

2017

A Study of Teacher Job Satisfaction, Teacher Preferred Leadership Behaviors, and the Impact of the Leadership Behaviors on Teacher Job Satisfaction

Lorna Jackie Tobias

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/education_etd



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tobias, Lorna Jackie, "A Study of Teacher Job Satisfaction, Teacher Preferred Leadership Behaviors, and the Impact of the Leadership Behaviors on Teacher Job Satisfaction" (2017). *Education Dissertations and Projects*. 263.
https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/education_etd/263

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Dissertations and Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University. For more information, please see [Copyright and Publishing Info](#).

A Study of Teacher Job Satisfaction, Teacher Preferred Leadership Behaviors, and the
Impact of the Leadership Behaviors on Teacher Job Satisfaction

By
Lorna Jacqueline Tobias

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Gardner-Webb University School of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Gardner-Webb University
2017

Approval Page

This dissertation was submitted by Lorna Jacqueline Tobias under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Gardner-Webb University School of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Gardner-Webb University.

Jeff Peal, Ed.D.
Committee Chair

Date

Stephen Laws, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Date

Willyetta Mitchell, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Date

Jeffrey Rogers, Ph.D.
Dean of the Gayle Bolt Price School
of Graduate Studies

Date

Acknowledgements

Mentors taught me “leadership is about empowering and coaching others to do the work that must be done and removing the barriers so that they may do it well.” This study came from a place of learning and inquiry. The desire to be a better leader and the need to encourage growth for all by creating an environment that sustains excellence guided this research.

To Dr. Peal, my chair, and my professors at Gardner Webb, thank you for a great experience and for critiquing and giving suggestions to guide me to the end of this journey. Dr. Shellman, I would like to thank you for taking your personal time to assist me with data that guided my study.

To my cohort of phenomenal women, Kim, Tamika, and Teresa, thank you for making this fun and challenging me to continue. We have been through life-changing experiences with each other; thank you for allowing me to call you friends.

To my family, thank you for all your support. To my husband Andrew, thank you for reading and pushing me to success and not allowing me to deviate from the path of excellence. Thank you for encouraging me to walk in my strength.

To my children Kristie, Drew, Josh, and Gabbi, you are all great in your own right. You inspire me to more greatness and to continuously be a role model for each of you. You have now become my role models as you accomplish much in life.

I am nothing without my faith in God; and in the small moments when I did not have a thought or word to write, I got wisdom from above.

Abstract

Teacher Job Satisfaction, Teacher Preferred Leadership Behaviors, and the Impact of these Behaviors on Teacher Job Satisfaction. Tobias, Lorna Jacqueline, 2017: Dissertation, Gardner-Webb University, Teacher Job Satisfaction/Leadership Behaviors/Impact of Leadership Behaviors

This study's purpose was to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction. Current research points to a myriad of contributing factors regarding teacher job dissatisfaction including increased accountability, heavy workloads, low salary, and perceived lack of principal support.

In this study, 81 teachers secondary from an urban school district in North Carolina completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1994). This online survey identified job satisfaction levels of teachers, preferred leadership behaviors, and correlations between teacher job satisfaction and the preferred leadership behaviors.

Findings from this study indicated that teachers were ambivalent regarding their job satisfaction level overall but were very satisfied with the job itself. They were not satisfied at all with pay. The teachers preferred leaders who exhibited qualities such as being good communicators, supportive, honesty, integrity, team players, and who appreciated and recognized achievement. They did not prefer laissez-faire leaders. These characteristics would include leaders who did not act with urgency or waited for things to go wrong. Findings from the study indicated that there were no significant relationships between teacher job satisfaction and preferred leadership behaviors.

This research may assist in developing leadership training and effective practices that can cultivate effective climates for maintaining teacher job satisfaction in schools.

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study	6
Statement of the Problem.....	7
Operational Definitions.....	10
Theoretical Framework of the Study	11
Summary	12
Chapter 2: Literature Review	13
Overview	13
Research Questions	14
Leadership Theory	14
Leadership Styles	22
Motivational Theories	31
Principal Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction	35
Summary	38
Chapter 3: Methodology	40
Participants.....	41
Research Design.....	41
Instruments.....	43
MLQ5X.....	43
JSS.....	45
Procedures	47
Data Analysis	49
Limitations	49
Delimitations.....	50
Summary	50
Chapter 4: Results	51
Introduction.....	51
Demographics	53
Descriptive Statistics.....	54
Research Question 1	54
Research Question 2	57
Research Question 3	62
Summary	68
Chapter 5: Interpretations, Recommendations Conclusions.....	70
Overview.....	70
Finding and Interpretations	71
Limitations	91
Implications.....	92

