TEACHER EMPOWERMENT: SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS LEADING TEACHERS TO LEAD

by

Kelly A. Moran

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

in the

Educational Leadership

Program

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

December, 2015

Teacher Empowerment: School Administrators Leading Teachers to Lead

Kelly A. Moran

I hereby release this dissertation to the public. I understand that this dissertation will be made available from the OhioLINK ETD Center and the Maag Library Circulation Desk for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Kelly A. Moran, Student Date

Approvals:

Dr. Karen H. Larwin, Thesis Advisor Date

Dr. Robert J. Beebe, Committee Member Date

Dr. Kenneth Miller, Committee Member Date

Dr. Lisa Shoaf, Committee Member Date

Dr. Salvatore A. Sanders, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies Date

Abstract

The rapidly compounding demands placed on school principals for increased student achievement in conjunction with greater levels of accountability have added countless responsibilities to the already interminable job descriptions of school leaders. Therefore, principals are finding the need to assign leadership tasks to their teachers in an attempt to free up time and more efficiently accomplish the countless objectives required by local, state, and federal governing bodies. This study was designed to contribute to the growing body of literature on teacher empowerment, thus informing school leaders on the importance of the practice of empowering teachers. The first research question explored the level of perceived teacher empowerment compared with principal's gender. The second research question sought out whether having an assistant principal present in the building was related to teachers' perceived level of empowerment. The third research question compared teachers' perceived empowerment to their building level: elementary, middle, or high. The fourth research question explored if stronger feelings of empowerment were felt with principals of longer tenure. The fifth research question analyzed whether male or female teachers felt more empowered. The final research question explored other variables that moderate reported levels of empowerment. The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), a 38-item instrument using a 5-point Likert-type scale, established by Short and Rinehart (1992) to measure teachers' perceived levels of empowerment, was administered to a sample of teachers and school administrators in Lake County, Ohio. Demographic variables of gender, building level, and years of service were collected.

Keywords: empowerment, teacher-leader, principal, accountability, leadership

Dedications

I dedicate this work first and foremost to my most beloved husband, best friend, inspiring coach, and partner in life, J.P. Moran. My life forever changed for the better the day I met you. With you by my side each day somehow becomes filled with more love and happiness. You have encouraged me to accomplish goals and dreams that were bigger than my heart and head could have ever imagined being possible. I look forward to lacing up my shoes every morning to continue the long run with you for the rest of our lives together. To my darling daughter, Mackenzie Lee, I only wish you could know the amount of love and hope you have blessed us with. You are our greatest gift and we will forever be grateful for being awarded the privilege of being your parents. I will be ever thankful for your patience as a baby listening to me reread excerpts of this work out loud to you and for your generosity in allowing my computer to share in our cuddle time together. Thank you for being the most angelic and forgiving editor. I can only hope that I will be half the role model for you that my parents were and continue to be for me. To my mom and dad, this work exists because of you. I hold close to my heart the time you devoted to taking me to the library as a child, proofreading all of my written work, celebrating my accomplishments, encouraging me to take risks, and standing there with encouraging and well knowing smiles at every important milestone in my life at the exact moment when I finally somehow managed to catch my breath and look over my shoulder to make sure you were still there. You never once doubted that I would somehow complete every last thing I set my heart out to do. To my brother Kevin, thank you for teaching me the importance of battle buddies. I'll keep my fingers crossed that you know how much I love you.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Dr. Karen Larwin for not hesitating when I asked her to chair my dissertation committee. Her steadfast work ethic, unyielding patience, expert knowledge, and motivating disposition kept me inspired and energetic throughout the entire process. Dr. Larwin's commitment toward seeing her students succeed is just one of the many outstanding qualities that make her an exemplar educator and friend. Her teaching, knowledge, and refinements have made this project one of high quality. My doctoral student experience began with a course taught by Dr. Bob Beebe whose kindness and personal empathy resonated with me instantly. Thank you Dr. Beebe for exemplifying the pure and heartwarming support only a true educator is capable of providing. To Dr. Kenneth Miller, thank you for your time and energies invested in this project. You encouraged me to think deeply, question in ways I never had before, and challenge myself academically. I have endless gratitude for Dr. Lisa Shoaf who will forever be my most influential teacher. From instilling a love of writing in me as my seventh grade English teacher to teaching me tenants of effective school leadership as a graduate professor I have always looked up to you as a role model. Your professionalism, work ethic, balance of priorities, and mentoring capabilities inspired me to pursue a doctoral degree in the first place.

I would also like to thank all of the people who touched my life as a learner. Thank you to all the educators at Euclid City and Madison Local Schools for preparing me with the foundation to be a lifelong learner. To the educators at John Carroll University, thank you for providing me with the knowledge and skills necessary for beginning my career as a teacher and then later a school administrator. Thank you to the

Kirtland Local School District for making my dream of becoming an educator come true and supporting me through the doctoral program. To Youngstown State University, I am grateful for the privilege of attaining my most coveted educational achievement to date. Thank you for guiding me in this journey to pursuing a doctoral degree in education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

Recent changes in education at the local, state, and federal levels have caused changes in the nature of both administrative and teacher job roles and expectations. The impacts of an assessments-driven environment in education devoid of in-depth student thinking, comprehension, and writing created by The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 have sparked movement for advanced curricular practices from a new direction. The continuously swinging pendulum of education brings with it new initiatives, changes in philosophy and instructional approaches, increased accountability and responsibilities, and a more rapid pace for expected implementation. While school administrators scramble to stay abreast of numerous changes, redesign school programs, educate their staffs, and develop a sense of urgency for change, in addition to meeting all of their preexisting tasks, students continue to arrive at school each day in anticipation of making gains in their growth and development. The job of the school principal is rapidly expanding to encompass more responsibility, greater accountability, and a growing expectation for expertise in curriculum and assessment. Over time, the field of education has observed the role of school principal evolve from that of master, or lead, teacher to that of building manager, and, more recently, to that of an instructional leader. To meet the ever changing demands of the principalship and, simultaneously, become a specialist in both building supervision and instructional leadership, principals will need to empower teachers to higher levels of leadership to assist in accomplishing and managing the abundance of newly added responsibilities of state and federal mandates.

This study seeks to explore the perceived relationship of empowerment existing between teachers and multiple constructs. The constructs include the gender of the

school principal, whether or not the building has an assistant principal, the level of the building (elementary, middle, or high), and tenure of the building principal. As teachers work in various contexts under leaders that greatly differ from one another, it will be informative to study and analyze the perceptions teachers have if the extent to which they are empowered is demonstrated. A quantitative survey methodology using descriptive statistics and comparative analysis will be used to analyze the results of teacher surveys. Building principals will also complete the survey. The two data sets, from principals and teachers, will then be analyzed to determine if any relationships exist. Gender, for both teachers and principals, will be a complex portion of the data to analyze and report. This study hypothesizes that the gender of building principal has an effect on the amount to which teachers feel they are empowered. The gender of the teacher, however, may also make a difference in how these experiences of potential empowerment are perceived. Therefore, gender of teacher in relation to gender of school building principal will need to be carefully analyzed and delineated in the reporting of results.

Historical Perspective

Although some aspects of public education have not changed over the past hundred years, the job description of school principal has shifted drastically. What was once considered to be a boss-like role, has now transformed to a "facilitator of teachers" in which leadership style has changed from a traditional "subordination and isolation [model] to collaboration and consensus building" (Rinehart, Short, Short, & Eckley, 1998, p. 631). To encourage and promote collaboration and consensus, many building principals now aspire to empower teachers to accept greater responsibilities and partner with the administration to attain and accomplish goals. According to Bogler and Nir

(2012) “empowerment implies actual changes in employees’ professional authority and conduct, evident in their increased autonomy and involvement in broader organizational issues beyond their daily routine tasks” (p. 290). Creating opportunities for teachers to become more involved with new initiatives and responsibilities develops their autonomy. Empowering teachers requires principals to elicit “changes in one’s role, which are likely to be evident mostly in the level of authority that individuals have on the job” (Bogler & Nir, 2012, p. 291). “Empowerment calls on team members to learn about themselves and others so that they can relate, interact, and contribute more effectively” as a united community working to facilitate student academic success (Dee, Henkin, & Duemer, p. 272). The principal should recognize that “influence is not limited to those in formal leader roles within an organization; all organization members have the potential to influence decisions and people within the organization” (Jackson & Marriott, 2012, p. 234). In order to embrace more rigorous expectations of teaching and learning, school principals would be wise to investigate ways in which they can empower and promote leadership qualities within teachers to share in the workload of educational tasks. Such practices of empowerment will allow for more balance of principals’ time to assist teachers with instructional practice. Visionary principals inspired to work diligently for the benefit of student success understand that “leadership does not reside in formal school leaders but rather is located throughout the organization” (Jackson & Marriott, 2012, p. 251).

Among the changes educators and school administrators are facing, such as new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts (ELA) and math in at least 46 of the 50 states, are the expectations that student learning and instruction reach

much higher levels of rigor (CCSS, n.d.). As a result of the new standards, principals have been given the responsibility to oversee even greater expectations for student performance than schools have witnessed in the past. "As schools have become more intricate and intense in the needs and demands of daily practices and ongoing accountability, the definition of the school leader has changed" producing a growing need for the leadership to be distributed amongst staff (Crum, Sherman, & Myran, 2009, p. 50). As a result of new, rigorous curricula from CCSS, numerous states have aligned with one of two consortia awarded grants from the U.S. Department of Education (ED). These consortia comprise the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), both designated to take part in newly designed, technology-based assessments that measure student achievement (ED, 2010). Preparations have begun for the integration of such assessments, which require schools to invest more of their limited resources in technology infrastructure, resources, and teacher training. Some states have also commenced the rewriting and introduction of new curriculum expectations and standards for science and social studies, adding more strain to overwhelmed and fatigued administrators and teachers. This requires teachers and administrators to redesign curriculum maps and pacing guides, rewrite assessments, and purchase new materials aligned to redeveloped standards for almost all subject areas.

In addition to national initiatives, public schools are facing multiple dimensions of change at the state level. Many states have recently passed legislation that requires radical changes in multiple aspects of public school education. Such is the case in Ohio, with the recent passage of Senate Bill 316, mandating, among many things, new teacher

evaluations, new formatting and ratings for school district report cards, and possible retention of students not meeting cut scores on standardized tests (Bloom, 2012). Beginning in the 2012-2013 school year, teachers and administrators in the state of Ohio were faced with a new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES), a new Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES), the requirement to write Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and Student Growth Measures (SGMs), and new district level report cards. All of these changes to education provisions were included in SB 316, passed by the Ohio Senate in 2012. State legislative requirements such as these have mandated that "building leaders must be data-based decision-makers and strong instructional leaders" (Crum, Sherman, & Myran, 2009, p. 50).

The impact of multi-level change and mandates is not only severe for principals and teachers; students are also largely affected. In the state of Ohio, Senate Bill 316, which includes mandates for the Third Grade Reading Guarantee (TGRG), requires that students in third grade be retained if they do not meet a specific cut score on a state standardized reading assessment (Ohio Department of Education [ODE], 2012). The TGRG also requires specific credentials for teachers of reading in grades K-3, forcing many teachers to go back to school for additional licensure (ODE, 2012). It is no surprise, then, that "increased expectations for student achievement have expanded the role of the principal" to facilitate teacher development and adherence to guidelines and law (Crum, Sherman, & Myran, p. 49). It is incumbent upon principals to be knowledgeable of all changes, as they are solely responsible for educating their staffs, preparing and providing for such transformations to occur, and monitoring the progress of implementation of aforementioned programs. Multiple changes at a rapid pace can

cause stress for both school administrators and teachers. However, findings from Dee, Henkin, and Duemer (2002) "suggest that empowerment may be an important means for enhancing organizational commitment and reducing levels of teacher burnout and turnover" (p. 272). Teachers who have more opportunities to take part in collective decision-making tend to feel a stronger commitment to the overall organization and fulfilled by the work they do as opposed to feeling underappreciated and overworked for little positive gain (Henkin & Duermer, 2002). To prevent outcomes of excessive stress, administrators need to be proactive and empower teachers to assist in managing the workload, while at the same time, foster collaborative responsibility and ownership. The literature in the area of teacher empowerment that would help administrators to learn how to develop such practice, however, is limited and outdated. Additional research on teacher empowerment needs to be conducted now that the CCSS, technology assessment creation, new state report card models, and novel teacher evaluations based on student achievement are in place.

The influx of demands being placed on schools and school leaders over recent decades have resulted in states developing new teacher licensure systems and new teacher-leader endorsement programs. These new state teacher-leader endorsement programs were predicated by a report issued by the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, which outlined the need for and benefits associated with promoting teacher leadership within schools. The report stated that "teacher leaders can help principals support professional development by identifying teacher development needs, offering professional learning experience, developing and delivering opportunities, and evaluating the outcomes of staff development" (National Comprehensive Center for

Teacher Quality, 2007, p. 3). The report also noted that "teacher leadership provides the additional person power needed to run the organizational operations of the school, which are too complex for principals to run alone" (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2007, p. 4). This notion was certainly seen and felt in the state of Ohio, where in 2009, the entire teacher licensure system was redesigned (ODE, 2014, para. 1). Ohio's "four-tiered [teacher licensure] system provides opportunities for teachers to advance in their professional careers and serve as school improvement leaders, without leaving the teaching profession" (ODE, 2014, para. 1). Among the new designations offered to teacher-leaders in the state of Ohio are the senior professional educator license and the lead professional educator license. These graduate level programs have fostered the ongoing demand to develop teachers' levels of knowledge and expertise to serve as leaders in their respective schools. In the state of Ohio "the Teacher Leader Endorsement [can] be issued to an individual who has successfully completed four years of teaching experience, holds a master's degree, and has met the program standards, [and] who is deemed to be of good moral character" (ODE, 2009, p. 7). As a means to support the teacher as leader movement, The Ohio Department of Education developed standards for university teacher-leader programs. An example of one of these standards reads "teacher leader candidates know and demonstrate skill in evidence-based principles of effective leadership and teacher learning" (ODE, 2009, p.7). In addition to Ohio's new four-tiered teacher licensure system, the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) generates a consistent need for trained teacher-leaders to participate in the leadership frameworks of school districts. The OIP is Ohio's strategy for "establishing a statewide system of support … based on a commonly understood and implemented approach that uses a consistent set of

protocols and tools directly aligned with the tenets of OLAC (The Ohio Leadership Advisory Council)" (Ohio Leadership Advisory Council, 2014, para. 1). The Ohio Leadership Advisory Council promotes "support and agreement to focus on leadership as a set of essential practices that need to occur in an aligned and coherent manner across all levels of the system through the effective development of team structures at the district-, school-, and teacher-level" (para. 1).

Ohio was not the only state to embrace the teacher-leader endorsement movement. "During the winter of 2008, Kansas embarked on an extraordinary journey for the sole purpose of defining and writing a legally effective regulation for a licensure endorsement honoring career teacher leaders" (Martin & Coleman, 2011, p. 6). The state assigned a committee to "develop teacher-leader standards, regulatory language, and a teacher-leader performance-based assessment during the course of a year" (Martin & Coleman, 2011, p. 6).

The job of the principal continues to expand in its list of expected duties, yet the hours in the school day remain the same. The field of education is realizing what the business world has known for a long time, that "leadership is not static […and] individuals enter and exit moments of influence and leadership" fluidly (Jackson & Marriott, 2012, p. 233). Often administrative staffs are reduced in districts to save costs in an economically challenging time period. What needs to occur for leadership and management to increase student success resides in the empowerment of teachers and teacher-leaders to embrace the challenge of meeting higher and more arduous expectations. In order to develop more successful educational programs for students, teachers need to be elevated to higher levels of engagement and "principals should

support or facilitate the work of their teachers and supply what is needed to accomplish that work" (Rinehart et al., 1986, p. 644). For effective teacher empowerment to exist, "principals may strengthen the meaningfulness of employees' work via interactions where they accentuate the importance of individual roles, and emphasize how the individual work of a teacher supports the interdependent activities of the school that are targeted to common goals and outcomes" (Moye, Henkin, & Egley, 2005, p. 271).

Looking at successful models of empowering teachers will require an examination of school administrators. Among some of the factors that could potentially have an impact on the ways in which, and, the amount of teacher empowerment exists in a building would be gender and the absence or presence of an assistant principal in the building. Although some would say that the number of male versus female administrators is still unbalanced in the field of education, "women have made tremendous gains in obtaining positions in school administration" (Costellow, 2011, p. 4). Costellow (2001) argued that this influx "may be due to the evolution of cultural norms for women in the workplace, or to the shift for school leaders to be less of a building manager and more of a relationship and culture-building mentor" (p. 4). Costellow also reminds readers that typically "the leadership traits or styles exhibited by women often differ greatly from those of male school administrators" (p. 6). Costellow's (2001) results "indicated that while the majority of male and female teachers had no preference in regard to their principal's gender, each group had a significantly higher preference for males (p. xii). Rosener (1990) also investigated the different leadership styles of men and women and "discovered that both men and women experience work-family conflict [for example], but that women experience it at a higher level (p. 5).

