DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 044 SP 035 330

AUTHOR Short, Paula M.; Johnson, Patsy E.
TITLE Exploring the Links among Teacher Empowerment, Leader Power, and Conflict.
PUB DATE [94]
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Responsibility; Participative Decision Making; *Power Structure; Principals; Professional Development; *Role Conflict; *Role Perception; Secondary School Teachers; Self Efficacy; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Alabama; *Teacher Empowerment

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between leader power and the amount of conflict with teachers' perceptions of their empowerment. Drawing from the literature, the study identified underlying dimensions of empowerment as teachers' involvement in decision making, and teacher impact, status, autonomy, opportunities for professional development, and self-efficacy. To measure power bases, the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI), a School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES), and the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory I (ROCI-I) were completed by elementary school, middle school/junior high school, and high school teachers employed by the state of Alabama. Results showed that a principal's power was exerted because he or she was the boss; teachers' who perceived themselves as participating in the school decision making process gave the principal power because of their personal belief in the administrator's good will; and the only significant relationship between conflict and empowerment was found between intrapersonal conflict such as teachers trying to decide whether home requirements were more important than school requirements, or whether it was more important to spend time on discipline or instruction. Tables displaying descriptive statistics are included. (Contains 35 references.) (LL)

Exploring the Links Among Teacher Empowerment, Leader Power, and Conflict

Paula M. Short
The Pennsylvania State University

Patsy E. Johnson
University of Alabama

Exploring the Links Among Teacher Empowerment, Leader Power, and Conflict

Teacher empowerment has become a focus of educational reform, leadership models, and teaching effectiveness. Responding to the lead of business and industry, educational planners and policy makers are assuming that commercial productivity issues are applicable to educational productivity. Business organizations have found that empowered workers contribute more to the profit motives of the company at less cost. Educational leaders faced with similar productivity concerns and cost constraints are also exploring empowerment strategies for their personnel.

The main force driving the empowerment movement in education is teacher effectiveness. The assumption is that teachers who design and control their educational services and are free from a subordinating school administration are more effective than teachers who feel alienated and powerless (Kanungo, 1992). When teachers are more effective, student achievement, responsiveness to student conflict, teacher satisfaction, and the school environment improves. Productivity increases as schools are expected to do more with less.

The connection between the school's environment including teacher attitudes, and the successful attainment of its mission (Ellis, 1988), can be affected adversely if certain factors, e.g., the amounts and types of conflict and the successful or unsuccessful management of that conflict, impinge upon that environment. In addition, leader use of power to influence teacher action can impact teacher commitment (Rahim, (1989).

Fairman and Clark (1983), in their assessment of conflict's toll upon school climate, suggested that "The greatest problem that it [conflict] presents . . . is interference with the establishment and maintenance of other priorities within the organization" (pp. 93-94). However, it is not known if conflict and principal use of power impact teachers' perceptions of empowerment.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the nature of the relationship between leader power and amount of conflict with teacher's perceptions of their empowerment. Specifically, we asked whether the teachers' perception of their empowerment is related to (a) leader power, or (b) amount of conflict the teacher perceives. The influence of age, race, and principal's sex on teacher empowerment was also analyzed.

Conceptual Framework

Empowerment

The interest in empowerment in education has sprung from business and industrial efforts to improve productivity. Kanungo (1992) cited alienation at work "as the most pervasive phenomenon of the post-industrial society and management in both the private and public sectors are engaged in a constant struggle against it for their own survival" (p. 414). Alienated workers are apathetic, frustrated, and uninvolved with their jobs. Businesses that can counter worker alienation with empowerment plans will improve their position to compete with firms who have solved this problem. The principal strategy is to replace authority based management with participative management.

Contempory educational trends have incorporated empowerment strategies as a means to improve school effectiveness. The principle is that those who are closest to the teaching should be making the decisions about teaching. Terms such as site-based management, teacher empowerment, and local control have filled the literature as industrial models have been adapted to educational settings.

Short & Rinehart (1992) identified six underlying dimensions of empowerment: (1) involvement in decision making, (2) teacher impact, (3) teacher status, (4) autonomy, (5) opportunities for professional development, and (6) teacher self-efficacy.

