

A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF PERCEIVED PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP STYLE AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

by

JENNIFER L. CARPENTER

(Under the direction of C. Thomas Holmes)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between principal's leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction. It also sought to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between teachers' job satisfaction and the subtest scores of third grade students on Georgia's Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) as well as the principal's leadership style and the same test scores. Leadership style was determined using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2000). Satisfaction was measured using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed at the University of Minnesota. Test scores were obtained from the Georgia Department of Education website. This study found that there was no statistically significant relationship between principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, nor was there a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and the subtest scores on the CRCT. There was no statistically significant relationship found between transformational leadership style and sub test scores on CRCT. There was a statistically significant relationship found between transactional leadership style and the subtests of Math, Language Arts, Reading and Social Studies on the Georgia CRCT.

INDEX WORDS: Leadership styles, Teacher job satisfaction, Transformational leadership style, Transactional leadership style

A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF PERCEIVED PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP STYLE AND
TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

by

JENNIFER L. CARPENTER

B.S. ED., State University of West Georgia, 1989

M.Ed., State University of West Georgia, 1992

Ed. S., State University of West Georgia, 1996

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

© 2004

Jennifer L. Carpenter

All Rights Reserved

A CORRELATIONAL STUDY OF PERCEIVED PRINCIPALS' LEADERSHIP STYLE AND
TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

by

JENNIFER L. CARPENTER

Major Professor: C. Thomas Holmes

Committee: William Swan
Sally Zepeda

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2004

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who helped me in this process. First, I'd like to thank my committee. Without the help, support, and encouragement, this would have been more difficult to complete. Dr. Holmes, you did a great job stepping in and encouraging me to complete this. Thank you. Dr. Zepeda and Dr. Swan were very supportive and gave me some wonderful ideas. I'd also like to thank my family – without whose support none of this would be possible. My husband, Robert, and my children were all super during this entire process. Thanks for sticking by me and trying to understand when I had to say “no” to some things so that I could finish. Lastly, I'd like to thank my best friend, Shari. You were my editor for so many years. Without your editing expertise and encouragement to complete this for you to have something to do, I don't know when this would have been finished. Thank you is not enough for all of you, but it will have to suffice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Limitations	5
Organization of the Study	5
2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
Leadership	8
Leadership Style Theories	8
Satisfaction	20
Standardized Test Scores	27
Conclusion	30
3 RESEARCH DESIGN	31
Null Hypotheses	32

Subjects	33
Sources of Data	35
Variables.....	35
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.....	36
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.....	38
4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	40
Population and Sample	40
Restatement of the Null Hypotheses	41
Findings	42
5 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	49
Implications	53
Recommendations	54
REFERENCES	56
APPENDICES	61
A First letter sent to school principals requesting permission to use his/her school in this study	61
B Letter sent to principals with questionnaire and consent form	63
C Principal's consent form	66
D Cover letter sent to teachers with questionnaires.....	68

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Leadership Style Theories and its Indicators.....	9
Table 2: Comparison of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style Categories	42
Table 3: Comparison of Transactional and Transformational Scores by School	43
Table 4: Analysis of Variance for Transactional and Transformational l	
Leadership Styles	44
Table 5: Correlations of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style and	
Teacher Job Satisfaction.....	45
Table 6: Correlations between Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles and	
Subtest Scores on 2001-2002 CRCT	46
Table 7: Correlations between the Mean Teacher Job Satisfaction Scores and Subtest	
Scores on the 2001-2002 CRCT.....	47
Table 8: Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores and CRCT Subtest Scores by School	48

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Even before the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (1983), America's public schools have been scrutinized. MacNeil (1992) stated that "The schools of the 1990's are not meeting the demands of our changing society" (p.12). Many presidents have used education as part of their election platforms and enacted legislation for improvement. President Reagan had his *Goals 2000* and President George W. Bush has his *No Child Left Behind*. On the state level, Georgia enacted the *Quality Basic Education Act (QBE)* in 1983 and followed it with Governor Barnes's *A Plus Education Reform Act* in 2000. All of these have attempted to address the ills of schools globally.

Research has been conducted to determine what defines an effective school. One common trait was a strong principal. It was hypothesized that today's principal could directly influence teachers' job satisfaction and therefore, indirectly affect student achievement. "Based on the number of studies alone, one can reasonably conclude that current school leaders are capable of having a significant influence on the basic skills achievement of students" (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1992, p. 14). This was usually accomplished through the leader's style or approach to leadership and/or actions.

Background of the Study

Falling standardized test scores was one concern voiced in the media and various reports. "Demand for halting the slide of test scores led to greater principal accountability for instructional purposes" (Stiles, 1993, p.2). Tests were often the only

instrument used to evaluate a school, even though high test scores can only predict high test scores and little else (Goodlad, 2002). It was necessary to halt the decline of test scores since the tests “dictate the curriculum – what is to be taught – regardless of what any given group of youngsters may actually need to learn and despite the professional judgment of the teacher” (Tye & O’Brien, 2002, p. 28).

The increased accountability of schools led to much research and many theories. One such set of research is collectively called “effective schools” research. Effective schools research attempted to determine specific characteristics of effective schools. These studies have shown that a school’s climate does have an impact on student achievement (Keith & Girling, 1991; Stiles, 1993). “The composite satisfaction of principal, teachers, students and parents constitutes a significant indication of a school’s quality, including achievement” (Goodlad, 2004, p. 31).

“The factors most affecting achievement are under the schools’ control” (Palestini, 2003, p.30). Many researchers, including Anderman (1991), Leithwood, et al., (1992) and Stiles (1993), have documented a statistically significant relationship between principals and school climate. These researchers further noted that a principal’s leadership affected overall teacher satisfaction and commitment as well as the basic skills achievement of students. This might have been because “current principals seem capable of influencing teachers’ adoptions and use of innovative classroom practices and teachers’ job satisfaction” (Leithwood et al., 1992, p 14.). As Goodlad (2004) stated, “Without a doubt, teachers will experience greater work satisfaction and higher morale when they are viewed by their principals as the professionals they perceive themselves to be” (p. 179).

The principal's influence comes from his leadership style. One model, the Full Range of Leadership model developed by Bass and Avolio (1994), has been used to describe leadership styles and places the styles on a continuum from laissez-faire to transformational. The laissez-faire leader does nothing. A transactional leader relied on transactions between him/her and his/her staff. A transformational leader was often seen as a facilitator. He/she transformed the environment to ensure teacher empowerment and improved performance. Burns (2003) believed that empowerment is the process where people transform themselves so that leaders empower followers and followers then empower leaders.

Transformational leadership has shown a statistically significant positive relationship with teacher job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Having satisfied teachers became important because "teacher satisfaction reduces attrition, enhances collegiality, improves job performance, and has an impact on student achievement" (Weasmer, 2002, p. 186). After conducting a survey, the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) discovered that a large number of teachers, especially those with 20 or more years in teaching, are leaving the profession (Ferguson, 2002). "Overall, teachers report greater satisfaction to their work when they perceive their principal as someone who shares information with others, delegates authority, and keeps open channels of communication with the teachers" (Bogler, 1999, p. 7). Woods and Weasmer (2002) noted "teachers who claim a voice in moving toward organizational goals, increase their commitment to the district and enhance their job satisfaction (p. 186).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between a principal's perceived leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction. This study also sought to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the teachers' job satisfaction and the subtest scores a standardized test of third grade students in select schools. The study also sought to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between a principal's perceived leadership style and the subtest scores of a standardized test of third grade students in select schools. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, based on the Full Range Leadership Model was used to determine the perceived leadership style and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to determine the teachers' job satisfaction. Test scores were obtained from the individual school's report card as reported on Georgia's Department of Education website.

Significance of the Study

This study will add to the growing body of research on this topic. Kim and Loadman (1994) stated that although there has been much research in this area in the last 60 years, this area is still incomplete. MacNeil (1992) stated that a reason for studies of leadership styles and job satisfaction is the "positive influence job satisfaction has on performance and the effect leaders have on personnel satisfaction" (p.5). Since faculty constitutes the largest cost and human capital resource for a school, it is imperative to understand what makes a teacher satisfied in order to have a successful school (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).

Research Questions

There were three research questions that drove this study.

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between a leader's perceived leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the principal's perceived leadership style and students' subtest scores on a standardized test?
3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and students' subtest scores on a standardized test?

Limitations

1. The sample used for this study consisted of third grade teachers and their principals in a metro school system in Atlanta, Georgia that returned the completed questionnaires. The questionnaires were sent to the teachers in a school that had the same principal as the previous year, and whose principal had agreed to allow the researcher to send the questionnaires to his/her school.
2. The findings of this study can be generalized only to this population.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 was an overview of the study. Sections included were the introduction, background information, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, limitations of this study, and organization of this study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature. The review begins with a history of leadership style theories. It continues with the literature review of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and standardized tests.

Chapter 3 describes the methods and procedures for conducting the study. Sections included are the problem of the study, the purpose of the study, research questions, variables, population, sample, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis of the data.

Chapter 4 is a report of the results and findings from the data analyses. The results are presented in table format and then summarized.

Chapter 5 contains the conclusions drawn from the analyzed data, and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

“Since the early 1980s, the United States has become increasingly aware of the range of critical issues facing its schools” (Ulriksen, 2000, p. 6). Some of these issues have included declining academic performance, student apathy, and the attrition and qualifications of public school teachers. Many of these problems fell to the principal as head of the school. The principal has maintained accountability for all situations that arise in a school –from student performances on standardized tests to teacher job satisfaction. Casavant and Cherkowski (2001) cited Sergiovanni as saying that the growing body of research on effective schools has consistently pointed to the importance of responsible, assertive, and visible in-school leadership for school success. The role of the principal has changed through the years. The newest role for the principal had him/her being an instructional leader as well as sharing his/her vision with the faculty and staff, and including them in the decision making process. This was accomplished through the principal’s leadership style. Bass and Avolio (1994) stated that one leadership style is not appropriate for every situation.

