

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND PSYCHOLOGICAL
EMPOWERMENT OF TEACHERS

by

GINA MCFALL BAGGETT

C. JOHN TARTER, COMMITTEE CHAIR

ROXANNE MITCHELL
DAVE DAGLEY
JOHN DANTZLER
JING PING SUN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy, and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2015

Copyright Gina McFall Baggett 2015
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This study examined the individual and collective relationships between the dimensions of transformational leadership as defined by Leithwood (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006) and the dimensions of positive psychological empowerment as defined by Spreitzer (1995). Transformational leadership is comprised of four dimensions: setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instructional programs. Psychological empowerment consists of four dimensions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact.

A total of 60 elementary schools in Northwest Alabama participated. There were 1,665 teacher respondents that completed surveys. Survey instruments were administered during regularly scheduled faculty meetings at each of the schools. Two instruments were used to collect quantitative data for this research project: Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents and Spreitzer's Psychological Empowerment Instrument. This project was the first to use Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents therefore; data analysis provided scale reliability. The unit of analysis was the school.

Six hypotheses were tested. The research found the dimensions of transformational leadership individually and collectively predicted the psychological empowerment dimension of impact ($r = .50, p < .01$). Collectively, transformational leadership had an adjusted R^2 of .20 ($p < .01$).

A post hoc factor analysis of psychological empowerment was conducted. Results for the component meaning/competency found the transformational leadership dimension improving instruction to be a predictor factor ($\beta = .60, p < .05$). The multiple regression of the component impact/self-determination found statistical significance at the .05 level ($R = .44, p < .05$), with the transformational leadership dimension redesigning the organization ($\beta = .76, p < .01$) providing the only significant predictor. A post hoc power analysis revealed statistical power ranged from .84 - .99.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

α	Cronbach's alpha index of internal consistency
β	Beta
df	Degrees of freedom: The number of values in the final calculation of a statistic that are free to vary
M	Mean: The central tendency either of a probability distribution or of the random variable characterized by that distribution
P	Probability: A number expressing the likelihood that a specific event will occur expressed as the ratio of the number of actual occurrences to the number of possible occurrences
r	Pearson product-moment correlation
t	Computed value of t test
<	Less than
\leq	Less than or equal to
=	Equal to
\neq	Not equal to

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who have assisted me throughout this endeavor. First, my dissertation committee: Dr. John Tarter, Dr. Roxanne Mitchell, Dr. David Dagley, Dr. John Dantzler, and Dr. Jing Ping Sun. An extraordinary thank-you must be given to chair, Dr. John Tarter and co-chair, Dr. Roxanne Mitchell for their dedication to our cohort.

Second, my cohort members: Les Abston, Tina Blankenship, Jon Brett Smith, Paige Terry, and Marla Williams. I cannot imagine what this journey would have been like without the “Speake Six”. I appreciate the collaboration (especially in collecting, inputting, and interpreting the data), and friendship.

Third, my professional colleagues (and friends): Jon, Dimple, Linda, and Lynn. Jon, (aka Carl), I appreciate your ideas, suggestions, editing, and support throughout this adventure. I plan on doing the same for you. Dimple, my woodchuck friend, thank you for listening, laughing, and keeping me grounded. For that I am eternally grateful. Linda, my partner in crime, thank you for putting up with my mischievous tactics and being the best assistant an Elementary Curriculum/Federal Programs director could ever have. You make my job fun and enjoyable! Lynn, our “appointments” mean the world to me. Thanks for being there and always encouraging me to do my best.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to express my gratitude to my immediate and extended family. Your support and guidance have been incredible. I could not have made it without you!!! I think my next degree will be accounting ... just saying.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Significance of the Study	4
Research Question and Hypotheses	4
Definition of Concepts	5
Limitations of the Study.....	7
Summary	7
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Introduction.....	9
Transformational Leadership	9
Leithwood’s Model of Transformational Leadership	13
Criticisms of Transformational Leadership	16
Leithwood’s and Janzi’s Rebuttal of Criticisms	18
Empowerment.....	19

Transformational Leadership and Empowerment	24
Theoretical Framework.....	27
Rationale and Hypotheses	27
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	31
Overview	31
Research Design	31
Data Sample	32
Data Collection Procedures	32
Instrumentation	33
Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents	33
Psychological Empowerment Instrument	34
Data Analysis Procedures	34
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS	36
Descriptive Statistics	36
Reliability.....	39
Correlations.....	40
Testing Hypotheses	42
Post Hoc Analyses	49
Post Hoc Factor Analysis.....	49
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis	52
Post Hoc Power Analysis.....	56
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	58
Introduction.....	58

Hypothesized Findings.....	58
Non-Hypothesized Findings	60
Implications.....	60
Theoretical Implications	60
Practical Implications.....	61
Limitations	62
Recommendations for Future Research	63
REFERENCES	65
APPENDICES	
A. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP SURVEY FOR TEACHER RESPONDENTS	70
B. PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT INSTRUMENT	71
C. IRB APPROVAL	72

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Summary of School Configurations.....	37
2.	Descriptive Statistics of the Measures	38
3.	Cronbach’s Alpha for Study Variables (N = 60)	40
4.	Correlations among all Major Variables Examined in the Study	42
5.	Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Meaning on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership.....	44
6.	Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Competency on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership	45
7.	Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Self Determination on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership	46
8.	Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Impact on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership.....	47
9.	Regression Coefficients of SES and Total Psychological Empowerment on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership.....	48
10.	Factor Analysis Descriptive Statistics	50
11.	KMO and Bartlett’s Test.....	50

12. Communalities	51
13. Extraction Sum of Squared	52
14. Component Matrix	53
15. Rotated Component Matrix.....	54
16. Regression Coefficients of Meaning/Competency on the Transformation Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, and Improving Instruction.....	55
17. Regression Coefficients of the Impact/Self-Determination on the Transformation Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, and Improving Instruction.....	56

CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

This study was an examination of the relationship between the dimensions of transformational leadership and the dimensions of psychological empowerment of teachers in elementary schools in northwest Alabama. This chapter will include a background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, and significance of the study. A research question will be introduced as well as the hypotheses of the study. Definitions of key concepts will be provided. Finally, the limitations and a summary for this study will be discussed.

Background of the Study

This study focused on the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment of teachers in northwest Alabama elementary schools. The transformational leadership portion was based on Leithwood's model which developed out of Bass' (1990) expansion of Burns' (1978) ideas regarding the main concepts of transformational leadership. Four broad behaviors encompassed the model developed by Leithwood and Jantzi (2006): setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving the instructional program; these are the core practices of successful school leadership (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, & Harris, 2006).

In order to set direction, the leader develops a shared vision and goals for the school, while holding high performance expectations from staff members, teachers, and students. To develop people, leaders provide individual support, intellectual stimulation, and model expected high ethical behaviors. To redesign the organization, leaders strengthen the school culture by

building trust, enabling collaboration, and engaging parents and community stakeholders. To improve the instructional program, leaders focus on providing instructional support and staffing programs (Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

The psychological empowerment segment was based on Spreitzer's (1995) expanded model of Thomas and Velthouse's (1990) work with intrinsic task motivation. Alienation must be looked at as the direct opposite of empowerment to fully understand the importance of empowerment. Marx (as cited in Burns, 1978) was the first to suggest that alienation at work represented loss of individuality and deprived workers of self-fulfillment. Spreitzer's (1995) model included four dimensions of empowerment: 1) feeling of meaningfulness, 2) feeling of competency, 3) feeling of self-determination, and 4) feeling of having impact. In feeling of meaningfulness, individuals feel they work in an environment where their time and power is valued. The feeling of competency is to what extent an individual believes he can execute his job duties skillfully and effectively. The feeling of self-determination depicts how well an individual believes he is able to carry out job duties without intervention. The feeling of having an impact refers to how individuals enjoy their work and if they feel what they do makes a difference

Statement of the Problem

School leaders are expected to encourage, influence, and motivate teachers to provide students with the skills and strategies needed to succeed. Transformational leaders challenge followers to find their own way to accomplish tasks thereby improving followers' empowerment and autonomy (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012). Transformational leaders set high expectations, communicate vision, and set high performance standards (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004). Empowerment seems to be a management tool, which is used to exchange the shared vision that

the organization expects to materialize into common goals (Raquib, Anantharaman, Eze, & Murad, 2010). Therefore, one way to increase teacher empowerment could be through the use of transformational leadership techniques. The determination of a positive link between these two concepts may provide insight into leadership skills that can lead to an increase in teacher empowerment.

Purpose of the Study

This project examined whether or not there was a positive relationship between the dimensions of transformational leadership as defined by Leithwood (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006) and the dimensions of positive psychological empowerment as defined by Spreitzer (1995). A correlation between transformational leadership and positive psychological empowerment could point to school leaders' capability to identify management approaches that may increase and expand teacher empowerment.

Many studies have been conducted between the dimensions of transformational leadership and positive psychological empowerment in the fields of business, management, and nursing with few studies being performed in the educational setting (Castro, Perinan, & Bueno, 2008; Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012; Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, & Wilk, 2001; Ozaralli, 2002). There are gaps in the literature related to educational research. In particular, there is little literature relating the dimensions of transformational leadership to the dimensions of psychological empowerment. If school leaders can use of the dimensions of transformational leadership to develop teachers' psychological empowerment, the administration, teachers, and the school organization could benefit. This research added to the literature in educational research on transformational leadership and teacher psychological empowerment.

Significance of the Study

The theoretical significance of this study was that it added to the educational research literature in the areas of transformational leadership and positive psychological empowerment. This research tested the dimensions of transformational leadership and their relationship to psychological empowerment. This study was the first to use Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents; therefore, data analysis provided scale reliability. This study filled in research gaps between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment in the field of education.

The practical significance was that administrators can incorporate dimensions of transformational leadership to help establish relationships by empowering teachers. This would support a shared vision and goals for the school as well as promote opportunities for their personal growth and a feeling of independence in their teaching abilities. Correlating the constructs of transformational leadership and empowerment could result in a further understanding of their importance in school settings. Therefore, the performance and success of schools may progress.

Research Question and Hypotheses

The overall research question was "What is the individual and collective relationship between the dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment?"

This study also tested six hypotheses that have been generated by the theory, using data from Northwest Alabama schools:

1. H₁: The dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment will positively co-vary with each other;

2. H₂: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of meaning;
3. H₃: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of competency;
4. H₄: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of self-determination;
5. H₅: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of having an impact; and
6. H₆: The dimensions of transformational leadership will independently and collectively predict overall empowerment.

Definitions of Concepts

Transformational leadership: a leaders' ability to engage with followers so that they raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality (Burns, 1978), a form of principal leadership that moves individuals toward a level of commitment to achieve school goals by setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the instructional program (Leithwood et al., 2006).