Rosener's (1990) work led her to believe that males use a leadership style developed on the basis of self-interest, whereas women's leadership style is often more characteristic of pursuing group goals through shared decision-making, collaboration, and fostering a sense of community. Other researchers such as Reynolds, White, Brayman, and Moore (2009) found that female administrators are unique from males in that they tend to be categorized as more "intuitive, collaborative, collegial, consultative […] emotionally responsive, nurturing, and motherly" (p. 43).

Another potential factor contributing toward or inhibiting the amount to which teachers are empowered could be the presence of building assistant principals. Funding cuts have resulted in many districts eliminating positions such as assistant principals. These individuals can have a significant impact on many elements of the school building from climate and instances of student discipline to consistency in the principal's absence to the amount in which teachers are empowered. As with the changing role of the school principal in today's educational climate, "the complex nature of schools has helped shape the traditional role of the assistant principal as someone who acts as chief disciplinarian, conflict mediator, and hall patroller (Bartholomew, Melendez-Delaney, Orta, & White, 2005, p. 23). Having an assistant principal adds to the dynamic of collaboration, therefore "removing structural barriers can help principals and assistant principals develop a process that empowers and actively engages teachers and key stakeholders" (Bartholomew et al., 2005, p. 23). Assistant principals can also play a large role in improving school procedures with their ability to empower educational professionals. An assistant principal able to leverage teacher leadership knows that "successful leaders

surround themselves with great people […and therefore] ask the support staff for ideas and suggestions on how to improve school procedures" (Gerke, 2004, p. 40).

Statement of the Problem

As the job of the principal increases in difficulty due to new and more rigorous expectations for accountability and student achievement, empowering teachers grows in importance. Principals must learn how teachers feel about being empowered, how to best empower teacher-leaders in their buildings, and how to study the perceived levels of empowerment in their respective school buildings.

Research Questions

This study will focus on the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference in the level of teacher empowerment experienced in school buildings with female administrators versus male administrators?
2. Is there a difference in the level of teacher empowerment experienced in school buildings with an assistant principal as compared to those buildings without an assistant principal?
3. How do levels of perceived empowerment differ depending on the building level (elementary, middle, or high school)?
4. Are stronger feelings of teacher empowerment felt with principals of longer tenure?
5. Do male or female teachers feel more empowered?
6. What other variables moderate reported levels of empowerment (i.e., years of experience of teacher, years of experience of administrator, participants' occupation)?

Significance of the Study

This study will provide meaningful information to both teachers and principals as they develop plans to best implement change within their buildings and districts as a result of new legislation and local requirements. Ever increasing levels of accountability place greater demands on school principals, who must then rely more heavily on teacher-leaders. These empowered leaders will need to encourage others within the building to improve instructional practice and rigor as a means to generating higher student test scores. Through further research in the area of teacher empowerment, educators will come to understand that "the positions of leaders and followers are dynamic as organizations engage in the varied purposes and activities required to accomplish organizational goals" (Jackson & Marriott, 2012, p. 235). Researchers, such as Bogler and Somech (2004), suggested that the literature be extended to studies that examine the effects variables have on the relationship between teacher empowerment and student achievement, prompting the realm of social science to look more closely at this potential process of influence. This study will reexamine the concept of teacher empowerment during a time in which new educational initiatives continue to rapidly accumulate. Learning how to increase teacher empowerment within the culture of initiative overload will help to develop greater sustainability of student learning over time.

Methodology

This quantitative study will explore teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment. With permission from the Superintendents of the public schools in a small sized, suburban school district, a questionnaire will be disseminated to both teachers and principals to collect data on perceived levels of teacher empowerment. The

survey will be distributed to teachers and principals through the use of Survey Monkey, an online survey and data collection tool. Data will be collected from teachers and principals during a single school year. All demographic data pertaining to the makeup of each school and its rankings in terms of student achievement will be taken from district report cards as reported by the ODE.

Limitations of the Study

The validity of this research project could be compromised by a lack of participation. Another potential concern regarding the completion of this study will be the number of years in which teachers have been working for their respective district. If teachers are new to the profession or new to the district, their opportunities for empowerment may be limited or not as great as their more experienced colleagues. The data collected will be quantitative in nature, limiting the possibility for more in depth and reflective responses that could be generated through interviews or focus groups with teachers and principals. Therefore, the data may be limited in showing the range and variation of empowerment within schools. There have been many changes, recently, in the state of Ohio regarding instructional standards with the inception of the Common Core, the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES), and new state mandated initiatives such as the Third Grade Reading Guarantee (TGRG). The context of the current educational climate and environment in the state may have a potential influence on the amount to which teachers feel that they are empowered to embrace new responsibilities. For example, the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System rubric suggests ways in which teachers go above and beyond expected duties to earn markings in the accomplished category.

Delimitations of the Study

A delimitation of this study is that it will not be generalizable to larger and more urban school districts. The data will only be representative of schools in northeast Ohio and will not generalize nationwide. Depending on the number of female administrators employed in the selected county, the data might not show an accurate representation of experiences with female administration.

Definition of Key Terms

> *Empowerment* –actual changes in employees' professional authority and conduct, evident in their increased autonomy and involvement in broader organizational issues beyond their daily routine tasks (Bogler & Nir, 2012, p 290).

Summary

The study will investigate the perceived level of empowerment of teachers based on their working experiences with their building administrators and amount to which they have been asked or solicited to take on greater job responsibilities. A survey will be administered to all public school educators and public school building administrators in a northeast county of Ohio. A quantitative analysis of survey results will be used to investigate any correlations between teachers' perceived levels of empowerment on The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and variables including the gender of the school principal, the level of building (elementary, middle, or high) the teacher works in, the amount of experience of the principal, and whether or not the school has an assistant principal. Results from the survey will be analyzed and discussed. Implications for

future research, as well as practical application for current school leaders and teachers, will also be explored.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The foundation for school leadership continues to evolve, and many schools are embracing a new mindset in which the "leadership in schools is no longer solely performed by the school principal; instead leadership is [viewed as] an aggregated function, and other members of the leadership team with formally designated leadership roles take part in leading the school" (Devos, Tuytens, & Hulpia, 2014, p. 212). The increased accountability demands associated with school leadership from new federal mandates and curricular initiatives have educators and district leaders focused almost solely on student achievement. There are many variables that could potentially be linked to increasing student success, and motivated districts are scrambling to look to the research to find any possible ways to raise test scores. One link to student achievement is that of teacher empowerment. For many, "teacher empowerment is a panacea that many education reformers consider essential for school restructuring and optimum teacher development" (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006, p. 45). Some researchers argue that increasing teacher empowerment within the building or district has a direct impact on student achievement, whereas others are not quite so convinced. Ross and Gray (2006) proposed that "principals influence student achievement by creating capacity in the organization in terms of teacher beliefs in their collective agency and in terms of their commitment to the goals of the organization" (p. 799). Creating the capacity for collective agency to build and thrive is a result of empowering teachers to work together and assume greater responsibilities. Seed (2006) studied a middle school in which the philosophy of teacher empowerment in shared decision-making is well developed. From

analyzing this school district in the 1990s, where the author also worked as a middle school teacher and experienced the empowered environment, Seed concluded that "empowerment of teachers is a necessary ingredient of school improvement" (p. 41). Seed advocates the notion that "empowering teachers and promoting collaboration are two ideas in need of re-examination given new pressures to micromanage the work of teachers" (p. 43).

Initiative Overload

What is presently known, and experienced, however, in the conflicting views of what actually helps student achievement rise is the increased pressure and stress from overworked school administrators. These principals and assistant principals feel as if they cannot keep up with the daily management of the building and, at the same time, encounter pressure to embody the necessary skills requisite of being an expert in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Some "educators believe that recognizing teaching as a profession and developing professional teachers is a possible solution to teachers' lack of motivation and satisfaction, professional, and empowerment" while others are not as convinced (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006, p. 44). Long before Seed established his claims regarding the need for re-examination of teacher empowerment, Rice and Schneider (1994) noted that the "current educational reform movement [has] strongly advocated increased teacher involvement in school decision-making" through empowerment models (p. 43). Others heed the same caution and note that the "work demands in education are thought to be rapidly increasing in complexity," requiring a greater need for shared decision-making and teacher empowerment (Prawat, 1991, p. 749). Hatcher (2005) also noted, "in the school context it is argued that the work process

has become much more complex and intensive, and [principals] are dependent on their teacher colleagues to implement mandated reforms" (p. 254). Therefore, there is a strong argument for the "importance of legitimate, authentic teacher involvement in decision-making" for the survival and sustainability of the nation's schools in the ever-changing environment of accountability (Rice & Schneider, 1994, p. 55). As a result of the increasing professional demands, the rapid pace of meeting work responsibilities, and expanding roles for greater accountability for school principals, recent research shows a "strong interest in allocating greater decision-making authoring to teachers" (White, 1992, p. 69). If both administrators and teachers are to meet the never ending list of professional demands, "according to the empowerment argument, they must be given greater autonomy and decision-making power in schools and in the teaching profession" (Prawat, 1991, p. 749). Therefore, many researchers and educators are pushing for "increased teacher participation in school decision-making as a method to improve" schools (White, p. 69).

Although many researchers advocate for the increased use of teacher empowerment models as a positive way to battle the intensity of professional work place demands and potential link to student achievement, others are leery to recommend empowerment as the clear path to increasing student success. Marks and Louis (1997) argued "the link between teacher empowerment and student performance has not been clearly established" therefore sparking the need for additional research to be completed in this area (p. 245). Although they are careful not to link empowerment with student achievement, their work does document positive outcomes of teacher empowerment in the educational setting and develops an argument for how teacher empowerment could

potentially impact student achievement indirectly. Marks and Louis hypothesized that when "teachers direct their influence toward promoting a commonly shared and intellectually focused school instructional mission, […] empowerment will serve to improve student academic performance" (p. 248). What the two found through their research was that greater teacher empowerment resulted in "greater school-wide attention to instruction and student learning" (p. 259). They argue, then, indirectly, that teacher empowerment can enhance student achievement as their findings support the argument that "empowerment will positively influence teachers' efforts to improve instruction" (p. 263). Furthermore, their data suggest that "those who are empowered to affect student and school-wide policies put forth more effort in all arenas, working more closely with colleagues on pedagogy and also spending more time on governance" (p. 266). Hatcher (2005) contended that although "participation is nominally inclusive" in empowerment structures, often the "authority is exclusive", meaning that teachers do not always have as much power to engage in decision-making as the model intends (p. 259). Hatcher (2005) also suggested that "sharing leadership is risky" and that empowerment trends "may not succeed in reinforcing commitment to management agendas" (p. 260). Therefore, principals need to better understand the dynamics of perceived feelings associated with empowerment.

Philosophy of Empowerment

School administrators need to become knowledgeable of what empowerment practices look like in the school environment in addition to the skills and behaviors this practice includes. This knowledge will then assist them in replicating such models of empowerment in their own districts in hopes of maximizing student achievement. As

defined by Marks and Louis (1997), teacher empowerment is "an educational reform initiative that often accompanies policies to increase decision-making authority and accountability at the school level (p. 245). According to Seed (2006), who experienced empowerment first hand as a teacher and defines it a little differently, administrators empower teachers by "acting as a buffer between the school board and critical community members while simultaneously aiding the [teacher] teams" in their decision-making practices (p. 41). Hatcher (2005) proposed a slightly different view and proposed that empowerment is "the opportunity to exercise leadership [that] can be made available to the body of teachers within a school by creating a non-hierarchical network of collaborative learning" (p. 255). According to Devos, Tuytens, and Hulpia (2014), however, empowerment resides "where the leadership is distributed among all members of the leadership team and where teachers can participate in school decision-making" methods (p. 205). Empowerment, then, is a " dynamic, interactive influence process" comprised of the "concerted action of people working together […] which brings about a situation in which the amount of energy created is greater than the sum of the individual actions" (Devos et al., 2014, pp. 208-209). The school that follows a leadership framework of elevating teacher-leaders is one that follows a "model that empowers groups of teachers to act as a professional practice in their school" (Williams, 2007, p. 211). In highly empowered school environments, "leadership functions are stretched over the work of a number of individuals, and tasks are accomplished through interaction between multiple leaders" (Devos et al., 2014, p. 209).

Delegating decision-making tasks to teachers is a major element of teacher empowerment. For example, the teachers of a middle school building studied by Seed

(2006) reported that they felt that "their ability to change the daily schedule [was] the most empowering aspect of their work" (p. 42). This delegation of tasks can also be referred to as the "redistributing [of] power within the school, among the teaching staff" and resembles the "sharing of collective decision-making power" (Hatcher, 2005, pp. 263, 264). In addition to daily schedule changes, the empowered teachers Seed (2006) studied were granted authority in other areas as well and "planned, implemented, and reviewed instruction and curriculum, [and] …took on the responsibilities of an assistant principal" (p. 42). Administrators seeking relief from an overabundance of job duties and demands they cannot keep up with should seek to empower teachers in similar ways in their own buildings. Releasing power to the teachers to help with curriculum decisions and student discipline can free up the assistant principal and principal to tend to other, equally pressing matters within the school culture. This release of power, however, stems from a change in mindset. School leaders who have developed this mindset for shared leadership are those who believe "envisioning teachers as entrepreneurial owners of the academic instruction they provide unlocks tremendous potential for reform that is both teacher-friendly and aimed squarely at enhancing achievement opportunities for students (Williams, 2007, p. 211). For those interested in a sustainable effect compared with results associated with short-term change, Rice's and Schneider's (1994) decade of studying teacher empowerment developed their argument that "lasting school improvement will occur when teachers become more involved in professional decision-making at the school site" (p. 43). Their findings documented that in an environment of fostered empowerment, "teacher's levels of actual involvement, desired involvement, interest and expertise increased over time" (p. 56).

Shared Vision

School empowerment often stems from the establishment of a shared vision or goal. Researchers have studied how this element of empowerment is linked to school success. Marks and Louis (1997) conducted a study of 24 schools, representing 16 states and 22 school districts, most of which were urban, that yielded survey data from more than 900 teachers. They studied teacher empowerment and the "relative importance of teachers' influence or control in four specific policy domains-school operations and management, teacher work life, students' school experiences, and classroom practice" (p. 246). Marks and Louis noted that "clearly articulated school values and a consensus about what is expected of teachers serve simultaneously to channel and support" teacher empowerment (p. 248). Teacher empowerment, as evidenced in their findings, highlights the administrative delegation and the elevation of teacher roles necessary, such as when "administrators, through control of agendas and information flow, can attenuate teacher influence" (p. 250). School administrators looking to enact models of empowerment should understand that "empowerment should focus on decisions that affect mid-level policies regarding school functioning: those that are broader than a single classroom, but still clearly related to the improvement of learning environments" (p. 265).

According to Prawat (1991), "the key to empowerment […] is to change the nature of the conversations teachers have with their settings to encourage them to be open to new and more effective ways of constructing the classroom and workplace environment" (p. 739). He proposed that developing empowerment is evidenced by administrators who "provide teachers with greater control and autonomy in the workplace" (p. 748). Inversely, it is relevant to note that without empowerment, the

school building suffers and opportunities for advancement are limited. Prawat warned that "a lack of autonomy and control on the part of teachers is problematic because it affects their productivity and commitment to the workplace" (p. 749). Rolling out models of empowerment, however, is not the quick fix some administrators may be looking for to remedy concerns for future school years. According to Prawat, "empowerment agendas evolve slowly over time as participants work to construct a shared understanding of group purposes or goals" (p. 756).

Empowerment and Trust

As the need for shared and collaborative leadership continues to grow alongside the influx of administrator and educator responsibilities, so does the research on the area of empowering teachers. Although this is an area in which researchers need to continue to collect and share data, previous findings provide some insightful implications for current school leaders. For example, Rinehart et al. (1998) found that teacher empowerment is related to principals' social attractiveness or likeness, credibility, and trustworthiness. Their findings are consistent with other findings from Short and Greer (1997) who found trust to be a major element of initiating teacher empowerment. In order to empower teachers and develop collaborative leadership within school buildings, principals must first focus their efforts on establishing trusting relationships. Fostering positive relationships is not a novel idea for most administrators, and it continues to present itself in the literature on empowerment. Consistent with Rinehart et al. (1998), Short and Greer (1994), and Moye, Henkin, and Egley (2004) also found themes of relationships and trust to be a critical part of empowerment noting that "trust contributes to a positive working environment characterized by honest, supportive relationships" (p.