Goodlad (2004) believed that it would be a mistake to identify the principal as the main factor determining teacher satisfaction. It was believed, however, that the principal may be one factor in determining teacher job satisfaction. Although there is no one leadership style that fits all areas, some have been more effective than others in bringing about changes in teachers’ job satisfaction and student performance on standardized test

scores. With the increased call for accountability, most principals found themselves having to be measured by some form of standardized testing (Murphy and Louis, 1994).

Leadership

There have been many theories and definitions of leadership style and what makes a strong leader. “According to Sergiovanni, moral authority is a means by which to add value to an administrator’s leadership practice, and added value results in extraordinary commitment and performance in schools” (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996, p. 36). Powell (as cited in Trott & Windsor, 1999) stated, “Leadership is described as the act of accomplishing more than the science of management says is possible” (p. 129) while Burns (2003) believed that “leadership is not only a descriptive term but a prescriptive one, embracing a moral, even a passionate, dimension” (p. 2). As head of the school, the principal was expected to be a strong instructional leader. This strong instructional leadership has been found to be a common factor in effective schools research (MacNeil, 1992.) Avolio (1999) wanted people to view leadership as a system. This system considered inputs (people, timing, and resources), processes (interaction with people and resources over time), and outcomes (levels of motivation and performance). This broad range of looking at leadership was the basis for the Full Range Leadership Model (Avolio, 1999, p. x). In this theory, each section had to cooperate and interact with each other.

Leadership Style Theories

Leadership theories have changed many times in our country’s history. In the late 1800s, Taylor’s scientific management theory was popular. This theory concentrated on improving the efficiency of work processes. This theory did not transfer to schools well

since it focused on factories and products and not people (Keith & Girling, 1991). In the 1940s and 1950s, many leaders practiced ideas in trait theory (see table 1). This theory held that there were certain traits that made a leader effective. Because of its shortcomings, this theory gave rise to the behavioral theories. These theories held that a person's behavior as a leader made a difference in the organization. This set of theories led to the situational leadership theories in which different ideas and situations determined the individual's leadership style.

Table 1

Leadership Theories and its Indicators	
Leadership theory	Indicator of theory
Scientific management	Concentrated on improving work efficiency in factories
Trait theories	Certain traits made an effective leader
Behavioral theories	Certain behavior made an effective leader
Situational leadership theories	Certain ideas and/or situations determined the effective leadership style
Human resource theories	Leaders believed in the workers (people)
Organizational theories	Stressed openness, participation and empowerment.

In the 1960s and 1970s, human-resource leadership theories became the norm. These had the common trait of belief in the people (workers). From these theories evolved the organizational leadership theories, which stressed participation, openness, and empowerment. Organizational leadership theories included having a shared vision,

meeting human needs, and empowering the staff (Palestini, 2003). Transactional and transformational leadership qualities were inherent in these theories.

Trait Theories

According to Palestini (2003), trait theories suggested that one could evaluate leadership and propose ways of leading effectively by considering whether an individual possessed certain personality traits, social traits, and physical characteristics. That is to say that a person ought to possess certain characteristics to be an effective leader. The leader also had certain responsibilities. These included setting tasks and standards for the workers; telling the workers how to do the job; and inspecting, or appointing an inspector, to inspect the work. The leaders also used coercion when workers resisted work. Due to the various responsibilities, the leader and workers were usually adversaries. These vast responsibilities, and the number of workers needing supervision, did not allow leaders of schools to be strong instructional leaders. This led to the birth of school systems, systems theories, and bureaucracy (Keith & Girling, 1991).

Systems Theories

The systems theory maintained that the leader viewed the organization as a system—one large system comprised of smaller systems. If there was a change in one part of the system, this caused a change in other parts of the system (Keith & Girling, 1991). Leaders worked on the system while workers worked in the system and were part of the whole. However, the individual within the organization was sometimes overlooked (Keith & Girling, 1991). This gave rise to the human relations theories.

Human Relations Theories

Human relations theories have often been interchanged with the term human resource theories.

The outgrowth of the Hawthorne studies along with the social climate of the country following World War II stimulated the beginning of the human relations movement. This movement stressed the central importance of both the supervisor and the work groups in determining job satisfaction and productivity. (Ulriksen, 2000, p. 25)

The human relations theory approached productivity and effectiveness in social terms. It focused on the leader's style of interacting with workers. Human resource leaders believed in "productivity through people" (Palestini, 2003, p. 10.)

Some known human relations researchers have included Likert, Herzberg, and McGregor. Likert's Systems theory broke leadership styles into four systems. His systems worked on a continuum from the first system to the fourth. The first system leaders were authoritarian and followed a bureaucratic organization. The fourth system relied on teamwork and cooperation between the leader and subordinates working toward high performance goals (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996).

Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory described why workers did their work. Herzberg described the hygiene factors as those items that were dissatisfiers. These were lower order, extrinsic items such as conditions and supervision. Once these items were engaged, then workers could move to the higher order level of thinking. The motivators satisfied the workers and were intrinsic in nature. These included, but were not limited to, recognition and achievement. If a leader recognized where on the continuum his/her workers were, then he/she could use this information to encourage the worker to strive for better performance (Bogler, 1999).

McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y concentrated on general management philosophies. Theory X assumed that people disliked work and would avoid it. People needed to be coerced, directed, and sometimes, threatened in order to do work because of the inherent dislike of work. This theory also believed that most people wanted to be directed by a leader. Theory Y assumed that work was as "natural as play or rest; and commitment to objectives is a function of rewards for achievement; and under proper conditions, people accept and seek responsibility" (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996, p. 30.) Theory Y did not concentrate on organizational structure, but on arranging an organization in order to best fit a situation. The organizational theories arose from Theory Y (Keith & Girling, 1991).

Organizational Theories

Organizational theories were based upon the set-up of an organization. It embodied many ideas and practices. One such practice involved site-based management. Site-based management represented a change in how a school district was structured. This paradigm concerned how responsibility and authority were shared between the schools and the district (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). Site-based management usually mandated that a team be formed consisting of major stakeholder groups of the school. The composition of the team varied from school to school, even from system to system. The responsibilities of the team were as varied as the teams themselves. Some teams were responsible for all decisions in a school while others were responsible for menial tasks.

Site-based management was another management tool that began in industry and tried to make itself prevalent in schools. Site-based management was based on Deming's

Total Quality Management model (TQM). Lunenburg and Orenstein (1996) stated that TQM was “based on the assumption that people want to do their best and that it is management’s job to enable them to do so by constantly improving the system in which they work” (p. 38). Bass and Avolio (1994) believed that “TQM is an effective management plus effective leadership which is built over time” (p. 131). TQM emerged from a basic Japanese premise that employees of an organization are the crucial element in determining organizational health and productivity. This contrasted with scientific management movement, which believed that increases in productivity were dependent on improved technology (Sherman, 1986).

Participative management has grown out of TQM in schools. “Participative management is characterized by school-level planning and decision making linked to professional accountability” (Keith & Girling, 1991, p. 16). In participative management, employees are significantly involved in all of the decision making of the organization. Since participative management had been successful in many corporations and businesses, there had been a trend to try and incorporate this style into the educational setting. Participative management had been seen as an extension of the bureaucratic model with assumptions of top-down and bottom-up flow of communication. According to Lunenburg and Ornstein (1996), “Participatory management stresses the importance of motivating employees and building an organization for that purpose. The organization is structured to satisfy employees’ needs, which will in turn result in higher worker productivity” (p. 30). Bass and Avolio (1994) believed that efforts to achieve total quality stressed a return to reliance on the individual worker or teams of workers in order to ensure quality in all aspects of the organizational functioning.

Transformational Leadership

Deming's model of TQM closely paralleled transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). "Transformational leaders change the system to recreate their environment" (Silins, 1992, p. 319). Palestini (2003) stated, "A transformational leader changes an organization by recognizing an opportunity and developing a vision, communicating that vision to organizational members, building trust in the vision, and achieving the vision by motivating organizational members" (p. 10).

According to Palestini, "Charismatic, or transformational, leaders use charisma to inspire their followers. They talk to them about how essential their performance is, how confident they are in their followers, how exceptional the followers are, and how they expect the group's performance to exceed expectations" (p. 10). Many researchers agreed (e.g., Avolio & Bass, 2002; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Burns, 2003; Palestini, 2003) that transformational leaders motivated their workers to do more than was thought possible. Setting higher and higher expectations and informing the workers of the importance of attaining the goals accomplished this. This allowed the workers to focus on general goals for the entire group, and therefore the school. It also allowed the workers to realize personal needs and goals. Burns (2003) believed that the interaction between a transformational leader and their followers was a "powerful causal force for change" (p. 25).

In the process of motivation, the leader developed followers into leaders (Avolio, 1999). Sosik and Godshalk (2000) agreed by saying, "Transformational leadership involves forming a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (pp. 369-370). This

was discovered in their study examining the leadership behaviors of mentors and their proteges' perception of the mentoring function as well as job related stress. The researchers found a correlation between transformational leadership and effectiveness of the subordinates (p. 381). They concluded their research by saying that “organizations should couple mentoring programmes with transformational leadership training for mentors to maximize reductions in protégé job-related stress (and its associated costs)” (p. 383).

Bass and Avolio (1994), stated:

Transformational leadership is seen when leaders:

- stimulate interest among colleagues and followers to view their work from new perspectives;
- generate awareness of the mission or vision of the team and organization;
- develop colleagues and followers to higher levels of ability and potential; and
- motivate colleagues and followers to look beyond their own interests toward those that will benefit the group. (p. 2)

Burns believed that some figures in history, such as FDR, have shown qualities of being a transformational leader. He declared that a “radical change of the very condition or nature of a thing, a change into another substance” is fostered by a transformational leader (p. 24). This, he noted, was evidenced by the way that FDR immobilized the country during World War II. He further stated “leaders take the initiative in mobilizing people for participation in the processes of change, encouraging a sense of collective identity and collective efficacy, which in turn brings stronger feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy” (p.25).

