Antecedents of Teacher Empowerment

ABSTRACT: Empowerment of teachers in the school setting is a vital instrument to meet the success in the attainment of the institution's mission and vision. Moreover, empowered teachers can do innovation to further develop the existing limitations of the school curriculum, uplift school standards, and transform students to be well-rounded individual in the society. In addition, teachers who are empowered increase their morale and become proud of the so called noblest profession. The main objective of this study was to describe the level of empowerment of teachers in terms of individual and institutional dimensions. It also attempted to identify the antecedents of teacher empowerment. The study utilized the descriptive method of research. The participants of the study were 90 Teachers and 10 Department Heads in a Public School in the Division of Makati in the Philippines. The data were gathered using the Teacher Empowerment Scale developed and validated by Guillermo Roman, Jr. (2001). Data were analyzed using the mean, t-test, and one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance). Findings reveal that teachers’ level of empowerment under individual dimension, which includes knowledge, value, and action, is strongly felt. Likewise, the level of teacher empowerment in the institutional dimension, which includes clarity, attitude and behavior, recognition, communication, management in the workplace, and participation is strongly felt, with the exception on fairness, teachers’ level of empowerment is somewhat felt. It was also found out that length of service, educational attainment, and position are not antecedents of teachers’ individual empowerment. However, they are found to be antecedents of some components of teachers’ institutional empowerment.
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INTRODUCTION

Empowerment is not a new concept that strikes in the different field nowadays, particularly in the world of education. It has been an issue for a couple of decades now. But still, the concept has not yet totally realizes nor exercises. In the field of education, power is always exercise by the top managers, while others remain to be followers. The teachers receive the end string of power from their superior and given less participation in terms of planning, monitoring, and executing. Their authority is handcuff to the so called standards that limits the full potentials of the teachers to excel in their chosen field or career (IEAB, 2008; Cook, 2009; and GEMR, 2018).

“Two heads are better than one”, an adage that could attest that sharing responsibility, sharing of powers bring a more goal oriented relationship in a group. Empowering one
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Another in the institution to do the task will most likely result in the attainment of objectives and goals. Moreover, empowering one another gives the chance to impart their wisdom, knowledge, and skill that has been hidden due to less opportunity or waiting for the moment to share it with others. Thus, empowerment brings smooth relationship among members in the group (Longwell-McKean, 2012; Ledesma & Joyas, 2015; and Alosaimi, 2016).

Some concerned individuals and groups in both education and non-educational sectors feel the increasing need for teachers’ empowerment. The concern seems not only to be justifiable, but also necessary in an effort to find a more workable; and lasting solution to the problem of deteriorating quality of education and lack of wide participation of teachers in the field. It is felt that the teachers should be given more opportunity to participate in decision making and in other activities that would give more freedom to think and act on matters that concern them personally and that of their job (Ibrahim & Alkire, 2007; WDR, 2013; and Stromquist, 2018).

Another expectation in the empowerment process is the need to address the financial needs of the educators. It is sad to note that while the 1987 Philippine Constitution, Article XIV, Section 3, Paragraph 4, provides that:

[…] the State shall give the highest budget priority to education and ensure that teaching will attract and retain its rightful share of the best available talents through adequate remuneration and other means of job satisfaction and fulfillment (cited in Vera, 2017).

Yet many teachers are forced by circumstances to borrow money from loan sharks, do moonlighting, and even work as domestic helper just to augment their meagre income. Thus, the teachers cannot situate themselves in the education process. Everybody tells them that they are important, but realities prove otherwise (Ibrahim & Alkire, 2007; WDR, 2013; and Stromquist, 2018).

Empowerment of teachers in the school setting is a vital instrument to meet the success in the attainment of the institution’s mission and vision. Moreover, empowered teachers can do innovation to further develop the existing limitations of the school curriculum, uplift school standards, and transform students to be well-rounded individual in the society. In addition, teachers who are empowered increase their morale and become proud of the so-called noblest profession. On the other hand, less empowered teachers deliver low result, low students’ performance, and inactive in the participation of the school programs that could affect the overall standing or performance of the school (Lazaro, 2011; Perso, 2012; and Greier & Gouvea eds., 2017).

