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Abstract

Principals, as managers of education reform, have influenced the change process of schools through teacher empowerment. An explanation of principal influence is social influence theory of social psychology, which suggests expertness (perceived specialized skills and knowledge), trustworthiness (perceived willingness to serve the best interests of the school), and social attractiveness (perceived similarity to teachers), are powerful contributors to influence. This study replicated *Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process* (Rinehart et al., 1998), to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' social influence and their own feelings of empowerment. Results of this study, which examined high school teachers, indicated that expertness was the strongest predictor of social influence theory to emerge in the regression analysis, but trustworthiness and social attractiveness also correlated with teachers' perceptions of empowerment.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. General Statement of the Problem

Educational reform in the 1990s focused on site-based management, teacher empowerment, and organizational change. Site-based management involves schools taking over responsibilities from the district school boards. Teacher empowerment involves giving teachers increased authority in the site-based management structure of schools (Murphy, 1991), and organizational change is an evolutionary process involving dynamic and complex interactions between people, organizational structures, and environments resulting in the creation of new environments to facilitate positive outcomes (Gold, 1999; Lueddeke, 1992; Milner & Cangemi, 2000). Along with restructuring and reform comes a rethinking of how power is distributed and used, particularly by principals, in order to implement change successfully (Dufour & Eaker, 1992; Keedy & Finch, 1994; Sergiovani, 1992; Barth, 1990; Fullan, 1994). The body of literature surrounding educational reform and influence in school leadership focuses on organizational structures that lead to staff participation in decision-making (teacher empowerment), including meta-cognitive processes (Begley & Slater, 2001), but very little research has been done on the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership and their own sense of empowerment.

The general purpose of this study is to add to existing knowledge of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership. As schools face continuous educational reform efforts, principals, and teachers need to redefine their roles
in the school structure. According to Michael Fullan, Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto, sustainable reform initiatives can only be accomplished within today’s dynamically complex education environment with high-quality leadership (Fullan, 2002). The study of leadership “is the strategy of the decade” (Fullan, 2002, pg. 4). Principals are being challenged to shed their traditional power-oriented leadership roles and become who influence and inspire teachers to facilitate change. Similarly, teachers are being challenged to accept additional responsibilities and become part of the school governance structure that effectively implements change. Fullan (2002) argues, “We need […] leaders who can create a fundamental transformation in the learning cultures of schools and the teaching profession itself” (pg. 1). Sarson (cited in Leithwood, 1992) suggests that existing power relationships among teachers, administrators, parents, school staffs and students are largely to blame for the failure of educational reform. In order to understand this influence process, researchers have studied leadership styles, the influence process, the relationship between principal and teachers, teacher trust and loyalty, teacher job satisfaction, power bases, empowerment, and organizational structures. Rinehart, Short, Short and Eckley (1998) report that studies, to date, show significant associations between empowerment and many organizational variables such as job satisfaction, climate, conflict, commitment and program structure. They also report that changes to school governance do not necessarily result in increased feelings of participant empowerment. Therefore, teacher empowerment may be related to organizational variables but not to school governance. In order to explain the relationship between principal leadership and teacher
empowerment, the researchers focus on social influence theory that suggests, "credibility (a combination of expertness and trustworthiness) and social attractiveness are potent and persuasive elements of influence" (p. 636).

This study will replicate Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process (Rinehart et al., 1998), in order to explore the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principals’ social influence and their own empowerment. Specifically, this study will investigate the correlation between the views teachers have of their principal’s trustworthiness, expertness, and social attractiveness and their sense of empowerment.

B. Review of Literature

Reform efforts have been part of the educational landscape since the 1950’s when the launch of Sputnik, by the Soviet Union, prompted the United States to look at its public education system with a critical eye and a mission to prepare students for the space age. Current educational reform efforts seek to move the education system from the industrial age to the information technology age, preparing students to compete in the new global economy. Educational reform, by its very nature, attempts to improve the education system yet critics argue that reform efforts over the past three decades have failed because they have been unsustainable. A paradox seems to emerge from the research which suggests that sustainable educational reform is not possible without comprehensive organizational change, yet there are too many external pressures to make comprehensive organizational change possible. The consequence of failed attempts at educational reform is the creation of more resistors, as teachers who have had negative
experiences with previous attempts at educational reform become cynical or apathetic to subsequent reform efforts (Gold, 1999). The effect of these negative experiences undermines reform efforts; rather than empowering teachers, the work of teachers is kept in “blue collar” mode as they work in isolation, are generally excluded from knowledge production, are subject to external influences such as quality control, and have little opportunity to influence educational policy (Sagor, 1997). In order to understand why reform efforts have been unsuccessful; researchers have looked at implementation, organization, and the relationship between leadership and teacher empowerment.

**Achieving Sustainable Educational Reform**

Educational literature suggests that reform has not worked when done in isolation yet comprehensive systemic reform efforts have been equally problematic. Barth (1990) argues that reform efforts are not sustainable because the operating values in most schools do not include consensus building, collaboration, or cooperation. Lueddeke (1999) argues that educational reform initiatives fail because of implementation problems including the introduction of reforms through central management and executive fiat as well as hurried implementation of reform efforts with a view of short-term results. Fullan (1998) contends, “We have witnessed pockets of innovation, but little that could be characterized as large-scale patterns of success” (pg. 10). According to Fullan, the problem with failed reform efforts is not a lack of good ideas but fragmented and incoherent delivery of reform initiatives that “have a short shelf-life as [they] are dropped in favour of the latest new policy” (Fullan, 1998, pg. 6).

Fullan (2001) views educational change as a rapid, non-linear cycle that cannot be
controlled. However, he contends that educational change or transformation cannot occur without the accompanying chaos and messiness. The danger in a culture of change is the tendency to adopt too many innovations leading to “disconnected, episodic, piecemeal, superficially adorned projects” (Fullan, 2001, pg. 109). Yet, the experience of upheaval is necessary in order to achieve unforeseen benefits reform initiatives have to offer, as creative solutions are often generated after the status quo has been disrupted. Fullan suggests that leaders need to accept this condition and strive to make change coherent; however, Fullan cautions that “persistent coherence is a dangerous thing” as it may lead to prolonged periods of status quo (pg. 108). In order to disrupt the status quo in a way that will lead to positive outcomes, Fullan refers to a strategy call “Productive Disturbance” (pg. 110).

Rather than taking on all initiatives, Fullan (2001) argues that educational leaders must create and direct the tensions created by reform initiatives, selecting initiatives that will lead to desired outcomes. Fullan refers to this intentional disruption of the status quo as Productive Disturbance. Within this context, reform initiatives may be selected but once implementation begins, the change process cannot be controlled; it can only be led since there is no blueprint for the complex problems that accompany change. Further, Fullan cautions that all reform efforts experience an implementation dip as they move forward since change often challenges deep-rooted beliefs and behaviours. The challenge for an educational leader is to ensure that, within a cycle of change, teachers do not become complacent. When complacency takes root, Fullan suggests that it is time for a new Productive Disturbance. This view of educational reform as a nonlinear cycle that
can be managed but not controlled is supported in a study by Gold (1999) whose Punctuated Equilibrium Theory approximates Fullan’s theory of Productive Disturbance.

A longitudinal study by Gold (1999), using 23 years of qualitative data collected through ethnographic field work documents the pattern of change at elementary school, from the time it opened in 1974 until June 1997. An analysis of the long-term change process observed in this study reveals that educational reform efforts often terminate within the first two years of adoption without achieving full implementation. This is attributed almost entirely to internal organizational issues including: fallacious assumptions about the behaviour of students and teachers by policy makers, poor planning and implementation, resistance to reform efforts within the school community, financial, and political obstacles. Gold concludes that change is not the product of short-term initiatives, which are often abandoned before full implementation; it is a dynamic cyclical process. These observations support a Punctuated Equilibrium theory of organizational change, which argues that failed reform initiatives do not terminate but “create punctuations that produce alternations between short periods of rapid change that reconfigure and transform the organizational deep structure – the distribution of power, organizational culture, relations with the environment, and classroom practice – and long term incremental change that refines the transformation” (Gold, 1999, p. 192). Lincoln Acres Elementary School experienced periods of failed initiatives producing punctuations. New leadership then introduced changes altering the organizational deep structure of the school, which led to periods of equilibrium when the pace of change slowed considerably, allowing for the refinement of reform initiatives. According to
Gold, this cycle of change occurred twice in the 23-year period of the study. Gold’s contention that radical organizational change is not necessary to achieve sustainable educational reform is supported in a study by Sagor (1997), which suggests that systemic reforms do not achieve sustained educational reform initiatives.

Sagor (1997) and his colleagues from Washington State University’s Project LEARN, view collaborative action research as a systemic solution to effectively produce and support successful educational change for all school participants. Sagor identifies four cultural markers that result from successful collaborative action research: common focus, collective locus of control, common cultural perceptions, and an appreciation of leadership. After several months of mandated involvement with Project Learn and collaborative action research, two similar high schools experienced opposite outcomes; for one school in the study collaborative action research became an integral part of its school culture years after its first experience with the project, while the other school abandoned collaborative action research within its first year of involvement. Sagor concludes that collaborative action research is subject to many variables such as school culture, past experience, leadership, and organizational support and that it does not provide a systemic model for sustainable educational change.

**Organizational Change and Educational Reform**

An alternative point of view argues that organizational change in education is necessary in order to prepare students for the information technology age (McGraw, 1998; Sherritt and Bassom, 1996). Sherritt and Bassom (1996) find that, “A complex, technological, perpetually changing, interdependent world creates its own educational
requirements” (p.288). Private sector research shows that pressures of technology, customers, competition, the relationship between employers and employees, and change itself will also challenge traditional organizational structures as a result of the new global economy (Miller & Cangemi, 2000; Spence, 1999). Whitaker (1997) concludes that not enough attention has been given to preparing the organizational structure of the education system for educational reform, resulting in resistance to change, and failure to achieve sustainable reforms.

Organizational change can be defined as an evolutionary process involving dynamic and complex interactions between people, organizational structures, and environments (Gold, 1999, Lueddeke, 1992). According to Millar and Cangemi (2000), organizational change involves the need to create a new environment to facilitate positive outcomes. Hill and Guthrie (1999) suggest that organizational change involves the creation of productive organizations. Each of these definitions recognizes that organizational change is a positive and necessary process involving organizational renewal leading to productive outcomes. Within an educational context, these positive outcomes include educational reform efforts.

Sirotnik (1999) suggests that successful educational reform efforts require new organizational settings that encourage change. The need for organizational change to facilitate positive outcomes is supported in a study by Deming (cited in Sirotnik, 1999), that states, workers are only responsible for 15 percent of the problems and inefficiencies within a system while 85 percent is attributed to the organizational structure itself. Educational reform research also suggests that traditional ‘top down’ management
structures do not lead to successful educational reform efforts, pointing to the need for new organizational models. This is supported by Burns' (1978) theory of transformational leadership. According to Burns, transformational leadership results in a mutually beneficial relationship for leaders and those being led. According to Spencer's (1999) Reengineering Concept of educational change, the traditional hierarchical structure of educational organization was well suited to the post world war two industrial economy but current demands on education require an organizational structure that will facilitate innovation and adaptability through the flattening of the management structure and the empowerment of teachers. Hendricks-Lee and Mooney (1998) argue that teachers unions must also be restructured in order to remove a traditional barrier to educational reform. Bowman (1999) argues that reform efforts must be comprehensive or systemic, coherent and coordinated, rather than viewed in isolation. Coherence requires developing internal legitimacy for the reforms being implemented, and competence of those who will be implementing the changes.