- *Setting Directions* – encompasses the leadership practices that entail articulating a common vision, setting group goals, and setting expectations for high performance. In doing so, the authors' noted three dimensions: shared vision, collaborative goal-setting and collaborative priority-setting. The notion builds upon the understanding that followers are more likely to act when unified by a

compelling purpose that meets both organizational and personal goals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

- *Developing People* - purposeful development of the faculty and staff's capacity to reach the intended, stated, and shared goals. Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) describe the dimensions of this category as providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, and modeling desirable professional practices and values. Leader behaviors are geared toward empowering teachers' ability to problem-solve and attend to the individual teacher's personal needs (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).
- *Redesigning the Organization* – accounts for leadership practices that are geared toward achieving change effects through the establishment of organizational routines, systems, and structures that enhance collaborative culture and collective learning (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).
- *Improving the Instructional Programs* – monitoring and providing resources that allow teachers/staff to improve instruction. The addition of this set of leadership practices characterizes the variation between models of transformational leadership developed for school and nonschool environments (Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

Positive psychological empowerment: giving people the knowledge, skills, self-awareness, authority, resources, opportunities, and freedom to manage themselves and be accountable for their behavior and performance (Gill, 2006).

- *Feeling of being meaningful*: worthiness of job purpose, individuals feel they work in an environment where their time and power is valued (Thomas &

Velthouse, 1990) and they care about what they are doing (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997).

- *Feeling of competency*: to what extent an individual can execute his job duties skillfully and effectively (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), individuals are confident about their ability to do their work (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997).
- *Feeling of self-determination*: how well an individual is able to carry out job duties without intervention (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).
- *Feeling of having an impact*: how individuals enjoy their work and feel what they do makes a difference (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990) individuals believe they have influence on their work (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997).

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study include threats to internal and external validity. Data for this study was collected through surveys administered to 60 public elementary schools in north Alabama. The schools in this sample were taken from a group of school districts that consented to participate in this study. A possible threat to the internal validity was that this study was a cross-sectional study of northwest Alabama elementary schools. Schools may have diverse educational, cultural, and personal beliefs. Threats to the external validity of this study consisted of generalizing the results obtained to other school populations across the nation due to the study using a sample of convenience.

Summary

Transformational leadership and psychological empowerment have both been significant components of organizational commitment (Ismail, Mohamed, Sulaiman, Mohamed, & Yusuf, 2011), job satisfaction (Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, & Wilk, 2004), followers' perceived

work characteristics (Nielsen, Randall, Yarker, & Brenner, 2008), and attitudes (Castro, Perifinan, & Bueno, 2008). However, little research has been conducted which relates Leithwood's model of transformational leadership with Spreitzer's model of psychological empowerment. This study was the first to use Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents in conjunction with Spreitzer's (1995) Psychological Empowerment Instrument. This study attempted to expand the research in educational literature.

CHAPTER II:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents the research history and literature review of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. It is divided into three sections: conceptual framework, theoretical framework, and hypotheses. The conceptual framework includes transformational leadership and psychological empowerment and gives a detailed research history of each concept. A theoretical explanation of how the concepts interact is also presented. Finally, hypotheses testing the theoretical framework are provided.

Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as occurring when one or more persons engage with others so that they raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. He also states that the leaders and their followers' purpose become fused. Transformational leadership becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and follower. Burns suggested that Gandhi aroused and elevated the hopes and demands of millions of Indians and his life and personality were enhanced in the process.

Bass (1985) proposed effective leaders focus on the analysis of relationships. Furthermore, transformational leaders analyze relationships by diagnosing the leader-follower association, understanding job demands, and matching the readiness of followers to the situation. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), leaders are responsible for building relationships with

followers and identifying successful ways of dealing with people by selecting a style of leadership called contingent reward. Contingent reward is seen as transactional when the reward is materialistic, as in a bonus, and transformational when the reward is psychological, as in praise. Einstein and Humphreys (2001) stated that transformational leaders begin the leader-follower relationship with a sense of being responsible for the growth and development of the followers. Leaders seek to enhance the relationship by arousing trust, confidence, and desire in their followers. The goal is to transform the followers toward a relationship that shifts from the dependent responsible for to the followers being interdependent and responsible to each other. A transformational leader must bring followers to a level where they can succeed without direct leader intervention.

According to Burns (1978), the leadership process is either transformational or transactional. Bass and Avolio (1993) defined the relationship of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and no leadership (*laissez-faire*) as the Full Range Leadership Program (FRLP). Transformational leadership incorporates a change to benefit both the relationship and the resources of those involved. The effect is a change in the intensity of commitment and an increased ability for achieving common goals. Transactional leadership occurs when a person makes contact with others for the purpose of an exchange. The exchange can be economical, political, or psychological in nature.

In Bass and Avolio's (1993) model, seven factors are identified; four are included in transformational and three in transactional. Transformational leadership factors are sometimes referred to as the four I's and include the following: ideal influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. In ideal influence, the leader inspires values that create esteem, approval, and allegiance in followers while emphasizing a strong commitment to the organization. In inspirational motivation, the leader encourages followers by

being optimistic regarding tasks and the future of the organization. In intellectual stimulation, the leader enhances followers' abilities to think about old issues in new ways, producing creative ideas in problem solving. In individual consideration, the leader forms personal connections with followers while providing opportunities to increase learning and confidence in their ability to make decisions.

The three transactional factors identified by Bass and Avolio (1993) are contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership. Contingent reward (such as praise) provides incentive for effort and recognizes good performance. Needs are identified and linked to what the leader wants to accomplish as well as the rewards for followers. In management-by-exception, leaders remain passive until problems arise. Followers' performances are monitored and only when leaders identify mistakes made do they act. Modes of reinforcement include the following: punishment, criticism, and negative feedback. Laissez-faire leadership is defined as the absence of leadership. There is neither a transaction nor an agreement between leaders and followers. Feedback, involvement, and rewards are missing and there is no motivation for followers.

Bass (1985) proposed that the key to understanding the relationship between transformational leadership and transactional leadership is referred to as the augmentation effect. Bass and Avolio (1993) asserted that the augmentation effect is a fundamental aspect of transformational-transactional leadership theory. The augmentation effect states that transformational leadership procedures essentially build on transactional leadership techniques. Bass (1985) suggested that transformational leadership increases transactional leadership. The transformational practices encourage commitment and foster change while the transactional components deal with the basic needs of the organization. By comparing transformational

leadership and transactional leadership researchers can better predict and define a range of leadership behaviors observed by followers (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

As defined by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), transformational leadership differs from transactional leadership in that a transformational leader attempts to elevate the needs of the follower in line with the leaders' own goals and objectives. The transactional leader tries to maintain and satisfy the follower's current psychic and material needs. Bass (1985) emphasized a greater amount of satisfaction is possible from transactional leadership if it is augmented by transformational leadership. These leadership factors can be further divided into active or passive sub-categories or what Bass and Riggio (2006) identified as directive or participative components of the Full Range of Leadership Model.

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), the directive sub-category is straightforward. Leaders simply direct their followers in actions that need to be taken. When leaders use this style and make decisions with little or no input from their followers, problems can arise. In the participative sub-category, leaders support their followers and engage them in the decision making process. This participative action allows followers the opportunity to become less competitive and more collaborative in nature.

Leithwood's (1992) study, aimed at schools responding to district and state level initiatives, found that transformational leaders are in continuous pursuit of three fundamental goals: (a) helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture; (b) fostering teacher development; and (c) helping teachers solve problems together more effectively. He judged the evidence of the effects of transformational educational leadership to be limited but positive, believing more research is needed in the field of education.

Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) identified three dimensions of transformational school leadership practice: setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization. These three dimensions of practice plus the added dimension of managing the instructional program (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005) are sometimes referred to as successful leadership (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, & Hopkins 2006).

Leithwood's Model of Transformational Leadership

Leithwood and Jantzi's (2006) research on transformational leadership practices is specific to schools; therefore, their model offers a convincing framework for use in educational settings. Their model of transformational leadership provides a set of leadership practices linked to key elements of Burns's (1978) theory while building on the work of Bass and Avolio (1993). The model centers on four categories of leadership practices: 1) setting directions, 2) developing people, 3) redesigning the organization, and 4) improving the instructional programs. The first three dimensions include the fundamental principles of transformational leadership. According to Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), the fourth dimension accounts for managerial or transactional leadership but is included due to Bass and Avolio's (1993) concept of the Full Range Leadership Program (FRLP). However, Leithwood and Sun (2012) noted the expansion and inclusion of the fourth dimension, improving the instructional programs, represents the major difference between models of transformational leadership developed for schools and those used in other areas (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005).

Bass and Avolio's (1993) *dimension of setting direction* includes leadership practices that express a common vision, setting organizational goals, and setting high expectations for performance. This includes shared vision, collaborative goal setting, and collaborative priority

setting. This dimension builds on the understanding that followers are more likely to act when they are united by a common purpose that meets both organizational and personal goals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Leithwood, Begley, and Cous (1994) stated that transformational leaders who address the need to “clarify and prioritize a set of shared goals” and who involve a wide range of faculty and staff members enhance school improvement efforts (p. 144). Research has suggested that collaborative processes that are comprehensive, balance district and campus needs, and based on shared values are more effective in improving school conditions (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Leithwood et al., 1994). The literature on transformational leadership also suggested that processes which distribute authority and power while developing the shared vision, goals, plans, and expectations are more effective relative to higher order change efforts (Leithwood et al., 1994, Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990).

The *dimension of developing people* addresses the intellectual and emotional capacity of teachers (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Transformational leadership involves purposeful development of the faculty and staff’s ability to reach intended, stated, and shared goals. Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) described this dimensions as providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, and modeling appropriate professional practices and values. The personal attention of the principal to the teacher concerning his/her growth and development increases motivation, efficacy, and commitment to improve instructional practices (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Leithwood et al. (1994) indicated principals who are actively involved with staff development events are more effective at enhancing teachers’ abilities. The principal’s direct involvement in providing intellectual stimulation and individualized support also provides opportunities for modeling desired practices (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

This dimension accounts for leadership practices that are geared toward attaining second-order change effects through the establishment of organizational routines, systems, and structures that enhance collaborative culture and collective learning (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). The elements of this dimension are developing a collaborative school culture, creating structures to encourage participation in school decisions, and creating productive community relationships. Transformational leaders build collaborative structures that provide teachers time and opportunities to share specific teaching techniques, provide teachers with ongoing classroom observations and feedback, and include collaborative planning and evaluation for instructional lessons (Leithwood et al., 1994). The researchers also suggest the use of symbols and rituals as effective strategies leaders use to develop a collaborative culture. An example of a symbol would be the school logo or mascot. A homecoming parade would be an example of a ritual. A ritual is defined as a school activity or ceremony that binds people to each other and shapes the unwritten culture of a school (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000).

This dimension was added to the transformation leadership model to address leadership practices specifically associated with schools (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). These include establishing effective staffing practices, providing instructional support, monitoring school activities, and protecting staff from excessive and distracting outside demands. Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) believe this dimension combines the conventions of instructional leadership and transformational leadership.

