A STUDY OF TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT IN RELATION TO TEACHER MOTIVATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MEHSANA DISTRICT

A

RESEARCH REPORT

FOR

MINOR RESEARCH PROJECT

SUBMITTED TO

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION, PUNE

FILE NO – 23-642/12 (WRO) DATE: 03/05/2013

Principal Investigator

DR. PRASHANT BHARATKUMAR PARIHAR

(M.A., M.Ed., M. Phil, NET, GSET, Ph. D)

Assistant Professor

Swami Vivekanand Sarvodaya Bank Education College,

Mehsana, Gujarat

:ABSTRACT:

The objectives of the present research study were (i) to assess the level of self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (ii) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to gender on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (iii) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to geographical location on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (iv) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to academic qualification on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (v) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to professional qualification on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (vi) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to in-service training on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (vii) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to types of school on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (viii) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to teaching experience on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (ix) to study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to age on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools; (x) to study the relationship between teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation. In the present research study independent variables was teacher motivation while dependent variable was teacher self-empowerment and attribute variables were gender, geographical location, in-service training, academic qualifications, professional qualifications, types of schools, teaching

experience, age. Null hypotheses were framed to study the objectives of the research study. Descriptive Survey Method was used. The population consisted of 2415 secondary school teachers from government schools, grant-in-aid schools and private schools of Mehsana district. The sample of the study consisted of 953 secondary school teachers selected by using purposive sampling technique. To collect the data the self-constructed standardized Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

The major findings of the study were: **(i)** The total sample of secondary teachers reflected above average performance on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and the mean scores on the following dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale: (a) Decision-making; (b) Professional Growth; (c) Professional Knowledge; (d) Status and (e) Self-Efficacy. **(ii)** The total sample of secondary teachers reflected above average performance mean scores on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the mean scores on the following dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale: (a) Competence; (b) Responsibility; (c) Autonomy; (d) Recognition; (e) Collegiality and (f) Relatedness; **(iii)** No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of male teachers and total sample of female teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Mean and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(iv)** No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of Male Teachers and total sample of Female Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(v)** No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of Rural Teachers and total sample of Urban Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(vi)** No significant difference was found between mean scores of

total sample of Rural Teachers and total sample of Urban Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(vii)** The Teachers with In-Service Training were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than Teachers of without In-Service Training on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores (3.906≥ 1.96) and mean scores on Decision-Making (2.539 ≥ 1.96), Professional Growth (3.717≥ 1.96), Professional Knowledge (2.303 ≥ 1.96), Status (2.222 ≥ 1.96) and Self-Efficacy (3.473≥ 1.96) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(viii)** The Teachers with In-Service Training were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than Teachers without In-Service Training on Teacher Motivation Total Mean Scores (3.405≥ 1.96) and mean scores of Competence (3.398 ≥ 1.96), Responsibility (2.684≥ 1.96), Autonomy (2.498≥ 1.96), Recognition (2.057≥ 1.96), Collegiality (3.434≥1.96) and Relatedness (2.753≥1.96) dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(ix)** The types of schools were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the total sample of Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools, Teachers of Government Schools and Teachers of Private Schools on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Decision-Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(x)** Teachers of Government schools were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and the Teachers of Private schools on mean scores on Status dimension (1.983≥1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xi)** The types of schools were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the total sample of Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools, Teachers of Government Schools and Teachers of Private Schools on Teacher Motivation

Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xii)** The levels of academic qualifications were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the Under-graduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and Decision-Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xiii)** The levels of academic qualifications were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the Under-graduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality, and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xiv)** The levels of professional qualifications were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Decision-Making, Professional Knowledge and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xv)** Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on mean scores on Professional Growth dimension (2.592 $\geq$1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xvi)** Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on mean scores on

Status dimension (2.039≥1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xvii)** The levels of professional qualifications were found to have no significant effect on Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xviii)** No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status, and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xix)** Teachers of 21-30 years of age were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on mean scores on Decision Making dimension (2.989 ≥1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xx)** No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xxi)** No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Decision-Making, Professional

Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status, and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xxii)** Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores (2.109≥1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xxiii)** Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Decision making dimension (3.285≥1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale; **(xxiv)** No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xxv)** Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Recognition dimension (1.989 ≥1.96) of Teacher Motivation Scale. **(xxv)** The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Teacher

Self-Empowerment Total Scores and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.668); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Competence dimension (.713); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Responsibility (.817); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Autonomy (.740); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Recognition (.747); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Collegiality (.585); and between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Relatedness (.606) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xxvi)** The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Decision Making and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.577); between Decision Making and Competence dimension (.529); between Decision Making and Responsibility (.518); between Decision Making and Autonomy (.467); between Decision Making and Recognition (.411); between Decision Making and Collegiality (.451); and between Decision Making and Relatedness (.510) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xxvii)** The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Professional Growth and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.513); between Professional Growth and Competence dimension (.548); between Professional Growth and Responsibility (.456); between Professional Growth and Autonomy (.464); between Professional Growth and Recognition (.482); between Professional Growth and Collegiality (.467); and between Professional Growth and Relatedness (.591) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xxviii)** The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Professional Knowledge and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.619); between Professional Knowledge and

Competence dimension (.459); between Professional Knowledge and Responsibility (.489); between Professional Knowledge and Autonomy (.557); between Professional Knowledge and Recognition (.631); between Professional Knowledge and Collegiality (.683); and between Professional Knowledge and Relatedness (.639) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale. **(xxix)** The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Status and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.490); between Status and Competence dimension (.520); between Status and Responsibility (.585); between Status and Autonomy (.584); between Status and Recognition (.685); between Status and Collegiality (.589); and between Status and Relatedness (.621) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale; **(xxx)** The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Self-efficacy and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.584); between Self-efficacy and Competence dimension (.623); between Self-efficacy and Responsibility (.670); between Self-efficacy and Autonomy (.758); between Self-efficacy and Recognition (.692); between Self-efficacy and Collegiality (.697); and between Self-efficacy and Relatedness (.510) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

****

RESEARCH REPORT

A STUDY OF TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT IN RELATION TO TEACHER MOTIVATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MEHSANA DISTRICT

1 INTRODUCTION

No other profession has been subjected to so much scrutiny, debate and discussion as the teaching profession since educational quality both in developed countries and developing countries has become a topic of intense interest, primarily because of countries' efforts to maintain quality in the context of quantitative expansion of educational provision. Many countries have simultaneously implemented innovations based on more active approaches to teaching and learning further challenging education systems and, especially, teachers since with expansion and reform taking place at the same time, a severe burden has fallen on teachers to be flexible and to reject traditional approaches and to internalize and practice new approaches - often within the context of conceptual confusion about the reforms and minimal understanding of them (Alexander 2000; UNESCO 2004). Andy Hargreaves (2000) pointed out that, "Having once been the crucible of social optimism, education now became a target for purging, despair and panic…Change became ubiquitous and was implemented with an escalating sense of urgency. And teachers were blamed for everything by everybody…The result was extensive pressure on teachers. Burnout, morale problems and stress levels all increased (Dinham & Scott, 1997; Vanden Berghe & Huberman, 1999)-even in countries like Japan where educational reform cycles started later (Fujita & Wang, 1997). Many teachers started to feel deprofessionalized as the effects of reform and restructuring began to bite (Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Nias, 1991; Hargreaves & Goodson, 1996). Teachers experienced more work, more regulation of

their work, and more distractions from what they regarded as being the core to their work (teaching children) by the bureaucratic and form-filling burdens of administrative decentralization (Hargreaves, 1994; Helsby, 1998)." As a result none of the innovations have an effect on fundamental school reform due to top-down orientation which have removed the persons responsible for implementation of the innovations from the initial decision making process.