Five possible scenarios emerge from the research to explain the factors that influence the process of reform and organizational change in education (Hatch, 2000). According to these five scenarios, educational reform is either: (a) a necessary and controllable process influenced by forces from within the organizational structure, (b) a necessary but uncontrollable evolutionary process that is influenced by forces external to the organizational structure, (c) dependent upon the adaptability of current organizational structures to internal and external forces, (d) dependent upon the reinvention of current organizational structures to facilitate successful sustainable comprehensive reform
initiated by internal or external forces, or (e) that sustainable comprehensive reform is impossible due to the influence of external forces. The first three scenarios suggest that current organizational structures can either influence or adapt themselves to change. The fourth scenario suggests that it is possible to completely change organizational structures to facilitate successful sustainable educational reform efforts, whether or not these reform efforts are the result of internal or external forces (Hatch, 2000). The first four scenarios are based on the assumption that the forces of change are stronger than the forces that promote stability (Levin, 1998). Hatch, in his fifth scenario, suggests that external forces make sustainable educational reform and organizational change impossible resulting in a constant state of instability. The failure of sustainable educational reform and the lack of success of organizational change efforts in the past lend credibility to this final scenario. However, each of these scenarios is based on traditional research models that look at educational reform and organizational change efforts as short-term moments rather than as an ongoing evolutionary process (Gold, 1999).

Levin (1998) looks at the dynamic interaction between internal and external forces that influence organizational change and educational reform efforts. This study suggests that the interplay between internal and external forces leads to an environment of instability, which makes sustainable educational reform difficult yet creates an environment within which change is part of an evolutionary process. According to Levin, the forces of external determinism include “government intervention, government funding behaviors, government policies, [...] social policy, and other government and agency actions [...] viewed as precipitators of organizational change” (Levin, 2000,
Internal forces that influence organizational change include individuals and
groups, senates, academic councils, department groupings, managers, unions, and various
levels of administrators. Each of these internal forces can be seen as preservers of
traditions and practices, resisters to progress, or as agents of change (Levin, 1998). Gold
(1999) refers to the forces that initiate change as internal and external triggers. Internal
triggers are controlled by the organization, and external forces such as provincially
mandated standardized testing, funding formulas, and Provincial and Federal legislation
control external triggers. Forces of internal control may also include the actions of
managers and administrators who “interpret external environments and choose actions
that will lead to the fulfillment of organizational goals” (Levin, 1998, p. 44). Internal
forces that are contained within existing organizational structures and combine with
institutional history and culture may resist change as an internal reaction to external
forces but may also embrace change from internal or external initiators if the changes are
perceived as being compatible with internal needs.

Levin (1998) concludes that organizational change is neither totally determined by
external forces nor fully controlled by internal forces but that these forces play off of
each other to meet the changing needs of the internal and external environments. This
conclusion highlights the dynamic relationship that exists between internal and external
forces leading to an environment of instability within which change is part of an
evolutionary process.

**Alternative Educational Paradigms and Educational Reform**

An understanding of the dynamics of educational reform and organizational change
process has led researchers to look beyond traditional models of educational reform toward new organizational paradigms; however, these efforts also prove ineffective in achieving sustainable educational reforms. The traditional paradigms of school organization view the school as a deliverer of program and policy determined by external forces. Traditional organizational paradigms include Darling and Hammond's (1997) Teacher Qualities paradigm that attributes the productivity and quality of a school to a well-educated, well-motivated teaching staff (cited in Hill & Guthrie, 1999). Hill and Guthrie (1999) point to Powel et al. (1985) and the Resident Programs paradigm, which views a school's quality and productivity because of the programs offered, and appropriately placed students. Both of these paradigms view outside forces, such as administrators and educational reformers, as the fundamental determinants of school productivity. Arguably, the most dominant organizational paradigm, as Hill and Guthrie point out, is the Policy Research paradigm that sees policy makers as the overseer of schools, and schools as recipients and implementers of external mandates. According to Hill and Guthrie (1999), the Consortium On Renewing Education (CORE) concludes that none of the existing paradigms understand the factors that influence the process of sustainable educational reform and educational change, or the relationship that needs to exist between schools as productive organizations and their external environments. Each of these traditional organizational paradigms assumes that external forces determine a school's effectiveness. Although school productivity is viewed as a result of external forces, researchers recognize that schools cannot effectively deal with a series of unrelated reforms that lack internal legitimacy.
An alternative educational paradigm is offered by Hill and Guthrie (1999). According to the CORE paradigm, a school's productivity depends upon the relationship between teachers inside the organizational structure of the school and how the school community manages "the school's collective external relationships" (Hill & Guthrie, 1999, p. 514). The CORE paradigm sees a new role for schools as agents able to "initiate actions, determine [their] own priorities, make decisions that affect [their] future capacities, and obligations, and respond to changes in [their] environment" (Hill & Guthrie, 1999, p.520). The only role of external forces, according to the CORE paradigm is to contribute to school productivity. The fundamental challenge for the CORE paradigm and other alternative educational organization paradigms is to "determine the means by which individual schools can accept government funding and yet recognize the primary loci of production" (Hill & Guthrie, p. 520). Hill and Guthrie conclude that external forces will always influence the internal operation of schools as long as government funding and mandates such as new curriculum and standardized testing are present, yet offer no solutions to ensure that schools remain the primary determinant of school productivity.

The creation of the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) by the Bush Administration in 1991, like the CORE paradigm, was a direct response to concerns about the state of the American education system and to the ineffectiveness of previous educational reform efforts (Hatch, 2000). The mandate of NASDC to create "break-the-mold" school designs represented a possible solution to the conflict that existed between the internal and external forces that influenced the effectiveness of
educational reform efforts. NASDC contended that comprehensive designs for radically different schools were needed since isolated reform efforts were not meeting the needs of a changing society. The NASDC request for design proposals stated, "the design teams should understand that NASDC's intentions go far beyond the expectations of prior reform efforts ... this is a request for break-the-mold designs, not for fixing up the designs that are already in place" (NASDC, 1991, p.20) (cited in Hatch, 2000). To this end, NASDC funded eleven design teams that were to create radically new schools with large-scale innovations. The Authentic Teaching and Learning For All Students (ATLAS) team was one of the more comprehensive design teams but external pressures made it almost impossible for the ATLAS project to succeed (Hatch, 2000).

The efforts of the ATLAS team were conducted within an environment that favoured the exploitation and improvement of established practices that could be implemented quickly, easily, and with the least amount of disruption or controversy, rather than the exploration of new ideas, as was the initial mandate of NASDC (Hatch, 2000). Internal pressures on ATLAS schools included high turnover rates of teaching staff and administration that affected continuity and commitment to comprehensive "break-the-mold" initiatives. External pressures, which inhibited radical new designs included the demand by schools and school districts that ATLAS schools demonstrate quick improvements in student achievement, the competition between design teams for continued funding, tying funding to yearly assessments of progress, and the pressure of high-stakes negative feedback. In addition, NASDC expected design teams to focus on the traditional disciplinary divisions: English, History, Geography and Mathematics. The
problem for the ATLAS team and similar design teams was that they were trying to create break-the-mold school designs while conforming to conventional organizational structures and expectations (Hatch). Because of internal and external pressures, ATLAS and other design teams sponsored by NASDC were able to achieve little more than the exploitation of current practices and watered down innovation with few examples of truly innovative change; the goal of creating "break-the-mold" schools was never realized.

According to Hatch, the failure of NASDC and ATLAS, to achieve their mandate suggests that without "long-term support, schools and reform efforts have little protection from the constantly changing pressures of turbulent environments" (Hatch, p.577). The research by Hatch (2000) suggests that organizational structures have had little effect on sustained educational reform efforts including teacher empowerment, as there are too many external pressures to make comprehensive organizational change possible. (Gold, 1999). Having determined that external pressures make it difficult to achieve sustained educational reforms it is necessary to look at the relationship between internal variables of school culture, including teacher empowerment and leadership, and achievement of sustainable educational reforms.

**Teacher Empowerment and Educational Reform**

Teacher empowerment is part of organizational reform initiatives, and alternative models of leadership. Melenyzer (1990) (cited in Wu, & Short, 1996, p.85) proposes that teacher empowerment includes having the confidence and opportunity to influence personal performance in one’s profession. According to Keedy and Finch (1994), teacher empowerment involves an enhanced feeling of professionalism, satisfaction with the
work environment, collegial collaboration, and increased responsibility. According to Short (1998), teachers' perceptions of empowerment results from the opportunity to develop professionally, and to demonstrate personal ability within the school setting. Short and Rinehart (1992) identify six dimensions of teacher empowerment: teacher perceptions of status, self-efficacy, autonomy, impact, decision-making, and opportunities for professional growth. According to Lightfoot (1986), empowerment "refers to the opportunities a person has for autonomy, responsibility, choice, and authority" (p.9). Rappaport (1987) suggests that empowerment involves a sense of self-determination, democratic participation, and developing ability within a social construct. The social aspect of empowerment acknowledges the relationship between an individual and an outside influence. If empowerment can be defined as a construct that links individual strengths and competencies with opportunities for social change through involvement with communities and organizations, psychological empowerment, is the expression of an individual's participatory experience with empowerment. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) refer to this as a connection between a personal sense of competence and a desire for and willingness to take public action.

In order to gain an understanding of the psychological aspect of empowerment, Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) conducted three studies to examine the relationship between empowerment and participation to test their hypothesis that participation in community activities and organizations are associated with psychological empowerment. The first study examines the differences among groups identified as being willing to participate in personally relevant or community relevant activities. The second study
examines the differences of groups as defined by actual involvement in community activities and organizations. The third study replicates study number two, using a different population. The sample groups for these studies are college students and community residents.

The first study develops a construct of psychological empowerment. Using a random sample of students enrolled in an introductory psychology course (N=392), participants responded to two undesirable scenarios that offered individuals an opportunity to exert control and influence. The first scenario was relevant to the well being of the individual and the second scenario was relevant to the well being of the community. The results of these responses were categorized into four groups of responses: those willing to change both personally and community relevant scenarios, those willing to change the personally relevant scenario only, those willing to change the community relevant scenario only, and those who were not willing to change either scenario.

The second study attempts to replicate the findings of the first study, using the same participants but substituting real behaviours for the hypothetical scenarios of the first study. Students in the second study completed an activity checklist that asked students to list all activities they had participated in during the past year, and the number of hours spent at each activity. A composite level of participation variable was then generated, which resulted in a measurement of level of participation. Students were then divided into high, moderate, and low levels of involvement based on their responses on the checklist. A fourth group that reported no involvement, was used as a comparison group.
The third study is a replication of the second study using the same community involvement checklist but the population was community residents (N= 176). Participants were divided into two groups: those involved in community organizations and those not involved in community organizations.

The results all three studies support the hypothesis that greater levels of participation with community and group activities are associated with psychological empowerment. The main analysis of the first study tested for the expected group differences on personality, cognitive, and motivational measures as a function of one's willingness to participate in personally and community relevant activities. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) across the indices of empowerment was significant (F = 2.67; df = 33, 1088; p < .01). In each case the participants that recorded a 'yes' for their willingness to participate in both personal and community relevant activities scored highest on the variables of empowerment while those who answered no to both scored lowest. The MANOVA for the second study was also significant (f = 3.15; df = 22,740; p = < .01). The students who were highly active scored higher on each of the significant variables than the low-active students. The results for the third study were analysed under the headings: community activities and level of involvement. The analysis of community activities found that the MANOVA for activity groups was significant (F = 3.53; df = 21, 325; p = < .01). The most active respondents scored highest on all significant measures of empowerment except internal control. The MANOVA results for the analysis of level of involvement indicated differences between groups for indices of empowerment (F = 1.50; df = 33, 429; p = < .05). Students and residents involved with
community organizations reported a greater sense of empowerment than did participants who were less involved. Although the findings of this study do not indicate if involvement enhances empowerment or if empowered individuals are those who participate, these findings are significant as they suggest that greater levels of empowerment may be expected in organizations that encourage participation in decision-making and allow participants to involve themselves in personally relevant activities. Conversely, it is possible that organizations with traditional hierarchical structures that do not offer relevant opportunities for participation will be less likely to promote psychological empowerment (Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988). The link between teacher empowerment and participation is supported in a study by Ma and MacMillan (1999).