Decision Making

This dimension of empowerment relates to the participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their work. Providing teachers with a significant role in school decision making is a key element in empowerment in that teachers gain the opportunity to increase control over their work environment.

Impact

Impact refers to teachers' perceptions that they have an effect and influence on school life. Ashton and Webb (1986) posit that teachers' self-esteem grows when they feel that they are doing something worthwhile, that they are doing it in a competent manner, and that they are recognized for their accomplishments. Lightfoot (1986) adds that teachers in her study of good schools grew from the respect they received from parents and community as well as the support they felt for their ideas.

Status

The status on the empowerment scale refers to the teacher's sense of esteem ascribed by students, parents, community members, peers, and superiors to the position of teacher. Recognition of this esteem can be found in comments and attitudes from the various constituents of the school environment, responses to the teacher's instructions, and the respect afforded the teaching profession.

Autonomy

Autonomy, as a dimension of empowerment, refers to teachers' beliefs that they can control certain aspects of their work life. This may be control over scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning.

Professional Growth

As a dimension of empowerment, professional growth refers to teachers' perceptions that the school in which they work provides them with opportunities to grow and develop professionally, to learn continuously, and to expand one's own skills through the work life of the school.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to teachers' perceptions that they have the skills and ability to help students learn, are competent in building effective programs for students, and can effect changes in student learning. Blase (1982) states that the primary rewards in teaching result from the teacher's positive self-evaluations of performance with students in instructional, moral, and counseling terms. Self-efficacy develops as an individual acquires self-knowledge and the belief that they are personally competent and has mastered skills necessary to effect desired outcomes.

Conflict

Conflict has been identified as either *intra*personal or *inter*personal (intragroup and intergroup). Intrapersonal or role conflict occurs when an individual must choose between alternatives which are opposing and compelling (Rahim, 1992). Intrapersonal conflict may occur when experiences contradict role expectations. Role conflict has been associated with undesired personal and organizational outcomes (e. g., Behrman & Perreault, 1984).

Rahim (1992) characterized interpersonal conflict as incompatibilities, disagreements, or differences between two or more persons. In an organization, interpersonal conflict can occur within a group (intragroup) or between groups (intergroup) and can involve a lateral or collegial relationship (Pondy, 1967). Zuelke and Willerman (1992) recognized that within the school setting several groups may

experience conflict with one another. Fielder (1967) identified three task group types within which intragroup conflict may occur: interacting, coaching, and counteracting. An interacting task group includes members who work interdependently such that the completion of a task by one member is dependent upon the work of another. Team teaching exemplifies this classification. A coaching task group includes members who work somewhat independently in which the success of one group member is not necessarily dependent upon the work of another group member. Self-contained classroom teachers exemplify this classification. The counteracting task group involves persons working together to reconcile differences and mitigate the effect of conflict. A negotiating or consulting team exemplifies this classification.

Intergroup conflict occurs in complex organizations when two or more groups are interdependent and operate with different goals, norms, or orientations, thereby creating circumstances in which conflict is inevitable (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Walton & Dutton, 1969). Examples include conflict between sales and production teams in business and between teachers and administrators in education.

Conventional wisdom suggests that as the ills of society permeate our classrooms, time devoted to conflict management will increase, diverting attention from school priorities. If the effective school is dependent upon the effective principal and teachers, then it would appear that "the resolution of those conflicts is often crucial in determining the progress or decay that will characterize a school's learning environment" (Hughes & Robertson, 1980, p. 3).

The styles by which conflict is managed within an organization can be functional or dysfunctional (Rahim, 1992). Functional conflict management moves the organization from stagnation to generation; it stimulates and energizes. Ideas and issues are often clarified. Productivity increases and creative problem solving is exhibited. Dysfunctional conflict management reduces communication, diminishes effective

interactions, and decreases problem solving. It creates chaos, and it demoralizes and renders unproductive teachers, administrators, and students.