261). The further an individual investigates in the literature, the more trust and empowerment can be observed as a key factor. In their study of relationships between principals and elementary teachers Moye et al. (2004) found that "empowerment was a significant predictor of interpersonal-level trust" suggesting that principals need to be aware of the relationship between the two (p. 267). Therefore, based on their findings, they recommend that "complex organizations, including schools, continually seek new ways to extend parameters of trust, and encourage cooperation and collaboration among employees" (p. 261). Collaboration and cooperation are the foundation for empowerment of teachers to take place. Empowerment allows teachers to attain greater responsibilities and consequently make valuable contributions to the school. School principals will need to rely more on collaboration and cooperation to keep up with the countless changes and initiatives on the horizon in today's climate of educational reform. In addition to linking teacher empowerment to principal relationships built on trust, Rinehart et al. (1986) concluded that there are "higher levels of empowerment in schools where principals were viewed as having higher levels of persuasion" (p. 643). Principals can conclude that credibility and influence to persuade come as a result of buy-in and maintaining trust in their leadership. To maximize the ability to persuade, inspire, lead, and empower their teachers, principals should remain focused on the relationships they have with staff.

Empowerment and Job Satisfaction

Not only is empowerment important for launching school change, it is relevant to several other aspects of organizational functioning and effectiveness. Bogler and Nir (2012) found teachers' levels of perceived empowerment to be a "key factor in affecting

job satisfaction, both intrinsically and extrinsically" (p. 301). Many would argue that overall job satisfaction results in longer lasting and future contributions from the employee to the organization benefiting all who are invested in making the most of change initiatives. The research supports such a claim. Dee et al. (2002) documented that "empowered teachers had a stronger affective attachment to the school organization" (p. 270). Long lasting commitment to the organization as developed through a sense of job satisfaction and empowerment has been documented in the literature outside of the United States as well. Bogler and Somech (2004) studied teachers in Israel, finding that those teachers who perceived they were practicing elements of empowerment were more strongly committed toward the organization and the profession. Teachers have a greater sense of belonging and commitment in those schools that put empowerment models into practice, often because they believe "that their input [is] valued since their recommendations [are] often followed" (White, 1992, p. 75). Devos et al. (2014) also found similar linkages between teacher empowerment and increased sense of commitment to the organization. Their study of 1,495 teachers from 46 secondary schools yielded results that showed "teachers feel more committed to the school when the principal provides opportunities for the assistant principals and the teacher- leaders to perform leadership roles" (p. 225). In those schools that boast of highly empowered school environments "authority is more evenly distributed, teachers are more involved in decisions, and teachers play more diverse roles" (White, 1992, p. 75). In their decade-long study of teacher empowerment in 22 schools in Wisconsin, Rice and Schneider (1994) similarly found associations between empowerment and teacher job satisfaction. Using a "three-way analysis of variance," Rice and Schneider (1994) "found a significant

relationship existed between respondents' level of decision involvement and job satisfaction" (p. 51). Additionally, they reported that the "higher the level of involvement the higher the reported job satisfaction" (p. 55). In addition to job satisfaction and greater levels of involvement, other researchers have found benefits such as a "greater sense of professionalism by teachers" to be a result of increased levels of empowerment (White, 1992, p. 74). White also found that "teacher participation in school decision-making has improved teacher morale" and that "increased opportunities to participate in school decision-making increased self-esteem, enabled teachers to speak out and express their views, and even encouraged teachers to seek higher degrees" (p. 77).

Empowerment has great potential for developing success within the organization, especially when it is personalized for employees. Effective means of "empowerment for the individual within organizational settings results from the internalization of a framework that is grounded in personal meaning and is responsive to the larger aims of the organization" (Culbert & McDonough, 1986, p. 186). In order for school principals to enact empowerment in such a way that is individualized and personalized for teachers, communication skills need to be greatly considered and reflected upon. "Communicating information openly with teachers is fundamental in terms of enabling them to make responsible decisions" (Moye, Henkin, & Egley, 2005, p. 272). With greater empowerment comes a greater responsibility to allow others to take on tasks and tackle problems. If principals wish to allow teachers the autonomy to make decisions, they must make sure that they communicate openly and effectively. White (1992) also found improved communication between teachers and school leaders as a benefit from empowering teachers to become involved in greater decision-making responsibilities.

Improved communication was one of five benefits "of the impact of increased authority on teacher work life" also including "improved teacher morale, better informed teachers, […] improved student motivation, and increased incentives that serve to attract and retain quality teachers" (White, 1992, p. 71). Additionally, White reported that 71 of the 90 teachers interviewed in her study "reported that their involvement gave them a feeling of importance and of being in charge" (p. 72). These teachers, for example, were "more careful with [budget] allocations when they were in charge of balancing their own account" since their level of ownership in the process had increased from the empowered levels of decision-making bestowed upon them (White, 1992, p. 72). These same teachers "expressed the belief that the more input they had on curriculum decisions and the more comfortable they were with administrators, the better lessons students received and the more connection between teacher empowerment and student achievement (White, 1992, p. 74).

Constraints and Limitations

As with any new buzzword, philosophy, or initiative in education, district leaders should be aware of the constraints and limitations associated with teacher empowerment prior to restructuring the decision-making process within their building. In districts where teachers felt and documented examples of empowerment, Seed (2006) found that "administrators often had to take flak for the decisions the [teacher] teams made" (p. 43). "Reluctance on the part of administrators to allocate authority and encourage teacher input sets limits of teacher responsibility" and, therefore, depends greatly on the leadership philosophy and ability to release control on part of the principal (White, 1992, p. 81). Despite the fact that some teachers have been empowered to handle increased

responsibilities, they may "remain limited by the traditional patterns of authority where administrators are at the top of the hierarchy and teachers are at the bottom" (White, 1992, p. 81). As supported by results from the work of Devos et al. (2014), ultimately, it is the school principal who "strongly influences how leadership is distributed" (p. 220). Finding the time to meet the increase in expectations was another limitation as teachers "found themselves spending more time on a broader variety of concerns than they had previously spent due to newly granted autonomy" (Seed, 2006, p. 43). Teachers in highly empowered settings at times also reported that "working together was not always a joyful experience" (Seed, 2006, p. 43). Prior to an expansion of empowerment, teachers were used to working more in isolation and not having to collaborate with or communicate their rationale for decisions with colleagues and administration. In their study of 24 schools throughout the country, Marks and Louis (1997) found limitations associated with teacher empowerment. Similar to Seed, their findings demonstrated that time was a considerable factor and that participation in teacher empowerment models "may infringe on the discretionary time that teachers allocate for instruction-related activities, such as preparing for class or grading papers" (Marks & Louis, 1997, p. 250). In addition to Seed (2006) and Marks and Louis (1997), White (1992) also reported that time is a limitation associated with teacher empowerment models. In her over 100 personal interviews with teachers and administrators, she found that "the major constraints to teachers' input in school decision-making included limited time, training and funding" (p. 71). Teachers who work in environments in which empowerment is leveraged and valued "spend a great deal of time honing the decision-making process, since that is the professional cornerstone on which the school culture is built" (Williams,

2007, p. 214). Teachers can become drained given that "the hours are long, and the hats the teacher[s] wear are many" (p. 214). Other researchers such as Marks and Louis, however, found little evidence to support the time distraction theory, which argues that "teachers involved in school-wide policy discussions will spend too much time on governance to the detriment of working on instruction (1997, p. 266). In addition to time, White (1992) cited that not being trained specifically in an area of expertise such as budgeting was a limitation when it came to making teachers more empowered to take on greater decision-making roles. White (1992) also found concerns that teachers who were empowered "were crossing the lines into managerial roles and were not being compensated for their increased responsibilities" as cited by the union representatives in the schools she studied (p. 77). Union representatives may remain wary of empowerment models as they worry that teachers will "end up doing the work of principals without the pay bump that serving as a principal usually provides" (Williams, 2007, p. 215). Teachers may also become skeptical of how much leniency they should have in decision-making as an empowered employee. Williams (2007) cautioned that "there are some tasks - usually far removed from instruction - that teachers still want someone else to deal with" (p. 215). These tasks include student discipline and making budget cuts.

Rationale for Further Study on Teacher Empowerment

The future of school success in embracing and initiating state and federal mandates may reside in the school leaders' ability to empower teachers. Understanding how to initiate and maximize teacher empowerment, however, is yet just one of many new concepts and initiatives with which principals need to become familiar. Therefore, there is a critical need for extensive research to be completed in the area of teacher

empowerment within the school setting to inform principals of best practice. Of concern for school leaders is that, currently, "little, if any, empirical evidence exists that describes the relationship between empowerment and principal characteristics that influence teachers to change their orientation and practices" (Rinehart et al., 1998, p. 634). Williams (2007) also argued that "researchers have not been conducting serious studies of what we might learn about the kinds of decisions teachers make when given the chance and what those decisions mean in terms of student achievement" in empowered environments (p. 216). What currently exists in the literature is only a "starting point to gather other measures of the interpersonal relationship between teachers and their principal" (Rinehart et al., 1986 p. 645). Rinehart et al. (1986) have sparked an interest for robust research to take place pointing out that "the study of persuasion in school leadership is relatively new, and the processes by which principals and teachers influence each other are poorly understood" (pp. 645-646). Although some research exists on the topic of teacher empowerment, Bogler and Somech (2004) noted that the research is limited and does not deeply explore the relationships between teacher commitments, their behaviors, and their level of self esteem in congruence with empowerment. "School leaders need to focus on different qualities of teacher empowerment," yet without a large body of literature available they may be unable to find the necessary resources to assist them in learning what contributes to this behavior (Bogler & Nir, 2012, p. 301). According to Bogler and Nir, the factors playing a role in empowerment are neglected in the literature. However, "if principals create a work environment that enhances feelings of empowerment, teachers may be more likely to trust their supervisors," leading to the accomplishments of greater depth of instruction and learning as required by new change

initiatives (Moye, Henkin, & Egley, 2004, p. 265). Dee, Henkin, and Duemer (2002) offered similar suggestions, advocating the "need to investigate further potential relationships between school team structures and teachers' perceptions of empowerment" (p. 259). In addition to studying the connection between professional relationships with level of empowerment, Dee et al. also reported that prior research reveals a need to "consider the question of empowerment in terms of potential effects on teachers' level of commitment to the school" (p. 261).

The work in this area, then, must generate new data on teacher empowerment that can be added to the existing body of knowledge for practitioners of school leadership. Jackson and Marriott (2012) suggested that more research needs to be conducted on establishing teacher as leaders so that principals can learn how to best strengthen empowerment and organizational relationships. Furthermore, Jackson and Marriott (2012), proposed expansion of data collection to focus on empowerment that results when "teachers and principals are engaged in conjoint activity" as a means to meet school outcomes (p. 236). It has been reported by researchers such as Rice and Schneider (1994) that "teachers continue to desire more involvement than they are afforded" (p. 55). With the desire for increased involvement on behalf of teachers in our schools, educational leaders should aim to unlock the strategies in empowering these professionals and determine ways to best leverage their capabilities to offset the workload in today's school systems.

Principals already struggle to keep up with the daily duties and tasks of running a school. Embracing the changes of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), new technology assessments, transformed report cards, and state legislation greatly jeopardize

principals' available time to provide support and guidance to teachers. Empowering teachers to take on leadership roles and embrace responsibility for new challenges they did not previously possess will allow for greater levels of empowerment, especially, because "empowered teachers believe that they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve it" (Rinehart et al., 1998, p. 635). "Principals who strive to raise teachers' commitment to the organization and to the profession" through an empowerment model will reap benefits from teachers who feel a stronger sense of belonging, which could potentially lead into a trickledown effect that would pave the way for improvements in instruction and students' learning (Bogler & Somech, 2004, p. 286). Teacher empowerment more effectively provides for the completion of the multitude of tasks required of schools through a model that encourages cohesion and collaboration. "Empowerment may provide the conditions necessary to build organizational commitment," developing the endurance necessary for implementation of long-lasting change (Dee et al., 2002, p. 261). Principals are responsible for shaping the climate of their building as a means to create a safe and engaging learning environment for all. This type of setting is necessary for increases in student achievement to continue amidst the new requirements being placed on school districts and school leaders. Bogler and Nir (2012) found that "teachers who consider their school a place that values their contribution and cares about their well-being are more likely to be satisfied both intrinsically and extrinsically" (p. 301). These findings were consistent with previous research of Bogler and Somech (2004) who reported "teachers who have high expectations of themselves to perform effectively and successfully in school will carry out extra functions beyond the formal ones and will feel more committed to their school

and to the teaching profession" (p. 284). Setting the stage for dedication above and beyond traditionally expected responsibilities will be a major task of tomorrow's school leaders. Schools will need to provide a setting in which "principals and teachers reconceptualize roles and responsibilities" to ensure that all requirements are being addressed (Jackson & Marriott, 2012, p. 237). In order to make this evolution a smooth transition, researchers need to continue to add to the growing body of literature on teacher empowerment.

"As accountability and its associated daily practices permeate the work of school leaders worldwide," the need for shared leadership becomes glaringly apparent (Crum, Sherman, & Myran, 2009, p. 48). The question for administrators is how to best leverage their positions as influential leaders to lift and empower the teachers in their buildings to take on new tasks, share in the work load, and inspire others. Principals need to craft the philosophy that "a leader is not a leader simply because of a formal role" encouraging teachers to take part in shared leadership for the overall benefit of the school (Jackson &Marriott, 2012, p. 235). "School leaders need to focus on various qualities of teacher empowerment" to more effectively enact change in their buildings and manage added stress associated with new initiatives (Bogler & Nir, 2012, p. 301). Teacher empowerment has the potential to positively impact the overall organization according to Dee et al. (2002) who reported that "participation in administrative/governance teams and community-relations[*sic*] teams enhanced feelings of empowerment which, in turn, yielded higher levels of organizational commitment" (p. 270). "If teachers are to be empowered and regarded as professionals, then, like other professionals, they must have the freedom to prescribe the best treatment for their students" which can only come from

the release of control from school administrators (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006, p. 44). Understanding that teacher empowerment can lead to stronger organizational commitment can prompt principals to act accordingly and tackle the elevated goals of new state and federal mandates. Unfortunately, today's rapid pace of change offers little time for trial and error in employing different types of leadership styles to generate teacher empowerment. School principals need meaningful and practical steps based on research that they can put in place immediately to empower teachers and move forward in embracing new programs and protocol for change. The problem lies in the lack of information in the area of teacher empowerment, especially in the era of increased school accountability.

Although Bogler and Nir (2012), and Bogler and Somech (2004) conducted studies in Israel on the topic of teacher empowerment, the results may not be generalizable to the United States. The broader literature base, also, is not largely and equally representative of differing levels of education: elementary, middle, and high school. Many of the studies conducted on the topic of teacher empowerment are representative of elementary schools. The field needs more research on teacher empowerment conducted at the middle and high school levels. Additionally, a large proportion of the literature found on the topic of teacher empowerment is qualitative in nature, relying on case studies or interview responses. Social science would benefit from a growing database of quantitative data on the topic of teacher empowerment establishing a great need for such research in this area. The concept of empowering employees within the organization is a topic that is more widely studied in the business world, yet, "there has been little evidence of its existence in the educational realm" (Bogler & Nir, 2012, p.

291). Prompting the need for additional studies and research in this area is the notion that "empowered teachers with increased task motivation, enhanced feelings of meaning, and strong organizational commitment are the foundation" for a sustainable educational infrastructure (Dee et al., 2002, p. 273).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the characteristics and traits of individuals and buildings in which teacher empowerment is strongest so that those schools and individuals can be further studied and emulated. An additional purpose of the study is to investigate the relationships between principals and school environment characteristics and levels of teacher empowerment. It is hypothesized that those buildings that have only one building administrator will have higher levels of teacher empowerment as compared with buildings that have both a principal and assistant principal. The researcher hypothesizes the opposite to be true for buildings with an assistant principal. Furthermore, it is hypothesized that buildings with male administrators will have higher levels of teacher empowerment than buildings with female administrators. Finally, it is hypothesized that school buildings and districts with higher report card ratings, including a higher Performance Index score (PI), and have met or exceeded Value Added in multiple areas, have higher levels of teacher empowerment.