According to Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), the first three transformational dimensions include a total of nine detailed areas of practice. Included in setting directions are the dimensions of building school vision, developing specific goals and priorities, and holding high

performance expectations. In the area of developing people are the dimensions providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, and modeling professional practices and values. The third dimension, *redesigning the organization*, includes developing a collaborative school culture, creating structures to foster participation in school decisions, and creating productive community relationships. Leithwood and Sun (2012) stated the fourth dimension, *improving the instructional program*, includes a focus on instructional development.

According to Leithwood and Sun (2012), transformational leadership theory states that a small number of leadership actions are capable of increasing the commitment of organizational members toward the achievement of organizational purposes. The theory argues that when followers, in this case teachers, are given adequate support, they will become highly motivated by goals that are inspirational because the goals are coupled with values that they already internalize.

Criticisms of Transformational Leadership

A key criticism of transformational leadership is that it has the potential for leaders to abuse their power. The first extreme being that the leader resorts to psychological and/or physical coercion to achieve their goals; the second being the followers' lack self-esteem which allows the leader to have power over them (Burns, 2003). Because transformational leaders motivate their followers by appealing to strong emotions some leaders may not attend to positive moral values. According to Bass (1997), transformational leaders can exert a very powerful influence over followers, who offer them trust and respect. Some leaders may have narcissistic tendencies, thriving on power and manipulation. Moreover, some followers may have dependent characters and form strong and unfortunate bonds with their leaders.

Bass (1997) summarized some of the other criticisms of transformation leadership. Transformational leadership can lend itself to amoral self-promotion by leaders since it makes use of impression management. He suggested that it can be antithetical to organizational learning and development involving shared leadership, equality, consensus, and participative decision-making. It encourages followers to go beyond their own self-interests for the good of the organization and may emotionally engage followers in pursuit of evil ends. While acceptable behavior might be supported in this way, so too might socially unacceptable behavior. Finally, Bass noted that transformational leadership can see followers manipulated in ways that may have them lose more than they gain.

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), the theory of transformational leadership has been criticized for portraying leadership in too much of a positive image. They acknowledge it is important to explore the negative aspects of transformational leadership. The work required to be a transformational leader and to foster effective working and mentoring relationships with followers may lead to leader burnout and cause conflicts or imbalance at work and home.

Northouse (2010) identified five criticisms of transformational leadership. The first criticism suggested that transformational leadership theory lacks conceptual clarity due to the overlapping of behaviors and characteristics. Secondly, he suggested that the validity of the MLQ has not been fully established because some of the factors tested are not exclusive to transformational leadership. His third criticism proposed that transformational leadership treats leadership more as a personality trait rather than as behaviors that can be learned. Fourth, transformational leadership is seen as elitist and antidemocratic. Bass and Avolio (1993) countered this argument by contending that transformational leaders can be directive and participative, as well as, democratic and authoritative. The final criticism is in line with the

beliefs of Burns (2003) and Bass (1997), which stated that some transformational leaders may abuse their power.

Yukl (1999) has emphasized that there is a great deal of vagueness on what behaviors are essential for transformational leadership. He believes most of the transformational theories have conceptual weaknesses that create limitation in explaining its effectiveness. The weaknesses he identified include ambiguous constructs, insufficient descriptions of the explanatory processes, a narrow focus on dyadic process, omission of some relevant behaviors, insufficient specification of limiting conditions, and a bias toward heroic conceptions of leadership. Yukl (1999) did not specifically address his concerns to Leithwood's model.

Leithwood and Janzi's Rebuttal of Criticisms

Leithwood and Janzi (2006) believe that many of those who criticize the theory of transformational leadership do not recognize the modifications in their model compared to more traditional models. The researchers addressed three of Yukl's identified conceptual weaknesses. First, the model used by Leithwood and Janzi (2006) provides precise practices for transformational leaders. This deflates the idea that there is ambiguity regarding behaviors of transformational leaders. Second, the assertion that there is a narrow focus on dyadic processes (influence on the individual) is specifically countered by the of transformational leadership dimension of redesigning the organization which focuses on organizational routines which improve collaborative culture. Finally, the belief of the omission of some relevant behaviors is addressed through the wide range of dimensions in the model that are not found in other models (Leithwood & Janzi, 2006). Leithwood and Janzi (2006) also added improving the instructional program as a response to criticisms regarding the model's initial emphasis on solely

transformational leadership practices. This category focuses on leadership practices that are specific to schools.

Empowerment

Spreitzer (2007) wrote that during the past two decades empowerment has been identified by two corresponding viewpoints. The first is universal in nature and centers on social-structural situations that facilitate empowerment in the workplace, while the second is individual in orientation, focusing on psychological occurrences of empowerment at work. Initially social-structural and psychological empowerment seem relatively comparable. However, there is a significant difference between the two. According to Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, and Wilk (2004), structural empowerment is the perception of the presence or absence of empowering conditions in the workplace while psychological empowerment is the employees' psychological interpretation or reaction to these conditions. Therefore, psychological empowerment signifies a response of employees to structural empowerment situations. Laschinger et al. (2001) tested these ideas in the field of nursing and found validation to propose that psychological empowerment is a prevailing variable between structural empowerment and employee effectiveness. Each perspective plays an essential role in the understanding and development of a theory of empowerment (Spreitzer, 2007).

The social-structural empowerment perspective of empowerment is embedded in theories of social power and social exchange. According to Laschinger et al. (2004), the primary advocate of empowerment was Kanter. In her book, *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977), she claimed that both formal job characteristics and informal alliances affect the ability of employees to accomplish their work. Kanter's (1977) theory of structural empowerment focused on the structures within the organization. She defined power as the "ability to mobilize resources

to get things done” (Kanter, 1979) and used the comparison of an electrical circuit to describe how productive power is accomplished and sustained in work situations. Power is *on* when employees have access to lines of information, support, resources, and opportunities to learn and grow. Power is *off* when the lines or sources of power are unattainable making productive work impossible. These lines of power are sources of structural empowerment within the organization (Laschinger et al., 2004).

Kanter (1977) believes that lines of power are derived from formal and informal systems within organizations. She stated that formal power accompanies highly visible jobs and requires a primary focus on independent decision making and flexibility in how work is accomplished. Informal power comes from building relationships and coalitions with colleagues and peers. High levels of formal and informal power facilitate access to the lines of power and opportunity that enable employees to accomplish their work in meaningful ways (Laschinger et al., 2004). According to Spreitzer (2007), relevance is the key – empowered employees have the power to make decisions that fit within the scope and domain of their work.

Kanter (1993) stated that to promote empowerment, leaders should build environments for successful work organizations that allow employees opportunities for advancement, access to information, access to support, access to resources, formal power, and informal power. Employees who believe their work environment provides access to these factors are empowered (Spreitzer, 2007). The focus of Kanter’s theory is on the employees’ perception of the actual conditions in the work environment, and not on how they interpret this information psychologically. Thus, structural empowerment has been found to predict job satisfaction, organizational commitment, decision involvement, trust in management, and job stress (Laschinger et al., 2001).

The social-structural empowerment perspective has gained consideration from organizations because it associates detailed managerial practices to performance; it is limited because it provides an organizationally focused perspective on empowerment. It does not address the idea of empowerment as experienced by employees. This limitation facilitated the development of the psychological perspective of empowerment (Spreitzer, 2007).

The term psychological empowerment denotes a set of psychological states that are required for individuals to feel a sense of control in relation to their work. In contrast to the social-structural perspective of empowerment, which focused on managerial practices that encourage sharing power at all levels, the psychological perspective focuses on how employees' personal experiences influence their role in the organization (Spreitzer, 2007).

Researchers approach the definition of psychological empowerment from two different perspectives; motivational and relational (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). From a motivational perspective, Conger and Kanungo (1988) defined empowerment as improving the feeling of self-efficacy of employees while Thomas and Velthouse (1990) defined empowerment as internal motivation that is based on the four perceptual dimensions of sense, competence, choice, and impact. From the relational perspective, Conger and Kanungo (1988) defined empowerment as the process by which management gives away or shares power among workers whereas Hales and Klidas (1998) defined empowerment as sharing knowledge, information, and power with subordinates.

Spreitzer (1995) expanded the work of Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and defined psychological empowerment as "increased intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions reflecting an individual's orientation to his or her work role: meaning, competence, self-determination and impact" (Spreitzer, 1995 p. 1443). An individual experiences meaning when he/she believes that work is meaningful and is given greater responsibilities. Competence refers to

an individual's feelings of self-efficacy or personal mastery that he/she can successfully accomplish a task. Self-determination refers to an individual having the freedom to choose how to perform his/her tasks (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997). Self-determination shows one's feelings of autonomy in making decisions in areas such as work methods, time, pace, and effort (Spreitzer, 1995). Finally, impact refers to the degree to which an individual believes that his/her work makes a significant difference in achieving the purpose of the task, and the extent to which the individual believes that he or she can influence organizational outcomes (Spreitzer, 1995).

According to Spreitzer and Quinn (1997), empowerment is not something management does to employees but rather a mindset that employees have about their role in the organization. These researchers found two approaches to empowerment used by management executives; the first, mechanistic or a "top-down" approach, the second an organic or "bottom-up" approach. In the mechanistic approach the strategy used for empowerment was to 1) start at the top; 2) clarify the organization's mission, vision, and values; 3) clearly specify the task, roles, and rewards for employees; and 4) hold people accountable for results. In the organic approach, the strategy used for empowerment was to 1) start at the bottom by understanding the needs of the employees; 2) model empowered behavior for the employees; 3) build teams to encourage cooperative behavior; 4) encourage intelligent risk taking; and 5) trust people to perform.

For the most part empowerment is seen as a positive influence in an organization; however, empowerment can have negative consequences when followers' goals are out of alignment with the organization. Bass and Riggio (2006) suggested that empowerment can also be negative when the follower's goals oppose the organizations goals. This can provide the opportunity for sabotage of the organization. Gill (2006) stated both the lack of trust and fear of risk taking due to unknown consequences are seen as enemies of empowerment. On its dark

side, empowerment can be seen as paternalistic, a way of governing followers comparable to a father's relationship with his children (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Pfeffer, Cialdini, Hanna, and Knopoff (1998) discovered empowerment could signify a moral hazard for leaders. Mishra, Mishra, and Spreitzer (1998) defined moral hazard as agency costs, meaning some employees are not willing to allow risks due to the lack of individual rewards thus causing employees to undermine the organization. To reduce the risk of the moral hazard, leaders and organizations should 1) set clear limits and boundaries as to what level of empowerment is appropriate, 2) build trusting relationships in which employees are less likely to operate on self-interest, and 3) measure and reward key performance goals to ensure that individual and organizational goals are aligned (Blanchard, Carlos, & Randolph, 2001; Mishra, Mishra, & Spreitzer, 1998; Spreitzer & Mishra, 1997). Mills and Ungson (2003) found empowerment depends on the ability of the leader to reconcile the potential loss of control inherent in sharing power with the need to empower employees for higher levels of motivation and productivity.

