DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 315 TM 025 883

AUTHOR Klecker, Beverly; Loadman, William E.
TITLE An Analysis of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short and Rinehart, 1992) Based on Data from 4091 Teachers in 183 Restructuring Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; *Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Incentives; *Participative Decision Making; Professional Autonomy; *School Restructuring; *Secondary School Teachers; State Programs; Surveys; *Teacher Empowerment; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Ohio; *School Participant Empowerment Scale

ABSTRACT

As an increasing number of schools undertake restructuring efforts, an instrument to measure teacher empowerment would be a useful took for researchers and evaluators. Such an instrument was used in a census survey of 10,544 teachers in 307 Venture Capital Schools in Ohio to obtain baseline measures of classroom teachers' participation in school restructuring. Thirteen dimensions of teacher empowerment were identified, and the School Participant Empowerment Scale (P. M. Short and J. S. Rinehart, 1992) was selected as the instrument that best measured these constructs. The Ohio Venture Capital Schools, which comprise about 10% of the state's schools, receive grants from the state for educational improvement. Complete responses from 4,091 classroom teachers in 183 schools were analyzed. Results indicated that the subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale should be used with caution. The total score measures teacher empowerment with some redundancy, and the items of the subscales should be reviewed carefully to see if they are measuring different content. Subscales developed in this study may assemble the items from the School Participant Development Scale in a better way. (Contains 20 tables and 26 references.) (SLD)

An Analysis of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992) Based on Data from 4091 Teachers in 183 Restructuring Schools

Beverly Klecker
Eastern Kentucky University
e-mail: eadkleck@acs.eku.edu

William E. Loadman
The Ohio State University
e-mail: wloadman@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New York, New York
April 11, 1996

Teacher empowerment is a multi-dimensional construct used to help define "new roles" for classroom teachers and is described by many educational researchers as essential to the success of school restructuring efforts (e.g., Holmes Group, 1986, 1990; Lieberman & Miller, 1990; Sarason, 1992; Prawat, 1991; Griffin, 1991; Zeichner, 1991; Fullan, 1993). As increasing numbers of schools undertake restructuring, an instrument to measure teacher empowerment--including defined dimensions--with stability, reliability, and validity would be a useful tool for both researchers and evaluators. Such an instrument was sought for a census survey of 10,544 teachers in 307 Venture Capital Schools in Ohio to obtain baseline measures of classroom teachers' participation as the schools initiated restructuring efforts in February and March, 1995 (Klecker, 1996).

Thirteen dimensions of teacher empowerment were identified through a review of the literature (e.g., Lightfoot, 1986; Levin, 1991; Comer, 1988; Lieberman & Miller, 1990; Lichenstein, McLaughlin, & Knudsen, 1991; Sprague, 1992; Rappaport, 1987; Sizer, 1984; Bredenson, 1989; Zeichner, 1991; Morris & Nunnery, 1993; Short, 1991). These were: (1) accountability, (2) authority/leadership, (3) curriculum planning/design, (4) collegiality/collaboration, (5) decision-making, (6) impact/causal importance, (7) professional growth, (8) professional knowledge, (9) responsibility, (10) self-efficacy, (11) self-esteem, (12) status, and (13) training new teachers. The School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992) was selected to measure teacher empowerment in this study as it was grounded in both the literature and Short's empirical work and research in , "The Empowered School District Project," conducted on school empowerment in nine school districts across the country from 1989 to 1992 (Short, 1991). Further, the School Participant Empowerment Scale was the only instrument identified in the literature that measured as many as six of the dimensions of teacher empowerment.

Context for the Study--Ohio's Venture Capital Schools

In the recent era of public school reform the role of state legislatures in the public school reform effort has shifted. "If states are serious about improving the quality of education and striving for excellence, " Timar & Kirp (1989, p. 511) stated, "they must create a context in which organizational competence at the school level can develop." In the state of Ohio, this context has been created through funding from the state legislature. Venture Capital grants of $25,000 per year per school have been made available to support school improvement. These Venture Capital grants were designed to serve as catalysts for local schools to redesign their internal structures. The venture capital grants were made available to individual schools for a period of five years on a renewable basis and were offered to "spark" school renewal

efforts (Ohio Department of Education, July, 1993). The state of Ohio's commitment to restructuring was stated clearly:

> School improvement can only be achieved if there is a willingness to fundamentally restructure Ohio's education system. School improvement must focus on the development and interrelationships of all the main components of the system simultaneously - teaching and learning, assessment, governance, organization, and professional development. It must also focus on the culture of the system (Ibid, p. 6).

Local school districts were asked to nominate schools for Venture Capital grants. Following the district's nomination, proposals were submitted by the individual schools describing the nature of the proposed reform. Factors were identified by the Ohio State Department of Education (July, 1993) as being essential to continuous school improvement. These evaluative criteria for the Venture Capital proposals were:

1. Evidence of community readiness and willingness to develop and implement new school improvement ideas and to anticipate change and reshape thinking and behavior.

2. School improvement strategies collaboratively designed by the community and integrated into the school's structure demonstrating that all children can learn.

3. Planned changes that are systematic and wide-ranging.

4. Evidence that community agencies and groups are thoughtfully and purposefully involved.

5. School improvement strategies that focus on learning.

6. Evidence that teachers are given expanded roles in planning and implementing change.

7. Policies and practices that contribute to the success of all students.

8. School improvement plans that leverage existing dollars and resources and identify new monies and resources for the support of improvement efforts (p. 10).

Nine restructuring models were selected by the Ohio Department of Education as examples for schools. These were: Accelerated Schools, Classroom of the Future, Coalition of Essential Schools, Effective Schools Process, North Central School Improvement, Ohio Community Learning Experience, Outcome-Based

Education, School Development Program and Success for All. Additionally, schools were invited to design their own restructuring models (Ohio Department of Education, July, 1993). As a condition for applying for funding, the individual schools had to provide evidence that at least 80% of the school staff was supportive of the proposed ideas contained in the proposal as well as evidence that the building staff was poised and ready to undertake the proposed changes. The proposals were submitted by Venture Capital Coordinators in each school through traditional signoffs by the school district central office.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were to analyze and describe the dimensions of teacher empowerment measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale (with six subscales) developed by Short & Rinehart, 1992.

Methodology

This was a descriptive research study using mailed survey methodology.

Sample

The population for the study was 10,544 classroom teachers working in the 307 Venture Capital Schools funded in rounds I and II by the state of Ohio. (The 307 schools comprise approximately 10% of all schools in the state). As the goal of the Venture Capital Schools was to involve all of the classroom teachers in school restructuring, a census survey, including the total population was chosen for the study.

Instruments

Teacher Empowerment

Teacher empowerment was measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES). This 38-item instrument measured teacher empowerment on six dimensions: (1) decision-making, (2) professional growth, (3) status, (4) self-efficacy, (5) autonomy, and (6) impact. The SPES used a five-point Likert-type rating scale for each of the 38 items (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Cronbach's coefficient alpha reliabilities for the subscales measuring the dimensions were reported as: decision-making, .79; professional-growth, .66; status, .84; self-efficacy, .83; autonomy, .83, and impact, .91. Alpha reliability for the total scale was .94 (Short & Rinehart, 1992). The six dimensions of teacher empowerment were defined by Short (1991) as:

> Decision-making relates to the participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their work. In many cases, this means participation in decisions involving budgets, teacher selection, scheduling, curriculum, and other programmatic areas...

Professional Growth refers to teachers' perceptions that the school in which they work provides them with opportunities to grow and develop as professionals, to learn continuously, and to expand one's own knowledge and skills through the work life of the school...

Status refers to teachers' perceptions that they have professional respect and admiration from colleagues. Teachers feel that others respect their knowledge and expertise...

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...

Autonomy refers to the teachers' sense of freedom to make certain decisions that control certain aspects of their work life. These aspects may be scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning...

Impact refers to the teachers' sense that they have an effect and influence on school life. They feel that what they are doing is worthwhile, they are doing it in a competent manner, and they are recognized for their accomplishments... (p.9-14).

Demographic Data

Demographic data for the classroom teachers were collected through self-report questionnaires included in the mailing.

Data Collection

As the questions for the study sought responses from all of the classroom teachers within each building (as well as the building principal for the larger study), a metaphor, "a snapshot in time," was used in the cover letter designed to be sent to each Venture Capital School coordinator. The number of classroom teachers within each building was identified from the Ohio Educational Directory (Ohio Department of Education,1994-95). The number of classroom teachers within each building ranged from 7 to 28. A packet containing the cover letter, a questionnaire for each classroom teacher and building principal (required for questions in the larger study) in the school was mailed to each Venture Capital School coordinator, with a self-addressed postage-paid return envelop, February 13, 1995. An envelope was attached to each instrument with instructions to the respondents to complete the survey, seal the envelope, identify the envelope with his or her initials only and return it to the Venture Capital School coordinator. (This minimal identification was required to aid the Venture Capital coordinator with data collection). The "picture" of the school requested in the cover letter was defined as a response from at least 80% of the classroom teachers and the building principal. The use of the "total picture" metaphor to clarify the data collection for the larger study was detailed by Klecker & Loadman (1995).