Significance of Study

This study will provide meaningful information to both teachers and educators as they develop plans to best implement new levels of change within their buildings and districts as a result of new legislation and local requirements. The increasing levels of accountability place greater demands on school officials who will need to rely on

teachers to encourage others within the building to improve instructional practice and rigor as a means to generate higher student test scores. Through research in the area of teacher empowerment, educators will come to understand that "the positions of leaders and followers are dynamic as organizations engage in the varied purposes and activities required to accomplish organizational goals" (Jackson & Marriott, 2012, p. 235). Several researchers, such as Bogler and Somech (2004), suggested that the literature be extended to studies that examine the effects variables have on the relationship between teacher empowerment and school related outcomes, prompting the realm of social science to look more closely at this influence process. As the area of study on teacher empowerment is a lacking topic in social science research, and, what little research that does exist is outdated and not applicable to a more modern role and view of school leadership, this study will reexamine the concept of teacher empowerment during a time in which new educational initiatives continue to accumulate. Learning how to increase teacher empowerment within the culture of initiative overload will help to develop sustainability of schools over time.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This investigative study hypothesizes a relationship between perceived level of teacher empowerment and four different constructs. First, the study hypothesizes a relationship between gender of school principals and the degree to which teachers feel empowered in their buildings. Additionally, the study hypothesizes that teachers in buildings without an assistant principal are more likely to perceive increased levels of empowerment. The study then investigates whether or not a relationship exists between levels of perceived empowerment and in which type of building the teacher is employed: elementary, middle, or high school. Finally, this investigation hypothesizes that those teachers in school buildings with a principal of longer tenure perceive greater levels of empowerment than those teachers who work under an administrator who has fewer years of administrative experience. Teachers will complete a survey instrument to assess their perceptions concerning the extent to which they have been empowered in their professional work setting. Principals will complete a demographic survey to elicit information such as gender, years of experience, and their perceptions of how much empowerment they extend to their teachers.

The two surveys will then be analyzed for potential relationships. Gender will be a complex factor to analyze for both teachers and principals. This study hypothesizes that gender of building principal will make a difference in the amount to which teachers in the building feel that they are empowered. However, it is possible that male and female teachers interpret their experiences of empowerment differently. Therefore,

gender of teacher in relation to gender of school building principal will need to be carefully analyzed and delineated in the reporting of results.

Research Questions

This study will focus on the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference in the level of teacher empowerment experienced in school buildings with female administrators versus male administrators?
2. Is there a difference in the level of teacher empowerment experienced in school buildings with an assistant principal as compared to those buildings without an assistant principal?
3. How do levels of perceived empowerment differ depending on the building level (elementary, middle, or high school)?
4. Are stronger feelings of teacher empowerment experienced with principals of longer tenure?
5. Do male or female teachers feel more empowered?
6. What other variables moderate reported levels of empowerment (i.e., years of experience of teacher, years of experience of administrator, participants' occupation)?

Design of the Study

This quantitative study will explore the relationships existing between principals' and teachers' perceptions of levels of empowerment. The quantitative study will use a survey design in order to gather responses from teachers and principals. The 38-item School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), with the addition of demographics and six open-ended questions, will compose the primary data collection for this research.

Participants

The Superintendents of the nine school districts in a northeast county of Ohio will be contacted for permission for teachers and principals to participate in this study. The nine school districts in this county include: District A (two buildings), District B (three buildings), District C (five buildings), District D (13 buildings), District E (five buildings), District F (four buildings), District G (eight buildings), District H (three buildings), and District I (12 buildings). Upon approval from the Superintendent, email directory information for principals and teachers will be accessed through the human resource liaison for the district or the district's web page. Details regarding the number of participants from each district are provided in Table 1.

Table 1 *Sample Size by District*

District A	27
District B	76
District C	223
District D	459
District E	162
District F	105
District G	244
District H	101
District I	571
Source: National Center For Education Statistics (2015)	Total number of district employees in Lake County, Ohio: 1,968

Instrumentation

The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) Plus will be distributed to teachers and principals in all participating school districts in the selected county (Short &Rinehart, 1992). This 38-item instrument "measures an overall perception of empowerment" using a "5-point Likert-type scale" (Rinehart et al., 1998, p. 638). The SPES has been used by other researchers such as Bogler and Nir (2012), Bogler and Somech (2004), and Rinehart et al. (1998), documenting its recognized credibility and widespread use in the field of social science research. The instrument was designed by Short and Rinehart (1992) to "assess several conceptually derived dimensions" of empowerment (p. 953). The survey was created through a sequence of three stages:

- In the first stage, 79 teacher-leaders and a "panel of four experts in school empowerment" participated in the study (p. 953). Participants listed "ways in which they felt empowered in the schools in which they taught" (p. 953). A list of 110 items was created, which was then decreased to 75 items that were "judged by the authors to represent empowerment components from past research" (p. 954). Content validity of the 75 items was established with ratings from the panel of four experts (p. 954). The number of items was then condensed further to 68 items as a "one-digit difference criterion was set for item inclusion" based on judges' ratings (p. 954).
- In stage 2, "211 secondary teachers from three high schools in three states" participated in the study and completed the survey (p. 954). In this stage, "factor analysis revealed six dimensions of empowerment" (p. 956). The six dimensions

are decision-making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact. In his dissertation research, Sharp (2009) found the stable reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) across these six factors ranging from $\alpha = .81$ to $\alpha = .89$.

- The third stage of the survey creation consisted of a study in which "176 secondary teachers in three schools in three states" participated (Short & Rinehart, p. 956). The researchers selected these schools to "provide the contrast necessary to test discriminate validity of the 68-item instrument used in" the previous stage (p. 956). The survey will be presented through the online Survey Monkey tool and will also include six demographic inventory questions and three open-ended questions.

The SPES consists of 38 questions that can be categorized in six dimensions of teacher empowerment: decision-making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact (Rinehart & Short, 1992). A copy of the SPES plus is provided in Appendix A.

Decision-Making

Decision-making refers to the practice of including teachers in the collective process of coming to consensus on solutions to problems to benefit the school or district. According to Ingersoll (1996) "teachers ought to have input into a school's allocative, planning, and strategic policies" (p. 163). Teachers, therefore, should be empowered to partake in decision-making practices so that they, too, have "influence over school policy" (Ingersoll, p. 164). Ingersoll elaborated on his definition of decision-making by explaining that it is "the extent to which teachers have power over the social and normative decisions in schools" (p. 171).

Professional Growth

Teachers feel better equipped and eager to participate in opportunities for greater responsibility within the school when they have invested time and energy into their professional growth. Leadership skills and traits are often enhanced and developed further through professional growth opportunities in which teachers take part. Professional growth is closely linked to teacher empowerment in that "involving district professional teachers in local professional development activities may have the impact of spotlighting specific skills while personalizing the process" (Hickey & Harris, 2005, p. 12). Furthermore, "allowing employees to participate in [professional growth] in profound ways increases the sense of ownership that exists" (Hickey & Harris, 2005, p. 13).

Status

Status refers to how teachers perceive the extent to which their work and contribution to the field are valued by individuals around them. "Raising teachers' status is not mainly about raising salaries," but, rather is about valuing the work that they do through empowering them to take greater autonomy in decision-making practices (Dillon, 2011, para. 16). Status includes the amount of respect teachers receive from others such as students, parents, administrators, and community members. Status increases when teachers feel that they are working in "a respected and supported profession" (Sawchuk, 2012, para. 11). Status is the "degree of prestige" teachers feel for the work in which they are invested and, one of the major reasons for lagging status is the "perceived lack of trust in educators and absence of professional autonomy in schools" (Sawchuk, 2012, para. 46).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is another dimension of empowerment that is related to teachers' "openness to new ideas and their attitudes toward teaching" (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy 1998, p. 214). In terms of teacher empowerment, "self-efficacy has to do with self-perception of competence rather than actual level of competence" (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 211). "Teachers' beliefs about their own capacities as teachers" exemplifies how self-efficacy can be defined in the educational setting (Tschannen-Moran et al., p. 202). Additionally, teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy have been found to believe that "they could control, or at least strongly influence student achievement and motivation" (Tschannen-Moran et al., p. 202).

Autonomy

Empowering teachers requires the development of their autonomy. Teacher autonomy, according to Lamb (2001), is the "extent to which teachers have the capacity to improve their own teaching through their own efforts" (p. 33). Autonomy, then, is the "freedom to be able to teach in the way that one wants to teach" (p. 33). Furthermore, autonomy involves "teachers in considering their own long-standing beliefs about the nature of learning and in particular about the roles of teachers and learners, and being prepared to reflect on them critically" (Lamb, p. 32).

Impact

Teacher impact refers to the "life-transforming effects" they have on students (Hanushek, 2011, p. 42). The more opportunities teachers have to be empowered, the more they are likely to feel that they have a greater sense of impact in the field. Impact relates to a determinate of effectiveness and how teachers perceive that they are able to

change a student's life (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013). Protheroe (2008) stated that impact exists when teachers "believe they can teach all children in ways that enable them to meet" high standards (p. 45).

The SPES was selected for this study because of its reliability and successful use by other researchers in the field of education. Squire-Kelly (2012) used the SPES in her study of 135 middle school teachers in Georgia. The purpose of her study "was to determine if there is a relationship between teacher empowerment and student achievement" (p. 50). Therefore, Squire-Kelly coded each "teacher's scale score from the SPES to the teacher's student achievement data" (p. 50). After coding, the "relationship between teacher empowerment and student achievement was computed through the use of a Pearson correlation" (p. 51). Squire-Kelly's findings from use of the SPES "revealed there was no correlation between teacher empowerment and student achievement" (p. 60).

Psychoyos (2012) also used the SPES as a means to "explore the perceptions of K-12 teachers to discover how they observed and may have influenced organizational learning at their schools" (p. 9). Psychoyos intended to contribute to the "knowledge base about how and to what extent teacher empowerment influenced organizational learning in schools" (p. 9). Although her ethnomethodological case study was largely comprised of individual interviews with 25 Pre-Kindergarten through 12th-grade teachers, she administered the SPES to teachers in the study on three different occasions to triangulate her data (Psychoyos, 2012). Psychoyos administered the SPES multiple times "for the purpose of comparing perceptions about personal empowerment" as teachers participated in the ProEd Professional Learning Community [ProEd PLC] program

(p.61). Findings from her mixed-methods data collection showed that "teacher empowerment perceptions increased during the 10-month study" (Psychoyos, p. 104).

Klecker (1996) also used the SPES to measure perceived teacher empowerment. The purpose of his use of this instrument was to "examine and describe teacher empowerment in schools undertaking restructuring through the use of Venture Capital grants in the state of Ohio" (p. 10). More specifically, Klecker's descriptive research study of 307 Venture Capital schools looked closely at the "relationships between the demographic characteristics and teacher empowerment" and the "relationship between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction" (p. 10). Klecker selected the SPES instrument for the population of his study, which included 10,554 teachers and 307 principals , as it "was the only one identified through [his] literature review that measured as many as six of the multi-dimensional construct [*sic*] of teacher empowerment" (p. 56). Klecker's findings indicated "significant differences between the way female teachers and male teachers had responded" (p. 85). In general, findings indicated that "the elementary teachers' mean ratings were higher than those of teachers in the other three categories" (Klecker, p. 90). Klecker concluded from responses gathered on the SPES that "teachers in the Venture Capital Schools [felt] they have not had a strong impact with other teachers" (p. 287). Klecker noted that "there was a difference in the total score on the School Participant Empowerment Scale by school level […as] elementary teachers rated their empowerment higher than high school teachers [*sic*]" (p. 315).

Procedure

With permission from the Superintendents of the public schools in a northeast county in Ohio, a questionnaire will be distributed to both teachers and principals in this

county to collect data on perceived levels of teacher empowerment. The survey will be distributed to teachers and principals through the use of Survey Monkey, an online survey and data collection tool. Data will be collected from teachers and principals within a two month period. All demographic data pertaining to the makeup of each school will be taken from district report cards as reported by the ODE.

Upon receiving approval from the Internal Review Board (IRB) at Youngstown State University, a letter requesting participation in this study will be sent to the nine Superintendents in a northeast county of Ohio. After permission is granted from Superintendents, letters will be sent to teachers and principals explaining this research project and requesting their participation. The letter will also include a distinct five-digit code for each participant to access the online survey and directions to access the online survey link. Directions for completing the survey will be included. The codes will be used to track and pair the teacher and principal respondents to their respective school buildings, eliminating the need to track them by name. Two weeks after letters are mailed, a postcard reminder will be sent to non-respondents. Two weeks later an email reminder to anyone who had not yet responded will be sent out.

Proposed Data Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics will be used to address research questions. Reliability estimates will be computed for the established factors of the SPES. Some form of regression analysis will likely be used to assess relationships that exist. Open-ended responses will be analyzed for trends.

Limitations of Methodology

The validity of this research project could be compromised by a lack of participation. A limitation of this study is that it will not be generalizable to larger and more urban school districts. The data will only be representative of schools in northeast Ohio and will not generalize nationwide. Depending on the number of female administrators employed in Lake County, the data might not show an adequate representation of experiences with female administration. The data collected will be mostly quantitative in nature, aside from three open-ended questions included in the survey, limiting the possibility for more in-depth and reflective responses that could be generated through interviews or focus groups with teachers and principals. Therefore, the data may be limited in showing the range and variation of empowerment within schools.

Summary

This study will provide timely and meaningful data applicable to current school leaders. The data collected will contribute to the growing body of literature in the area of teacher empowerment. As the educational arena embraces new initiatives and reform for more rigorous education, so will the need for ongoing research continue to grow and demand that leadership practices be studied and analyzed. Public schools hoping to raise student achievement in light of higher standards, more rigorous assessments, and greater fiscal strains will benefit from the data collected through this project.

Chapter 4

The focus of this study is grounded in the perceptions teachers have regarding the amount in which they feel empowered in their school building. As the job of the building principal becomes more demanding and inundated with countless additional responsibilities, it is imperative that principals empower their teachers to take on some of the additional responsibilities within the building. The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) Plus survey was sent to teachers and administrators in seven of the nine public school districts in Lake County, Ohio, who gave their consent to gather data on the perceptions these school employees have relevant to teacher empowerment. The 38 Likert scale questions found on the SPES survey, plus six open-ended questions, were asked of participants to uncover trends, patterns, and correlations between the behaviors and demographics of building principal and their teachers' feelings of empowerment.

The data from all respondents included in this study were gathered through the on-line survey questionnaire tool, Survey Monkey. After the completion of the data collection, all results were exported into SPSS for further analysis. A total of 317 completed surveys were received from seven different school districts located in northeast Ohio. The survey was sent to 938 educators in Lake County. The total response rate was 33.8 %.

This chapter outlines the specific data analyses that were run to explore the data collected from the survey. The demographics of the study are presented first and include an overview of the distribution and frequency of responses from participants. Reliability analysis is then presented showing how the 38 items on the SPES are categorized into six

different elements of empowerment. The reliability analysis was conducted to determine the reliability of participants' response for each of the six empowerment dimensions. Tests of basic statistical assumptions follow the reliability analysis to show independence. Independence is important as it will show that behaviors of one participant do not influence others. After the presentation of tests of basic statistical assumptions, the analysis of individual research question is exhibited. Finally, a summary of results from the statistical analysis is shared.

Demographics

In order to develop greater insight for the respondents of the study, descriptive data were collected and reviewed. Demographic variables of gender, occupation, and years of experience in the occupation for all participants were charted and analyzed. Reviewing the demographic data assisted in developing a better overall understanding of the participants and helped determine if they presented a well represented sample.

Respondents included teachers, building administrators, and central office administrators from school districts located in Lake County, Ohio. The size of the school districts varied. Two of the school districts in the county declined to participate, yielding 78% of the districts participating. Of the 317respondents, *n*=237 were female (74.53%) and *n*= 78 were male (24.53-%). Elementary school teachers were the highest representation with *n*=114 (35.85%) total respondents. The second highest representation of participants was middle school teachers with a total sample of *n*=79 respondents (24.84%). Only *n*=10 (3.13%) principals responded and n=6 (1.89%) holding central office positions.

The demographic variables of gender, occupation, and years of experience in current positions were included in the survey to more thoroughly understand the participants in the sample. The first question asked in the survey provided the distribution of responses from each school district participating. As seen in Table 2, the largest response was from the Painesville School District, followed by Wickliffe, then Perry.

Table 2 *Distribution of Survey Response by District*

District	*f*	%
Fairport Harbor	9	2.83
Kirtland	37	11.64
Madison	44	13.48
Painesville	73	22.96
Perry	52	16.35
Riverside	48	15.09
Wickliffe	53	16.67

This distribution of responses is somewhat representative of the number of district personnel in the participating districts. The table below shows the number of employees in each district according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2015). As indicated, the largest number of teachers is found in the Riverside School District followed by the Madison School District, then the Painesville School District. Of the top three districts that had highest percentage of participation, two are in the top three for having the greatest number of employed teachers: Riverside and Painesville. Perry, which is the fourth smallest district in terms of number of teachers employed, was in the top three of highest percentage of participation.

Table 3 *Number of Employees*

District	# of Teachers
Fairport Harbor	27
Kirtland	76
Madison	223
Painesville	162
Perry	105
Riverside	244
Wickliffe	101

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of both teachers and administrators on the amount to which they believe teachers are empowered in their current school setting. Therefore, it was imperative for respondents to acknowledge their occupation so that survey responses could be distinguished between those of teachers and those of administrators. Table 4 documents the number of respondents for each occupation.