Spreitzer and Quinn (2001) recognized five reasons many empowerment techniques failed. They include ambivalence, authoritarian customs, disagreement(s) within the firm, individual time constraints, and a basic misunderstanding of how empowerment is achieved. Ismail, Mohamed, Sulaiman, Mohamed, and Yusuf (2011) stated that negative factors can create lack of consistencies between organizational plans and actions, which may serve as barrier to foster empowerment. Therefore, when consistency between plan and execution fluctuates, a distortion the framework of empowerment can occur because empowerment needs both accurate precision and execution of the plan. Ongori, and Shunda (2008) identified four factors that may defer staff empowerment in firms: 1) dejected standing of the management, 2) distrust in

management, 3) reluctance to share power, and 4) employees unwilling to take responsibility for their actions.

According to Avolio and Bass (1991), an important factor in making empowerment work is for the leader to delegate tasks effectively to followers. Leaders who sense followers are too empowered may feel threatened when followers take unnecessary risks and may worry that these employees could become 'loose cannons' who are not aligned with the needs of the organization (Spreitzer & Quinn, 1996). Spreitzer, Kizilos, and Nason (1997) found followers who reported more of the meaning dimension in their work also reported more strain. The researchers speculated this was due to followers taking their job more seriously thus causing more stress.

Transformational Leadership and Empowerment

Avolio and Bass (1991) identified empowerment of followers as a crucial process that helps define transformational leadership and illustrates why it is effective in building follower commitment and inspiring better performance. Empowerment is a delicate balance between sharing power and control and relinquishing power and control. Menon (2001) and Spreitzer (1995) stated that, in a transformational leadership model, empowerment is viewed as a proactive, strategic management practice that exists in an organization that promotes high commitment human relation practices. Avolio et al. (2004) found the application of transformational leadership techniques in an organizational framework shows that followers' moralities and concern about organizational interest can be developed if leaders stimulate followers' intellects, develop followers' potentials, design and communicate targeted goals and motivate followers' to think beyond self interest in organizations. If such transformational processes are implemented properly, it will increase followers' empowerment to efficiently and effectively perform their jobs (Spreitzer, 1995; Ismail et al., 2011).

Leithwood and Sun (2012) reviewed 79 unpublished studies regarding the nature and impact of transformational school leadership (TSL) on the school organization, teachers, and students. Regarding school conditions, TSL had positive effects on shared goals, working environment, and improved instruction. TSL had positive correlations with job satisfaction and teacher commitment. Castro, Periñan, and Bueno (2008) surveyed 437 directors, managers, and technical staff of a Spanish food and beverage company. The results were similar to Leithwood's and Sun's (2012) findings in that psychological empowerment had a significant correlation with general job satisfaction and with organization commitment.

Allameh et al. (2012) surveyed 150 teachers in the schools of Abade Township. The transformational leadership portion was based on Bass' dimensions and his multi-leadership styles questionnaire (1990). The psychological empowerment survey used was a self-made researcher questionnaire based on Spreitzer's theory of psychological empowerment (1995). The study established a significant relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment correlation coefficient between teachers' transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. The researchers also established a significant relationship between dimensions of transformational leadership and dimensions of psychological empowerment. The correlation coefficient between dimensions of transformational leadership (ideal influence, inspiring motivation, mental persuasion and personal consideration) (Bass, 1990) and dimensions of psychological empowerment (feeling of competency, feeling of being effective, feeling of independence and being meaningful) (Spreitzer, 1995) was significant. A step-by-step regression was applied to predict dimensions of psychological empowerment as dependent variables through dimensions of transformational leadership as predicting variables. Researchers discovered the best predictor of psychological empowerment in dimensions of being

meaningful and competency is ideal influence, in the independence dimension is inspiring motivation and in the being effective dimension is personal consideration.

Bartram and Casimir (2007) investigated the relationship between the transformational leadership style and followers' performance and satisfaction, as well as the mediating effects of employees' empowerment and trust in the leader. They found the effects of transformational leadership style on performance were mediated by psychological empowerment and trust in the leader. However, the effects of transformational leadership behavior on employees' satisfaction were found to only be partially mediated by trust in the leader. Ozaralli (2002) also studied the effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and found a positive relationship.

Alimo-Metcalfe and Alban-Metcalfe (2002) found that transformational leadership is perceived as engaging followers as allies in developing and achieving a shared vision while enabling them to lead, creating a productive, encouraging environment for creative thinking, challenging assumptions about how a service or business should be delivered. Leaders are also able to display sensitivity to the needs of a variety of internal and external stakeholders. Their research also suggested collaboration and concern for individuals' well-being is more important than vision and charisma. Gill (2006) stated that effective leaders empower people to be able to do what needs to be done.

Based on the above recent research findings, transformational leadership techniques enhance followers' feelings of empowerment. Transformational leaders spread the spirit of teamwork, encourage enthusiasm, creative problem solving, enhance feelings of self-efficacy, while allowing followers to achieve higher levels of job satisfaction (Al-Swidi et al., 2012). Although there are numerous studies examining the relationship of transformational leadership with some dimensions of empowerment in management, business, and nursing the research in

education is limited. No studies have been found that relate Leithwood's model of transformational leadership to Spreiter's model of psychological empowerment. Therefore, this study added to the educational literature by examining the individual and collective relationship between the dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment of teachers.

Theoretical Framework

As stated earlier, there are very few, if any, studies relating transformational leadership, as defined by Leithwood and Janzi (2006) and psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) of teachers. However, there are several studies relating transformational leadership, as defined by Bass (1990) and psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) in other fields. In a longitudinal study of a gas company in Turkey, Hassanzade (2010) reported positive and significant impact of transformational leadership on psychological empowerment. Khanmohammadi, Otaghsara, and Mohseni (2010) concluded in their research that there is a positive and significant relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles with psychological empowerment. Gumuslugle and Ilsey (2008) reported a positive relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment in the business community. More research is needed investigating the relationship of the dimensions of transformational leadership with the dimensions of psychological empowerment. There is a major literature gap between the two variables in educational research.

Rationale and Hypotheses

The review of literature argues that the dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment are related. This study helped to determine to what extent the dimensions of the two variables are correlated in schools of Northwest Alabama.

Bass (1985) argued that transformational leadership has been shown to empower followers to recognize the importance of their work and develop their knowledge, skills, and abilities to reach their full potential. Allahem et al. (2012) stated that one impact of transformational leadership is empowerment. Therefore, empowerment is possible as a result of the leader's confidence in employees' abilities, decision making skills, and by encouraging followers to accept responsibility, thinking about new approaches to solve problems and enjoying strategic thinking empowerment. Avolio, Zhu, Koh, and Bhatia (2004) indicated empowering followers is the essence of transformational leadership in order to achieve the overall organizational goals. Empowerment and giving freedom of action to employees is one of the main strategies to enhance performance and provide survival in current organizations (Allahem et al., 2012). Therefore, followers must be encouraged to take risks, stimulate innovation, and cope with uncertainties (Spreitzer, 1995).

H₁: The dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment will positively covary with each other.

The transformational leader is described as giving followers meaning, purpose, and a sense of higher value in their work (Bass, 1990). They provide people with individual support and stimulation to work harder and collectively with others. The dimensions of setting direction and developing people may be used to communicate a clear vision that allows employees to see where their work fits in with organizational goals (Leithwood & Janzi, 2006; Nielsen, Randall, Yarker, & Brenner, 2008). When the mission and/or goals of the organization are aligned with their own values, employees feel that their work is important and care deeply about what they do (Spreitzer, 1995; Spreitzer & Quinn, 1997; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

H₂: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of being meaningful.

Transformational leaders have a profound impact on followers' perceptions of their work by expressing confidence in their abilities perform at a high level (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). By providing employees with individual support, intellectual stimulation, and modeling high ethical behaviors, Leithwood and Janzi (2006) described these attributes as the dimension of developing people; leaders promote followers to have a sense of competency. Conger and Kanungo's (1988) defined competence as synonymous with self-efficacy in that it is the knowledge an individual has the skills necessary to successfully perform specific tasks. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) defined competency as the degree that an individual can perform his job duties skilfully and successfully.

H₃: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of competency.

Leithwood (1992) believes power is consensual and facilitative in transformational leadership and is embodied through people instead of over people; people are integrated in a common purpose that is best for everyone. Self-determination reflects autonomy in making decisions about work methods, procedures, pace, and effort (Spreitzer, 1995). Thomas and Velthouse (1990) referred to self-determination as the sense of freedom or discretion one has to perform the work in the way one chooses.

H₄: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of self-determination.

Bass and Riggio (2006) stated that transformational leaders empower followers to perform their jobs autonomously and creatively and that this empowerment leads followers to

feel satisfaction, commitment, and valuable. In a study of 47 teams of workers in four Korean organizations, Jung and Sosik (2002) explored the relationship between transformational leadership, empowerment, and group effectiveness. They found that transformational leaders not only empowered followers but also enhanced the team's collective sense of effectiveness. Impact refers to the degree to which an individual feels that his/her work makes a difference in achieving the overall purpose of the task (Thomas & Velthouse 1990) and to what extent the individual believes that he or she can influence organizational outcomes in a positive way (Spreitzer, 1995).

H₅: The dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of having an impact.

Research suggests that there is a significant relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment (Allameh et al., 2012). Similarly, results determine that there is a relationship among dimensions of transformational leadership and dimensions of psychological empowerment (Gumuslugle & Ilsey, 2008; Khanmohammadi, Morteza, & Mohseni, 2010).

H₆: The dimensions of transformational leadership will independently and collectively predict overall empowerment.

CHAPTER III:
METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter provides a description of the methodology involved in this study. The description includes information concerning the research design, data sample, data collection procedures, and measurement instruments. Data analysis procedures are explained and conclusions are discussed.

Research Design

The research design was a non-experimental quantitative survey design that measured the relationship between the dimensions of transformational leadership and the dimensions of psychological empowerment. The independent variable (x) consisted of the dimensions of transformational leadership; the dependent variable (y) consisted of the dimensions of psychological empowerment; the control variable was socio-economic status (SES) of the schools. SES was controlled for to account for the possibility of the variable being related to the dimensions of psychological empowerment (y).

For this study, socio-economic status was defined operationally by a formula using the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches (FRL) through the National School Lunch Program at schools included in this investigation. SES is inversely related to the percentage of students receiving FRL. This study used the formula $1 - \text{FRL}$ to calculate the SES of the schools. Since this is not an exact measurement, this formula served as a representation for

SES. The unit of analysis for this study was the schools surveyed. Creswell (2009) stated that the use of a survey design of this type is preferable because the method allows for generalization from a sample to a population while providing a rapid turnaround of data.

Data Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 60 K-6 elementary schools or a combination thereof in Northwest Alabama. There were 1,665 teacher respondents that completed surveys. Survey instruments were administered during regularly scheduled faculty meetings at each of the 60 schools. Each school had a teacher faculty of at least 15 or more certified personnel and the school was given a seven digit identifier code which was used for comparative analysis. Survey instruments were divided in to four packets (A, B, C, and D). Packets A, B, and C were randomly distributed to all certified personnel at scheduled faculty meetings. Packet D was given to each school principal.