Return Rates

Fifty-six schools responded with 100% of the classroom teachers; 48 schools responded with between 80-99% of the classroom teachers; 47 schools had a classroom teacher return rate between 50-79%; 23 schools had a classroom teacher return rate between 30-49%; 9 schools responded with 29% or fewer classroom teacher responses. Overall return rates were: schools (n=183) 59.6%, and teachers (n=4091) 38.8%. Clearly, more responses were received from schools with a small number of teachers. Two-way ANOVAs by gender and return rate by item were used to compare classroom teachers' responses to the 38 items of the SPES in each return-rate group with the 100% return-rate group. No statistically significant ($p<.01$) interactions were found by gender and return-rate. Statistically significant ($p<.01$) differences were found by gender on 9 items in the comparison of the 80-99% return-rate group and the 100% return-rate group, and on 4 items in the comparison of the 29% or fewer return-rate group with the 100% return-rate group. Statistically significant ($p<.01$) differences by return-rate were found on 2 or fewer or the 38 items on each of the two-way ANOVAs comparing groups. Because there were so few differences across the return rate subgroups, the data were aggregated for further analysis.

Data Analysis and Results

The data from the 4,091 classroom teachers were coded, entered, and analyzed on the IBM mainframe computer at The Ohio State University using SAS.

Demographics of the Teacher Sample

Frequencies and Percentages were computed to describe the demographic characteristics of the sample of teachers. These are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

Seventy-two percent of the teachers responding were female, 28% were male (Table 1). The gender proportions were similar to national proportions; according to 1991 data of all teachers in the United States reported in the Digest of Educational Statistics (Snyder & Hoffman, 1994), 72.1% of the teachers were female and 27.9% were male. The age range for teachers in the sample was from 22 to 71 years with a mean age of 41.2. This, also, was comparable to the national mean age for teachers, 42 years (Ibid). The categories presented in Table 1 were created to provide a more complete picture of the ages of the teachers in the study. The modal age of this group of teachers was 40-49 (43.1%). The 40-49 age category was also the national mode with 38% of teachers in the United States in 1991 in this category (Ibid). Ninety-two percent of the teachers responding to the survey were Caucasian, 6% were African-American, fewer than 1% were Asian, and 1% responded to the "other" category of the item. This number of Caucasian teachers in the Venture Capital

sample (92%) was slightly higher than the national proportion (87%). Nationally, in 1991, 8% of the teachers in the teaching force were African American, 1% were Asian, and 4% were reported as "other" (Ibid).

The teachers were divided almost equally in their responses to the "Academic Degrees" question. In the sample, 49% had Bachelors Degrees, 50% had Masters Degrees, and 1% had Doctoral Degrees. Nationally 51.9% of the teachers had Bachelors Degrees, 42.1% had Masters Degrees, 0.5% had Doctorates, and 4.6 had Educational Specialists Degrees. For the state of Ohio 54.5% of the teachers had Bachelors, 41.3% had Masters Degrees, 2.4 had Educational Specialists Degrees, and 0.6% had Doctorates. The Venture Capital teachers were similar to both the national and state statistics, however, the category of "Educational Specialist," was not included in the Venture Capital demographic questionnaire.

The Venture Capital teachers were relatively evenly categorized within the "Years of Teaching Experience" as well. The distribution was relatively flat; twenty percent had been teaching 16-20 years and 20% had been teaching 21-25 years. Eighteen percent of the teachers had been teaching fewer than five years, 15% had 6-10 years of teaching experience, 14% had taught 11-15 years, and 12% had been teaching longer than 26 years. The national median for years of teaching experience in 1991 was 15 years (Snyder & Hoffman, 1994), thus, the teachers in Venture Capital Schools had proportionately more years of teaching experience than the teachers in the national census.

Most of the teachers had been working in their current position fewer than five years (39%). Twenty three percent had held their current position 6-10 years, 13% responded to the 11-15 years category, 9% had held their current position 21-25 years and 5% had been teaching in their current position for more than 26 years. Most of the teachers were teaching in elementary schools (42%); twenty percent were middle school/jr. high school teachers; thirty-four percent were high school teachers, and 4% were teaching in "other" schools, that is, vocational and magnet schools. Statistics available on the national teaching population were available only as elementary (52%) and secondary (48%) (Ibid). It was difficult to compare the data in this study with these categories as the middle school/jr. high school category in this study included grades 5 through 9 (or some combination thereof according to school).

The School Participant Empowerment Scale

Statistical Analyses of the Subscales

The analysis of School Participant Empowerment Scale using the data from 4,091 teachers began by repeating the procedures used to develop the original subscales described by Short & Rinehart (1992).

> Responses to the 68 items from the 211 teachers were submitted to a principal component analysis followed by an oblique rotation. A scree test was utilized to determine the number of factors to rotate. Items to be included on the instrument were chosen by selecting factor loadings that were double the critical value for significance for an ordinary correlation coefficient as suggested by Stevens (1986). Thus, items were chosen that had a factor loading of .60 on the factor of interest (p. 955).

The data from 4091 classroom teachers in this study were first analyzed using a principal components analysis. An examination of the scree plot indicated that there were six components in the scale. The components were rotated using a Harris-Kaiser oblique rotation. Table 2 presents the factor structure (correlations) resulting from the oblique rotation.

Table 2 about here

Establishing a criterion for identifying salient loadings was problematic with the large data set. Three options were explored: (1) identify all items with factor loadings of .50 or greater on the factor, (2) identify all items with factor loadings of .60 or greater on the factor, and (3) identify items with the factor on which they have the highest loading. The subscales created with the first two criteria resulted in the omission of items in the instrument. The third criterion was selected for identifying factor loadings resulting in 6 subscales with each item loading on one subscale. The subscales thus created were then compared with the subscales of Short & Rinehart (Table 3).

Table 3 about here

Clearly, the subscales identified in the data were not the same as those identified by Short & Rinehart (1992). To further explore the subscales, three additional analyses were performed: (1) a principle components analysis with an orthogonal rotation, (2) a principal axis factor analysis with an oblique rotation, and (3) a principal axis factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4 about here

A comparison of the items loading on factors in each factor analyses indicated that analyses of the large data set resulted in similar subscales. However, these identified subscales were not the subscales developed by Short & Rinehart (1992).

As Short & Rinehart had used only secondary teachers (N=211) in their development of subscales (Short & Rinehart, 1992), subscale definitions were next explored with only the secondary teachers in the data from this study (N=1363, 776

female teachers and 587 male teachers) using the same four methods of analyses described above. Table 5 presents the subscales identified through these analyses.

Table 5 about here

The subscales identified in this subset of the study data were similar to those identified in the total data of this study but, again, were not the subscales identified by Short & Rinehart. As the subscales identified in a subset of the study data were comparatively consistent with those identified by analyses of the total data set , the total data set was used to develop new subscales for the School Participant Empowerment Scale.

New subscales for the School Participant Empowerment Scale were created through the analysis of the large dataset. A principal axis analysis followed by a Harris-Kaiser oblique rotation was chosen to identify the subscales. The principal axis analysis permitted the inclusion of the most variance; the oblique rotation was chosen as there were clear inter-correlations among the subscales. Table 6 presents the factor structure resulting from these analyses.

Table 6 about here

The newly defined subscales were identified by using the item's highest factor loading. The subscales identified were:
Subscale 1: Items 8, 21, 2, 15, 3 and 20.
Subscale 2: Items 14, 26, 12, and 16.
Subscale 3: Items 9, 6, 32, 4, 18, 10, 34, 36, 22, 29, 28, and 27.
Subscale 4: Items 17, 23, 7, 24, 11, 1, 19, and 13
Subscale 5: Items 38, 25, 37, 33, and 31.
Subscale 6: Items 30, 35, and 5.

Cronbach's coefficient alpha reliabilities were computed for each of the newly-identified subscales. Tables 7 through 12 present the results of these analyses.

Table 7 about here

The total subscale reliability for Subscale 1 (Table 7) was .84. Correlations with the total ranged from a low of .53 for Item 20, "I work at a school where kids come first," to a high of .68 for Item 21, "I have the support and respect of my colleagues." Each of the 6 items contributed to the overall reliability.

Table 8 about here

Each of the four items contributed to the overall reliability of .70 for Subscale 2 (Table 8). Item correlations with the total scale ranged from a low of .40 for Item 12, "I participate in staff development," to a high of .58 for Item 14, "I have the opportunity for professional growth."