Conflict is a concern surrounding all phases of the empowerment model. Before the infusion of empowerment strategies, workers who feel powerless and alienated may experience psychological and physiological symptoms characteristic of dysfunctional conflict. Dysfunctional conflict creates chaos and interferes with job performance and productivity. It tends to lessen communication among members of the organization. When cooperation is needed, the members are introspective and lack enthusiasm for the task at hand. Withdrawal and distancing of the participants decreases problem solving and effective interaction. Under these circumstances implementation of the empowerment process may be impossible.

Empowerment strategies depend on all of the organizational functions that dysfunctional conflict inhibits. Teachers must communicate, engage in problem solving interactions, and cooperate. However, schools with the greatest needs are possibly those which suffer most from high amounts of conflict, a large percentage of time devoted to its management, and ineffective conflict management styles; thus, school leaders are faced with the prospect of adding to the amount of conflict in a dysfunctional school by introducing empowerment.

Leader Power

Power is defined as "the ability of one party to change or control the behavior, attitudes, opinions, objectives, needs, and values of another party" (Rahim, 1989, p. 545). Power is determined by the extent the leader can influence subordinates (Dahl, 1957; French & Raven, 1959;Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979; Krausz, 1986). The source of power that leaders use is critical to the influence they acquire. French and Raven (1959) have organized a typology to identify five power bases: Legitimate Power—the legitimate right of the leader usually by virtue of the position that the leader

holds to prescribe or control behavior; Coercive Power—the leader's control over punishment; Reward Power—the leader's control over reward; Expert Power—special knowledge or expertness; and Referent Power—the subordinate's desire to identify with the leader.

The school leader typically may use one or more of these power bases to accomplish any or all of the goals and objectives adopted for the school. The power base or bases chosen by the leader potentially affect such psycho-social dimensions as conflict, trust, and influence, either positively or negatively.

The definition of leadership, as Yukl (1989) points out, is varied and elusive. Yukl also observes that "researchers usually define leadership according to their individual perspective and the aspect of the phenomenon of most interest to them" (p. 2). For purposes of this study, leadership has been defined as "the way power is used in the process of influencing the actions of others" (Krausz, 1986, p. 86).

Leader Power Effectiveness

The leader's power is perceived by the subordinate. The subordinates identify the leader's power and allow the leader to influence their behavior. The leader-subordinate interaction may have either constructive or destructive consequences in an organization. Constructive consequences occur when members of the organization feel competent as professionals and as human beings. Subordinate satisfaction with leadership is high. Destructive consequences occur when members feel powerless, alienated, and oppressed and become passive and combative. Subordinates are dissatisfied with the leadership. "The organizational climate with such leadership reflects mistrust, low morale, and chronic lack of motivation" (Krausz, p. 90).

Yukl (1989), after a disclaimer regarding inadequacy of power research, offers a summary of the effect on power bases on subordinate outcomes. These outcomes include commitment, compliance, and resistance. The most likely outcomes are either

commitment or compliance to referent, expert, legitimate, and reward power. Resistance is the most likely outcome of coercive power. Rahim (1989) found that legitimate, expert, and referent power bases were positively associated with subordinate compliance and that reward power was not. Reward and coercive power would likely be associated with resistance, a form of conflict. Rahim also found that only referent and expert power bases were positively associated with subordinate satisfaction. Johnson (1989) found that teacher satisfaction as a measure of school climate was strongly associated with the amount of teacher conflict.

The above literature indicates that power bases are important in determining the actions of other. Also, the power bases have an effect on the way people feel about their own actions and the actions of others. One of the actions taken by school is teacher empowerment. The context of the power bases in which empowerment is attained may be related to the amount of conflict that teachers experience.

The questions to be answered in this study are:

1. What power bases used by the school leader are associated with teacher empowerment?

2. What is the relationship of conflict to teacher empowerment?

3. What is the relationship of age, race, and principal's sex to teacher empowerment?

Method

Instruments

The five French and Raven (1989) bases of power were measured by the *Rahim Leader Power Inventory* (RLPI) (Rahim, 1988). This 29-item instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale to measure the perceptions of teachers regarding the principals' bases of power. A higher score indicates a greater base of a principals' power. The author

reported internal consistency reliabilities ranging between .72-.88 from a random sample of business organization members.

