

# Principal's Leader Power, Teacher Empowerment, Teacher Compliance and Conflict

Patsy E. Johnson and Paula M. Short

POWER IS DEFINED AS 'the ability of one party to change or control the behavior, attitudes, opinions, objectives, needs, and values of another party' (Rahim, 1989: 545). Power in organizations is determined by the extent the leader can influence subordinates (Dahl, 1957; French and Raven, 1959; Hersey et al., 1979; Krausz, 1986). The source of power that leaders in organizations use determines the influence they acquire. French and Raven (1959) have organized a typology to identify five power bases or sources: *legitimate power*, the legitimate right of the leader, usually by virtue of the position that the leader holds, to prescribe or control behavior; *coercive power*, the leader's control over punishment; *reward power*, the leader's control over reward; *expert power*, special knowledge or expertise; and *referent power*, the subordinate's desire to identify with the leader. More recently, definitions theoretically consistent with French's and Raven's, but expressed in behavioral terms, have been proposed that involve the ability of one individual to administer tangible or intangible outcomes for another: *legitimate power*, the ability to administer to another feelings of obligation or responsibility; *coercive power*, the ability to administer to another things not desired or remove things desired; *reward power*, the ability to administer to another things desired or remove things not desired; *expert power*, the ability to administer to another information, knowledge, or expertise; and *referent power*, the ability to administer to another feelings of personal acceptance or approval (Hinkin and Schriesheim, 1989).

The principal of a school typically may use one or more of these power bases to accomplish any or all of the goals and objectives adopted for the school. The power base or bases chosen by the principal potentially affect such psycho-social dimensions for teachers as conflict, compliance, and empowerment, either positively or negatively. Rahim (1989) found that legitimate, expert, and referent power bases were positively associated with subordinate compliance and that reward power was not. Reward and coercive power would likely be associated with resistance, a form of conflict. Only referent and expert power bases were positively associated with subordinate satisfaction and performance (Hinkin and Schriesheim, 1989; Rahim, 1989; Schriesheim et al., 1991; Yukl and Falbe, 1991). Yukl (1994) offers a summary of the effect of power bases on subordinate outcomes. These outcomes include commitment, compliance, or resistance. The most likely outcomes are either commitment or compliance in response to referent, expert, legitimate, or reward power. Resistance is the most likely outcome of coercive power.

Teachers identify the principal's power and allow the principal to influence their behavior. This principal-teacher (leader-subordinate) interaction may have either con-

structive or destructive consequences in a school. Constructive consequences may include teachers joining in cooperative planning and teaching scenarios, supporting administrative or faculty developed policies for operating the school program, and pursuing professional development avenues to improve teacher and school effects. Constructive consequences can occur when teachers in a school feel competent as professionals and as human beings. Subordinate satisfaction with leadership is high (Zirkel and Guditus, 1979). Destructive consequences may include teachers feeling isolated without access to collegial and leader support, experiencing high levels of conflict with the principal, teachers, and students, and offering low levels of compliance with school procedural and educational policies. Destructive consequences occur when teachers feel powerless, alienated and oppressed and become passive and combative. Teachers are dissatisfied with the principal's leadership. 'The organizational climate with such leadership reflects mistrust, low morale, and chronic lack of motivation' (Krausz, 1986: 90).

Power, compliance, and conflict relationships found in business and industry provide some insight into how to predict the organizational dynamics that may emerge when restructuring efforts proceed in schools. However, many of the interpersonal relationships found in schools are idiosyncratic to the academic environment because of the professional training of the teachers and principals, and the tendency of teachers to work in isolation from other teachers with little collegial contact as they perform their craft in separate rooms (Lortie, 1975). Also, vast differences in goals are found for business and education. Schools operate from a moral and political mandate to educate all children. Businesses operate from an economic mandate to make a profit. Just as the organizations are served by two different kinds of professionals, so are their bottom lines equally dissimilar. Because school restructuring efforts have been motivated and guided by business experiences (Cunningham and Gresso, 1993), it is possible that unsuccessful outcomes from these efforts may result when the characteristics of the educational environment are ignored. Therefore, it was reasoned that the relationships of quantitative measures of power, compliance, and conflict should be examined in an educational context. This reasoning led to the following research questions: (1) What are the relationships of the bases of the principal's leader power to teachers' empowerment, teachers' compliance with the principal's wishes, and the amount of teachers' conflict within self, with peers, and with the principal? (2) What are the relationships of teacher empowerment and teacher compliance to the amount of teachers' conflict with self, peers, and the principal?

