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A Presentation and Theories in Support of Teacher and Principal Empowerment as Proposed by the Freedom School Model of School Governance

About 25 years ago the findings of the National Commission on Excellence on Education (1983), in its report “A Nation at Risk” revealed that the professional working life of teachers is, on the whole, unacceptable for a professional. The Commission issued seven recommendations to improve the preparation of teachers and to make teaching a more rewarding profession. These recommendations have for all practical purposes been ignored by educational policy makers in the various state legislatures. Congress too, with its continuing bent on passing more legislation to control public schools, has apparently overlooked the recommendations as well.

The whole idea of teacher professionalism has been the topic of much debate since the issuance of the Commission’s report. Many researchers have argued that it is time to upgrade the status, training, and working conditions of teachers. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006; Ingersoll & Alsalam, 1997).

John Swett, California’s most prominent free school advocate at the time the California Constitution was adopted, warned: “Our destruction, should it come at all, will be … [f]rom the inattention of the people to the concerns of government….. I fear that they may place too implicit confidence in their public servants and fail properly to scrutinize their conduct…. Make them intelligent, and they will be vigilant; give them the means of detecting the wrong, and they will apply the remedy.” (Quoted in Cloud, The Story of California’s Schools, p. 20.) Swett is right if he refers to state and federal bureaucrats, as they have taken over more and more control of public education at the expense of teachers and school principals.

Swett points out a troubling event that is present today throughout the United States. There has been scant attention paid to and little analysis from a systemic view of the entire system of public school governance for over 50 years. This system of public school governance includes Congress, the United States Department of Education, state boards of education, school boards, superintendents, central office administrators, school building administrators, teachers, universities, and others. The governance system of public schools has remained largely unchanged since the horse and buggy era. The fact that it has been over 50 years since we have had any positive significant change in K-12 public school governance, this fact alone should alone be sufficient cause to examine the nation’s public school governance system. The results the nation is obtaining from its public school system may be another reason to examine the governance system. However, perhaps even a more compelling reason to examine the system of public school governance is that many of the people who deal with students on a daily basis, and who have the most interaction with students, teachers and school principals have become demoralized, demotivated, and distraught due to the current environment they must work in, which is a direct result of a highly regulated and politicized public school governance system. This system deskills them and disrespects them. This deskillings disrespect can affect their job performance and their ability to meet the needs of students.

To correct these problems, this writer argues for the creation of a new era of public schools – the freedom school era. The new model of public school governance, the freedom school model, rests upon the theory that a deregulated and depoliticized public school governance system that empowers teachers and school principals. The theory behind the new governance system is that it will result higher levels of teacher and principal motivation which will translate to improved teaching performance - which will result in improved student academic performance in the nation’s K-12 public schools.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the literature and theories that support this call for empowerment of teachers and school principals under this new governance design. A review of motivation theory will be undertaken. Before examining the literature that provides the basis for the theory that school performance will improve if teachers and principals are empowered, the design of the freedom school model of public school governance will be described.

I. The Freedom School Model of Public School Governance

The freedom school model is a unique and newly proposed structure and system of public school governance. The model largely de-regulates and de-politicizes public schools. Under this new model of public school governance, rather than electing school board members, they are appointed and required to have special expertise. School districts are reorganized into county units. Although this model calls for school district
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1 Although there is no known model of school governance that has all the essential elements of the freedom model of school governance, a select blue-ribbon committee appointed by the Governor of Massachusetts has recently developed a model of schools called readiness schools which is similar to the freedom school model. See Governor of Massachusetts (2008).
consolidation in those instances where counties have multiple school districts, the model does not require consolidating individual schools. Nor would consolidating schools be encouraged under the new model. Thus, rural schools and small schools would not only continue to exist, but might even expand in number.

With this new model, a school building leadership team, consisting of a principal and several senior level faculty members who will lead the faculty, will negotiate five year school operating contracts with school boards. These contracts will govern the academic and day to day operations of the school. Certain performance standards and accountability requirements will be included in the contract. The contract also includes a requirement that the school staff must adopt the quality philosophy and must use the quality process tools in their effort to continuously improve.

Under this new model, the student’s parents have a wide choice of schools for their child to attend. Any school within the county will be available to the student and his parents. However, transportation will only be provided to certain schools in the general area of each student’s residence. Government school funding will flow to school buildings based upon student enrollment under a weighted student-funding formula which will provide increased per student revenue for children who have special needs.

At the heart of freedom schools are de-regulation, de-politicization, and the empowerment of teachers and principals. Schools are freed of excessive government regulation in return for strict accountability requirements. Day to day decision-making authority is delegated to the building leadership team. School boards, superintendents, and central office staff do not manage the academic operations of the school but focus instead on facilities and transportation during the term of each operating contract.

Only if the contract’s performance requirements are met will the school leadership team be guaranteed a renewal of their five-year contract. With this new empowerment of teachers and principals comes the ability for schools to be flexible, innovative, and creative. Teachers and school leaders, not government bureaucrats, will determine school rules, policies, curriculum, textbooks, and instructional strategies and methods within the framework of state adopted standards. The new freedom school will have a variety of academic and other measurements of quality. This model results in empowerment and an increase of professionalism for teachers and school level leaders. Their authority to manage the school increases while their accountability for results also increases.

The theory behind freedom schools, although unique and untested in the United States, is not without support from the world community. The World Bank/IMF\(^2\) central strategy for creating optimal conditions for successful economic development in impoverished nations is a strategy of decentralization of public schools and democracy. (World Bank 2002) [as cited in Barrs 2005]. Like the World Bank, the goal of freedom schools is to create conditions which encourage greater levels of participation in local school governance by teachers and principals. As suggested by the World Bank, this will lead to improved local school governance that is more representative and thus more accountable. The underlying theory behind the World Bank’s strategy, and behind the freedom school governance design, is that enhanced local school governance will increase the demand for better services and that greater autonomy will also allow more innovation and competition to help raise standards and the quality of services. (Barrs, 2005).

As a final comment, the freedom school model is a governance design for public schools, not private schools. It is not a voucher plan that would divert taxpayers’ money to private schools. The model will significantly change the role and function of state and federal legislative bodies, state boards of education, state departments of education, school boards, and school district central offices. The empowerment of teachers, principals, and building level school leaders will rise to unprecedented levels.