There were four areas that are evident with transformational leaders. These areas were known as the four I's. These were: 1. individual consideration; 2. intellectually stimulating; 3. inspirational leader; and 4. idealized influence (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Transformational leaders demonstrated individualized consideration by paying special attention to each follower's needs and acting as a coach or mentor. The leader also listened effectively and encouraged two-way communication (Avolio & Bass, 2002).

With intellectual stimulation, the transformational leader encouraged creativity and did not publicly criticize mistakes. The leader encouraged followers to answer old problems in new ways (Avolio & Bass, 2002). Bass and Avolio (1994) stated this as one way to redirect and redefine a problem with others to be more concrete.

As an inspirational leader, the leader showed that a problem can be solved and everyone had a voice in solving that problem (Bass & Avolio, 1994). They continued by saying that a leader who communicated goals and expectations clearly would provide meaningful and challenging work. With idealized influence, the leader could show concern for the problem and a need for the solution. This allowed the leader to act in ways that would make him/her a role model.

A transformational leader led the followers in a path that would allow them to "disengage and disidentify with the past" (Palestini, 2003, p. 10). He/She provided for "ideological explanations that link their follower's identities to the collective identity of their group or organization" (Jung & Avolio, 2000, p. 950). This allowed for the empowering of the followers. Palestini (2003) stated, "The charismatic leader must empower others to help achieve the vision" (p.10).

Jung and Avolio (2000) found evidence to indicate "that transformational leadership affects followers' performance in ways that are quantitatively greater and qualitatively different from the effects of other leadership styles such as transactional" (p. 949). In their experimental study of 194 undergraduates, Jung and Avolio sought to

determine if transformational leadership had a statistically significant different relationship with followers' trust and value congruence than other leadership styles such as transactional leadership. They concluded, "transformational leadership had both direct and indirect effects on followers' performance. However, transactional leadership mainly had indirect effects on performance mediated by followers' trust and value congruence" (p. 959).

Silins (1992) found that transformational leadership was more effective in initiating change and further noted that a "reliance on given procedures, rules, or reward systems, is less effective" (p. 330) than transformational leadership. The author further stated, "The success of a transformational leader is demonstrated both by increased performance outcomes and the degree to which followers have developed their own leadership potential and skills" (p. 319). His study examined the relationship between school leadership and school improvement outcomes. His leadership styles were concentrated on the transformational and transactional leader. He further concluded that his study "supported the view of the principalship as a major source of leadership contributing to the school improvement process, although not always the sole source" (p. 322).

According to Jung and Avolio (2000), "several leadership researchers have argued that developing a shared vision is one of the most integral components of the transformational leadership process" (p. 950). Van Engen, van der Leeder, and Willemsen (2001) believed that while both democratic and transformational leadership value active participation in decision making, transformational leadership should not be confused with democratic, participative leadership. "It often may be so, but at times it

can also be directive, decisive, and authoritative” (Avolio & Bass, 2002, pp. 6-7). Trott and Windsor (1999) believed that, “staff members who value a more participative long-term outlook, generally prefer the transformational leader” (p. 127). Since the 1980s, research has supported the idea that “transformational leadership is more effective than transactional leadership in generating the extra effort, commitment, and satisfaction of those led” (Trott & Windsor, 1999, p.1).

Transactional Leadership

Bass and Avolio (1994) and Jung and Avolio (2000) both defined the transactional leader as one who emphasized the transaction among leaders, colleagues, and followers. Bass and Avolio (1994) further stated, “this exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfill those requirements” (p. 3). Silins (1992) recognized that “transactions are at the heart of the interchange between leaders and followers” (p. 318). These interchanges focused on the interests of the people involved, only. The rewards offered would often satisfy only the people engaged in the interchange (Avolio, 1999).

Bogler (1999) described transactional leadership as, “each [person] enters the transaction because of the expectation to fulfill self-interests, and it is the role of the leader to maintain the status quo by satisfying the needs of the followers” (p.4; brackets inserted by the author). A transactional leader emphasized maintaining the status quo. The leader was also the person responsible for administering policies, dispensing rewards or punishments as appropriate, and who gained his/her power through the position. Jung and Avolio (2000) found that for trust to be gained by the leader, he/she had to be

consistent in rewarding followers. They further noted, “followers may need extra incentives, time and/or motivation before they are willing to go beyond the call of duty to engage in extra-role behavior” (p. 959).

The transactional leadership style has been further divided into sections. These were: 1. contingent reward; 2. management by exception active; 3. management by exception passive; and 4. laissez-faire. Sosik and Godshalk (2002) found “the most effective form of transactional leadership is contingent reward leadership where one sets goals, clarifies desired outcomes, provides both positive and negative feedback, and exchanges rewards and recognition for accomplishments when they are deserved” (pp. 369-370). Followers received a reward only when they had completed a task. In comparison, management by exception active leaders would actively monitor problems and take actions only when needed. Management by exception active leadership was less effective than contingent reward, but might have been necessary in some instances. Management by exception passive occurred when a leader waited for problems to arise and then tried to correct these problems. This style was only slightly more effective than laissez-faire leadership. Laissez-faire leadership was one in which the leader does nothing. This type of leader focused on “error detection, monitoring, and correction” (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 126).

“Although transactional leadership can be quite effective, it does not involve a leader’s commitment toward follower’s personal development nor does it involve a strong emotional attachment to the leader” (Jung & Avolio, 2000, p. 951). A transactional leader can be described more as a manager than a leader. He/She was most

effective in crisis situations where short-term resolutions are required (Trott & Windsor, 1999).

“Since the 1980s, research has supported the idea that transformational leadership is more effective than transactional leadership in generating the extra effort, commitment, and satisfaction of those led” (Avolio & Bass, 2002, p. 1). The authors further stated that it was important to note that one specific leadership style is not appropriate for all situations. Each situation may require a different style. “Each leader has a profile that includes some or all of these transformational, transactional and nontransactional behaviors. The better leaders do both, and the best leaders are more transformational than transactional” (Avolio & Bass, 2002, p. viii).

Satisfaction

“Based on a number of measures of teacher satisfaction, teachers were more satisfied with their work in 1993-94 than they had been in 1987-88” (Henke et al., 1995, p. 8). Kim and Loadman (1994) stated that many researchers have been studying job satisfaction in the educational setting for over 50 years. This research had its base in that “the educational craft succeeds or fails depending on the way teachers feel about their work, and how satisfied they are with it” (Bogler, 1999, p. 6). There have been difficulties in the research. One such difficulty has been in the definition of the term job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) stated that this term lacks an adequate definition because it is multi-dimensional. Sherman (1986) stated,

The classic definition of job satisfaction states that it is a combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental conditions that result in a person feeling satisfied with his job. Satisfaction is also viewed as a component of a larger integrated model of motivation and is focused on the fulfillment acquired by experiencing various job activities. (p. 13)

Halpin (1967) defined satisfaction as group members' attainment of conjoint satisfaction in respect to task accomplishment and social needs, while the National Center for Education Statistics (1997) defined satisfaction as "an affective reaction to an individual's work situation" (p. 2). Stiles (1993) defined job satisfaction as an outcome. The outcome is determined by how an individual perceives his/her work environment.

Kim and Loadman (1994) reviewed literature on job satisfaction in an attempt to determine predictors for satisfaction. They found no such predictors and suggested that satisfaction is attained by both internal and external factors. Lester (1988) found that many researchers have been unable to agree upon the factors that affect job satisfaction. He further noted, "discrepancies among studies occur because factors included in some studies do not appear in other studies" (p. xiii). He further quoted Sergiovanni, from 1969, "that teachers obtain satisfaction from activities that center upon the work itself" (pp. x-xi).

Stiles (1993) stated, "satisfaction is a personal perception and involves motivation, performance and recognition" (p. 42). This showed the relationship between satisfaction and motivation and that they are not synonymous. Kim (2002) believed that satisfaction was one of the earliest outcomes to be expected from teacher empowerment, while Chung (1970) related that satisfaction with their jobs, as well as commitment to their school, is an important component in teacher motivation.

The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) noted, "a teacher's satisfaction with his or her career may influence the quality and stability of instruction given to students" (p. 2). Kim and Loadman (1994) believed that teachers are moral agents who are dedicated to serving the public, while Weasmer (2002) stated that,

“Improving teachers’ job satisfaction is paramount in an era when 50% of new teachers drop out of the profession in the first five years” (p. 186). However, career satisfaction has been high among new teachers. “In a recent national poll, 96% of young teachers said that they loved their jobs and 80% said that, if they had to start their careers over, they would still choose teaching” (Jones, 2002, p. 82).

The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) found that younger and less experienced teachers were more satisfied than older and more experienced teachers. The authors also found that the educational background of a teacher, the class size, and the race of a teacher were not significantly related to job satisfaction. It was further noted that compensation and benefits showed little relationship with job satisfaction. This finding was supported by Goodlad (2004) and Lester (1988). Ulriksen (2000) suspected that the intrinsic aspects of teaching have deteriorated. The author further believed that teachers have become devalued in society.

Some studies on job satisfaction drew attention to the work environment for increasing teacher job satisfaction and reducing the teacher turnover rate. The areas of work environment that have been studied extensively include administrative support; teachers’ participation in school decision-making policies; cooperation of staff members; and teachers’ access to materials and supplies to teach efficiently (Henke et al., 1995). Since workplace conditions have been shown to be positively related to job satisfaction (e.g. Henke et al., 1995; and the National Center for Educational Statistics, 1997), it should be feasible for principals to work on workplace conditions to improve job satisfaction.