School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) is a 38-item instrument containing six subscales. They are: (a) Decision Making, (b) Professional Growth, (c) Status, (d) Self-Efficacy, (e) Autonomy, and (f) impact. The response scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale. It was reported that coefficient alphas was .94 for the total scale and those for the six factor scale ranged from .81 to .89. The split-Half reliability of this instrument is .75 (Short & Rinehart, 1992).

The amount of conflict was measured by the *Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory I* (ROCI-I) (Rahim, 1983). The ROCI-I is a 21-item instrument using a 5-point Likert-scale to measure three independent dimensions of organizational conflict: intrapersonal, intragroup, and intergroup. A higher score indicates a lower amount of conflict for most of the items. Reliability coefficients for the ROCI-I for the sample were computed using Cronbach's alpha. They were intrapersonal, alpha = .73; intragroup, alpha =.85; and intergroup, alpha = .812. The reliability coefficients are comparable to those reported by Rahim (1983).

Sample

Three hundred teachers were randomly selected by computer from the list of teachers employed in the State of Alabama. Each of the teachers was mailed a packet containing the three instruments used in the study, a demographic questionnaire, and a letter describing the study and requesting the teachers' participation. They were to return the completed instruments in an enclosed postage-paid envelope. The initial mailing yielded 124 usable responses. After two weeks a follow-up packet was sent to the nonrespondents asking that they proceed with participating in the study. This produced and addition 70 usable responses for an overall return rate of 65 percent.

Results and Discussion

The distribution of subjects across school levels was elementary (92), middle school/junior high school (53), and senior high school (49). The average age was 42.7 with the range extending from 23 to 65. The average number of years teaching experience was 14.7 with the range extending from 0 to 38. Other demographics included race (white 125, non-white 67, and 1 not responding), gender of the teachers (male 34, female 160), and gender of the teacher's principal (male 129, female 61, and 4 not responding).

Descriptive Statistics. The means on each of the test instruments, the RLPI, the SPEA, and the ROCI-I, were examined for each of the subscales. The larger the mean for the RLPI subscales, the more the teachers attributed their leader with the associated power base. The larger the means for the SPEA subscales, the more the teachers identified with the associated empowerment dimensions. the smaller the mean for the ROCI-I subscales, the more the teachers identified the amount of conflict with the associated conflict scale. All means for the subscales in each test were compared using a paired t-test, and all were found to be significantly different (p=.05). Table 1 contains the summary of the subscale means and their standard deviations.

Insert Table 1 about here.

MANOVA and Multiple Regression Analyses. A multivariate test with Pillai's criterion was conducted to check if the independent variables (demographics, the five power bases, and three conflict scales) were significantly related to the dependent variables (Decision Making, Professional Growth, Status, Self-Efficacy, Autonomy, and Importance). This yielded a value of .75015 with an approximate F ratio of 2.27 and a significance of p<.001. The calculated effect size for an N=187 was .21 with a power of 1.0. Seven of the 194 usable cases were rejected because of missing data. The univariate F-tests for the

three dependent variables yielded F values as follows: Decision Making, 3.72; Professional Growth, 4.85; Status, 2.46; Self-Efficacy, 2.89; Autonomy, 2.58; Importance, 2.91. Each was significant ($p<.01$). Then, six hierarchical multiple regression analyses were computed to test the relationships of the demographics, the five power bases, and the three conflict scales to the six dependent variables using the SPSS computer package. In each regression analysis, each group of variables was entered as a set, first the demographics, then the power bases, and last the conflict scales. The demographics were entered first to control for the effects on empowerment of Race, Age and Gender of the Principal. The power bases were entered second because of the their hypothesized influence on the conflict scales. A test for the interaction between and amount the power bases and the conflict scales yielded no significant effects.

Results from the regression analysis employing Decision Making as the dependent variable show a significant F change when Demographics and Power bases were added to the equation. The demographic set accounted for 4.5% of the variance of the dependent variable and the power bases accounted for 11.6% of the variance. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only the Referent power base accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Decision Making. The positive Beta coefficient indicates a positive relationship between Decision Making and Referent Power.

