather they are more powerful ways of viewing organizations for a clearer understanding of the problems that are present in organizations and leadership. In educational settings these four perspectives, or frames, help principals find clarity and meaning amidst the confusion of leadership duties. They suggest that the duty of the leader is not to get what he or she wants but to empower others to get what they want. Therefore, if one truly seeks to develop a clearer understanding of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership, a logical starting point would be a clearer understanding of Bolman and Deal’s (1991) four organizational frames.

The Relationship Between Principal Leadership Styles and Bolman and Deal’s Four Organizational Frames

Understanding the way organizations are framed enables principals to see more clearly current structures in existence and aids in identifying new ways of framing organizational power to promote site-based management,
school restructuring, and teacher empowerment (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991). However, before organizations can be reframed in ways that promote teacher empowerment, it is necessary to understand how principals use power and authority in Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames.

Based upon the theories of sociologists, the structural frame emphasizes the importance of formal roles and relationships. Structures, typically depicted as hierarchical in nature, are created to fit an organization's environment and technology. In schools, the basic technology is classroom teaching. The environment, the local community, provides the raw materials. Structurally framed organizations create divisions of labor, allocate responsibilities, generate rules and policies, and develop management hierarchies that facilitate and coordinate the organization's activities. Clearly defined goals and policies, well defined jobs, employees who behave rationally, and control systems tend to increase the structural organization's efficiency (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

Consequently, schools that operate from a structural perspective emphasize productivity and assume that not only the classroom but also the school itself works best when goals and roles are clear and the efforts of individuals and
groups are well coordinated through authority, policies, and rules (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

In essence, principals, who are structural leaders, view themselves as social architects whose leadership styles lean toward analysis and design. They provide knowledge and expertise that help make the production process as efficient as possible. Structural leaders focus on strategy, environment, implementation, experimentation, and adaptation. They believe that specialization, coordination, and control provide solutions for increased organizational efficiency. Problems that arise in schools, therefore, can be addressed by restructuring the organization. Assuming the role of management engineers, structurally oriented principals plan, organize, and coordinate school activities by manipulating strategies and solutions for optimum effectiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1994).

In a study conducted by Bolman and Deal (1992a), surveys revealed that structural principals strongly emphasize careful planning and clear thinking, develop and implement clear, logical procedures, use logical analysis and careful thinking, tend to approach problems with facts and logic, and strongly believe in a clear chain of command.

Another of Bolman and Deal's (1991) organizational frames uses the theories of psychology to focus on the
needs of people and the interdependence between people and organizations. The human resource frame is built around several assumptions. First, organizations exist to serve humans, not humans to serve organizations. Second, organizations and people need each other. Organizations need the ideas, energy, and talents that people provide while people need the careers, salaries, and work opportunities that organizations provide. Third, if there is conflict between the organization and individual, both parties will suffer. Finally, when the fit is good between the organization and the individual, both reap the benefits.

Highlighting the importance of needs and motives in educational settings, the human resource frame holds that schools work best when individual needs and motives are satisfied in a caring, trusting, work environment. The emphasis is placed on ways to relate people's needs, skills, and values, on the one hand, with their formal roles and expectations of the organization, on the other. In the human resource frame, schools are viewed as families, as opposed to factories. Schools are seen as a group of people who care about each other and are linked by shared needs and personal relationships rather than by standardized rules and roles or an educational assembly line (Bolman & Deal, 1992b).

Human resource principals communicate their view of
believing in people by being visible and accessible, increasing participation, showing support for teachers, sharing information with stakeholders, and moving decision making down into the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Hence, the principal is a catalyst and servant whose leadership style is supportive and caring and shows concern, respect, and love for each individual. Effective human resource principals consistently help and respond to others, emphasize support and concern for others, listen well, build trust, collaborate relationships, give personal recognition, generate loyalty and enthusiasm, and foster high participation in decision making (Bolman & Deal, 1992a). Often referring to employees as partners and wanting to make it clear that employees have a stake in the organization's success, these principals are committed to the concept that individuals want to take responsibility and will do so if they are given the authority and information they need (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

A third frame, the political frame, is based on political science theories in which power, conflict, and the distribution of scarce resources are the central issues. The political frame views organizations as arenas of scarce resources where individuals or groups are constantly battling for the allocation of supplies. Rather than seeing
organizations as systems in which the authority at the top has the right to set goals, the political frame views organizations as coalitions of individuals and interest groups. Each individual or group possesses different objectives and resources, and each attempts to influence the goals and decision making of the organization by the use of power, coalition, bargaining, or conflict. The political frame points out the limits of authority and the inevitability that resources are too scarce to fulfill all demands (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

As a virtual human jungle, the school is a coalition of a variety of different groups. Each group has its own specific backgrounds, values, beliefs, and interests. Schools and classrooms become arenas where individuals and groups jockey for power and resources. They are centers of political activity where goals emerge from bargaining and compromise among the different interests rather than from decisions reached at the top (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

Therefore, principals, as political leaders, clarify what they want and what they can get. They assess the distribution of power and interests; they build linkage to other stakeholders by using persuasion first, negotiation second, and coercion only if necessary. By recognizing that power is essential to their effectiveness, they know that it
must be used judiciously (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

In a study conducted by Bolman and Deal (1992a), researchers found that political leaders are skillful and shrewd negotiators, unusually persuasive and influential, and develop alliances to build bases of support. Therefore, cooperation is achieved by principals who understand the uses of power, coalition, bargaining, and conflict (Bolman & Deal, 1992a).