The insight from these observations was the impetus to contemplate a study that looked into the antecedents of empowerment of teachers in the institution. The findings of this study may help educational managers to reflect on their management style and look up to the factors contributing to the full participation that lead to empowering of teachers in the field whether individual or institutional (cf Bolden, 2010; Ryan, 2010; and MacBeath, 2012).

**Conceptual Framework.** This study was anchored on R. Kanter (1977)’s *Theory of Structural Empowerment*, which focuses on the structures within the organization rather than the individuals’ own qualities (Kanter, 1977). In this context, R. Kanter (1977) and other scholars believed that leader’s power will grow by sharing the power through empowering others as a result; leaders will realize increased organizational performance. They identified two systematic sources of power that exist in organizations, these are formal and informal power. Formal power accompanies high jobs and requires a primary focus on independent decision making. Informal power comes from building relationships and alliances with peers and colleagues (Kanter, 1977; O’Brien, 2010; and Mota, 2015).

There are six conditions required for empowerment to that takes place according to R. Kanter (1977) and other scholars, these are: opportunity for advancement; access to information; access to support; access to resources; formal power; and informal power (Kanter, 1977; Martin, 2010; and Wong & Laschinger, 2012).
To further support R. Kanter (1977)'s theory, contingency approaches to leadership of managers can be associated to increase the level of empowerment among members in the institution. Such contingency models were: Fred E. Fieldler (1967)'s Contingency Model; Victor H. Vroom & Arthur G. Jago (1988)'s Leader Participation Model; Robert J. House (1996)'s Path-Goal Leadership Theory; and P. Hersey, K. Blanchard & D. Johnson (2008)'s Situational Leadership Model. These approaches to leadership can improve the management style of a leader depending on the situation or group of individual being manage or work with. It also suggested in the different contingency approaches the level of participation of the members to achieve specific objectives or goals (Fieldler, 1967; Kanter, 1977; Vroom & Jago, 1988; House, 1996; and Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 2008).

The study also banked on the Behavioural Management Approaches, because empowerment is not only influenced by management style used by leaders, but also humanitarian purpose or good human relationship (Frischer, 2006; and Northouse, 2013). In M. Parker Follett (1918)'s approach, she describes organizations as communities within which people combined talents to work for a greater good (Follett, 1918). The Human Resource Theory of Hawthorne, as cited in Elton Mayo (1949) and Ozgur Onday (2016), on the other hand, suggested that work behavior is influenced by social and psychological forces and that work performance may be improved by better human relations (Mayo, 1949; and Onday, 2016).

Likewise, Abraham H. Maslow (1943 and 1971) stated that self-fulfilment can be experienced by individual through fulfilment of the each level in hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943 and 1971). Moreover, D. McGregor (1966) suggested that managers should shift into “Theory Y” thinking, which views individual as independent, responsible, and capable of self-direction (McGregor, 1966). And also, C. Argyris (1957)'s Theory of Personality pointed out that people in the work place are adults and may react when constrained by strict management practices and rigid organizational structures (Argyris, 1957; and Schermerhorn, Jr., 2008).

Another theory that supports empowerment is the Theory of Motivation. A motivated individual has high sense of commitment, direction, and participation in the organization. According to J.S. Adams (1965)'s Equity Theory, social comparisons take place when rewards are distributed in the workplace. People who feel inequitably treated are motivated to act in ways that reduce the sense of inequity; person conceived negative inequity may result in some working less hard in the future (Adams, 1965; Adams & Freedman, 1976; and Kabanoff, 1991).

Another is the Law of Effect, which states that the behavior followed by a pleasant consequence is likely to be repeated; behavior followed by an unpleasant consequence is unlikely to be repeated (Berridge, 2001; and Schunk, 2012). And lastly employing Positive Reinforcement will work best, when applied according to the law of contingent and immediate reinforcement (Baron & Galizio, 2005; and Schermerhorn, Jr., 2008).