Recommendations	95
Conclusion	96
References	98
Appendices	
A Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Sample	111
B Job Satisfaction Survey Sample.....	113
C Permission to Use MLQX5.....	115
D Permission to Use JSS	117
E Demographic Questionnaire and Consent	119
F Electronic Example of MLQX5 and JSS	122
Tables	
1 Factors Affecting Job Attitudes	33
2 Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	34
3 Subscales and Corresponding Questions for the JSS.....	54
4 Descriptive Statistics for the JSS	55
5 Description of Subsets of the MLQ5X Leadership Behaviors and Related Questions	58
6 Descriptive Statistics for the MLQ5X	59
7 Summary of the Three Questions with Highest Frequencies of the MLQ5X.....	60
8 Summary of the Three Questions with the Highest Frequencies of Negatively Referred Behaviors.....	61
9 Summary Responses to Open-Ended Questions.....	62
10 Pearson <i>r</i> Correlations of the Mean MLQ5X and the JSS.....	63
11 Pearson <i>r</i> Correlations of the Three Highest Preferred Behaviors on the MLQ5X and the Three Highest Job Satisfaction.....	64
12 JSS and MLQ5X Pearson Correlations.....	66
13 JSS and MLQ5X Pearson Correlations.....	67

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Since its inception in the 18th century, the United States public education system has assumed the responsibility of preparing future leaders of the country (Public Broadcasting Service, 2001). This was a tremendous responsibility because “roughly half a million United States teachers either move or leave the profession each year, attrition that costs the United States up to 2.2 billion annually” (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2014, p. 1). Estimates for North Carolina are slightly over \$84.5 million annually (Reiman, 2016). Education in the United States is now under intense scrutiny by public and private interests who question the system’s ability to fulfill its goals of teaching basic skills, instilling values, preventing dropouts, and producing a productive workforce (Wetherill, 2002). Teacher attrition has been on the radar of education advocates, school leaders, researchers, analysts, and policymakers since the early 1980s. Warnings of the possibility of severe loss of qualified teachers have threatened for a number of years (Ingersoll, 2001). The United States Department of Education (USDE, 2015) reported that there has been a teacher shortage of some sort in all states across the country from 1990-1991 through 2015 (Cunningham, 2015).

According to USDE (2015), every state in the country was struggling to fill vacant teacher positions. The report highlighted the extensive impact of teacher turnover. In addition to the financial cost of teacher turnover, teachers have the most significant influence on student achievement (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012); however, many new teachers become dissatisfied and leave the classroom in search of new careers (Thomas, 2014). Therefore, it is imperative that policymakers and school officials identify the most significant factors that influence teacher job satisfaction and foster

teacher retention. The supply of competent teachers was decreasing due in part to teacher retention (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Darling Hammond (2001) also reported that almost a third of new teachers leave the field within 5 years, with higher rates in the most disadvantaged areas. In recent years, federal, state, and local education officials have increased efforts to address teacher shortages across the United States (Thomas, 2014).

According to the National Education Association (NEA, 2014), attrition, retirement, increased student enrollment, and an emphasis on student assessment were the main reasons the nation's schools will need 2 million teachers in the next several years. Low unemployment rates and other careers offering higher salaries compounded the problem (NEA, 2014). Teacher attrition is the largest single factor that determines the need for additional teachers. Thirty percent of traditionally trained teachers leave the profession by their third year. The research suggested that higher teacher job satisfaction has been associated with a lower propensity to leave the profession (Mayes & Ganster, 1986). Teacher attrition is not a new phenomenon as there have been times in the last 50 years when the demand for teachers was greater than the supply (Cochran-Smith, 2005). In the past, school districts have increased their recruiting efforts to combat teacher shortages; however, teacher retention was identified as the most significant challenge of late (Cochran-Smith, 2005). In the early 1990s, the teacher attrition rate in the United States was 14% (Ingersoll, 2001). Research suggested that up to two million teachers would be needed to meet the demands of growing enrollment and high teacher attrition rates in the near future (Kelly, 2004).

The increase in teacher attrition is based on several factors. Some teachers leave for financial reasons, yet many leave for intrinsic reasons that were directly related to working conditions and the culture at the school level. Fowler and Mittapalli (2007)

found that “retirement and job dissatisfaction were among the leading reasons for teachers to leave their professions altogether. Low pay and fewer benefits were not reasons for attrition” (p. 4). Researchers found that the following factors rank highest when a teacher decides to leave or to stay: administrative support, financial incentives, paperwork, family responsibilities, and the joy of teaching (Kersaint, Lewis, Potter, & Meiseis, 2007).