Table 4 *Occupation*

Occupation	*f*	*%*
Elementary Teacher	114	35.85
Middle School Teacher	79	24.84
High School Teacher	75	23.58
Elementary Principal	1	.31
Elementary Assistant Principal	1	.31
Middle School Principal	5	1.57
High School Principal	1	.31
High School Assistant Principal	2	.63
Central Office Administrator	6	1.89
Other	27	8.49
Elementary and Middle School Teacher	1	.31
Middle and High School Teacher	4	1.26

As shown in the table above, the majority of the 317 respondents, *n*= 114 (35.58%) reported that they are elementary school teachers. The second highest percentage of participants in the study was middle school teachers, *n*=79 (24.84), closely

followed by high school teachers, *n*=75 (23.58). Therefore, the total number of teacher respondents is 273. According to NCES, there are 105,999.80 teachers in the state of Ohio. The number of administrator responses was low when compared with the number of teacher responses which is representative of today's public school structure. There was only one elementary and one high school principal that responded to the survey in addition to five middle school principals who responded. The data revealed that 27 (8.49%) respondents selected the category of other for their occupation.

In order to more adequately track respondents' answers in relation to the type of administrative structure they work under, it was relevant to view the number of teachers at each building level (elementary, middle, or high school) separately, by district. Table 5 documents the number of teachers in each building from each district that participated in the survey.

Table 5 *Teacher Occupation by District*

District	Elementary Teacher	Middle School Teacher	High School Teacher	Elementary and Middle School Teacher	Middle and High School Teacher
Fairport Harbor	3	1	4	0	1
Kirtland	16	8	8	0	1
Madison	20	9	7	0	0
Painesville	33	20	10	0	1
Perry	13	21	12	0	0
Riverside	17	9	16	0	1
Wickliffe	12	11	18	1	0

Similarly, it was relevant to determine the number of administrators at each building level per district to compare administrative structures with teachers' reported levels of perceived empowerment. Table 6 indicates the number of administrators by position from each district that participated in the survey.

Table 6 *Administrator Occupation by District*

District	Elementary Principal	Elementary Assistant Principal	Middle School Principal	High School Principal	High School Assistant Principal	Central Office Administrator	Other
Fairport Harbor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kirtland	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Madison	0	0	0	0	2	0	6
Painesville	1	0	2	0	0	2	4
Perry	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
Riverside	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Wickliffe	0	0	1	0	0	3	7

The survey participants were asked to indicate their gender. Table 7 specifies the responses by gender of the respondents.

Table 7 *Gender*

Gender	*F*	%
Male	78	24.53
Female	237	74.53

As noted in this table, the majority of individuals who participated in the survey were female. This is representative of the national number of public school female educators compared with males. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, 75.9% of the nation's teachers are female and 24.1% are male (NCES, 2015).

Table 8 *Gender by Occupation*

	Elementary Teacher	Middle School Teacher	High School Teacher	Elementary Principal	Elementary Assistant Principal	Middle School Principal	High School Principal	High School Assistant Principal
Male	13	16	35	1	1	3	1	1
Female	101	63	39	0	0	2	0	1

The next question asked respondents to report if there is an assistant principal working in their building. In this data set, 63.52% of respondents reported that they work in a building with an assistant principal. Of the participants in the study, *n*=106 (33.33%) reported that they work in a building that does not have an assistant principal.

Table 9 *Assistant Principal Position Exists in the Building*

Assistant Principal	*f*	%
Yes	202	63.52
No	106	33.33

The subsequent category was gender of the building principal. There was a somewhat equal split in gender of male building principals with *n*=169 (53.14%) and *n*=136 (42.77%) of female building principals. These findings were not consistent with national statistics that report 51.6% of school principals are female and 48.4% are male (NCES, 2015).

Table 10 *Gender of Building Principal*

Gender	*f*	%
Male	169	53.14
Female	136	42.77

Next, respondents were asked to report on the gender of their assistant principal if applicable. Table 11 summarizes the gender of assistant principals of the respondents. The data in the table revealed that *n*=83 (26.10%) respondents work with a male assistant principal and *n*=101 (31.76%) respondents work with a female assistant principal.

Table 11 *Gender of Assistant Principal*

Gender	*f*	%
Male	83	26.10
Female	101	31.76

The current investigation examines whether or not a correlation between years of experience teaching and the amount to which one feels empowered exists. Therefore, the next survey item asked participants to report how many years of experience in education they had.

Table 12 *Participants' Years of Experience*

Years	*f*	*%*
Less than 5 years	42	13.21
6-10 years	66	20.75
11-15 years	69	21.70
16-20 years	61	19.18
21-25 years	43	13.52
26-30 years	19	5.97
31-35 years	3	4.09
Over 35 years	2	.94

The largest number of respondents, *n*=69 (21.70%) reported having 11-15 years of experience, followed closely by *n*=66 (20.75%) who reported having 6-10 years of experience, then *n*=61 (19.18%) who reported having 16-20 years of experience. The

smallest category of respondents was that of the over 35 years' bracket which only 2 (.94%) participants selected. Closely related was the category of 31-35 years which only three respondents marked as their total years of experience (4.09%).

The investigation was designed to determine whether or not a correlation exists between the level of perceived empowerment of a teacher and the number of years of experience the building principal had. Therefore, the survey asked participants how many years of experience in administration their current school building principal had. The results are in Table 13.

Table 13 *Building Principal Years of Experience*

Years	*f*	*%*
Less than 5 years	106	33.33
6-10 years	56	17.61
11-15 years	28	8.81
16-20 years	5	1.57
21-25 years	7	2.20
26-30 years	5	1.57
31-35 years	2	.63
Over 35 years	4	1.26
Don't Know	94	29.56

When responding to years of experience for building principals, the highest percentages of responses were found for the less than five years' designation with 106 individuals (33.33 %). The second highest population of responses was from those individuals who did not know how many years of experience their building principal had in administration. This category yielded 94 (29.56%) responses. The data showed that 56 respondents reported that their building principal has 6-10 years of experience in administration and 28 reported that their principals have 11-15 years of experience.

The subsequent question of the survey then asked the number of years of experience assistant principals had. Table 14 summarizes the results.

Table 14 *Assistant Principal Years of Experience*

Years	*f*	%
Less than 5 years	111	34.91
6-10 years	8	2.52
11-15 years	10	3.14
16-20 years	3	.94
21-25 years	2	.63
26-30 years	2	.63
31-35 years	2	.63
Don't Know	59	18.55
Don't have an assistant principal	61	19.18

Similar to the previous question, the largest number of respondents' answers for assistant principals' years of experience fell in the less than five years' category with 111 (34.91%). A considerable percentage 18.55% (n=59) of respondents reported that they did not know how many years of experience their assistant principal has in administration. Another noteworthy percentage, 19.18% (n=61) reported that they do not have an assistant principal in their building. The categories of 21-25 years, 26-30 years, and 31-35 years all had two responses which equaled only .63%.

Reliability Analysis

The SPES consists of 38 questions that can be categorized in six dimensions of teacher empowerment: Status, Professional Growth, Self-Efficacy, Decision-Making, Impact, and Autonomy (Rinehart & Short, 1992). Reliability analysis was conducted to determine the reliability of participants' responses for each of the six dimensions. Reliability is measured by Cronbach's Alpha. According to Filed (2009), Cronbach's Alpha is a measurement of internal consistency that shows the extent to which items within a group are related.

Questions 2, 3, 8, 15, 20, and 21 of the SPES pertained to the first factor of Status. Status indicates the degree to which teachers feel that their work and contributions to the

organization are valued by others. Table 15 delineates the reliability coefficient for the dimension of Status.

Table 15 *Status*

Factor	Items	A
Status	6	.81

Factor two is that of Professional Growth and corresponds with questions 12, 14, 16, and 26 of the SPES. Professional Growth encompasses a teacher's willingness and availability to participate in continuing education through workshops, staff meetings, college classes, online learning modules, and professional reading. The extent to which teachers have opportunities to take part in learning situations that help them develop and grow their level of expertise is linked to one's level of professional development. Table 16 outlines the reliability coefficient based on survey results for the factor of Professional Growth.

Table 16 *Professional Growth*

Factor	Items	A
Professional Growth	4	.71

Self-efficacy is factor three, which describes teachers' attitudes and dispositions toward their practice of educating students. This factor is related to the self-perceptions teachers have of their level of competence and capacities as an educator. Table 17 shows the reliability factor for Self-efficacy.

Table 17 *Self-efficacy*

Factor	Items	A
Self-efficacy	12	.89

The next factor is that of Decision-Making. The following questions are linked with the factor of Decision-Making: 1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, and 24. Decision-Making is related to the act of being involved in the process of building consensus to solve problems. This factor also involves teachers' abilities and willingness to provide input into the policies and practices of the school. The reliability factor for Decision-Making can be found below in Table 18.

Table 18 *Decision-Making*

Factor	Items	A
Decision-Making	8	.78

Factor five is Impact, or a teacher's ability to have an effect on students. The extent to which teachers feel they are effective and can change a student's life is their ability to impact. Table 19 documents the reliability factor for Impact.

Table 19 *Impact*

Factor	Items	A
Impact	5	.78

The final factor is that of Autonomy. Autonomy is the ability to self-directly improve one's practice or behaviors. Autonomy is grounded in one's personal effort to improve and change. The reliability factor for Autonomy is shown in Table 20.

Table 20 *Autonomy*

Factor	Items	A
Autonomy	3	.867

Based on the guidelines of Field (2013), all of the reliability estimates meet or exceed the minimally acceptable guidelines. This indicates that the SPES reliability measured the six factors it is intended to measure.

Test of Basic Statistical Assumptions

To judge assumptions for this study, independence must be established. According to Field (2013), independence is important so that it can be shown that "the behavior of one participant does not influence the behavior of another" (p. 133). Respondents in this investigation were invited to participate individually through email. Participants were not made aware of other individuals taking part in the survey.

The SPES consists of 38 questions that can be separated into six factors of teacher empowerment: Status, Professional Growth, Self-efficacy, Decision-Making, Impact, and Autonomy (Rinehart & Short, 1992). An analysis of the mean, standard deviation was conducted in SPSS. Additionally, skewness, kurtosis, and Kolomogrov Smirnov tests were conducted in an effort to examine whether the variables were normally distributed. The values associated with each of the factors are provided in Table 21.

Table 21 *Descriptive Statistics for Each Sub-Factor*

Measure	*Status*	*Professional Growth*	*Self-efficacy*	*Decision-Making*	*Impact*	*Autonomy*
Mean	3.97	3.80	4.21	2.99	3.37	2.53
Std Dev	.58	.58	.44	.62	.69	1.03
Kurtosis	.73	.28	1.72	-.43	.39	-.72
Skewness	-.57	-.40	-.43	-.07	-.45	.15
K-S	1.93*	1.98*	1.39*	.92*	1.57*	1.72*

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

Skewness and kurtosis were within the acceptable range for all factors. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was significant for all factors. Based on the guidelines provided by Field (2013), these factors can be assumed normally distributed.

A Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was conducted to assess if the factors demonstrate homogeneity of variance. Table 22 shows the homogeneity of variance as calculated through this test.

Table 22 *Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances*

Test	F	Df1	Df2	Sig.
Status	1.689	7	155	.115
Pro Growth	.539	7	155	.804
Self-Efficacy	.744	7	155	.635
Decision-Making	1.627	7	155	.132
Impact	.775	7	155	.609
Autonomy	.404	7	155	.899

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 22, none of the factors presented significant values for the Levene's test, indicating that homogeneity of variance is tenable for each of the factors (Field, 2013).

Lastly, zero-order correlations were conducted in an effort to understand the relationship between the six factors. These results are presented in Table 23.

Table 23 *Zero-Order Correlations between Sub-Factors of Empowerment*

	Status	Professional Growth	Self-Efficacy	Decision-Making	Impact	Autonomy
Status	-	.471**	.465**	.449**	.578**	.249**
Professional Growth		-	.460**	.528**	.650**	.191**
Self-Efficacy			-	.430**	.413**	.271**
Decision-Making				-	.542**	.483**
Impact					-	.282**
Autonomy						-

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Analysis of Research Questions

This investigation sought to answer six research questions. The SPES instrument was used to gather data to provide insight into each question's area of focus. The first two research questions asked:

1. Is there a difference in the level of teacher empowerment experienced in school buildings with female administrators versus male administrators?
2. Is there a difference in the level of teacher empowerment experienced in school buildings with an assistant principal?

A MANOVA was conducted in an effort to answer these two questions which looked at the six factors together and separately across whether the administrator and/or the assistant principal were male/female. In addition, the gender of the participant (research question five) was examined as part of the MANOVA.

The Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices is shown in Table 22. This function tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups. The test violated the notion of equality, F (147, 4968) = 1.21, p = .045. However, the error degrees of freedom are greater than 20 and, therefore, Field (2013) maintained that this violation will not present any statistical issues. The multivariate test asks the question across all six factors considered as one, but it isolates the overlap in the factors. Table 23 shows the results of the multivariate test.

Table 24 *Multivariate Tests*

Effect	*f*	*Hypothesis df*	*Error df*	*Sig*
Gender	.822	6.000	150.000	.555
Is your building principal male or female?	3.419	6.000	150.000	.003*
Is your assistant principal male or female?	2.739	6.000	150.000	.015*
Gender	.822	6.000	150.000	.555
Is your building principal male or female by Participant Gender	.411	6.000	150.000	.871
Is your assistant principal male or female by Participant Gender	.830	6.000	150.000	.548

Based on the multivariate analysis, examining all of the factors as if they represented a single factor of empowerment, the gender of the building principal, and the gender of the assistant principal has a significant association with the level of empowerment reported. No significant differences were found for gender of participant, or interactions with gender of participants. The next analysis examines each factor separately on the same variables. Table 25 shows the results of this test.

Table 25 *F Tests Results of Between-Subjects' Effects*

Factor	Gender of Teacher	Gender of Principal	Gender of Asst Principal
Status	1.092	7.588*	0.068
Prof. Growth	0.432	2.865	1.294
Self-Efficacy	3.304	1.631	4.969*
Decision-Making	0.005	1.405	2.298
Impact	0.324	5.362*	1.469
Autonomy	0.338	1.263	1.864

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 25 the gender of the participant did not have an impact on the participants' reported level of empowerment across any of the factors. However, the level of empowerment on the factor of Status and Impact was significantly associated to the gender of the principal, and, the level of empowerment on the factor of Self-Efficacy

was significantly associated with the gender of the participants' assistant principal. Specifically, participants with male principals had a higher reported level of Status empowerment ($M = 4.01$, $sd = 5.6$) compared to participants with female principals ($M = 3.91$, $sd = .60$). Participants with male principals had a higher reported level of Impact empowerment ($M = 3.48$, $sd = .63$) compared to participants with female principals ($M = 3.29$, $sd = .76$). Participants with male, assistant principals had a higher reported level of Self-Efficacy empowerment ($M = 4.31$, $sd = .41$) compared to participants with female assistant principals ($M = 4.15$, $sd = .44$). Further analysis of the interaction between participant gender and the principal or assistant principal gender revealed no significant interactions.

The third research question asked in which buildings (elementary, middle, or high schools) are levels of perceived empowerment greatest. This was considered by examining the impact of building level for each factor and for the sum of all factors. Table 26 provides the results from a One Way ANOVA that compared the means.

Table 26 *Analysis of Variance Examining the Impact of Building Level on Empowerment Factors*

Factors	F	Between Groups Df	Total Df	Sig
Status	1.48	2	267	.229
Pro Growth	2.03	2	267	.133
Self-Efficacy	1.22	2	267	.295
Decision-Making	2.17	2	267	.117
Impact	2.53	2	267	.081
Autonomy	5.10	2	267	.007*
Total Factors	.21	2	267	.814

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 26, the empowerment factor of Autonomy was found to be significant across the different building levels. Specifically, participants working in an

elementary building had a higher reported level of Autonomy empowerment ($M = 2.76$, $sd = 1.07$) when compared to participants in a middle school ($M = 2.29$, $sd = .93$) and to those in a high school ($M = 2.49$, $sd = 1.04$). No other factors were found to be significant.

The fourth research question examines whether stronger feelings of teacher empowerment were felt with principals of longer tenure? The results of a one way ANOVA are presented in Table 27.

Table 27 *ANOVA Examining Feelings of Empowerment in Relation to Principals' Length of Tenure*

Factors	F	Df	Total Df	Sig.
Status	1.93	7	272	.078
Pro Growth	2.76	7	272	.014*
Self-Efficacy	1.20	7	272	.308
Decision-Making	.43	7	272	.857
Impact	1.05	7	272	.394
Autonomy	1.60	7	272	.150
Total Factors	.69	7	272	.654

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 27, the factor of Professional Growth was associated with length of principals' tenure. Specifically, participants with a principal of 6-10 years' experience had the highest reported level of Professional Growth empowerment ($M = 3.98$, $sd = .56$).