Larger institutional decisions affecting teachers' work are still controlled by administrators and policymakers as the educational institutions tend to reflect hierarchical organizational structures, within which autocratic authority prevails. Principals of the schools remain highly respectful to their supervisors' authority and that the teachers tend to see the principal as the director and final decision maker. Everything from hiring, budgeting, scheduling, textbook and technology selections to professional development and curriculum is often in the hands of others. The net effect is that the existing education system has little in a way of "carrot" or "stick" element to encourage teachers' performance (Cheng, 2002). The lack of motivation for teachers to participate in implementing educational innovations effectively undermines all the attempts to bring about meaningful educational reforms. The VSO report (2002), based on three country case studies in Malawi, Zambia and Papua New Guinea, on valuing teachers concludes that "a potential crisis in the teaching profession threatens the ability of national governments to reach internationally agreed targets to expand and improve education. In many developing countries, the teaching force is demoralised and fractured" (VSO, 2002). Maxine Greene (1973) in her book 'Teacher As Strangers', commenting on

teacher's perceived contradictions and ambiguities in conventional justifications of the work he does, asserts that:

"Committed though he may be to the nurture of cognitive development, the encouragement of self-realization, or the promotion of citizenship, for example, he cannot help being affected by the doubts and uncertainties below the familiar surfaces of classroom and school. On the one hand, more is being asked of education than ever before in history; on the other hand, institutional education is being attacked for its inefficacy and is losing both legitimacy and support. Held accountable for failures in his classes, asked to come forth with a better product to individualize, to become more immediately concerned, the teachers suddenly finds himself pulled in many directions. To whom is he responsible- the community, the administrators of the schools, his students, and his profession? And for what is he responsible for? ...Teachers react in variety of ways. At times they screen out the scapegoating and incessant challenges to what they are doing. They bite down hard and say, 'It is better not to think about it.' They concentrate on the daily routines, trying to be cool and disengaged, as functional and impersonal as machines. At other time the gap between what is asked for and what seems possible becomes so wide that they experience outrage or despair. They may then project their frustrations outward to the children or to the young people in their classrooms by inventing self-fulfilling prophecies and resigning themselves to the likelihood that they and their students will fail. Most commonly, they behave like clerks, subjects of more remote authority that issues orders, supervises, and asks little more than conformity to custom, to the prevailing 'law.' They are powerless and they accede."

The importance of teacher motivation and empowerment in 21st century - which Castells (1996) called as 'the informational society' emerging from the 'ashes of old industrialism'; considered education as the 'quality of labour' and teachers as 'the new producers of informational capitalism'- in key education areas cannot be underestimated. A belief by teachers that their knowledge of teaching and learning matters and is considered a valuable factor in decision-making can motivate them to connect to their schools in powerful ways. This connection can help improve the retention of those teachers in their classrooms and, ultimately, the success of the students they teach. As noted by Richard Ingersoll (2003) in his book 'Who Controls Teachers' Work? Power and Accountability in America's Schools,': "Those who are entrusted with the training of this next generation are not entrusted with much control over many of the key decisions in their work." He further pointed out that, "The result of this disenfranchising of teachers will be schools that 'deprofessionalize and demotivate teachers'." Cunningham and Gresso (1993) supported this view indicating that "the only way education will improve is if an invitation is issued for ideas from the people who work in the schools. These people are influential in determining which reforms are acceptable. Indeed, only those reforms that are found acceptable will be the ones that will have a positive effect on the school." Thus, when teachers are involved in making decisions about changes that affect them, enjoy being around children, have the skills to impart appropriate knowledge and manage their classrooms, and understand their role in the community, they are usually highly motivated and their students' achievement tends to improve.

2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The current research has several purposes: first to define and measure teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation in terms of teachers' power to control critical decisions about teaching and learning practices in the classroom; second, to examine the significance of difference between the mean scores of attribute variables on teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation; third to examine the relationship of teacher self-empowerment with teacher motivation.

"A STUDY OF TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT IN RELATION TO TEACHER MOTIVATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MEHSANA DISTRICT"

3. PRESENT STUDY – A RATIONALE

Improvement in the quality, efficiency and equity of the education, to a considerable extent depends on the nexus of teaching and learning, which is in turn influenced by the quality of teachers. The teacher has been identified as the single most important factor influencing the quality of education by the Indian Education Commission and the National Policy on Education. Consequently, the government of India, like that of many other developing countries, has been trying to meet the challenge of improving teacher quality on several fronts- by raising pre-service education requirements, improving the teacher training and increasing the diversity of the teaching force. In spite of all the efforts made by central and state governments to improve the quality of teachers, it has been observed that teachers in India are unhappy, frustrated, uninspired and unmotivated. In this context a recent study commissioned by the World Bank and conducted by several Harvard University economists offers interesting insight into this phenomenon. Based on

survey of 3,700 schools across 20 Indian states, the study indicates that 'government school teachers are among the least motivated workers in India. Over 25 percent of the government teachers are absent on given working day. Secondly, the more disturbing, even among teachers who were present, only about half were found engaged in teaching (Kremer et. al. 2005). The present research study has been attempted to find out the teachers' self-empowerment in relation to motivation since in the present research study empowerment as motivational construct has been viewed as individual and personal.

The researcher in his Ph.D. work has studied the level of self-empowerment, motivation and self-regulation of secondary school teachers of Banaskantha district which is the remote and backward district of Gujarat. In the present research study, the researcher intended to assess if the secondary school teachers of Mehsana district perceive the same level of self-empowerment and motivation in their work.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

(i) To assess the level of self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(ii) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to gender on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(iii) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to geographical location on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(iv) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to academic qualification on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(v) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to professional qualification on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(vi) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to in-service training on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(vii) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to types of school on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(viii) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to teaching experience on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(ix) To study the significance of difference of mean scores with reference to age on self-empowerment and motivation of teachers of secondary schools.

(x) To study the relationship between teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation.

5. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

In the present research work following hypotheses had been constructed according to the objectives of the study:

$H_{1.1.1}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{1.1.2}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{1.1.3}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean score on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{1.1.4}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{1.1.5}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{1.1.6}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{o.2.1}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{o.2.2}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

$H_{o.2.3}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.2.4 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.2.5 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.2.6 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.3.1 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.3.2 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.3.3 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.3.4 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.3.5 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.3.6 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.4.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.4.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.4.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.4.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.4.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.4.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.5.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.5.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.5.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.5.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.5.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.5.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.6.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.6.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.6.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.6.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.6.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.6.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and

Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.$_{7.1}$ There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.$_{7.2}$ There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.$_{7.3}$ There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.$_{7.4}$ There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.$_{7.5}$ There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.7.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.8.1 There is no significant difference among scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.8.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.8.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.8.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.8.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age

and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.8.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.9.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.9.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.9.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.9.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience,

Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.9.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Status dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

Ho.9.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

H1.10.1 The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

H1.10.2 The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

H1.10.3 The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

H1.10.4 The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

H1.10.5 The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{1.10.6}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{1.10.7}$ The total sample of secondary teachers has above average performance on mean scores on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.1}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.2}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.3}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.4}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.5}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.6}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.11.7}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Male Teachers and Female Teachers on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.12.1}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

$H_{o.12.2}$ There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.12.3 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.12.4 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.12.5 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.12.6 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.12.7 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Rural Teachers and Urban Teachers on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.1 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.2 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.3 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.4 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.5 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.6 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.13.7 There is no significant difference between mean scores of Teachers without In-service Training and Teachers with In-service Training on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.14.7 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of Government schools, Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and Teachers of Private schools on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and

Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.15.7 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.16.7 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Undergraduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers

of 51-60 years of age on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.17.7 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.1 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Teacher Motivation Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.2 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Competence dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.3 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Responsibility dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.4 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of

teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Autonomy dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.5 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.6 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Collegiality dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

Ho.18.7 There is no significant difference among mean scores of Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Relatedness dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale.

H1.19.1 The correlation coefficients among Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores, Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the total scores on dimensions of Teacher Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale are not positive and significant.

H1.19.1.1 The correlation coefficients among Decision-Making dimension of Teacher Empowerment Scale, Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the total scores on dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale are not positive and significant.

$H_{1.19.1.2}$ The correlation coefficients among Professional Growth dimension of Teacher Empowerment Scale, Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the total scores on dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale are not positive and significant.

$H_{1.19.1.3}$ The correlation coefficients among Professional Knowledge dimension of Teacher Empowerment Scale, Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the total scores on dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale are not positive and significant.

$H_{1.19.1.4}$ The correlation coefficients among Status dimension of Teacher Empowerment Scale, Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the total scores on dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale are not positive and significant.

$H_{1.19.1.5}$ The correlation coefficients among Self-Efficacy dimension of Teacher Empowerment Scale, Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the total scores on dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale are not positive and significant.

6. VARIABLES OF THE STUDY

To meet the objective of the present research study, the variables under the investigation had been categorized and classified under different headings mentioned below:

1. **Independent Variables:** Teacher motivation is considered as independent variables or predictive measures as the objectives of the research study is to determine the relationship of teacher motivation with teacher self-empowerment.
2. **Independent Variables (Attribute Variables):** In the present research study, after reviewing related literature teachers' characteristics such as gender, geographical location of schools, in-service training, types of schools, academic qualifications,

professional qualifications, teachers' age and teachers' teaching experience are taken as independent variables to measure the significance of difference on mean scores of teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation.