In a study examining the influences of workplace conditions on teachers’ job satisfaction, Ma and MacMillan (1999) report that the most significant “factor in maintaining teachers’ commitment to the school appears to be their perception of meaningful, organizational involvement” (p. 40). In the New Brunswick Elementary School Study, the New Brunswick Department of Education collected data from 2,202 elementary school teachers, the total population of elementary teachers in New Brunswick. Teachers completed a questionnaire that included five components: (1) teacher and their students, (2) school discipline, (3) academic and social environment, (4) parent involvement, and (5) job satisfaction and autonomy. Using a five point Likert-type scale, workplace conditions were measured through three composite variables: (1)
teaching competence, (2) administrative control, and (3) organizational culture. Of the three composite measures, administrative control was the most significant factor influencing teacher job satisfaction, with a correlation coefficient of .37, compared to teaching competence (.30) and organizational culture (.29). According to Ma and MacMillan (1999), the results of this study are significant because they point to the connection between principal leadership style and teachers’ perceptions of job satisfaction, a component of teacher empowerment. This is also significant since research indicates that teacher empowerment, a component of transformational leadership, is the key to effective and sustainable educational reform.

Examining the effects that transformational leadership has on organizational change and improved organizational outcomes, Leithwood and Janzi (2000) isolate six dimensions of transformational leadership, which can lead to greater levels of job satisfaction and to sustainable educational reform. Leithwood’s six dimensions of transformational leadership include: “building school visions and goals; providing intellectual stimulation; offering individualized support; symbolizing professional practices and values; demonstrating high performance expectations; and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000, p. 113). Since they consider transactional leadership fundamentally important to the organizational stability of a school and to its daily operation, they also include four dimensions of transactional leadership: staffing, instructional support, monitoring school activities, and community focus. The results of this study suggest that transformational leadership, as defined in this study, has “strong, significant direct effects on
organizational conditions” (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). This is significant as it supports the hypothesis that transformational leadership and the inclusion of teachers in the organization and governance of a school, can lead to greater levels of teacher empowerment and sustained educational change.

Teacher involvement in school governance through shared decision-making, a component commonly referred to as teacher empowerment, became a centerpiece of school reform. Lueddeke (1999) found that successful implementation of educational reform requires that participants are empowered through meaningful involvement in the decision making process and that their professional experience is valued. This is supported in a study by Cooper (1993) (cited in Whitaker, 1997), which suggests that successful organizational change requires enhancing the role of teachers who possess talents beyond their pedagogy. Garmston (1998) claims that organizational development of staff must precede actual implementation of educational reform. Sagor (1997) looks at the professional empowerment of teachers at the site level with teaching teams working collaboratively to effectively implement change. Dufour and Eaker (1992) theorize that the conditions necessary for effective teaching and for continuous school improvement include teacher autonomy and teacher empowerment, which includes shared decision-making and participation in setting school goals. In 1986, The Carnegie Task On Teaching as a Profession (cited in Keedy & Finch, 1994) "concluded that only intelligent and autonomous teachers could bring about authentic school improvement" (p.162). In addition, proponents of shared decision making argue that teacher empowerment can have a positive effect on student learning (Wu & Short, 1996), although this type of
measurement is usually not possible (Ma & MacMillan, 1999). Thus, the research indicates that teacher empowerment and the resulting change in roles and responsibilities of teachers and principals, as the key to implementing change successfully.

**Principal Leadership and Teacher Empowerment**

Researchers studying educational reform and the influence process have examined the influence that principal leadership has on teacher empowerment. Since teachers traditionally, have very little control over their teaching environment, including students, class sizes, instructional blocks, curriculum, and assessment and evaluation expectations, teaching as a profession may be “infantilized” or at very least marginalized, resulting in disenfranchised teachers working in isolation (Waldron, 1996). Blasé and Blasé (1999) conclude that effective instructional leadership depends upon a principal's belief that teachers should be included in decision-making regarding classroom instruction. Similar results are found in studies that argue that workplace conditions and teacher empowerment is a direct result of the influence of a democratic or empowering principal (Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Hoy, Tater &. Bliss, 1990; Parkay, Currie & Rhodes, 1992; Rinehart et al., 1998; Short, 1998; Short Rinehart, 1992). Short (1998) theorizes that the key to moving schools toward greater degrees of excellence, the goal of educational reform, is leadership that involves all school participants in problem solving and decision making, a conclusion that is supported in a key study by Gonzales and Short (1996).

In their study, which examines the relationship between principals’ use of power and teachers’ perceived level of empowerment, Gonzales and Short (1996) test the
hypothesis that principals' democratic power bases influence teachers' perceived level of empowerment. The participants in this study were teachers (N = 301) from an urban school district in the state of Florida. The sample included teachers from six elementary schools, five middle schools, and three high schools. Using the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) (Short and Reinhart, 1992), Gonzales and Short measured teachers' perceived levels of empowerment. The split-half reliability of this instrument is .75 (Short & Rinehart, 1992). A complete description of the SPES is provided later in this paper. The Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) was used to measure teachers' perceptions of principals' use of five power bases: (1) coercive power, (2) reward power, (3) legitimate power, (4) expert power, and (5) referent power. Gonzales and Short claim that the internal consistency reliability coefficients for the RLPI subscales range from .72 to .88. A multiple regression analysis was used to test the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and teachers' perceptions of principals' use of power bases.

The results of this study support the hypothesis that principals' democratic power bases influence teachers' perceived level of empowerment. According to Gonzales and Short (1996) the multiple regression revealed that teachers' perceptions of principals' use of expert power, referent power, and reward power contribute significantly to teachers' perceptions of empowerment. Expert power is based on teachers' perceptions of principals' special knowledge and skill, referent power is based on teachers' identification with principals, and reward power is based on teachers' perceptions that principals can offer rewards (Gonzales & Short, 1996). These results are significant as they indicate that empowered teachers grant power to principals rather than take power
away, and of greater significance, that principals can use their power to empower teachers.

Studies have also linked teachers' perceptions of empowerment because of principal leadership, to teacher loyalty (Johnston & Germinario, 1985; Johnston & Venable, 1986). Participation in the decision making process is believed to create an elevated sense of status and enhanced teacher job satisfaction (Johnston & Germinario, 1985). Johnston and Germinario conclude that teachers who are satisfied with their decision making status express loyalty to their principal and that elementary school teachers tend to express a greater degree of principal loyalty than secondary school teachers. Johnston and Venable (1986) found that teachers express loyalty to principals who satisfied teacher needs and helped teachers to achieve goals.

These conclusions are supported by Dufour and Eaker (1992), who examine principals as empowerers of teachers, promoters and protectors of values, instructional leaders and managers of school climate. To resolve the apparent conflict in leadership research regarding the most effective leadership style, Dufour and Eaker (1992) turn to Waterman's concept of directed autonomy. Directed autonomy, when practiced by a principal in a school that has identified a few common goals or values, provides teachers with direction, encourages individual creativity and innovation, but will also demand, "rigid adherence to these few non-negotiable values" (50). Chapman and Boyd (1986) conclude that principals must facilitate change through collaborative efforts with teachers, rather than through traditional positions of authority.

One clear theme that emerges from this body of literature is that educational reform
efforts require principals to become facilitators rather than "bosses" and require teachers to evolve from a position of subordination to one of collaboration (Rinehart et al., 1998). Most studies agree that the traditional autocratic form of principalship does not lead to a positive teaching environment (Burns, 1978; Chapman & Boyd; 1986; Gonzales & Short, 1996; Rahim, 1989; Spaulding, 1997). This conclusion is supported in a study of leadership power bases by Rahim (1989).

In order to determine the effectiveness of using leadership power to influence behavioural compliance to leadership directives and influence satisfaction with supervisors, Rahim (1989) surveyed a representative random sample of managers (N = 476) from 45 different industries, taken from the Standard and Poor's Directory of Executives and Directors. Managers were asked to complete a survey combining three instruments: (1) Rahim's Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) (Rahim, 1988), a 29-item instrument using a 5-point Likert scale, to measure the perceptions of subordinates regarding the use of power bases by superiors; (2) Rahim's Compliance with Superior's Wishes (CSW) (Rahim, 1988), a 5-item instrument using a 5-point Likert scale, to measure perceived behavioural compliance to superior's wishes; and the Job Description Index (JDI) an 18 question instrument measuring satisfaction with supervision.

The results of multiple regression analysis show that the use of coercive and reward power bases by superiors are not significantly associated with compliance or job satisfaction; legitimate, expert, and referent power bases are positively associated with compliance; and referent and expert power bases are positively associate with job satisfaction, while legitimate power is negatively associated with job satisfaction.
This study is important because it suggests that leaders can, through an understanding of
the effect that leadership power bases have on compliance and job satisfaction of
subordinates, increase compliance and job satisfaction through the use of appropriate
power bases. This study is also significant since the sample group is made up of people
who are also in leadership positions and have the power to influence subordinates.

Similar studies have found that autocratic leaders, who demanded compliance,
experience a reduction in real authority, as employees offer only minimal compliance,
lacking necessary emotional commitment (Johnston & Venable, 1986; Sergiovani,
1992). Rather than leading by coercion through autocratic authority, principals have a
responsibility to be ethical leaders, and must convince teachers that they share and
support the same values in order for teachers to feel empowered (Lashway, 1996;

Studies that look at aspects of empowering leadership conclude that democratic
principals often described as a "facilitators" or "enablers," enhance teachers' sense of job
satisfaction and empowerment (Gonzales & Short, 1996; Parkay et. al., 1992; Wu
Short, 1996; Lightfoot, 1986; Rinehart et al., 1998; Short & Rinehart, 1992). In a
multiple-case longitudinal study, Parkay et al. (1992) document the professional
socialization of 12 first-time high school principals, 6 females, and 6 males from five
states, during the first three years of their appointments. Specifically, this study
investigates the perceptions, experiences, and concerns of high school principals during
their first three years as a new principal. Secondly, this study seeks to discover if these
perceptions, experiences, and concerns change over time and if they do, is there an
identifiable pattern to these changes. Finally, this study reveals that the process of professional socialization of a principal leads to empowering leadership.

According to Parkay et al. (1992), the results of their study suggest that there are five identifiable stages of professional socialization that new principals experience. Stage 1, characterized by personal concerns and professional insecurity, involves survival. Principals in this study, who were at stage 1 report experiencing “frustration, powerlessness, and professional inadequacy” (Parkay et al., 1992, p. 54). In stage 2, characterized as a control phase, principals’ focus is on setting priorities and managing “the overwhelming flow of new demands” (Parkay et al., 1992, p. 57). Principals from this study identified as stage 2 principals reported being concerned with “acquiring new skills or technical expertise to manage day-to-day operation of the school” (Parkay et al., 1992, p. 57). In stage 3, characterized as a period of stability, principals achieve veteran status and can effectively deal with management related tasks “effectively and efficiently.” It is significant to point out that stage 3 principals report a more realistic outlook about the limited possibility of promoting meaningful change. According to Parkay et al. (1992), this results in “a feeling of resignation, the limited commitment that comes with ‘doing the job’” (Parkay et al., 1992, p. 58). This is significant as it supports the hypothesis that, in order to feel empowered, individuals need to have a real opportunity to influence change.

While the first three stages are defensive, characterized by leadership struggles and compromising strategies and feelings of ineffectiveness, stage 4, principals, who are perceived as having legitimate power, begin to focus educational vision and on
curriculum leadership, and develop long-term visions supporting change. (Parkay et al., 1992). Stage 5 involves professional actualization. According to the study, a stage 5 "leader's vision for the school is not imposed on an unwilling faculty; instead, faculty members believe that they have been truly empowered and work collegially and harmoniously to improve the school" (Parkay et al., 1992, p. 58). While the power base of a stage 1 principal comes from the position held, the personal power base of a stage 5 principal comes from the leader's personal characteristics, respect of a faculties shared vision for a school, and commitment to the profession. This study is significant to the issue of teacher empowerment and achieving sustainable educational change as it points out that principals can develop into empowering leaders and that an awareness of the process of professional socialization can lead to leadership development programs that can help principals deal with the problems associated with earlier stages of professional socialization and help leaders achieve stage 5 status (Parkay et al., 1992).