Results from the regression analysis employing Professional Growth as the dependent variable show a significant F change when each of the predictor variables was added to the equation. The demographic set accounted for 7% of the variance of the dependent variable, the power bases accounted for 11.5% of the variance, and conflict accounted for 4.7% of the variance. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only the Gender of the Principal accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Professional Growth. The positive Beta coefficient indicates a positive relationship between Professional Growth and female principals.

Results from the regression analysis employing Status as the dependent variable show a significant F change when Demographics and Power bases were added to the equation. The demographic set accounted for 4.5% of the variance of the dependent variable and the power bases accounted for 6.6% of the variance. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only the Gender of the Principal and Legitimate Power accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Status. The positive Beta coefficient indicates a positive relationship between Status and female principals and Legitimate Power.

Results from the regression analysis employing Self Efficacy as the dependent variable show a significant F change when Demographics and Power bases were added to the equation. The demographic set accounted for 5.4% of the variance of the dependent variable and the power bases accounted for 6.7% of the variance. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only the Age, Legitimate Power, and Intrapersonal Conflict accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Self-Efficacy. The negative Beta coefficient indicates that ratings of Self-Efficacy decrease with increased age. Higher ratings of Legitimate Power indicate higher scores on Self-Efficacy, and lower amounts of Intrapersonal Conflict were associated with higher scores on Self-Efficacy.

Results from the regression analysis employing Autonomy as the dependent variable show a significant F change only when the predictor variable of Power and was entered into the equation. The power bases accounted for 6.6% of the variance. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only the Reward Power accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Autonomy. The positive Beta coefficient indicates a positive relationship between Reward Power Autonomy.

Results from the regression analysis employing Importance as the dependent variable show a significant F change when Demographics and Power bases were added to

the equation. The demographic set accounted for 7.2% of the variance of the dependent variable and the power bases accounted for 6.1% of the variance. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only the Gender of the Principal, Age, and Legitimate Power accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Importance. The positive Beta coefficient indicates a positive relationship between Importance and both Legitimate Power and female principals. However, the negative Beta coefficient indicates that ratings of Importance decrease with Age. The regression results are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Results from the regression analysis employing a composite Empowerment score as the dependent variable (the six subscales combined into one score) show a significant F change when each of the dependent variables was added to the equation. The Demographic set accounted for 8.2% of the variance of the dependent variable, Power bases accounted for 8.9%, and Conflict accounted for 4%. However, when all of the independent variables were entered in the equation, only Gender of the Principal, Age, and Legitimate Power accounted for a significant portion of the variance in Empowerment. The positive Beta coefficient indicates a positive relationship between Empowerment and both Legitimate Power and female principals . However, the negative Beta coefficient indicates that ratings of Empowerment decrease with Age. The regression results are summarized in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

Because none of the school districts in the state in which this study was conducted are under any directive to implement any kind of teacher empowerment plan such as site

based management, variability in empowerment ratings by the teachers derives from differences in leadership beliefs and styles found among the individual school administrators. Within this context, principals in this study were seen to use their legitimate power base most frequently and the reward power base the least. The principal exerts power because she or he is the boss. This concept of leader power is traditional in this state and no particular incentive has been offered to change. Reward is the lowest rated power base probably because of the limited rewards available to the administrator.

The principal's legitimate power base was a significant predictor in three of the *School Participant Empowerment Scale* subscales—Status, Self-Efficacy, and Impact—in the multiple regression analysis. The amount of empowerment found in each of these subscales was positively correlated to legitimate power. The relationship of legitimate power to Teacher Status seems logical. If the principal derives power because of position, then teachers might expect to derive status because of position. However, the relationship of legitimate power to Self-Efficacy and Impact is somewhat of an enigma. An explanation of this relationship probably derives from the combined result of high legitimate power and low coercive and reward power. Rahim (1989) observed that legitimate power was positively associated with compliance and that reward and coercive power was likely to produce resistance. The positive affect for teachers associated with the legitimate power possibly has some impact on the affective dimensions of Self-Efficacy and Impact.