This was a sample of convenience. The school was the unit of analysis. Participation was anonymous and voluntary. Schools were chosen based on superintendent approval as well as principal and teacher willingness to participate. The sample covered several school districts and counties. This provided a diverse group of schools.

Data Collection Procedures

Data for this quantitative study was collected from participating schools with superintendent and principal approval. Meetings were held with school superintendents and principals to discuss the purpose and process of the study. Data collection, participant confidentiality, and any other concerns were addressed. Due to the sensitive nature of some of the survey questions, the researcher or a member of the graduate cohort was present to administer and collect surveys during regular scheduled faculty meetings. Teachers were asked

to participate and given the option to refuse involvement. Volunteers were able to skip any question or discontinue participation at any time during the survey. Data was collected at one point in time (cross-sectional) as opposed to multiple points in time (longitudinal).

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used to collect the quantitative data for this research project. The transformational leadership portion was based on Leithwood, Aitken, and Jantzi (2006). This study was the first to distribute Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents. The psychological empowerment portion used Spreitzer's (1995) Psychological Empowerment Instrument.

Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents

The questionnaire included 20 questions using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), which tested the four components of transformational leadership (setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving the instructional program). Sample items for each of the four subscales included the following: To what extent do the leaders in your school – “Give staff a sense of overall purpose” (setting direction); “Give you individual support to help you improve your teaching practices” (developing people); “Encourage collaborative work among staff” (redesigning the organization); and “Provide or locate resources to help staff improve their teaching” (improving the instructional program). The reported reliability has been shown to be strong with Cronbach's alphas being .81 (setting direction), .85 (developing people), and .80 (redesigning organizations) (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006).

Psychological Empowerment Instrument

This survey was used to measure psychological empowerment in relation to the four dimensions of being meaningful, competency, self-determination, and having an impact. The questionnaire included a 16-item scale to measure self-reported psychological empowerment. Items were scored by a 7-point Likert scale ranging from A (very strongly disagree) to G (very strongly agree). Sample items for each of the four subscales included the following: “The work I do is very important to me” (meaning); “I am confident about my ability to do my job” (competence); “I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work” (self-determination); and “My impact on what happens in my department is large” (impact) (Spreitzer, 1995). The instrument has been used successfully in more than 50 studies. Test reliability has been reported at .80 (Spreitzer & Quinn, 2001).

Data Analysis Procedures

Correlational analysis and least squares multiple regression were used to analyze the data and study the relationship among the research variables of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. Each response was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A complete statistical analysis (mean, standard deviation, range, bivariate correlation, linear regression, reliability analysis, and factor analysis) was conducted. A block entry regression analysis was performed between the dependent variables (y) of psychological empowerment, the independent variables (x) of transformational leadership, and the control variable SES. Beta weights of each independent variable are reported and discussed in relation to each dependent variable. A post hoc factor analysis was completed to investigate variable relationships and a post hoc power analysis was conducted.

Regression were used to address the following questions: a) what was the size of the overall relationship between psychological empowerment (y) and transformational leadership (x); and b) how much does each dimension of transformational leadership contributed to that relationship? The multiple correlation coefficient was determined as well as the regression equation.

CHAPTER IV:

FINDINGS

This chapter reports the results of the data analyzing the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. The chapter includes descriptives, reliabilities, correlations, hypotheses tested, and un-hypothesized findings. The 1-FRL formula was used to control for SES.

Descriptive Statistics

This study examined 60 elementary schools in Northwest Alabama. Out of 77 schools contacted, 60 schools participated in this study providing a 78% participation rate. Elementary schools with an arrangement of K-6 were the desirable configuration; however, it became difficult to limit the study to this structure due to the lack of consistency in the northwest Alabama area. Configurations varied widely across school districts, and sometimes within districts. A summary of configurations that participated in the study is given in Table 1.

Table 1

Summary of School Configurations

Configuration	Total (N = 60)	Percent of Total (100%)
P-K	1	2
P-2	2	3
K-3	1	2
K-4	6	10
K-5	7	12
K-6	9	15
K-8	5	8
1-2	2	3
3-5	2	3
3-6	1	2
4-8	1	2
5-6	1	2
5-8	2	3
6-8	5	8
6-12	2	3
K-12	13	22

There were 1,665 teacher respondents that completed surveys. Survey instruments were administered during regularly scheduled faculty meetings at each of the 60 schools. Participation in data collection was voluntary and respondents were guaranteed anonymity. The unit of analysis was the school and each school was provided a seven-digit identifier code for comparative analysis.

The Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents and four subtests served as independent variables. The Psychological Empowerment Instrument and four subtests served as

the dependent variables. Table 2 provides descriptive statistics of means, standard deviations, and range of variables tested.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Measures

Variable	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Transformational Leadership	60	3.22	4.93	4.15	.38
Setting Direction	60	3.25	5.00	4.29	.38
Developing People	60	3.31	5.00	4.19	.42
Redesigning Organization	60	3.16	4.85	4.07	.41
Improving Instruction	60	3.00	4.89	4.07	.40
Psychological Empowerment	60	4.49	5.56	5.04	.25
Meaning	60	5.11	7.00	6.42	.46
Competency	60	4.88	6.75	6.09	.42
Self-Determination	60	4.31	6.42	5.52	.43
Impact	60	3.73	6.63	5.28	.47
SES	60	.10	.92	.43	.18

For each of the survey variables, the standard deviation ranged from .18 to .47. Mean scores ranged between 4.06 and 6.42 for each of the sub-scale measures. The mean score for transformational leadership was 4.15, with the dimensions scores of setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction, ranging from 4.06 to 4.29. The mean score for psychological empowerment was 5.04, with the dimension scores of meaning, competency, self-determination, and impact, ranging from 5.28 to 6.42. The data collected for SES had a mean of .43 for the 60 schools. The data were examined for outliers by using Tukey's Hinges percentiles. No outliers were identified.

Reliability

The two surveys used in this study were Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents and Spreitzer's Psychological Empowerment Instrument. The new Educational Leadership survey is a 20-item response survey where teachers responded to a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The questions for the Educational Leadership Survey measure four dimensions of transformational leadership. The dimensions are setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving the instructional program. This is the first known study to utilize Leithwood's new Educational Leadership Survey for Teacher Respondents, therefore this study will assist in determining reliability of this version of the scale.

Psychological Empowerment is a 16-item scale where teachers respond to a 7-point Likert scale ranging from *very strongly disagree* to *very strongly agree*. The questions measure four subtests of psychological empowerment. The four subtests include meaning, competency, self-determination, and impact. Spreitzer's (1995) Psychological Empowerment Scale has been widely used to measure psychological empowerment, in other areas including business, management, and nursing with typical Chronbach Alpha Correlations around .80 (Spreitzer & Quinn, 2001).

To test internal reliability, Cronbach's alpha (α) was performed on both instruments and subtests. Table 3 shows Cronbach's alpha correlation reliability scores for each variable and the number of items measured in each instrument.

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha for Study Variables (N = 60)

Variable	Cronbach's alpha	Number of Items
Transformational Leadership	.98	20
Setting Directions	.95	4
Developing People	.95	5
Redesigning the Organization	.91	4
Improving Instruction	.94	7
Psychological Empowerment	.93	16
Meaning	.96	4
Competency	.92	4
Self-determination	.70	4
Impact	.92	4

Correlations

Bivariate correlations among all variables tested in the study are shown in Table 3. Positive correlations were found between total transformational leadership and the subtest dimensions of setting direction ($r = .96, p < .01$), developing people ($r = .96, p < .01$), redesigning the organization ($r = .94, p < .01$), and improving instruction ($r = .95, p < .01$). Total transformational leadership also had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimension impact ($r = .34, p < .01$). The transformational leadership dimension of setting direction had a positive correlation with the transformational leadership dimensions of developing people ($r = .93, p < .01$), redesigning the organization ($r = .89, p < .01$), and improving instruction ($r = .89, p < .01$). Setting direction also had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimension of impact ($r = .34, p < .01$). The transformational leadership dimension developing people had a positive correlation with the transformational

leadership dimensions of redesigning the organization ($r = .91, p < .01$), and improving instruction ($r = .88, p < .01$). Developing people also had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimension of impact ($r = .29, p < .05$). The transformational leadership dimension of redesigning the organization had a positive correlation with the transformational dimension improving instruction ($r = .85, p < .01$). Redesigning the organization also had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimension impact ($r = .43, p < .01$). The transformational leadership dimension of improving instruction had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimension of impact ($r = .30, p < .05$).

Positive correlations were found between total psychological empowerment and the subtest dimensions of meaning ($r = .77, p < .01$), competency ($r = .78, p < .01$), self-determination ($r = .79, p < .01$), and impact ($r = .81, p < .01$). The psychological empowerment dimension of meaning had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimensions of competency ($r = .88, p < .01$), self-determination ($r = .46, p < .01$), and impact ($r = .49, p < .01$). The psychological dimension of competency had a positive correlation with the psychological dimensions of self-determination ($r = .46, p < .01$) and impact ($r = .46, p < .01$). The psychological empowerment dimension of self-determination had a positive correlation with the psychological empowerment dimension impact ($r = .55, p < .01$). Table 4 provides correlations for all dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment.

Table 4

Correlations among all Major Variables Examined in the Study

Var.	TL	SD	DP	RO	II	PE	M	C	SfD	IM	SES
TL	1	.96**	.96**	.94**	.95**	.23	.20	.15	.13	.34**	.04
SD		1	.93**	.89**	.89**	.22	.18	.14	.11	.34**	.07
DP			1	.91**	.88**	.18	.15	.10	.15	.29*	.07
RO				1	.85**	.24	.16	.11	.18	.43**	.06
II					1	.24	.25	.23	.10	.30*	.01
PE						1	.77**	.78**	.79**	.81**	-.05
M							1	.88**	.46**	.49**	-.07
C								1	.46**	.46**	-.02
SfD									1	.55**	-.01
IM										1	-.01
SES											1

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note. Transformational Leadership (TL), Setting Directions (SD), Developing People (DP), Redesigning the Organization (RO), Improving Instruction (II), Psychological Empowerment (PE), Meaning (M), Competency (C), Self-Determination (SfD), Impact (IM), Socioeconomic Status (SES)

Testing Hypotheses

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, a simple correlation coefficient was computed between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. Then a correlation coefficient was calculated between each of the four dimensions of transformational leadership and each of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment. Block entry regression was used to test the effects of the dimensions of transformational leadership on the dimensions of psychological empowerment. Due to multicollinearity, a factor analysis was completed on the psychological empowerment instrument.

Hypothesis 1, which predicted the dimensions of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment would positively co-vary with each other, was not supported ($r = .23, p = .08$).

Hypothesis 2, which predicted the dimensions of transformational leadership would individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of being meaningful was not supported. A block entry regression method was performed with the dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) as independent variables while controlling for SES. The psychological empowerment dimension of meaning was entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression indicated no statistical significance in step 1 ($R = .07, p = .58$) or step 2 ($R = .28, p = .61$). Furthermore, the regression results indicate that the combined influence of transformational leadership explains only 3% of the variance in the psychological empowerment dimension of meaning (Adj. $R^2 = -.03$). Table 5 shows there were no significant standardized coefficients.