Related studies support the claim that a principal's influence has a direct effect on teacher commitment (Hoy et al., 1990). In a study of instructional leadership, Heck et al. (1990) sampled high and low achieving public elementary and high schools in California (N = 30). Teachers (N = 168) and principals (N = 30) in the study were asked to respond to the Instructional Activity Questionnaire, used to determine how elementary and high school principals can influence school achievement. In addition to identifying qualities of effective instructional leadership, Heck et al. (1990) report findings that indicate principals in academically successful schools involve teachers in decision-making regarding instructional strategies. A similar study by Blasé and Blasé (1999) examining
teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership, concludes that principals who promoted classroom instruction display many social influence characteristics. Teachers report that principals who positively influence classroom instruction: communicate with teachers about instruction; create a cooperative and non-threatening atmosphere, encourage peer collaboration, empower teachers through shared decision-making, and support professional development. While these studies involve positive aspects of democratic or empowering leadership, a study by Marshal (1992) identifies traits of empowering leaders as being those of atypical leaders.

In a study of atypical school administrators' values, Marshal (1992), identifies atypical leaders as being different from typical leaders. Typical leaders, according to Marshal (1992), are described as while male administrators who avoid career risks. Specifically the sample (N = 26) includes 5 male minorities, 9 female minorities, 8 white females, and 4 risk taking white males. Participants participated in two interviews: the first interview collected information regarding decision making, socialization, and management strategies, and the second interview collected information regarding identifying and managing ethical dilemmas. The collected data was then analyzed using constant comparative analysis to identify patterns and categorize findings. According to Marshal (1992), atypical leaders are considered to be leaders who question bureaucratic control and hierarchical authority, value the use of persuasion, and express deep sensitivity to teachers. Having identified the values shared by administrators identified as being atypical, Marshal suggests that schools under the leadership of an atypical administrator will be characterized by ‘increased [levels of] equity, empowerment, and
professional development of teachers'” (Marshal, 1992, p. 382). It is important to note that these findings are not generalizable to all administrators as only atypical administrators were interviewed; however, it is significant to note that atypical leaders are associated with teacher empowerment.

While much of the discussion surrounding principal leadership and teacher empowerment focuses on positive results, other studies point out the implications of empowerment in a restructured school (Short, 1998; Smylie, & Brownlee-Conyers, 1992, Weiss, Cambone & Wyeth, 1992). Short claims that teachers in empowered schools must understand the responsibility that comes with empowerment and shared decision-making. Similarly, Weiss et al. (1992) point out that teacher empowerment and shared decision making places increased demands on teachers' time, requires them to expand their knowledge base into areas that were previously the sole concern of administrators, and changes collegial relationships. Johnston and Germinario (1985) acknowledge that not all teachers in their study wanted increased participation in decision-making or school governance.

In their study, Johnston and Germinario (1985), look at the relationship between teachers' level of involvement in decision-making and loyalty to principals. The participants in this study (N = 450) are teachers from 10 elementary and 5 secondary schools in New Jersey. During mandatory staff meetings, participants were asked to complete two questionnaires: the Loyalty Instrument, an 8-item index used to measure teacher loyalty to a school principal, and a teacher decisional participation questionnaire used to measure the level of teacher involvement in decision making. Of the teachers
surveyed in this study, only 9 percent were in a state of decisional equilibrium – the level of participation equals desired level of participation – while 4 percent were saturated – the level of participation exceeds the desired level of participation. In contrast, 87 percent of teachers in this study were decisionally deprived – the level of participation is less that the desired level of participation. These results were consistent with elementary and high school participants. The results of this study indicate that there is a positive relationship between teacher loyalty and the level of involvement in decision-making. Specifically, teachers whose decision-making status was in a state of equilibrium were found to be significantly more loyal to their principal than did teachers experiencing saturated or deprived levels of involvement in decision-making (Johnston & Germinario, 1985). This is significant as suggests that principals can increase levels of teacher loyalty through appropriate levels of involvement in decision-making.

The changing relationship between principals and teachers as a result of empowerment and shared decision making, requires that new roles and responsibilities are made clear for both parties in order for changes to be effective (Smylie & Brownlee-Conyers, 1992). In a study that explores the development of new working relationships between teacher leaders and their principals, Smylie and Brownlee-Conyers (1992) interviewed 7 pairs of teacher leaders and their principals. Using constant comparative method of content analysis, which allows for the identification of themes and patterns of development to emerge from the data collected. Six factors related to the development of new relationships between teacher leaders and principals were discovered: ambiguities and uncertainties, interests and prerogatives, expectations, for the
teacher leadership roles, interpersonal obligations, strategic interaction, and key events. According to Smylie and Brownlee-Conyers (1992), these factors appeared with all seven teacher leader – principal pairings. This discovery led Smylie and Brownlee-Conyers to theorize that it is possible to develop new working relationships between teacher leaders and principals but that this process can only be successful if individual needs are accommodated so that the pair’s collaborative attention can be turned to school improvement initiatives. This requires that principals empower teacher leaders by working collaboratively with teachers and sharing some power. Keedy and Finch (1994) present similar findings in a case study of teacher-principal empowerment.

In a single case study involving a high school adopting a shared governance structure, Keedy and Finch (1994) hypothesize that “Organizational member attitudes and norms are shaped far more by informal negotiation and social interaction than by state and district rules and regulations” (p. 163). According to Keedy and Finch (1994), the redefinition of a principals' power requires that a principal abandons the role of autocratic power broker and become a "statesperson" in order to facilitate collaboration.

A "statesperson" would recognize the importance of teacher expertise and would facilitate shared power in ways that took advantage of that expertise. To support this hypothesis, the researchers used a series of five interviews that had the principal describe his mission, the political and professional culture of the school, his vision for school improvement, and his intentions and strategies used in implementing the shared governance structure. Ten teacher participants were then asked to share their perspective on how their principal helped to improve their school and to identify norms that they
shared with their principal. Finally, all 33 teachers on staff and the assistant principal were asked to complete a school-wide norm checklist. Using thematic analysis, the principal’s responses were compared to teacher responses to support the use of unilateral and shared power.

The results of the Keedy and Finch case study show that the principal initially used authoritarian power to gain control over the school but that the principal and teachers learned how to share power as they worked together to improve their school. The researchers also observed that as teachers became empowered through their participation in the shared governance structure, the principal’s power shifted from positional and unilateral to facilitative. One of the most interesting observations to come out of this case study was the emerging relationship between facilitative leadership and teacher empowerment. According to Keedy and Finch, teacher empowerment resulted in the emergence of facilitative leadership, while facilitative leadership strategies seemed to be a source of teacher empowerment; the two processes became indistinguishable. Although based on a single case study of a principal who believed that shared decision making was essential to achieve instructional improvement, the findings of this study are significant as they point out that “Judicious use of facilitative power [can provide] the organization stability within which teachers are empowered to influence appropriate workplace conditions” (Keedy & Finch, 1994, p. 172). Using the social influence theory, which examines how influence occurs in social situations, researchers examine how principals facilitate teacher empowerment.
Principal Leadership and Social Influence Theory

Initially proposed by Strong (1968), the social influence model, which grew out of opinion change research, suggests that counseling is a process of interpersonal influence. Strong (1968) applies the results of this research to counseling, which attempts to influence clients to attain goals set by the counselor. Dorn (1988) explains the social influence theory as a counseling model that helps clients’ to recognize that perceived difficulties are a result of factors within their control, thus empowering clients to make a positive change. According to Dorn (1988), this method of counseling challenges the client’s worldview leading to a state of cognitive dissonance. Following Festinger’s (1957) cognitive dissonance theory, cognitive dissonance is experienced when an individual knowingly holds an opinion that differs from the opinion of another (cited by Strong, 1968). The dissonance experienced by an individual will increase proportionately with the amount of perceived discrepancy between the two opinions (Strong, 1968). Although a client can attempt to resolve this dissonance in a variety of ways, the counselor wants the client to accept the factors that he or she proposes. According to Dorn (1988), “clients are more likely to accept the counselor’s suggested reattributions if they perceive the counselor as expert, trustworthy, and socially attractive” (p. 271).

From this research, Strong (1968) proposes the social influence theory, which isolates expertness, trustworthiness, attractiveness, and involvement as key variables for counselors to successfully deal with cognitive dissonance and empower clients to move in a predetermined direction. Strong (1968) suggests that a communicator’s ability to
resolve cognitive dissonance and change the opinion of a client is directly affected by the
communicator’s perceived expertness. This suggests that a high level of perceived
expertness will allow for greater degrees of discrepant communications, which will also
promote greater degrees of change in a client. A counselor’s perceived trustworthiness is
a product of reputation for honesty, professional credibility, sincerity and openness, and
perceived altruistic motivation. Strong (1968) cites studies by Hovland and Weiss
(1951), Kelam and Hovland (1953), Hovland and Mandel (1952), and Zogna and Hunter
(1953), which show that trustworthiness and opinion change increases with high source
credibility. Research suggests that “Perceived untrustworthiness can obviate the
influence of expertness; perceived trustworthiness can compensate for ambiguous
expertness” (Strong, 1968, pg. 219). The perceived attractiveness of a communicator
reflects the degree to which a subject views the communicator as being similar. If the
opinion of the communicator and the subject is perceived to be similar, the subject will be
more likely to view the communicator as being compatible, likeable and intelligent, thus
affecting the communicator’s ability to influence change (Strong, 1968). Finally, opinion
change is most successful when the recipient of the communication is highly involved in
the influence process. Based on his analysis of opinion change research, Strong (1968)
concludes that perceived expertness, trustworthiness, attractiveness, and involvement are
important variables for reducing cognitive dissonance created by discrepant
communications and; therefore, are essential for a counselor to effectively influence a
client.

When applied to counseling, Strong (1968) suggests that counselors must be aware
of the relationship between perceived expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness and a client’s willingness to change. Counselors must provide evidence of expertness by displaying symbols of expertness such as diploma’s, licenses, and certificates; and by properly structuring and organizing communication. A counselor’s perceived trustworthiness can be enhanced through sincere displays of dedication to an optimistic outlook about a client’s welfare. Counselor attractiveness can be controlled by the behaviour of the counselor when communicating with a client. When a counselor communicates empathy and understanding to a client in a non-judgmental way, similarity is also being communicated. Active listening and restating a client’s feelings will also enhance client involvement (Strong, 1968). These conclusions, which form the basis of social influence theory, suggest that the communicator can manipulate the variables affecting opinion change.

Two key components of social influence theory are credibility and social attractiveness (Cooper & Croyle, 1984). Martin (1978) identifies credibility as expert power and attractiveness as referent power. Expert power results from the, belief of a person that another person has special knowledge or skill. Referent power results when a person identifies positively with another person based on perceived similarities. A study by Rahim (1989) concludes that there is a significant relationship between expert and referent power bases to compliance and employee satisfaction. In order to measure the effect that components of social influence theory has on teachers, the researchers use the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES).

The SPES, a 5-point Likert scale, is designed to measure six aspects of empower-
ment that included decision-making, professional growth status, self-efficacy, autonomy, and impact (Rinehart et al., 1998). Findings suggest that the SPES has potential as a measurement of teachers' perception of empowerment and is able to identify empowered and unempowered schools (Short & Rinehart, 1992). In order to measure principals' expertness, social attractiveness, and trustworthiness, the three components of social influence, the researchers adapted a social influence rating scale (Barak, 1979), which was "designed to measure clients' perception of their counselor's ability to persuade" (p. 638). Rinehart et al., conclude, "social attractiveness and trustworthiness were significantly related to teacher empowerment...[and] that all dimensions of participant empowerment [were] positively related to all three components of social influence theory" (p. 644). This suggests that a principal's ability to influence teacher empowerment is directly related to individual social attributes as well as to teachers' perceptions of principals in terms of credibility (expertness and trustworthiness), and social, attractiveness.

These results are supported in a review of business leadership models by Goleman (1998), which looks at technical skills, IQ, and emotional intelligence, as measures of excellent performance. After analyzing competency models from 188 companies and categorizing capabilities into three categories: purely technical skills, cognitive abilities, and emotional intelligence, emotional intelligence proves to be twice as important as technical skill and expertness for jobs at all levels in promoting change. Components of emotional intelligence as a measure of a leader's ability to work with others and effectively lead change include trustworthiness and integrity, service to clients and
customers, effectiveness in leading change, persuasiveness, optimism, organizational commitment and expertise in building and leading teams (Goleman, 1998).