Using the theories of anthropology, Bolman and Deal’s (1991) symbolic frame views organizations as cultures with shared values. Organizations are held together more by shared values and symbols than by goals and policies. They are fueled more by rituals and policies than by managerial authority. In the symbolic frame, organizations are seen as theaters, with workers playing the leading roles. The audience, or the outside world, forms impressions of the organization based on what they see on stage. The symbolic frame centers on the concepts of meaning, belief, and faith. Thus, myths, rituals, and ceremonies are often used to bring meaning out of chaos, clarity out of confusion, and predictability out of mystery (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

Similarly, the symbolic frame in schools centers attention on symbols, meanings, beliefs, and faith. Schools create symbols, cultivating commitment, hope, and loyalty.
which govern behavior through informal, shared, and implicit rules, agreements, and understandings. Stories, metaphors, heroes and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and symbols add enthusiasm to the educational environment. School members might be diverse in many ways, differing in age, background, and personal interest, but they are held together by a shared faith, common belief, and a deeply held commitment to one another. Thus, the school becomes a way of life rather than merely a place to work (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

As symbolic leaders, principals view themselves as artists, poets, or prophets whose leadership styles are based on inspiration. They use symbols and stories to communicate visions that build faith and loyalty among the school's stakeholders. Symbolic leaders inspire others to do their best, are highly charismatic, communicate a strong and challenging sense of mission, are highly imaginative and creative, and see beyond current realities to create new opportunities (Bolman & Deal, 1992a). Symbolic leaders have the responsibility of sustaining and encouraging faith in themselves and recalling it in others when faith is diminished or lost. Thus, symbolic principals identify cultural themes, values, and dreams around which teachers can rally (Slater, 1994).
Summary

Teachers develop a perception of empowerment when they are allowed to display their existing competencies and are allowed to acquire new competencies which support and strengthen their functioning (Short & Rinehart, 1992a). Teachers perceive they are empowered when they are permitted to use their creative talents, are encouraged to assume responsibility for their professional work life, and are allowed authority to make decisions (Glickman, 1990). Empowerment is the teachers' perception that their skills and abilities will affect the daily functioning of the school (Klecker & Loadman, 1998).

A principal's leadership style is an important factor contributing to teacher empowerment (Maeroff, 1988a). Teachers' perceptions of powerlessness can be decreased by working collaboratively with principals to transform their professional roles to include increased trust, power, communication, and status (Sprague, 1992). Principals who promote power sharing through collaboration and participative decision making give teachers a sense of ownership, enhanced self-esteem, and increased perceptions of empowerment (Stimson & Applebaum, 1988).

Although there is vast disagreement about the exact definition of effective leadership, there is a certain level
of agreement among many scholars regarding the impact it can make in organizations. Bolman and Deal (1991) suggested that organizations and leaders can be put into four categories or frames that represent a way to view and organize the large and complex body of research on leadership. The structural frame focuses on the formal demands of the system such as goals, policies, and constraints. The human resource frame considers the human needs of participants. The symbolic frame addresses the values, rites, and rituals that provide members with a sense of community. Lastly, the political frame considers the way that participants pursue their own interests. Bolman and Deal (1991) explain that these frames provide clarity and meaning for principals functioning as managers and leaders in educational organizations. Understanding the way organizations are framed enables principals to see more clearly current structures in existence and aids in identifying new ways of framing organizational power to promote site-based management, school restructuring, and teacher empowerment (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991). However, because prior research fails to consider the relationship between secondary teacher empowerment and principal leadership within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames, this study explores teachers' perceptions of empowerment as it relates
to principal leadership in structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames, selected teacher demographics, and school size.
Overview

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' impressions of principals' leadership styles as they are related to schools' structural, human resource, political, and symbolic organizational frames. Specifically, this study investigated the relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames and their own perceptions of empowerment.

Participants

The teachers in this study were from high schools in Tennessee Secondary Schools Athletic Association (TSSAA) Regions 1 and 2. A stratified sample of the schools was taken from that population, and all teachers in the chosen schools were invited to participate in this investigation. Stratification of the sample ensured that teachers from TSSAA Class A (small), TSSAA Class AA (medium), and TSSAA Class AAA (large) high schools were represented in this study. Teachers employed in the high schools completed three...
survey instruments: the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992b), the Leadership Orientations Other Scale (Bolman & Deal, 1990), and a demographic form compiled by the researcher.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission to conduct the study was requested by telephone from the principal of each selected school. After gaining consent, the purpose of the study was explained and clarified, the instruments the teachers would complete were explained, and a time to meet with the faculty was set. Immediately after the phone conversation, a follow-up letter confirming the faculty meeting and copies of the survey instruments were sent to each principal.