Table 5

Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Meaning on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	6.50	.16		41.21	.00
SES	-.19	.34	-.07	-.55	.58
<i>R</i> = .07, <i>R</i> ² = .01, Adj <i>R</i> ² = -.01					
Step 2					
(constant)	5.40	.71		7.60	.00
SES	-.14	.35	-.06	-.41	.68
Setting Direction	.10	.69	.08	.15	.89
Developing People	-.36	.62	-.33	-.58	.57
Redesigning Organization	.00	.59	.00	.01	1.00
Improving Instruction	.46	.71	.40	.65	.52
Total T.L.	.07	2.00	.06	.03	.97
<i>R</i> = .28, <i>R</i> ² = .08, Adj <i>R</i> ² = -.03.					

Note. Significant at $p < .001$

Hypothesis 3, which predicted the dimensions of transformational leadership would individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of competency was not supported. A block entry regression method was performed with the dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) as independent variables while controlling for SES. The psychological empowerment dimension of competency was entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression indicated no statistical significance in step 1 ($R = .02$, $p = .86$) or step 2 ($R = .30$, $p = .51$). Furthermore, the regression results indicate that the combined influence of

transformational leadership explains only 1% of the variance in the psychological empowerment dimension of meaning (Adj. $R^2 = -.01$). Table 6 shows there were no significant standardized coefficients.

Table 6

Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Competency on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	B	t	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	6.12	.15		41.75	.00
SES	-.06	.31	-.02	-.17	.86
$R = .02, R^2 = .00, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.02$					
Step 2					
(constant)	5.25	.65		8.03	.00
SES	.01	.32	.01	.04	.97
Setting Direction	.27	.63	.24	.43	.67
Developing People	-.31	.57	-.31	-.55	.59
Redesigning Organization	.15	.54	.14	.27	.79
Improving Instruction	.79	.65	.75	1.22	.23
Total T.L.	-.68	1.84	-.62	-.37	.71
$R = .30, R^2 = .09, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.01.$					

Note. Significant at $p < .01$

Hypothesis 4, which predicted the dimensions of transformational leadership would individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of self-determination was not supported. A block entry regression method was performed with the dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) as independent variables while controlling for SES.

The psychological empowerment dimension of self-determination was entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression indicated no statistical significance in step 1 ($R = .01, p = .96$) or step 2 ($R = .22, p = .85$). Furthermore, the regression results indicate that the combined influence of transformational leadership explains only 6% of the variance in the psychological empowerment dimension of meaning ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = -.06$). Table 7 shows there were no significant standardized coefficients.

Table 7

Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Self Determination on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	5.52	.15		37.04	.00
SES	-.02	.32	-.01	-.05	.85
$R = .01, R^2 = .00, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.02$					
Step 2					
(constant)	5.12	.68		7.52	.00
SES	-.06	.33	-.03	-.19	.85
Setting Direction	-.15	.66	-.13	-.23	.82
Developing People	.39	.60	.38	.65	.52
Redesigning Organization	.44	.56	.42	.78	.44
Improving Instruction	.03	.68	.03	.05	.96
Total T.L.	-.60	1.92	-.54	-.31	.76
$R = .22, R^2 = .05, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.06.$					

Note. Significant at $p < .001$

Hypothesis 5, which predicted the dimensions of transformational leadership would individually and collectively predict the psychological empowerment dimension of impact was supported. A block entry regression method was performed with the dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) as independent variables while controlling for SES. The psychological empowerment dimension of impact was entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression analysis indicated no statistical significance in step 1 ($R = .01, p = .93$). However, there was statistical significance in step 2 ($R = .51, p < .01$). Collectively, SES and transformational leadership explained 18% of the variance in the psychological empowerment dimension of impact. Table 8 shows the unstandardized and standardized coefficients.

Table 8

Regression Coefficients of SES and Psychological Empowerment Dimension of Impact on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	5.30	.16		32.67	.00
SES	-.03	.35	-.01	-.09	.93
$R = .01, R^2 = .00, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.02$					
Step 2					
(constant)	3.34	.65		5.12	.00
SES	-.12	.32	-.04	-.37	.72
Setting Direction	.71	.63	.57	1.13	.26
Developing People	-.58	.57	-.52	-1.02	.31
Redesigning Organization	1.23	.54	1.08	2.28	.03
Improving Instruction	.16	.65	.14	.25	.80
Total T.L.	-1.03	1.84	-.85	-.56	.58
$R = .51, R^2 = .26, \text{Adj } R^2 = .18$					

Note. Significant at $p < .01$

Hypothesis 6 which predicted the dimensions of transformational leadership will individually and collectively predict overall empowerment was not supported. A block entry regression method was performed with the dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) as independent variables while controlling for SES. The collective dimensions of psychological empowerment were entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression indicated no statistical significance in step 1 ($R = .05, p = .70$) or step 2 ($R = .31, p = .50$). Furthermore, the regression results indicated that the combined influence of transformational leadership explained only 1% of the variance in the collective dimensions of psychological empowerment ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = -.01$). Table 9 shows there were no significant standardized coefficients.

Table 9

Regression Coefficients of SES and Total Psychological Empowerment on the Transformational Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Improving Instruction, and Total Transformational Leadership

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	5.08	.09		59.60	.00
SES	-.07	.18	-.05	-.39	.70
$R = .05, R^2 = .00, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.02$					
Step 2					
(constant)	4.37	.38		11.49	.00
SES	-.08	.19	-.05	-.41	.69
Setting Direction	.23	.37	.34	.62	.54
Developing People	-.24	.33	-.41	-.71	.48
Redesigning Organization	.28	.31	.47	.91	.37
Improving Instruction	.20	.38	.33	.54	.59
Total T.L.	-.30	1.07	-.47	-.28	.78
$R = .31, R^2 = .09, \text{Adj } R^2 = -.01$					

Note. Significant at $p < .01$

Post Hoc Analyses

Post Hoc Factor Analysis

The purpose of the post hoc factor analysis was to explore the structure underlying the psychological empowerment item responses in the data set. This analysis reduces a large set of variables to a smaller set of factors, fewer in number than the original variable set, but capable of accounting for a large portion of the total variability in the items. The identity of each factor was determined after a review of which items correlate the highest with that factor. Items that correlate the highest with a factor define the meaning of the factor as judged by what conceptually ties the items together.

In the context of this study, there was validity evidence supporting the conclusion the scores from this instrument are a valid assessment of psychological empowerment. This kind of validity evidence is called internal structure evidence because it suggests that items line up in a predictable manner, according to what thematically ties them together conceptually. The descriptive information provided in Table 9 displays the means and standard deviations for the 16 questions of the psychological empowerment survey. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$). Thus from the perspective of Bartlett's test, factor analysis was feasible. As Bartlett's test is almost always significant, a more discriminating index of factor analyzability, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was considered. For this data set, $KMO = .86$, which is very large, so the KMO also supported factor analysis (see Table 11).

Table 10

Factor Analysis Descriptive Statistics

Questions	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Confident in ability to do job	6.22	.46	60
Work is important	6.53	.48	60
I have autonomy	5.52	.45	60
My impact is large	5.52	.52	60
My job activities are meaningful	6.23	.50	60
I have control	5.07	.58	60
I can decide on my own	5.24	.55	60
I really care	6.48	.46	60
My job is in scope of ability	6.38	.48	60
I have opportunity for independence	5.50	.82	60
I have mastered skills necessary	5.77	.48	60
My opinion counts	5.37	.46	60
My work is meaningful	6.44	.50	60
I have influence	5.17	.52	60
I am self-assured about capabilities	6.01	.46	60
I use personal initiative	5.80	.48	60

Table 11

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.86
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1055.88
	Df	120.00
	Sig.	.00

The Principal Component Analysis communalities ranged from .61 to .91, thus most of the variance of these variables was accounted for by this two-dimensional factor solution.

Communalities indicate the degree to which the factors explain the variance of the variables. In this study, the communalities were adequate, providing further evidence that the results are appropriate for interpretation (see Table 12).

Table 12

Communalities

Questions	Initial	Extraction
Confident in ability to do job	1.00	.83
Work is important	1.00	.89
I have autonomy	1.00	.64
My impact is large	1.00	.83
My job activities are meaningful	1.00	.84
I have control	1.00	.86
I can decide on my own	1.00	.79
I really care	1.00	.91
My job is in scope of ability	1.00	.85
I have opportunity for independence	1.00	.88
I have mastered skills necessary	1.00	.61
My opinion counts	1.00	.70
My work is meaningful	1.00	.83
I have influence	1.00	.90
I am self-assured about capabilities	1.00	.81
I use personal initiative	1.00	.76

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

The Principal Component Analysis procedure was used to extract the factors from the variable data. Kaiser's rule was used to determine which factors were most eligible for interpretation because this rule requires that a given factor is capable of explaining at least the equivalent of one variable's variance. Using this rule, two factors were extracted (see Table 13). Together they are capable of explaining 72.64% of all the variable variances. The Kaiser rule was further supported by the Scree plot.

Table 13

Extraction Sum of Squared

Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.11	56.99	56.99
2	2.51	15.65	72.64

Two components were extracted. The component matrix is provided in Table 14.

Table 14

Component Matrix

Component Questions	1	2
My job activities are meaningful	.90	
I really care	.90	
I am self-assured about capabilities	.87	
My job is in scope of ability	.86	
Work is important	.86	
I use personal initiative	.82	
Confident in ability to do job	.81	-.41
My work is meaningful	.81	-.41
My impact is large	.77	.42
I have autonomy	.72	
I have mastered skills necessary	.70	
I have influence	.67	.66
I can decide on my own	.66	.48
My opinion counts	.66	
I have control	.61	.68

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
a. 2 components extracted

The data from Table 14 was used to determine the two component names. According to the factor analysis, the first component is named meaning/competency due to the fact that the analysis grouped all eight of the statements from these two dimensions of Spreitzer's (1995) Psychological Empowerment survey together. The second component is named impact/self-determination due to the fact that the factor analysis grouped the four statements on impact and three of the four statements regarding self-determination together from Spreitzer's (1995) Psychological Empowerment survey. A Varimax with Kaiser Normalization rotation was performed on the two components. The results are noted in Table 15.

Table 15

Rotated Component Matrix

Component Questions	1	2
Work is important	.92	
I really care	.91	
My work is meaningful	.90	
Confident in ability to do job	.89	
My job is in scope of ability	.88	
I am self-assured about capabilities	.83	
My job activities are meaningful	.81	
I have mastered skills necessary	.77	
I have influence		.94
I have control		.92
My impact is large		.83
My opinion counts		.75
I can decide on my own		.69
I use personal initiative		.65
I have autonomy		.60

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations

To test for internal reliability, Cronbach's alpha (α) was performed on the statements ($\alpha = .97$). The first component, meaning/competency measured eight statements from the psychological empowerment survey. A multiple regression was performed. The dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) were used as independent variables. The psychological empowerment dimensions of meaning/competency were combined, according to the factor analysis, and entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression indicated no statistical

significance ($R = .31, p = .23$). However, improving instruction was found to be a predictor factor ($\beta = .60, p < .05$). Furthermore, the regression results indicate that the combined influence of transformational leadership explains 3% of the variance in meaning/competency ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = .03, p < .01$). Table 16 shows there were no significant standardized coefficients.