Guillermo Roman, Jr. (2001), and other scholars, identified factors that could lead to empowerment of the academicians in the educational institution. They found out that teacher empowerment consists of two dimensions, these are: individual empowerment and institutional empowerment. Individual empowerment consists of three components, which are: knowledge, value, and action. Institutional dimension, on the other hand, consists of eight components, which are: clarity of purpose, attitude, behavior, recognition, fairness, communication, management in the workplace, and participation (Roman, Jr., 2001; Calves, 2009; and Kimwarey, Chirure & Omondi, 2014).

In the field of education, empowering the teachers may result to their greater involvement in different programs or activities. In turn, this may produce or increase the level of productivity in terms of students’ performance in National Achievement Test, National Career Assessment Examination, or other performance assessment of teachers and the school (Mulford, 2003; and Nicolas-Victorino, 2011).
The conceptual paradigm of the study is shown in figure 1. Individual empowerment consists of three components, which are: knowledge, value, and action. Institutional empowerment, on the other hand, consists of eight components, which are: clarity of purpose, attitude, behavior, recognition, fairness, communication, management in the workplace, and participation. Experience, educational attainment, and position are hypothesized to be antecedents of teachers’ empowerment (Boonyarit, Chomphupart & Arin, 2010; and Seibert, Wang & Courtright, 2011).

**Statement of the Problem.** This study attempted to identify the antecedents of teacher empowerment in a Public Secondary School in Makati City, the Philippines. Moreover, it sought answers to the following questions: (1) What is the level of individual empowerment of teachers in terms of the following components: knowledge, value, and action; (2) Are there significant differences in the level of individual empowerment among the teachers, when grouped according to the following variables: years of service, educational attainment, and position; (3) What is the level of institutional empowerment of teachers in terms of the following components: clarity of purpose, attitude and behavior, recognition, fairness, communication, management of workplace, material provisions, and participation; and (4) Are there significant differences in the level of the institutional empowerment of teachers, when they are grouped according to the following variables: experience, educational attainment, and position.

**METHODS**

**Research Design.** This study used the descriptive survey research design, which involves the collection of data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. The descriptive method was utilized in this study, because it aimed to identify and describe the existing antecedents of teacher empowerment in a Public Secondary School (Cronholm & Hjalmarsson, 2011; Smith, 2012; and al-Kindy, Shah & Jusoh, 2016).

**Participants of the Study.** The participants of this study were all Teachers in a Public High School in Makati City, the Philippines. One hundred Faculty Members participated in the study. Table 1 shows the distribution of the participants according to Departments.

**Research Instrument.** The following research instrument was utilized in this

### Table 1: Distribution of Participants by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 1: Conceptual Paradigm of the Study](image-url)
study, namely *Teacher Empowerment Scale*. This instrument was developed and validated by Guillermo Roman, Jr. (2001) measures the level of teacher empowerment. The questionnaire has three parts. The first part determines the personal profile of teachers, such as name, area of specialization, length of service, educational attainment, and position. The second part measures the level of teacher empowerment on institutional dimension. It consists of seven components with a total of 76 items. The third part of the instrument measures teacher empowerment on individual dimension. It has three components with a total of 25 items (Roman, Jr., 2001).

Table 2 shows the distribution of items in the questionnaire by components.

As shown in the table, there were six questions for the personal profile of the teachers, seventy six questions on institutional dimension, and twenty five questions on individual empowerment. The empowerment levels were measured in terms of institutional and individual empowerment climate. Each item in the questionnaire measures the level of teacher empowerment in a public secondary school.

Each item in the questionnaire is a four-point Likert-scale item, wherein the teachers responded to it by indicating the empowerment they feel being described by the item (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Roman, Jr., 2001; and al-Kindy, Shah & Jusoh, 2016). See table 3.

**Data Gathering Procedure.** The data gathering procedure followed two stages, namely: (1) Preparation Stage; and (2) Administration Stage. The procedures on each stage are presented as follows:

*Preparation Stage.* A letter of permission to conduct the study was prepared and handed out personally to the Schools Division Superintendent. After the Superintendent
signed the letter, it was presented to the Principal of the target institution.  

**Administration Stage.** After the permission was granted, the questionnaire was distributed to the Teachers. The Assistance of the Heads of the Departments of the different subject areas for the proper distribution of questionnaires was sought. The accomplished questionnaires were retrieved immediately as soon as they were completed.