## Teachers' Psycho-Social Reactions to Leader Power Bases

### Conflict

Conflict has been identified as either *intrapersonal* or *interpersonal* (intragroup and intergroup). Intrapersonal—conflict within self—occurs when an individual must choose between alternatives which are opposing and compelling (Rahim et al., 1992). Intrapersonal conflict may occur when experiences contradict role expectations and is associated with undesired personal and organizational outcomes. Among the factors that might affect the reaction to role conflict are perceptions of the role sender's power and importance. The more a sender can withhold or provide something of value, the more distress one is likely to experience by not complying with this person's expectations (Siegall, 1992). Another factor that may affect role conflict is the importance of the role senders. Importance is defined as the desire to meet a particular role sender's expectations. Whereas power of the role sender relates to job factors under the role sender's control, importance relates to the personal

relationship between the two. These consequences can be extrinsic (through power) or intrinsic (through importance). The amount of experienced distress resulting from role conflict is a function of the power and importance of the person from whom soliciting expectations are received (Behrman and Perreault, 1984).

Rahim (1986: 59) characterized interpersonal conflict as 'incompatibilities, disagreements, or differences between two or more persons'. In an organization, interpersonal conflict can occur within a group (intragroup) or between groups (intergroup) and can involve a lateral or collegial relationship (Pondy, 1967). Zuelke and Willerman (1987) recognized that within the school setting several groups may experience conflict with each other. Fielder (1967) identified interacting and coaching task group types within which intragroup conflict may occur. An interacting task group includes members who work interdependently such that the completion of a task by one member is dependent upon the work of another. Team teaching, school-based governance, and teacher empowerment models exemplify this classification. A coaching task group includes members who work somewhat independently, in which the success of one group member is not necessarily dependent upon the work of another group member. Self-contained classroom teachers exemplify this classification.

Intergroup conflict occurs in complex organizations when two or more groups are interdependent and operate with different goals, norms, or orientations, thereby creating circumstances in which conflict is inevitable (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Walton and Dutton, 1969). Conflict between teachers and the administration exemplify this classification.

## **Teacher Empowerment**

Empowerment has been defined as a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems. Empowered individuals believe they have the skills and knowledge to act on a situation and improve it. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) have described empowerment as a construct that ties personal competencies and abilities to environments that provide opportunities for choice and autonomy in demonstrating these competencies. Although the construct can be applied to organizations, persons, and social policies, it appears to be a procedure whereby persons gain mastery or control over their own lives and democratic participation in the life of their community (Katz, 1984; Rappaport, 1987; Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988).

Maton and Rappaport (1984), in a study of a large number of individuals in a religious community, found that a sense of community and commitment were related to empowerment. Zimmerman and Rappaport, studying large numbers of college students and community residents who were participating in various community organizations, found a consistent dimension of empowerment. They described this dimension as 'a sense of civic duty, political efficacy, and perceived personal competence and was negatively related to alienation and positively related to willingness to be a leader' (1988: 136). Dunst (1991) has suggested that empowerment consists of two issues: (1) enabling experiences, provided within an organization that fosters autonomy, choice, control, and responsibility, which (2) allow the individual to display existing competencies as well as learn new competencies that support and strengthen performance.

Rinehart and Short (1991), in a study of empowerment of teacher leaders in the national program called 'Reading Recovery', found that teacher leaders saw opportunities for decision-making, control over their daily schedule, high level of teaching competency, and opportunities for growth and development, as empowering aspects of their work. School

restructuring has, as one of its components, the empowerment of teachers, administrators, and students. Murphy and Evertson (1990) include empowerment as an integral part of reform. Research by Gruber and Trickett (1987) cited control over decision-making as important in empowering participants in school organizations.