Referent power, the second rated power base of principals, was positively related to Decision Making, the lowest rated empowerment subscale. The relationship of teacher satisfaction with the principal to the principal's use of referent power was acknowledged by Rahim (1989). This finding suggests that teachers' who perceive themselves as participating in the school decision making process give the principal power because of the teachers' personal belief in good will of the principal; thus, principals who would

replace legitimate power with referent power also likely would invest more decision making opportunities in the faculty. Obviously, trust is an issue here.

The only significant relationship between conflict and empowerment was found between Intrapersonal Conflict and Self-Efficacy. Higher Intrapersonal Conflict scores were related to lower Self-Efficacy scores. Intrapersonal Conflict often is an indicator of role conflict—conflict between two or more competing tasks or expectations. Some teachers may find themselves facing a dilemma trying to decide whether home requirements are more important that school requirements or whether spending time on discipline is more important that instruction. Such role conflicts can have destructive consequences and a resultant sense of decreased self-efficacy.

This study provides empirical evidence of the relationship of principal leader influence and teachers' perceptions of empowerment. A clearer understanding of how leader power, conflict in the organization and teachers' sense of empowerment is needed in order to create environments and relationships conducive to school participants' sense of contribution and growth in their professional work life.

References

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, B. W. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.

Blase, J. J. (1982). A social-psychological grounded theory of teacher stress and burnout. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(4), 93-113.

Behrman, D., & Perreault, W. D., Jr. (1984). A role stress model of the performance and satisfaction of industrial salespersons. Journal of Marketing, 48, 9-21.

Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 2, 201-215.

Dunst, R. (1991). Issues in empowerment. Presentation before the annual meeting of Children's Mental Health and Service Policy Convention, February, 1991, Tampa, Florida.

Ellis, T. I. (1988). School climate. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 154)

Fairman, M., & Clark, E. A. (1983). Common sense strategies for managing conflicts. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 67, 93-102.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

French, Jr., J. R. P., & Raven, Bertran (1959). The bases of social power. In Dorwin Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp. 150-157). Ann Arbor, MI: Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 9-14.

Gruber, J., & Trickett, E. J. (1987). Can we empower others? The paradox of empowerment in a alternative public high school. American Journal of Community Psychology. 15, 353-372.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Natemeyer, W. (1979). Situational leadership, perception and the impact of power. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.

Hughes, L. W., & Robewrtson, T. A. (1980). Principals and the management of conflict. Planning and Changing, 11, 3-16.

Kanungo, R. N. (1992). Alienation and empowerment: Some ethical imperatives in business. Jourr al of Business Ethics, 11, 413-422.

Katz, R. F. (1984). Empowerment and synergy: Expanding the community's healing resources. Prevention in Human Services, 3, 201-226.

Krausz, R. R. (1986). Power and leadership in organizations. Transactional Analysis Journal, 16, 85-94.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Organization and environment—Managing differentiation and integration. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration.

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

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maton, K. I., & Rappaport, J. (1984). Empowerment in a religious setting: A multivariate Investigation. Prevention in Human Services, 3, 37-72.

Marx, K. (1932). Economic and philosophical manuscripts

Murphy J., & Evertson, C. (1990). Restructuring schools: Capturing the phenomena. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Pondy, L. R. (1967). Organizational conflict: Concepts and models. Administrative Science Quarterly, 12, 296-320.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. American Journal of Community Psychology, 15, 121-148.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventories: Professional Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rahim, M. A. (1988). The development of a leader power inventory. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 23, 491-502.

Rahim, M. A. (1989). Relationships of leader power to compliance and satisfaction with supervisors: Evidence from a national sample of managers. Journal of Management, 15, 545-556.

Rahim, M. A. (1992). Managing conflict in organizations (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rinehart, J. S., & Short, P. M., (1992). Reading recover as an empowerment phenomenon. The Journal of School Leadership, 1(4), 379-399.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1991). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Short, P. & Rinehart, J. (1992). School Participant Empowerment Scale: Assessment of the level of participant empowerment in the school. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54(2), 951-960.

Walton, R. E., & Dutton, J. M. (1969). The management of interorganizational conflict: A model and review. Administrative Science Quarterly, 14, 73-84.