From the principal's perspective, Keedy and Finch (1994) conclude that site-based management provides principals with autonomy to implement shared decision-making. They also conclude that judicious use of facilitative power by principals provide the organizational stability within which teachers are empowered to influence appropriate workplace conditions. A study by Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1992) claims that, although willing to embrace changes in school governance through greater teacher involvement, most principals in their study have difficulty breaking out of old administrative models. A similar study by Spaulding (1997) reports that only 12 out of 81 participating teachers describe a present or past principal as democratic or empowering. Chapman and Boyd (1986) report that principals who were forced to share decision-making felt that they lost power and found themselves in a struggle for power with individual teachers, school councils, and administrative committees. Principals found that collaboration was not always effective because of teachers whose goal it was to undermine the collaborative process (Chapman & Boyd, 1986). In order for changes in school governance to be implemented successfully, Weiss et al. (1992) warn that power needs to be well defined and lines of responsibility made clear since the principal is officially and legally accountable for decisions made by a participatory body. The impact that empowering leadership behaviours have on teachers includes increased confidence, motivation, job satisfaction, improved self-esteem, and a sense of security; however, Rinehart et. al. (1998) contend that there is not enough empirical evidence
that "describes the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal characteristics that influence teachers to change" (p.634).

In the study, *Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process*, Rinehart et al. (1998) look at "the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of a principal’s social influence and their own empowerment" (p. 636). Drawing upon social influence research, Rinehart et al. investigate the relationship between teachers’ views of principals’ trustworthiness, expertness, and social attractiveness, key components of social influence theory, and their own sense of empowerment. Elements of participant empowerment include decision-making, autonomy, professional growth, impact, status, and self-efficacy.

In order to establish this relationship, Rinehart et al. (1998) pose two major research questions. The first research question asks, "what is the relationship between a composite measure of school participant empowerment and the principals’ persuasiveness (trustworthiness, expertness, and social attractiveness)?" (p. 637). The second research question in this study asks, "what is the relationship between the dimensions of empowerment (decision making, autonomy, professional growth, impact, status, and self-efficacy) and principals’ perceived social [influence] characteristics (trustworthiness, expertness, and attractiveness)?" (p. 637). The hypothesis of this study is that there will be a relationship between a principal’s perceived social influence characteristics and dimensions of teacher empowerment.

In order to capture individual perceptions, the participants in the Rinehart et al. (1998) study (N = 525), chosen as the unit of analysis, were teachers taken from a
random sample of 25 elementary schools in a central region of a northeastern state in the United States of America. Teachers from the randomly selected schools were invited to participate if they had been teaching at their present location for at least 1 year, and their principals had been in their role for at least 2 years.

The methodology of this study involved gaining consent to conduct the study from the school district and then contacting the principals by phone to explain the study and to gain his or her approval to invite teachers from that school to participate. Arrangements were made to attend staff meetings at each of the participating schools where the researchers explained the purpose and methodology of the study, distributed the data collection instruments, provided instructions for the completion of the instruments, assured confidentiality, and identified a teacher who would be responsible to collect and return completed instruments. The completed instruments were then returned to the researchers in self-addressed stamped envelopes. Participating teachers were asked to complete two questionnaires: (a) the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), a 38 question instrument that measures the overall perception of empowerment (Short & Rinehart, 1992) and (b) the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS), a 36-item questionnaire that measures perceived levels of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness - three key dimensions of social influence theory. (see Design and Methodology in the present study for a detailed description of these instruments)

The data collected from the instruments was used to investigate the two research questions. The relationship between teachers’ perceived levels of empowerment and their perceptions of principals’ expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness was
analysed using a composite for each of the variables and submitting the variables to a regression analysis with empowerment as the dependent variable and expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness as the independent variables. The second research question, which examined the relationship between the dimensions of empowerment (decision making, autonomy, professional growth, impact, status, and self-efficacy) and the social influence characteristics of principal persuasiveness (expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness) was analysed by submitting the sub-scales of the two constructs to a canonical correlation and Pearson Product Moment Correlations.

The results of the Rinehart et al. (1998) study are significant as they suggest that there is a strong relationship between the variables for participant empowerment and principals’ social influence. Specifically, participants in this study report higher perceived levels of empowerment in schools where principals were perceived as being socially influential. Although the results indicate that all dimensions of participant empowerment are positively related to the three components of social influence, regression analysis of the composite for empowerment over the components of social influence reveal that the components of social influence most significantly relating to participant empowerment are social attractiveness and trustworthiness. These findings are significant as they suggest that teacher empowerment can be linked to principal leadership attributes and to the relationship between principals and teachers. If teacher empowerment is considered a key to achieving sustainable educational reform initiatives, principals must be aware of this relationship, and develop the attributes of social influence. Although significant, these findings represent the perceptions of 525
elementary school teachers from the northeastern United States. Accordingly, Rinehart et al. conclude that additional research on the relationship between teacher empowerment and the social influence of principals must be conducted with other populations in other geographical locations.

C. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The present study will be organized similar to the study, *Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process* (Rinehart et al., 1998). It will investigate the following two research questions: First, what is the relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and the principals' social influence, as measured by a stepwise multiple regression analysis of the components of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (decision making, autonomy, status, impact, professional development, and self-efficacy), in a high school population in southwestern Ontario, Canada?

A more detailed analysis will be used to examine the correlation between the various components of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (decision making, autonomy, status, impact, professional development, and self-efficacy) and the components of the principals' perceived social influence (trustworthiness, expertness, and attractiveness).

D. Significance of the Proposed Study

The original study, *Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process* (Rinehart et al., 1998), examined a population of elementary school teachers in a northeastern state in the United States of America.
Rinehart et al. (1998) caution that "the results, conclusions, and implications [of their study] should be applied to teachers and administrators at other grade levels and at other geographical locations with caution" (p. 645). Limiting factors such as teacher training, school organization and governance, external pressures [including politics, economics, and accountability measures], curriculum expectations, and the potential difference between elementary and high school teachers must be taken into consideration. Additional research is needed to understand the significance that the social influence theory has for high school teachers and principals in a Canadian public school system, which is the focus of the current study.

The current study is significant to all of the participants in educational reform and school governance at the elementary and high school level. Provincial Premiers, Ministers of Education, and education policy-makers who institute educational reform need to understand the influence process in order to successfully implement change. District school board trustees also need to understand the influence process in order to empower both principals and teachers and thus see changes implemented effectively. Directors of Education and Superintendents might benefit from this study as they learn how to give principals the authority to empower teachers. They will be able to recruit and train potential principals who understand the role of the principal in influencing change and facilitating teacher empowerment. Parents' councils might benefit from this study, as it will provide valuable insight into the power structure of schools and the most effective relationship between principals and teachers.

This study might be significant to principals, as it might help them to understand
the benefits and ramifications of teacher empowerment. Teachers, the front line participants who implement change, might benefit from this study as it will help them understand the relationship between teacher and principal, it will make them aware of their own level of and desire for empowerment, and will address the implications and responsibilities that accompany teacher empowerment.

Universities and Faculties of Education might also benefit from this study, as the findings will help them to teach future principals the value of sharing power. These institutions will also be able to teach future principals how to influence teacher empowerment. Since the goal of educational reform, theoretically, is to provide better education for all students, the effective implementation of change through principals’ influence of teacher empowerment will ultimately benefit student achievement.
CHAPTER II

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. Subjects

The current study modified the original study by examining public secondary school teachers in southwestern Ontario. The population of this study included teachers from 12 high schools from a public board of education in southwestern Ontario. All teachers who had been employed as instructors at their present site for at least 1 year, where principals had assumed their administrative role for at least 1 semester, were invited to participate. The length of time principals had assumed their administrative role at their assigned schools, which was reduced from 2 years to 1 semester, was necessary due to the high number of transfers and newly appointed principals during the time of this study. A total of 197 teachers out of a possible 564 teachers responded for a 34.9% return rate, significantly lower than the 77.4% return rate of the original study.

B. Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were the same as the data collection instruments used in Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process (Rinehart et al., 1998). Teachers and principals were asked to respond to two questionnaires: (a) the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) (see Appendix A), designed by Short and Rinehart (1992) and (b) the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS) (see Appendix B), designed by Dorn (1984) based on Barak’s (1979) Counselor Rating Form. These instruments are designed to measure a construct that contains subscales or components (Rinehart et al., 1998, p. 639).
The SPES is a 38-item instrument that measures an overall perception of empowerment. A five point Likert scale, with anchors from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, were used to collect the reactions of the participants. A factor analysis of the SPES revealed six dimensions that underlie the construct. The dimensions and the internal consistency estimates (coefficient alpha) are decision-making (.89), professional growth (.83), status (.86), self-efficacy (.84), autonomy (.81), and impact (.82). As a composite, the 38 items have a reliability estimate of .94 (Rinehart et al., 1998; Short & Rinehart, 1992). This study used the same six dimensions. The internal consistency estimates (coefficient alpha) of the dimensions were very similar to the original study: are decision-making (.85), professional growth (.80), status (.87), self-efficacy (.88), autonomy (.54), and impact (.83). As a composite, the 38 items have a reliability estimate of .94.

The PRQS is a 36-item semantic differential scale that measures three social influence dimensions: expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Rinehart et al., 1998). The PRQS was adapted by Rinehart et al. (1998) from “a rating scale of social influence (Barak, 1979; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), which was based on the work of Strong (1968)” (Rinehart et al., 1998). Barak’s Counselor Rating Form was originally designed by Barak and LaCrosse (1975) to test Strong’s (1968) conclusions that “counselors who are perceived by clients as expert, attractive, and trustworthy, should be more influential with clients that counselors not perceived as such” (Barak, 1979, pg.2). Although constructed to test Strong’s (1968) assumptions, the purpose of the Counselor Rating Form was extended to serve as a dependent variable in counseling research by
accurately assessing the perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness of
counselors; as a means to provide meaningful feedback to a supervised counselor; and as
a tool to compare perceptions of all participants in the counseling process (Barak, 1979,
pg. 2). To develop the Counselor Rating Form, eighty-three adjectives relating to
counselors' expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, were taken from research by
Dell (1973); Kaul & Schmidt (1971); Schmidt & Strong (1970, 1971); Strong (1968,
1970, 1971); Strong & Dixon (1971); Strong & Matross (1973); Strong & Schmidt
(1970a, 1970b); and Strong, Taylor, Bratton & Lapper (1971), and were classified into
one of the three categories of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness by a panel of
four judges. (See Barak, 1979, for a full description of the classification process).
Thirty-six items were selected to create the Counselor Rating Form, with each of the
three categories of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness represented by 12
items. The adjectives were then matched with an antonym to create “a bipolar adjective
pair with a 7-point bipolar scale” and were then randomly distributed throughout the list
(Barak, 1979).

Barak (1979) reported mean reliabilities for expertness, attractiveness, and
trustworthiness to be .87, .85, and .91, respectively. Convergent and divergent validity
between scales was indicated by moderate intercorrelations between scales (Rinehart et
al., 1998). The predictive validity of the Counselor Rating Form is supported in a study
by LaCrosse (1979), although this study found that initial perceptions of expertness
“were the most powerful predictors of outcome among the predictors studied” (LaCrosse,
1979, pg. 324). In the present study, the mean reliabilities for the three social influence
dimensions are expertness (.93), attractiveness (.91), and trustworthiness (.94). As a composite, the three social influence dimensions have a reliability estimate of .97. Concurrent validity was demonstrated by using the instrument to find differences between participants.

C. **Design and Procedures**

The design and procedures of this study differ slightly from the original study. This relational study was not a random convenience sample as all secondary schools in the participating school board were invited to participate. Of the two schools that did not participate, one was about to be closed and the principal of the other had only been in his current position for 4 months and thus did not meet the required criteria. Permission to use the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Principal Rating Form Quick Score was requested, and granted from Rinehart (see Appendix C). Permission to conduct the study was requested, and granted from the Ethics Committee at University of Windsor (see Appendix D). Permission to conduct the study was also requested, and granted from the Director of Education (see Appendix E).