The choice of public school governance structure is a political choice. (Levacic, 2002). Thus, it is up to the various state legislatures to create a deregulated and depoliticized public school governance system. It is also up to the U.S. Congress to deregulate the public school system as they have enticed public schools into more and more federal regulations governing public schools in exchange for taxpayer money collected by the federal government and then redistributed to the states to spend on specific education programs.

**Review of Literature that Supports Theory of Empowerment**

Throughout the past quarter of a century, teachers and school principals have encountered many changes in their professional lives. New educational programs have come and gone, new administrative regulations by state and federal agencies have been promulgated, and more and more state and federal statutes have been enacted into law governing teachers and principals. Teachers also experience other changes, such as a change in school board and school corporation mission, vision and direction; change in superintendents with new visions, goals, and reforms for
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2 The World Bank/IMF is the most influential player in the formation of international policies aimed at development in low and middle income countries throughout the world.
the school district; a change in principals, often bringing new leadership styles to the staff; a change in school buildings, assignments, and classes; and many other changes. Many of these changes to reform public education have been mismanaged, ill-conceived, and short-lived. As a result, many experienced teachers have developed deep skepticism about how supportive the school context will be for their implementation efforts. (Huberman, 1998). Leithwood et al. (2002) report that negative context beliefs created by these past negative experiences can attach themselves onto teachers’ perceptions of current reform initiatives in their schools and thus erode the motivation to implement a reform. [p. 101-102]

Recent studies illustrate that teachers suffer more than other professional groups from an occupational lack of motivation. Many teachers are not highly motivated. (Neves de Jesus & Lens, 2005). In spite of the fundamental importance attributed to teacher motivation, research reveals that teachers exhibit lower levels of motivation and higher levels of stress. (Alvarez et al., 1993; Esteve, 1992; Kyriacou, 1987; Lens & Jesus, 1999; Pithers & Fogarty, 1995; Prick, 1989). Teaching is a highly stressful and complex profession that routinely presents even the most capable teachers with problems and dilemmas. (Butler, 2007). Leading a public school is even more stressful and complex. Many principals also not only suffer from stress but also have a lack of occupational motivation because they continuously practice their profession in a school governance system that ignores their professional skills, talents, training, and education, and all too often deskills them and reduces them to legal compliance officers. They work in an environment of compliance as opposed to an environment of creativity and innovation. This causes stress as their need to achieve self-actualization is frustrated and denied because of the demands to implement other people’s laws, rules, ideas, and visions.

Hargreaves defines change as movement from one state to another and reminds us that change and emotion are inseparable. (Hargreaves, 2004). Many of these changes require the teacher or principal to abandon familiar routines and relationships for new routines and new relationships. Many changes that teachers and principals encounter are accompanied by profound feelings of loss. (Maris, 1974). This can lead to feelings of anxiety, insecurity, and even abandonment, particularly when changes in leadership occurs. (Fink & Brayman, 2004; Loader, 1997). All too often school districts incur frequent changes in leadership at district and school building levels. These frequent and repeated rotations of leadership, and the constant changes in direction of schools and school districts that these leadership changes bring, can result in high levels of endemic insecurity in teachers and principals. Teachers and principals learn to harden themselves against all change and its champions. (Hargreaves, 2004; MacMillan, 2000; Hargreaves & Fink, 2004).

The renowned psychologist Kurt Lewin observed that there can be no change without pain (cited in Abrahamson, 2004, p. 19). This is especially true in the schoolhouse. Poorly conceived and badly managed change results in excessive and unnecessary emotional suffering for teachers and principals. (Hargreaves, 2004). When the frequency of change is repetitive, two results occur: initiative overload and change-related-chaos. Initiative overload happens when there are more change initiatives than teachers and principals can reasonably handle. Change-related chaos occurs when the continuous state of upheaval that results when so many instances of change have permeated the school organization that few employees know which change they are implementing and why they are implementing that change. Change-related chaos also frequently occurs when staff changes and there are few or no employees left who have the organizational memory of how things get done. The resulting pain for a school organization experiencing change-related chaos is administratively unnecessary, organizationally disruptive, and personally demoralizing to teachers and principals. (Abrahamson, 2004, p. 3).

When teachers and principals are confronted with an idea for educational change, they first think it is probably externally mandated rather than internally developed. (Goodson, 2001). The most recent wave of educational reform that began in the 1990’s, which ushered in the standards and accountability era, has had an emotionally negative and painful effect on teachers and principals. (Hargreaves, 2004). Some of the negative effects on teachers and principals of this new era of mandated reforms include: feelings of demoralization, (Nias, 1991) lost confidence, (Helsby, 1999) resignation, and retreatism, (Woods et al., 1997; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Troman & Woods, 2000) disabling degrees of teacher stress, (Dinham & Scott, 1997) feeling abused and degraded by the derogatory tones of school reformers, (Hargreaves, 2003); becoming distrustful of politicians and school leaders (Hargreaves, 2003); and feelings of anger, annoyance, and frustration directed outwards towards government, bureaucrats, and school leaders (Hargreaves, 2004). Thus, it is not hard to understand why teachers and school...
principals, who conceive educational change as mostly mandated external change, view this change as unwanted, imposed, repetitious, and repellent, compared with internally developed change – which they often embrace. (Hargreaves, 2004).

**Definitions of Motivation.** Motivation has been variously defined in the literature. Deci & Ryan (1985 p. 3) defined motivation as the energization and direction of behavior. Geen (1995, p. 2) referred to motivation as the initiation, intensity, and persistence of behavior. Berelson & Steiner (as quoted in Owens, 1991, p. 102) viewed motivation as made up of inner striving conditions, such as wishes, desires, and drives that activates or moves individuals. As to work motivation, Hoy & Miskel (1991 p. 168) see motivation as the complex forces, drives, needs, tension states, or other mechanisms that start and maintain work-related behaviors toward the achievement of personal goals. Finally, Hersey and Blanchard (1977, p. 16) observed that motivation is the level of effort an individual is willing to apply toward the achievement of a particular goals or motive.

**Views of People and How They Affect Motivation.** A discussion on motivation would be incomplete without mention of the theories that have been developed to explain how an individual views other people. The way an individual views people shapes the individual’s view of motivation.

Douglas McGregor’s (1960) familiar Theory X and Theory Y is a helpful starting point. An individual who embraces his Theory X will view people as inherently lazy, unmotivated, shirking responsibility, and disliking work of any kind. Proponents of Theory X believe workers must be coerced, controlled, and threatened with punishment. The frequent management style of Theory X leaders is to use the “carrot-and-stick” approach to management. In other words, Theory X proponents believe it is necessary to develop a system of rewards and punishments to manage workers and induce them to behave in the desirable way.