Table 9 about here

Each of the twelve items of Subscale 3 contributed to the overall reliability of .89 (Table 9). The item correlations with the total ranged from a low of .45 for Item 27, "I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach," to a high of .74 for Item 32, "I perceive that I am making a difference."

Table 10 about here

The overall reliability of Subscale 4 was .80; each of the 8 items contributed to the overall reliability (Table 10). The item correlations with the total ranged from a low of .41 for Item 13, "I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school," to a high of .63 for Item 23, "I make decisions about curriculum."

Table 11 about here

Item 31 was the only one of the 5 items of Subscale 5 that did not contribute to the overall alpha of .83 (Table 11). Alpha would be slightly higher (.84) if this item were to be deleted. This item, "I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school," also had the lowest correlation with the total (.48). Item 38, "I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas," had the highest correlation with the total (.72).

Table 12 about here

The overall Subscale 6 alpha reliability was .83 (Table 12). Items 30 and 35 had an inter-item correlation of .77. Item 5 had an inter-item correlation with Item 30 of .56 and with Item 35 of .55. The reliability of the subscale would increase substantially (to .87) if Item 5 were deleted. However, Item 5 has a moderately high correlation with the total (.59). These items were: Item 30, "I can determine my own schedule,"; Item 35, "I can plan my own schedule,"; and Item 5, "I have control over daily schedules."

The Cronbach coefficient alpha reliabilities for the subscales were: Subscale 1, .84; Subscale 2, .70; Subscale 3, .89; Subscale 4, .80; Subscale 5, .83; and Subscale 6, .83. For an additional perspective on the reliabilities of the subscales, the six subscales were downloaded and analyzed using FACETS, a PC statistical program using Item Response Theory as the underlying statistical theory. Tables 13 through 18 present the results of these analyses.

Tables 13 through 18 about here

The FACETS analysis of the subscales (Tables 13 through 18) provide additional information on the reliabilities and the item-fit of the newly created subscales. Although the FACETS analysis; based on item response theory (Linacre & Wright, 1989-93), and Cronbach's coefficient alpha, based on classical test theory, approach subscale analyses differently; the results from these two analyses of the dataset for the study were similar. The reliabilities measured by FACETS were, "the Rasch equivalent to the K-20 or Cronbach Alpha statistic, that is, the ratio of 'True variance' to "Observed variance'," (Ibid, p. 65). These subscale reliabilities were: Subscale 1, .99 (Table 13); Subscale 2, 1.00 (Table 14); Subscale 3, 1.00 (Table 15); Subscale 4, 1.00 (Table 16); Subscale 5, 1.00 (Table 17); and Subscale 6, .99 (Table 18).

All of the item-to-subscale analyses met the "fit" criteria of FACETS. Using the FACETS criterion of an Infit or Outfit measure of "1" as indicating fit, most of the item fit statistics on the six subscales were just below 1 (0.9). This indicated "muting," that is, too little variation in the items. On a rating scale a less than "1" Infit or Outfit FACETS measure indicated an overuse of the middle categories of the rating scale. The item with the largest departure from 1 was Item 31 on Subscale 5 (Infit and Outfit were both 1.5). This item-to-subscale relationship was similar to that identified through the Cronbach's coefficient alpha analysis. However, this item met the FACETS fit criteria.

Content Validity of the Newly-Formed Subscales

Consideration was given to the method that Short & Rinehart used to establish content validity. As a first step in the development of the School Participant Empowerment Scale, Short (1991) explored the underlying dimensions of school participant empowerment and presented, "... an empirically-derived set of dimensions of teacher empowerment...These dimensions were derived from my research in 'The Empowered School District Project,' conducted on school empowerment in nine school districts across the country from 1989 to 1992." (p. 7). She defined empowerment as:

> Empowerment has been defined as a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems. Empowered individuals believe they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve. Empowered schools are organizations that create opportunities for competence to be developed and displayed (p. 5).

The six dimensions of teacher empowerment identified by Short (1991) were: (1) decision-making, (2) professional growth, (3) status, (4) self-efficacy, (5) autonomy, and (6) impact. The procedures used by Short & Rinehart in developing the School Participant Empowerment Scale (1992) were described as:

> Several steps were taken to establish content validity of the 75-item empowerment characteristics list. To evaluate each item's general representativeness of the construct of empowerment, the panel of four experts rated each of the items on how well it represented empowerment in schools. Each item was rated on a 5-point continuum of representativeness, from highly representative (1) to highly unrepresentative (5). To determine each item's conceptual fit with theoretically-derived components of empowerment, the panel of experts assigned each item to one of the 11 dimensions of empowerment: (a) knowledge base, (b) competence, (c) status, (d) influence, (e) autonomy, (f) control, (g) responsibility, (h) collaboration, (i) involvement in decision making, (j) impact, and (k) choice. (p. 954).

There were 11 dimensions of teacher empowerment used by experts to categorize 75 items. When six dimensions were identified through the statistical analysis of *68 items* there was no discussion by Short & Rinehart (1992) of the criteria used to discard or combine the remaining five "theoretically-derived components of empowerment." Additionally, there was no discussion as to how the statistically identified subscales were named (self-efficacy and professional growth appear to be combinations of components), or of how the item-to-subscale content validity was confirmed after the statistical identification.

A presentation of the definition of the dimension and the items measuring the dimension (Table 19) in the subscale from Short's (1991) definitions of the dimensions and Short & Rinehart's (1992) definition of subscales in the School Participant Empowerment Scale is made below. Comments are in parentheses following the items.

Decision-making relates to the participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their work. In many cases, this means participation in decisions involving budgets, teacher selection, scheduling, curriculum, and other programmatic areas...

1. I am given the responsibility to monitor programs.
7. I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in school.
13. I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school.
19. I am involved in school budget decisions.
25. I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers.
30. I can determine my own schedule.
33. Principals, other teachers. and school personnel solicit my advice.
35. I can plan my own schedule.
37. My advice is solicited by others.
38. I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas.

(Items 7, 13, 19, would seem to be directly related to the definition of the dimension "decision-making.")

Professional Growth refers to teachers' perceptions that the school in which they work provides them with opportunities to grow and develop as professionals, to learn continuously, and to expand one's own knowledge and skills through the work life of the school...

2. I function in a professional environment.
8. I am treated as a professional.
14. I have the opportunity for professional growth.
20. I work at a school where kids come first.
26. I am given the opportunity to continue learning.
31. I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school.

(It is unclear how item 20 is related to "professional growth.")

Status refers to teacher perceptions that they have professional respect and admiration from colleagues. Teachers feel that others respect their knowledge and expertise...

3. I believe that I have earned respect.
9. I believe that I am very effective.
15. I have the respect of my colleagues.
21. I have the support and respect of my colleagues.
27. I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach.
34. I believe that I am good at what I do.

Self-Efficacy refers to teacher's 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...

4. I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.
10. I believe that I am empowering students.
16. I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.
22. I see students learn.
28. I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with students.
32. I perceive that I am making a difference.

Autonomy refers to the teachers' sense of freedom to make certain decisions that control certain aspects of their work life. These aspects may be scheduling, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional planning...

5. I have control over daily schedules.
11. I am able to teach as I choose.
17. I have the freedom to make decisions on what is taught.
23. I make decisions about the curriculum.

Impact refers to the teachers' sense that they have an effect and influence on school life. They feel that what they are doing is worthwhile, they are doing it in a competent manner, and they are recognized for their accomplishments...

6. I believe that I have the ability to get things done.
12. I participate in staff development.
18. I believe that I am having an impact.
24. I am a decision maker.
29. I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.
36. I perceive that I have an impact on other teachers and students.

Table 19 presents the new subscales created by the analysis of the data from the 4,091 classroom teachers in this study with the dimensions identified by Short (1991) and the items from the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992).

Table 19 about here

The subscale labels were added by comparing the content of the newly-created subscales with those of the School Participant Empowerment Scale and by reviewing the definitions of the subscale dimensions (Table 19). In reviewing these dimensions the correlation of the concepts was striking; by using an oblique rotation on the six factors this correlation was retained. The three items measuring the dimension of "Autonomy" were problematic. In the literature control over scheduling was identified as a part of teacher autonomy in the public school, however, other aspects of autonomy were clearly not measured by the three items of the scale. Thus, this subscale was renamed, "Autonomy over Scheduling."

Redundancy of Items in the School Participant Empowerment Scale

The large dataset in this study permitted a critical look at the relationships between items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale. A redundancy of content measured by the items was noted by teachers responding to the instrument. Table 20 presents the simple correlations among the 38 items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale.

Table 20 about here

This exploration of inter-item correlations (Table 20) found high correlations between items that apparently measured the same or highly related content. Examples of this are: Item 6, "I believe that I am good at what I do and Item 9, "I believe that I am very effective," (r=.70). Both of these items loaded on the 12-item Self-Efficacy subscale in this study. The Cronbach's coefficient alpha of this subscale (.89) would decrease only slightly (.88) with the deletion of either of these items (Table 5).