Redefining the traditional links between power and personnel means changing beliefs, attitudes, and cognitive structures regarding roles, accountability, and rewards. In industry, empowerment succeeds in the workplace only after substantial employee retraining (Kanungo, 1992). Many leaders and workers must develop new planning and assessment skills. Such conditions provide fertile ground for conflict. For teacher empowerment to be effective, teachers must be willing and prepared to accept leadership roles. They must not be resistant to changing the institutionalized power and role paradigms that characterize traditional public education (Kirby and Colbert, 1994).

### **Compliance with Superior's Wishes**

According to Rahim and Afza (1993: 614), compliance 'is an ideal criterion measure because it is the variable that is the most directly linked with the outcome of power use'. One measure of the effect of a leader's power base is the extent to which the subordinates comply, either through desire or behavior, with the leader's wishes. Studies have indicated that coercive power provides little reason for subordinates to comply with the leader's wishes (Bachman, 1968; Bachman et al., 1966; Fontaine and Beerman, 1977; Ivancevich and Donnelly, 1970; Patchen, 1974; Speckman, 1979; Student, 1968). Warren (1968) found that all five power bases were positively related to teacher conformity, referent power having the highest relationship. However, no consistent relationships have been found between the other power bases and compliance. Rahim and Afza (1993) suggested that measurement and sampling deficiencies contributed to not finding a consistent relationship between power bases and compliance.

Power bases are important in determining the actions of others. Also, the power bases have an effect on the way people feel about their own actions and the actions of others. Subordinates may respond with commitment, compliance, or resistance. These feelings may also be reflected in satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Derived from this complex of actions, reactions, and feelings is a web of conflict connecting teachers and the principal. The object of this research is to examine the nature and strength of these connections.

## **Method**

### **Instruments**

The five French and Raven (1959) bases of power were measured by the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (Rahim, 1988). This 29-item instrument consisted of five subscales corresponding to each of the five leader power bases – referent, expert, legitimate, reward, and coercive. A higher score on an individual subscale indicates that the principal has a stronger power base associated with the subscale.

Teacher empowerment was measured using the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Short and Rinehart, 1992a). This instrument included items representing six dimensions of teacher empowerment: (1) involvement in decision-making, (2) teacher impact, (3) teacher status, (4) autonomy, (5) opportunities for professional development, and (6) teacher self-efficacy. A higher mean score for all items indicates greater teacher empowerment.

Attitudinal and behavioral compliance were measured using the 10-item Compliance with Superior's Wishes Scale (e.g. attitudinal compliance, 'I like to do what my superior

suggests'; behavioral compliance, 'I comply with the instruction of my superior') developed by Rahim (1988) and Rahim and Buntzman (1988). A higher mean score for all items indicates greater compliance with the superior's directives and wishes.

The amount of conflict was measured by the Rahim Organization Conflict Inventory I (ROCI-I) (Rahim, 1983). The ROCI-I is a 21-item instrument consisting of three subscales to measure three independent dimensions of organizational conflict: conflict within self (intrapersonal), conflict with peers (intragroup), and conflict with the principal (intergroup). Conflict-within-self items are concerned with job satisfaction and feelings of self-worth in the job. Conflict-with-peers items are concerned with the level of cooperation and good feeling among members of the faculty. Conflict-with-principal items are concerned with the level of cooperation and good feeling between members of the faculty and the school principal. A higher score indicates a higher amount of harmony and a lower amount of conflict.

## Sample

From the list of teachers employed in one state of the southern United States, 250 were randomly selected. Each of the teachers was mailed a packet containing the four instruments used in the study, a demographic questionnaire, and a cover letter describing the study and requesting the teacher's participation. Each teacher was to return the completed instruments in an enclosed self-addressed postage-paid envelope. After two weeks a follow-up packet was sent to the non-respondents again asking that they participate in the study. The behavioral and demographic variables of the first wave ( $n = 124$ ) and the second wave ( $n = 30$ ) of usable responses were compared with one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and chi-square tests. No significant differences at the .05 level were found on any variable between the two groups of respondents. The data from the two waves ( $n = 154$  for a 62 percent return rate) were combined for further statistical analysis.

The distribution of subjects across school levels was elementary (72), middle school/junior high school (42), and senior high school (41). The average age was 42.8 and the average number of years teaching experience was 14.8. Other demographics included race (white 108, non-white 46), gender of the teachers (male 30, female 124), and gender of the teacher's principal (male 104, female 48, and 2 not responding).