The Leave No Child Behind Act (2002) and the various state accountability laws were derived, perhaps unwittingly, out of Theory X principles. State accountability laws are mixed in that some states provide only punishments for schools that fail to achieve the legislatively mandated performance on standardized tests, while others have these punishments but also reward teachers with performance pay for students that excel in meeting the desired standards. The federal law, however, is clear in that it provides only punishments and not rewards.

An individual with McGregor’s (1960) Theory Y orientation will view other people as workers who naturally enjoy their work and who derive deep personal satisfaction from their work. Theory Y leaders understand that workers are self-directed and self-controlled if they are committed to the organization’s objectives. Proponents of Theory Y believe even the average worker can learn to accept responsibility and that all workers, not just managers, can make good decisions. With the top down nature of the mandates of state and federal laws, and the controlling nature of laws and regulations, it is apparent that state and federal legislators have discarded Theory Y as a viable theory for the nation’s public schools.

Perhaps neither Theory X nor Theory Y fully explain public school teachers and principals inclinations and nature. Perhaps what is need is a new theory – Theory X+Y. Perhaps all people have some Theory X and some Theory Y in themselves, but just in varying degrees. The degree of each Theory present in teachers and principals may well be dependent upon the work environment that they find themselves in – with a disrespecting and distrusting work environment that fails to treat them as respected and admired caring professionals encouraging Theory X behavior, and a respectful and trusting work environment encouraging and enabling Theory Y behavior. Certainly attempting to create a trusting and respectful professional work environment for teachers and principals would be worth a try from state and federal legislators.

William Ouchi (1981) advanced the idea of Theory Z as a leadership style that would lead to greater worker and organizational performance and productivity, as well as higher degrees of worker satisfaction and loyalty. Theory Z is a model based upon five interdependent organizational characteristics: (1) commitment to an overall organizational philosophy; (2) emphasis on the long term development of the organization; (3) the showing of broad concern for the welfare of all workers; (4) workers should be trusted to make their special contributions and to advance their ideas for the solution of problems that they face in the workplace; and (5) participative decision-making.

O’Hanlon (1983) a quarter of a century ago suggested that Theory Z ideas may have some potential for addressing two long time problems in public education. The first is the weakness of the teacher subculture - specifically a lack of a common language among teachers, the failure of teachers to establish adequate supporting relationships with each other, and the stagelessness of teaching as a career, all of which O’Hanlon suggested depresses teacher motivation.

---

4 Indiana is an example of a state that provides only punishments for schools that do not achieve desired proficiency levels. See I.C. 20-xxxxxxx. Florida is a state that provides both punishments and rewards. See xxxxxx
The second problem that Theory Z may help address is the segmented nature of the school. O’Hanlon (1993) argues that although individual teacher entrepreneurship may provide the basis for teachers to enjoy their jobs, this is inconsistent with the development of the student because learning is a long-term multifaceted process and cannot be accomplished with isolated efforts.

Theory Z has strong underpinnings of Theory Y concepts. Chandler (1984) suggested that it has a strong egalitarian atmosphere and that each worker can apply discretion and work autonomously without close supervision because they can be trusted to do the right thing. He argues that self direction replaces hierarchical direction which then will enhance commitment, loyalty, and motivation. He concludes that in school organizations this results in a higher sense of personal autonomy, freedom, and enthusiasm for school staff members.

Finally, Sergiovanni (1992) expanded upon Theory X, Y, and Z concepts by formulating three rules of motivation in the school setting. His first rule is that “what gets rewarded gets done.” (p. 27). This traditional rule of motivation is consistent with Theory X philosophy. Sergiovanni cautions though that if this rule is true, then the reverse must be true – “what does not get rewarded does not get done.” (p. 24). This rule may explain why many educational policy makers are frustrated with the pace of reform in the public schools.

He further cautions that those who receive the rewards in exchange for the desired worker behavior, become dependent upon these extrinsic rewards and the leader to provide the rewards, which serves to indenture the worker to the rewards. He concludes that in the long run this discourages independence and autonomy.

Sergiovanni (1992) offered a second rule of motivation – “what is rewarding gets done.” This view is consistent with Theory Y. Under this rule, teachers and principals are not indentured to rewards but are motivated by intrinsic gain. Their motivation comes from within. The message for educational policy makers is that they need to design a public education system that rewards teachers and principals for “getting things done.” If policy makers accept this rule, then they will design a public education system that provides teachers and principals with maximum opportunities for achievement, challenge, responsibility, autonomy, and advancement. (Thompson, 1996).

Sergiovanni’s (1992) third view of motivation arises from his concepts of professional and moral authority as sources or substitutes for leadership. He defines professional authority as “craft knowledge and expertise.” (p. 31). Moral authority is said to be based upon “obligations and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals, (p. 31). This third rule reads – “what is good gets done.” (p. 27). Good is to Sergiovanni what people believe in, and what they feel obligated to do because of a moral commitment. This particularly applies to teachers and principals, as this writer has not observed in over 30 years more than a handful of teachers or principals who did not have a high moral commitment to educating all children under their jurisdiction.

Theories about Motivation. There are three categories of theories of motivation that have been developed to inform the study of employee behavior in organizations. These are: reinforcement, process, and content theories. (Bartol and Martin, 1998; Campbell and Pritchard, 1976). For purposes of this discussion, the content theory is most relevant. Content theories focus on the values and needs which motivate people (Thompson 1996) and are primarily concerned with identifying the variables that influence behavior and with attempting to explain the specific factors that motivate people. (Campbell and Pritchard, 1976; Ferguson, 2000).

Abraham Maslow’s theory of motivation is one of the earliest and best known content theories of motivation. Maslow proffers that there are five levels or human needs, which he refers to as a “hierarchy of needs.” (Maslow, A. 1943; Maslow, A. 1954). The first level of human needs according to Maslow are physiological needs, such as food, drink, shelter, sleep, and sex. These needs include the most basic needs of all human beings. They are survival needs. Few teachers and principals have remained at this level as their profession ordinarily provides sufficient income to meet these most basic needs.

Maslow’s second level of needs is the need for security and safety. This second level is closely related to the first level. This level speaks to the need for employees to be free from danger, to be secure from financial security, and to be free from other dangers that threaten their physical security and safety. Order and structure are desired in a person’s life. A teacher who continuously worries about being assaulted by students at the school may be stuck at this level. Or a teacher or principal may be functioning at this level if he or she does not have sufficient income to pay for extraordinary medical expenses, or sufficient income to pay the mortgage or rent and is thus facing foreclosure or eviction.