Anderman (1991) found “environments that stress affiliation, accomplishment, and recognition may be conducive to satisfaction and commitment” (p. 16). Ulriksen (2000) concluded that these factors helped meet the intrinsic needs of teachers. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) and Zuber (2002) both found that many employees want feedback and appreciation for a job well done. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) further stated, “most satisfied teachers worked in a more supportive, safe, autonomous environment than the least satisfied teachers” (p. 32). Schackmuth (1979), however, noted that the nature of the work was more related to job satisfaction than were factors of the work environment. Some studies (e.g., Anderman, 1991; Weasmer, 2002; Weasmer & Woods, 2002) found that collegiality contributed to job satisfaction. Weasmer (2002) noted that this collegiality was fostered by periodic gatherings of teachers to share needs and concerns. Anderman (1991) noted that teachers were more committed to their jobs when this collegiality was present and there was a decreased stress on power and competition.

While some teachers seemed to have entered the field for job security, job security and job satisfaction were found to be statistically significantly related in only one study (Herzberg et al., 1957.) Many researchers (e.g., Henke et al., 1995; Kim & Loadman, 1994; and the National Center for Education Statistics, 1997; Schneider, 1984) Education Statistics, 1997) found that while security might have been the reason for entering the field of teaching, job autonomy became an important work factor. They all found that autonomy was strongly related to teacher job satisfaction. Kim and Loadman (1994) stated that conditions that are directly affected by the administrator, such as job autonomy, “contribute substantially to morale” (p. 8). Schackmuth (1979) found that this

autonomy led to an improved professional self-image. If the self-image was increased, so was the satisfaction. He further noted a positive correlation between effective supervisor communication and employee job satisfaction.

Thompson (1971) noted a relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction as well. His conclusion was that the “more supportive styles of supervision were found to be associated with higher levels of job satisfaction” (p. 349). He continued by saying, “There is evidence that within the work situation, the supervisory style of the boss plays an important role in providing the opportunity for the individual to experience satisfaction of personal needs” (p. 349). The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) noted a positive relationship between job satisfaction and recognition by the principal for a job well done as follows.

Studies of leadership/satisfaction have generally found that consideration on the part of the supervisor (which may include mutual trust, respect for staff ideas, and consideration of staff members’ feelings) is more highly related to satisfaction than the structuring behavior (extent to which supervisors define and structure their role and that of their subordinates to objectives). (Wilkinson & Wagner, 1993, p. 15)

Chung (1970) found a strong relationship between a high teacher-centered management style of a principal and teacher job satisfaction in elementary and secondary schools.

Kim (2002) noted, “researchers and practitioners in both the public and private sectors agree that participative management improves employees’ job satisfaction” (p. 231). Kim did a study of government employees in an effort to determine if a statistically significant relationship exists between a manager’s use of participatory management style and employee job satisfaction. The author found a positive correlation between the leadership style and job satisfaction. Schneider (1984) found a similar relationship in her study with public middle or junior high teachers in Wisconsin. The

author noted a difference in the level of involvement in decision-making and the level of satisfaction--the higher the level of involvement, the higher the satisfaction. Kim concluded that those who participated in making decisions had higher satisfaction because they were in control of their working environment in the broadest manner that was possible.

Bogler (1999) discovered a positive relationship between job satisfaction and teacher's occupation perception. He further noted that the occupation perception was affected by a principal's transformational leadership style. Jung and Avolio (2000) noted a strong relationship between transformational leadership style and staff performance quality. There was also a strong negative relationship between transformational leadership style and performance quantity. It was concluded that the former relationship might have been due to the leader's use of intellectual stimulation, which caused the followers to look at long-term effects and trade off quality for quantity. Bass and Avolio (1994) noted that in much research done in all types of businesses, industries, military and educational settings, the transformational style of leadership was more satisfying than transactional.

Dissatisfaction

"Job dissatisfaction poses a serious threat to efforts to raise student achievement" (Ferguson, 2000, p. 18). Anderman (1991) believed that students would suffer if teachers were dissatisfied with their work lives. Many researchers (e.g., Ferguson, 2000; Schackmuth, 1979; Tye & O'Brien, 2002) concluded that the work environment has led to the dissatisfaction of many teachers. Tye and O'Brien (2002) further stated that it was circumstances of the environment--level of bureaucracy as well as increased paperwork

and additional non-teaching demands – that affected the level of satisfaction. Kim and Loadman (1994) said, “Teachers find that conditions in the schools inhibit their ability to do what they most want to do, help children learn, and some of these inhibiting factors are amenable to change” (p. 11).

Principal leadership styles have also been found to affect teacher job dissatisfaction. Schackmuth (1979) found that authoritarian work settings damaged one’s self-esteem, which may contribute to job dissatisfaction. This work setting has resulted in reduced productivity and the absence of any rewards – physical or psychological. Wilkinson and Wagner (1993) found that the greater degrees of burnout were associated with leaders who exhibited a style of high direction and low support. The lack of support, along with the lack of confidence that schools would reward effective teachers with increased responsibilities and advancement opportunities, was given as a reason for leaving teaching in many studies (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997; Ulriksen, 2000; Weasmer & Woods, 2002;). Schneider (1984) also found that the lack of involvement in making decisions was related to low levels of satisfaction.

Salaries are often mentioned as a reason for dissatisfaction, but not for satisfaction. Similarly, the opportunity for advancement is often stated as a reason of dissatisfaction and not satisfaction (Herzberg, et al., 1957). Tye and O’Brien (2002) further noted that the lack of any clear career ladder has led to teacher dissatisfaction. This was further supported by The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) which found no statistically significant relationship between salary or benefits and teacher satisfaction.

Hom and Kinicki (2001) believed that companies should address the underlying attitudes and causes of leaving and not the symptoms. They stated, "It is imperative to garner more insight into the process by which dissatisfaction activates turnover" (p. 975). This led to their study to try and determine what process led from dissatisfaction to turnover. They concluded by advising companies to "address underlying attitudinal causes of withdrawal rather than surface symptoms" (p. 981).

Herzberg et al. (1957) believed that it was important to discover who was dissatisfied in order to initiate morale-building programs where they were needed. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) declared the importance of knowing what caused teachers dissatisfaction since this knowledge could be used to reduce the number of negative teacher turnover. It was also pointed out that this would not eliminate attrition since some attrition is natural.

Standardized Test Scores

Cotton (2003) found, through her review of various studies, "studies have shown that principals who are knowledgeable about and actively involved with their school's instructional program have higher-achieving students than principals who manage only the noninstructional aspects of their schools" (p. 25). She further noted,

A large and growing volume of research repeatedly finds that, when principals empower their staffs through sharing leadership and decision –making authority with them, everyone benefits, including students. In the research examined for this report, principals of high-achieving schools involved their staffs in school governance and instructional program decisions. (p. 21)

She did not, however, define high-achieving students or schools. She further stated that "decades of research have consistently found positive relationships between principal behavior and student academic achievement" (p. 1). Again, however, she failed to define

academic achievement. In many cases, this has meant the students' scores on standardized test scores.

“Americans have grown so accustomed to taking multiple-choice tests to prove themselves that people don't bother to question the tests' legitimacy” (Sacks, 1999, p. 1). In fact, there has been much debate on the use of standardized test scores in the educational setting. The use of tests began in the mid-1800s in Massachusetts. The intention of this early test was to measure students' individual achievement. It contained only 30 questions that were to cover an entire year's curriculum (Sacks, 1999, p.71).

Sacks retorted,

The lesson from history is that political motivations and the exercise of political power by those in positions of authority, rather than sound educational reasons, have driven the nation's use of standardized tests in schools. Indeed, whatever the perceived problems with the nation's schools, the answer has been almost always the same: more testing. (p. 70)

Goodlad (2004) agreed by saying, “We try to use achievement test scores as a kind of thermometer indicative of good or bad school performance as scores rise or fall” (p. 61)

Standardized test scores have been used to hold schools accountable for their teaching contradicting the generalized findings of standardized tests. Sacks (1999) found that:

1. Standardized test scores generally have questionable ability to predict one's academic success; and

2. Standardized tests scores tend to be highly correlated with socioeconomic class.

He further noted that “test scores stratify largely along race, class, and even gender lines, whether it's an IQ test of young children or the SAT for college admission” (p. 201).

McNeil (2000) studied the effects of Perot's standardizing the curriculum in Houston, Texas. She found, that "over time, the longer the standardized controls are in place, the wider the gap becomes as the system of testing and test preparation comes to substitute in minority schools for the curriculum available to more privileged students" (p. 3). McBee and Moss (2002) noted that the growing pressure to raise standardized test scores had a "perverse effect on the curriculum and that the test results inaccurately represented what our students knew or could do" (p. 62). McNeil noted that the further the gap widens, the more resources are spent on test prep materials than for teaching the curriculum (p. 244). She further noted, "standardization is used to support management systems that in fact mask persistent inequities" (p. 231).

Gilman and Lanman-Givens (2001) offered advice to principals to raise the standardized test scores of their students ethically. One suggestion was to align the curriculum, tests, and state proficiencies by making a checklist. This checklist would allow all those involved to know what skills and objectives are expected to be mastered. They further stated that "contrary to often stated beliefs, students should be encouraged to change their answers because research has shown that 63 percent of the time answers are changed, they are changed from a wrong answer to a correct answer" (p. 48). Pep rallies, the day of the test, should be discouraged because they have been shown to have no effect on test scores. McBee and Moss (2002) encouraged their teachers to expose students to many types of written and visual materials. This could help students to transfer skills and knowledge to unfamiliar print contexts.