Item 15, "I have the respect of my colleagues," and Item 21, "I have the support and respect of my colleagues," were highly correlated (r=.73). Both of these items loaded on the Status Subscale (6-items)in this study. The alpha correlation of .84 of this subscale (Table 57) would decrease to .82 with item 15 deleted or to .81 with item 21 deleted. Item 15 contributes slightly more to the subscale.

Item 30, "I can plan my own schedule," and Item 35, "I can determine my own schedule," had a correlation of r=.77. These items were two of the three items on the newly-created Autonomy in Scheduling subscale. Items should be developed to measure other aspects of autonomy contained in the definition of the dimension by Short (1991) to measure the whole dimension rather than just the "scheduling" aspect measured in the newly-created subscales for this study.

Items 25, "I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers," and 38, "I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas," were also highly correlated (r=.71). Both of these items loaded on the 5-item Impact Subscale (Tables 56 and 70). The Cronbach's alpha reliability of this subscale (.83, Table 6) would decrease to .80 with the deletion of Item 25 and to .78 with the deletion of Item 38. Two additional items on the Impact Subscale had high inter-item correlations (r=.70). These were Item 33, "Principals, other teachers, and school personnel solicit my advice," and Item 37, "My advice is solicited by others." The alpha reliability of the Impact Subscale (Table 61) would decrease from .83 to .79 if either of these items were to be deleted.

Discussion

The Sample of Classroom Teachers

The picture of the classroom teachers described by the demographic variables examined in this study clearly overlays the picture of teachers in the national population (Snyder & Hoffman, 1994) with two exceptions. The sample data had fewer minority teachers than the national population of teachers and the teachers in the sample had slightly more teaching experience than did teachers in the national population. The data from the large sample of teachers in this study furnished a rich data source for exploring the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992).

The Subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

The subscales identified through the analyses using the large dataset in this study (N=4091) were not the subscales identified by Short & Rinehart (1992) for the following possible reasons: (1) Short & Rinehart based their subscale identification on the principal components analyses of 68 items, (2) Short & Rinehart used a small sample (N=211) in proportion to the number of items in their study (68), (3) the analyses in this study were based on a large N (4091) of public school teachers with

demographic characteristics that overlay the characteristics of the national population of public school teachers (Table 1), and (4) Short & Rinehart used only secondary teachers whereas this study included elementary, middle school/jr. high school, and high school teachers.

After the review of the subscales, the choices available for the larger study (Klecker, 1996) were: (1) to use the subscales identified by Short & Rinehart, (2) to use the newly-developed subscales, or (3) to use only the total School Participant Empowerment Scale Score. This last choice was made by Rinehart & Short (1993) in subsequent research with the instrument. As the new subscales had been created with a large data set that overlay the national population of teachers on demographic variables and there was clear dimensionality in the School Participant Empowerment Scale, identified by different methods of factor analysis, the choice was made to use both the newly-created subscales and the total scale score. The use of the subscales provided a dimensional look at teacher empowerment in the Venture Capital Schools and the total scale score would allow the results of the study to be compared with other research. As other researchers are currently using the School Participant Empowerment Scale instrument proposed by Short & Rinehart (1992), it is important to ensure that the subscales of the instrument are reliable and valid. Data from this study indicate that the subscales proposed by Short & Rinehart are of questionable validity. The items appear to be redundant as well as empirically loading on different factors. The subscales determined through the study appear to have greater validity and more stability than from Short & Rinehart (1992).

Professional Knowledge as a Dimension of Teacher Empowerment

It is striking that the dimension of professional knowledge was not included in the School Participant Empowerment Scale. This was the first of the theoretically-derived components of empowerment listed in Short & Rinehart's (1992) procedural description for establishing content validity. Lichtenstein, McLauglin, & Knudsen (1991) measured teacher empowerment by professional knowledge only, which they defined as, "knowledge of professional community, educational policy, and subject ares, " (p. 5). Maeroff (1998) and Morris & Nunnery (1993) included professional knowledge as a dimension of teacher empowerment. The widely-held conceptual relationship of knowledge and power, and the intuitive sense that a teacher's' power within a restructuring school environment would be related to that teacher's professional knowledge and understanding of the school's present and envisioned organizational structure, beg for this dimension to be included in any measure of "teacher empowerment." The indication that this dimension was within the construct of teacher empowerment measured by the School Participant Empowerment Scale, came from the teachers' high mean rating of Item 27, "I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach." This item, the only one that asked teachers to rate their knowledge, had the highest mean rating (4.41) and the lowest standard deviation (0.63) of the 38 items on the School Participant Empowerment Scale in this study. The item had its highest factor loading (0.47) on the Impact subscale (Tables

56 and 70), but it had the lowest item-with-total correlation (contrasted with the other 11 items) on this subscale (0.45, Table 61). This was an indication that, with other items added to measure the content of "professional knowledge," this should probably be a measurable dimension of teacher empowerment.

Conclusions

From the analyses of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short & Rinehart, 1992) with the large sample of teachers in this study (N=4091) it is clear that (1) the subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale identified by Short & Rinehart (1992) should be used with caution, (2) the total score of the School Participant Empowerment Scale measures teacher empowerment with some redundancy, that is, there are items that could be dropped without hurting the instrument and (3) if subscales are to be used, the subscales developed in this study are conceptually and substantively more sound than those identified by Short & Rinehart (1992). The items of the subscales should be reviewed carefully to see if they are measuring different content. As the item-subscale relationship is reviewed the question must be asked, "Does this item seem to measure this dimension of teacher empowerment as defined by Short (1991)?" Researchers considering the School Participant Empowerment Scale developed by Short & Rinehart (1992) are encouraged to use the subscales developed in this study as well as considering adding additional items/dimensions to the measurement of empowerment. Short & Rinehart have good item content, but there is a better way to put it together. Continuing empirical investigation is required to move science forward and scale validation with respect to empowerment is no exception to the maximum.

References

Bredeson, P. V. (1989). Empowered teachers--empowered principals: Principal's perceptions of leadership in schools. Paper presented at The University Council for Educational Administration Convention, Scottsdale, AZ.

Comer, J. P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259 (5), 42-48.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces. New York: The Flamer Press.

Griffin, G. (1991). Toward a community of learning: The preparation and continuing education of teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's school: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Klecker, B., & Loadman, W. E. (1995). Using a metaphor to increase survey return rates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Vancouver, BC.

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

Levin, H. (1991). Building school capacity for effective teacher empowerment: Applications to elementary schools with at-risk students. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Lichtenstein, G., McLaughlin, M, and Knudsen, J. (1991). Teacher empowerment and professional knowledge. CPRE Research Report Series. New Brunswick, NJ: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works, Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 759-764.

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

Linacre, J. M. & Wright, B. D. (1989-1993). FACETS many-facet rasch analysis. Chicago, IL: MESA Press.

Morris, V. G., & Nunnery, J. A. (1993). Teacher empowerment in a professional development school collaborative: Pilot assessment. Technical Report 931101, Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, College of Education, Memphis State University.

Ohio Department of Education. (July, 1993). Ohio's commitment to school renewal. Columbus, OH: Author.

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

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

Rinehart, J. S., & Short, P. M. (1993). Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers, and regular classroom teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Sarason, S. B. (1992). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Short, P. M. (1991). Dimensions of teacher empowerment. Pennsylvania State University, Program in Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 338614).

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. Educational and Psychological Measurement 52. 951-961.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). The school participant empowerment scale. Lexington, KY: Authors.

Snyder & Hoffman. (1984). Digest of educational statistics. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Sprague, J. (1992). Critical perspectives on teacher empowerment. Communication in Education, 41 (4), 181-203.

Timar, T. B., & Kirp, D. L. (1989). Education reform in the 1980's: Lessons from the states. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 504-51

Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Contradictions and tension in the professionalization of teaching and the democratization of schools. Teachers College Record, 92 (3), 362-379.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Classroom Teachers Responding to School Participant Empowerment Scale

Variable	N*	%
Gender		
Female	2936	72.4
Male	1117	27.6
Age		
22-29	582	15.6
30-39	882	23.7
40-49	1605	43.1
50-59	605	16.2
60 and Over	53	1.4
Race		
African-American	253	6.3
Asian	23	0.6
Caucasian	3694	91.8
Other	50	1.2
Academic Degrees		
Bachelors Degree	1973	49.3
Masters Degree	1997	49.9
Doctoral Degree	33	0.8
Years of Teaching Experience		
Under 5 years	739	18.3
6-10 years	615	15.2
11-15 years	582	14.4
16-20 years	792	19.6
21-25 years	795	19.6
Beyond 26 years	523	12.9
Years of Experience in Current Position		
Under 5 years		
6-10 years	1591	39.2
11-15 years	919	22.7
16-20 years	518	12.8
21-25 years	455	11.2
Beyond 26 years	361	8.9
	211	5.2
Teaching Level		
Elementary	1729	42.3
Middle School/Jr. High School	827	20.2
High School	1376	33.7
"Other" Schools	152	3.