3. **Dependent Variable:** In the present research study teacher self-empowerment is considered as dependent variable or criterion measure since the objectives of the study is to measure the level of teachers' self-empowerment in relation to motivation.

7. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Delimitations of the present research study are mentioned as follows:

1. The study had been delimited to teachers of government, grant-in-aid and private secondary schools of Mehsana district.
2. The study had been delimited to the dimensions of: (i) Teacher Self-Empowerment i.e. Decision-making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status, Self-efficacy; (ii) Teacher Motivation i.e. Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality, Relatedness.
3. The study had been delimited to study relationships among teacher motivation with teacher self-empowerment.
4. The findings of the study were limited to the validity and reliability of the instruments.
5. The findings of the study were limited to the accuracy of the participants who completed the instruments.

8. REVIEWS OF RELATED LITERATURE OF TEACHER EMPOWERMENT

Teacher empowerment had been reviewed in two contexts: (A) teacher empowerment through power handed down to classroom teachers by school or administrative authorities i.e. the school level and administrative level empowerment. Martin (1990) measured teacher empowerment in relation to instructional leadership behavior of the supervisors. Short, Paula M and Rinehart, James (1992) in their research examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of school climate and their perceptions of empowerment. Moore and Esselman (1992) explored the relationship among teacher efficacy, empowerment, focused instructional climate and student achievement. Bomotti, Sally; Ginsberg, Rick and Cobb, Brian (1999) queried about teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment, school climate and working conditions. Marcial J. (2005) explored effect of independent variables (i) teacher preparation (field experience), (ii) self-efficacy, (iii) empowerment, (iv) amount of support from administration, (v) effectiveness of mentors and support systems and (vi) salary as predictors as teacher retention. Somech, Anit (2005) examined the relative effect of the directive leadership approach as compared with a participative leadership approach on school staffs' motivational mechanisms and effectiveness. Joyce A. Beckett, Anderson; Jackson, L. Flanigan measured dimensions of shared decision-making.

The findings of the above studies show that teachers' empowerment increases with leadership behavior (Martin, 1990, Marcial J 2005 & Somech, Anit 2005); classroom and school based participative decision making (Moore and Esselman, 1992, White 1992 & Joyce A Beckett, Anderson; Jackson, L. Flanigan); school climate (Short, Paula M and

Rinehart, James, 1992, Bomotti, Sally; Ginsberg, Rick and Cobb, Brian 1999). The leadership behavior of school authorities, conducive school climate and participative decision-making approach of school authorities increase teachers' empowerment. But Short, Paula M and Rinehart, James (1992) suggest that greater empowerment may result in organizational conflict and lowered school climate. As teachers become empowered, they become more critical of school functioning and therefore teachers need organizational problem-solving skills and an awareness of group processes. Joyce A Beckett, Anderson; Jackson, L. Flanigan ( ) recommended that teachers' involvement in all the types of decision-making is not possible. The school could decide that some decisions should be left to the administration with teachers acting as consultants.

Real teacher empowerment should be geared and enhanced (B) through professional growth and knowledge i.e. the teacher level empowerment. Ruscoe, Whitford and Eggiton, Esselman (1989) found out the relationship between teacher efficacy and teacher empowerment. Lichtenstein, Mc Laughlin and Knudsen (1991) in their research presented a well reasoned argument for emphasizing professional knowledge as a dimension of teacher empowerment. Morris and Nunnery (1993) measured Mentoring Self-Efficacy, Teaching Self-Efficacy and Collegiality as construct of teacher empowerment. Klecker, Beverly and Loadman, William E., (1996) studied decision making, professional growth, status, self-efficacy, autonomy and impact as theoretical dimensions of teacher empowerment. Klecker, Beverly and Loadman, William E., (1996) identified decision making, collegiality/collaboration, professional knowledge, self-efficacy, autonomy, and status of classroom teachers as frequently identified dimensions of teacher empowerment. Less frequently identified dimensions were authority,

curriculum planning/design, impact/casual importance, leadership, mentoring, responsibility and self-esteem. Marks, Helen M; Louis, Keren Seashore (1997) examined the relationship of teacher empowerment with teacher commitment, expertise and student achievement. Wall, Russell and Rinehart, James S., (1997) investigated decision making, status, professional growth, self-efficacy, autonomy and impact as the sub-scales of teacher empowerment. Sweetland S.R. and Hoy, W.K. (2000) explored the teacher empowerment in relation to school climate, school effectiveness, and students' achievements in schools. Scribner, Jay Paredes, D. Truell, Allen, R.Hager, Douglas and Srichai, Sonathana (2001) assessed the level of teacher empowerment among career and technical education teachers on six sub-scales i.e. decision making, status, professional growth, self-efficacy, autonomy and impact. Somech, Anit and Bogler, Ronit (2004) found out the relationship between teacher empowerment and teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Pearson L, Carolyn and Moomaw, William (2005) examined the relationship between teacher autonomy and on-the-job stress, work satisfaction, empowerment and professionalism.

The findings show that professional knowledge (Lichtenstein, McLaughlin and Knudsen 1991 and Klecker, Beverly, Loadman, William E., 1996, Marks, Helen M; Louis, Keren Seashore 1997, Sweetland S.R. and Hoy, W.K. 2000, Somech, Anit and Bogler, Ronit 2004, & Pearson L, Carolyn and Moomaw, William 2005) is one of most important factors of teacher empowerment besides other contributing factors like decision making, collegiality/collaboration, professional knowledge, self-efficacy, autonomy, status authority, curriculum planning/design, impact/casual importance, leadership, mentoring, responsibility and self-esteem (Ruscoe, Whitford and Eggiton, Esselman 1989, Morris

and Nunnery 1993, Klecker, Beverly and Loadman, William E 1996, Wall, Russell and Rinehart, James S. 1997, & Scribner, Jay Paredes, D. Truell, Allen, R.Hager, Douglas and Srichai, Sonathana 2001). Lichtenstein, McLaughlin and Knudsen (1991) argued that teachers' development of professionally relevant knowledge is necessary for genuine teacher empowerment. The researchers' view of teacher empowerment was based on professional knowledge defined as "…knowledge of professional community, educational policy and subject area." Klecker, Beverly and Loadman, William E., (1996) suggested that teacher must pursue knowledge beyond that of subject content and pedagogy. Their professional knowledge must include a thorough grounding in both the philosophy and processes of the change model adopted by their school.

Teacher self-empowerment was found to differ on demographic variables such as gender, age, length of service, geographical location, levels and types of schools, level of education, teaching subject and race.

In the present research study teacher self-empowerment has been viewed as Short, Greer and Melvin (1994) defined it as "a process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems." It is individual's belief that they have the skills and knowledge to improve the situation in which they operate. Sweetland S.R. and Hoy, W.K. (2000) states that teacher empowerment is effective when it is aimed at enhancing teacher professionalism rather than bureaucratic control. They further argue that teacher empowerment is effective when it is authentic i.e. when teachers have powers and use it to make important classroom and instructional decisions. Genuine teacher empowerment increases teachers' job

satisfaction (Pearson L. Carolyn and Moomaw, William 2005) teachers' organizational commitment and professional commitment (Somech, Anit and Bogler, Ronit 2004) which results into pedagogic quality and improvement in students' academic performance (Helen M, Louis, Keren Seashore 1997).

9. REVIEWS OF RELATED LITERATURE OF TEACHER MOTIVATION

Teacher Motivation had been reviewed in three contexts: (A) Teachers' motivation examined with both extrinsic and intrinsic motivaton. Singh B. (1980) in his research identified broad areas of teachers' motivation to work ; (i) classroom teaching, (ii) school organization and administration, (iii) evaluation and guidance, (iv) co-curricular activities and (v) extra activities. Wayne Pennington, Philip (1997) studied the relationship of teacher motivation and leadership style. VSO Report (2002) explored from national teachers' own perspectives the critical factors influencing their motivation and identified the changes required in national and international policy, practice and process in order to enhance teachers' motivation. Kusereka, Louis Garudzo (2003) explored the factors affecting teacher motivation. Portelli, Maria Viviana (2004) in her study aimed to investigate motivation, job satisfaction, commitment and general health. Paynter, Jeanne L. (2004) assessed the strength and direction of the three dependent variables, teacher's preference for extrinsic, intrinsic, and moral motivators in relation to age, career stage and school achievement level. Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince (2007) in his study assessed the differences and relationship between the levels of teacher's job satisfaction, motivation and their teaching performance. Belle, Louis Jinot (2007) in his study focused on the factors that impact on teacher motivation.