Table 16

Regression Coefficients of Meaning/Competency on the Transformation Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, and Improving Instruction

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	B	T	Sig.
(constant)	5.35	.64		8.37	.00
Setting Direction	.05	.44	.05	.13	.90
Developing People	-.41	.42	-.40	-.98	.33
Redesigning Organization	-.05	.33	-.05	-.15	.88
Improving Instruction	.64	.32	.60	2.01	.05

Note: Significant at $p < .01$ (2 tailed), $p < .05$ (1 tailed) $R = .31, R^2 = .10, \text{Adj } R^2 = .03$.

The second component, impact/self-determination measured 7 statements from the psychological empowerment survey. A multiple regression was performed. The dimensions of transformational leadership (setting direction, developing people, redesigning the organization, and improving instruction) were used as independent variables. The psychological empowerment dimension of impact was combined with 3 of the 4 statements of self-determination, according to the factor analysis, and entered as the dependent variable. The multiple regression indicated no statistical significance at the .01 level but showed statistical significance at the .05 level ($R = .44, p < .05$) with redesigning the organization being the only predictor ($\beta = .76, p < .01$). Furthermore, the regression results indicated that the combined

influence of transformational leadership explained 13% of the variance in impact/self-determination ($\text{Adj. } R^2 = .13$). However, the transformational leadership dimension redesigning the organization ($\beta = .76, p < .01$) was the only significant predictor of the component impact/self-determination (see Table 17).

Table 17

Regression Coefficients of the Impact/Self-Determination on the Transformation Leadership Dimensions of Setting Direction, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, and Improving Instruction

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	B	T	Sig.
(constant)	22.90	3.82		6.00	.00
Setting Direction	1.15	2.60	.16	.44	.66
Developing People	-3.41	2.49	-.53	-1.37	.18
Redesigning Organization	5.04	1.98	.76	2.55	.01
Improving Instruction	-.27	1.90	-.04	-.14	.89

Note: Significant at $p < .01$ (2 tailed). $R = .44, R^2 = .19, \text{Adj } R^2 = .13$

Post Hoc Power Analysis

A post hoc power analysis was conducted using the software package, G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). The sample size of 60 was used for the statistical power analysis. One predictor variable equation for total transformational leadership was used for the first section of each hypothesis, while a four-predictor variable equation for the individual dimensions of transformational leadership was used for the second half of each hypothesis. According to Cohen (1988), studies should be designed to have at least an 80% probability of detecting an effect. The post hoc analysis revealed statistical power ranged from .84 - .91. Therefore, this study was well within the effect range (84% - 91%) for detection of the

independent variables (the dimensions of transformational leadership) and the dependent variables (the dimensions of psychological empowerment).

CHAPTER V:

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. This chapter will discuss findings, identify both theoretical and practical implications, and provide recommendations for future research.

Hypothesized Findings

1. *Setting Direction was Positively Related to Impact* ($r = .34, p < .01$). The transformational leadership dimension of setting direction builds on the understanding that followers, in this case, teachers are more likely to connect to the organization when there is shared vision, collaborative goal setting, and high expectations for performance (Leithwood & Janzi, 2005). Setting direction was measured using items such as, “Gives staff a sense of overall purpose,” and “Demonstrates high expectations for your work with students.”
2. *Developing People was Positively Related to Impact* ($r = .29, p < .05$). The transformational leadership dimension of developing people addresses the emotional and intellectual capacity of teachers. Leithwood and Janzi (2006) defined this dimension as providing intellectual stimulation, individual support, and modeling professional practices and values. This dimension was assessed with statements such as, “Models a high level of professional practice,” and “Develops an atmosphere of caring and trust”.

3. *Redesigning the Organization was Positively Related to Impact* ($r = .43, p < .01$). In the transformational leadership dimension of redesigning the organization leaders provide teachers time for collaborative planning, evaluation and feedback regarding instructional lessons, and encourage participation in school decision making activities (Leithwood et al., 1994). Data for this dimension were collected with statements such as “Encourages collaborative work among staff” and “Ensures wide participation in decisions about school improvement.”
4. *Improving Instruction was Positively Related to Impact* ($r = .29, p < .05$). Leithwood and Janzi (2005) added the dimension of improving instruction to address leadership practices that are associated with schools to the new version of this scale which was used in this study. This dimension provided a focus on instructional development (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). Data for this dimension were calculated by statements such as, “Regularly observes classroom activities” and “Encourages data use in planning for individual student needs.”
5. *Transformational Leadership was Positively Related to Impact* ($r = .34, p < .01$). Collectively, transformational leadership was positively related to the psychological empowerment dimension of impact. When teachers are provided with support from their leaders, they are likely to experience increased feelings that what they do makes a difference (Leithwood & Sun, 2012, and Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

A multiple regression was performed and indicated that the dimensions of transformational leadership did have a combined statistical effect psychological empowerment ($R = .50, p < .01$). The combined effect of the transformational leadership dimensions explained 20% of the variance in the psychological empowerment dimension of impact (Adj. $R^2 = .20, p <$

.01). However, the transformational leadership dimension redesigning the organization ($\beta = .87$, $p < .01$) was the only significant predictor of psychological empowerment dimension of impact.

Non-Hypothesized Findings

In addition to the hypothesized findings, other results that were not included in the study were discovered. A post hoc factor analysis of Spreitzer's (1995) Psychological Empowerment Instrument revealed that all items loaded onto one of two factors with high reliability (meaning/competency and impact/self-determination). This may indicate the need to consolidate the constructs of psychological empowerment. The results identified improving instruction as a predictor of the factor meaning/competency and redesigning the organization as a predictor of impact/self-determination.

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), when the value for any variance inflation factor (VIF) exceeds 10, multicollinearity is a concern. Multicollinearity was discovered between the collective transformational leadership dimensions and the dimension of developing people (VIF = 10, tolerance = .10). Multicollinearity was also present in the subset dimensions of transformational leadership with all VIF values greater than 10.

Implications

Theoretical Implications

This is the first known study to investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment using Leithwood's new transformational leadership survey and Spreitzer's psychological empowerment instrument. This study shows a possibility of a relationship between the variables. However, due to the small sample size and multicollinearity between some subtests, more research is necessary (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Previous studies from other disciplines have suggested a relationship between

transformational leadership and psychological empowerment but not in education. Stronger relationships between the variables were expected.

The psychological empowerment dimension of impact infers organizational involvement and reflects whether individuals feel that they are making a difference in their organization. Impact indicates a sense of advancement toward a common goal and a belief that activities influence important outcomes in the organization (Spreitzer, 1995).

The relationship of impact to transformational leadership is important because impact is highly related to other dimensions of empowerment. The relationship of transformational leadership to empowerment is probably through a sequence, given the inter-relatedness of the empowerment subtests and the lack of connection of subtests other than impact.

There are possibly variables that intervene in the relationship of leadership to empowerment. Collective efficacy may be an important link between transformational leadership and empowerment as teachers, somewhat empowered by the leadership of the principal judge the potential success of their colleagues and the school. It is likely that transformational leadership and psychological empowerment would combine to make a context in which collective efficacy develops. The dimensions of psychological empowerment may mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and positive organizational outcomes.

Practical Implications

The results of this study indicate the importance of making school leaders aware of how their leadership practices influence teachers' psychological feelings of empowerment.

Administrators who utilize transformational leadership techniques may increase psychological empowerment dimensions if teachers feel their work has an impact both at the school level and

in classroom settings. Transformational leaders may be able to influence significant school change by appealing to teachers' feelings of impact.

Administrators may be able to improve the school culture and climate by incorporating Leithwood's transformational leadership dimensions. Districts could provide training for school leaders on how to implement the dimensions of transformational leadership into practice. Training programs may facilitate collaboration, shared goal setting, increase motivation, and enable teachers to feel more empowered.

Limitations

Limitations of this study include a small sample size ($N = 60$), differences in school configurations (see Table 1), and descriptive data being averaged at the school level (see Table 2). This is known as restriction of range. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggested that N should be $50 + 8(k)$ when testing a regression model. Since there were five-predictor variables used in this study, the minimum sample size should have been 90. However, the post hoc power analysis ranged from .84 - .99. According to Cohen (1988), these values are within the recommended range for medium and large effect size. Meaning, there was an 84% - 99% chance of correctly detecting the effects of the dimensions of transformational leadership given the sample size of 60.

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate K-6 elementary schools. However, there was a lack of consistency in Northwest Alabama schools regarding grade configurations. Multiple arrangements of elementary schools could have had an effect on data results.

Weber (2001) defined restriction of range as abbreviating the value of one or both correlated variables. Since the unit of analysis for this study was the school, the school's average was used and determined by the average of individual teacher responses. Furthermore, the

transformational leadership and psychological empowerment score of each school was calculated from the mean of these averages. Meaning, the scores were averages of averages. Restriction of range may have had an effect on the ability to accurately identify statistical significance in this study.

Recommendations for Future Research

Hoy and Tarter (2011) suggested the use of positive psychology as a perspective to refocus the study of educational organizations and administration. Since this is the first known study to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment in the educational setting using these instruments, more research is needed. This study has drawn together important research concepts from two separately researched areas of leadership/follower relationships. By combining research on transformational leadership and psychological empowerment, new developments in understanding how to manage leadership and empowerment may be realized. Additional research is needed to further develop the framework that explains the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment. More research is also needed to look at differences between principal and teacher perceptions regarding both constructs.

Second, the importance of a reciprocal relationship (over time) between transformational leadership techniques and psychological empowerment should be explored. Teachers with low psychological empowerment feelings may make it difficult for an administrator to apply the dimensions of transformational leadership or may have difficulties in benefiting from these leadership dimensions because they perceive the leadership procedures in a negative way. Therefore, an interesting issue to investigate would be to examine why some teachers react

positively to transformational leadership while others have negative reactions. The construct of motivation may be a contributing factor.

Finally, the relationship of collective efficacy with transformational leadership and psychological empowerment should be investigated. Collective efficacy is defined as the perceptions of teachers that the faculty can execute actions required to positively affect student achievement (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004). Therefore, these findings may have implications for research on student achievement and the improvement of low performing schools. For example, transformational leadership behaviors that allow faculty members to collaborate may prove instrumental in redesigning the organization, improving instructional programs, and could have an indirect effect on student achievement gains through direct effects on collective efficacy.