As a general rule, most teachers and principals have their needs for security and safety met. Teaching is not known to be an extraordinary violent profession with significant risks to physical injury or death. The profession of teaching, although not always true in the course of history, now is widely agreed upon to provide sufficient income to provide a middle class financial existence for teachers and principals. Thus, few teachers and principals function at this level.

The third highest level of human needs according to Maslow (1943) are the social and emotional affiliation needs of people. These needs include such needs as love, friendship, and acceptance by a group (such as the school
Although not yet confirmed by research, this writer’s observation is that this is where a significant number, if not most, teachers and principals are at their need development level. Many teachers are highly social beings and extroverts who enjoy being with children and adults in the school. Many teachers are having their needs met at this level due to the socialization of many school faculties.

The fourth level of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is the need for esteem and appreciation. These needs include the need for self-esteem, self-confidence, recognition by peers, respect, dignity, status, appreciation, and prestige. It is at this level that we see a large drop-off in the number of teachers and principals who are functioning at this level. This has been confirmed at numerous discussions with educational leadership graduate students in this writer’s graduate classes. A large study of 4,184 teachers in England also confirms that the status of teaching, at least as perceived by teachers, is not great. In that study most teachers saw the status of the teaching profession as being at or below the midpoint of a five-point Likert scale (with 1 being low and 3 being medium and 5 being high). (Sturman, 2005).

This need is being met in fewer and fewer teachers and principals due to the constant criticism of educators. State accountability laws and the Leave No Child Behind Act (2002) are some of the biggest reasons for this lack of esteem and appreciation. A school principal whose school has just been flagged as a “failing school” by the media because the school did not meet the NCLBA adequate yearly progress requirements has suffered a huge public blow to the principal’s status and prestige in the community. Likewise, the faculty of such a school is also characterized as failures too, regardless of the amount of effort or commitment of the faculty. It is because of these public “floggings” that a significant number of teachers and principals are not having their needs of esteem and appreciation met in this era of accountability.

The fifth level of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is the need for self actualization, or what can be termed self-realization. This is the need for maximum achievement of a person’s potential, self-expression, creativity, autonomy, self-direction, and psychological growth. This is the highest level for humans to function at. A teacher whose students year after year show more growth than may be expected may be functioning at this level. A principal who took over a “failing” school and turned it around in a few years may be functioning at this level.

Porter (1961; see also Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Owens, 1991, 1995) developed a needs theory that can apply to a school principal whose school has just been rated as a “failing school” by the media because the school did not meet the NCLBA adequate yearly progress requirements. He eliminated the basic physiological needs level since all managers (and presumably all professionals such as teachers) have these needs met. He added a level to replace the physiological needs level, to wit: autonomy. He viewed the need for autonomy as the desire to control one’s work situation, the desire to influence the organization, decisional participation, and a desire for authority to use the organization’s resources. He placed this need level immediately below the self-actualization level. Thus his five levels would be: (1) security; (2) affiliation; (3) self-esteem; (4) autonomy; and (5) self-actualization.

However, few educators get the opportunity, or take advantage of the opportunity, to achieve the autonomy or self-actualization level in their jobs. A superintendent who is constantly subjected to lay board control, and who is mired down in school and community politics and conflicts, and who is regularly pressured by interest groups to give them more of what they ask, and who is responsible for assuring all staff comply with the massive amount of laws and regulations that govern public education, is typically denied the opportunity to function at either the autonomy or self-actualization level. A school principal who leads a school classified as “failing” may not have the opportunity to function at either of these levels. In fact, all schools, or nearly all schools, will not have the pleasure of achievement by the school year 2013-2014 as Congress has mandated that one hundred percent (100%) of all students will make adequate yearly progress. Thus, the United States Congress has essentially guaranteed that teachers and principals will not be functioning at the self-actualization level by the 2013-2014 school year.

Educational policy makers would be well advised to reflect on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs or Porter’s need satisfaction theory. By setting a standard of perfection for public schools have state and federal legislators created a public school system that is guaranteed to “fail”? Have they foreclosed all reasonable opportunities for teachers and principals to function at the fifth level of the hierarchy of needs by denying them the opportunity to achieve autonomy and job satisfaction in this environment of public chastising of teachers and principals? What policy makers can do is to recreate the public school governance system using the freedom school model. (Abbott, 2008).

By organizing public schools to provide teachers and principals greater opportunities to fulfill the first four levels of Maslow’s needs hierarchy, then teachers and principals will be freed to work and achieve at their full potential, thus increasing their self-actualization and their job performance as well. To provide more autonomy policy makers can design a system that provides opportunities for teachers and principals to participate in the most important education decisions (particularly the academic decisions), that confers upon teachers and principals greater authority in the procurement and use of organizational resources, and that grants teachers greater control over their classrooms. (Thompson, 1996).
Two theoretical frameworks that are helpful in understanding teacher motivation are the job factors approach (Herzberg, 1966) and the expectancies approach (Vroom, 1964). Herzberg’s content theory, the two factor theory of motivation (Herzberg et al., 1959) advances that there are two factors of motivation - hygiene factors and maintenance factors, or sometimes referred to as satisfiers and dissatisfiers.

Under the job factors approach to motivation, all humans are believed to have two basic types of needs that they seek to fulfill at work and in other settings: the need to avoid pain and the need for psychological growth. The tasks assigned and the work environment determine whether these needs are fulfilled.

Certain facets of a teacher’s or principal’s job can fulfill pain avoidance needs but do not generate either feelings of satisfaction or motivation to work harder. Herzberg (1966) refers to these job facets as hygiene factors. Hygiene factors normally are extrinsic to tasks and are generally associated with the context or setting in which work is performed. Hygiene factors include organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary, fringe benefits, working conditions, status, job security, and others. (Silver, 1982). A lack of presence of hygiene factors can serve as demotivators.

Motivation factors, or satisfiers, are generally intrinsic to the work of a teacher or principal. These factors make tasks more interesting and even enjoyable. Motivation factors include recognition, achievement, responsibility, advancement, professional and personal growth, and even aspects of the job itself.