After receiving permission to conduct the study, the researcher contacted every principal by phone to explain the study, to ask for permission to include his or her school in the study, to briefly explain the study and specify what instruments the teachers would be expected to complete, and to offer an information package if the principal required a more detailed explanation of the study. Immediately after the phone conversations, follow up letters, and information packages if requested, were sent to principals acknowledging the arrangements (see Appendix F). Program Leaders from each school
volunteered to be a school contact. The school contacts were mailed research packages, which contained individual Teacher Research Packages (see Appendix G). The school contacts then placed Teacher Research Packages in the mailboxes of every teacher at each of the participating schools. Each package contained a Teacher Information Letter (see Appendix H), data collection instruments, and a return envelope. The Teacher Information Letter outlined the purpose and methodology of the study, the rights of participants to withdraw, and issues of confidentiality. It also indicated that the return of completed questionnaires would be taken as “implied consent” for participation in this study. Teachers were also asked to place completed questionnaires in the envelopes that were included with their packages and to submit their envelopes to the school contacts who then placed the teacher envelopes in large self-addressed return envelopes. The school contacts collected and returned completed questionnaires to the researcher within two weeks.

D. Data Analysis

As in the original study, the teachers (N=197) in this relational study were chosen as the unit of analysis to capture individual perceptions. The data collected from the participating teachers was used to investigate the two research questions. The first research question was to examine the relationship between teacher’s perceptions about empowerment and their principals’ expertness, trustworthiness, and social attractiveness. A composite was formed for each of the four variables, and they were submitted to a stepwise regression analysis with empowerment as the dependent variable and expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness as the independent variables (Rinehart et

The subscales of the constructs were used to address the second research question, which looked at the relationship between the six components of empowerment and the three components of principal social influence.

E. Results

As in the original study, multicolinearity could have existed among the independent variables. There was a moderately high correlation between trustworthiness and expertness \( (r = .76, p = .01) \), a high correlation between trustworthiness and social attractiveness \( (r = .87, p = .01) \), and a moderate correlation between expertness and social attractiveness \( (r = .69, p = .01) \) (Table 1) In order to determine if statistical instability would be present, variance inflation factors (VIF) were calculated.

**Table 1**

Pearson Product Moment Correlations and Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>SPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Empowerment</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Decision making</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Professional Growth</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Status</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Autonomy</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Impact</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Expertness</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Social attractiveness</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* < .05

VIFs are measures that are used to indicate if there is a strong linear relationship between
independent variables. A statistical problem is thought to exist when VIFs exceed 10 (Rinehart et al., 1998, p. 641). The VIFs for social attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness, as presented in Table 1, are .16, .08, and .15 are statistically insignificant. Therefore, even though the bivariate correlations appear to be moderately high, multicollinearity is not a statistical problem.

Table 2
Stepwise Regression – Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>-0.043*</td>
<td>-0.471</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>-0.015*</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Expertness
b. Dependent Variable: SPES Total

Table 3
Regression Coefficients, Standard Error, t test, Multiple Correlation, and F Ratio for the Regression Analysis of Empowerment, Social Attractiveness, Expertness, and Trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t test</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>93.46</td>
<td>8.395</td>
<td>11.133</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>-1.578</td>
<td>2.939</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertness</td>
<td>8.511</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.795</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first and only variable to emerge from the stepwise regression analysis was Expertness (R = .387; R² = .15; F = 3,193 = 11.35; p = < .001) (Table 3).

Trustworthiness and Social Attractiveness did not add to the analysis. Table 2 shows the results of the stepwise regression analysis. Analysis of the regression coefficients indicates that principals’ expertness was the strongest predictor of social influence theory to emerge in the regression analysis, but trustworthiness and social attractiveness also
correlated with teachers' perceptions of empowerment (p < .05, see Table 1). These outcomes suggest that secondary school teachers feel empowered when they perceive that their principals are experts. This does not suggest that principals can disregard attractiveness and trustworthiness as powerful motivators or exclude teachers from the decision making process as the correlation coefficients for these variables also indicated a positive relationship with teacher empowerment.

Forced entry regression, which included attractiveness and trustworthiness produced an insignificant change (R = .387, R² = .150) compared to the stepwise regression (R = .386, R² = .149), which included only expertness. This result supports a study by Dorn (1988) that challenges the initial view of the social influence process upon which the data collection instruments for this study were built, arguing that the qualities of social influence are interdependent. Rather than viewing the sub-scales of social influence as interdependent, Dorn (1988) argues that perceived expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness are independent measurable qualities, questioning the correlational relevance of these variables. According to Dorn (1988), counselor power fluctuates between the three qualities of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, but they are difficult to employ simultaneously at an optimum level. Dorn (1988) questions this assumption, suggesting that expertness, social attractiveness, and trustworthiness are interrelated and are simply one quality.

F. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' social influence (trustworthiness, social attractiveness, and
expertness) and their own feelings of empowerment (decision-making, professional development, status, autonomy, impact, and self-efficacy). The results of this study provide empirical data about the qualities of socially influential principals and the effect that these qualities may have on teachers' perceptions of empowerment, as perceived by 197 high school teachers from 12 public secondary schools in southwestern Ontario.

The results of this study support several of the conclusions from the original study, Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process (Rinehart et al., 1998). As is the original study, the data analysis in this study support a strong relationship between the two sets of variables for participant empowerment and social influence theory. In addition, the results of both studies indicate that teacher empowerment is directly linked to the relationship between principals and teachers. An implication of this relationship is the power of perception. If teachers perceive principals as being socially influential their own perceptions of empowerment may increase. Clearly, perceptions do matter and perceptions can be shaped if principals are aware of the significance of this aspect of their relationships with teachers.

Since the present study uses the same data collection instruments as Rinehart et al. (1998), some of the results are similar. Both studies report multicolinearity between social attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. While the Variance Inflation Factors in the original study were higher for social attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness at 5.04, 3.64, and 7.67, statistical instability was not a problem in either study. Therefore, the data collection instruments proved to be equally reliable. Results of the regression analysis from the original study (R = .42, R^2 = .18) are only slightly
higher than the present study, indicating a similar relationship among the four variables, empowerment, social attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness, in predicting empowerment.

The most significant difference between the present study and Rinehart et al. (1998) is in the correlation between empowerment and social attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. When the composite for empowerment was regressed over the components of social influence (social attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness) a strong relationship between social attractiveness, trustworthiness and teacher empowerment. The regression coefficients for attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness were 0.26, 0.03, and 0.29. These results also show a statistically insignificant relationship between teacher empowerment and expertness. These results are the opposite of the present study, which reports regression coefficients for attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness of −1.6, 8.5, and .84. In the present study, the only statistically significant relationship is between teacher empowerment and expertness. It is interesting to note that, in the present study, the least significant relationship exists between teacher empowerment and social attractiveness.

While expertness was found to be the strongest predictor of social influence, the results of this study suggest either a lack of understanding of the term “Attractive” within the context of social influence, or a lack of comfort responding to a question about principal attractiveness. On question 5 of the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (Appendix B), which asks respondents to rate their principals as being attractive or unattractive, selection 4, representing a neutral stance on attractiveness, was the largest
single response at 29.4 percent. Eighty-seven percent rated their principal between selection 1 (strongly agree) and 4 (neutral) on the seven point Likert scale. Fifty-eight or 29.4 percent of the respondents chose number 4, which registers as a neutral answer on the seven point Likert scale while 20 percent chose number 3 indicating a moderate perception of principal attractiveness. Only 13.2 percent chose selection number 1, indicating attractiveness while 57.9 percent of respondents, the cumulative percentage of selections 1, 2, and 3 rated their principals as moderately to strongly attractive. Twenty five percent of respondents, the cumulative percentage of selections 5, 6, and 7 rated their principals as moderately to strongly unattractive. Only 5.6 percent chose number 5, 5.6 percent chose number 6 and 1.5 percent chose selection number 7. Although a majority of respondents rated their principal as being moderately to strongly attractive, the correlation between attractiveness and teachers’ feelings of empowerment was the least significant variable in this study, as a predictor of principals’ social influence.

The differences between the present study and the study by Rinehart et al. (1998) may suggest differences between high school and elementary teachers, with the relationships that exist between teachers and administrators in the elementary and high school systems, the perceived roles that administrators play in the respective panels, and the personalities of teachers and administrator’s in the respective panels. In elementary schools, which are typically smaller than high schools, the principal, as the instructional leader may be in closer contact with staff, thus increasing the power of social attractiveness as a motivator. Further, elementary teachers are required to assume a more nurturing role with students than is generally the case in a high school. This may account
for an increased emphasis on trustworthiness and social attractiveness when compared to high schools, where principals may be viewed less as instructional leaders and more as managers, thus explaining the power of perceived expertness as a motivator in the high school panel. This premise is supported by Gonzales and Short (1996) whose study reported that empowered teachers perceive their principals to use expert, referent and reward power bases. Finally, the personalities of elementary and high school teachers may differ since elementary school teachers are typically subject generalists compared to subject specialists at high schools. It is reasonable to assume that a subject specialist will look more favourably on a principal who is perceived as an expert and that a high school subject specialist will feel empowered when involved with curriculum related decision making and planning.

Although the findings of this study support the findings of the original study, in establishing a relationship between principal leadership and teacher empowerment, it is important to note that the original study, which studied elementary school teachers, established a positive correlation between principals’ perceived trustworthiness and social attractiveness while this study found the strongest correlation between teacher empowerment and principals’ perceived expertness. Further study into the differences in the environments of elementary schools and secondary schools may help to explain this discrepancy. The current study and the original study assumed that the length of time a principal had been in a school was significant. The design of this study assumes that the validity of teachers’ perceptions of their own level of empowerment and of their principal’s leadership style increases and decreases according to the length of time a
principal has been in a building. Due to high retirement numbers during the time of this study, there have been many transfers and newly appointed principals. As a result, the length of time principals had assumed their administrative role at their assigned schools was reduced from 2 years to 1 semester. Seven of the 12 participating schools had an administrator who had been in their current for less than 2 years, while 3 schools had administrators who had been in their position for less than one year. This limitation may explain why principals’ expertness was significantly related to teacher empowerment while trustworthiness and attractiveness were statistically insignificant since in many cases, there had not been enough time for staff to get to know and trust their administrator. In this situation, teachers may have only been able to accurately respond to the quality of expertness as there had not been sufficient time for teachers or administrators to establish a rapport. It is also possible that participants who felt unfamiliar with their principals, may have assumed a level of “expertness” in absence of personal familiarity. This is a plausible explanation as teachers were faced with many secondary school reform initiatives during the time of this study. As leaders in a time of change, it would have been easy for teachers to perceive “expertness” in an administrator who was relatively new to a school. This suggests that a teacher’s perception of a principal’s trustworthiness and social attractiveness may increase over time because of an increased amount of interaction. This may also suggest that early perceived ‘expertness’ may show attrition as teachers accurately assess principals’ level of expertise over time and in a variety of situations.

If principals understand the dynamic nature of the principal teacher relationship,
that perceptions may change over time or as working relationships change, they will understand that they must continually work on building relationships with the teaching staff. This conclusion is supported by Fullan (2001) who contends that leaders must be relationship builders since they “will increase their effectiveness if they continually work on the [...] components of leadership” (pg. 11). Principals may also want to deal with this dynamic relationship by developing transformational leadership skills. This supports the findings in the study by Johnston and Germinario (1985) who concluded that there is a positive relationship between teacher loyalty and the level of involvement in decision-making. Specifically, teachers who were happy with their level of involvement with decision-making were found to be more loyal to their principal than teachers who were not happy with their decision-making status. This supports the conclusion that principals can use social influence characteristics to improve the relationship with teachers and increase teacher loyalty. Smylie and Brownlee-Conyers (1992) theorize that it is possible to develop new working relationships between teacher leaders and principals but that this process can only be successful if individual needs are accommodated so that the pair’s collaborative attention can be turned to school improvement initiatives. This conclusion is supported by Leithwood (1992) who suggests that “transformational leaders are in [...] continuous pursuit of three fundamental goals: 1) helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture; 2) fostering teacher development; and 3) helping them solve problems together more effectively” (pg. 9-10). With an awareness of the potentially ever changing perceptions of teachers and of transformational leadership strategies, principals may work toward maintaining a positive
relationship with teachers by continually reminding the teaching staff that of their shared commitment to teaching and learning and that the expertise and efforts of the teaching staff is valued.