*Frequencies may not sum to N because of non-response to the item.

Table 2. Rotated Factor Structure Resulting from A Principal Components Analysis followed by A Harris-Kaiser Rotation of the 38 Items of the SPES

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Item 30	0.88243*	0.39711	0.05276	0.28418	0.35059	0.42490
Item 35	0.87230*	0.40307	0.08026	0.29259	0.35311	0.41945
Item 5	0.75779*	0.4394	0.06398	0.30857	0.37867	0.32517
Item 31	0.50093	0.33769	0.23572	0.35838	0.57020*	0.56605
Item 17	0.33974	0.79064*	0.11651	0.34224	0.38849	0.38460
Item 23	0.34753	0.78383*	0.12365	0.32467	0.39087	0.38460
Item 11	0.31633	0.65866*	0.29012	0.39141	0.45224	0.29219
Item 1	0.29501	0.58354*	0.16645	0.29743	0.45636	0.50578
Item 7	0.46132	0.68639*	0.12142	0.38196	0.54496	0.63543
Item 24	0.23624	0.60142*	0.43851	0.50330	0.42280	0.54118
Item 12	0.19973	0.34368	0.60774*	0.32521	0.36304	0.47521
Item 18	0.21286	0.40421	0.63826	0.65533*	0.36449	0.38066
Item 16	0.25244	0.47951	0.58701*	0.58119	0.52994	0.40898
Item 22	0.24602	0.42409	0.57317	0.64707*	0.50443	0.39604
Item 29	0.14840	0.42718	0.52871	0.58148*	0.46027	0.43334
Item 28	0.27375	0.42736	0.52928	0.61158*	0.51414	0.41117
Item 19	0.43317	0.45898	-0.30496	0.15362	0.32534	0.47708*
Item 13	0.37379	0.40855*	-0.35276	0.15127	0.30324	0.40358
Item 9	0.29874	0.39077	0.26380	0.80172*	0.46621	0.37867
Item 6	0.28852	0.35190	0.32588	0.77413*	0.40575	0.37320
Item 4	0.28190	0.30691	0.37560	0.70964*	0.43642	0.34077
Item 34	0.02977	0.28638	0.46183	0.65021*	0.34337	0.28037
Item 32	0.31190	0.44150	0.47967	0.78196*	0.53679	0.52195
Item 10	0.35982	0.45800	0.33365	0.68084*	0.44476	0.39750
Item 36	0.30114	0.40654	0.37368	0.69095*	0.56989	0.66733
Item 27	0.04643	0.30059	0.36043	0.50735*	0.33581	0.25445
Item 2	0.35017	0.47064	0.25888	0.42295	0.74681*	0.44355
Item 20	0.37335	0.39793	0.23890	0.36800	0.70638*	0.43141
Item 14	0.27452	0.34210	0.47645	0.33006	0.69732*	0.43900
Item 8	0.39445	0.55384	0.20248	0.46228	0.77192*	0.53248
Item 15	0.12149	0.38012	0.12121	0.53370	0.72408*	0.49585
Item 21	0.14065	0.37426	0.14676	0.55554	0.74845*	0.53961
Item 26	0.28924	0.33771	0.46717	0.32052	0.63165*	0.46118
Item 3	0.15208	0.38814	0.14397	0.58115	0.67127*	0.44949
Item 38	0.37962	0.47352	0.25928	0.35153	0.51631	0.82456*
Item 37	0.30550	0.44172	0.26342	0.53603	0.52942	0.80570*
Item 25	0.37409	0.49496	0.09551	0.25315	0.47979	0.76777*
Item 33	0.39939	0.48844	0.15063	0.46374	0.56655	0.79768*
**	5.434099	8.275981	4.607235	9.642856	10.19658	9.463965

*Indicates item loading on factor

**Variance explained by each factor ignoring other factors

Table 3. A Comparison of Subscales Identified by Analysis with the Subscales of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

	Items Loading on Factors *	Items in Short & Rinehart Subscales
Subscale 1	5, 30, 35	1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38
Subscale 2	1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 23, 24	2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31
Subscale 3	12, 16	3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 34
Subscale 4	4, 6, 9, 10, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36	4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 32
Subscale 5	2, 3, 8, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 31	5, 11, 17, 23
Subscale 6	19, 25, 33, 37,38	6, 12, 18, 24, 29, 36

*Note: Items placed in numerical order for ease of comparison.

Table 4. Factor Analyses of School Participant Empowerment Scale with the Resulting Subscales

Method	Number of Factors	Items Loading on Factors
Rinehart and Short (1992) Principal Components Oblique Rotation (N=211)	6	F= 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38 F= 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31 F= 3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 34 F= 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 32 F= 5, 11, 17, 23 F= 6, 12, 18, 24, 29, 36
Principal* Components Oblique Rotation (N=3113)	6	F=5, 30, 5 F= 1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 23, 24 F= 12, 16 F= 4, 6, 9, 10, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F= 2, 3, 8, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 31 F=19, 25, 33, 37, 38
Principal Components Orthogonal Rotation (N=3113)	6	F= 4, 6, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F= 2, 3, 8, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 31 F= 13, 19, 25, 33, 37, 38 F= 1, 7, 11, 17, 23, 24 F= 5, 30, 35, F= 12
Principal Axis Oblique Rotation (N=3113)	6	F= 2, 3, 8, 15, 20, 21 F= 12, 14, 16, 26 F= 4, 6, 9, 10, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F= 1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 24 F= 25, 31, 33, 37, 38, F= 5, 30, 35
Principal Axis Orthogonal Rotation (N=3113)	6	F=4, 6, 9, 10, 12,16,18,22, 24,27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F= 25, 31, 33, 37, 38 F= 2, 3, 8, 15, 20, 21 F= 1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23 F= 5, 30, 35 F= 12, 14, 26

*Note; Data from Table 66 is repeated here for comparison with other methods.

Table 5. Comparison of Subscales Resulting from Factor Analyses of the School Participant Empowerment Scale: High School Data Only with the SPES Subscales by Short & Rinehart (1992)

Method	Number of Factors	Items Loading on Factors
Rinehart and Short (1992) Principal Components Oblique Rotation (N=211)	6	F1= 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38 F2= 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 31 F3= 3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 34 F4= 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 32 F5= 5, 11, 17, 23 F6= 6, 12, 18, 24, 29, 36
Principal* Components Oblique Rotation	6	F1=12, 14, 26, 27 F2= 4, 6, 9, 10, 16, 18, 22, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F3= 1, 7, 11, 17, 23, 24 F4= 5, 13, 19, 30, 35 F5= 25, 31, 33, 37, 38 F6=2, 3, 8, 15, 20, 21
Principal Components Orthogonal Rotation	6	F1= 4, 6, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F2= 2, 3, 8, 14, 15, 20, 21 F3= 25, 33, 37, 38 F4= 1, 7, 11, 17, 23, 24 F5= 5, 13, 30, 31, 35, F6= 12, 26
Principal Axis Oblique Rotation	6	F1= 2, 3, 8, 15, 20, 21 F2= 1, 7, 11, 17, 23, 24 F3= 4, 6, 9, 10, 16, 18, 22, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F4= 25, 33, 37, 38 F5= 12, 14, 26 F6= 5, 13, 19, 30, 31, 35
Principal Axis Orthogonal Rotation	6	F1=4, 6, 9, 10, 12,16,18,22, 24,27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 36 F2= 2, 3, 8, 15, 20, 21 F3= 25, 33, 37, 38 F4= 5, 13, 30, 31, 35 F5=1, 7, 11, 17, 19, 23 F6= 14, 26

Total N=1363 F=776 (56.9%) M=587 (43.1%)

Table 6. Factor Structure (Correlations) of the 38 Items of the SPES Resulting from a Principal Axis Factor Analysis Followed by a Harris-Kaiser Rotation