Findings of the above studies show the extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of teacher motivation. They were: Working with students; learning and achievement of students (Singh B., 1980; VSO Report, 2002 & Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004); family commitment (Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004); school organization and administration (Singh B., 1980; VSO Report, 2002; Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004; Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince, 2007 & Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); leadership style (Wayne Pennington, Philip, 1997); working conditions (VSO Report, 2002; Kusereka, Louis Garudzo, 2003 & Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); pay and fringe benefits and material awards (VSO Report, 2002 & Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince, 2007); interpersonal relationship (Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004 & Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); job satisfaction (Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince, 2007); commitment to altruism (Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004); discipline, instructional resources and materials, class size, paper work and work load, parental involvement, teacher autonomy, praise, recognition, feedback and principalship (Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007) and policy environment (VSO Report, 2002 & Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince, 2007). From the above intrinsic and extrinsic determinants of teacher motivation, teachers were found to be highly motivated while working with students, learning and achievement of students (Singh B., 1980; VSO Report, 2002 & Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004); interpersonal relationship (Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004 & Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); family commitment (Portelli, Maria Viviana, 2004); and collegiality, autonomy, praise, feedback and recognition (Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007) while teacher were found to be highly dissatisfied with leadership style (Wayne Pennington, Philip, 1997 & Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); educational and administrative policy issues (VSO Report, 2002 & Ololube, Nwachukwa Prince 2007); working conditions (VSO Report, 2002; Kusereka,

Louis Garudzo, 2003 & Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); paper work and work load (Belle, Louis Jinot, 2007); pay and fringe benefits and material awards (VSO Report, 2002 & Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince, 2007).

Teacher motivation was also reviewed in the context of (B) Extrinsic Motivaton. Mc Kinney, Pamela Anne (2000) studied teacher motivation in relation to awarding career pay and student achievement. Bush, Cheryl L. Mason., (2003) examined the extent to which a relationship existed between teachers' motivation to work and their perceptions of the leadership styles of their principals. Ofoegbu, F.I., (2004) determined relationship of teacher motivation with classroom effectiveness and school improvement. Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame (2007) studied teacher motivation in relation to incentives.

Findings of the above studies show the extrinsic determinants of teacher motivation. They were: Student achievement (Mc Kinney, Pamela Anne, 2000); leadership style (Bush, Cheryl L. Mason., 2003); classroom effectiveness and school improvement (Ofoegbu, F.I., 2004); school organization and administration (Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame, 2007); working conditions (Ofoegbu, F.I., 2004 & Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame, 2007); pay, fringe benefits and material awards (Mc Kinney, Pamela Anne, 2000 & Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame, 2007); job satisfaction (Bush, Cheryl L. Mason., 2003); competence and commitment to job (Bush, Cheryl L. Mason., 2003 & Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame, 2007); self-actualization (Bush, Cheryl L. Mason., 2003); school accountability; security and conflict; the policy environment and occupational status (Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame, 2007).

Findings of the studies of Ofoegbu, F.I., (2004) and Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame, (2007) show that teacher motivation can be enhanced if salaries are paid regularly, teaching and learning facilities are made available and put in place and better working conditions, living conditions and more effective management can be provided. But Mc Kinney, Pamela Anne (2000) in her study revealed that teachers who received career pay were not more intrinsically or extrinsically motivated than teachers who did not receive career pay. It was also found out that the student achievement was not increased by the awarding of career pay. Bush, Cheryl L. Mason (2003) found out that basic needs, school climate (decision-making, communication, goal commitment, and coordination influence) and end results (educational excellence, job satisfaction) were negatively correlated. Significant positive relationship was found out between self-actualization and end results.

The third context of review of related literature was (C) Intrinsic Motivation. Farber, Barry A. (1982) identified motivating aspects and stress factors of teaching. Bishay, Andre (1996) measured the levels of job satisfaction and motivation of teachers. de Jesus, Saul Neves and Lens, Willy., (2005) proposed and tested a model of teacher motivation that could integrate constructs from several cognitive-motivational theories. Peretomode, V.F. (2007) examined three states of decisional participation as determinants of teacher motivation, job satisfaction and morale.

Findings of the above studies show the intrinsic determinants of teacher motivation. They were: Working with students; learning and achievement of students (Farber, Barry A., 1982 & Bishay, Andre, 1996); family commitment (Farber, Barry A., 1982); school

organization and administration (Farber, Barry A., 1982 & Peretomode, V.F., 2007); leadership style (Wayne Pennington, Philip, 1997); interpersonal relationship (Farber, Barry A., 1982); job satisfaction (Peretomode, V.F., 2007); competence and commitment to job (Farber, Barry A., 1982); responsibility level (Bishay, Andre, 1996) and morale (Peretomode, V.F., 2007). The findings of the above studies show that Farber, Barry A. (1982) found out that the satisfactory experiences of teachers were those that made them feel sensitive to and involved with their students and committed to and competent in their job. Relationship with their colleagues, families and friends were also found important. Sources of stress were excessive paperwork, unsuccessful administrative meetings, and lack of advancement opportunities. Bishay, Andre C (1996) found out that teachers who worked in a school with students had high level of overall motivation and job satisfaction. It appeared that gratification of higher order needs was important for motivation and job satisfaction. de Jesus, Saul Neves and Lens, Willy (2005) found out that teachers suffered more than other professional groups from the occupational lack of motivation. Peretomode, V.F. (2007) found out that teachers who were given the opportunity by their principals to participate in as many decisions as they desired were more motivated, satisfied and had high morale than those who were deprived or saturated in decision-making.

Teacher motivation was found to differ on demographic variables such as gender, age, geographical location, length of service, small and large family, career stage and school achievement level, professional qualifications, levels and types of schools, teaching subject and teaching activity. Thus, it can be concluded that teacher motivation can be more effectively enhanced by work content factors like opportunities for professional

development, recognition, challenging and varied work, increased responsibility, achievement, empowerment, and authority as compared to work context factors that include working conditions such as class size, discipline conditions, and availability of teaching materials; the quality of the principal's supervision; and basic psychological needs such as money, status and security.

10. RESEARCH METHOD

In the present research study, Descriptive Survey Method was used to study the level of teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation.

11. LOCALE OF THE STUDY

In the present research study, secondary schools of Mehsana district were the locale of the study.

12. POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population of the present study consisted of secondary teachers from 260 government schools, grant-in-aid schools and private schools of Mehsana district of Gujarat. Sample of the present research were selected from 2415 secondary school teachers of Mehsana district.

13. SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

Sample of 953 secondary school teachers was selected from 149 government schools, grant-in-aid schools and private schools of Mehsana district using purposive sampling technique.

14. INSTRUMENTS OF THE STUDY

The researcher used self-constructed Teacher Self-Empowerment and Teacher Motivation Scale to collect the data from 953 teachers from 149 schools of Mehsana district.

(i) Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale: To measure teachers' self-empowerment the researcher prepared and standardized a self-rating Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale consisted of five subscales: (i) Decision Making; (ii) Professional Growth; (iii) Professional Knowledge; (iv) Status and (v) Self-Efficacy. The test-retest reliability of the scale was .891; split half reliability was .946 while the unequal-length Spearman Brown Prophecy formula estimated the reliability to be .972; and the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated to be .962. The content validity as well as convergent validity and discriminant validity (construct validity) were calculated.

(ii) Teacher Motivation Scale: To measure teachers' motivation the researcher prepared and standardized a self-rating Teacher Motivation Scale consisted of six subscales: (i) Competence; (ii) Responsibility; (iii) Autonomy; (iv) Recognition (v) Collegiality and (vi) Relatedness. The test-retest reliability of the scale was .905; split half reliability was .964 while the unequal-length Spearman Brown Prophecy formula estimated the reliability to be .982; and the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated to be .967. The content validity as well as convergent validity and discriminant validity (construct validity) were calculated.

16. DATA COLLECTION

In research study, various steps are involved to get a meaningful picture out of raw information gathered through the use of various tools. The data needs to be edited, classified and tabulated so that it should serve worthwhile purposes.