Research question five addressed whether male or female teachers felt more empowered. As previously indicated in Table 24, showing the multivariate tests for research questions one and two, gender of the participant was not associated with perceived level of empowerment.

The last research question examines what other variables might moderate the level of reported empowerment. The variables examined for this analysis included years of experience of teacher, whether or not there is an assistant principal, and the years of experience of the assistant principal. Table 28 shows the results of the relationship between feelings of empowerment to years of experience as a teacher.

Table 28 *ANOVA Examining Feelings of Empowerment in Relation to Teachers' Years of Experience in the Field*

Factors	F	Df	Total Df	Sig.
Status	1.20	7	272	.303
Pro Growth	2.02	7	272	.053
Self-Efficacy	.92	7	272	.489
Decision-Making	1.03	7	272	.407
Impact	1.37	7	272	.219
Autonomy	.99	7	272	.436
Total Factors	1.53	7	272	.156

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 28, none of the sub-factors were associated with length of teachers' tenure.

The next variable in this last research question considered whether or not there is an assistant principal in the building. Table 29 indicates the results from this one way ANOVA comparison.

Table 29 *Test of Homogeneity of Variances – Feelings of Empowerment in Relation to Whether or Not the Building Working in Has an Assistant Principal*

Factors	F	Df	Total Df	Sig.
Status	1.03	1	272	.310
Pro Growth	2.47	1	272	.117
Self-Efficacy	1.20	1	272	.274
Decision-Making	11.23	1	272	.001*
Impact	3.13	1	272	.078
Autonomy	1.26	1	272	.262
Total Factors	.15	1	272	.697

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 29, the empowerment factor of Decision-Making was associated with whether or not the school building has an assistant principal.

Research question six considered whether the number of years of experience of the assistant principal was related to the factors of empowerment felt by teachers. Table 30 presents the findings from this one way ANOVA.

Table 30 *ANOVA Examining Impact of Assistant Principals' Tenure*

Factors	F	Df	Total Df	Sig.
Status	1.84	10	272	.054
Professional Growth	2.41	10	272	.009
Self-Efficacy	1.14	10	272	.334
Decision-Making	2.10	10	272	.025*
Impact	1.94	10	270	.041*
Autonomy	.60	10	272	.812
Total Factors	1.62	10	272	.100

Note: * indicates $p < .05$

As indicated in Table 30, the empowerment factors of Decision-Making and Impact were associated with the years of experience of the building assistant principal. Specifically, participants with an assistant principal of 11-15 years' experience had the highest reported level of Decision-Making empowerment ($M = 3.61$, $sd = .56$).

Participants with an assistant principal of 6-10 years' experience had the highest reported level of Impact empowerment ($M = 3.57$, $sd = .41$).

The last six questions of the survey instrument were open-ended questions that invited participants to share their thoughts, feelings, and opinions regarding their personal experiences with empowerment. These questions were numbered 47-52 on the survey instrument and can be seen in the last page of the survey in Appendix A. The open-ended questions were as follows:

1) In the box below describe what behaviors or actions your principal takes to make you and/or others in your building feel empowered?
2) In the box below, tell about a time in which you were empowered to take part in a decision making process for your current school or district.
3) In your opinion what are the benefits to empowering teachers? Describe your thoughts in the box below.
4) In your opinion, what are the benefits to being empowered as a teacher to take on more leadership responsibilities?
5) What incentives would motivate you as a teacher to take on additional roles or job responsibilities?
6) What barriers (if any) prevent teachers from taking on additional responsibilities or a leadership role?

Participants' responses were analyzed and grouped by common themes and trends.

When considering actions that the principal has taken to make teachers feel empowered many participants reported that their principal allowed them to make decisions and/or solicited their input. The second question asked respondents to describe

a time in which they felt empowered. Several responses for this question focused on being involved in group or committee work or in the hiring process of new employees. The next open-ended question probed into respondents' thoughts on the benefits to empowering teachers. Participants shared comments that largely focused on common trends of increased motivation, increased performance and productivity of teachers, and creating a stronger sense of ownership. The fourth open-ended question asked participants what they felt the benefits to being an empowered teacher include. The most common answer to this question centered on developing the feelings of being respected and valued. The next question in the series asked participants to comment on incentives that would motivate a teacher to take on more responsibilities. The most frequently reported answers for this question were specific to extra time, compensation, and gaining respect and recognition. The final open-ended question focused on the barriers that prevent teachers from taking on additional responsibilities. The most common responses for this question cited time, money, and existing family and personal commitments.

Summary

A close review of the demographic data in this investigation revealed that 317 school employees were represented from seven school districts in Lake County, Ohio. Of the total respondents, 273 were teachers and 10 were building principals. The school district with the highest response rate was Painesville; 73 of its employees completed the survey which totaled 22.96% of all responses received. The highest percentage of responses was received from elementary teachers totaling 114 or 35.85% of all responses. The majority of participants were females (n=237, 74.53%). These data were consistent with the national number of public school female educators compared with male

educators as NCES reports that 75.9% of the nation's teachers are female and 24.1% are male (NCES, 2015).

Sixty-three percent of respondents work in a building that has an assistant principal, while 106 (33.33%) reported that they work in a building with no assistant principal. A greater number of respondents (n=169, 53.14%) work for a male principal, while 136 (42.77%) work for a female principal. Inversely, a larger proportion of respondents have a female assistant principal (n=101, 31.76%) as compared with n=83 (26.10%) who have a male assistant principal. When reporting on years of experience the greatest number of respondents noted that they have been working in the field for 11-15 years (n=69) 21.70%. Participants were asked how many years of experience their building principal has and the majority selected less than five years (n=106, 33.33%) followed by 94 respondents who selected the Don't Know option (29.56%). Respondents were also asked to select the number of years of experience for their assistant principal. The largest number of responses was also for five years or less (n=111, 34.91%).

Reliability analysis was used to measure the reliability of participants' responses for the six dimensions of the SPES: Decision-Making, Professional Growth, Status, Self-efficacy, Autonomy, and Impact. All of the reliability estimates met or exceeded minimally acceptable guidelines. The highest reliability factor was found for Self-Efficacy (12 items, α .89). The second highest reliability factor was that of Autonomy (three items, α .867).

One way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the individual factors and total factor with specific variables as denoted in the individual research questions. Findings show that the gender of the building principal and the gender of the assistant principal

have a significant association with the level of empowerment felt by teachers in this study. However, the gender of the participant did not have an impact on the level of empowerment reported by teachers across any of the factors. When considering the gender of the principal, though, the factors of Status and Impact were significant. Additionally, the level of empowerment for the factor of Self-Efficacy was associated with the gender of the assistant principal. Additional analysis of the relationship between respondents' gender and the gender of the principal or assistant principal revealed no significant interactions. The empowerment factor of Autonomy was found to be significant when considered in relation to different building levels. No other factors in this comparison were found to be significant. When analyzing the length of principals' tenure across the factors and total factor, the category of Professional Growth was found to be significant. The empowerment factor of Decision-Making was the only factor to have an association with whether or not the school building has an assistant principal. Years of experience of the building assistant principal were related to the empowerment factors of both Decision-Making and Impact.

Additional tables that address specific descriptives for principal and assistant principal gender on empowerment, the school level on empowerment, and assistant principal and principal duration on empowerment levels are included in Appendix B.

Chapter 5

The job of the public school principal is quickly changing. More and increasingly higher demands are placed upon these school leaders with each passing year. Federal, state, and local mandates require more attention, energy, and focus of principals than have ever before. In order to meet the demands and requirements they are faced with, principals need to empower teacher-leaders within their buildings to take on some of these additional responsibilities and roles. Sharing in the workload alongside the principal allows for the school building to run more smoothly and for tasks to more easily be completed.

The current investigation was designed to contribute to the existing body of literature on teacher empowerment. Its purpose was to measure the amount to which teachers feel empowered in their current work setting. There were six research questions the current investigation set out to answer. The first area of focus was on the gender of the school building principal and whether or not it has an effect on the level to which teachers feel empowered. The second area of focus explored whether or not there is a difference in perceived level of empowerment in school buildings that have an assistant principal versus school buildings that do not. Third, the study investigated the differences in levels of empowerment felt for teachers in elementary, versus middle, versus high school buildings. The next research question sought to determine if teachers had stronger feelings of empowerment with principals of longer tenure. Gender was considered in the next research question that considered whether male or female teachers felt more empowered. The final area of focus in the current investigation centered on which other variables moderated reported levels of empowerment such as years of experience for

teacher and administrator and participants' occupation. To answer the questions described above, both descriptive and inferential statistics were analyzed. Participant ratings of perceived level of empowerment were collected and analyzed using the SPES.

Research questions one and five both pertained to the concept of gender as it relates to perceived levels of teacher empowerment. The first research question in the current investigation sought to uncover if a difference in the level of teacher empowerment exists with a male principal versus a female principal. The fifth research question asked whether male or female teachers feel more empowered. The current investigation found that the gender of the participant did not have an impact on the level of empowerment reported by teachers across any of the factors. However, the data indicate that gender of both the building principal and the assistant principal have a signification association with a teacher's reported level of empowerment. Empowerment factors of Status and Impact were associated with the gender of the principal, while the factor of Self-Efficacy was associated with the gender of the assistant principal. This data are inconsistent with other existing known research on the subject of teachers' perceptions of empowerment. In their study of teachers' perceptions of use of "empowering-type activities" by the building principal, LoVette, Holland, and McCall (1999) reported that when considering the gender of the building principal that "no significant difference between the two groups was found" (p. 10). Chen and Addi (1992), however, found that the gender of the principal is related to teacher empowerment and indicated that "teachers' professional rank and their job seniority are directly related to their principal's gender" (p. 7). Chen and Addi went on to report that even more specifically, "female teachers under male principals have the highest

professional rank" (p. 7). These conflicting results show that there is need for more in-depth research on the topic of principals' gender as it relates to empowering teachers with more and greater responsibilities in the workplace. Additionally, future research needs to look more closely at why male principals are more closely linked with higher levels of perceived levels of status and impact, but not related to the other four areas of empowerment. What is it about the principals of male gender that elicits a greater sense of status and impact from employees?

The second research question in the current investigation considered whether empowerment levels for teachers were higher in buildings that have an assistant principal versus buildings that do not have an assistant. Teachers' perceived levels of the empowerment factor of Self-Efficacy were significantly related to the presence of an assistant principal in the school building. This finding has great implications for the continued employment of the assistant principal position. As more and more districts are faced with budget cuts and financial constraints, often the position of assistant principal is eliminated in an effort to save costs. Superintendents would be wise, however, to maintain this position in their respective school buildings to not only help offset the workload of principals, but also to help support teachers so that they feel good about the work they do. The presence of an assistant principal can empower teachers to increase feelings of self-efficacy which would in turn lead to an overall greater sense of happiness and productivity in the work place. Literature on assistant principals and their association with teacher empowerment is scare. This may be due to the notion that most assistant principals spend the greater portion of their day handling student discipline over facilitating teachers. The National Association of Secondary School Principals

recognizes this reality of the assistant principal role as it reports that "assistant principals are often delegated the management tasks that inhibit their likelihood of being involved in a meaningful way with the instruction program" (Katz et. al, n.d., para. 2). In order to explore the dynamics between assistant principals and opportunities for teacher empowerment, future research in this area needs to be conducted.

The next research question asked at which building level: elementary, middle, or high, was levels of empowerment highest. The empowerment factor of Autonomy was the only element that was found to be significant across the building levels. This finding is consistent with existing research. LoVette and Holland (1999) studied if "principals of elementary schools [were] perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than junior high/middle school or high schools [*sic*]" (p. 10). They concluded that "no significant differences were noted" across the three building levels. A possible explanation for finding is that school administrators complete the same university training programs for school leadership and administration regardless of which building level they seek employment in as a school principal. Principals, therefore, are likely to execute similar styles of empowerment and teacher leadership strategies no matter the building level in which they work. What needs to be studied further are the building dynamics for elementary, middle, and high schools, as well as any existing personality types of teachers associated with each level, so that principals and assistant principals can know which strategies for empowerment work best with various populations of teachers. Another variable that is likely to moderate this relationship is the size of the student population.

The next question was designed to explore if teachers feel more empowerment with principals of longer tenure. The empowerment factor of Professional Growth was associated with length of principals' tenure. This finding likely relates to the concept that principals of longer tenure value and respect teachers' individual choices and needs for quality professional growth opportunities. Experienced principals are often likely to support teachers in their efforts to grow and develop professionally by allowing them to attend conferences and workshops. Additionally, experienced principals may more often believe, that, in order to help struggling teachers improve in both the areas of teacher and student performance, as measured by teacher evaluations and student growth measures they need to be immersed in quality teacher development programs and workshops. This finding can also be supported by the idea that principals of longer tenure understand that in order for empowerment to exist, they "have to earn trust" (Whitaker & Moses, 1990, p. 129). These long-standing principals know and believe that "the empowerment of teachers will not come easily or quickly […as] many teachers are skeptical about the motives and sincerity of administrators" (Whitaker & Moses, p. 129). The existing body of research on principals' tenure with regard to teacher empowerment is lacking. Educators can glean insight into assumptions about principal tenure, by considering that experienced principals are more likely to understand that they "play a central role in creating a climate of change and support for teachers in their decision-making efforts," but the field needs concrete data to support such ideas (Teacher Empowerment Policy, 2015).

The final research question of the current investigation examined what other variables might moderate the level of reported empowerment. The variables examined

for this analysis included years of experience of teacher, and the years of experience of the assistant principal. The findings indicated that none of the factors for empowerment were associated with length of teachers' tenure. This may be due to the fact that all teachers, regardless of length of career, feel overworked and inundated with too many professional and family commitments that they are hesitant to take on additional responsibilities in the workplace. These tired and stressed teachers may feel that they are not empowered, given that they shy away from such opportunities presented to them that come without additional pay or time.

The final portion of the last research question considered whether the number of years of experience of the assistant principal was related to any of the factors of empowerment. The factors of Decision-Making and Impact were both associated with years of experience of the building assistant principal. Assistant principals are likely to see their role as one that assists and helps the principal of the building in addition to the teachers and students in the school. Assistant principals are often eager to please and help make the jobs of others in the school building easier. Working alongside teachers to assist in the decision-making processes through an empowerment model is practice that is likely to be demonstrated by assistant principals who have a longer tenure. These experienced assistants have been immersed in the culture long enough to know how to support both teachers and principals and to help make the building run efficiently. When this synergy occurs, empowered teachers feel as if an impact has been made.

Open-Ended Responses

The open-ended questions at the end of the survey provided further insight into teachers' thoughts and perceptions regarding empowerment. In these opportunities to respond openly, teachers shared their thoughts regarding the many positive aspects of empowerment for individual teachers. For example, one teacher reported that "empowered teachers work in a more invigorated way." Another respondent stated that empowered teachers "have a more positive attitude, less stress and have a greater impact on student learning" (question 50, Painesville). Some teachers noted the positive effects empowering teachers can have in the overall organization. For example, one teacher reported that "teachers who involve themselves in leadership opportunities learn more about the organizational nature of schools and are likely to be more sympathetic to administrative decisions that do not need to be made centrally." One participant suggested that teacher empowerment "helps to get everyone in the building pointed in the same direction and helps to build common goals and purposes." The voices of teachers who are truly inspired and moved by being empowered are found in quotes such as the following, "when a teacher is empowered to take on more leadership responsibilities it makes them feel that they are valued and recognized for the hard work that they do […and] by having actual teachers take on leadership roles, it allows them to have authentic experiences and expertise to draw upon when they are put into the position as a leader. They will better understand how their decisions as a leader will impact other teachers who have shared similar experiences."

Empowering teachers does not come without encountering barriers. When responding to open-ended questions, participants reported multiple reasons for why they

do not take on additional responsibilities. The most common themes that emerged from these answers included not having enough time and not receiving additional compensation for extra duties. Some participants also cited family and personal commitments as a factor in not wanting to be empowered in the work setting. One teacher replied by stating, "quit asking us to take more and more time away from our own families for no extra money." Feelings of frustration could also be heard in some responses regarding barriers to empowerment. One participant remarked that "teachers are hesitant to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles because they are not being monetarily compensated for the extended amount of time that is required above their 40 hour work week…[additionally,] teachers may feel overwhelmed at figuring out OTES, doing their lesson planning, differentiation, and implementing brand new literacy programs. These already high expectations for their schedules make additional responsibilities seem daunting and almost impossible".