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Item 21	0.76296*	0.55431	0.52111	0.41886	0.54241	0.22740
Item 15	0.72602*	0.52656	0.49553	0.41416	0.50090	0.21489
Item 3	0.66641*	0.49758	0.53529	0.41821	0.46042	0.23170
Item 8	0.71792*	0.61951	0.46409	0.59002	0.54472	0.42523
Item 2	0.64628*	0.61332	0.43719	0.50236	0.46563	0.36864
Item 20	0.59095*	0.57256	0.38491	0.45067	0.45017	0.37115
Item 13	0.38765	0.11522	0.09264	0.43567*	0.36956	0.37873
Item 14	0.51435	0.69294*	0.39264	0.38312	0.44740	0.27927
Item 26	0.46062	0.63928*	0.38250	0.38449	0.45696	0.28591
Item 12	0.25835	0.51726*	0.40506	0.33986	0.43088	0.19762
Item 16	0.41380	0.63217*	0.61465	0.45304	0.42909	0.25827
Item 9	0.51444	0.41442	0.74932*	0.41885	0.39741	0.31577
Item 6	0.43636	0.41018	0.72566*	0.37722	0.38747	0.29488
Item 4	0.42061	0.45486	0.65661*	0.34444	0.36103	0.27248
Item 32	0.52827	0.61037	0.77260*	0.46737	0.53228	0.32625
Item 34	0.30597	0.44102	0.61742*	0.26194	0.29835	0.07624
Item 18	0.28363	0.55140	0.68129*	0.37672	0.39164	0.20816
Item 10	0.43647	0.46765	0.63884*	0.46609	0.41739	0.34461
Item 22	0.40529	0.61091	0.66084*	0.41763	0.41514	0.24546
Item 36	0.56699	0.57281	0.67310*	0.45786	0.65232	0.33994
Item 27	0.28957	0.38958	0.47397*	0.26882	0.27243	0.10095
Item 28	0.41772	0.59862	0.61983*	0.42353	0.42894	0.27511
Item 29	0.38485	0.56023	0.59329*	0.39747	0.43553	0.18636
Item 17	0.39113	0.36350	0.35252	0.69555*	0.40483	0.36126
Item 23	0.40230	0.38288	0.34028	0.73484*	0.50786	0.37345
Item 11	0.38868	0.44717	0.41414	0.54181*	0.34693	0.32151
Item 7	0.55049	0.47266	0.38676	0.69522*	0.61548	0.47700
Item 1	0.42988	0.41560	0.32199	0.53970*	0.48156	0.32303
Item 19	0.41666	0.14501	0.10741	0.49838*	0.43377	0.43439
Item 24	0.38356	0.52510	0.52855	0.54671*	0.52070	0.27296
Item 38	0.49414	0.53224	0.37364	0.54798	0.78930*	0.40729
Item 37	0.55682	0.51115	0.53039	0.50118	0.78096*	0.35802
Item 25	0.48790	0.43098	0.26454	0.56360	0.71294*	0.40398
Item 33	0.60443	0.48522	0.45192	0.56055	0.76561*	0.44290
Item 30	0.35463	0.30344	0.27283	0.46802	0.42917	0.87614*
Item 35	0.35115	0.31812	0.28518	0.46907	0.42369	0.84766*
Item 5	0.37139	0.31761	0.29378	0.47514	0.34881	0.65492*
Item 31	0.50482	0.50365	0.37165	0.43269	0.53724*	0.46204
**	8.942299	9.336313	9.460461	8.681241	9.287372	5.597051

*indicates item loading on factor

**variance explained by factor ignoring other factors

Table 7. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability with Item Correlations for the Subscale 1 of the SPES

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha				
for RAW variables			0.837850	
for STANDARDIZED variables			0.845171	
	Raw Variables		Standardized Variables	
Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Item 8	0.678838	0.797851	0.669328	0.811093
Item 21	0.656218	0.805480	0.676327	0.809708
Item 2	0.644096	0.805183	0.628415	0.819108
Item 15	0.612020	0.813840	0.633181	0.818181
Item 3	0.601222	0.814341	0.613459	0.822004
Item 20	0.542380	0.832160	0.532100	0.837441

N=3923

Table 8. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability with Item Correlations for the Subscale 2 of the SPES

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha				
for RAW variables			0.683350	
for STANDARDIZED variables			0.702894	
	Raw Variables		Standardized Variables	
Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Item 14	0.552248	0.565764	0.576644	0.582642
Item 26	0.514302	0.593828	0.533172	0.610817
Item 12	0.396072	0.695684	0.396934	0.694096
Item 16	0.458033	0.625905	0.451042	0.661918

N=3922

Table 9. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliability and Item Correlations for the Subscale 3 of the SPES

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha

for RAW variables 0.894509
for STANDARDIZED variables 0.895408

	Raw Variables		Standardized Variables	
Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Item 9	0.670981	0.882758	0.671942	0.883588
Item 6	0.644274	0.883952	0.645654	0.884980
Item 32	0.741334	0.878598	0.739275	0.879984
Item 4	0.615118	0.885564	0.616449	0.886517
Item 18	0.594617	0.887531	0.593679	0.887707
Item 10	0.603943	0.886107	0.606215	0.887052
Item 34	0.557938	0.888604	0.557945	0.889562
Item 36	0.636491	0.884359	0.634552	0.885567
Item 22	0.623058	0.885279	0.620927	0.886282
Item 29	0.553265	0.889275	0.552183	0.889860
Item 28	0.604362	0.886279	0.605139	0.887109
Item 27	0.453263	0.893115	0.455308	0.894804

N=3678

Table 10. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliabilities and Item Correlations for the Subscale 4 of the SPES

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha

for RAW variables 0.792935
for STANDARDIZED variables 0.801894

	Raw Variables		Standardized Variables	
Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Item 17	0.567641	0.761609	0.583385	0.768843
Item 23	0.622587	0.750572	0.634849	0.760760
Item 7	0.627482	0.749625	0.629336	0.761633
Item 24	0.430524	0.780335	0.449428	0.789174
Item 11	0.430068	0.780615	0.451394	0.788883
Item 1	0.481542	0.772971	0.489374	0.783217
Item 19	0.485244	0.774261	0.457028	0.788048
Item 13	0.431048	0.789126	0.411412	0.794761

N=3752

Table 11. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliabilities and Item Correlations for the Subscale 5 of the SPES

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha				
for RAW variables			0.830674	
for STANDARDIZED variables			0.834615	
	Raw Variables		Standardized Variables	
Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Item 38	0.729452	0.766424	0.719307	0.777256
Item 25	0.634714	0.797607	0.627237	0.803507
Item 37	0.656142	0.793876	0.663223	0.793384
Item 33	0.672353	0.785086	0.686615	0.786710
Item 31	0.484054	0.836563	0.485642	0.841661

N=3914

Table 12. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha Reliabilities and Item Correlations for the Subscale 6 of the SPES

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha				
for RAW variables			0.835800	
for STANDARDIZED variables			0.835255	
	Raw Variables		Standardized Variables	
Deleted Variable	Correlation with Total	Alpha	Correlation with Total	Alpha
Item 30	0.755650	0.713470	0.754270	0.713588
Item 35	0.753779	0.715217	0.752591	0.715303
Item 5	0.590210	0.872130	0.590212	0.872133

N=3996

Table 13. FACETS Analysis of Subscale 1 of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Avrge	Fair Avrge	Calib Logit	Model Error	Infit MnSq	Infit Std	Outfit MnSq	Outfit Std	PtBis	Item No.
14769	3691	4.0	3.4	0.06	0.03	1.0	0	0.9	-1	0.53	2
15071	3693	4.1	3.5	0.31	0.03	1.0	0	0.9	-2	0.45	3
14013	3679	3.8	3.1	-0.49	0.03	0.9	-4	0.9	-2	0.53	8
15163	3658	4.1	3.6	0.52	0.03	0.9	-4	0.9	-5	0.45	15
13912	3678	3.8	3.0	-0.56	0.03	1.3	9	1.4	9	0.46	20
14911	3692	4.0	3.5	-0.17	0.03	0.8	-8	0.9	-9	0.49	21
14639.8	3681,8	4,0	3,4	0.00	0.03	1.0	-1.7	1.0	-2.1	0.49	Mean (Count 6)
495.4	12.3	0.1	0.2	0.40	0.00	0.2	5.5	0.2	5.5	0.03	S.D.

RMSE 0.03 Adj S.D. 0.40 Separation 13.83 Reliability 0.99
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 1196.78 d.f.: 5 significance : .00 Random (normal) chi-square: 5.00 d.f.: 4 significance: .29

Note: Scale range=1-5 1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree

Table 14. FACETS Analysis of Subscale 2 of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Avrge	Fair Avrge	Calib Logit	Model Error	Infit MnSq	Infit Std	Outfit MnSq	Outfit Std	PtBis	Item No.
12439	3373	3.7	2.7	-0.73	0.02	1.1	4	1.2	5	0.31	12
13879	3396	4,1	3,5	0.09	0.03	0.9	-5	0.8	-7	0.43	14
14245	3381	4.2	3.7	0.42	0.03	1.1	2	1.1	2	0.35	16
13960	3371	4.1	3.6	0.22	0.03	0.9	-3	0.9	-5	0.40	26
13630.8	3380.3	4.0	3.4	0.00	0.03	1.0	-0.4	1.0	-0.9	0.38	Mean (Count 4)
701.4	9.8	0.2	0.4	0.44	0.00	0.1	4.2	0.2	5.6	0.4	S.D.