16.1 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The data of the present study was collected from teachers of secondary schools of government, grant-in-aid and private administrations of Mehsana district. The detail information schedule was prepared along with instructions and final forms of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale. This information was regarding gender, geographical location of their service, in-service training, academic qualifications, professional qualification, type of schools they are serving in, teaching experience, age of the secondary school teachers. The response pattern of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale were illustrated with instructions of the scales. The data collection procedure was accomplished by individual contacts of the teachers of secondary schools and by mailing the scales to the schools where it was not possible to reach by acquiring prior permission of the heads of the schools both from urban as well as rural areas within the time schedule of 5th December, 2013 to 23rd March, 2015.

16.2 DATA COLLECTION

The two scales-Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale were administered to 1335 secondary teachers (52.28%) of 163 schools (62.69%) of Mehsana district out of which responses of 1035 secondary school teachers (77.52%) from 149 schools i.e. 91.41 % of the schools were received from 5th December, 2013 to 23rd March, 2015. The total received response rate from the selected sample of secondary school teachers was 90.85% which was quite satisfactory to meet the objectives of the present research study. Out of 1035 secondary school teachers, the sample of 953 secondary school teachers i.e. 94.08% of the responses was finally considered to calculate and

analysis the data for the interpretation of the findings of the present research study. Out of responses of 1035 secondary school teachers, the responses of 82 (7.92 %) secondary school teachers were discarded for final data calculation, analysis and interpretations due to insufficient information for final calculation, analysis and interpretations of the data.

16.3 ORGANIZATION AND TABULATION OF DATA

The responses of total number of 953 secondary school teachers of government, grant-in-aid and private schools were recorded as per the scoring procedures of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale. The scores were obtained on each item of all the three scales with the items of respective dimensions to get the scores on different dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale. The score obtained on all the dimensions of the rating scales were added to calculate the total self-empowerment score and the total motivation score of individual teachers.

After scoring the collected data, the researcher conducted tabulation and statistical calculation. Tabulation refers to the recording of classified material in accurate mathematical terms by determining the range of gap between the highest and lowest score by deciding the number and size of groups or class intervals in which the data is to be arranged and by tallying the scores in their proper interval. The researcher himself has recorded properly edited and classified material following above mentioned steps. Before tabulation of collected data, due care was taken to test all raw data to serve the purpose for which they were gathered. Only useful and relevant data was tabulated for better results.

16. STATISTICAL TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

In the present research work, Mean, S.D., t-value, F-value, Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients statistical calculations were used to analyse and interpret obtained data by self- constructed Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

17. FINDINGS

The major objective of the present research work was to find out the relationship of teacher self-empowerment with teacher motivation and the relationship among their dimensions. To achieve this objective, the analysis and interpretations of data were made. Testing hypotheses of the research work had drawn findings of the research work.

The findings, conclusion, educational implications and suggestions for further research have been discussed. The findings are discussed under the following heads:

1. Performance of total sample of teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and its dimensions.
2. Performance of total sample of teachers on Teacher Motivation Scale and its dimensions.
3. Effect of gender on teacher self-empowerment.
4. Effect of gender on teacher motivation.
5. Effect of geographical location on teacher self-empowerment.
6. Effect of geographical location on teacher motivation.
7. Effect of in-service training on teacher self-empowerment.
8. Effect of in-service training on teacher motivation.
9. Effect of types of school on teacher self-empowerment.
10. Effect of types of school on teacher motivation.

11. Effect of academic qualifications on teacher self-empowerment.

12. Effect of academic qualifications on teacher motivation.

13. Effect of professional qualifications on teacher self-empowerment.

14. Effect of professional qualifications on teacher motivation.

15. Effect of teachers' age on teacher self-empowerment.

16. Effect of teachers' age on teacher motivation.

17. Effect of teaching experience on teacher self-empowerment.

18. Effect of teaching experience on teacher motivation.

19. Correlation coefficients among teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation and dimensions of teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation.

17.1 PERFORMANCE OF TOTAL SAMPLE OF TEACHERS ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT SCALE AND ITS DIMENSIONS.

(i) The total sample of secondary teachers reflected above average performance on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and the mean scores on the following dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale: (a) Decision-making; (b) Professional Growth; (c) Professional Knowledge; (d) Status and (e) Self-Efficacy.

17.2 PERFORMANCE OF TOTAL SAMPLE OF TEACHERS ON TEACHER MOTIVATION SCALE AND ITS DIMENSIONS.

(i) The total sample of secondary teachers reflected above average performance mean scores on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and the mean scores on the following dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale: (a) Competence; (b)

Responsibility; (c) Autonomy; (d) Recognition; (e) Collegiality and (f) Relatedness.

17.3 EFFECT OF GENDER ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of male teachers and total sample of female teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Mean and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.4 EFFECT OF GENDER ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of Male Teachers and total sample of Female Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.5 EFFECT OF GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of Rural Teachers and total sample of Urban Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.6 EFFECT OF GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) No significant difference was found between mean scores of total sample of Rural Teachers and total sample of Urban Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.7 EFFECT OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) The Teachers with In-Service Training were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than Teachers of without In-Service Training on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores (3.906≥ 1.96) and mean scores on Decision-Making (2.539 ≥ 1.96), Professional Growth (3.717≥ 1.96), Professional Knowledge (2.303 ≥ 1.96), Status (2.222 ≥ 1.96) and Self-Efficacy (3.473≥ 1.96) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.8 EFFECT OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) The Teachers with In-Service Training were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than Teachers without In-Service Training on Teacher Motivation Total Mean Scores (3.405≥ 1.96) and mean scores of Competence (3.398 ≥ 1.96), Responsibility (2.684≥ 1.96), Autonomy (2.498≥ 1.96), Recognition (2.057≥ 1.96), Collegiality (3.434≥1.96) and Relatedness (2.753≥1.96) dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.9 EFFECT OF TYPES OF SCHOOLS ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) The types of schools were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the total sample of Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools, Teachers of Government Schools and Teachers of Private Schools on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Decision-Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

(ii) Teachers of Government schools were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools and the Teachers of Private schools on mean scores on Status dimension (1.983≥1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.10 EFFECT OF TYPES OF SCHOOLS ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) The types of schools were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the total sample of Teachers of Grant-in-aid schools, Teachers of Government Schools and Teachers of Private Schools on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.11 EFFECT OF ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) The levels of academic qualifications were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the Under-graduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and Decision-Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.12 EFFECT OF ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) The levels of academic qualifications were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of the Under-graduate Academic Group of Teachers, Graduate

Academic Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Academic Group of Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality, and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.13 EFFECT OF PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) The levels of professional qualifications were found to have no significant effect on mean scores of Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Decision-Making, Professional Knowledge and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

(ii) Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on mean scores on Professional Growth dimension (2.592 $\geq$1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

(iii) Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on mean scores on Status dimension (2.039$\geq$1.96) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.14 EFFECT OF PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) The levels of professional qualifications were found to have no significant effect on Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers, Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.15 EFFECT OF TEACHERS' AGE ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status, and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

(ii) Teachers of 21-30 years of age were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on mean scores on Decision Making dimension ($2.989 \geq 1.96$) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.16 EFFECT OF TEACHERS' AGE ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 21-30 years of age, Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean

scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.17 EFFECT OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE ON TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT.

(i) No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and mean scores on the Decision-Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status, and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

(ii) Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores ($2.109 \geq 1.96$) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

(iii) Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Decision making dimension ($3.285 \geq 1.96$) of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale.

17.18 EFFECT OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE ON TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) No significant difference was found among mean scores of the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience and Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience on Teacher Motivation Total Scores and mean scores on the Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale.

(ii) Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher at .05 level of significance than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Recognition dimension (1.989 $\geq$1.96) of Teacher Motivation Scale.