Applying Herzberg’s theory of motivation, it can be observed that a teacher’s or principal’s extrinsic motivation factors are only minimal requirements to prevent job dissatisfaction. Herzberg argues that it is the intrinsic motivation factors that are necessary to fulfill teachers’ and principals’ psychological growth needs. He argues that factors that lead to positive job attitudes do so because they satisfy a person’s need for self-actualization in his or her work and that the presence of these intrinsic factors lead to increased motivation, more job satisfaction, improved attitudes, and better performance. (Herzberg et al., 1959 at p. 114). Motivation factors have generally been found to be better predictors of job attitudes than are hygiene factors (Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Halpern, 1966; Armstrong, 1971; Sergiovanni, 1966). Overall, intrinsic rewards are generally much more powerful than extrinsic rewards. (National Institute of Education, 1981, p. 2).

From the educational studies on motivation it can be concluded that the aspects of work that are intrinsic to the tasks themselves are significantly related to individuals’ attitudes and their levels of motivation. (Silver, 1982). Thus, these studies reveal the importance for policy-makers to design a workplace for teachers and principals that is not only professional, non political, and non bureaucratic, but is also an environment where teachers and principals can perform and achieve meaningful tasks and responsibilities, be recognized for those achievements, grow in knowledge and skills, increase their responsibility throughout their career, and advance to higher levels of stature and pay upon accepting additional responsibility.

The second category of motivation theory is referred to as process theories. (Thompson, 1996). Vroom’s Expectancy Model of Motivation best exemplifies this category. Under this model, employees are motivated to put forth an effort to attain a certain level of performance. Their effort is influenced by their expectancy, i.e. the probability that their effort will lead to a desired level of performance. Vroom said that the worker’s effort is also influenced by instrumentality, or the probability that a given level of performance will result in a positive outcome, which can be rewards, incentives, recognition, achievement, or other favorable outcomes. Lastly, under Vroom’s theory, a person’s motivation is influenced by the valence, or the desirability or value that the worker attaches to the outcome.

Expectancy theory involves the teacher’s or principal’s subjective assessments of the likelihood of certain outcomes. As stated previously, the term instrumentality refers to the perceived relationship between a direct outcome and an indirect outcome. Vroom refers to the perceived probability that the desired direct outcome will be achieved as expectancy. Vroom argues that the motivation to perform a particular task is a function of the instrumentality of its desired direct outcomes times the expectancy that the desired direct outcome will be achieved. [Silver 1982]. Mathematically this can be expressed as M=I x E, where M = motivation, I = instrumentality, and E = expectancy.

Vroom (1964) took an approach to the study of employee motivation that was much different than Herzberg’s. Vroom viewed motivation as a drive or force that is within human beings. They want to perform particular actions that fulfill these drives or forces. Vroom viewed humans as hedonistic, i.e. they seek to maximize pleasure and minimize pain. According to Vroom’s expectancy theory, humans’ internal drives or forces are influenced in intensity and direction by the likely outcomes of their actions. Vroom argued that the more probable and the more desirable the results of a particular action, the stronger the drive will be to perform that action.

Vroom instructed that two types of outcomes of an action are possible: direct outcomes and indirect outcomes. Direct outcomes are the immediate results of an action. Indirect outcomes are what happen as a consequence of the immediate results of the action. An example is when teachers strike, the direct outcome is that
they do not teach and thus no school may be held for students. The indirect outcome from a teacher strike, is that come payday they get no pay check, the students fall behind in there learning, and lingering bitterness between teachers and the school board often occurs. Vroom and Silver (1982) believe that an employee is motivated to perform an action to the extent that the direct outcomes will yield more desirable indirect outcomes and to the extent that the desired outcome is feasible.

Many studies have shown that the quality of an employee’s work is a function of the attractiveness of the possible results of the employee’s efforts and the utility or instrumentality of good work for attaining those results. (Silver, 1982; Henson, 1976; Miskel et al., 1980; Hackman & Porter, 1968; Lawler & Porter, 1967; Schneider & Olson, 1970; Sheridan et al., 1975). This is especially true for inner-directed employees since these types of employees, as opposed to outer-directed employees, have a stronger belief that their own effort will affect the outcomes. (Lawler & Porter, 1967).

Thus, the research makes it clear that a teacher’s or principal’s job performance is influenced by the degree of attractiveness of the indirect outcomes and the instrumentality of the actions for achieving the most desirable outcomes. The more often teachers and principals receive honest and straightforward praise, interesting professional responsibilities, growth opportunities, and chances for advancement in status and pay as a result of excellent teaching, the more likely they will be to perceive good teaching as instrumental in attaining these desirable indirect outcomes. (Silver, 1982). So why don’t many teachers and principals perceive a correlation between teaching effort and attractive outcomes? It is because all too often that rewarding excellent teaching is not done at all or is done superficially without any increase in professional responsibilities, and without any career advancement within the teaching profession. The only advancement for teachers generally available in most school systems is to leave the classroom altogether and go into school administration. Public education will be much better off and higher quality teaching and school building leadership performance will occur when and only when teachers have meaningful career advancement opportunities without going into school administration.

Hackman’s and Oldham’s Job Characteristics Mode of Work Motivation (1976) is a job design model which has important implications for educational policy makers. Policy makers have the opportunity to create conditions for teachers and principals whereby they can experience high intrinsic motivation. This model incorporates into a job design model Maslow’s and Porter’s works on needs hierarchy, Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, and Vroom’s Expectancy Theory.

This model suggests that there are three psychological states of mind which are a precondition to workers’ high intrinsic motivation. These states are: (1) felt meaningfulness of the work; (2) felt responsibility for outcomes of the work; and (3) awareness and knowledge of the results of the work. The extent to which workers in the school organization experience these three critical psychological states is influenced by the presence or absence of certain core job characteristics in a worker’s job. Hackman and Oldham (1976) identified three job characteristics which influence the felt meaningfulness of the work, to wit: (1) variety of activities and skills required; (2) task identity that allows a worker to complete the whole job as opposed to just a piece of the job; and (3) the worker recognizes the job’s task significance and its impact on the lives of others. Thompson (1996, p. 21) argues that the felt responsibility for work outcomes is influenced by the core job characteristic of autonomy. He defines autonomy as the degree to which a worker has freedom, discretion, and independence to schedule and carry out the work. He also asserts that knowledge of work results is influenced by the core job characteristic of feedback, or the degree to which the work activities continuously inform a person how effectively he or she is performing on the job. (Thompson, 1996, p. 21).

With a job that contains a high number of core job characteristics, a teacher and a principal are more likely to experience the three critical psychological states and thus will be more likely to have a higher degree of intrinsic motivation than otherwise. (Thompson, 1996 p. 21).