At the faculty meeting, the purpose of the study was explained, confidentiality was assured, and procedures and directions for completing the instruments were discussed. Teachers were then given an opportunity to seek clarification on any directions or ask questions concerning the instruments. Once the three instruments were completed they were returned to the researcher at the meeting in a white envelope, which was provided to each teacher to ensure confidentiality.
Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in collecting the data: the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992b), the Leadership Orientations Other Scale (Bolman & Deal, 1990), and a teacher demographic form.

Permission was granted to use the School Participant Empowerment Scale, developed by Short and Rinehart (1992b), which measures teachers' perceptions of empowerment on six dimensions: decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact. A copy of the permission letter is presented in Appendix E. The instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale with these anchors: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5). In a study of 211 teachers, the coefficient alpha reliabilities for this instrument were reported as follows: decision making (.89), professional growth (.83), status (.86), self-efficacy (.84), autonomy (.81), impact (.81), and total scale (.94) (Short & Rinehart, 1994). The School Participant Empowerment Scale has also proven to be a valid instrument for measuring teacher empowerment in numerous studies (Klecker & Loadman, 1998; Rinehart & Short, 1994; Rinehart, Short P., Short J., & Eckley, 1998; Short, 1994; Short & Johnson, 1994).

Authorization was secured to use Bolman and Deal's
(1990) 32-statement instrument, Leadership Orientations Other Scale, to measure principals' leadership styles. A copy of the letter granting permission is presented in Appendix F. The instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale with these anchors: Never (1), Occasionally (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4), and Always (5). The instrument measures the extent to which a principal is viewed by the teacher as demonstrating a leadership style related to a structural, human resource, political, or symbolic school organizational framework. In tests conducted by independent raters and a study of teachers in 25 schools, coefficient alpha reliabilities for the subscales were reported as follows: Structural Frame (.78), Human Resource Frame (.87), Political Frame (.81), Symbolic Frame (.97), and Total Instrument (.96) (Heimovics, Herman, & Jurkiewicz, 1993). The validity of the Leadership Orientations Other Scale was established from research conducted in schools, higher education, government, and the private sector (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Heimovics, Herman, & Jurkiewicz, 1995). Additionally, in a study of 140 United States school administrators, which was replicated with 229 Singapore principals, the instrument was shown to be a valid measure of leaders' frame alignment (Bolman & Deal, 1992b).

Demographic data were collected from teachers'
responses to a demographic form developed by the researcher specifically for this study. Teachers reported demographic data concerning age, highest educational level, and teaching experience. A group of teachers who were not included in the study were asked to assess the clarity and format of the demographic data instrument.

**Research Design**

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between secondary teacher empowerment and Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames, selected teacher demographics, and school size. The study used the survey method of data collection. Regression analysis was used to analyze the data because it provided estimates of both the magnitude and statistical significance of the relationships among variables. Regression analysis permits researchers to investigate the degree of relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables.

**Null Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were developed for this study:

1. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of
empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) structural frame.

2. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) human resource frame.

3. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) political frame.

4. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) symbolic frame.

5. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' age.

6. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' educational level.
7. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' experience.

8. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and school size (small, medium, large).

9. There is no statistically significant relationship between secondary teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment, teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership styles within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames, teacher demographics (age, educational level, teaching experience), and school size (small, medium, large).

Data Analysis

Data collected from responding teachers on the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992b), the Leadership Orientations Other Scale (Bolman & Deal, 1990), and the Teacher Demographic form were used for statistical analysis. The collected data were coded and entered into a computer for analysis. The SAS computer system was used to calculate descriptive measures. Additionally, Pearson product-moment correlation, Spearman correlation, and multiple regression analysis were used to identify
potentially significant patterns or relationships between the variables.

The criterion variable, or dependent variable, was the teachers' scores on the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992b). Teachers' scores on the Leadership Orientations Other Scale (Bolman & Deal, 1990), teacher demographics (age, educational level, and teaching experience), and school size were the predictors, or independent variables. Pearson product-moment correlational analysis served as the test method used to analyze the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their empowerment, teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames, and teachers' age and years of experience. Spearman correlation served as the analytical procedure used to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment, teachers' educational level, and school size. Multiple regression was employed to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment, teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership styles within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames, teacher's age, teacher's educational level, and school size. The relationship, if any, was considered statistically
significant at an alpha level of .05.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' impressions of principals' leadership styles as they are related to schools' structural, human resource, political, and symbolic organizational frames. Specifically, this study investigated the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames and their own perceptions of empowerment. Teacher demographic data were also collected to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' age, educational level, and years of experience. Additionally, school demographic data were collected to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and school size. An analysis of the data collected and the description of the sample are presented in this chapter.

Data Collection

School Participant Empowerment Scales, Leadership Orientations Other Scales, and demographic forms were received from 323 secondary teachers. Of these 323,
eight sets of responses were determined to be unusable due to one or more of the following reasons: (1) incomplete School Participant Empowerment Scale, (2) incomplete Leadership Orientations Other Scale, or (3) incomplete demographic form.

The number of teachers completing all three survey instruments from TSSAA Class A (small) schools was 61 (19%), from TSSAA Class AA (medium) schools 115 (37%), and from TSSAA Class AAA schools 139 (44%). Ninety percent of the surveys were returned from the teachers who were employed in the six high schools.