Yukl, G. A. (1989). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zimmerman, M. A., & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. American Journal of Community Psychology, 16(5), 725-750.

Zuelke, D. C., & Willerman, M. (1987). Conflict and decision making in elementary schools: Contemporary vignettes and cases for school administrators. New York: University Press of America.

Table 1

Number of Items, Means, and Standard Deviations of Power, Empowerment, and Conflict Subscales

Subscales	No. of Items	*M*	*SD*	Cronbach's α
Power				
Legitimate	6	4.01	.6015	.73
Referent	6	3.69	.9336	.81
Expert	6	3.56	.8995	.90
Coercive	5	3.13	.8581	.71
Reward	6	2.34	.7672	.72
Empowerment				
Status	6	4.12	.8591	.96
Self-Efficacy	6	4.07	.9128	.96
Impact	6	4.01	.7948	.89
Professional Growth	6	3.83	.8633	.88
Autonomy	4	3.46	.7732	.60
Decision Making	10	3.02	.6635	.78
Conflict				
Intragroup	8	3.53	.7853	.90
Intergroup	6	3.67	.9619	.91
Intrapersonal	7	4.00	.5938	.74

Table 2

Multiple Regression Analysis for Demographics, Power, and Conflict with Empowerment Scales

Source	*Beta*	sr^2	*t*	Sign. of *t*	R^2	R^2 Change	F	F Change	Sign. of F Change
Decision Making									
Step 1: Demographics					.0454	.0454	2.900	2.900	.036
Step 2: Power Referent	.2735	.021	2.108	.037	.1616	.1162	4.288	4.934	.001
Step 3: Conflict					.1895	.0279	3.719	2.008	.114
Professional Growth									
Step 1: Demographics Gender of Principal	.1544	.022	2.237	.026	.0704	.0704	4.622	4.622	.004
Step 2: Power					.1859	.1155	5.082	5.051	.001
Step 3: Conflict					.2337	.0478	4.854	3.640	.014
Status									
Step 1: Demographics Gender of Principal	1.619	.024	2.207	.028	.0457	.0457	2.923	2.923	.035
Step 2: Power Legitimate	.2149	.032	2.539	.012	.1118	.0661	2.800	2.648	.025
Step 3: Conflict					.1339	.0221	2.459	1.487	.220

Table 2 (Continued).

Source	*Beta*	sr^2	*t*	Sign. of *t*	R^2	R^2 Change	F	F Change	Sign. of F Change
Self-Efficacy									
Step 1: Demographics					.0537	.0537	3.461	3.461	.018
Age	-.1662	.025	-2.287	.023					
Step 2: Power					.1210	.0673	3.062	2.725	.021
Legitimate	.2024	.028	2.419	.016					
Step 3: Conflict					.1538	.0328	2.891	2.262	.083
Intrapersonal	.1993	.027	2.342	.020					
Autonomy									
Step 1: Demographics					.0356	.0356	2.254	2.254	.083
Step 2: Power					.1023	.0667	2.536	2.245	.024
Reward	.1653	.023	2.172	.031					
Step 3: Conflict					.1397	.0374	2.584	2.535	.058
Impact									
Step 1: Demographics					.0715	.0715	4.698	4.698	.004
Gender of Principal	.1538	.022	2.121	.035					
Age	-.2221	.045	-3.057	.003					
Step 2: Power					.1324	.0609	3.397	2.500	.032
Legitimate	.2383	.039	2.85	.005					
Step 3: Conflict					.1546	.0222	2.910	1.531	.208

Table 3.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Demographics, Power, Conflict with Empowerment Score

Source	*Beta*	sr^2	*t*	Sign. of *t*	R^2	R^2 Change	F	F Change	Sign. of F Change
Empowerment									
Step 1: Demographics					.0822	.0822	5.462	5.462	.001
Gender of Principal	.1763	.031	2.518	.013					
Age	-.1526	.021	-2.176	.031					
Step 2: Power					.1718	.0896	4.614	3.849	.003
Legitimate	.1831	.023	2.267	.025					
Step 3: Conflict					.2116	.0399	4.270	2.948	.034