RMSE 0.03 Adj S.D. 0.44 Separation 16.27 Reliability 1.00
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 1264.84 d.f. : 3 significance: .00
Random (normal) chi-square: .00 d.f.: significance: .22

Note: Scale range=1-5 1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree

Table 15. FACETS Analysis of Subscale 3 of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Avrge	Fair Avrge	Calib Logit	Model Error	Infit MnSq	Infit Std	Outfit MnSq	Outfit Std	PtBis	Item No.
16283	3896	4.2	3.6	0.26	0.03	1.0	1	1.0	1	0.47	4
15309	3852	4.0	3.2	-0.39	0.03	0.9	-5	0.9	-3	0.48	6
15406	3833	4.0	3.3	-0.27	0.03	0.7	-9	0.8	-9	0.50	9
15271	3867	3.9	3.1	-0.47	0.03	0.9	-3	1.0	-1	0.46	10
15018	3853	3.9	3.0	-0.60	0.03	1.3	8	1.3	9	0.44	18
16301	3890	4.2	3.6	0.30	0.03	1.0	-1	1.0	-1	0.48	22
16981	3871	4.4	3.9	1.07	0.03	1.2	8	1.4	9	0.33	27
16841	3888	4.3	3.8	0.84	0.03	1.1	2	1.0	0	0.46	28
15707	3883	4.0	3.3	-0.18	0.03	1.3	9	1.3	9	0.41	29
15424	3843	4.0	3.3	-0.28	0.03	0.7	-9	0.7	-9	0.56	32
16372	3872	4.2	4.2	0.44	0.03	1.4	9	1.3	8	0.40	34
14954	3881	3.9	3.9	-0.72	0.03	0.8	-8	0.9	-4	0.48	36
15822.3	3869.1	4.1	3.4	0.00	0.03	1.0	0.1	1.0	0.7	0.46	Mean Count 12)
673.1	19.2	0.2	0.3	0.55	0.00	0.2	7.1	0.2	6.6	0.06	S.D.

RMSE 0.03 Adj S.D. 0.55 Separation 18.93 Reliability 1.00
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 4029.36 d.f: 11 significance: 00
Random (normal) chi-square: 11.00 d.f.: 10 significance: 36

Note: Scale range=1-5 1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree

Table 16. FACETS Analysis of Subscale 4 of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Avrge	Fair Avrge	Calib Logit	Model Error	Infit MnSq	Infit Std	Outfit MnSq	Outfit Std	PtBis	Item No.
14135	3867	3,7	1,7	0.27	0.02	1.0	1-	1.0	0	0.37	1
14760	4028	3.4	1.5	-0.07	0.02	0.7	-9	0.7	-9	0.48	7
16125	4037	4.0	2.1	0.84	0.02	1.0	0	1.1	2	0.33	11
10201	4022	2.5	1.1	-1.15	0.02	1.4	9	1.4	9	0.34	13
15468	4035	3.8	1.9	0.55	0.02	0.8	-8	0.8	-7	0.42	17
10217	4015	2.5	1.2	-1.14	0.02	1.1	5	1.2	7	0.38	19
14271	4033	3.5	1.6	0.09	0.02	0.8	-9	0.8	-9	0.46	23
15638	4031	3.9	1.9	0.62	0.02	1.0	1	1.1	3	0.32	24
13726.9	4028	3.4	1.6	-0.00	0.02	1.0	-1.6	1.0	-0.4	0.39	Mean (Count 8)
2169.4	53.9	0.5	0.3	0.72	0.00	0.2	6.3	0.2	6.7	0.06	S.D.

RSME 0.02 Adj. S. D. 0.72 Separation 37.07 Reliability 1.00
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 11848.97 d.f. 7 significance: .00
Random (normal) chi-square: 7.00 d.f.: 6 significance: .32

Note: Scale range 1-5 1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree

Table 17. FACETS Analysis of Subscale 5 of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Avrge	Fair Avrge	Calib Logit	Model Error	Infit MnSq	Infit Std	Outfit MnSq	Outfit Std	PtBis	Item No.
12711	3900	3,3	2,9	-0.61	0.02	1.1	2	1.1	2	0.49	25
14613	3893	3.8	3.6	0.56	0.03	1.5	9	1.5	9	0.38	31
14172	3899	3.6	3.4	0.25	0.03	0.9	-4	0.9	-5	0.50	33
14070	3850	3.7	3.4	0.30	0.03	0.8	-9	0.8	-9	0.48	37
12784	3865	3.3	3.0	-0.50	0.02	0.7	-9	0.7	-9	0.55	38
13670.0	3881.4	3.5	3.3	0.00	0.02	1.0	-2.2	1.0	-2.4	0.48	Mean (Count 5)
775.4	20.2	0.2	0.3	0.46	0.00	0.3	7.0	0.3	7.1	0.05	S.D.

RMSE 0.02 Adj S.D. 0.46 Separation 18.72 Reliability 1.00
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 1799.04 d.f.: 4 significance: .00
Random (normal) chi-square: 4.00 d.f.: 3 significance: .26

Note: Scale range 1-5 1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree

Table 18. FACETS Analysis of Subscale 6 of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Avrge	Fair Avrge	Calib Logit	Model Error	Infit MnSq	Infit Std	Outfit MnSq	Outfit Std	PtBis	Item No.
11949	3678	3.2	3.3	0.36	0.03	1.4	9	1.3	9	0.46	5
11360	3658	3.1	3.1	0.01	0.03	0.8	-8	0.8	-9	0.58	30
10834	3670	3.0	2.9	-0.36	0.03	0.8	-9	0.8	-9	0.58	35
11381	3668.7	3.1	3.1	-0.00	0.03	1.0	-2.7	1.0	-3.0	0.54	Mean (Count 3)
455.4	8.2	0.1	0.2	0.29	0.00	0.3	8.3	0.3	8.5	0.06	S.D.
RMSE 0.03 Adj S.D. 0.29 Separation 11.37 Reliability 0.99											
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 390.80 d.f.: 2 significance: .00											
Random (normal) chi-square: 2.00 d.f.: 1 significance: .16											

Note: Scale range 1-5 1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree

Table 19. Subscales Created from a Principal Axis Factor Analysis with a Harris-Kaiser Oblique Rotation of the Responses from 4091 Teachers

Factor 1 - Status
2. I function in a professional environment
3. I believe that I have earned respect.
8. I am treated as a professional.
15. I have the respect of my colleagues.
20. I work at a school where kids come first.
21. I have the support and respect of my colleagues.
Factor 2 - Professional Growth
12. I participate in staff development.
14. I have the opportunity for professional growth.
16. I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.
26. I am given the opportunity to continue learning.
Factor 3 - Self Efficacy
4. I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.
6. I believe that I have the ability to get things done.
9. I believe that I am very effective.
10. I believe that I am empowering students.
18. I believe that I am having an impact.
22. I see students learn.
27. I have a strong knowledge base in the areas in which I teach.
28. I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with students.
29. I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.
32. I perceive that I am making a difference.
34. I believe that I am good at what I do.
36. I perceive that I have an impact on other teachers and students.
Factor 4 - Decision Making
1. I am given the responsibility to monitor programs.
7. I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in school.
11. I am able to teach as I choose.
13. I make decisions about the selection of other teachers for my school.
17. I have the freedom to make decisions on what is taught.
19. I am involved in school budget decisions.
23. I make decisions about curriculum.
24. I am a decision maker.
Factor 5 - Impact
25. I am given the opportunity to teach other teachers.
31. I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school.
33. Principals, other teachers, and school personnel solicit my advice.
37. My advice is solicited by others.
38. I have an opportunity to teach other teachers about innovative ideas.
Factor 6 - Autonomy in Scheduling
5. I have control over daily schedules.
30. I can determine my own schedule.
35. I can plan my own schedule.