Demographic Data

A demographic form was completed by each teacher who volunteered to participate in the study. Demographic data were reported concerning highest educational level, number of years as a full time teacher, and the respondent's age.

Data concerning the respondents highest educational level were divided into four categories: Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, Educational Specialist's Degree, and Doctorate Degree. The data revealed that the largest number of teachers, 158 (50.2%), held a Master's Degree. Of the remaining 157, 144 (45.7%) held a Bachelor's Degree, 12 (3.8%) held a Educational Specialist's Degree, and only
1 (0.3%) held a Doctorate Degree (see Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Educational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Specialist's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching experience ranged from 1 to 38 years, with a mean of 14.90 years and a standard deviation of 9.54. The distribution for "Years as Full Time Teacher" revealed that 68 (21.6%) had been teaching fewer than six years and 59 (18.7%) had 6 to 10 years of teaching experience. Fifty-eight (18.4%) reported having 16 to 20 years experience, 41 (13%) had taught 11 to 15 years, 35 (11.2%) had taught 21 to 25 years, 33 (10.5%) had 26 to 30 years of experience, and 21 (6.6%) had been teaching longer than 30 years (see Table 2).

Table 3 shows that the ages of teachers participating in the study spanned a range of 45 years. The youngest
Table 2

**Teacher Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

respondent was 21 years of age and the oldest respondent was 66 years of age. Teacher's age was divided into five categories: 20 - 29 years, 30 - 39 years, 40 - 49 years, 50 - 59 years, and 60 years and over. The mean age of the responding teachers was 41.60, with a standard deviation of 10.01. The sample's modal age of 40 - 49 (31.2%) fit the national profile reported by Snyder and Hoffman (1994). Of the remaining 217 teachers, 91 (28.9%) were between the ages of 30 - 39 years, 71 (22.5%) of the teachers' ages ranged between 50 - 59 years, 44 (14%) of the teachers were between
21 - 29 years, and 11 (3.4%) were 60 years or older (see Table 3).

Table 3
Teacher Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 - 29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Orientations Other & School Participant Empowerment Scales

Completed Leadership Orientations Other Scales were received from 315 secondary teachers. Bolman and Deal's (1990) 32-statement instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale with these anchors: Never (1), Occasionally (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4), and Always (5). The instrument measures the extent to which a principal is viewed by a teacher as demonstrating a leadership style related to a structural, human resource, political, or symbolic school organizational
The teachers' scores on the structural organizational frame ranged from 11 to 45, with a mean score of 31.02 and a standard deviation of 6.64. The sample's modal score for the structural frame was 40. The human resource organizational scores ranged from 9 to 40, with modal score of 32. The mean score for the human resource frame was 29.59 with a standard deviation of 7.16. Data concerning the political organizational frame indicated a range from 10 to 40. The mean score for the political frame was 29.85 with a standard deviation of 6.64. The score reported most frequently for the political frame was 33. The teachers' scores on the symbolic organizational frame ranged from 8 to 40 with a mean of 28.73 and a standard deviation of 7.34. The modal score for the symbolic frame was 30 (see Table 4).

Completed School Participant Empowerment Scales were also returned by 315 secondary teachers. Short and Rinehart's (1992b) instrument measures teachers' perceptions of empowerment. The instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale with these anchors: Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Neutral (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5). A high score indicates a more positive perception of empowerment by the respondent. Teachers' scores on the instrument ranged from a low of 71 to a high of 190. The mean score on the School
Participant Empowerment scale was 140.71 with a standard deviation of 20.65. The sample's modal score was 125 (see Table 4). The Shapiro-Wilk statistical test for normality indicated that the sample was normally distributed.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Leadership Orientations Other & School Participant Empowerment Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Res.</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.73</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>140.77</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis

Null hypothesis 1 stated that there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) structural frame. Results were analyzed using Pearson correlational analysis. Analysis of the data revealed a
significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and their perceptions of their principal's leadership style within the structural organizational frame. Statistical analysis of the data produced a Pearson correlation coefficient of .56 and a probability of .0001. Therefore, null hypothesis 1 was rejected. Data generated for hypothesis 1 are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Pearson Correlational Analysis of the Effects of Principals' Leadership Frames, Teachers' Age and Experience on Teachers' Perceptions of their Level of Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Frame</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.6210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.4333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 2 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of
their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) human resource frame. Pearson correlational analysis between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and their principal's leadership style within a human resource frame revealed a significant relationship. Statistical testing yielded a Pearson correlation coefficient of .55 with an observed significance level of .0001. Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was rejected (see Table 5).

Null hypothesis 3 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) political frame. Pearson correlational analysis of teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and a principal's leadership style within a political frame indicated a significant relationship. The Pearson product-moment correlational analysis produced a coefficient of .54 and a probability of .0001. The null hypothesis 3 was rejected. Data generated for hypothesis 3 are presented in Table 5.

Null hypothesis 4 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of
their level of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) symbolic frame. Results were analyzed using Pearson correlational analysis. A significant relationship was found between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and a principal leadership style within a symbolic frame. Analysis yielded a Pearson correlational coefficient of .54 and a probability of .0001. Therefore, null hypothesis 4 was rejected. Data generated for hypothesis 4 are presented in Table 5.