## Analysis

### Descriptive Statistics

The number of items, means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of all the behavioral variables are presented in Table 1. The reliability coefficients for all variables were satisfactory (see Nunnally, 1978).

### Interrelationships of Variables

The zero-order intercorrelation analysis among the variables used in this study is presented in Table 2. The 28 correlation coefficients that were significant at the .05 level are displayed and those with values exceeding .35 are displayed in bold print. The strength of these latter correlations suggests a common factor or factors. Factor analysis of the 10 variables yielded two factors. The variables and their factor loading are presented in Table 3. Factor 1 (personal power, conflict, and empowerment) includes the expert and referent power bases, the three conflict variables, and teacher empowerment, which indicates a positive relationship between the two personal power variables to the general feeling of harmony and low

Table 1. Number of Items, Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alpha for Independent and Dependent Variables

Subscale	No. of items	M <sup>a</sup>	SD	Standardized Cronbach's alpha
Coercive	5	3.13	.85	.68
Expert	6	3.62	.90	.90
Legitimate	6	4.05	.57	.70
Referent	6	3.80	.90	.90
Reward	6	2.36	.79	.75
Empowerment	38	3.71	.61	.95
Compliance	10	3.93	.70	.89
Conflict within Self	7	1.98	.60	.74
Conflict with Peers	8	2.45	.77	.90
Conflict with Principal	6	2.29	.93	.91

<sup>a</sup> A 5-point Likert-type scale was used for items on each instrument ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Table 2. Significant Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients of the Independent and Dependent Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Coercive										
2. Expert										
3. Legitimate										
4. Referent										
5. Reward	.24									
6. Conflict within Self										
7. Conflict with Peers										
8. Conflict with Principal										
9. Compliance										
10. Empowerment										

.39

.79 .42

Intercorrelations for Expert, Legitimate, and Referent power bases

.55 .28 .39

.40 .18 .39

.63 .21 .67

Intercorrelations for Expert, Legitimate, and Referent power bases and Amount of Conflict subscales

.40

.41 .69

Intercorrelations for Amount of Conflict subscales

For  $r > .15, p < .05$  (two-tailed); for  $r > .35, p < .001$  (two-tailed)

conflict among teachers as well as their feeling of empowerment. (Higher scores on the conflict variables indicate less conflict and more harmony.) Factor 2 (teacher compliance) includes the coercing and reward power bases and the compliance variable, which indicates a positive relationship between these two position power bases to teacher compliance.

### MANOVA and Multiple Regression Analyses

In the first analysis, MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) and univariate tests were used to determine that the independent variables (coercive, expert, legitimate, referent, and reward power bases and the demographic set) as a group were significantly related to the set of dependent variables (conflict within self, conflict with peers, conflict with principal, teacher compliance, and teacher empowerment). Five multiple regression analyses were used to test the relationships of the demographic variables and the five power bases to each of the five dependent variables. No relationships were found for the demographic variables

Table 3. Factor Relationships of Independent and Dependent Variables

Variable	Factor 1 (Personal Power, Conflict, and Empowerment)	Factor 2 (Position Power and Compliance)
Coercive Power		.58
Expert Power	.68	
Legitimate Power		
Referent Power	.67	
Reward Power		.81
Conflict within Self	.57	
Conflict with Peers	.80	
Conflict with Principal	.82	
Compliance		.59
Empowerment	.51	

Table 4. Summary of Five Multiple Regression Analyses for Relationships Between Each Dependent Variable and the Independent Variables and the Percentage of Common Variance

Dependent Variable for Each Analysis	Independent Variables (Power Bases)					% of Variance
	Coercive	Expert	Legitimate	Referent	Reward	
1. Conflict with Self		+				32
2. Conflict with Peers		+				19
3. Conflict with Principal		+		+		49
4. Compliance			+		+	13
5. Empowerment	-	+	+			10

+ = positive relationship; - = negative relationship ( $p < .05$ )

to the dependent variables. However, numerous significant relationships were found for the remaining variables. The strength of the relationships were determined by computing the percentage of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables. These relationships are indicated in Table 4.