Why is this idea of teacher and principal motivation so important? It is especially important in schools that lack resources. In these schools particularly, a teacher’s motivation may become the main factor influencing the quality of education. (Barrs, 2005). In schools that operate effectively, teacher and principal morale is always higher, and teachers take responsibility for student performance. Better morale raises teachers’ and principals’ performance. (World Bank, 1996). But even though there is a strong link between teachers’ and principal’s motivation and performance, and education quality, improving their motivation has seldom been a major concern of national and even international policy-makers. (Voluntary Service Overseas, 2002).

IN a 2005 survey of 4,184 teachers in England the General Teaching Council of England found that eight out of ten teachers said that making a difference in pupil’s lives is what motivates them to teach. (Sturman, et al., 2005). Policy makers should construct a public education environment that allows them to do just that – make a difference in children’s lives.
Teachers talk about the joy, satisfaction, and pleasure of teaching. (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Much literature confirms that a major source of teacher satisfaction is the progress toward learning that children make. (Emmer, 1994; Hargreaves, 1998; Hatch, 1993; Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975; Nieas, 1989; Sutton, 2000). Other sources of joy, satisfaction, and pleasure in teaching occurs when former students come back to school to talk with them (Hargreaves, 1998; Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975; and Sutton, 2000); students cooperate with no major disruptions (Emmer, 1994; Hatch, 1993; Sutton, 2000); when teachers get everything done they need to (Hatch, 1993); when colleagues are supportive of their efforts (Erb, 2002); and when teachers believe that parents are responsible, support their efforts, and respect their judgment. (Lasky, 2000).

**Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.** There are two generally cited goals that motivate teachers and principals, to wit: intrinsic and extrinsic. An intrinsic goal is a goal that emanates from within an individual based upon the person’s values and beliefs. Intrinsic goals such as helping students learn and seeing them meet achievement goals are often cited as what typically motivates teachers. (Goodlad, 1984; Lortie, 1975). However, intrinsic and extrinsic goals combine to influence teachers and principals. Even though teachers and principals may be more motivated by intrinsic goals, they may be also be motivated by extrinsic goals, such as money, especially when their pay is not sufficient to pay their basic living expenses. (Ozcan, 1996).

There are three problems in public education that need special attention and that require different orientations to teacher and principal goals. These include: (1) attracting good teachers and principals to the profession; (2) retaining good teachers and principals; and (3) engaging teachers and principals and encouraging them to improve their own practice and performance. (Johnson, 1986). Leithwood (2002) comments that the third goal requires the orchestration of organizational incentives that encourage teachers to think about their work in new ways and commit themselves to new standards and goals. But principals too need these same types of organizational incentives. These incentives for teachers and principals need to provide them with shared organizational purposes and affirm their professional identity.

It is vitally important that the work environment of teachers and principals be such that it enables teachers to be more motivated by intrinsic goals that extrinsic goals. This is so because teachers and principals who are constrained in ways likely to reduce their intrinsic motivation to teach and lead a school may behave in more controlling ways and thus be less effective in teaching students and leading staff. (Leithwood, 2002).

But it is not enough that teachers and principals have goals that energize them. If they don’t believe they are capable of accomplishing these goals, they will not likely accomplish them. Understanding the term capacity beliefs is important to an understanding of teacher motivation. Capacity beliefs include psychological states such as self-efficacy, self-confidence, self-concept, and self-esteem. (Leithwood et al., 2002) at 100.) Goddard (2000) observed that perceived self-efficacy increases the intrinsic value of effort and contributes to a sense of collective efficacy on the part of a group as well. Ross (1998) and Smylie (1990) offered that a teacher’s beliefs about his individual professional efficacy is significantly related to the effectiveness of his classroom practices, student learning, and the likelihood that he will engage in classroom and school improvement initiatives.

Among the most important variables of a teacher’s work environment are the teacher’s sense of control over the teacher’s own classroom conditions, the existence of a sense of community in the school, and the nature of the school’s culture. (Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991; Ross, 1998).

Teacher motivation is an important concern for educational policy makers because teacher motivation has an important effect on student motivation. Neves de Jesus & Lens (2005) proclaimed that a common teacher’s complaint is the difficulty of keeping students motivated to learn in the classroom, and then asked – how much more difficult is it if the teachers themselves are not motivated? Pittman (1998) found that students’ perceptions of the teacher as intrinsically motivated increase the chances that the students will be intrinsically motivated as well. A teacher’s beliefs about his or her personal teaching efficacy influence students through the type of classroom environment that the teacher creates. (Bandura, 1993). Teachers have been found to be influenced by the confidence they had in their ability to implement the necessary changes in their practices, and that successful teachers have perceived a link between their efforts and subsequent improvements in student academic achievement. (Heneman, 1998; Kelley & Protsik, 1997).

Teacher motivation is extremely important for the success of educational reforms. Motivated teachers are much more likely to work for successful implementation of educational reform and for progressive legislative initiatives. Also, it is important to understand that it is a motivated teacher who guarantees the implementation of reforms originating at the policy-making level. (Neves de Jesus & Lens, 2005). Finally, beyond the issue of the well being of teachers and principals, much research has established that teachers who are motivated and satisfied with their jobs are absent less and leave their jobs less. (Jesus & Conboy, 2001; Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984; Porter & Steers, 1973). This is why the motivation of teachers and principals is a vitally important consideration in designing a public school governance system. It impacts the students’ classroom environment and their motivation.
**Emotions.** Emotions are an integral part of teachers’ and principals’ lives. Along with motivation and cognition, psychologists now recognize emotions as one of three fundamental categories of mental operations. (Mayer *et al.*, 2000). It is important for policy-makers to understand that achievement of or failure to achieve a teacher’s or principal’s purposes is one of the three prime social psychological determinants of human emotion (Oatley, 1991; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1998).5

In a study that included interviews of 50 teachers in 15 Canadian elementary and secondary schools, Hargreaves (2004) found that the emotional responses of teachers to mandated legislated change was predominantly negative, occasionally mixed, and seldom favorable, but that emotional responses to self-initiated change were predominately positive. Thus, knowledge of teachers’ and principals’ emotions is essential in understanding teachers and principals.

Emotions may be classified as positive or negative. A positive emotion is one that involves pleasure and happiness. It happens when a teacher or principal is making progress toward a goal. (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). Negative emotions involve impatience, frustration, and anger. These emotions are not uncommon in teaching. (Sutton, 2000; Jackson, 1968).