Table 20. Simple Correlations Among the 38 Items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

	Item1	Item2	Item3	Item4	Item5	Item6	Item7	Item8	Item9	Item10	Item11	Item12
Item1	1.00											
Item2	0.39	1.00										
Item3	0.32	0.46	1.00									
Item4	0.20	0.32	0.39	1.00								
Item5	0.28	0.29	0.20	0.20	1.00							
Item6	0.24	0.27	0.37	0.50	0.21	1.00						
Item7	0.47	0.41	0.33	0.24	0.40	0.26	1.00					
Item8	0.39	0.62	0.50	0.29	0.33	0.31	0.51	1.00				
Item9	0.23	0.31	0.41	0.51	0.26	0.70	0.29	0.38	1.00			
Item10	0.26	0.30	0.32	0.50	0.27	0.46	0.32	0.33	0.52	1.00		
Item11	0.28	0.33	0.27	0.23	0.27	0.26	0.35	0.36	0.28	0.30	1.00	
Item12	0.22	0.27	0.21	0.23	0.13	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.19	0.22	0.22	1.00
Item13	0.23	0.17	0.15	0.10	0.26	0.07	0.35	0.23	0.13	0.16	0.14	-0.12
Item14	0.27	0.37	0.33	0.26	0.20	0.25	0.30	0.41	0.25	0.26	0.28	0.30
Item15	0.27	0.38	0.52	0.32	0.19	0.32	0.31	0.42	0.37	0.32	0.29	0.19
Item16	0.27	0.36	0.34	0.38	0.21	0.38	0.30	0.33	0.37	0.39	0.32	0.37
Item17	0.31	0.28	0.25	0.19	0.27	0.22	0.38	0.34	0.25	0.28	0.48	0.16
Item18	0.22	0.24	0.29	0.39	0.16	0.41	0.23	0.27	0.40	0.37	0.26	0.38
Item19	0.26	0.23	0.17	0.11	0.29	0.11	0.38	0.27	0.15	0.18	0.15	0.06
Item20	0.27	0.50	0.31	0.27	0.26	0.26	0.36	0.51	0.29	0.30	0.28	0.19
Item21	0.26	0.41	0.53	0.31	0.20	0.33	0.33	0.46	0.38	0.32	0.27	0.23
Item22	0.23	0.34	0.33	0.43	0.19	0.39	0.27	0.33	0.40	0.41	0.27	0.30
Item23	0.34	0.29	0.25	0.19	0.28	0.21	0.48	0.35	0.23	0.28	0.36	0.23

Continued

Table 20 (Continued). Simple Correlations Among the 38 Items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

	Item1	Item2	Item3	Item4	Item5	Item6	Item7	Item8	Item9	Item10	Item11	Item12
Item24	0.34	0.30	0.30	0.28	0.22	0.30	0.36	0.34	0.31	0.31	0.31	0.31
Item25	0.34	0.31	0.25	0.20	0.25	0.20	0.43	0.36	0.22	0.26	0.24	0.24
Item26	0.24	0.32	0.28	0.25	0.19	0.24	0.29	0.34	0.26	0.27	0.24	0.26
Item27	0.13	0.32	0.28	0.25	0.19	0.24	0.29	0.35	0.26	0.27	0.24	0.26
Item28	0.23	0.30	0.31	0.41	0.21	0.35	0.28	0.33	0.38	0.40	0.28	0.27
Item29	0.23	0.28	0.34	0.29	0.21	0.31	0.26	0.30	0.31	0.32	0.28	0.30
Item30	0.24	0.27	0.18	0.20	0.56	0.23	0.36	0.32	0.24	0.25	0.26	0.13
Item31	0.26	0.36	0.29	0.26	0.31	0.26	0.32	0.40	0.28	0.27	0.25	0.23
Item32	0.30	0.38	0.40	0.49	0.26	0.52	0.33	0.40	0.55	0.50	0.33	0.30
Item33	0.37	0.35	0.40	0.29	0.29	0.31	0.49	0.46	0.34	0.33	0.28	0.28
Item34	0.15	0.18	0.26	0.33	0.13	0.38	0.15	0.19	0.37	0.30	0.20	0.22
Item35	0.23	0.26	0.19	0.22	0.56	0.24	0.35	0.31	0.24	0.27	0.27	0.16
Item36	0.30	0.34	0.42	0.41	0.25	0.44	0.36	0.38	0.46	0.41	0.28	0.30
Item37	0.34	0.32	0.37	0.29	0.23	0.33	0.41	0.39	0.34	0.33	0.26	0.31
Item38	0.37	0.36	0.29	0.26	0.25	0.26	0.44	0.40	0.26	0.29	0.25	0.31

Continued

Table 20 (Continued). Simple Correlations Among the 38 Items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

	Item13	Item14	Item15	Item16	Item17	Item18	Item19	Item20	Item21	Item22	Item23	Item24
Item13	1.00											
Item14	0.13	1.00										
Item15	0.23	0.36	1.00									
Item16	0.03	0.36	0.36	1.00								
Item17	0.26	0.21	0.28	0.28	1.00							
Item18	-0.05	0.26	0.23	0.48	0.21	1.00						
Item19	0.48	0.11	0.20	0.07	0.29	-0.06	1.00					
Item20	0.18	0.43	0.35	0.31	0.23	0.20	0.24	1.00				
Item21	0.18	0.38	0.73	0.33	0.25	0.26	0.21	0.39	1.00			
Item22	0.06	0.32	0.32	0.48	0.21	0.50	0.07	0.34	0.35	1.00		
Item23	0.29	0.23	0.26	0.28	0.55	0.22	0.38	0.26	0.28	0.27	1.00	
Item24	0.13	0.28	0.29	0.35	0.32	0.40	0.14	0.25	0.31	0.41	0.41	1.00

Continued

Table 20 (Continued). Simple Correlations Among the 38 Items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

	Item13	Item14	Item15	Item16	Item17	Item18	Item19	Item20	Item21	Item22	Item23	Item24
Item25	0.33	0.29	0.30	0.23	0.29	0.14	0.39	0.32	0.33	0.19	0.40	0.29
Item26	0.16	0.61	0.32	0.32	0.23	0.23	0.15	0.35	o.31	0.33	0.25	0.29
Item27	0.05	0.25	0.28	0.30	0.18	0.25	0.06	0.18	0.27	0.30	0.18	0.27
Item28	0.11	0.33	0.34	0.43	0.26	0.38	0.11	0.31	0.34	0.46	0.24	0.33
Item29	0.06	0.26	0.32	0.40	0.23	0.40	0.06	0.22	0.32	0.39	0.24	0.39
Item30	0.29	0.20	0.18	0.20	0.27	0.16	0.34	0.25	0.19	0.17	0.29	0.20
Item31	0.24	0.36	0.32	0.27	0.26	0.22	0.25	0.38	0.36	0.28	0.27	0.25
Item32	0.14	0.35	0.39	0.31	0.31	0.26	0.16	0.34	0.42	0.50	0.29	0.42
Item33	0.28	0.31	0.39	0.31	0.31	0.26	0.35	0.34	0.43	0.50	0.29	0.41
Item34	0.01	0.21	0.26	0.33	0.14	0.37	0.00	0.16	0.26	0.37	0.12	0.32
Item35	0.27	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.29	0.15	0.31	0.26	0.20	0.18	0.30	0.23
Item36	0.17	0.35	0.43	0.38	0.26	0.40	0.20	0.33	0.48	0.41	0.27	0.42
Item37	0.22	0.30	0.42	0.33	0.28	0.31	0.26	0.30	0.46	0.33	0.33	0.39
Item38	0.28	0.34	0.32	0.29	0.27	0.26	0.30	0.33	0.34	0.30	0.36	0.38

Continued

Table 20 (Continued). Simple Correlations Among the 38 Items of the School Participant Empowerment Scale

	Itm25	Itm26	Itm27	Itm28	Itm29	Itm30	Itm31	Itm32	Itm33	Itm34	Itm35	Itm36	Itm37	Itm38
Itm25	1.00													
Itm26	0.35	1.00												
Itm27	0.15	0.27	1.00											
Itm28	0.23	0.36	0.39	1.00										
Itm29	0.19	0.25	0.28	0.44	1.00									
Itm30	0.33	0.18	0.09	0.20	0.11	1.00								
Itm31	0.35	0.36	0.16	0.31	0.22	0.37	1.00							
Itm32	0.27	0.33	0.33	0.48	0.49	0.25	0.37	1.00						
Itm33	0.48	0.31	0.19	0.31	0.25	0.37	0.41	0.37	1.00					
Itm34	0.07	0.20	0.38	0.33	0.43	0.06	0.12	0.43	0.13	1.00				
Itm35	0.30	0.21	0.10	0.22	0.17	0.77	0.36	0.25	0.37	0.01	1.00			
Itm36	0.35	0.34	0.30	0.42	0.44	0.26	0.40	0.59	0.48	0.39	0.26	1.00		
Itm37	0.44	0.28	0.24	0.23	0.36	0.30	0.38	0.43	0.70	0.30	0.30	0.60	1.00	
Itm38	0.71	0.36	0.17	0.17	0.29	0.33	0.44	0.36	0.53	0.18	0.32	0.43	0.54	1.00

TM025883

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: An Analysis of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short + Rinehart 1992) Based on Data from 4091 Teachers in 183 Restructuring Schools	
Author(s): Beverly Klecker, Willard E. Loadman	
Corporate Source: American Educational Research Association	Publication Date: April 11, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4" x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

Sample sticker to be affixed to document

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Beverly Klecker	Position: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
Printed Name: BEVERLY KLECKER	Organization: EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY
Address: 412 COMBS CLASSROOM EASTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY RICHMOND, KY 40475-3111	Telephone Number: (606) 622-1133
	Date: April 11, 1996

OVER

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of this document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor:	
Address:	
Price Per Copy:	Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name and address of current copyright/reproduction rights holder:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, NW Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186