Conclusion

“Because the principal is viewed as the leader of her or his school, considerable attention is being directed to ways to overhaul the principal’s role to facilitate the type of leadership needed to transform teaching and learning” (Murphy and Louis, 1994, p.7). The newest reform movement in education included making the teacher a stakeholder in the school. They become stakeholders when they play active roles as agents for change in the schools (Weasmer & Woods, 2002). Weasmer (2002) further stated that for teachers to become stakeholders, they needed to know that their contributions to the school culture are honored. Teachers who claimed a voice in moving toward organizational goals increased their commitment to the district and enhanced their job satisfaction (Weasmer, 2002, p. 187). Brookover, et al. (1982) believed that it was essential that the principal provide strong leadership or at least actively support other staff to bring about the needed changes. The first step was to identify what was to be changed. Along with identifying what needed to be changed, an effective leader shared his/her vision with his/her followers. McNeil (2000), and Gilman and Lanman-Givens (2001) all stated that it takes the entire school to educate a child. An effective leader includes the whole school in this education. “During the times of change, significant activity takes place in role redefinition and learning an alternative role to support change” (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 141). Due to the behaviors exhibited by a transformational leader, Bass’s model has indicated that transformational leaders will be more effective in bringing about change (Silins, 1992). Change may sometimes be necessary for the community to experience greater satisfaction with the school and for the school to raise standardized test scores while keeping teacher morale high.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter presents the specific steps that were taken to collect and analyze the data. These include the following: a restatement of the problem, the null hypotheses, a description of the sample of the study, a discussion of the independent and dependent variables, an explanation of the instrumentation, and an explanation of the data collection procedures.

This study was conducted to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the principal's perceived leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction and to determine if there was a relationship between teachers' job satisfaction and the average standardized subtest scores of the students. This study further sought to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the principal's perceived leadership style and the mean subtest scores on a standardized test. Data were collected from two different questionnaires that were sent to selected teachers in elementary school (K-5th grade) in a metro area school system whose principal had agreed to participate in this study.

The questionnaires were mailed directly to the third grade teachers. The two questionnaires were the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, form 5X (MLQ 5X). The first questionnaire evaluated teachers' job satisfaction. It was developed at the University of Minnesota as an

assessment to evaluate the satisfaction of an employee as a basis of remaining in a particular job. The second survey was used to evaluate their principals' leadership style. Administrators and staff members can use this questionnaire as a method of determining the perceived leadership style. This survey was based on the Full Range leadership model developed by Bass and Avolio. Confidentiality of the teachers was ensured since no names were requested. The only identifying information requested was the name of the teachers' school.

The researcher also used test score information available to the public by the Georgia Department of Education. The scores for the participating schools were analyzed to see if a relationship existed between the test scores and the teachers' job satisfaction in these schools as well as the scores and principal leadership style.

Null Hypotheses

In this study, three hypotheses were tested. All of the hypotheses were chosen to ascertain a relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the principal's perceived leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction.

Null Hypothesis 2: There will be no statistically significant relationship between principal's perceived leadership style and the mean subtest scores of the students on a standardized test.

Null Hypothesis 3: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the teachers' job satisfaction and the mean subtest scores of the students on a standardized test.

Subjects

Once the researcher was given permission by the University of Georgia and by the Board of Education of a metro Atlanta school system to conduct this study, the subjects were selected from elementary schools in this school system. The schools were selected based on the following criteria:

1. an elementary (K-5) school;
2. not a charter school; and
3. the school had the same principal in the 2002-2003 school year and 2003-2004 school year.

Thirty-two schools in this metro school system met these criteria.

A letter was sent to the principal of each of the 32 schools. The letter included the purpose of the research and stated the school system had granted permission for the research to be conducted. The letter requested permission for the researcher to send two questionnaires to his/her school's third grade teachers. The names and addresses of the teachers were also requested so that the questionnaires could be mailed directly to them. The principal was also informed that he/she would be asked to complete a questionnaire similar to the teachers' to investigate if the perceived leadership style of the principal was the same from teacher to principal. The letter further stated that no school would be identified and no teacher would be asked to submit his/her name. A stamped envelope with the researcher's name and address was also included. A second letter and an email were also sent to try and elicit more responses. A total of 20 school principals responded to these letters. Fourteen school principals stated that they would allow their schools to participate and sent the names and addresses of the teachers to be contacted.

Once permission was granted, teachers in these schools were sent the questionnaires and a letter soliciting their participation. The letter estimated the time that might be necessary for the teachers to complete the questionnaires as well as the purpose of the study. A copy of the letter the researcher received from the metro school's Board of Education giving the researcher permission to use the teachers was included. A self-addressed stamped envelope was also included so the teachers could return the form to the researcher while remaining anonymous. The teachers were asked to complete the questionnaires in a timely manner. Questionnaires were mailed to 81 teachers. When the first mailing received very few responses (less than 10%), a second mailing was necessary in order to elicit more responses. A total of 39 (48%) were received. Of these, 27 (35%) were usable. The 12 questionnaires that were discarded were done because they were either incomplete, or the principal of their school did not return his/her form.

The researcher also sent a letter, a consent form, and the leader's form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire form 5X (MLQ 5X) to the 14 principals who had agreed to participate. The consent form was necessary since the researcher could trace information back to a specific person. However, confidentiality was ensured since the researcher was the only person with access to the completed questionnaires. Nine questionnaires and consent forms were returned completed. Three questionnaires were returned without the signed consent form. The consent form was forwarded to these principals along with a letter asking for their compliance in completing and returning the form. Another stamped envelope with the researchers address was included. A second letter, consent form and questionnaire were sent to the two remaining principals.

Information on the standardized test scores for the schools was found on the website run by the Georgia Department of Education. The information was available using the web address www.doe.k12.ga.us. The Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT), which had been given to third graders during the 2001-2002 school year, was used. On this site, the researcher clicked on report card under the Learning Section. The researcher then proceeded to the section labeled "Section and Schools." The researcher was then able to pull up the 2001-2002 report cards for each individual school and find the scores for the 3rd grade.

Sources of Data

The data were collected from the results of the questionnaire. The researcher then accessed the information for the school's standardized test scores on the webpage from the Georgia Department of Education.

Tests were conducted to determine a statistically significant correlation between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, between leadership style and standardized test scores, and between teacher job satisfaction and standardized test scores. A correlation test was used with an alpha level of .05.

Variables

This study used two dependent variables (teacher job satisfaction and standardized test scores) and one independent variable (principal's leadership style). The dependent variable of teacher job satisfaction, in the review of literature, was affected by certain leadership styles. Stiles (1993) stated that principal leadership behaviors were described as the key to educational excellence, while Schackmuth (1979) found that highly bureaucratic organizations tended to hinder professional attitude development.

Weasmer and Woods (2002) noted that without additional support from administrators, teachers' sense of personal efficacy can falter. This may inhibit teachers from doing their best for the students and the school.

The second dependent variable of standardized test scores has been found to be affected by leadership styles and by teacher job satisfaction. Stiles (1993), for example, reported that there were two viewpoints for raising standardized test scores. One point was to identify and develop teaching behaviors that increased student achievement. The second point comprised of identifying behaviors of effective leadership styles. He found that satisfaction of teachers coincided with a supportive leadership style. Further, it was found that if teachers were satisfied with their jobs, then their students' test results were higher.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is one method of evaluating job satisfaction. This questionnaire began from the Work Adjustment Project at the University of Minnesota, which began in 1957. The studies demonstrated "that satisfaction in a variety of work environments can be predicted from the correspondence of measured vocational needs and either estimated or inferred job reinforcer systems" (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967, p. v). The MSQ was developed in order to make it feasible to obtain a more individualized picture of worker satisfaction. "This measurement is useful because two individuals may express the same amount of general satisfaction with their work but for entirely different reasons" (p. vi).

The MSQ was to measure satisfaction with a reinforcer. The reliability of the MSQ was tested using the Hoyt analysis-of-variance method. The MSQ scales ranged

from a high of .97 on Ability Utilization and on Working Conditions to a low of .59 on Variety (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, p. 14.) With these data, the MSQ scales have adequate internal consistency reliabilities.

The construct validity was supported from studies of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire. Further evidence for the validity of the MSQ as a measure of general job satisfaction comes from other construct validation studies based on the Theory of Work Adjustment studies (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). Based on the linear function found when reinforcement was found to be constant, the indication was that the MSQ measured satisfaction in accordance with expectations (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist).

Evidence for the concurrent validity of the MSQ was derived from the study of group differences in satisfaction, especially occupational differences in satisfaction. “A large body of research accumulated over the last thirty years indicates that there are occupational differences in job satisfaction, in both level and variability” (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967. p. 18). Data indicated that the MSQ can differentiate among occupational groups.

The MSQ short-form was also tested for reliability using the Hoyt reliability coefficients. The reliability coefficients obtained were high. The validity of the short-form was inferred from the validity of the long-form since the short-form is based on a subset of the long-form items (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

This instrument has been used to measure satisfaction in numerous occupations. The occupations range from accountants to warehousemen. Educators’ job satisfaction has also been tested using this instrument.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

This evaluation was developed to broaden the range of leadership styles typically studied. It was developed based on Avolio's Full Range Leadership model since a wide range of leadership styles, from transformational to laissez faire, are evaluated using this questionnaire.

The newest version of this questionnaire, Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, form 5X (MLQ 5X), was developed in response to criticism of an earlier survey. The survey was constructed by pooling items from several sources. This included a factor analyses with the earlier survey (MLQ 5R). This provided a base for selecting items that best exhibited the convergent and discriminant validities. When completed, the authors "made use of Howell and Avolio's preliminary results with an earlier version of the MLQ 5X using Partial Least Squares analysis" (Bass, & Avolio, 2000, p. 11). Finally, six scholars in the field of leadership received an early version of the MLQ 5X and made recommendations for modifying and/or eliminating items. They then judged whether the items referred to behavior or impact. "These items were included in the final development phase of the MLQ 5X" (Bass, & Avolio, 2000, p. 11). Finally, 14 samples were used to validate and cross-validate the MLQ 5X. Nine samples were collected for an initial validation study and five samples were later used for a cross-validation study. The results of these samples support the construct validity of this instrument.