17.19 CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AMONG TEACHER SELF-EMPOWERMENT AND TEACHER MOTIVATION.

(i) The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.668); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Competence dimension (.713); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Responsibility (.817); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Autonomy (.740); between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Recognition (.747); between Teacher

Empowerment Total Scores and Collegiality (.585); and between Teacher Empowerment Total Scores and Relatedness (.606) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

(ii) The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Decision Making and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.577); between Decision Making and Competence dimension (.529); between Decision Making and Responsibility (.518); between Decision Making and Autonomy (.467); between Decision Making and Recognition (.411); between Decision Making and Collegiality (.451); and between Decision Making and Relatedness (.510) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

(iii) The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Professional Growth and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.513); between Professional Growth and Competence dimension (.548); between Professional Growth and Responsibility (.456); between Professional Growth and Autonomy (.464); between Professional Growth and Recognition (.482); between Professional Growth and Collegiality (.467); and between Professional Growth and Relatedness (.591) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

(iv) The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Professional Knowledge and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.619); between Professional Knowledge and Competence dimension (.459); between Professional Knowledge and

Responsibility (.489); between Professional Knowledge and Autonomy (.557); between Professional Knowledge and Recognition (.631); between Professional Knowledge and Collegiality (.683); and between Professional Knowledge and Relatedness (.639) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

(v) The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Status and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.490); between Status and Competence dimension (.520); between Status and Responsibility (.585); between Status and Autonomy (.584); between Status and Recognition (.685); between Status and Collegiality (.589); and between Status and Relatedness (.621) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

(vi) The total sample of secondary school teachers reflected positive and significant relationship between Self-efficacy and Teacher Motivation Total Scores (.584); between Self-efficacy and Competence dimension (.623); between Self-efficacy and Responsibility (.670); between Self-efficacy and Autonomy (.758); between Self-efficacy and Recognition (.692); between Self-efficacy and Collegiality (.697); and between Self-efficacy and Relatedness (.510) dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

18. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study primarily investigated the relationship of teacher self-empowerment with teacher motivation. Teacher self-empowerment, in the present study, has been defined in

terms of teachers' power based on his / her professional knowledge to control critical decisions about teaching and learning conditions which results into professional respect and admiration. The findings of the present study showed that the total sample of secondary school teachers of Mehsana district reflected above average level of self-empowerment on total scores of the scale as well across the five subscales of the Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale. This finding implies that teachers perceive themselves self-empowered since they possess decision making opportunities about teaching-learning process of their classrooms; have scope for professional growth by upgrading their subject matter knowledge as well as disciplinary knowledge; are respected (status) and perform well (self-efficacy) in their schools. The results of research study of Sweetland, S.R and Hoy, W.K (2000) emphasized that teacher empowerment is effective when it is aimed at enhancing teacher professionalism rather than bureaucratic control and when teachers have power to make important classroom and instructional decisions.

There were no statistical significant differences in the level of self-empowerment on total scores and across the five subscales among the teachers based on gender, geographical location and academic qualifications. Teachers across all these independent variables reflected above average self-empowerment on total scores as well as on all the dimensions of the scale.

Teachers with In-service Training were found to be significantly higher than Teachers without In-service Training on total scores of the scale as well as on Decision Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status and Self-Efficacy dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale. This finding implies that in-service training of the teachers influences their decision-making strategy by developing competence and ability

(Self-Efficacy) to act in the educational settings which motivate them to feel more committed to their schools and to the teaching profession. It also implies that when the teachers are given opportunities to participate in different types of in-service training, they feel that they work in a supportive and nurturing environment that influences their feeling of commitment to the organization and the profession. Statistical significant difference was found between Teachers with In-service Training and Teachers without In-service Training on Professional Knowledge and Status dimensions of the scale. These findings indicate that teachers' in-service training helps the teachers to acquire the knowledge of the new teaching strategies and leads to professionalization of teaching of which professional growth is one measure as it enhances the teachers' existing knowledge of content and pedagogy. As a result the teachers get respect and admiration (Status) from higher authorities, colleagues, students as well as from the society and feel committed to their organization and to the teaching profession.

Teachers of Government Schools were found to be significantly higher than Teachers of Grant-in-aid Schools and Teachers of Private Schools on status dimension of the scale. This finding implies that the teachers employed in the government schools have more opportunities to grow professionally than Teachers of Grant-in-Aid Schools and Teachers of Private Schools. Authorities in grant-in-aid schools and private schools do not give more autonomy and opportunities to their teachers to grow professionally as compared to the authorities of government schools which have greatly impacted their feeling of commitment and responsibilities of students' achievement.

Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers were found to be significantly higher than the Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group

of Teachers on mean scores on Professional Growth dimension and Status dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale which shows that Under-graduate Professional Group of Teachers make attempts to grow professionally as compared to Graduate Professional Group of Teachers and Post-graduate Professional Group of Teachers.

Teachers of 21-30 years of age were found to be significantly higher the Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age on mean scores on Decision Making dimension of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale which shows that Teachers of 21-30 years of age participate in decision making of schools procedures more enthusiastically than the Teachers of 31-40 years of age, Teachers of 41-50 years of age and Teachers of 51-60 years of age .

Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Decision Making Dimension which shows that teachers having more experience reflects more empowerment through acquiring decision making skills.

The total sample of the teachers reflected above average motivation level on the total scores and the means scores on the dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale. This finding implies that the teachers perceive themselves primarily committed to their teaching profession; feel competent to carry out their responsibilities by taking different independent decisions (autonomy) for students' academic excellence as well as achievement. It also implies that teachers feel that their ability to carry out

responsibilities and commitment towards organization and the profession (relatedness) are duly recognized by the authorities as well as by their colleagues (collegiality).

No statistical significant differences were found in the level of motivation on total scores and on the scores of six subscales of Teacher Motivation Scale among the teachers based on gender, geographical location, type of schools, academic qualifications, professional qualifications, and age.

Teachers with In-service Training were found to be significantly higher than Teachers without In-service Training on total scores and the scores on Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions of Teacher Motivation Scale. These findings imply that teachers who get opportunities for in-service training feel competent to carry out their responsibilities since it enhances their expertise and efficiency which motivate the teachers to believe that they can make a difference with their students. Thus, those teachers who have high expectations of themselves to perform effectively and successfully in school carry out extra functions beyond the formal ones and feel more involved and committed to their students, colleagues, organization and to the teaching profession.

Teachers of 29-35 years of teaching experience were found to be significantly higher than the Teachers of 1-7 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 8-14 years of teaching experience, Teachers of 15-21 years of teaching experience and the Teachers of 22-28 years of teaching experience on mean scores on Recognition dimension of Teacher Motivation Scale which shows that teachers with more professional growth with the length of the service and teacher's commitment and achievements bring him recognition from authorities, colleagues, students and community.

Statistically significant and positive correlation coefficients were found between the Total Scores of Teacher Self-empowerment Scale and Total Scores of Teacher Motivation Scale; and significant, positive and high correlation coefficients were found among the dimensions of Teacher Self-Empowerment Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale.

These findings imply teacher self-empowerment can necessarily be increased by teacher motivation since teacher motivation was highly correlated with teacher self-empowerment. This finding implies that teacher self-empowerment varies with teacher motivation and teacher motivation has greater magnitude of influence on teacher self-empowerment which supports the conceptual framework that teacher self-empowerment is one of the most important constructs of teacher motivation.

The findings of this study of secondary school teachers of Mehsana district of Gujarat state lend support to several conclusions mentioned below:

The results of the present study support the conceptual and theoretical frameworks of the study. First, the data shows that teachers perceive themselves motivated and self-empowered if they feel in-charge of initiating and implementing their pedagogical practices in the classroom by making use of their professional competence with decision-making autonomy and responsibility to carry out instructional strategies successfully.

Second, teachers with in-service training showed higher level of self-empowerment and motivation than teachers without in-service training which indicate that in-service training of the teachers is very important factor for enhancing teacher motivation and teacher self-empowerment. It was important to note that teachers with in-service training perceived themselves self-empowered on all the dimensions i.e. Decision-making, Professional Growth Professional Knowledge, Status and Self-Efficacy dimensions

which indicate teachers who participate in in-service training perceive that they have opportunities for professional growth. Third, teachers of government schools perceived more self-empowered since they feel opportunities for professional growth in their schools as compared to teachers of grant-in-aid schools and teachers of private schools. Junior Teachers with less teaching experience i.e. Teachers of 21-30 Years of Age participate enthusiastically in decision making strategy than Senior Teachers i.e. Teachers of 31-40 Years of age, Teachers of 41-50 Years of Age and Fourth, Teachers of 51-60 Years of Age. Teachers of 29-35 Years of Teaching Experience feel more empowered and motivated than Teachers of 1-7 Years of Teaching Experience, Teachers of 8-14 Years of Teaching Experience, Teachers of 15-21 Years of Teaching Experience, Teachers of 22-28 Years of Teaching Experience. Fifth, teacher motivation and teacher self-empowerment are positively and significantly related.

19. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Important implications of the present study based on the findings are as follows:

1. The findings of the present research work show that teachers perceive themselves empowered when they have autonomy to make their own decisions; when they feel that they have opportunities to grow professionally; when they make use of their professional knowledge to achieve their instructional goals and when they feel that they are efficacious to meet out challenges. Thus, genuine teacher self-empowerment can be grown and flourished when the principals of the schools are supportive and egalitarian than directive and restrictive.
2. The data of the present research support the conceptual framework that teachers feel motivated when they work with their students; when they feel that they can contribute

to students' achievement and when they feel that they have support of their colleagues and students to carry out their responsibilities. Hence, the principals of the schools should recognize the efforts made by the teachers for students' achievement and colleagues should lend professional and moral support to the other teachers to carry out their responsibilities successfully.