It may be important for teachers, administrators, and senior administration to be aware of the potentially dynamic relationship that exists between a principal’s length of time in a building and perceived levels of expertness, trustworthiness, and social attractiveness. If perceptions can change over time teachers may wish to periodically reevaluate their perceptions of their principals as empowering leaders, rather than form an early opinion that forms the basis of a lasting perception. Principals must also be aware that the amount of time they spend in a building may affect teachers’ perceptions of their trustworthiness and social attractiveness and that they must may need to continually upgrade their knowledge base in order to maintain a high level of perceived expertness, a perceived quality that may in fact decrease with time. This potential relationship may also be significant to superintendents and directors who may wish to move principals periodically to deal with any potentially negative effects that time may have on a principal’s ability to be an empowerer of teachers and a leader in a culture of change.

This study does not take into account a principal’s years of experience, or length of time at a school, which may have an impact on teachers’ perceptions of empowerment and principal leadership style. Parkay et al. (1992) identify 5 stages of professional socialization that principals may experience. According to this study, principals progress through the stages of professional socialization because of years of experience.
Principals in stages 1, 2, and 3 rely on positional power, are mostly concerned with adjusting to the pressures of the job, are concerned with maintaining control, and limit the contributions of others. As principals advance to higher stages of professional socialization they not only recognize the need to empower teachers, they facilitate empowering activities such as shared decision-making, and are perceived as being empowering (Parkay et al. 1992). This suggests that stage 5 principals have highly developed social influence characteristics. The current study only identifies a relationship between teachers' perceptions of empowerment and leadership style, it does not investigate the possibility that teachers' perceptions of empowerment may increase with principals' years of experience.

An explanation for the statistical insignificance of “attractiveness” as an empowering quality is the possibility that respondents did not understand the term “attractiveness” within the context of this study. While the researchers in the original study spoke directly to respondents at staff meetings and were able to explain all aspects of the study in detail and answer questions, the current study was limited to providing participants with a cover letter explaining the study. It was anticipated that participants would be more likely to participate in the study if the teacher packages did not require a significant amount of reading. Because of this decision, neither the term “attractive” nor the social influence theory was explained in this letter. This omission may be viewed as a limitation to this study.

A possible statistical limitation of this study, compared to Rinehart et al. (1998) is the relatively small sample (N = 197) when compared to the significantly larger sample
(N = 525) in the original study. In addition, item eleven was omitted from the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) that was sent to the participants in this study. This item was part of the autonomy subscale. This is the smallest of six subscales of the SPES, with only four corresponding items: numbers five, eleven, seventeen, and twenty-three. This did not have a noticeable impact on the mean reliabilities of this study, which are reported as being very similar to the mean reliabilities in original study and it did not have a noticeable effect on the correlations between the SPES and the PRQS since principal expertness was the only dimension of the SPES to have a statistically significant relationship to teachers’ perceptions of empowerment; however, this omission must be noted as a potential limitation within the subscales.

While the results of this study are important in understanding the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principals’ social influence characteristics and their own sense of empowerment, these results must be viewed with caution when applying them to high school teachers and principals in schools in other geographic areas, or to separate or private schools, or to senior administrators, vice-principals, colleges, or universities.

The hostile political climate that has existed in Ontario throughout the 1990s, between the Premier, Minister of Education and secondary school teachers, surrounding secondary school reform efforts, will also confound the results. It is important to note that educational reforms in Ontario, throughout the late 1990s did not follow an empowering implementation strategy but rather were implemented through legislation imposed on district school boards, principals, and teachers.
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Appendix A: School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES)
Copyright © Paula M. Short & James S. Rinehart

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS)

Principal Rating Form Quick Score

Listed below are several scales which contain word pairs at either end of the scale and seven spaces between the pairs. Please rate your participation on each of the scales:

(1) agreeable 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 disagreeable
(2) unalert 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 alert
(3) analytic 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 diffuse
(4) unappreciative 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 appreciative
(5) attractive 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 unattractive
(6) casual 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 formal
(7) cheerful 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 depressed
(8) vague 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 clear
(9) distant 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 close
(10) compatible 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 incompatible
(11) unsure 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 confident
(12) suspicious 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 believable
(13) undependable 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 dependable
(14) indifferent 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 enthusiastic
(15) inexperienced 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 experienced
(16) inexpert 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 expert
(17) unfriendly 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 friendly
(18) honest 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 dishonest
(19) informed 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 ignorant
(20) insightful 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 insightless
(21) stupid 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 intelligent
(22) unlikeable 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 likeable
(23) logical 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 illogical
(24) open 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 closed
(25) prepared 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 unprepared
(26) unreliable 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 reliable
(27) disrespectful 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 respectful
(28) irresponsible 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 responsible
(29) selfless 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 selfish
(30) sincere 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 insincere
(31) skillful 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 unskillful
(32) sociable 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 unsociable
(33) deceitful 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 straightforward
(34) trustworthy 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 untrustworthy
(35) genuine 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 phony
(36) warm 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 ----- 6 ----- 7 cold
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Appendix C: Letter of Permission to Use Data Collection Instruments – James Rinehart

James R. Morton
P.O. Box 764
Wyoming, Ontario, N0N 1T0

2000 03 20

James S. Rinehart
Department of Administration and Supervision
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky, 40506

Dear Mr. Rinehart:

My name is James Morton and I am graduate student at the University of Windsor's Faculty of Education. I am writing to request your permission to use the School Participant Empowerment Scale and the Principal Rating Quick Form Score in a research study that I plan to conduct in order to meet the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

The proposed study will replicate Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process (Rinehart, Short, Short & Eckley, 1998). I plan on modifying the study by looking at a random sample of 25 public high schools in southwestern Ontario. Teachers and principals who participate in this study will be asked to complete the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS). Participation will be voluntary and confidentiality will be ensured.

Aside from the modified sample, all aspects of the study will replicate your original study. The research proposal is enclosed.

The Faculty of Education Ethics Committee at the University of Windsor has approved this research study. If you have any questions or concerns about the proposed study, I can be reached at home (-519-845-0069) or at work (1-519-882-1910).

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

James R. Morton

enclosure
Appendix D: Letter of Permission to the Ethics Committee

Friday, May 30, 2003

Ethics Co-coordinator
Office of Research Services
University of Windsor
Chrysler Hall Tower, Room 309
Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4

Dear Ethics Co-coordinator:

My name is James Morton and I am graduate student at the University of Windsor's Faculty of Education. I am writing to request your approval for a research study that I plan to conduct in order to meet the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

The proposed study will replicate Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process (Rinehart, Short, Short & Eckley, 1998). The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teacher's perceptions of principals and their own empowerment. Specifically, this study will investigate the covariance between teachers' view of their principal's trustworthiness, expertness, and social attractiveness and their sense of empowerment. Data will be collected from those high schools in the Lambton Kent District School Board where principals have assumed their duties for at least one year. Only those teachers who have been employed as instructors at their present site for at least one year will be invited to participate. Teachers who participate in this study will be asked to complete two instruments: the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS). Participation will be voluntary and confidentiality will be ensured.

There are no known risks associated with this study and participants may withdraw at any time. Seven copies of the University of Windsor Application To Involve Human Subjects In Research, data collection instruments, and the appropriate letters requesting permission and consent are enclosed. If you have any questions or concerns about the proposed study, I can be reached at home (1-519-845-0069), at work (1-519-882-1910), or by e-mail (jns@xcelco.on.ca).

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing this request.

Sincerely,

James R. Morton

enclosure
Appendix E: Letter of Permission to Director of Education

2003-05-30

Mr. Paul De Sadeleer  
Director of Education  
Lambton Kent District School Board  
200 Wellington Street, P.O. Box 2019  
Sarnia, Ontario, N7T 2L7

Dear Mr. De Sadeleer:

My name is James Morton, I am a graduate student at the University of Windsor's Faculty of Education, and I am a Program Leader of Languages at Lambton Central Collegiate and Vocational Institute. I am writing to request your permission to include the Lambton Kent District School Board in a research study that I plan to conduct in order to meet the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Education.


The general purpose of this study is to add to existing knowledge of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership. As schools face continuous educational reform efforts, principals and teachers need to redefine their roles in the school structure. Principals are being challenged to shed their traditional power-oriented leadership roles and become instructional leaders who influence and inspire teachers to facilitate change. Similarly, teachers are being challenged to accept additional responsibilities and become part of the school governance structure that effectively implements change. In order to understand this influence process, researchers have studied leadership styles, the influence process, the relationship between principal and teachers, teacher trust and loyalty, teacher job satisfaction, power bases, empowerment, and organizational structures. Rinehart, Short, Short and Eckley (1998) report that studies, to date, show significant associations between empowerment and many organizational variables such as job satisfaction, climate, conflict, commitment and program structure. They also report that changes to school governance do not necessarily result in increased feelings of participant empowerment. Therefore, teacher empowerment may be related to organizational variables but not to school governance. In order to explain the relationship between principal leadership and teacher empowerment, the researchers focus on social influence theory that suggests, credibility which is a combination of expertness and trustworthiness, and social attractiveness are powerful and persuasive elements of influence.

This study will explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals’
social influence and their own empowerment. Specifically, this study will investigate the covariance between the view teachers have of their principal’s trustworthiness, expertness and social attractiveness and their sense of empowerment. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principals and their own sense of empowerment.

Data will be collected from those high schools in the Lambton Kent District School Board where principals have assumed their duties for at least one semester. The original study required principals to have been in their present position for at least two years but due to retirements and administrative moves within the Lambton Kent District School Board, I have had to modify the criteria to allow for a suitable sample. Only those teachers who have been employed as instructors at their present site for at least one year will be invited to participate. Teachers who participate in this study will be asked to complete two instruments: the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS).

The School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) is a 38-item instrument that measures an overall perception of teacher empowerment (Short & Rinehart, 1992). A five point Likert scale, with anchors from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, will be used to collect the reactions of the participants. A factor analysis of the SPES revealed six dimensions that underlie the construct. The dimensions and the internal consistency estimates (coefficient alpha) are decision-making (.89), professional growth (.83), status (.86), self-efficacy (.84), autonomy (.81), and impact (.82). As a composite, the 38 items have a reliability estimate of .94 (Rinehart et al., 1998; Short & Rinehart, 1992).

The Principal Rating form Quick Score (PRQS) is a 36-item semantic differential scale that measures three social influence dimensions: expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (Rinehart et al., 1998). The PRQS was adapted by Rinehart et al. (1998) from “a rating scale of social influence (Barak, 1979; Barak & LaCrosse, 1975), which was based on the work of Strong (1968)” (Rinehart et al., 1998). According to Rinehart et al. (1998), Barak (1979) “reported mean reliabilities for expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness to be .87, .85, and .91, respectively” (p.638). Convergent and divergent validity between scales was indicated by moderate intercorrelations between scales (Rinehart et al., 1998). Current validity was demonstrated by using the instrument to find differences between participants.

The data analysis to be used in the present study will be the same as the study being replicated. In this relational study, the teacher will be chosen as the unit of analysis to obtain individual perceptions. The data collected from the participating teachers will be used to investigate the two research questions. The first research question is to examine the relationship between teacher perceptions about empowerment and their principals’ expertness, trustworthiness, and social attractiveness. A composite will be formed for each of the four variables, and they will be submitted to a stepwise regression analysis.
with empowerment as the dependent variable and expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness as the independent variables (Rinehart et al., 1998, p. 639). The subscales of the constructs will be used to address the second research question, which will look at the relationship between the six components of empowerment and the three components of principal persuasiveness. Relationships among these sets of variables will be examined by submitting them to a canonical correlation (Rinehart et al., 1998, p.639).