Frustration and anger arise from a number of sources related to goal incongruence. (Sutton & Wheatley, 2003). These sources include such matters as students’ misbehavior and violation of rules; (Emmer, 1994; Erb, 2002; Hargreaves, 2000; Sutton, 2000) uncooperative colleagues; (Bullough *et al.*, 1991; Erb, 2002; Nieas, 1989) uncooperative parents who do not follow institutional norms of appropriate parental behavior or are perceived as uncaring; (Lasky, 2000); irresponsible students’ poor academic work that is due to controllable factors such as laziness or inattention; (Reyna & Weiner, 2001) and factors outside the classroom that make it difficult to teach well (Golby, 1996; Nias, 1989).

A teacher’s willingness to implement an educational reform is sustained by a positive emotional climate. Ozcan (1996) reported that among other conditions, a dynamic and changing job helped support a positive emotional climate.

So why is a discussion of teachers’ emotions valuable in understanding teacher and principal motivation? What does it do with improving the quality of public schools? The reason it is important to attend to the emotional needs of teachers and principals is that there are empirical and theoretical reasons for believing that teachers emotions influence teaching and student learning. Teachers who experience negative emotions impact their cognitive functions, and suffer a decrease in attention, memory, and problem-solving skills (Sutton & Wheatley 2003). Even though a teacher may try to hide his or her negative emotions and feelings, students are often aware of and are influenced by the teacher’s negative emotions. (Sutton & Wheatley 2003). A teacher who yelled at students resulted in students feeling small, sad, ashamed, guilty, hurt, and embarrassed in one study. (Thomas & Montgomery, 1998 p. 374).

Teachers and principals who express positive emotions, especially when they show they care for students, affect students of various grade levels. Students who believe their teacher cares about them will be more motivated. (Phelan *et al.*, 1992; Wong & Dornbusch, 2000; Wentzel, 1996; Skinner & Belmont, 1993). Teachers and principals who experience more positive emotions such as joy, interest, pride, and love broaden their momentary thought-action repertoires (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2001 p. 133-134) and may generate more teaching ideas and strategies. Further reason for being concerned about teachers’ and principals’ emotions is that emotions may affect their intrinsic motivation, attributions, efficacy, beliefs, and goals. (Sutton & Wheatley 2003). Negative emotions reduce teachers’ and principals’ intrinsic motivation. (Pekrun *et al.*, 2002 p. 97).

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) argues that positive emotions are a necessary but not sufficient precondition for intrinsic motivation. He proffers that enjoyment in a worker’s job is a necessary precondition for experiencing what he calls “flow”. Similarly, in self-determination theory, feelings of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are necessary preconditions for intrinsic motivation. (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

**Authority, Autonomy, and Empowerment.** Empowering teachers to participate in decisions about how policies will be implemented has been linked to positive context beliefs of teachers. (Leithwood, 2001). Covey (1989, p. 173) provides a framework for educational policy makers to design a public education system that delegates freedom and authority in the decision making process to teachers and principals. His framework is based on a paradigm of “appreciation of the self-awareness, the imagination, the conscience, and the free will of other people.” (Covey, 1989, p. 173). He argues that delegation should focus on results and not methods – methods should be left up to the delegee. He refers to this as *stewardship delegation*. This is in direct contrast to *gofers delegation*, which focuses on methods and not results.

---

5 The other two are the exercise or effects of power and the strength or weakness of communication and relationships.
Covey (1989, pp. 173-174) presents five areas that need to be clarified up front: (1) create a clear mutual understanding of the desired results; (2) identify the guidelines or parameters within which the worker should operate; (3) identify the human, financial, technical, or organizational resources the worker can use to accomplish the project; (4) set up the standards of performance that will be used in evaluating the worker’s performance on the project in order to hold the worker accountable, and (5) specify the consequences, good and bad, of the results of the project that will be evaluated.

Ingersoll defines authority as “the extent to which teachers influence school decisions concerned with key educational issues” (p. x). He later added to that definition “the degree of individual autonomy exercised by teachers over planning and teaching within the classroom” (Ingersoll & Alsalam, 1997, p. vii).

However, this writer believes the definition of authority as offered by Ingersol is too narrow when examining public education reform from a policy perspective. For purposes of this paper, teacher and principal authority refers to the power, right, ability, and clout to practice their profession in a manner that they determine to be in the best interests of their clients - the students. Senior level teachers and principals must have more than the authority to influence school decisions concerned with key educational issues. They must have the full authority to make school decisions and to operate all the academic operations of the school without interference from special interest groups, powerful parents, central administrative offices, school boards, state and federal departments of education, and state and federal legislative bodies. Without this, they cannot control their profession. The freedom school governance model would be provide full authority for teachers and principals to practice their profession without such outside interference.

But this expanded authority and autonomy would come at a price under the freedom school model. Teachers and principals will be held accountable for results. Renewal of their contracts depends upon their performance and the results achieved under the school operating contract. Individual and group accountability are an important part of the freedom school model of school governance. Without mechanisms for increasing accountability, a performance-based approach to reform is simply a hollow shell. (Leithwood, et al, 2002).

The definition of teacher and principal autonomy is not clear cut in the literature. Willner (1990) identified the old concept of teacher autonomy as independence based upon isolation and alienation, and a newer concept based upon collaborative decision making and freedom to make prescriptive professional choices concerning services rendered to students. Researchers have agreed with this newer concept of autonomy presented by Willner. (Frase & Sorenson, 1992). Pearson & Hall (1993) define autonomy as the teachers’ feelings of whether they control themselves and their work environments. Teacher autonomy refers to the amount of independence teachers or principals have to practice their profession. It embodies the idea of self-sufficiency in carrying out their professional responsibilities. Teacher autonomy is a common link when researchers examine teacher motivation, job satisfaction, stress, burnout, professionalism, and empowerment. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006; Brunetti, 2001; Kim & Loadman, 1994; Klecker & Loadman, 1996; Ulriksen, 1996). Many researchers who have examined these constructs and their relationships have found that teachers need to have autonomy because autonomy is a key variable in the success of education reform initiatives. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2007; Erpelding, 1999; Jones, 2000; Wilson, 1993). A number of researchers have argued that granting teachers autonomy and empowering them is a starting point to solve current school problems. (Melenyzer, 1990; Short, 1994). Pearson & Moomaw (2007) argue that recognizing teaching as a profession and teachers as professionals is a possible solution to teachers’ lack of motivation and job satisfaction. They argue that if teachers are to be empowered, they need to have the same autonomy as other professionals, i.e. to prescribe the best treatment for their students. Nero (1985) reported that teachers and principals believe that their greatest needs in their profession are security and autonomy.