Participants were also asked what would motivate them to take on additional roles in the workplace. The open-ended responses were analyzed for themes and the most popular answers included time, compensation, and respect/recognition. One respondent suggested that "thank yous, public recognition, and staff appreciation incentives are very rewarding and motivating" for encouraging teachers to take on additional responsibilities. Time and money were both found to be incentives to taking on additional leadership roles, and the barriers to not embracing additional responsibilities. School leaders, therefore, need to work collaboratively to look at pay schedules that could offer teachers additional compensation for extra duties. Flexibly scheduling teachers, or offering them opportunities to teach fewer periods during a day, could incentivize them to assume more

administrative responsibilities. Another option to overcome the barriers of time and money is to lengthen the number of days in the teachers' working calendar while at the same time increasing their salary. The district could offer the teacher more regularly scheduled release days to participate in committee work that meets during the regular school day, alleviating the need for before and after school meetings.

The open-ended responses showed that participants see great benefit to the act of empowering teachers. This finding lends itself to the greater potential for this act of leadership within the school setting. Therefore, future research on ways to increase and enhance the behaviors of principals to empower teacher-leaders should be conducted to generate a more influential impact in teaching and learning environments. There are several barriers to consider when trying to empower teachers, however. These barriers were cited by many participants in their open-ended responses. Future research in the area of teacher empowerment should focus on investigating what the barriers for female and male teachers include. Additionally, case studies focused on ways school districts have overcome barriers to teacher empowerment could add substantial and lasting data to the growing field of research in this area. The open-ended questions in this investigation asked participants to describe what motivates teachers to take on additional leadership responsibilities. Future quantitative studies, measuring the amount of increase in assuming leadership positions when offered incentives, would be an interesting lens looking more deeply into the specific areas of teacher empowerment.

Implications for Educational Leaders

Educational leaders are overworked and spread thin. In order to alleviate pressures and inability to complete all tasks, these leaders need to rely more heavily on

teacher-leaders to take part in the work load. Growth and success are "most likely to occur when employees have autonomy to think, interact, and innovate" (Whitaker & Moses, 2015, p. 128). Cultivating empowerment allows teachers more opportunities for interaction and innovation. Teachers "deserve the chance to seek creative solutions to school problems and find meaning in their work" which can be established through the practice of empowerment (Whitaker & Moses, p. 129).

The results of the current investigation present leaders in the field of education with valuable information on how to strengthen behaviors and practices that can enhance teacher empowerment. Gender of participants was not found to have an impact on level of empowerment felt. Therefore, principals and assistant principals should employ equal practices for empowering both male and female teachers. Gender of the principal and assistant principal, however, have further reaching implications. The gender of the principal is associated with stronger feelings of Status and Impact. Male and female principals then will need to be more keenly aware of their ability to effect teachers' perceptions on the impact they have in the school building based on their ability to take part in decision-making and change processes. To enhance levels of felt status, principals and assistant principals will need to take time to make sure that teachers feel valued and respected for the work that they do and for the contributions they make. The gender of the assistant principal was found to be associated with teachers' perceived levels of Self-Efficacy. Assistant principals need to be mindful of the influence they have on teachers in this area of empowerment. Supporting teachers in their decisions and letting them take the lead on solving issues of concern will help increase teachers' perceived levels of competence in the area of self-efficacy. Assistant principals who have a direct path of

interconnection between principals and teachers can set the tone for empowerment to take place if they send the message that "teachers in collaborative settings take responsibility for helping colleagues, whereas teachers in isolated settings feel that they must learn and do everything on their own" (Whitaker & Moses, 2015, p. 129). Assistant principals could be helpful in this area by leading curriculum initiatives and committees in which teachers take on leadership and decision-making roles, freeing the principal up to manage larger, more building-specific tasks. When assistant principals are present, teachers' feelings of decision-making are increased. Delegation can be a critical behavior in the practice of empowering teachers. Principals can charge assistant principals with instructional tasks who can, then, in turn, elicit teacher-leaders to step up and help tackle such projects. Assistant principals can lead this area of delegation by helping to "develop and support a school culture that expands the role of teachers beyond classroom teaching […and] nurture the growth of […] teachers and provide opportunities for them to take on leadership roles (Imig, Ndoye, & Parker, p. 27).

Principals' tenure and teacher perceptions of Professional Growth were associated with one another. This relationship has implications for both experienced and inexperienced principals. Being aware of the professional needs of the building will help new principals take advantage of missing opportunities to support teachers in areas of individualized growth and development. By supporting teachers' interests in attending conferences, workshops, and pursuing graduate degrees, they can enhance empowerment in their buildings. Taking time to talk directly with teachers about their personal growth and paths for continuing education will then allow building leaders to provide the necessary tools such as release time, information on existing programs, and purchasing of

materials to help support teachers' leadership capacities. School leaders of any length of tenure can grow levels of empowerment by offering teachers a supportive environment in which they can provide professional development to one another during the school year and over the summer by offering incentives such as release time during the day, leaving early, or being compensated an hourly rate for developing curriculum or other school programming in collaborative teams during the summer months.

Current educational leaders need to engage in conversation with teachers on a collaborative level so that they can best gauge the current beliefs and culture of their working environment. Knowing and understanding the context one is working in will assist the principal or assistant principals in leveraging opportunities to empower teachers. School leaders also need to vocalize to Superintendents the need for additional time and compensation for teachers who embrace additional responsibilities. In addition to time and money however, building leaders need to make sure that they reinforce teachers' sacrifices by seeking ways to also make them feel valued, appreciated, and respected.

Recommendations for Future Research

The area of teacher empowerment has proven to be a noteworthy investigative area of study with broad implications for school leaders. However, this study has provided insight into a very large domain of school leadership. While relevant findings have been discussed, this study uncovers the need for additional research.

Future research in the area of teacher empowerment should investigate more closely the relationship between level of teacher empowerment and job satisfaction. If there is a strong correlation between empowerment and job satisfaction, school leaders

can use the practice of empowering teacher-leaders to improve the overall working conditions and morale of the organization.

Other variables related to teacher empowerment should be considered. It would be worthwhile to compare levels of perceived empowerment between public school and private school teachers, as well as with online educators. Class size would be another factor to consider when considering perceived level of empowerment. Do teachers who have smaller class sizes tend to take on additional responsibilities?

Now that more universities are offering teacher-leader endorsement and master degree programs, it would be beneficial to research the number of teachers who hold such additional licenses and whether or not they experience greater levels of empowerment. If the universities are going to be able to sustain these programs they will need data that show their graduates are successful in the work place with putting into practice the new skills they have acquired. More and more teachers are pursuing teacher-leader endorsement programs as a means to earn additional credits for licensure renewal. However, often times there is little change in their professional responsibilities or title after completing the coursework for these programs. Districts could more positively support the work of teachers of these programs by more clearly defining and assigning teacher-leader roles and providing additional compensation for those teachers who are qualified to fulfill these positions.

In addition to teacher leadership endorsement programs, this investigation proposes a potential need for universities to also reconsider the scope and sequence of teacher preparation undergraduate programs. If school districts choose to embrace a model of leadership practice in which teachers are empowered to take part in decision

making practices and administrative duties, then it would be imperative for universities to better prepare new teachers to meet the expectations of this philosophy. A potential solution to better prepare teachers for an empowering environment would be to require them to take administrative and school leadership classes as electives.

School districts are graded on several areas, including student performance, that are presented in a yearly report card. Future research should be conducted to determine whether or not districts with higher reported levels of teacher empowerment also have higher student achievement levels. If there is a positive relationship found between these two variables, districts will want to structure their organizational practices in a way that favors teacher leadership models as a means to boost student achievement.

The final area for recommended future research is reproducing this study in various geographic locations. This study was limited to only teachers and administrators in Lake County, Ohio. This is a very limited and homogenous area. Future studies should be conducted in more urban and rural areas, as well as in various states. Do large, urban school districts experience higher or lower levels of teacher empowerment? Additionally, different states have different teacher evaluation models. Do these models prohibit or enhance the practice of empowering teacher-leaders?

Summary

While many teachers feel that they are empowered and have a voice in their current school setting, there are still areas of teacher empowerment that could be enhanced and strengthened. Teachers need additional time and compensation in order to be more greatly motivated to take on additional leadership roles. They also want to be

valued and recognized for the time spent on going above and beyond their expected duties.

Having an assistant principal position present in the school building aides in the development of teachers' perceptions regarding their empowerment. School districts should strive to maintain the position of the assistant principal even during times of financial strain to help promote shared leadership, collective sense of belonging, and stronger collective decision making processes. Gender and length of principal tenure matter in terms of leveraging teacher empowerment. Superintendents should analyze carefully principal candidates and also work to coach and cultivate inexperienced principals. Finding time to discuss ways in which a building principal is striving to grow opportunities for teacher leadership in the building will not only benefit the teachers in that building, but also the overall success of the students. These gains in turn help to then further develop a positive school culture and more efficiently run school district.

There are powerful implications for empowering teacher-leaders, one of which is the positive feelings of connectedness and having a shared sense of belonging to the organization. As one teacher put it, "students are not the only learners in our school. Teachers also need to continue learning, and empowering them creates an environment where morale is high and self-confidence grows. These two powerful components jettison people to be more involved in their own learning and their own self-improvement through professional development and advanced learning, especially when they know that their ideas and knowledge is respected and sought after through collaborative activities".

As accountability measures for students, teachers, and administrators all continue to rise, districts need to look to models of teacher empowerment to offset the additional stress that accompanies such measures. Therefore, future research needs to be conducted investigating the possible relationships between teacher empowerment and student achievement.

1. Please select your occupation from the options below.

- ☐ Elementary Teacher
- ☐ Middle School Teacher
- ☐ High School Teacher
- ☐ Elementary Principal
- ☐ Elementary Assistant Principal
- ☐ Middle School Principal
- ☐ Middle School Assistant Principal
- ☐ High School Principal
- ☐ High School Assistant Principal
- ☐ Central Office Administrator
- ☐ Other

2. Gender

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

3. Does the building you currently work in have an assistant principal?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

4. Is your building principal male or female?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

5. Is your assistant principal male or female?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Don't have an assistant principal

6. How many years of experience in education do you have?

- [ ] Less than 5 years
- [ ] 6-10 years
- [ ] 11-15 years
- [ ] 16-20 years
- [ ] 21-25 years
- [ ] 26-30 years
- [ ] 31-35 years
- [ ] Over 35 years

7. How many years of experience in administration does your current school building principal have?

- [ ] Less than 5 years
- [ ] 6-10 years
- [ ] 11-15 years
- [ ] 16-20 years
- [ ] 21-25 years
- [ ] 26-30 years
- [ ] 31-35 years
- [ ] Over 35 years
- [ ] Don't know

8. How many years of experience in administration does your current assistant principal have?

- [ ] Less than 5 years
- [ ] 6-10 years
- [ ] 11-15 years
- [ ] 16-20 years
- [ ] 21-25 years
- [ ] 26-30 years
- [ ] 31-35 years
- [ ] Over 35 years
- [ ] Don't know
- [ ] Don't have an assistant principal

9. Please rate the following statements in terms of how well they describe how you feel. Rate each statement on the scale given.

---

1. I am given the responsibility to monitor progress.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

10. 2. I function in a professional environment.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

11. 3. I believe that I have earned respect.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

12. 4. I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

13. 5. I have control over daily schedules.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

14. 6. I believe that I have the ability to get things done.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

15. 7. I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in school.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

16. 8. I am treated as a professional.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

17. 9. I believe that I am very effective.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

18. 10. I believe that I am empowering students.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

19. 11. I am able to teach as I choose.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

20. 12. I participate in staff development.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

21. 13. I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

22. 14. I have the opportunity for professional growth.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

23. 15. I have the respect of my colleagues.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

24. 16. I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

25. 17. I have the freedom to make decisions on what is taught.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

26. 18. I believe that I am having an impact.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

27. 19. I am involved in school budget decisions.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

28. 20. I work at a school where kids come first.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

29. 21. I have the support and respect of my colleagues.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

30. 22. I see students learn.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

31. 23. I make decisions about curriculum.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

32. 24. I am a decision maker.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

33. 25. I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

34. 26. I am given the opportunity to continue learning.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

35. 27. I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

36. 28. I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with students.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

37. 29. I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

38. 30. I can determine my own schedule.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

39. 31. I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

40. 32. I perceive that I am making a difference.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

41. 33. Principals, other teachers, and school personnel solicit my advice.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

42. 34. I believe that I am good at what I do.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

43. 35. I can plan my own schedule.

Strongly Disagree ○ Disagree ○ Neutral ○ Agree ○ Strongly Agree ○

44. 36. I perceive that I have an impact on other teachers and students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

45. 37. My advice is solicited by others.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

46. 38. I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

47. In the box below describe what behaviors or actions your principal takes to make you and/or others in your building feel empowered?

48. In the box below, tell about a time in which you were empowered to take part in a decision making process for your current school or district.

49. In your opinion what are the benefits to empowering teachers? Describe your thoughts in the box below.

50. In your opinion, what are the benefits to being empowered as a teacher to take on more leadership responsibilities?

51. What incentives would motivate you as a teacher to take on additional roles or job responsibilities?

52. What barriers (if any) prevent teachers from taking on additional responsibilities or a leadership role?

Appendix B

Principal Gender on Empowerment

Group Statistics

	Is your building principal male or female?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
STATUS	Male	153	4.0081	.56313	.04553
	Female	119	3.9162	.60486	.05545
ProGrowth	Male	153	3.8644	.57726	.04667
	Female	119	3.7094	.57499	.05271
SelfEfficacy	Male	153	4.2031	.47278	.03822
	Female	119	4.2136	.39247	.03598
DecisionMaking	Male	153	3.0390	.65003	.05255
	Female	119	2.9197	.57985	.05315
Impact	Male	152	3.4280	.62827	.05096
	Female	118	3.2992	.75975	.06994
Autonomy	Male	153	2.4237	1.00619	.08135
	Female	119	2.6723	1.05586	.09679
Total_Factor	Male	153	20.9438	2.87746	.23263
	Female	119	20.7026	2.79685	.25639

Assistant Principal Gender on Empowerment

Group Statistics

	Is your assistant principal male or female?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
STATUS	Male	77	4.0325	.66997	.07635
	Female	88	3.9239	.50731	.05408
ProGrowth	Male	77	3.8658	.55790	.06358
	Female	88	3.6799	.60620	.06462
SelfEfficacy	Male	77	4.3151	.41354	.04713
	Female	88	4.1537	.44110	.04702
DecisionMaking	Male	77	3.1596	.68508	.07807
	Female	88	2.9464	.57980	.06181
Impact	Male	76	3.3401	.74557	.08552
	Female	88	3.3284	.70139	.07477
Autonomy	Male	77	2.6753	1.07330	.12231
	Female	88	2.5057	1.07848	.11497
Total_Factor	Male	77	21.3450	3.25751	.37123
	Female	88	20.5380	2.51602	.26821

School Level on Empowerment

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
STATUS	Elementary Teacher	114	3.9977	.58130	.05444
	Middle School Teacher	79	4.0249	.45318	.05099
	High School Teacher	75	3.8742	.70179	.08104
	Total	268	3.9711	.58592	.03579
ProGrowth	Elementary Teacher	114	3.7332	.59260	.05550
	Middle School Teacher	79	3.9040	.48391	.05444
	High School Teacher	75	3.7856	.65605	.07575
	Total	268	3.7982	.58437	.03570
SelfEfficacy	Elementary Teacher	114	4.1971	.43715	.04094
	Middle School Teacher	79	4.1585	.44672	.05026
	High School Teacher	75	4.2677	.43437	.05016
	Total	268	4.2055	.43958	.02685
DecisionMaking	Elementary Teacher	114	2.9132	.57306	.05367
	Middle School Teacher	79	2.9645	.61200	.06885
	High School Teacher	75	3.1031	.69135	.07983
	Total	268	2.9815	.62217	.03801
Impact	Elementary Teacher	113	3.4044	.67250	.06326
	Middle School Teacher	79	3.4734	.61032	.06867

	High School Teacher	74	3.2304	.78891	.09171
	Total	266	3.3765	.69377	.04254
Autonomy	Elementary Teacher	114	2.7573	1.07285	.10048
	Middle School Teacher	79	2.2890	.93283	.10495
	High School Teacher	75	2.4889	1.01540	.11725
	Total	268	2.5442	1.03276	.06309
Total_Factor	Elementary Teacher	114	20.9730	2.80361	.26258
	Middle School Teacher	79	20.8144	2.36574	.26617
	High School Teacher	75	20.7068	3.37648	.38988
	Total	268	20.8518	2.85201	.17421