I will contact principals from high schools that meet the data collection criteria in order to explain the purpose and methodology of this study and to ask permission to conduct my research at their facility. Once I have received permission, each teacher will be given a research package, which will include a Teacher Information Letter and the two questionnaires, discussed previously. The Teacher Information Letter will outline the purpose and methodology of the study, the rights of participants to withdraw, and issues of confidentiality. The Teacher Information Letter will also indicate that the return of completed questionnaires will be taken as “implied consent” for participation in this study.

Participants will be asked to return completed questionnaires, within two weeks, in self addressed return envelopes. Neither the questionnaires nor the envelopes will require individual teachers to identify themselves, their principals, or their schools.

Significance of the Proposed Study

The original study, Teacher Empowerment and Principal Leadership: Understanding the Influence Process (Rinehart et al., 1998), examined elementary schools in a northeastern state in the United States of America. Considering this limitation, additional research is needed to understand the effects that social influence theory has for secondary school principals, which is the focus of the current study.

The current study is significant to all of the participants in educational reform and school governance who institute and implement educational reform initiatives. In order to implement change successfully at the elementary and high school level, all participants in educational reform initiatives need to understand the influence process. Provincial Premiers, Ministers of Education, education bureaucrats, district school board trustees, senior administration, school based administration, and teachers may benefit from a greater understanding of the relationship between principal leadership and teacher empowerment, and successful and lasting implementation of educational reform initiatives. Further, the Lambton Kent District School Board may benefit from this study as the results may be useful for recruitment and training of future educational leaders who understand the role of the principal in influencing change and facilitating teacher empowerment. Additionally, this study might be significant to principals, as it might help them to understand the benefits and ramifications of teacher empowerment. Parents' councils might also benefit from this study, as it may provide valuable insight into the
power structure of schools and the most effective relationship between principals and teachers for successful, lasting, implementation of educational reform efforts. Finally, teachers, the front line participants who implement change, might benefit from this study as it will help them understand the relationship between teacher and principal, it will make them aware of their own level of and desire for empowerment, and will address the implications and responsibilities that accompany teacher empowerment. Since the goal of educational reform, theoretically, is to provide better education for all students, the effective implementation of change through principals’ influence of teacher empowerment will ultimately benefit student achievement.

Participation will be voluntary and confidentiality will be ensured. There are no known risks associated with this study and participants may withdraw at any time until completed questionnaires are sent to me. The Teacher Information Letter, a sample Introductory Letter for principals, and copies of the data collection instruments are enclosed.

I have submitted this research proposal to the Ethics Committee at the University of Windsor. I expect University approval once I have received approval from the Lambton Kent District School Board. If you have any questions or concerns about the proposed study, I can be reached at home (1-519-845-0069) or at L.C.C.V.I. (1-519-882-1910). Concerns of an ethical nature can be addressed to the Ethics Coordinator at the University of Windsor (1-519-253-4232; Extension 3916) or by email (ethics@uwindsor.ca).

I will submit my findings to your office upon completion of the study. I will also share my findings with participating teachers and principals.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing this request.

Sincerely,

James R. Morton
Enclosure
Appendix F: Follow up Letter to Principals

2003-05-30

Mr. Bert Phills
Principal
Lambton Central Collegiate and Vocational Institute
4141 Dufferin Street
Petrolia, Ontario, N0N 1R0

Dear Mr. Phills:

I am writing to you as a follow up to our recent conversation regarding including Lambton Central Collegiate and Vocational Institute in a research study that I am conducting in order to meet the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

You will recall that L.C.C.V.I. has been selected, as one of fourteen public high schools in the Lambton Kent District School Board, to participate in this study. The general purpose of this study is to add to existing knowledge of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership. This study will explore the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principals’ social influence and their own sense of empowerment. Specifically, it will investigate the covariance between the view teachers have of their principal’s trustworthiness, expertness, and social attractiveness, and their sense of empowerment.

Only those teachers on your staff, who have been employed as instructors at L.C.C.V.I. for one year, are invited to participate. Teachers who participate in this study will complete two instruments: the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS). Participation is voluntary and confidentiality will be ensured. Neither the questionnaires nor the envelopes will require individual teachers to identify themselves, their principals, or their schools. There are no known risks associated with this study and participants may withdraw at any time until completed questionnaires are submitted.

As we discussed during our recent phone conversation, teachers will receive a research package in their mailboxes. Each package contains a Teacher Information Letter, data collection instruments, and a return envelope. The Teacher Information Letter outlines the purpose and methodology of the study, the rights of participants to withdraw, and issues of confidentiality. The Teacher Information Letter also indicates that the return of completed questionnaires will be taken as “implied consent” for participation in this study. Teachers will place completed questionnaires in the envelope that is included in their packages and submit to my mailbox. Completed questionnaires are to be returned within the next two weeks.
The Ethics Committee at the University of Windsor and the Lambton Kent District School Board has approved this research study. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, I can be reached at home (1-519-845-0069) or at L.C.C.V.I. (1-519-882-1910). Concerns of an ethical nature can be addressed to the Ethics Coordinator at the University of Windsor (1-519-253-4232; extension 3916) or by email (ethics@uwindsor.ca).

Thank you for your time, cooperation, and participation in this study. I will share my findings with senior administration, principals, and teachers from participating schools after my thesis has been published.

Sincerely,

James R. Morton
Enclosure
Appendix G: Letter to School Contacts

James R. Morton  
Lambton Central Collegiate and Vocational Institute  
4141 Dufferin Street  
Petrolia, Ontario, N0N 1R0

2003-05-30

Alexander Mackenzie Secondary School  
1257 Michigan Ave.  
Sarnia, Ontario, N7S 3YS

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for volunteering to assist with the distribution and collection of my research questionnaires. I appreciate that this is a busy time of year so I hope that this will be fairly easy.

Please place one Teacher Package in each mailbox. You are to keep the large return envelope as teachers are asked to submit completed questionnaires to you. Please place completed forms into the return envelope when they are submitted. You are not asked to monitor who has submitted forms or how many forms have been submitted. I will contact you within the next two weeks to arrange for the return of the completed questionnaires. If you sense that all questionnaires have been submitted before the end of the two week time period, please feel free to call me at L.C.C.V.I. (882-1910) and we will arrange for their return.

Thank you, again, for your participation and assistance with this research study.

Sincerely,

James Morton  
Program Leader – Languages  
L.C.C.V.I.
Appendix H: Teacher Information Letter

James R. Morton
Lambton Central Collegiate and Vocational Institute
4141 Dufferin Street
Petrolia, Ontario, N0N 1R0

2003-05-30

Alexander Mackenzie Secondary School
1257 Michigan Ave.
Sarnia, Ontario, N7S 3YS

Dear Colleague:

My name is James Morton, I am a graduate student with the University of Windsor's Faculty of Education, and I am the Program Leader for Languages at Lambton Central Collegiate and Vocational Institute. If you have been employed as an instructor at Alexander Mackenzie for at least one year, you are invited to participate in a research study that I am conducting in order to meet the thesis requirements for the degree of Master of Education. I understand that you are very busy, but would appreciate your participation in completing two quick response questionnaires.

The general purpose of this study is to add to existing knowledge of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leadership. This study will explore the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principals’ social influence and their own sense of empowerment. Specifically, it will investigate the covariance between the view teachers have of their principal’s trustworthiness, expertness, and social attractiveness, and their sense of empowerment. Your school has been selected, as one of fourteen public high schools in the Lambton Kent District School Board, to participate in this study. Only those teachers on your staff who have been employed at Alexander Mackenzie for at least one year are invited to participate in this study. Participation in this study involves completing two questionnaires: the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) and the Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PRQS). Your participation is voluntary and confidentiality will be ensured. There are no known risks associated with this study and you may withdraw at any time until completed questionnaires are submitted. The return of the attached questionnaires will be taken as “implied consent” for your participation in this study.

To ensure confidentiality, you will not include your name, your principal’s name, or your school’s name on the questionnaires. Please place completed questionnaires in the envelope that is included in this package and submit to Lia Farina, who has agreed to collect and return completed questionnaires. Completed questionnaires are to be returned within the next two weeks.
The Ethics Committee at the University of Windsor and the Lambton Kent District School Board has approved this research study. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, I can be reached at home (1-519-845-0069) or at L.C.C.V.I. (1-519-882-1910). Concerns of an ethical nature can be addressed to the Ethics Coordinator at the University of Windsor (1-519-253-4232; extension 3916) or by email (ethics@uwindsor.ca).

Thank you for your time, cooperation, and participation in this study. I will share my findings with senior administration, principals, and teachers from participating schools after my thesis has been published.

Sincerely,

James R. Morton
Enclosure
Appendix I: Table 3

**Table 4**
Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Empowerment</td>
<td>134.23</td>
<td>20.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Decision making</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Status</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Autonomy</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Impact</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Expertness</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Social</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Trustworthiness</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPES</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRQS</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study terms are defined as follows:

Climate - refers to workplace conditions that affect teacher job satisfaction. The structure of school governance as well as expectations placed on teachers is part of school climate. Communicator - a principal who communicates information to teachers (Rinehart et al., 1998).

Composite measurement – refers to the School Participant Empowerment Scale which is used to produce an overall measure of teachers’ perceptions of empowerment as well as measure six individual components of teacher empowerment: decision making, autonomy, professional growth, status, impact, and self-efficacy (Rinehart et al., 1998).

Credibility - a component of social influence theory, refers to the expertness and trustworthiness of principals (Rinehart et al., 1998).

Empowerment – a variety of definitions of empowerment are found in this body of literature. According to Lightfoot (1986), empowerment is “the opportunities a person has for autonomy, responsibility, choice, and authority”(p.9). Rappaport (1987) suggests that empowerment is a “mechanism by which people, organizations, and communities gain mastery over their affairs”(p.122). Similarly, empowerment is defined as a construct that joins individual competencies and abilities to an opportunity that demonstrates competencies and abilities in a democratic environment (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Empowerment also involves participation in decision-making (Wu, & Short, 1996, Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). In the present study, empowerment is an amalgam of these definitions.
Expertness - a component of social influence theory, is the belief of teachers that the principal possesses “specialized knowledge or skills” (Rinehart et al., 1998, p.632).

Expert power - is based on the perception that a leader has a special knowledge base.

Job Satisfaction – refers to a teacher’s self-efficacy and sense of professional growth and level of empowerment (Wu & Short, 1996).

Participant - a teacher or principal involved in instruction and governance of the school.

Power - the ability of a principal to change or control the behavior and attitudes of teachers through power bases.

Power bases – are principal leadership styles or metaphors. Keedy and Finch (1994) suggest that principals are either “power brokers” who exercise their authority over staff and create a confrontational atmosphere, “statespersons” who create collaborative environments, or “enablers” who exercise facilitative power judiciously in order to encourage a collaborative atmosphere, are collaborative participants, and are instructional leaders.

Principal - the political and instructional leader responsible for a school.

Principal Rating Form Quick Score (PQRS) - a 36-item scale that measures three social influence dimensions: expertness, trustworthiness and attractiveness (Rinehart et al., 1998). Referent power - an employee or subordinate liking and identifying with their superior (Rahim, 1989). Referent power is also referred to as social attractiveness (Rinehart et al., 1998).

School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) - a 38-item instrument that measures an overall perception of teacher empowerment (Short & Rinehart, 1992).
Social Attractiveness - involves one person identifying and wanting to be like another person because of perceived similarities including experiences and background (Rinehart et al., 1998).

Teacher - instructs students for 1250 minutes per week and is a participant in the school structure.

Teacher Empowerment - Melenyzer (1990) (cited by Wu, & Short, 1996, p.85) proposes that teacher empowerment includes having the confidence and opportunity to influence personal performance in one’s profession. Short and Rinehart (1992) identify six dimensions of teacher empowerment: teacher perceptions of status, self-efficacy, autonomy, impact, decision-making, and opportunities for professional growth. According to Keedy and Finch (1994), teacher empowerment involves an enhanced feeling of professionalism, satisfaction with the work environment, collegial collaboration, and increased responsibility. In the present study, empowerment is an amalgam of these definitions.

Trustworthiness - a component of social influence theory, refers to teachers’ perception that the principals will use their skills and knowledge for the good of teachers and the school (Rinehart et al., 1998).
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