Autonomy is one facet of teacher motivation. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2007; Khmelkov, 2000; Losos, 2000; White, 1992). Many studies have demonstrated that the degree of autonomy perceived by teachers is indicative of their job satisfaction. Researchers have found that constraints on autonomy, such as perceived lack of control and sense of powerlessness, are related to tension, frustration, and anxiety among teachers (Bacharach, Bauer, & Conley, 1986; Blase & Mathews, 1984; Dinh & Scott, 1996; Dworkin, Haney, Dworkin, & Telschow, 1990; Evers, 1987; Lortie, 1975; Natale, 1993; Woods, 1989; Yee, 1991).

A lack of teacher autonomy appears to be a vital component in teachers’ motivation to leave the teaching profession and is indicative of job satisfaction. (Pearson & Moomaw 2006; Pearson & Hall, 1993). Thus, it is clear that although teachers have various reasons for leaving their profession, they most often leave their classroom because of lack of professionalism, recognition, or autonomy. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006; Natale, 1993; Pearson & Hall, 1993).

Many researchers and educators agree that if teachers and principals are to realize a new sense of professional autonomy, traditional bureaucratic governance models can no longer be retained, and teachers and...
Brown (1996) reported three major intrinsic reasons why teachers leave their profession: (1) a need and energy to pick up a book or newspaper, or watch a documentary about their subject interests. (2) A desire for flexibility in their work schedules, and (3) a lack of respect and recognition for their efforts. Brown points out that many teachers talk about a “love of children” as why they entered teaching and why they stay. But as she wryly points out, that a “love of children” may prompt a teacher to put in long hours counseling students, but with a few awful classes and regular experience of children swearing, spitting, or fighting this fondness soon begins to wear thin. She argues that the answer is not for the government to order more specialization, but for government to recognize the important of motivating teachers and principals. The freedom school model does just that.

Brunetti (2001) found that retaining autonomy in the classroom highly influences the decision of a majority of teachers to remain in the teaching profession. Teacher turnover and exit from the profession can be reduced. But simply put, if significant improvement in the nation’s public schools is to occur, teaching and their school leadership teams must be upgraded to a professional status. Teachers and principals must have full authority and autonomy to make decisions regarding matters of school policy. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006).

Ingersoll (1997) talked about teacher authority, and mentioned it as one of the traditional characteristics used to distinguish professional teachers from those in other types of occupations. This raises two questions. Is a teacher a professional or a craftsman? Is the principal a professional or a craftsman? To answer these questions, one needs, among other items, to analyze the autonomy of teachers and principals. There is little debate that autonomy is a critical element in the determination of whether an occupation is a profession. (Pearson & Moomaw, 2006; Blasé & Kirby, 2000; Ingersoll, 1997; Ingersoll & Alsalam, 1997; Khmelkov, 2000).

Ingersoll & Alsalam (1997, p. 7) summarized the benefits of increasing teacher authority beyond what the current governance system allows:

“Advocates of increases in faculty influence and increases in teacher autonomy argue that teachers will not only make better informed decisions about educational issues than district or state official, but that top-down decision making often fails precisely because it lacks the support of those who are responsible for the implementation and success of the decision.”

Other scholars have agreed with Ingersoll and Alsalam that teachers and principals must have full authority to make key decisions about the services they render, and that any top-down imposition of change is counter to the development of professionalism. (Firestone & Bader, 1992). With increased authority will come increased teacher and principal commitment to their job and their profession. (Khmelkov, 2000).

The same argument can be made for principals. School principals play a crucial role in motivating teachers. Even in the most rigid and inflexible school districts, school principals have considerable discretion that can be directed toward elevating teachers’ motivation. (Silver, April 1982). However, in many school systems, principals have very little authority or autonomy to lead their schools. They are beholden to the central office administration in large school districts, and to the school board in smaller school districts. They, like teachers, have been deskilled by this lack of authority and autonomy. They have been reduced largely to the role of compliance officer with their chief duty to make sure that their staff complies with the excessive number of state and federal laws, rules, regulations, and school district policies that govern schools. Coupled with this role as chief building compliance officer, they must cater to the whims and needs of powerful parents who have the ear of the superintendent or school board, interest groups, and school district politics. If real reform is to occur in the public schools, it will not occur until and unless school principals have the full authority and autonomy to lead their staff without outside interference. The freedom school model provides this full authority and autonomy within the context of real and meaningful accountability.

Conclusion. Williams (2003) asked the question what motivates teachers in England to stand before 30 bored teenagers, putting up with one new government initiative after another? She alarmingly points out that in a 2003 survey report from the General Teaching Council that only 24 percent (24%) of English teachers who enter teaching, enter because they love their subject matter, and that this percentage drops after employment to only 14 percent (14%) of teachers that are motivated to carry on for the love of their subject matter. As a teacher, she points out that many teachers talk about a “love of children” as why they entered teaching and why they stay. But as she wryly points out, that a “love of children” may prompt a teacher to put in long hours counseling students, but with a few awful classes and regular experience of children swearing, spitting, or fighting this fondness soon begins to wear thin. She argues that the answer is not for the government to order more specialization, but for government to ease up on the overload of initiatives in England that are at least partly responsible for robbing teachers of the time and energy to pick up a book or newspaper, or watch a documentary about their subject interests.

Brown (1996) reported three major intrinsic reasons why teachers leave their profession: (1) a need for personal growth that is unfulfilled; (2) a desire for a philosophy; and (3) a lack of respect and recognition for their efforts. Brunetti (2001) found that retaining autonomy in the classroom highly influences the decision of a majority of teachers to remain in the teaching profession. Teacher turnover and exit from the profession can be reduced. But it will take a school governance system that recognizes the important of motivating teachers and principals. The freedom school model does just that.

Simply put, if significant improvement in the nation’s public schools is to occur, teaching and their school leadership teams must be upgraded to a professional status. Teachers and principals must have full authority and autonomy to exercise their profession if policy makers want to improve the performance of public schools. This full authority and autonomy must be exercised though in an environment that imposes full accountability for their decisions, performance, and results. Without this change in the governance of public schools, most public schools will continue to limp along underperforming and never achieving their full potential.