Principal Duration on Empowerment

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean
						Lower Bound
STATUS	Less than 5 years	92	3.9203	.55459	.05782	3.8054
	6-10 years	53	4.0453	.48802	.06704	3.9108
	11-15 years	25	4.1333	.49535	.09907	3.9289
	16-20 years	5	3.8000	.46248	.20683	3.2258
	21-25 years	5	3.7667	1.18790	.53125	2.2917
	26-30 years	4	3.7917	.61426	.30713	2.8142
	over 35 years	4	3.2917	.51595	.25797	2.4707
	Total	188	3.9605	.55783	.04068	3.8802
ProGrowth	Less than 5 years	92	3.7708	.55492	.05785	3.6559
	6-10 years	53	3.9811	.58599	.08049	3.8196
	11-15 years	25	3.7067	.58091	.11618	3.4669
	16-20 years	5	3.6000	.62750	.28062	2.8209
	21-25 years	5	3.3500	.89443	.40000	2.2394
	26-30 years	4	3.5625	.74652	.37326	2.3746
	over 35 years	4	3.0625	.55434	.27717	2.1804
	Total	188	3.7863	.59839	.04364	3.7003
SelfEfficacy	Less than 5 years	92	4.1733	.41124	.04287	4.0882
	6-10 years	53	4.2464	.52010	.07144	4.1031
	11-15 years	25	4.2997	.44516	.08903	4.1159
	16-20 years	5	3.9091	.33799	.15115	3.4894
	21-25 years	5	3.9167	.81862	.36610	2.9002
	26-30 years	4	3.9432	.32932	.16466	3.4192
	over 35 years	4	4.2500	.41388	.20694	3.5914
	Total	188	4.1936	.46080	.03361	4.1273
DecisionMaking	Less than 5 years	92	2.9365	.59163	.06168	2.8140
	6-10 years	53	3.0034	.64643	.08879	2.8252
	11-15 years	25	3.0650	.59196	.11839	2.8207
	16-20 years	5	2.7500	.72349	.32355	1.8517
	21-25 years	5	2.9250	.62249	.27839	2.1521
	26-30 years	4	3.0313	.57168	.28584	2.1216
	over 35 years	4	2.6875	.56366	.28183	1.7906

Principal Tenure on Empowerment Levels continued

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean
						Lower Bound
DecisionMaking	Total	188	2.9639	.60540	.04415	2.8768
Impact	Less than 5 years	91	3.3907	.70518	.07392	3.2438
	6-10 years	53	3.5340	.63879	.08774	3.3579
	11-15 years	25	3.4580	.67941	.13588	3.1776
	16-20 years	5	3.4800	.68702	.30725	2.6269
	21-25 years	5	3.1600	.94234	.42143	1.9899
	26-30 years	4	3.0500	.57446	.28723	2.1359
	over 35 years	4	2.8500	.88506	.44253	1.4417
	Total	187	3.4176	.69110	.05054	3.3179
Autonomy	Less than 5 years	92	2.5978	1.07649	.11223	2.3749
	6-10 years	53	2.3836	.91846	.12616	2.1305
	11-15 years	25	2.2133	1.03584	.20717	1.7858
	16-20 years	5	3.3333	1.08012	.48305	1.9922
	21-25 years	5	2.2667	1.34164	.60000	.6008
	26-30 years	4	3.3333	.98131	.49065	1.7719
	over 35 years	4	2.6667	1.08866	.54433	.9344
	Total	188	2.5142	1.04352	.07611	2.3640
Total_Factor	Less than 5 years	92	20.7526	2.86347	.29854	20.1596
	6-10 years	53	21.1938	2.66962	.36670	20.4580
	11-15 years	25	20.8760	2.78165	.55633	19.7278
	16-20 years	5	20.8724	3.19986	1.43102	16.8993
	21-25 years	5	19.3850	5.22029	2.33459	12.9031
	26-30 years	4	20.7119	1.85092	.92546	17.7667
	over 35 years	4	18.8083	3.33601	1.66800	13.5000
	Total	188	20.8180	2.86087	.20865	20.4064

Assistant Principal Duration on Empowerment Levels

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean
						Lower Bound
STATUS	Less than 5 years	102	3.9212	.58672	.05809	3.8060
	6-10 years	7	4.2857	.38145	.14417	3.9329
	11-15 years	9	4.1111	.65617	.21872	3.6067
	16-20 years	3	4.1111	.78764	.45474	2.1545
	21-25 years	2	3.7500	.11785	.08333	2.6911
	26-30 years	2	3.7500	1.06066	.75000	-5.7797
	31-35 years	1	3.0000	.	.	.
	Total	126	3.9468	.59135	.05268	3.8426
ProGrowth	Less than 5 years	102	3.7574	.61429	.06082	3.6367
	6-10 years	7	3.7143	.63621	.24046	3.1259
	11-15 years	9	4.1389	.50173	.16724	3.7532
	16-20 years	3	3.5000	.25000	.14434	2.8790
	21-25 years	2	3.7500	.35355	.25000	.5734
	26-30 years	2	3.8750	.88388	.62500	-4.0664
	31-35 years	1	3.2500	.	.	.
	Total	126	3.7738	.60239	.05367	3.6676
SelfEfficacy	Less than 5 years	102	4.2092	.45932	.04548	4.1190
	6-10 years	7	4.4167	.38790	.14661	4.0579
	11-15 years	9	4.4907	.49379	.16460	4.1112
	16-20 years	3	4.2167	.62738	.36222	2.6582
	21-25 years	2	3.6667	.58926	.41667	-1.6276
	26-30 years	2	4.0947	.25177	.17803	1.8326
	31-35 years	1	4.0000	.	.	.
	Total	126	4.2289	.46462	.04139	4.1470
DecisionMaking	Less than 5 years	102	3.0033	.65795	.06515	2.8741
	6-10 years	7	3.2245	.30755	.11624	2.9401
	11-15 years	9	3.6111	.56057	.18686	3.1802
	16-20 years	3	2.8333	.31458	.18162	2.0519
	21-25 years	2	3.0625	.44194	.31250	-.9082
	26-30 years	2	3.2500	.88388	.62500	-4.6914
	31-35 years	1	2.6250	.	.	.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean
						Lower Bound
DecisionMaking	Total	126	3.0568	.64277	.05726	2.9435
Impact	Less than 5 years	102	3.3676	.73163	.07244	3.2239
	6-10 years	7	3.5714	.40708	.15386	3.1949
	11-15 years	9	3.5556	.76012	.25337	2.9713
	16-20 years	3	3.4000	.72111	.41633	1.6087
	21-25 years	2	3.3000	.42426	.30000	-.5119
	26-30 years	2	3.3000	.14142	.10000	2.0294
	31-35 years	1	2.2000	.	.	.
	Total	126	3.3817	.70930	.06319	3.2567
Autonomy	Less than 5 years	102	2.5033	1.09479	.10840	2.2882
	6-10 years	7	3.0476	1.06160	.40125	2.0658
	11-15 years	9	2.6667	1.05409	.35136	1.8564
	16-20 years	3	2.2222	.69389	.40062	.4985
	21-25 years	2	2.0000	1.41421	1.00000	-10.7062
	26-30 years	2	2.6667	.47140	.33333	-1.5687
	31-35 years	1	1.3333	.	.	.
	Total	126	2.5238	1.07450	.09572	2.3344
Total_Factor	Less than 5 years	102	20.7621	2.94540	.29164	20.1835
	6-10 years	7	22.2602	1.61164	.60914	20.7697
	11-15 years	9	22.5741	3.15946	1.05315	20.1455
	16-20 years	3	20.2833	2.73002	1.57618	13.5016
	21-25 years	2	19.5292	2.16257	1.52917	.0993
	26-30 years	2	20.9364	2.75022	1.94470	-3.7734
	31-35 years	1	16.4083	.	.	.
	Total	126	20.9120	2.91750	.25991	20.3976

Youngstown
STATE UNIVERSITY

One University Plaza, Youngstown, Ohio 44555
School of Graduate Studies and Research
330.941.3091
Fax 330.941.1580
graduateschool@ysu.edu

December 13, 2014

Dr. Karen Larwin, Principal Investigator
Ms. Kelly Moran, Co-investigator
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology & Leadership
UNIVERSITY

RE: HSRC Protocol Number: 064-2015
Title: Teacher Empowerment: School Administrators Leading Teachers to Lead

Dear Dr. Larwin and Ms. Moran:

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed the abovementioned protocol and determined that it is exempt from full committee review based on a DHHS Category 3 exemption.

Any changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Institutional Review Board and may not be initiated without IRB approval except where necessary to eliminate hazard to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the IRB.

The IRB would like to extend its best wishes to you in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Scott C. Martin
Interim Associate Dean for Research
Authorized Institutional Official

SCM/cc

c: Dr. Mary Lou DiPillo, Chair
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology & Leadership

References

Bartholomew, S.K., Melendez-Delaney, G., Orta, A., & White, S. (2005). Untapped resources: Assistant principals as instructional leaders. *PL, May 2005*. Retrieved November 6, 2014 from http://www.nassp.org/Portals/0/Content/51443.pdf

Bloom, M. (2012, June 22). SB 316: Twelve changes coming to schools near you. *State Impact NPR*. Retrieved from http://stateimpact.npr.org/ohio/2012/06/22/sb-316-twelve-changes-coming-to-schools-near-you/

Bogler, R., & Nir, A. E. (2012). The importance of teachers' perceived organizational support to job satisfaction: What's empowerment got to do with it? *Journal of Educational Administration,50*(3), 287-306.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 277-289. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.003

Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter. *Education Next, 13*(1). Retrieved August 30, 2014 from http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter/

Chen, M., & Addi, A. (1992, April 20-24). *Principals' gender and work orientations of male and female teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED346071.pdf

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (n.d.). Retrieved April 15, 2013, from http://www.corestandards.org

Costellow, T. D. (2011). *The preferred principal: Leadership traits, behaviors, and gender characteristics school teachers desire in a building leader.* Electronic Theses & Dissertations: Paper 9.

Crum, K. S., Sherman, W. H., & Myran, S. (2009). Best practices of successful elementary school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 48*(1), 48-63. doi: 10.1108/09578231011015412

Culbert, S., & McDonough, J. (1986). The politics of trust and organization empowerment. *Public Administration Quarterly, 10*(2), 171-88.

Dee, J. R., Henkin, A. B., & Duemer, L. (2002). Structural antecedents and psychological correlates of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration, 34*(3), 257-277. doi: 10.1108/09578230310474412

Devos, G., Tuytens, M., & Hulpia, H. (2014). Teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the mediating effects of distributed leadership. *American Journal of Education*, *120*, 205-231.

Dillon, S. (2011 March 16). U.S. is urged to raise teachers' status. *The New York Times.* Retrieved August 30, 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/16/education/16teachers.html?_r=0

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Gerke, W. (2004). More than a disciplinarian. *PL*, November, 2004. Retrieved November 7, 2014 from http://www.nassp.org/Portals/0/Content/48190.pdf

Hanushek, E. A. (2011). Valuing teachers: How much is a good teacher worth? *Education Next, 11*(3), 40-45.

Hatcher, R. (2005). The distribution of leadership and power in schools. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *26*(2), 253-267.

Hickey, W. D., & Harris, S. (2005). Improved professional development through teacher leadership. *The Rural Educator*, *26*(2), 12-16.

Imig, S., Ndoye, A., & Parker, M. (n.d.). Teacher empowerment, school leadership, and student performance in North Carolina's charter schools. University of North Carolina Wilmington. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from: http://www.academia.edu/649783/Teacher_Empowerment_School_Leadership_and_Student_Performance_in_North_Carolinas_Charter_Schools

Ingersoll, R. M. (1996). Teachers' decision-making power and school conflict. *Sociology of Education, 69*(2), 159-176.

Jackson, K. M., & Marriott, C. (2012). The interaction of principal and teacher instructional influence as a measure of leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(2), 230-258. doi: 10.1177/001316IXII432925

Katz, W. J., Allen, T., Fairchild, M., Fultz, D., & Grossenbacher, M. (n.d.). Changing role of the assistant principal. National Association of Secondary School Principals. Retrieved, March 23, 2015 from: http://www.principals.org/Content.aspx?topic=55757

Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the sleeping giant. Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Klecker, B. M. (1996). A *study of teacher empowerment in Ohio's venture capital schools*. (Doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Lamb, T. E. (2001). Learner autonomy and teacher autonomy. In A. W. Longman, *Future directions*. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Eaw5AAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA269&dq=Lamb,+T.E.+(2001).++Learner+autonomy+and+teacher+autonomy.++Future+Directions,+Addison+Wesley&ots=-HY99fbyPt&sig=ObjWVdxhmdk5xwFD9S7_NcuNLIw#v=onepage&q=Lamb%2C%20T.E.%20(2001).%20%20Learner%20autonomy%20and%20teacher%20autonomy.%20%20Future%20Directions%2C%20Addison%20Wesley&f=false

Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *63*(3), 9-28.

LoVette, O., Holland, G., & McCall, M. (1999, November 17-19). *Teachers' perceptions of the use of "empowering-type activities" by their building principals*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Point Clear, AL. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED436513.pdf

Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *19*(3), 245-275.

Martin, K., & Coleman, P. (2011). Licensing teacher leaders: The Kansas model. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, Spring 2011*, 6-9.

Moye, J. M., Henkin, A. B., & Egley, R. J. (2004). Teacher-principal relationships

exploring linkages between empowerment and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(3).

National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). Search for public school districts. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch/

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2007) Key issue: Enhancing teacher leadership. Retrieved November 6, 2014 from http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/EnhancingTeacherLeadership.pdf

Ohio Department of Education. (2009). Proposed program report-Teacher leader endorsement. Retrieved November 6, 2014 from http://sites.ehe.osu.edu/curriculum/files/2012/10/Teacher.Leader.Endorsement.pdf

Ohio Department of Education. Changes to education provisions of SB 316 - As passed by the senate. (2012, May 11) Retrieved from http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/DocumentManagement/DocumentDownload.aspx?DocumentID=125640

Ohio Department of Education. (2012). The third-grade reading guarantee guidance document. Retrieved August 29, 2012 from http://www.education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=5&ContentID=129423&Content=135729260-277. doi: 10.1108/0957823051059476

Ohio Department of Education. (2014). Senior professional educator and lead professional educator licenses. Retrieved November 6, 2014 from http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Licensure/Audiences/Senior-Professional-Educator-and-Lead-Professional

Ohio Leadership Advisory Council. (2014). Ohio improvement process. Retrieved November 6, 2014 from http://www.ohioleadership.org/view.php?cms_nav_id=7

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2006). Continuing validation of the teaching autonomy scale. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *100*(1), 44-51.

Prawat, R. S. (1991). Conversations with self and settings: A framework for thinking about teacher empowerment. *American Educational Research Journal*, *28*(4), 737-757.

Protheroe, N. (2008). Teacher efficacy: What is it and does it matter? *Principal, May/June 2008,* 42-45.

Psychoyos, D. G. (2012). *Teachers teaching teachers: A case study of the 2011 pro-ed professional learning community and its influence on creating a culture for organizational learning in schools in the republic of Panama.* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, St. Louis, MO.

Reynolds, C., White, R., Brayman, C., & Moore, S. (2008). Women and secondary school principal rotation/succession: A study of the beliefs of decision makers in four provinces. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 31(1), 32-54.

Rice, E. M., & Schneider, G. T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision-making, 1980-1991. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *32*(1), 43-58.

Rinehart, J. S., Short, P. M., Short, R. J., & Eckley, M. (1998). Teacher empowerment and principal leadership: Understanding the influence process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*, 630-649.

Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 68,* 119-125.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Society for the Study of Education*, *29*(3), 798-822.

Sawchuk, S. (2012, January 9). Teacher quality, status entwined among top-performing nations. *Education Week*. Retrieved August 30, 2014 from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/01/12/16teachers.h31.html

Seed, A. H. (2006). Making empowerment and collaboration part of the lives of highly qualified team teachers. *Middle School Journal*, *37*(5), 40-44.

Sharp, D. C. (2009). *A study of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness*. (Doctoral dissertation). Baker University, Baldwin City, KS.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts.* Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.

Short, P. M., Greer, J. T., & Melvin, W. M. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Research, 32*, 38-52.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52,* 951-960. doi: 10.1177/0013164492051004018

Squire-Kelly, V. D. (2012). *The relationship between teacher empowerment and student achievement.* Electronic Theses & Dissertations: Paper 406.

Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2009). *Using multivariate statistics*. London: Pearson.

Teacher Empowerment Policy: The view from the ground (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2015from: http://www.pitt.edu/~mmcclure/NEA/Siteview.html

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research 68*(2), 202-248.

U.S. Department of Education. (2010, September 2). *U.S. Secretary of Education Duncan announces winners of competition to improve student assessments.* Retrieved April 15, 2013, from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-secretary-education-duncan-announces-winners-competition-improve-student-asse\

Whitaker, K. S., & Moses, M. C. (1990). Empowerment: A key to restructuring. *The Clearing House, 64*(2), 127-130.

White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under "ideal" school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *14*(1), 69-82.

Williams, J. (2007). Revolution from the faculty lounge: The emergence of teacher-led schools and cooperatives. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *89*(3), 210-216.