Null hypothesis 5 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' age. Analysis of the data by Pearson correlational analysis indicated no statistically significant relationship existed between secondary teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teacher's age. A Pearson correlational coefficient of .02 and a probability of .62 resulted in failure to reject the null hypothesis 5 (see Table 5).

Null hypothesis 6 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' experience. Findings were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlational analysis. Analysis of the data revealed no
statistically significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' experience. The analysis yielded a Pearson correlation coefficient of .04 and a probability of .43. Therefore, null hypothesis 6 was not rejected. Data are represented in Table 5.

Null hypothesis 7 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' educational level. Results were analyzed using Spearman correlational analysis. Analysis of the data revealed a statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' educational levels. Statistical treatment of the data produced a Spearman correlational coefficient of .24 and a probability of .0042. Therefore, null hypothesis 7 was rejected.

Null hypothesis 8 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and school size (small, medium, large). Spearman correlational analysis indicated a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and school size. The calculated Spearman correlation coefficient value of .24, with an observed probability of .0001 resulted in the rejection of
null hypothesis 8.

Null hypothesis 9 stated there is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment, teacher's perceptions of their principal's leadership styles within Bolman and Deal's (1991) four organizational frames, teacher demographics (age, educational level, teaching experience), and school size (small, medium, large). Data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis. Based upon the results of the exploratory Pearson and Spearman correlational analyses, six predictor variables (structural frame, human resource frame, political frame, symbolic frame, degree, and size) were found to be significantly related to empowerment. Although teachers' age and teachers' experience were not found to be statistically significant by Spearman correlational analysis, they were retained in the multiple regression analysis due to their being of key interest to the study. Using multiple regression, teachers' empowerment scores were regressed on the linear combination of principals' leadership frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), teachers' age, teachers' experience, degree, and school size. The multiple regression model was found to be significant ($F=21.07$, $p<.0001$, $R$-squared$=.36$, and adjusted $R$-square$=.34$). Therefore,
hypothesis 9 was rejected. Additionally, standardized multiple regression coefficients were examined to assess the relative importance of the eight variables in the prediction of empowerment. Beta weights are presented in Table 6. The data show that only the structural frame displayed a coefficient which was significantly different from zero with a beta weight of .26 (p=.04).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Beta Weights</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Frame</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Age</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Experience</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

Null hypotheses one, two, three, and four were rejected based on Pearson correlational analysis. A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' impressions of principals' leadership styles as they are related to school's structural (p=.0001), human resource (p=.0001), political (p=.0001), and symbolic (p=.0001) organizational frames. Null hypothesis 5 was not rejected because the Pearson correlational analysis found no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' age (p=.6210). Null hypothesis 6 was also not rejected because Pearson correlational analysis found no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' experience (p=.4333). Null hypothesis seven and eight were rejected. Spearman correlational analysis indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' educational level (p=.0042) and school size (p=.0001). Null hypothesis 9 was rejected because the multiple regression analysis found a statistically significant relationship
between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment, teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's four organizational frames, teacher demographics (age, educational level, and teaching experience), and school size (small, medium, and large). Review of the standardized multiple regression coefficients revealed that the structural frame displayed a significant beta weight of .26 (p=.04). However, the Pearson correlational analysis revealed strong correlations between the leadership frames (see Table 7).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structural</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such high correlations suggest that these four frames may in fact be measuring similar leadership characteristics. Statistically, the strong correlations between the frames
lessen the confidence of the effects found from a multiple regression analysis. Chapter 5 contains the findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings
This study was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and their impressions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's four organizational frames, selected teacher demographics, and school size. The study used the survey method of data collection. Completed School Participant Empowerment Scales (Short & Rinehart, 1992b), Leadership Orientations Other Scales (Bolman & Deal, 1990), and demographics forms were received from 315 (90%) of the teachers surveyed in six secondary high schools.

The criterion variable, or dependent variable, was the teachers' scores on the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992b). Teachers' scores on the Leadership Orientations Other Scale (Bolman & Deal, 1990), teacher demographics (age, educational level, and teaching experience), and school size were the predictors, or independent variables. Pearson product-moment correlation, Spearman correlation, and multiple regression were used to identify potentially significant patterns or relationships between the variables. The level of significance was set at alpha = .05.
Three research questions were proposed and examined in this study. Findings related to research question 1 indicated a statistically significant relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' impressions of their principal's leadership style within Bolman and Deal's (1991) structural, human resource, political, and symbolic organizational frames. The statistical analysis related to research question 2 found no statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' age and experience. However, a statistically significant relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' educational level. Findings related to research question 3 also indicated a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and school size. Implications drawn from the major findings related to these questions will be presented in this chapter along with recommendations for further research on teacher empowerment.

Implications For Practice

Rinehart and Short (1994) reported that teacher empowerment does not simply happen. Principals need to learn under what conditions teacher empowerment works and how to
promote substantive educational reform. The realization that teachers perceive they are empowered when principals operate from each of the four frames presents challenging implications to principals interested in developing empowering school environments. Undoubtedly, the environment and leadership of most schools will continue to change rapidly during the coming years. Goldman (1998) noted that the development of such empowering school environments will necessitate that principals welcome changes in their leadership styles to better address the needs of teachers and schools.