REFERENCES

- Allameh, S. M., Heydari, M., & Davoodi, S. M. (2012). Studying the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment of teachers in Abade Township. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 224-230.
- Alimo-Metcalf, B. & Alban-Metcalf, J. (2002). The great and the good. *People Management*, January, 32-34.
- Al-Swidi, A. K., Nawawi, M. K., & Al-Hosam, A. (2012). Is the relationship between employees' job satisfaction contingent on the transformational leadership? A study on the Yemen Islamic banks. *Asian Social Science* 8(10), 130-150.
- Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advance manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio, & Associates.
- Avolio, B., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderation role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 951-1019.
- Bartram T., & Casimir, G. (2007). The relationship between leadership and follower in-role performance and satisfaction with the leaders: The mediating effects of empowerment and trust in the leader. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(1), 4-19.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, (Winter): 19-31.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional/transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130-139.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. *Leadership Theory and Research*, 49-80.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Blanchard, K., Carlos, J., & Randolph, A. (2001). *Three keys to empowerment*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York: Grove Press.

- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Castro, C. B., Periñan, M. V., & Bueno, J. C. (2008). Transformational leadership and followers' attitudes: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(10), 1842-1863.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471-552.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breathe self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 194-202.
- Einstein, W. O. & Humphreys, J. H. (2001). Transforming leadership: Matching diagnostics to leader behaviors. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(1) 48-60.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., and Lang, A.G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 4(4), 1149-1160.
- Gill, R. (2006). *Theory and practice of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 3-13.
- Gumuslugle J., & Ilsey, A. (2008). Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(4), 461-473.
- Hales, C., & Klidas, A. (1998). Empowerment in five-star hotels: Choice, voice, or rhetoric? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10(3), 88-95.
- Hassanzade, A. (2010). The relation between role transparency and psychological empowerment among employees of the Gas Company in Golestan province, M.A thesis, Department of Psychological and educational sciences, Isfahan University.
- Hoy, W. K. (2010). *Quantitative research in education*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Improving the measurement of socioeconomic status for the National Assessment of Educational Progress: A theoretical foundation*. <http://www.edweek.org/media/nagbmeasures-14socioeconomic.pdf> Retrieved March 1, 2014.

- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2011). Positive psychology and educational administration: An optimistic research agenda. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 427-445
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, H.A., Sulaiman, A.Z., Mohamed, M.H., & Yusuf, M.H. (2011). An empirical study of the relationship between transformational leadership, empowerment and organizational commitment. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 2(1), 89-107.
- Jung, D. I., & Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33, 313-336.
- Kanter, R.M. (1993). *Men and women of the corporation* (2nd ed). New York: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Khanmohammadi, O., Morteza, M., & Mohseni, A. (2010), Studying the impact of leadership styles (transformational, transactional, noninterference) on psychological empowerment, 24th International Electricity Conference.
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2004). A longitudinal analysis of the impact of workplace empowerment on work satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 527-545.
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2001). Impact of structural and psychological empowerment on job strain in nursing work settings: Expanding Kanter's model. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 31, 260-272.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-12.
- Leithwood, K., Aitken, R., & Jantzi, D. (2006). *Making schools smarter: Leading with evidence* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P.T. & Cousins, J.B. (1994). *Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools*. London: Falmer.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., & Harris, A. (2006). Successful school leadership: What is it and how it influences pupil learning. A report to the Department for Education and Skills.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112-129.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2005), A Review of Transformational School Leadership Research 1996-2005, *Leadership And Policy In Schools* 4(3): 177-199.

- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The essentials of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201-227.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of the evidence linking leadership to student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What do we already know about school leadership? In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda: Directions for research on educational leadership* (pp. 22-47). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K. & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 48(3), 387-423.
- Leyv, P. S., & Lemeshow, S. (1999). *Sampling of populations: Methods and applications*. New York: Wiley.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Menon, S.T. (2001). Employee empowerment: An integrative psychological approach. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(1), 153-180.
- Mills, P.K., & Ungson, G.R. (2003). Reassessing the limits of structural empowerment: Organizational constitution and trust as controls. *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 143-153.
- Mishra, K., Mishra, A., & Spreitzer, G. (1998). Preserving employee morale during downsizing. *Sloan Management Review*, 39(2): 83-95.
- Nielsen, K., Randall, R., Yarker, J., & Brenner, S. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on followers' perceived work characteristics and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study. *Work & Stress*, 22, (1), 16-32.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership Theory & Practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Ongori, H., & Shunda, J. P. W. (2008). Managing Behind the Scenes: Employee Empowerment. *The International Journal of Applied Economics and Finance*, 2(2), 84-94.

- Ozaralli, N. (2002). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 24(6), 335-344.
- Pfeffer, J., Cialdini, R. B., Hanna, B., & Knopoff, K. (1998). Faith in supervision and the self-enhancement bias: Two psychological reasons why managers don't empower workers. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 20: 313-321.
- Raquib, M. A., Anantharaman, R. N., Eze, U. C., & Murad, M. W. (2010). Empowerment practices and performance in Malaysia – An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(1), 123-149.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Spreitzer, G.M. (2007). Taking stock: A review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment at work. *The Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, New York: Sage Publications.
- Spreitzer, G.M., & Mishra, A.K. (1997). Giving up control without losing control: Trust and its substitutes' effects on managers' involving employees in decision making. *Group and Organization Management*, 24(2): 155-187.
- Spreitzer, G. M. & Quinn, R. E. (2001). A company of leaders: Five disciplines for unleashing the power in your workforce. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spreitzer, G.M., & Quinn, R.E. (1996). Empowering middle managers to be transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32(3), 237-261.
- Spreitzer, G. M. & Quinn, R. E. (1997). The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37-49.
- Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics (5th ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. S. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666-681.
- Weber, D. (2001, February). *Restriction of range: The truth about consequences and corrections*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.

APPENDIX A

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP SURVEY FOR TEACHER RESPONDENTS

Educational Leadership Survey For Teacher Respondents

Kenneth Leithwood

Setting Directions

To what extent do the leaders in your school:

1. Give staff a sense of overall purpose.
2. Help clarify the reasons for your school's improvement initiatives.
3. Provide useful assistance to you in setting short-term goals for teaching and learning.
4. Demonstrate high expectations for your work with students.

Developing People

To what extent do the leaders in your school:

5. Give you individual support to help you improve your teaching practices.
6. Encourage you to consider new ideas for your teaching.
7. Model a high level of professional practice.
8. Develop an atmosphere of caring and trust.
9. Promote leadership development among teachers.

Redesigning the Organization

To what extent do the leaders in your school:

10. Encourage collaborative work among staff.
11. Ensure wide participation in decisions about school improvement.
12. Engage parents in the school's improvement efforts.
13. Are effective in building community support for the school's improvement efforts.

Improving the Instructional Program

To what extent do the leaders in your school:

14. Provide or locate resources to help staff improve their teaching.
15. Regularly observe classroom activities.
16. After observing classroom activities, work with teachers to improve their teaching.
17. Frequently discuss educational issues with you.
18. Buffer teachers from distractions to their instruction.
19. Encourage you to use data in your work.
20. Encourage data use in planning for individual student needs

APPENDIX B

PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT INSTRUMENT

Psychological Empowerment Instrument

Listed below are a number of self-orientations that people may have with regard to their work role. Using the following scale, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that each one describes your self-orientation.

A. Very Strongly Disagree	D. Neutral	E. Agree
B. Strongly Disagree		F. Strongly Agree
C. Disagree		G. Very Strongly Agree

- ___ I am confident about my ability to do my job.
- ___ The work that I do is important to me.
- ___ I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.
- ___ My impact on what happens in my department is large.
- ___ My job activities are personally meaningful to me.
- ___ I have a great deal of control over what happens in my department.
- ___ I can decide on my own how to go about doing my own work.
- ___ I really care about what I do on my job. *
- ___ My job is well within the scope of my abilities. *
- ___ I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job.
- ___ I have mastered the skills necessary for my job.
- ___ My opinion counts in departmental decision-making.*
- ___ The work I do is meaningful to me.
- ___ I have significant influence over what happens in my department.
- ___ I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities.
- ___ I have a chance to use personal initiative in carrying out my work. *

Items which can be dropped for a 12 item scale with three items per dimension. The 12 item version has been found to be highly reliable and valid.

The validation of the instrument is described in Spreitzer (1995; 1996). The instrument has been used successfully in more than 50 different studies in contexts ranging from nurses to low wage service workers to manufacturing workers. The validity of the instrument is proven. Test retest-reliability has been shown to be strong and validity estimates for the dimensions are typically around .80. More information on the empowerment profiles for different contexts and norm data for the empowerment dimensions can be found in Spreitzer and Quinn (2001).

References

- Spreitzer, Gretchen M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5): 1442-1465.
- Spreitzer, Gretchen M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2): 483-504.

APPENDIX C
IRB APPROVAL

March 20, 2014

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

Jon Bret Smith
ELPTS
College of Education
The University of Alabama



Re: IRB # EX-14-CM-040 "An Investigation of School Characteristics in Northwest Alabama"

Dear Mr. Smith:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given exempt approval according to 45 CFR part 46.101(b)(2) as outlined below:

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
(ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your application will expire on March 19, 2015. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing Review and Closure.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carpanato T. Myles", written over a blue rectangular background.

Carpanato T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer

The official seal of the University of Alabama, featuring a central figure and the text "THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA" and "1820".

358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461
FAX (205) 348-7189
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066

Teacher Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of school culture in Northwest Alabama. This study will be conducted by Jon Bret Smith or another member of the research team investigating these school characteristics. All of these researchers are doctoral students at the University of Alabama and this research is a part of his/her dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a questionnaire about the effects of school culture.

Participation in this study will involve approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to understand effects of positive school culture in Northwest Alabama.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. You will not be asked to record any identifying information on the survey forms. Surveys will be collected by the researcher or one of his colleagues at a staff meeting in the absence of the principal. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate simply by not completing the survey. If there is anything about this study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, or if you have questions or wish to report a research related problem, you may contact Jon Bret Smith at 256-905-2420 or jbsmith@lawrenceal.org or at East Lawrence Middle School, 99 County Road 370, Trinity, AL 35673.

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Agreement to Participate

By completing the survey you are consenting to participate in this research study.

This is your copy of the consent document to keep for your own personal records.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 5-20-14
Expiration date: 7-19-15

Principal Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of school culture in Northwest Alabama. This study will be conducted by Jon Bret Smith or another member of the research team investigating these school characteristics. All of these researchers are doctoral students at the University of Alabama and this research is a part of his/her dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a questionnaire about the effects of school culture.

Participation in this study will involve approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to understand effects of positive school culture in Northwest Alabama.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. You will not be asked to record any identifying information on the survey forms. Surveys will be collected by the researcher or one of his colleagues at a staff meeting. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate simply by not completing the survey. If there is anything about this study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, or if you have questions or wish to report a research related problem, you may contact Jon Bret Smith at 256-905-2420 or jbsmith@lawrenceal.org or at East Lawrence Middle School, 99 County Road 370, Trinity, AL 35673.

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Agreement to Participate

By completing the survey you are consenting to participate in this research study.

This is your copy of the consent document to keep for your own personal records.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 3-20-14
Expiration date: 3-19-15