**Data Analysis Procedure.** The following statistical tools were used to analyze the data. Firstly, the Means and the Standard Deviations were used to describe the level of teacher empowerment both in the individual and institutional dimensions. Secondly, the One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to determine if there is a significant difference among the levels of teacher empowerment, when the respondents are grouped according length of service and educational attainment. Thirdly, the t-Test of Independent Samples was used to determine if there is significant difference between the level of teacher empowerment, when the respondents are grouped according to position (cf Creswell, 2009; Yin, 2009; and Jamie, 2012).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Level Individual Empowerment of Teachers.** Table 4 shows the level of teachers’ individual empowerment on action, knowledge, and value. As can be seen from the table, all indicators of individual empowerment are strongly felt by the teachers. This means that the teachers are aware of their rights and ready to fight for these if needed.  

Teachers are empowered in the institution, because of their awareness and exercise of their rights. Richard L. Daft (2000), and other scholars, explained that empowerment means giving employee the power, freedom, knowledge, and skill to make decisions and perform effectively (Daft, 2000; Saremi, 2015; and Paynevandy, 2016). In addition, Gene I. Maeroff (1988); Bruce Romanish (1993); and Nafiseh Rafiei & Fereshteh Davari (2015) stated that increasing the knowledge and ability of the teachers will increase their power (Maeroff, 1988; Romanish, 1993; and Rafiei & Davari, 2015). This is also supported by the comment of one of the teachers in Filipino Department, as following here:

> *I am empowered if all my rights are respected by my superiors and peers. My rights give me the power to do my task and duties; so, I can perform my job without thinking of what others will say* (interview with Respondent A, 3/7/2018).

The result also implies that the teachers are willing to accept their shortcomings or mistakes, and they are willing to be corrected if necessary. On the other hand, teachers’ morale is affected by low recognition to their achievements and contributions in the institution (cf Mulford, 2003; Grossman, 2004; and Robinson, 2010).

Milwida Guevarra (2001), and other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Verbal Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Action</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Value</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scholars, explained that when teachers are deprived of the opportunity to participate in decision-making and dissatisfied with some policies and programs of school managers at different levels, they lose their self-esteem and enthusiasm to perform their role the best they can (Hayes, 1994; Guevarra, 2001; and Canaya, 2008).

**Comparison of the Level of Teachers’ Individual Empowerment When Grouped According to Length of Service, Educational Attainment, and Position.** Table 5 shows the result of the one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) for the comparison of the level of teachers’ individual empowerment, when grouped according to length of service. The table shows that there is no significant difference among the levels of teachers’ individual empowerment on the three components: knowledge, value, and action. This means that length of service is not a factor to that affects teachers’ level of individual empowerment.

Moreover, experience is not a guarantee of how a teacher is empowered in the institution. According to Guillermo Roman, Jr. (2001), and other scholars, empowerment is about participation and involvement. No participation, no empowerment. In addition, seniority is resented when an incompetent individual uses it as an excuse to ignore his/her responsibilities, resists change, and refuses to upgrade one’s skills (cf Roman, Jr., 2001; Tremblay & Gutberlet, 2010; and Saremi, 2015).

Table 6 shows the one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) for the comparison of the level of teachers’ individual empowerment, when grouped according to educational attainment.

The table 6 clearly shows that there is no significant difference among the levels of teachers’ individual empowerment on the three components, when they are grouped according to educational attainment.

Table 7 shows the t-test for the

---

**Table 5:**

One-Way ANOVA for the Comparison of the Level of Teachers’ Individual Empowerment When Grouped According to Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>214.50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215.71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>169.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.56</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2 449.95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2619.64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>597.30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>621.71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6:**

One-Way ANOVA for the Comparison of the Level of Teachers’ Individual Empowerment When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>213.96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215.71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2 583.72</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2619.64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>612.55</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>621.71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparison of the level teachers’ individual empowerment, when grouped according to position. It is evident from the table that there is no significant difference between the level of individual empowerment of the heads and teachers in terms of knowledge, value, and action. This implies that position is not a factor that affects teachers’ individual empowerment.