Basic to Bolman and Deal's (1991) four frame theory is the belief that each principal operates primarily through one of the four frames: humanistic, political, structural, or symbolic. However, Bolman and Deal explain that the exclusive use of only one frame may lock principals into "old" ways of behaving, preventing principals from discovering new ways of developing the correlates of teacher empowerment. They contend that reframing, or learning to analyze schools through multiple frames, increases leadership effectiveness and raises principal leadership to a higher level. Ultimately, understanding the ways schools are framed and using a multi-frame leadership perspective enables principals to see more clearly current structures in
existence and aids in identifying new ways of framing schools to promote site-based management, school restructuring, and teacher empowerment (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991). Because the results of this study imply that there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and each of the four organizational frames, it is necessary to understand how principals can increase teachers' perceptions of empowerment in each of the four frames.

The study revealed that there is a positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and the structural frame. Therefore, principals may need to emphasize the certainty and predictability that the structural frame provides. Principals may also need to emphasize careful planning and clear thinking, develop and implement clear, logical procedures, use logical analysis and careful thinking, and approach problems with facts and logic. Furthermore, structural principals need to provide teachers with new knowledge and expertise that will help them to be effective in their roles. Rallis (1988) reported that professional growth and training are linked to teachers' perceptions of empowerment; thus, principals may need to develop a culture that encourages professional growth and sharing. As a result, teachers could possibly increase their sense of personal professionalism and their
perceptions of their level of empowerment.

Additionally, the study indicated a positive correlation between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and the human resource leadership frame. Believing in people, human resource principals need to communicate that belief by increasing participation, sharing information with stakeholders, and moving decision making down into the organization. Wall and Rinehart (1997) reported that teachers perceptions of empowerment increased when they were involved in decision making. Although the involvement of teachers in the decision making process is a complex task, principals need to understand that it appears to be a significant part of the process of teacher empowerment (Perry, Brown, & McIntire, 1994).

The study also indicated that a positive relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and the political leadership frame. Principals, as political leaders, need to understand that power is essential to their effectiveness and must learn that empowering teachers is in their best interest, and more importantly, in the best interest of students (Maeroff, 1988b). Stimson and Applebaum (1988) found that principals who promote power sharing give teachers a sense of ownership, enhanced self-esteem, and increased perceptions of empowerment. Principals need to
understand that the empowerment of teachers does not mean that they cease to be in charge, but it does mean more consultation and collaboration (Barth, 1988).

In addition, the research indicated a positive correlation between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and the symbolic leadership frame. Bolman and Deal (1991) explain that principals, as symbolic leaders, inspire others to do their best, are highly visible, are highly charismatic, communicate a strong sense of mission, and promote the concept of belonging to a cohesive group that is proud and aware of the value it is adding to the world. Empowered teachers are committed to quality, have pride in their work, and are motivated from the intrinsic satisfaction they desire from their work. In this way, empowerment promotes group ownership along with real and lasting change (Sergiovanni, 1991). Therefore, principals may need to identify cultural themes, values, and dreams around which teachers can rally (Slater, 1994).

Understanding that there is a relationship between each of the four frames and teacher empowerment should not only encourage principals to examine each frame individually but also to explore Bolman and Deal's (1991) concept of leadership reframing, or multi-frame approach, as it relates to teacher empowerment and principal leadership. In the
quest to develop a clearer understanding of teacher empowerment, principals might need to adopt Bolman and Deal's conception of leadership reframing. Perhaps, such a holistic leadership perspective could lead to principals' developing a more empowering school environment. Principals who deliberately use leadership reframing enable themselves to see more clearly the divergent factors inhibiting teacher empowerment in their schools. Seemingly, a multi-frame approach could lead to new, enlightened, and expanded opportunities for increasing teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. Furthermore, leadership reframing could provide an avenue for identifying and analyzing the six dimensions of teacher empowerment that significantly influence a teacher's perception of empowerment.

For instance, the development of professional growth activities might be influenced from a structural perspective by using test scores or data collected from classroom observations. This same dimension can be encouraged from a human resource perspective by listening to teachers' ideas and opinions on needed areas of professional development. Encouraging teachers to acquire ownership of their own professional growth, a characteristic of the political frame, could promote teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment in this area as well. Finally, principals can
improve their skills as symbolic leaders by rewarding teachers for engaging in professional growth activities, thus increasing their level of empowerment.

Another dimension of empowerment, decision making, might also be influenced from a multi-frame leadership approach. For example, encouraging principals to schedule time for teachers to engage in shared decision making, a structural frame approach, could influence teachers' perceptions of empowerment. Additionally, by providing teachers with information with which to make informed decisions, principals can improve their skills within the human resource frame. The dimension of decision making might also be positively influenced by encouraging principals, in a political role, to relinquish power and allow teachers to use their talents in school governance. Finally, educational leaders can improve their skills within the symbolic frame by creating a clear vision of the future, which might influence the decision making process of teachers.