In the second analysis, multivariate and univariate tests determined that the independent variables (teacher empowerment and teacher compliance) were significantly related to the dependent variables (conflict within self, conflict with peers, and conflict with principal). Three multiple regression analyses were computed to test the relationships of teacher compliance and teacher empowerment to each of the three conflict scales. Both independent variables were significantly related to all three dependent variables. The strength of the relationships was determined by computing the percentage of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables. The results from these three regression analyses are presented in Table 5.

## Results

The study was first concerned with investigating the relationships of the principal's bases of leader power to teacher empowerment, teacher compliance and the amount of conflict within self, with peers, and with the principal. Factor analysis and regression analysis revealed that the *personal* power bases of the principal—expert and referent—were strongly related to low amounts of conflict and to feelings of teacher empowerment. The

Table 5. Summary of Three Multiple Regression Analyses for Relationships Between Each Dependent Variable and the Independent Variables and the Percentage of Common Variance

<i>Dependent Variable for Each Analysis</i>	<i>Independent Variables</i>		
	<i>Compliance</i>	<i>Empowerment</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>
1. Conflict with Self	+	+	9
2. Conflict with Peers	+	+	10
3. Conflict with Principal	+	+	9

regression analysis also revealed that expert power formed a significant relationship with all three conflict scales and that expert and legitimate power formed significant relationships with empowerment. The combination of expert and referent power accounted for 49 percent of the variance in conflict with the principal. The factor analysis revealed that the *position* power bases—coercive and reward—were related only to teacher compliance. However, the regression analysis found a relationship for legitimate power with compliance and empowerment. The coercing power base was negatively associated with empowerment.

The demographic variables for the teachers (race, gender, years teaching experience, and school teaching level) were not significantly related to the dependent variables in each of the analyses. Therefore, no further consideration was given to the demographic variables as having a confounding effect on the relationships of the variables.

The second research question was concerned with the relationships of teacher empowerment and teacher compliance to the three conflict scales. The coefficients in each of the three regression analyses indicated that teacher empowerment and teacher compliance were positively associated with each of the conflict scales. The stronger the feelings of empowerment and compliance, the lower the amounts of each type of conflict (conflict within self, conflict with peers, and conflict with the principal). Teacher empowerment and teacher compliance combined to account for approximately 10 percent of the variance in each of the conflict scales.

## Discussion

This study investigated the relationships between bases of leader power and teacher empowerment, teacher compliance, and amount of conflict within self, with peers, and with principal. To assure validity of the results, the test instruments were chosen with psychometric qualities, a random sample was chosen from a state-wide list of teachers, and the data analytic techniques were chosen for their appropriateness for multiple dependent and independent variables.

The first analysis explored the relationships of the principal's leader power to teachers' empowerment, teachers' compliance with the principal's wishes, and the amount of teachers' conflict within self, with peers, and with the principal. Of the five power bases listed by French and Raven (1959), expert power had the strongest effect on the teacher empowerment and the amount of conflict. The legitimate power base related only to teacher compliance and teacher empowerment. The reward power base was associated only with teacher compliance. The more referent power the teachers perceived the principal to hold, the less they perceived themselves to be in conflict with their principal. And, not surprisingly, the coercing power base was negatively associated with teacher empowerment.



The above findings are similar to Busch's (1980) finding that expert and referent power bases were positively related to employees' satisfaction with supervision and that legitimate and reward power bases showed no significant relationship to satisfaction with supervision. They are also aligned with those of Rahim and Buntzman (1989) and Rahim and Afza (1993) who found a positive relationship between referent power, compliance, and satisfaction with supervision. Rahim and Afza (1993) also found a positive relationship between legitimate power and compliance. In this study, means for coercive and reward power bases were found at significantly lower levels than the other power bases, indicating that these power bases are found at lower levels in the examined educational work environments. Some of the differences between findings reported in this study and other studies may be attributed to the differences in the professions and the work environment, for example, sales personnel, blue-collar workers, business administration students, and accountants versus educators (Cobb, 1980; Rahim and Afza, 1993; Rahim and Buntzman, 1988).

Role conflicts are often the source for conflicts within self and are associated with dissatisfaction, anxiety, low performance, and low commitment. The amount of conflict with self that is associated with expert power may be related to the degree teachers' expectations are in opposition to the principal's expectations. When their expectations are aligned, expert power is high and conflict is low.