**Level of Teachers’ Institutional Empowerment.** Table 8 presents the summary of levels of teachers’ institutional empowerment on the different components.

Based on the overall Mean rating institutional empowerment, *Climate* is strongly felt by the teachers. This means that majority of the components’ indicators are essential to teachers’ empowerment. Thus, these factors are important antecedents of empowerment in the institution. Teachers gave the highest mean rating to *Clarity of Purpose*. This indicates that the purpose of the institution is clear enough for the faculty members. This means that the teachers are well oriented in the purpose of the institution; thus, knowledge on the mission and vision gives power to the faculty members to do their duties and responsibilities. Moreover, roles and positions are clear to the members; so, everyone is aware of their specific duties to perform in the organization (Mulford, 2003; Guhao, Jr., 2016; and Lacks, 2016).

Teachers are willing to do their work beyond their scheduled time of work. It also reveals that the teachers are giving importance to the sworn statement under oath, which is willingness to render service in case of exigency of work. In addition, teachers have high regard to work commitment. Teachers have high morale or values regarding their chosen craft. They can extend their precious time just to serve the needs of their students, but these qualities will turn into passiveness and then non-participation to the organization (UP, 2003; and Lawrence & Deepa, 2008).

Thus, extrinsic motivation must be employed to eliminate the flame of inactiveness in the institution and strengthen their individual power through discovering new things that can contribute to the betterment of everybody. This agrees to the concept of empowerment, according to Guillermo Roman, Jr. (2001) and other

---

### Table 7:
Results of t-test for the Comparison of the Level of Teachers’ Individual Empowerment When Grouped According to Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8:
Level of Teachers’ Institutional Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Purpose</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude and Behavior</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management in workplace</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>Somewhat felt</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>Somewhat felt</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Strongly felt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

scholars, that a person who enjoys his/her stay in the organization and is eager to contribute to the welfare of the organization (Roman, Jr., 2001; Tsai, 2011; and Stinglhamber et al., 2015).

To highlight the professional agency’s manifestations within a temporal continuum, K. Vahasantanen (2015), and other scholars, offered other perspectives of educational changes, both failure and success as well as transformation of identity. Recognition as a component of institutional empowerment is somewhat felt by the teachers. This implies that result of assessment of performance is somewhat felt by the teachers in the institution. They feel that their performance is not recognized by the institution (Zeichner, 2008; Vahasantanen, 2015; and Eckert, Goldman & Wenger, n.y.).

This resulted to low performance and low level of trust to administration. The evaluation is sometimes based on kinship or relatedness of the rater to the one who is being evaluated; thus, it affects the real result of job evaluation (Vahasantanen, 2015; Binmad & Li, 2018; and Ombanda, 2018). This situation is affirmed by one of the teachers in Physical Education Department, as following here:

> Performance is not based on criteria, but it on how you are close to the administration or not. Well, it’s their time we can’t do something unless we will go with the flow. (interview with Respondent B, 10/7/2018).

On this matter, teachers will be more productive if their performance is evaluated objectively regardless of the relationship exists between the evaluator and the one being evaluated. It creates a constructive and professional relationship that aims to further develop one’s skills and abilities. As a result, teachers will become empowered on things concerning his/her professional growth and perform the task based on the standard followed by many institutions. Whatever are the views of standards, both in schools and more importantly in teacher education’s accreditation, their implementation and promulgation persists (Kusek & Rist, 2004; CCSSO, 2013; and Bourke, Ryan & Ould, 2018).

Empowered teachers are those supported by the leaders and the whole organization in all activities to be undertaken. In this aspect, support (financial or moral) is one of the biggest factors for an individual to excel in his/her performance. In that sense, a person is able to push him/herself to the limit and make this as his/her driving force to bring honor not only to his/her name, but the whole organization that trusted him/her whole heartedly. Thus, empowerment is all about recognizing one’s need and wants (Sternberg, 2009; Bourke, Ryan & Ould, 2018; and OECD, 2018).

According to F.B. Soriano (2004), and other scholars, organization works best when teachers’ needs are met ample opportunities are provided for participation and shared decision-making. Furthermore, they pointed out that no matter how strong the principal may be, he/she can be helpless under conditions where teachers lack of support and trust, suspicion, indecisiveness, and insecurity in the workplace is the rule rather than expectation (Soriano, 2004; Soriano et al., 2010; Rouf & Mohamed, 2017; and Licorish et al., 2018).