Failure to practice a multi-frame approach might prohibit principals from identifying possible pitfalls to teacher empowerment thus keeping them from creating opportunities to enhance teachers' perceptions of empowerment. Principals who exclusively use only one frame dramatically narrow their understanding of schools and how
they operate. Unless principals habitually practice the art of leadership reframing, they are unable to lead schools at the expert performance level (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

A positive relationship was also found to exist between teacher empowerment and teachers' educational levels. If acquiring a higher educational degree is indeed a positive factor in the empowerment process, principals may need to encourage teachers to seek advanced educational degrees. Lee (1991) reported that empowerment is a belief that a school is composed of individuals who possess the competencies necessary to improve the educational process for all involved. Principals need to design ongoing educational opportunities for teachers to acquire new skills and refine old ones. Since making teachers more knowledgeable is an obvious step in the empowerment process, principals should aid them in improving their instructional skills, encourage them to deepen their knowledge in their disciplines, and direct them how and where to fill the gaps of their knowledge (Maeroff, 1988b).

Because a positive correlation was found to exist between teacher empowerment and school size, school size may have a potential effect on teachers' perceptions of empowerment. However, since only three levels of school size were measured in this study, care should be exercised when
searching for a definitive answer regarding the relationship between teacher empowerment and school size. Perhaps small schools afford greater opportunities for teachers and principals to work closely together. On the other hand, larger schools might provide increased opportunities for teachers to engage in consultation and collaboration with fellow educators. However, regardless of the school's size, principals need to develop an environment where teachers act as professionals and are treated as professionals.

A statistically significant relationship was not found to exist between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and teachers' age and experience. These findings are similar to those reported by Klecker and Loadman (1998). They used the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992b) to survey 4,084 Ohio public school teachers. They reported no difference on any of the subscale measures of teacher empowerment for the teacher demographics, years of experience, and age. Additionally, Thorlakson and Murray's (1996) study reported no significant relationship between empowerment and employee's age and years of service.

However, principals should strive to create an empowering environment where all employees, regardless of
age or experience, are encouraged to engage in all aspects of the school. Cunningham and Gresso (1993) suggest that organizations are empowered when all members of the group contribute fully. They point out that the key to school effectiveness is learning how to use individual differences to the fullest. Lee (1991) emphasized that school leaders need to provide all teachers with the authority to make decisions, a time and a place to work together, and a voice in efforts to deepen their knowledge and improve the functioning of the school. Wheatley (1995) contends that unless schools are created where all members are empowered to engage in the work, schools may not be in a position to meet the educational challenges of the 21st century.

**Recommendations**

Although this study did offer insight into the relationship between teacher empowerment, principal leadership, teacher demographics (age, experience, and educational level), and school size, further empirical research is needed in the area of teacher empowerment.

Because principal leadership is considered an important factor contributing to teacher empowerment (Maeroff, 1988a), it is recommended that further research be conducted to assist principals in developing leadership strategies.
that promote the empowerment of teachers. However, based upon the multicollinearity between the frames on the Leadership Orientations Other Scale (Bolman & Deal, 1990), perhaps a different instrument could be used to measure principals' leadership styles. A future study using a different instrument could perhaps distinguish which style or styles of leadership increase teachers' perceptions of empowerment.

It is also recommended that future research be conducted to determine if perceptions of empowerment are impacted differently for teachers who hold an administrative certification, as opposed to curriculum and instruction certifications.

An additional recommendation for future research is to include principal demographic data in the study. Principals' similarities and differences in background, personality, years of experience, and preparation programs could help to illuminate whether these variables impact teachers' perceptions of empowerment.

Further research is also recommended to clarify the impact school size has on teacher empowerment. A study should be conducted to determine if there is a difference in teachers' perceptions of empowerment utilizing actual student enrollments rather than forced classification.
rankings such as TSSAA categories of A, AA, & AAA.

Also, because a statistically significant relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' educational level, more research is needed to examine these effects.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this study has helped to illuminate some variables that impact teacher empowerment. Perhaps the results of this study may offer some information that could aid school leaders in the building of learning organizations that empower teachers to become even more meaningful contributors to the educational process.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

SCHOOL PARTICIPANT EMPOWERMENT SCALE
School Participant Empowerment Scale (Copyright Paula M. Short & James S. Rinehart)

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

I understand that my participation in this research project is strictly confidential and voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time.
Appendix B

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (OTHER) SCALE
Leadership Orientations (Other) (Copyright Lee G. Bolman & Terrance E Deal)

This questionnaire asks you to describe your principal in terms of leadership and management style. You are asked to indicate how often each item is true of your principal. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1 = Never
2 = Occasionally
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Always

So, you would answer "1" for an item that is never true of your principal, "2" for one that is occasionally true, "3" for one that is sometimes true, and so on. Be discriminating! Think about each item and distinguish the things that your principal really does all the time from the things that s/he does seldom or never.