Conflict with peers (intragroup conflict), also related only to expert power, is similar to intrapersonal conflict, as it is likely to be highly associated with role conflict because of the role sender (expert base) function of the principal. Individuals within the group will possibly have different expectations. The higher the perception of the principal's expert power base, the lower the amount of intragroup conflict. Likewise, when perception of the principal's expert power base is low, intragroup conflict increases. Implications are that principals should assure their expertise by clearly defining role expectations for teachers and presenting themselves as instructional leaders (Good and Brophy, 1986; High and Achilles, 1986). Additionally, personal power bases of the leader—referent and expert—should be the focus of principals when they are interested in reducing or maintaining lower levels of conflict with, among, and within subordinates (Keedy and Finch, 1994; Kirby and Colbert, 1994).

The second analysis in the study explored the relationships of teacher empowerment and teacher compliance with amount of conflict. The positive association of all three conflict types—conflict with self, conflict with peers, and conflict with principal—with teacher compliance is expected, i.e. low amounts of conflict associated with high levels of compliance. The positive relationship observed in the analysis of legitimate power to compliance, i.e. high levels of legitimate power and high levels of compliance, suggests that teachers subscribe to the notion that following directives from a person in authority—legitimate superior—is a socially desired behavior (Pfeffer, 1981). Non-compliance would be socially unacceptable or professionally undesirable in light of the teacher's role expectation to model socially accepted behavior.

The explanation for the relationship between teacher empowerment and conflict is more speculative than for teacher compliance. Some empowerment movements have generated conflict within faculties when changes in role and task orientation occurred through retraining (Kanungo, 1992). In a study of teachers in an empowerment project, an inverse relationship was found for the amount of conflict and the amount of empowerment (Short and Rinehart, 1992b). This may be attributed to the conflict generated by changes experienced by teachers in their beliefs, attitudes, habits, practices, and paradigms in

schooling (Kanungo, 1992). However, subjects in this study experienced lower amounts of conflict when experiencing higher empowerment. Perhaps this was because the state from which this study's population sample was drawn has not experienced a systematic or mandated state-wide teacher empowerment movement. Therefore, training of teachers in power-sharing roles may have been limited. However, a formal governance structure intended to provide for teacher empowerment may not produce more empowered teachers than informal structures (Rinehart et al., 1994).

One implication of the study is for the preparation and professional development of school leaders. Much attention should be devoted to developing the principal's skills and knowledge that teachers would perceive as expertise. Leithwood et al. (1992) suggest that expert leadership is expert problem-solving. They suggest that the more a person knows about how to solve any problem, the more expert the leadership will be perceived. The amount of conflict is lower when the principal serves as an instructional leader and helps teachers with instructional problems by sharing information or facilitating its access. These behaviors are what Good and Brophy (1986) cite as distinguishing principals in high-achieving schools from low-achieving schools. Such a link with school effects underscores the importance and urgency for expecting a change in principal behaviors from the traditional role of administrator/disciplinarian to the educational expert/administrator. The principal's knowledge of curriculum, pedagogy, materials, classroom management, evaluation, and educational philosophy matter to the teachers and impinge on the school's effects.

Another implication involves teacher empowerment. The main force driving the empowerment movement in education is teacher effectiveness. The assumption is that teachers who design and control their educational services free from a subordinating school administration are more effective than teachers who feel alienated and powerless (Kanungo, 1992). However, advancing teacher empowerment may actually increase the amount of teacher conflict in schools where inadequate training and motivation and teacher resistance precede its implementation. Because the link between expert power and empowerment is strong, the principal's expert role as the instructional leader is paramount in developing the teachers' skills in designing and controlling educational services and weakening any resistance to change (Leithwood et al., 1992). A sobering thought is that many schools are staffed by administrators and teachers, none of whom have such design and control skills.

A third implication is that teacher compliance with the leader's wishes is not necessarily an indicator that conflict is low. This implication is based, in part, on the observations that compliance was not found to be significantly related to expert power but that expert power is significantly related to all three types of interpersonal conflict. When the principal exhibits low expert power high amounts of conflict may be found, even though the teachers might exhibit high compliance. Teachers may adopt the 'do what you're told' response as the socially accepted action in superior/subordinate relationships. Such responses would likely nurture resentment and conflict.