Comparison of the Level of Teachers’ Institutional Empowerment of Teachers When are Grouped According to Experience, Educational Attainment, and Position. Table 9 presents the one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) for the comparison of the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment, when the grouped according to length of service.

The culture of institutions for teacher education can have its advancement through the in-house community of teacher educator’s learning. Likewise, the individuals’ learning experience can be influenced by the norm of learning of the institution (Soriano, 2004; Soriano et al., 2010; Tremblay & Gutberlet, 2010; Hadar & Brody, 2018).

The table 9 also shows that there is a significant difference on the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment on clarity, attitude and behavior, recognition, communication, management, and participation, when they are grouped according to experience. This means that length of service is a factor that affects teachers’ institutional empowerment.
Moreover, the longer of teacher in service more empowered is the teacher in the institution (Soriano, 2004; Soriano et al., 2010; Lawson, 2011; and Bidabadi et al., 2016).

Table 10 shows the one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) for the comparison of the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment, when grouped according to educational attainment. The table shows that there is significant difference among the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment on clarity of purpose, communication, management in the workplace, and participation, when the teachers are grouped according to educational attainment. This implies that educational attainment is a factor that affects teachers’ institutional empowerment on clarity of purpose, communication, management in the workplace, and participation (Mulford, 2003; Mansfield et al., 2016; Kebritchi, Lipschuetz & Santiago, 2017).

This goes along with the idea that from the very start, to develop graduates with high quality including indicators, such as maintaining enthusiasm for many years, motivation, and commitment as well as enjoying the work and having job satisfaction experience, are considered teacher education programs’ desired outcomes (Mulford, 2003; Han & Yin, 2016; and Mansfield et al., 2016).

However, educational attainment is not a significant factor that affects teachers’ institutional empowerment on attitude, fairness, and recognition. Table 11 presents the result of the t-test for the comparison of the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment, when they are grouped according to position. The table shows that there is significant difference between level of institutional empowerment of heads and teachers on attitude; while on clarity, fairness, and management, heads and teachers are not significantly different (cf Brandao, 1995; Henard & Roseveare, 2012; and Killingsworth & Xue, 2015).

Attitude can be considered as antecedent of teacher empowerment in relation to position, because the hierarchy in the institution is a basis for personal and professional relationship. The higher position in the institution, the higher regards to be
Another is communication. It can be considered as antecedent of teacher empowerment, because communication affirms the role of one another in the institution by sharing ideas, insights, and opinions regarding the welfare of the group (Mulford, 2003; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; and Kraft & Dougherty, 2013).

Moreover, transparency among members in the institution regardless of position will create a better working relationship; thus, a regular teacher feels they are part of the institution. Lastly, involving every member of the institution in planning, monitoring, and implementing projects will result to greater participation in the future. In such way, teachers feel that they are important in the whole development of the institution. For the sake of a shared purpose, teachers have to be challenged to step beyond traditional roles and generalized assumptions (Gleason et al., 2011; Vaz-Rebelo et al. eds., 2015; and Brown & Heck, 2018).

While responsibility for failure events can be assumed personally, improved performance and greater persistence can be brought upon by feelings of hope (Heskett, 2007; Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012; and Wang, Hall & Rahimi, 2015). To sum it up, teachers’ individual empowerment is felt by the teachers in the institution. However, teachers’ institutional empowerment is something to be felt by the members of the institution. One thing that an individual will feel institutional empowerment is through leadership. Leadership does not mean manipulating people with power and authority, but rather making them follow with respect and enthusiasm. A leader may not be highly intelligent. What matters most is the right attitude towards work and the people around him/her (Kooper et al., 2007; Singh, 2009; and Kolzow, 2014).

**Findings.** Based on the data gathered, the following findings are hereby summarized that the level of teachers’ individual empowerment in terms of knowledge, value, and action is strongly felt. Awareness of their rights and responsibility makes them empowered. They are also empowered in doing things that benefited their social and personal concern. However, their value is affected by low recognition of their works and contributions in the institution (cf Quisumbing, 2002; Mulford, 2003; and Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall eds., 2009).