The first nine samples used to validate this instrument were also used to test the reliability of the instrument. Reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94. The reliabilities within each data set generally indicated that the MLQ 5X was reliably measuring each of the leadership factors across

the initial nine data sets (Bass, & Avolio, 2000, p. 12). Many research studies have been completed in business and industry, government, the military, educational institutions, and nonprofit organizations, all of them showing that transformational leaders, as measured by the MLQ 5X, were more effective and satisfying as leaders than transactional leaders.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the data gathered as a result of this study. This study was conducted to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between a principal's perceived leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction. This study also sought to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the teachers' job satisfaction and the subtest scores of a standardized test of third grade students in select schools. This study also sought to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between a principal's leadership style and the subtest scores on a standardized test of third grade students. This study used two dependent variables (teacher job satisfaction and standardized test scores) and one independent variable (principal's leadership style).

Population and Sample

A metro Atlanta school system was used for this study. Of the 32 schools in this school system that met the criteria for participation in the study, 20 principals responded. Of these responses, 14 principals (44%) agreed to let their school participate in this study. These principals also sent the requested list of third grade teachers to be included in this study. Only 10 of these 14 principals returned the completed survey and signed consent form to the researcher. The survey these principals completed was the Leader Form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

There were a total of 81 teachers in the 14 schools who agreed to participate. The number of 3rd grade teachers participating in each school ranged from 2 to 10. Of the 81 teachers solicited, 39 questionnaires were returned (48%). Of these, only 27 were usable (35%). Eleven were discarded since the principal of the corresponding schools did not return the questionnaire sent to him/her. The teachers were asked to complete the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and the Rater Form of the MLQ. The MSQ was used to determine the level of satisfaction of the teacher. The MLQ was used to determine the leadership style of the principal.

Data for the Georgia Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) were collected using Georgia's Department of Education website. These scores were used to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between teacher job satisfaction and the test scores. The scores used were from the 2001-2002 academic year.

Restatement of the Null Hypotheses

Three null hypotheses were developed for this study:

Null Hypothesis 1: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the principal's perceived leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

Null Hypothesis 2: There will be no statistically significant relationship between principal's perceived leadership style and the mean subtest scores of the students on a standardized test.

Null Hypothesis 3: There will be no statistically significant relationship between the teachers' job satisfaction and the mean subtest score of the students on a standardized test.

Findings

Statistical analysis was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. For the first null hypothesis, a correlation was tested between the principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Before that could be tested, it was necessary to perform an ANOVA to ensure that the perceived leadership style of the principals was the same between principals and teachers. This was achieved by combining the questions from the MLQ defining the style. The MLQ consisted of 45 questions. The first 36 were concerned with leadership style and the last 9 were concerned with extra effort, job satisfaction, and effectiveness of the leaders. The questions were answered on a Likert scale of 0-4 with 0 corresponding to "Not at all" and 4 corresponding to "Frequently, if not always".

The 36 questions were divided into nine categories. These nine categories were divided into two leadership styles – transformational and transactional leaders. Table 2 illustrates this break down.

Table 2

Comparison of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style Categories.

Transactional Leadership Style	Transformational Leadership Style
Contingent reward	Idealized influence (behavior)
Management-by-exception (passive)	Idealized influence (attributed)
Management-by-exception (active)	Inspirational motivation
Laissez-faire	Individual motivation
	Intellectual stimulation

To run the ANOVA, it was necessary to combine the questions that corresponded to each leadership style. Most of the schools perceived their principal to be more

transformational than transactional. Table 3 shows the scores by school. The highest score that could be obtained on either area was 16. This table also shows the comparison between the principal's rating of himself/herself and the teacher's rating of his/her leadership style.

Table 3

Comparison of Transactional and Transformational Scores by School

		Transactional Score	Transformational Score
School #1	Principal	9	13
	Teacher	7.69	11.13
School #2	Principal	9.25	15
	Teacher	9.25	15
School #3	Principal	8.5	11.75
	Teacher	11.21	12.38
School #4	Principal	9	12.5
	Teacher	6.95	5.42
School #5	Principal	7.75	13
	Teacher	10.83	15
School #6	Principal	8.25	12.5
	Teacher	4.92	8
School #7	Principal	7.25	8.75
	Teacher	10.75	13
School #8	Principal	9	12
	Teacher	8.75	15.25
School #9	Principal	7.5	12.75
	Teacher	9.88	11.5
School #10	Principal	6.5	9
	Teacher	8.6	14.25

Table 4 shows the statistical analysis of the leadership styles. The results indicated that both principals and teachers agreed on the perceived leadership style of the principal. In other words, if the principals perceived himself/herself to be transformational, then so did the teachers.

Table 4
Analysis of Variance for Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
TRANSACTIONAL					
Between groups	.026	1	.026	.000	.987
Within groups	3138.785	36	89.860		
Total	3138.811	37			
TRANSFORMATIONAL					
Between groups	76.990	1	76.990	.455	.504
Within groups	5924.307	36	169.266		
Total	6001.297	37			

Once this pattern was established, it was possible to conduct a correlation test on the leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was established using the MSQ. This questionnaire consists of 20 questions using a Likert scale of 1 to 5. One (1) corresponded to “very dissatisfied” and 5 to “very satisfied”. Each teacher was asked to complete this survey. Once completed, the survey was scored to give a percentage score. Three scores were possible—intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and general satisfaction. A score of 75% or higher is considered highly satisfied and 25% or lower is highly dissatisfied. The general satisfaction score was used in this study as an indication of the teachers’ satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

As is noted on Table 5, there is no statistically significant relationship between the transactional leadership style and teacher job satisfaction ($r = .062$, $p = .760$). This table also shows that while there is a positive relationship between the transformational leadership style and teacher job satisfaction, it is not statistically significant ($r = .338$, $p = .084$).

Table 5
Correlations of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction

	Satisfaction
Transactional	
Pearson's Correlation	.062
Sig. (2-tailed)	.760
N	27
Transformational	
Pearson's Correlation	.338
Sig. (2-tailed)	.084
N	27

Based on these results, the first null hypothesis is accepted. There is no statistically significant relationship between principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

The second null hypothesis was tested using the MSQ and the Georgia Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) for each school that participated. The CRCT test scores were retrieved from the report card for each school from Georgia's Department of Education website. This site is www.doe.k12.ga.us. Each school's report card is published here according to the system in which the school is located. The report card

publishes all test scores for this school and compares the school's scores with the state's and system's scores. This information is delineated by subjects as well as grade levels. The third grade scores from the 2001-2002 school year were used for this analysis.

A correlation was conducted with the two leadership styles tested – transactional and transformational – and each subtest of the third grade scores from the school. The percentage of students passing the subtests for the CRCT was used. According to the *A Plus Education Reform Act* (2000), a student passes this test if he/she meets or exceeds the expectations for his/her grade level. Table 6 indicates the results from this test.

Table 6
Correlations between Transactional and Transformational Leadership Styles and Subtest Scores on 2001-2002 CRCT

	Reading	Math	Social Studies	Science	Language Arts
Transactional					
Pearson's r	.694	.688	.661	.602	.687
Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	.028	.038	.065	.028
N	10	10	10	10	10
Transformational					
Pearson's r	.060	.064	-.011	-.006	.054
Sig. (2-tailed)	.869	.860	.977	.968	.883
N	10	10	10	10	10

A transformational leadership style does not show a statistically significant relationship with any of the subtests for the third grade CRCT taken during the 2001-2002 school year. However, a transactional leadership style does show a statistically significant relationship to all subject tests with the exception of science. For each of the other subtests, there was a statistically significant relationship at the .05 level. For

example, the reading subtest had a positive relationship ($r = .694$, $p = .026$). With this analysis, the second null hypothesis is partially rejected. There was a statistically significant relationship between a transactional leadership style and four of the five subtests on the CRCT. Since all of the subtests did not show a statistically significant relationship, this hypothesis cannot be rejected completely.

To answer the third null hypothesis, a correlation was tested between the mean satisfaction score from a school and the percentage of students passing the subtests for the CRCT. A passing score was defined as those students meeting or exceeding expectations on the CRCT. Table 7 shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between a teacher's job satisfaction and the scores on this particular standardized test. Table 8 shows a breakdown of the mean general satisfaction scores and the mean subtest scores on the CRCT by school.

Table 7
Correlations between the Mean Teacher Job Satisfaction Scores and Subtest Scores on the 2001-2002 CRCT

	Reading	Math	Social Studies	Science	Language Arts
Satisfaction					
Pearson r	-.516	-.586	-.511	-.524	-.532
Sig. (2-tailed)	.127	.075	.131	.120	.113
N	10	10	10	10	10

Table 8
Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores and CRCT Subtest Scores by School

	Mean Satisfaction Score	CRCT Reading	CRCT Math	CRCT Science	CRCT Social Studies	CRCT Language Arts
School #1	72	98	100	98	99	98
School #2	85	96	97	93	96	95
School #3	80	90	84	87	88	93
School #4	78	96	96	91	98	95
School #5	55	90	93	89	91	93
School #6	45	86	91	81	82	88
School #7	45	86	92	80	87	87
School #8	57	71	71	50	61	65
School #9	49	96	96	89	97	96
School #10	55	68	67	55	60	62

Based on this information, the third null hypothesis is accepted. There is no statistically significant relationship between a teachers' job satisfaction and the scores on this standardized test.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 1982, Brookover et al., noted that the principal, as the instructional leader, should take the primary responsibility for evaluating students on mastering expected objectives. This should be done by identifying the objective and monitoring the success of the instructional program. Two years later, in 1984, Goodlad stated conventional wisdom of the day pointed out that “everything depends on the principal” (p. xvi). This includes accountability for students’ test scores and maintaining well-qualified teachers. Little has changed since then. Silins (1994) noted that the principal has been recognized as a critical element in school improvement and reform. Murphy and Louis (1994) observed that the “heightened responsibility to manage reform often comes at the expense of the principal’s educational/instructional role” (p. 35). This was the basis for this research.