The results and implications found in this study are hardly counter-intuitive. Rather they confirm the need for school administrators to refine those leadership qualities that foster positive interpersonal relations, especially with teachers. The aphorism, 'So goes the principal, so goes the school', finds reinforcement here. Therefore, principal preparation programs should infuse their curricula with components designed to develop candidates' capacities to operate from personal power bases rather than from position power bases. In-service education of principals should focus on recognizing connections between the amount of conflict found in schools and the interactions of the faculty and the school

administration. Evaluation of principals should examine connections between leadership behaviors, amount of conflict, and teacher empowerment, as well as other indirect links to school outcomes. In so doing, responses to calls for greater accountability in educating children could be directly linked to effective leadership behaviors.

## References

- Bachman, J.G. (1968) 'Faculty Satisfaction and the Dean's Influence: An Organizational Study of Twelve Liberal Arts Colleges', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 52: 55–61.
- Bachman, J.G., Smith, C.G. and Slesinger (1966) 'Control, Performance, and Satisfaction: An Analysis of Structural and Individual Effects', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4: 127–36.
- Behrman, D. and Perreault, W.D., Jr. (1984) 'A Role Stress Model of the Performance and Satisfaction of Industrial Salespersons', *Journal of Marketing* 48: 9–21.
- Busch, P. (1980) 'The Sales Manager's Bases of Social Power and Influence upon the Sales Force', *Journal of Marketing* 44(3): 91–101.
- Cobb, A.T. (1980) 'Informal Influences in the Formal Organization: Perceived Sources of Power among Work Unit Peers', *Academy of Management Journal* 23(1): 155–61.
- Cunningham, W.G. and Gresso, D.W. (1993) *Cultural Leadership: The Culture of Excellence in Education*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dahl, R.A. (1957) 'The Concept of Power', *Behavioral Science* 2: 201–15.
- Dunst, R. (1991) 'Issues in Empowerment', presentation before the annual meeting of Children's Mental Health and Service Policy Convention, February, Tampa, FL.
- Fielder, F.E. (1967) *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fontaine, G. and Beerman, J. (1977) 'Affective Consequences of Social Power: Powerholder and Target Expectancies Associated with Different Types of Power', *Psychological Reports* 40: 771–4.
- French, J.R.P., Jr. and Raven, B. (1959) 'The Basis of Social Power', in D. Cartwright (ed.) *Studies in Social Power*, pp. 150–67. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Good, T.L. and Brophy, J.E. (1986) 'School Effects', in M.C. Wittrock (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, pp. 570–602. New York: Macmillan.
- Gruber, J. and Trickett, E.J. (1987) 'Can We Empower Others? The Paradox of Empowerment in an Alternative Public High School', *American Journal of Community Psychology* 15: 353–72.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. and Natemeyer, W. (1979) *Situational Leadership, Perception and the Impact of Power*. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.
- High, R.M. and Achilles, C.M. (1986) 'Principal Influence in Instructionally Effective Schools', Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, San Francisco, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 115).
- Hinkin, T.R. and Schriesheim, C.A. (1989) 'Development and Application of New Scales to Measure the French and Raven Bases of Social Power', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74: 561–76.
- Ivancevich, J.M. and Donnelly, J.H. (1970) 'Leader Influence and Performance', *Personnel Psychology* 23: 539–49.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1992) 'Alienation and Empowerment: Some Ethical Imperatives in Business', *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(5): 413–22.
- Katz, R.F. (1984) 'Empowerment and Synergy: Expanding the Community's Healing Resources', *Prevention in Human Services* 3: 201–26.
- Keedy, J.L. and Finch, A.M. (1994) 'Examining Teacher-Principal Empowerment: An Analysis of Power', *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 27: 162–75.
- Kirby, P.C. and Colbert, R. (1994) 'Principals Who Empower Teachers', *Journal of School Leadership* 4: 39–51.