### Table 10:
One-Way ANOVA for the Comparison of the Teachers’ Level of Institutional Empowerment When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>110.118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.059</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>531.442</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>641.560</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>161.765</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.882</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5016.745</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5178.510</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>5.645</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>804.355</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>810.00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7.774</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.887</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>187.226</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195.000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>55.411</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.705</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>759.179</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>814.590</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>86.354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.177</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>788.236</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>874.590</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Between</td>
<td>63.096</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.548</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>952.294</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1015.390</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Antecedents of Teacher Empowerment

There is no significant difference on the level of individual empowerment dimension, when the respondents are grouped according to years of service, educational attainment, and position. The level of teacher in the institutional dimensions in terms of clarity, attitude and behavior, recognition, communication, management in the workplace, and participation are strongly felt by the faculty members. However, fairness is somewhat felt by the teachers (cf Williams, 2010; Dehaloo, 2011; and Sharifirad et al., 2012).

There is significant difference on the level of institutional empowerment among respondents in terms of clarity, attitude and behavior, recognition, communication, management in the workplace, and participation are strongly felt by the faculty members. However, fairness is somewhat felt by the teachers (cf Williams, 2010; Dehaloo, 2011; and Sharifirad et al., 2012).

There is significant difference on the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment on attitude and behavior, fairness, and recognition among respondents, when grouped according to educational attainment (cf Thomson, 1998; Dehaloo, 2011; and D’Ortenzio, 2012).

There is significant difference on the level of teachers’ institutional empowerment on clarity, fairness, and management in the workplace, when they are grouped according to position. Length of service, educational attainment, and position are not significant predictors of teachers’ empowerment (cf Theron, 2010; D’Ortenzio, 2012; and Eupena, 2012).

### CONCLUSION

In the light of the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made. Teachers who have personal knowledge regarding their responsibilities and duties are empowered. Teachers who have high morale and principles are empowered in the institution. However, it is affected by low recognition of their works and contributions in the fields. Teachers who seek personal and professional improvement are empowered in their own chosen field.

Length of service, educational attainment, and position are not significant factors that affect level of teachers’ individual empowerment. The level of teacher empowerment in the institution in terms of clarity, attitude and behavior, fairness, recognition, communication, management in the workplace, and participation is at satisfactory level. While fairness is somewhat felt by the teachers.

Length of service and educational attainment are factors that affect teachers’ level of institutional empowerment on clarity of purpose, attitude, recognition, communication, management in the workplace, and participation. Position is a factor that affects level teachers’ institutional empowerment on attitude and behavior, communication, and participation.

In the light of the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are given. The top managers and academic administrators should evaluate the existing leadership style being employed in their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
institution, so that it will adapt the constant changing of environment in managing and dealing with teachers.

School administrators should maximize the teachers’ participation in all institutional matters concerning teachers’ welfare and development. Involve them in making decisions, planning programs, and giving them accountability in performing their task in the institution. The school administrators should also develop mechanism that would further recognize the role of teachers in the institution and in the whole organization. Revise the existing policy of evaluation regarding teachers’ ranking and promotion. Make financial assistance and scholarship program open to all, so that everybody has the change to further improve or develop their chosen field.

The administrators should reiterate the purpose of the institution, especially to the new comers for them to fully understand the purpose and goal of the institution. During faculty meetings, administrators or school managers should give a concrete and comprehensive answer to queries, so that transparency will be established.

For the top and middle managers, make sure that communications like memorandum, invitation letters, and the like will be disseminated to every member. The Principal, as the mother or father in the institution, should be as much as possible treat everyone equally, assign task based on capabilities, assess performance objectively, and lead by example.

A similar study on teacher empowerment should be conducted in order to evaluate and identify other factors affecting empowerment.²
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Teachers who have personal knowledge regarding their responsibilities and duties are empowered. Teachers who have high morale and principles are empowered in the institution. However, it is affected by low recognition of their works and contributions in the fields. Teachers who seek personal and professional improvement are empowered in their own chosen field.