In the effective schools research, the principal was considered the major authority in school reform. Because of this, many studies have been conducted on effective leadership styles. Some of these include transformational and transactional leadership styles.

Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of something valued. Transformational leadership is based on more than the compliance of followers; it involves shifts in the beliefs, the needs, and the values of followers. (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987, p. 648)

Many studies have also been done on leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The idea of transformational leadership corresponding to teacher job satisfaction is supported in the research (e.g. Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bogler, 1999; Kim, 2002; Schneider, 1985). Bogler (2001) went so far as to say,

Principals who demonstrate transformational behavior, such as paying personal attention to the needs and interests of the teachers, providing for intellectual stimulation and challenges, raising teachers' expectations and motivation to devote and investing extra efforts, are assumed to encourage teachers to view their occupation as more rewarding and central to their lives. (p. 668)

Further, Foels, Driskell, Mullen and Salas (2000) found that democratic leadership resulted in higher satisfaction than did autocratic leadership.

Other researchers found other correlations with job satisfaction. Anderman (1991) found that "the more a teacher perceives an emphasis on recognition, the more satisfied that teacher is with his or her work" (p. 10). This recognition is part of the transactional leadership style. Henke et al. (1994) found that elementary school teachers were more likely to be satisfied and to believe that their principals were doing a good job than were secondary school teachers. The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) found that "administrative support and leadership, student behavior and school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy are working conditions associated with teacher satisfaction" (p. ix).

With this research, it was hypothesized that there would be a correlation between the principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. However, this was not the case. Elementary teachers were used, and most of the teachers perceived their principal's leadership style to be more transformational than transactional. It can be argued that the

third grade teachers were not highly satisfied due to pressures placed upon them. As Henke et al. (1994) stated, “Teaching is notable for unmanageable work loads and to juggle numerous other responsibilities (supervision of students outside the classroom, parent conferences, etc.) as well as classroom teaching” (p. 117). This year, third grade students were expected to pass the reading subtest of the CRCT in order to move to the fourth grade. This placed much stress on the principal, as instructional leader, and the teacher to try and get the students to pass. The scores are also tied to the Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) list put out each year by the federal government because of the *No Child Left Behind* legislation. If a school fails to meet AYP, there are consequences to be faced. This may have added more stress. It is interesting to note, that the schools with the lower pass rates tended to have the lower satisfaction rates.

A percentage score of 75 or higher on satisfaction corresponds to being highly satisfied. A percentage score of 25 or lower corresponds to being highly dissatisfied. A score below the 50th percentile is considered dissatisfied. The second null hypothesis stated that there was no statistically significant relationship between a principal’s leadership style and the mean score of the students on a standardized test score. Cotton (2003) stated, “Studies have shown that principals who are knowledgeable about and actively involved with their school’s instructional program have higher-achieving students than principals who manage only the noninstructional aspects of their school” (p.25).

There was no statistically significant relationship found between the transformational leadership style and the CRCT test scores. Most of the schools perceived their principal to be more transformational than transactional. With only one

exception, if the principal saw himself/herself as transformational, then so to did the teachers. In this case, the principal saw himself/herself as transformational, but the teachers' perceived his/her style to be more transactional. A transformational leader focuses on changing the work environment. If this is true, then it can be hypothesized that a change is not needed to improve test scores.

This study found a statistically significant relationship between transactional leadership style and the scores on the CRCT. Science was the only subtest without this relationship. It is interesting to note that more often than not, the largest subtest score for transactional leadership was contingent reward.

According to Avolio, Howell, & Sosik, (1999) a contingent reward leader focuses on the exchange. "In exchange for the leader's articulating a goal and providing rewards when the goal is achieved, followers are expected to comply with the leader's performance expectations" (p. 220). It is suggested that the CRCT results with transactional leadership, may be the result of the contingent reward profile that most administrators utilize. Bass and Avolio (1994) stated that all leaders exhibit all traits of transformational and transactional leadership, some traits are more evident than others and this may make the difference in any given situation.

This relationship of test scores and transactional leadership could also exist because of the relevance of the test items to the curriculum taught to the students. Gilman and Lanman-Givens (2001) suggested that in order to raise test scores, the curriculum and the tests be aligned. The CRCT is based on the state's standards of education. A transactional leader may use contingent reward techniques to ensure that

his/her teachers are teaching the standards and the curriculum in an effort to raise test scores.

The third null hypothesis was accepted because there was no statistically significant relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the CRCT test scores. It has been assumed in the research that if the teacher is satisfied with his/her job, then the scores on standardized tests for this teacher's class will rise. This has been assumed because in the business setting, a satisfied employee is a more productive employee. In education, productivity is often judged by a single test score. Kohn (2004) stated that there is a "top-down standards and coercive pressure to raise scores on an endless series of standardized tests" (p. 572). Hamilton and Stecher (2004) believed that for test-based accountability to be productive, there must be an incentive system in place. This incentive system, similar to contingent reward, must have rewards and sanctions that are meaningful to teachers. At the present time, this does not seem to be the case.

Implications

This study has implications for principals in that it supports the maxim, "*You can't make everybody happy.*" The research stated that transformational leadership led to greater job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Weasmer, 2002). This was not supported in this study. This study showed that even transformational leaders, leaders that rely on empowering teachers, do not guarantee that teachers will be satisfied. There are many extraneous factors involved in job satisfaction, and the principal of the school cannot eliminate them in order to have satisfied teachers.

This study also showed that satisfied teachers do not assure satisfactory student test scores. Much of the research on job satisfaction and improved outcomes has been in

business and industry. As many people will testify, a school is not a business and the outcomes of a school cannot be treated in the same manner as a business. The outcomes for a school are its students and community. This is usually judged to be successful or not by test scores. This study shows that making teachers happy will not guarantee a successful school.

This study did show, however, that the leadership style of a principal can show a relationship to test scores. The transactional leadership style correlated positively with the test scores. This leads me to believe that third grade teachers in this study thrive on contingent reward. If a principal can give meaningful rewards, or consequences, for satisfactory test scores, then the students will rise to the occasion. This is probably why some principals rely on the use of pep rallies and no homework as incentives.

Recommendations

If this study is replicated, it is recommended that a larger population be used. A larger population would allow for a better generalization of the data. It may also be relevant to see if the socioeconomic status, race, or gender of the students of the school would make a difference in this study. This question was not attempted by the researcher. It is also recommended that more grade levels be involved. By relying on one grade level, the majority of the school was overlooked. Is the perceived leadership style similar school-wide?

Another recommendation would be to use more current data. More current data would make any statistically significant relationship able to be generalized to a larger population. It may also be of interest to see if a statistically significant relationship existed between each category of the MSQ (extrinsic satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction

and general satisfaction) and the leadership styles. This may give an indication as to what areas a principal can influence teacher satisfaction.

REFERENCES

A Plus Education Reform Act of 2000. HB 1187. 2000

Anderman, E. M. (1991, April). *Teacher commitment and job satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, IL. Retrieved July, 2002, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 375 497.

Avolio, B. J. (1991). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership: Cases on transactional and transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Avolio, B.J., Howell, J.M., & Sosik, J.J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as a moderator of leadership style effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2), 219-228.

Bass, B. & Avolio B. (2000). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Binghamton, NY: Binghamton University.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 37(5), 662- 701.

Bogler, R. (1999, April). *Reassessing the behaviors of principals as a multiple-factor in teachers' job satisfaction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. Retrieved July, 2002, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 800.

Brookover, W., Beamer, L., Eftim, H., Hathaway, D., Lezotte, L., Miller, S., Passalacqua, J., Tornatzky, L. (1982). *Creating effective schools: An in-service program for enhancing school learning climate and achievement*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

- Burns, J.M. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Casavant, M. D., & Cherkowski, S. (2001). Effective leadership: Bringing mentoring and creativity to the principalship. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(624), 71-81.
- Chung, K.-S. (1970). *Teacher centered management style of public school principals and job satisfaction of teachers*. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Lansing, MI.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ferguson, D. (2000). NSTA survey lists teachers' dissatisfactions. *Curriculum Administrator*, 36(7), 18.
- Foels, R., Driskell, J., Mullen, B., & Salas, E. (2000). The effects of democratic leadership on group member satisfaction. *Small Group Research* 31 (6), 767-701.
- Gilman, D. A., & Lanman-Givens, B. (2001). Increase your school's test scores – ethically. *Principal Leadership*, 1(5), 45 – 50.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Goodlad, J. I. (2004). *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Goodlad, J. I. (2002). Kudzu, rabbits and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(1), 17-23.
- Halpin, A. W. (1967). *Theory and research in administration*. New York, NY: MacMillan Company.
- Hamilton, L., & Stecher, B. (2004). Responding effectively to test-based accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan* 85(8), 578-583.
- Henke, R. R., Choy, S. P., Xianglei, C., Geis, S., Alt, M., MPR Associates, Inc, S. P. Brougham Project Officer. (1995). *America's teachers: Profile of a profession, 1993-1994*. Retrieved July, 2002, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410 225.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job Attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hom, P. W., & Kinicki, A. J. (2001). Toward a greater understanding of how dissatisfaction drives employee turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 975-987.