- Krausz, R.R. (1986) 'Power and Leadership in Organizations', *Transactional Analysis Journal* 16: 85–94.
- Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W. (1967) *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Boston, MA: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P.T. and Cousins, J.B. (1992) *Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Lortie, D. (1975) *School Teacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Maton, K.I. and Rappaport, J. (1984) 'Empowerment in a Religious Setting: A Multivariate Investigation', *Prevention in Human Services* 3: 37–72.
- Murphy, J. and Evertson, C. (1990) 'Restructuring Schools: Capturing the Phenomena', Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978) *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Patchen, M. (1974) 'The Locus and Basis of Influence on Organizational Decisions', *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 11: 195–221.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981) *Power in Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Pondy, L.R. (1967) 'Organizational Conflict: Concepts and Models', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12: 296–320.
- Rahim, M.A. (1983) *Rahim Organization Conflict Inventories: Professional Manual* (experimental edn). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rahim, M.A. (1986) *Managing Conflict in Organizations*. New York: Praeger.
- Rahim, M.A. (1988) 'The Development of the Leader Power Inventory', *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 23: 1–13.
- Rahim, M.A. (1989) 'Relationships of Leader Power to Compliance and Satisfaction with Supervisors: Evidence from a National Sample of Managers', *Journal of Management* 15: 545–56.
- Rahim, M.A. and Afza, M. (1993) 'Leader Power, Commitment, Satisfaction, Compliance, and Propensity to Leave a Job among U.S. Accountants', *Journal of Social Psychology* 133: 611–25.
- Rahim, M.A. and Buntzman, G.F. (1989) 'Supervisory Power Bases, Styles of Handling Conflict with Subordinates, and Subordinate Compliance and Satisfaction', *Journal of Psychology* 123: 195–210.
- Rahim, M.A., Garrett, J.E. and Buntzman, G.F. (1992) 'Ethics of Managing Interpersonal Conflict in Organizations', *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(5): 423–32.
- Rappaport, J. (1987) 'Terms of Empowerment/ Exemplars of Prevention: Toward a Theory for Community Psychology', *American Journal of Community Psychology* 15: 121–48.
- Rinehart, J.S. and Short, P.M. (1991) 'Viewing Reading Recovery as a Restructuring Phenomenon', *Journal of School Leadership* 1(4): 379–99.
- Rinehart, J.S., Short, P.M. and Johnson, P.E. (1994) 'Empowerment and Conflict at School-Based and Non-School-Based Sites', paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association: New Orleans, LA.
- Schriesheim, C.A., Hinkin, T.R. and Podsakoff, P.M. (1991) 'Can Ipsative and Single-Item Measures Produce Erroneous Results in Field Studies of French and Raven's Five Bases of Power? An Empirical Examination', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76: 106–14.
- Short, P.M. and Rinehart, J.S. (1992a) 'School Participant Empowerment Scale: Assessment of the Level of Participant Empowerment in the School', *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 54(2): 951–60.
- Short, P.M. and Rinehart, J.S. (1992b) 'Teacher Empowerment and School Climate', *Education* 113(4): 592–7.
- Siegall, M. (1992) 'Some Effects of Role Conflict Source on the Experience of Role Conflict', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 22(8): 628–37.
- Speckman, R.E. (1979) 'Influence and Information: An Exploratory Investigation of the Boundary Role Person's Basis of Power', *Academy of Management Journal* 22: 104–17.

- Student, K.R. (1968) 'Supervisory Influence and Work-Group Performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 52: 188-94.
- Walton, R.E. and Dutton, J.M. (1969) 'The Management of Interorganizational Conflict: A Model and Review', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 14: 73-84.
- Warren, D.I. (1968) 'Power, Visibility, and Conformity in Formal Organizations', *American Sociological Review* 6: 951-70.
- Yukl, G.A. (1994) *Leadership In Organizations*, 3rd edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. and Falbe, C.M. (1991) 'The Importance of Different Power Sources in Downward and Lateral Relations', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76: 416-23.
- Zimmerman, M.A. and Rappaport, J. (1988) 'Citizen Participation, Perceived Control, and Psychological Empowerment', *American Journal of Community Psychology* 16(5): 725-50.
- Zirkel, P.A. and Guditus, C.W. (1979) 'Bases of Power Among Public School Principals', paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, San Francisco, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 856).
- Zuelke, D.C. and Willerman, M. (1987) *Conflict and Decision Making in Elementary Schools: Contemporary Vignettes and Cases for School Administrators*. New York: University Press of America.

Correspondence to:

PATSY JOHNSON, 111 Dickey Hall. Dept of Administration and Supervision, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0017, USA.