3. Teachers with In-service Training were found differ significantly than Teachers without In-service Training on Teacher Self-Empowerment Total Scores, Decision Making, Professional Growth, Professional Knowledge, Status and Self-Efficacy dimensions which indicate that existing in-service training programme contribute much to professional knowledge of the teachers. Hence, principals of the schools and policy makers should make strategies for teachers' high quality professional development which can improve their professional performance.

4. Teachers with In-service Training were found differ significantly than Teachers without In-service Training on Teacher Motivation Total Scores, Competence, Responsibility, Autonomy, Recognition, Collegiality and Relatedness dimensions. This indicates that there is need to launch different educational in-service programmes that motivate the teachers to create an environment of collegial leadership and mentorship which in turn make them competent to execute their own responsibilities successfully.

5. Teachers of Government Schools found to differ significantly than Teachers of Grant-in-aid Schools and Teachers of Private School on Professional Growth dimension. The principal of the grant-in-aid schools and private schools should motivate the teachers to participate in in-service training that provide them the opportunities to

grow professionally so that with professional development they can execute their responsibilities more effectively.

20. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present research was conducted with some delimitation related to sample size, variables etc. In view of the delimitations and findings of the present research work, following suggestions have been listed below for further research:

1. The study was delimited to the secondary school teachers (N=953) of Mehsana district. The study can be conducted on large sample of teachers i.e. secondary school teachers of Gujarat state so that a deeper understanding of teachers' motivation and self-empowerment can be cultivated.
2. The present research study was conducted in secondary schools, it may be worthwhile to investigate elementary schools and higher secondary schools to determine whether the results presented here reflect the general situation of teachers on all levels.
3. The impact of decentralized school governance on teacher motivation and teacher self-empowerment as opposed to the impact of centralized school governance on teacher self-empowerment and teacher motivation should be investigated.
4. The same study can be conducted by taking up sample of teachers of the same schools so as to compare the findings of the present research work and proposed future research suggestions of this study.
5. In the present research study the quantitative approach was employed. The same study can be conducted by employing qualitative approach.

REFERENCES

Aggarwal, Y.P. (1988). Statistical methods: Concepts, application and computation (2nd Edi.). Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi.

Alexander, Robin (2000). Culture and Pedagogy. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequality in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz(ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press.

Barmby, P. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention. *Educational Research, 48* (3), 248-265.

Barnes, M. (2003). Exploring teachers' understanding of pupil motivation. *Educational Psychology in Scotland, 7* (1).

Barry, K., & King, L. (1998). Beginning teaching and beyond. London: Social Science Press.

Baumeister, R.F., & Bushman, B.J. (2008). Social psychology & human nature. Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.

Beck, L.J. (2000). Metaphors of educational community: Analysis of the images that reflect and influence scholarship and practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35* (1), 13-45.

Bell, J. (2004) Doing your research project: a guide for first time researchers in education and social science. UK: Open University Press.

Belle, Louis Jinot (2007). The role of secondary school principals in motivating teachers in Flaq district of Mauritius. *http://www.dissertation.pdf.*

Bennell, Paul and Akyeampong, Kwame (2007). Teacher motivation in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Department of International Development. *http://www.ResearchingtheIssuesNo.71.pdf.*

Best, John W., & Kahn, James V. (2006). Research in education (9th ed.). Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.

Bishay, Andre (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: A study of employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Science*, 3, 147-154.

Boggiano, A.K., & Pittman, T.S. (1992). Achievement and motivation: A social development perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 20, 277-289.

Bomotti, Sally, Ginsberg, Rick, & Cobb, Brian (1999) Teacher in charter and traditional schools: A comparative study. *Educational Policy Analysis Achieves, 7* (22).

Borse, M.N (2012), Handbook of Research Methodology, Shree Niwas Publications, Jaipur, ISBN:978-81-88730-97-1.

Bush, Cheryl L.Mason (2003). Perceptions of school climate in charter schools and teacher motivation levels [Ed.D.]Wayne State University; AAT 3116517. *http://proquest.umi.com/pdlink?did=765202151.*

Caladarci, T. (1992). Teacher's sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 60* (4), 323-334.

Canvery, R& Others (2013) Research Methodology, S. Chand & Company Ltd. New Delhi, ISBN: 81-219-2220-8

Castells, M. (1996). The rise of the network society. Oxford, UK, Blackwell.

Cheng, K.M. (2002). The quest for quality education: The quality assurance movement in Hong Kong. In J.K.H. Mok and D.K.K. Chan (Eds.) Globalization and education (pp. 41-65). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Cole, G.A. (1996). Organizational behavior. DP Publications.

Crawford, M. (1997). Leadership and teams in educational management. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Crosby, Philip B. (1988). The eternally successful organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cunningham, W.G., & Gresso, D.W. (1993). Cultural leadership: The culture of excellence in education. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.

Davis, J. and Wilson, S. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House, 73* (6), 349-353.

De Jesus, Saul Neves and Lens, Willy (2005). An integrated model for the study of teacher motivation. *Applied Psychology. 54* (1), 119-134.

Dembo, M.H. (2001). Learning to teach is not enough: Future teachers also need to learn how to learn. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 28, 23-35.

Dorneyei, Zoltan (2001). Motivational strategies in the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drafke, M.W., & Kossen, S. (1998). The human side of organization. Reading: Addison.

Duke, D.L., & Gansneder, B. (1990). Teacher empowerment: A view from the classroom. *Educational Policy, 4 (2)*, 145-156.

Ellis, T.I. (1984). Motivating teachers for excellence. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management: ERIC Digest, Number 6. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED 259449.

Evans. L. (2001). Delving deeper into morale, job satisfaction and motivation among educational professionals: Re-examining the leadership dimension. *Educational Management and Administration, 29* (3), 291-306.

Farber, Barry A. (1982). Stress and burnout: Implications for teacher motivation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (New York, NY;March1982). ERIC. ED=222483. *http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERIC Web Portal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED222483.*

Feigenbaum, Arrand V. (1983). Total quality control. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fernet, C., Senecal, C., Guay, F., Marsh, H., & Dowson, M. (2006). The work tasks motivation scale for teachers. *http://Fernet%20et%20al%20juin%202006.pdf.*

Frase, L.E. (1989). The effects of teaching rewards on recognition and job enrichment. Journal of Educational Research, 83 (1), 53-57.

Frase, L.E. (1992). Maximizing people power in schools: Motivating and managing teachers. Newbury Park, CA: Crowin Press, Inc.

Fresko, B., Kfir, D., & Nasser, F. (1997). Predicting teacher commitment. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 13* (3), 429-438.

Garrett, Henry E., & Woodworth, R.S. (1969). Statistics in psychology and education (6th Edi.). Vaklis, Feffer and Simons Private Ltd, Bombay.

Gawel, J. (1997). Herzberg's theory of motivation and Maslow's hierarchy of needs: Practical Assessment, *Research and Evaluation, 5* (11), 1-6.

Greene, Maxim (1973). Teachers as strangers: Educational philosophy for modern age. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., California.

Gore, J.M. (1989). Agency, structure and the rhetoric of teacher empowerment. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 308180).

Hergberg, F., **Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959).** The motivation to work (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hargreaves, A., & Leslie, N.K. Lo. (2000). The paradoxical profession: Teaching at the turn of the century. *PROSPECTS,* 30 (2), (Issue number 114).

Harmer, J. (2001). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14* (8), 835-854.

Huysamen, G.K. (1995). Methodology for the social and behaviour sciences. Bloonfoutein: South book publishers.

Ingersoll, Richard (2003). Who controls teachers' work? Power and Accountability in America's schools. Harvard University Press. *http://www.teacherworkingconditions.org/empowerment/index.html#_ftnref1*.

Ingram, D.C. (1997). Leadership behavior of principals in inclusive setting. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35* (4), 411-427.

Joyce, A. Beckett, Anderson & Jackson, L.F. ( ). Teacher empowerment as perceived by South Carolina teachers and principals.

Keiser, N., and Shen, J. (2000). Principals' and teachers' perception of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3):115-118.

Klecker, Beverly & Loadman, William E. (1996). A study of teacher empowerment in 180 restructuring schools: Leadership implications, 48p.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (48th Chicago, IL, Feb.21-24, 1996).