- Jones, W. D. (2002). Making a difference through teaching. *Black Collegian*, 32(2), 82-84.
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 949-964.
- Keith, S., & Girling, R. H. (1991). *Education, management and participation: New directions in educational administration*. Boston, MD: Allyn and Bacon,.
- Kim, I., & Loadman, W. E. (1994). *Predicting teacher job satisfaction*. Retrieved July, 2002, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 707.
- Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 231-241.
- Kohn, A. (2004). Test today, privatize tomorrow: Using accountability to “reform: public schools to death. *Phi Delta Kappan* 85(8), 569-577.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 648-657.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1992). *Developing expert leadership for future schools*. Briston, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis, Inc.
- Lester, P. E. (1988). *Teacher job satisfaction: An annotated bibliography and guide to research*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Lunenberg, F. C., & Ornstein, F. (1996). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices* (2nd ed.) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, Company.
- MacNeil, A. (1992). *Principal instructional management and its relation to teacher job satisfaction*. Doctoral Dissertation for the University of South Carolina. UMI Dissertation Service, 9239066, Ann Arbor, MI.
- McBee, R. H., & Moss, J. (2002). PDS partnerships come of age. *Educational Leadership* 59(6), 61-65.
- McNeil, L. (2000). *Contradictions of reform: The educational costs of standardized testing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Murphy, J., & Louis, K.S. (1994). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation*. Retrieved July, 2002, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 412 181.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 Stat.1425 (2002).
- Palestini, R. H. (2003). *The human touch in educational leadership: A postpositivist approach to understanding educational leadership*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Sacks, P. (1999). *Standardized minds: The high price of America's testing culture and what we can do to change it*. New York, NY: Perseus Book Groups.
- Schackmuth, T. G. (1979). Creating job satisfaction in a static teacher market. *The Clearing House*, 52(5), 229-232.
- Schneider, G. T. (1984). Teacher involvement in decision making: Zones of acceptance, decision conditions and job satisfaction. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 18(1), 25-32.
- Sherman, R. B. (1986). *The relationship between quality circles and teacher satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation for the University of Houston. UMI Dissertation Services, 9239006, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Silins, H. C. (1992). Effective leadership for school reform. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 38(4), 317-334.
- Sosik, J. J., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 365-390.
- Stiles, D. C. (1993). *The relationship between organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction in Gwinnett County public schools*. Doctoral dissertation for the University of Georgia. UMI Dissertation Service, 9416288, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Thompson, D. E. (1971). Favorable self-perception, perceived supervisory style and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(4), 349-352.
- Trott, M. C., & Windsor, K. (1999). Leadership effectiveness: How do you measure up? *Nursing Economics*, 17(3), 127-130.
- Tye, B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(1), 24-32.

- Ulriksen, J. J. (2000). *Perceptions of secondary school teachers and principals concerning factors related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction*. Retrieved July, 2002, from ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 684.
- van Engen, M. L., van der Leeder, R., & Willemsen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(5), 581-598.
- Weasmer, J. (2002). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participants. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 186-189.
- Weasmer, J., & Woods, A. (2002). Teaching: An all-terrain career path. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 172-174.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W. & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota.
- Wilkinson, A. D., & Wagner, R. M. (1993). Supervisory leadership styles and state vocational rehabilitation counselor job satisfaction and productivity. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 37(1), 15-25.
- Woods, A., & Weasmer, J. (2002). Maintaining job satisfaction: Engaging professionals as active participant. *The Clearing House*, 75(4), 186-189.
- Zuber, A. (2002). Employing great managers results in a winning restaurant team. *Nations Restaurant News*, 36(23), 70.

APPENDIX A

First letter sent to school principals requesting permission to use his/her school in this study.

(Individual names and addresses were inserted.)

September 25, 2003

Dear:

With No Child Left Behind, President Bush increased the scrutiny surrounding public schools. This scrutiny has many facets. One facet is the hiring and retaining of good, qualified teachers. Good, qualified teachers are necessary to bring about the changes needed in students for learning. Because of the direct impact of principals on teachers, the study of leadership styles is an important area in the field of education.

I solicit your permission to use your faculty for this study. My study concerns the principal's leadership style and teachers' job satisfaction since research has shown that satisfied teachers may influence the quality and stability of instruction presented to the students. I would ask your teachers to complete two questionnaires requiring no more than thirty minutes of their time. The teachers should complete and return the questionnaires to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. One questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Short form, addresses the teacher's job satisfaction; the second questionnaire, the Full-Range Leadership Questionnaire, Short form, addresses teacher's perception of your leadership style. Teachers will be requested to only identify the school and give no personal information. Since I will be the only person evaluating the completed questionnaires, confidentiality is guaranteed. I will also ask you to complete the Full-Range Leadership Questionnaire on yourself to discern if your leadership style is the same as the teachers' perception.

Please feel free to contact me (550-123-4567) if you have any questions. If approved, please forward written permission on your school letterhead with a roster of your 3rd grade teachers and their addresses. I will send the questionnaires directly to them. I greatly appreciate your assistance in this project.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Carpenter, Teacher

APPENDIX B

Letter sent to principals with questionnaires and consent form.

February 17, 2004

Dear Principal:

Allow me to reintroduce myself. My name is Jennifer Carpenter, and I am working toward completion of my doctorate degree from the University of Georgia, department of Educational Leadership. The title of my study is "A correlational study of the perceived leadership style of principals and teachers' job satisfaction". The data for this study is to be gathered from selected third grade classroom teachers in this county, and may be published through the university. The Research and Evaluation Committee of this county has approved this study (see other side.)

Earlier in the school year, you agreed to allow your third grade teachers to participate in my study. Part of this agreement included your completing a questionnaire on your perceived leadership style. This is necessary in order to see if a relationship exists between what you perceive your leadership style to be and the style that your teachers perceive you to have.

Your input will be most helpful in making this study a success. Your participation in voluntary and you may skip any question that you feel uncomfortable answering. Your individual response will be kept confidential. Please take a few moments to complete the enclosed questionnaire. The expected time for completion of the questionnaire is about 20 – 30 minutes. No one will have access to an individual's responses. No individual information will be released as a result of this study. Overall leadership style and teacher job satisfaction level will be reported as an average of all in regards to grade level. I will need the name of your school in order to check the state's website to determine if there is a relationship between your responses on the two questionnaires and your school's standardized test scores. I have enclosed a stamped envelope with my home address in order for you to return the questionnaires directly to me.

In order for this study to be completed in a timely fashion, I am requesting that you complete the questionnaires at the same time and return them to me by February 28, 2004. Thank you for taking the time to help me gather information on this subject. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 770-924-6371 or by email at jencarpenter@mindspring.com. You may also contact my major professor. He is Dr. C. Thomas Holmes, whose address is The University of Georgia, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership, River's Crossing, 850 College Station Road, Athens, Georgia, 30602-4808. His phone number is (706) 542-3343.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Carpenter
Teacher, Middle School

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.

APPENDIX C

Principal's consent form

PRINCIPAL'S CONSENT FORM

I, _____, agree to participate in a research study titled " A correlational study of principal's perceived leadership style and teacher job satisfaction" conducted by Jennifer L. Carpenter from the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia (706-542-3433) under the direction of Dr. C. Thomas Holmes, Department of Educational Leadership, University of Georgia (706-542-0913). I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can stop taking part without giving any reason, and without penalty. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The reason for this study is to determine if a relationship exists between the leadership style of principals, as perceived by their third grade teachers, and the teachers' job satisfaction. This study will also seek to determine if the principal's leadership style correlates with the style perceived by the teachers as well as the third grade students' standardized test scores, as reported by Georgia's Department of Education's web site.

If I volunteer to take part in this study, I will be asked to do the following things:

- 1) Return a list of my third grade teachers' names and addresses in order that the researcher may send 2 questionnaires directly to them
- 2) Complete a questionnaire (the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire, Leaders form), which should take no more than 30 minutes.

I will receive no compensation for answering the questionnaire.

No risk is expected. No information about me, or provided by me during the research, will be shared with others without my written permission. I will be asked to provide the name of my school only, as will the third grade teachers in my school that will participate. No other personal information will be asked for or used.

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project (555-123-4567).

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

Jennifer L. Carpenter

Name of Researcher

Signature

Date

Telephone: 555-123-4567

Email: jencarpenter@mindspring.com

Name of Participant

Signature

Date

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D. Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu

APPENDIX D

Cover letter sent to teachers with questionnaires.

February 17, 2004

Dear Teacher:

My name is Jennifer Carpenter, and I am working toward completion of my doctorate degree from the University of Georgia, department of Educational Leadership. The title of my study is "A correlational study of the perceived leadership style of principals and teachers' job satisfaction". The data for this study is to be gathered from selected third grade classroom teachers in this county, and may be published through the university. The Research and Evaluation Committee has approved this study (see other side.)

As you are aware, public schools are under increasing scrutiny. With President Bush's No Child Left Behind, your role as a teacher has become even more important. You have a direct influence on a child's test scores and thoughts of school. Because of this, I would like your assistance in gathering data to be used in my dissertation. I believe this study will provide meaningful information to teachers and administrators in improving and maintaining teacher job satisfaction in this county. The focus will be on the leadership style that best influences teacher job satisfaction.

Your input will be most helpful in making this study a success. Your participation is voluntary, and you may skip any question that you feel uncomfortable answering. Your individual response will be kept confidential. Please take a few moments to complete the two enclosed questionnaires. The expected time for completion of the questionnaires is about 20 – 30 minutes. No one will have access to an individual's responses. No individual information will be released as a result of this study. Overall leadership style and teacher job satisfaction level will be reported as an average of all in regards to grade level. I will need the name of your school in order to check the state's website to determine if there is a relationship between your responses on the two questionnaires and your school's standardized test scores. I have enclosed a stamped envelope with my home address in order for you to return the questionnaires directly to me.

In order for this study to be completed in a timely fashion, I am requesting that you complete the questionnaires at the same time and return them to me by February 28, 2004. Thank you for taking the time to help me gather information on this subject. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 770-924-6371 or by email at jencarpenter@mindspring.com. You may also contact my major professor. He is Dr. C. Thomas Holmes, whose address is The University of Georgia, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership, River's Crossing, 850 College Station Road, Athens, Georgia, 30602-4808. His phone number is (706) 542-3343.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Carpenter
Teacher, Middle School

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.