1) Thinks very clearly and logically. 1 2 3 4 5
2) Shows high levels of support and concern for others. 1 2 3 4 5
3) Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done. 1 2 3 4 5
4) Inspires others to do their best. 1 2 3 4 5
5) Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines. 1 2 3 4 5
6) Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
7) Is a skillful and shrewd negotiator. 1 2 3 4 5
8) Is highly charismatic. 1 2 3 4 5
9) Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking. 1 2 3 4 5
10) Shows high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings. 1 2 3 4 5
11) Is unusually persuasive and influential. 1 2 3 4 5
12) Is an inspiration to others. 1 2 3 4 5
13) Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures. 1 2 3 4 5
14) Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
15) Anticipates and deals adroitly with organizational conflict. 1 2 3 4 5
16) Is highly imaginative and creative. 1 2 3 4 5
17) Approaches problems with facts and logic. 1 2 3 4 5
18) Is consistently helpful and responsive to others. 1 2 3 4 5
19) Is very effective in getting support from people with influence and power. 1 2 3 4 5
20) Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission. 1 2 3 4 5
21) Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results. 1 2 3 4 5
22) Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input. 1 2 3 4 5
23) Is politically very sensitive and skillful. 1 2 3 4 5
24) Sees beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities. 1 2 3 4 5
25) Has extraordinary attention to detail. 1 2 3 4 5
26) Gives personal recognition for work well done. 1 2 3 4 5
27) Develops alliances to build a strong base of support. 1 2 3 4 5
28) Generates loyalty and enthusiasm. 1 2 3 4 5
29) Strongly believes in clear structure and a chain of command.  
30) Is a highly participative manager.  
31) Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition.  
32) Serves as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.  

I understand that my participation in this research project is strictly confidential and voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time.
Appendix C

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHIC FORM
Teacher/School Demographics

Please complete the following information with a response or check where appropriate.

1. Age (Years) ____________________________
2. Years as Full-time teacher ______
3. Highest Educational Level
   a. Bachelor's Degree ______
   b. Master's Degree ______
   c. Educational specialist's Degree ______
   d. Doctorate ______
4. School Size (School's student population)
   a. Class A ______
   b. Class AA ______
   c. Class AAA ______

I understand that my participation in this research project is strictly confidential and voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time.
Appendix D

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
Dear (Principal's Name),

I recently contacted you by phone requesting permission and a time to meet with the faculty of your school in conjunction with a doctoral dissertation that I am presently working on in educational administration at East Tennessee State University. As I indicated on the phone the purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment and their impressions of their principal's leadership style as it relates to Bolman and Deal's (1991) structural, human resource, political, and symbolic organizational frames. This letter is to confirm that (Day, Date) at (Time) has been selected as the date and time most convenient for you and your staff.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the three survey instruments that each teacher will be requested to complete. At the faculty meeting, the purpose of the study will be explained, and procedures and directions for completing the instruments will be discussed. Teachers will then be given an opportunity to seek clarification on any directions or to ask questions concerning the instruments. After completing the instruments, teachers will return them to me at the meeting in a white envelope, which will be provided to each teacher. All responses will be strictly confidential as it is unnecessary to identify any individual teacher or principal for the completion of this study.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

George W. Walker III
Doctoral Student
Appendix E

CONSENT TO USE SPES
Mr. Scott Walker  
530 Columbia Rd.  
Jefferson City, TN 37750

January 28, 1999

Dear Mr. Walker:

We are delighted that you have chosen to use the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) to use in your dissertation study. Good luck with your dissertation.

As already indicated, you have the permission of Dr. Paula Short and myself to use this instrument. If you choose to use the instrument, we do have two requests. First, we would like a copy of the results of your study as we are interested in maintaining a file on completed studies. Second, we would ask that you print our copyright on all duplications of the instrument and that you acknowledge our authorship (on the SPES) and copyright in any printed material such as your dissertation or other publications.

Listed below are the subscale labels and the items that correspond with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBSCALE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth</td>
<td>2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5, 11, 17, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>6, 12, 18, 24, 29, 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The copy of the SPES that I am sending you is on a scan form. You may, of course, use a form of your choosing to gather data. Please do leave the items in the same order and use the same Likert-type anchors.

Sincerely,

James Rinehart, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Administration and Supervision
Appendix F

CONSENT TO USE LOOS
Memorandum

February 3, 1999

To: Potential Users of Leadership Orientations Instruments

From: Lee Bolman

Subject: Permission

Permission

On request, we routinely grant permission for non-commercial, research use of the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientations Instruments. We do ask that users agree to provide us with copies of any research reports that they produce using data from the Instruments, and that they submit to us, if we request it, a copy of their data file.
VITA

GEORGE W. WALKER III

Personal Data:

Date of Birth: June 20, 1957
Place of Birth: Jefferson City, Tennessee
Marital Status: Married to Janet L. Walker
Children: Justin S. Walker, Lindsey M. Walker

Education:

Public Schools, Jefferson City, Tennessee
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. Secondary Education, B.S., 1980
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. Educational Administration, M.S., 1981
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. Doctorate in Education in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Ed. D., 1999

Professional Experience:

Assistant Manager, T.G. & Y. Company Jefferson City, Tennessee, 1981-1982
Teacher, Gibbs High School, Corryton, Tennessee, 1982-1994
Assistant Principal, Morristown West High School, Morristown, Tennessee, 1995-present

Professional Organizations:

Member, National Education Association
Member, Tennessee Education Association
Member, Hamblen County Education Association
Member, Tennessee High Schools Athletic Administrators Association