Klecker, Beverly & Loadman, William E. (1996). Dimensions of teacher empowerment: Identifying new roles for classroom teachers in restructuring schools, 24p.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of Mid-South Educational Research Association (Tuscaloosa, AL, November 6-8, 1996) Pub. Nov.1996.

Kottler, J. A. & Zehn, S.J. (2000). On being a teacher: The human dimension. California: Corwin Press.

Kremmer, M., N.Chaudhary, F.H. Rogers, K. Murlidharan and J. Hammer (2005). Teacher absence in India: A snapshot. *Journal of European Economic Association 3* (2-3), 658-667.

Kruse, Sharon D., & Louis, Karen Seashore (1998). Creating conditions of empowerment: Resilient teachers and resilient students. Centre for Applied Research and Education Improvement, v6. nl, Research/Practice Newsletter. (Fall 1998).

Kusereka, Louis Garudzo (2003). Factors influencing the motivation of Zimbabwean secondary school teachers: An education management perspective. Unisa Electronic

Theses and Dissertation-description. University of South Africa, 2003, MED (EDUCATION MANAGEMENT) etd-03152005-110620 (urn).

Latham, A.S. (1998). Teacher satisfaction. *Educational Leadership*, 55, 82-83.

Liberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works, *Phi Delta Kappan, 71* (10), 759-764.

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

Lichtenstein, G., McLaughlin,M., & Knudsen, J. (1991). Teacher empowerment and professional knowledge. *CPRE Research Report Series*. New Burnswick, NJ; Consortium for Policy Research in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 337857).

Lortie, D. (1976). School teacher: A sociological study Chicago. Univeristy of Chicago Press.

Luce, J.K. (1998). Career ladder: Modifying teachers' work to sustain motivation. *Education, 19* (1), 15-19.

Maeroff, G.I. (1988). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*. *69* (71), 472-477.

Maeroff, G.I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. New York. NY: Teachers College Press.

Maeroff, G.I. (1988). Teacher empowerment: A step forward professionalization. A bulletin special. *NASSP Bulletin, 72* (511), 52-60.

McKinney, Pamela Anee (2000). A study to assess the relationship among student achievement, teacher motivation and incentive pay. *http://www.dissertationsept2002.pdf.*

Marks, H. M. & Louis. K.S. (1997) Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19,* (3), 245-275.

Martin, O.L. (1990). Instructional leadership behaviors that empower teacher effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 327513).

Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, p.370.

Maslow, A.H. (1970). Motivation and personality. 2nd edition, New York: Harper and Row.

Millet, Marcial J. (2005). An Examination of factors related to the retention of new teachers in the Metropolitan Nashville Tennessee School System. *UMI ProQeuest Digital Dissertation*, DAI-A 66/03, p.963, AAT 3167781, Sep.2005.

Mitchell, D.E., Ortiz, F.I. & Mitchell, I.K. (1987). Work orientation and job performance: Toward a cultural theory of work motivation. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Moore, W.P., & Esselman, M.E. (1992). Teacher efficacy, empowerment, and a focused instructional climate: Does student achievement benefit? Paper presented at

the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 350252).

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

Murthy, D. (2003). Motivating teachers. The Hindu:1.

Ofoegbu, F.I. (2004). Teacher motivation: A factor for classroom effectiveness and school improvement in Nigeria. *College Student Journal,* 1-6**.** ERIC. EJ:701 985.

Ololube, Nwachukwn Prince (2007) Teacher job satisfaction and motivation for school effectiveness: An assessment. *http://www.ololube.pdf.*

Oluchukwu, E.E. (2000) Staff motivation towards effective job performance in Nigerian schools. Management in Nigerian Education: Personal Administration and Quality in Education. Fadipe, J.O. and Ojedele, P.K. (eds.) 3, 25-39.

Owens, R.G. (1995). Organizational behavior in education. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Paynter, Jeanne L. (2004) The motivational profiles of teachers: Teachers' preferences for extrinsic, intrinsic and moral motivators. 194 pages. [Ed.D. dissertation]. United State-Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University;2004. ATT:3130757.

Pearson L., Carolyn, & Moomaw, William (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29, 38-54, ERIC: EJ718115.

Peretomode, V.F. (2007). Decisional deprivation, equilibrium and saturation as variables in teacher motivation, job satisfaction and morale in Nigeria. Academic Leadership. 4 (1). *http://academicleadership.org/empericalresearch/full.html*. (22nd Feb.2007)

Pintrinch, P.R., & Schunk, D.H. (1996). Motivation in education: Theory, research and applications. Eaglewood Cliff: Prentice-Hall.

Portelli, Maria Viviana (2004) Exploring teacher motivation, satisfaction and health in the secondary sector. *http://www.education.gov.mt/edu/edu.htm*.

PROBE Report (1999). Public report on basic education in India. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Raffini, J.P. (1996). 150 ways to increase intrinsic motivation in the classroom. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

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

Rice, E.M., & Schneider, G.T. (1994). A decade of teacher empowerment: An empirical analysis of teacher involvement in decision-making, 1980-1991. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32* (1), 43-58.

Rinehart, J.S., & Short, P.M. (1994). Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers, and regular classroom teachers. *Education, 114* (4), 379-399.

Robin, S.P. (1989). Organizational behaviour. Prentice-Hall Internal Inc. p.184.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well being. *American Psychologist,* 55(1), 68-78.

Scribner, Jay Paredes, D. Truell, R. Hager, Douglas and Sirachi, Sonthana (2001). An exploratory study of career and technical education teacher empowerment: Implications for school teachers. Journal of Career and Technical Education, 18 (1), 46-57.ERIC. EJ:636659.

Short, P. M. (1998). Empowering Leadership. *Contemporary Education, 69* (2), 70-72.

Short, P.M., & Greer, J.T. (1997). Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Short, P.M., Greer J.T. & Michael, L. (1991). Restructuring schools through empowerment: Facilitating the process. *Journal of School Leadership. 1*(2), 5-25.

Short, P.M., & Rinehart, J.S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement. 52* (4), 951-960.

Short, P. M., Greer, J.T. & Melvin, W. M. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Research, 32* (4), 38-52.

Singh, B. (1980). Teachers' motivation to work. Ph.D. Edu., Rajasthan University. M.B.Buch (Ed.) Third Survey of Research in Education 1978-1983, N.C.E.R.T., 1987. pp.843.

Somech, Anit (2005). Directive versus participative leadership: Two complementary approaches to managing school effectiveness. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41* (5), 777-800, ERIC: EJ723345.

Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education 20*, 277-299.

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

Srivastava, M.K. (2003) Transformational Leadership, Macmillan India Ltd., Delhi, ISBN: 1403-91077-4

Steyn, G.M. (2002). A theoretical analysis of educator motivation and morale. *Educare, 31* (1-2), 251-254.

Suslu, S. (2006). Motivation of Esl teachers. The Internet. *TESL Journal, 12* (1), 1-8.

UNESCO (2004). EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005: Education for All-The Quality Imperative. Paris: UNESCO.

Vail, K. (2005) Climate control. *American School Board Journal, 192* (6): 16-19.

Vroom, V.H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: John Willy & Sons.

VSO (2002) What makes teachers tick? A policy research report on teachers' motivation in developing countries. London, England. *http// www.org.uk./Images/position_papers_what_makes_teachers_tick_tcm8_2981.pdf.*

Wall, Russell & Rinehart, James S. (1997). School-based decision making and empowerment of secondary school teachers, 22p; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997) ERIC. ED:407 733, EA: 028 363.

Wan, Eric (2005). Teacher empowerment: Concepts, strategies, and implications for schools in Hong Kong. *Teacher College Record*, 107 (4), 842-86.

W.P., Philip (1997). Principal leadership and teacher motivation in secondary schools, Tennessee State University. *http://e-researchotnstate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1107&context=dissertations.*

Weiss, J. (2006). 10 tips to keep motivated employees. Jim Blasingame: The small business advocate.

Weld, J. (1998). Beyond the salary carrot. *Education Week, 17* (38), 33-35.

White, P.A. (1992) Teacher empowerment under "ideal" school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 14* (1), 69-82.

Wright, M., & Custer, R. (1998). Why they enjoy teaching: The motivation of outstanding technology teachers. *Journal of Technology Education, Spring, 9* (2), 60-77.

Yonemura, M. (1986). Reflections on teacher empowerment and teacher education, *Harvard Educational Review. 56* (4), 473-80.

****