Brenneman (2015) stated that North Carolina might be in a special class as it relates to teacher attrition. In North Carolina, the problems stemmed not necessarily from how many teachers left the profession, as opposed to how many were recruited. Despite some state actions that reduced teacher attrition, new data showed little or no return on such efforts, with turnover at the highest rate in at least 5 years, at nearly 15% of teachers. In 2010, turnover was at just over 11%. Literature on job satisfaction suggested that having a working relationship with supervisors and colleagues was essential (Adams, 2010). In a qualitative study focused on examining factors that impact teacher retention in North Carolina, McCoy, Wilson-Jones, and Jones (2013) discovered that salary, working conditions, and lack of support are the most commonly cited reasons for exiting the profession. Based on interviews from both beginning and veteran teachers, lack of support from mentors and colleagues but primarily from school administrators was a major factor in their decision to leave teaching. In addition to determining why teachers leave, McCoy et al. shared reasons for why teachers stay. McCoy et al. reported that veteran teachers stated that “excellent support from their peers and administrator” (p. 50) during their early years was their reason for remaining in teaching.

Today, there continues to be an increasing demand for quality teachers, yet a

decreasing supply of quality candidates (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1994), 13.7% of public school teachers with 1-3 years of experience leave their base school in search of another school, and 9.1% leave the teaching profession altogether. Understanding that teacher job satisfaction, administrative support, and high-stakes testing were some of the factors most significantly impacting these trends was critical to discovering more effective ways to address problems associated with high teacher attrition. Schools must give more attention to teacher job satisfaction to determine why, at such a crucial time, teachers were experiencing increasing dissatisfaction (Thomas, 2014).

Amos (2012) stated that teachers and principals were the foundation upon which our education system rests. Particularly, more than any other factor affecting student learning, teachers had the most significant influence on student achievement. It is imperative that policymakers and school officials identify the most significant factors that influence teacher job satisfaction and foster teacher retention (Thomas, 2014).

Over the years, the topic of job satisfaction has received considerable attention (Howard-Baldwin, Celik & Kraska, 2012). As school and state officials strived to find ways to increase the retention of teachers, it became necessary to identify factors that most significantly influence teacher satisfaction in their workplace (Thomas, 2014). Clearly defining the problem may produce a better understanding of the issues and may help guide the most effective way to solve them (Flores, 2007). The outcome of additional research of factors in public schools that have the most direct impact on teacher work experience and job satisfaction could influence hiring processes and staff development opportunities and have a positive impact on school culture, community relations, and ultimately student achievement (Thomas, 2014).

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI, 2015) reported that teacher attrition rose to the highest rate in the past 5 years. NCDPI (2015) found that 14.8% of the state's 96,081 teachers left their positions in the 2014-2015 school year, up from 14.1 the prior year. The district that was included in the research had the highest rate of attrition in the state at 20.4%. This district, compared to other districts with like demographics and student populations, had the highest teacher turnover rate (NCDPI, 2015). Of the top 20 districts in the state, this was the only urban district. The teachers in the district cited personal or other reasons as the highest category for departure (NCDPI, 2015).

State superintendent of North Carolina June Atkinson said, "We won't reverse this trend until we address the root causes of why teachers leave the classroom" (Hui & Helms, 2015, p. 1). In the latest report, NCDPI (2015) reported teacher dissatisfaction as the highest reason for departure from the teaching profession. Therefore, the focus of this study was an investigation of teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors and the impact of leadership behaviors on teacher job satisfaction as perceived by teachers.

Leadership was a major focus in education, more specifically; principal leadership plays an influential part in teacher outlook on their overall careers and their overall experience (Stewart, 2006). Principals as leaders within a school had a major impact on employee perceptions, interpretations, and behavior in the workplace (Djibo, Desiderio, & Price, 2010). It has been reported that leadership was a strong predictor of teacher intentions to continue working in or leave the teaching profession (Ndoye, Imig & Parker, 2010). Organizational research suggested that the perception of a leader's effectiveness was linked to how employees view themselves and perform in an

organization (Sauer, 2011). A sense of having administrative support, belongingness, and value was necessary for the development of trust and commitment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction. This study took place in 13 secondary schools in an urban district in North Carolina. Participants described their level of job satisfaction, chose leadership behaviors that they preferred, and explicated whether preferred principal leadership behaviors favorably or unfavorably influence their perceptions of job satisfaction. These behaviors included things that influence school policy and principal decisions that affect teachers, school culture, and/or climate. Participating teachers identified effective leadership behaviors that were crucial to teachers and could influence job satisfaction.

According to Gardner (2010), a strong link exists between job satisfaction and teacher retention. In a study of music teachers, Gardner found that job satisfaction played a key role in teacher decisions to stay in or leave the profession. Research suggested that several factors lead to teacher job dissatisfaction (Trait, 2008); however, the lack of leader support was among the primary factors that lead to job dissatisfaction (Alliance for Excellence in Education, 2005).

Based upon his analysis of federal survey data for more than 50,000 teachers nationwide, Ingersoll (2003) indicated that 42% of all those leaving the profession report doing so because of job dissatisfaction. When asked why they were dissatisfied, lackluster support from school administration, low salaries, lack of teacher influence over decision making, and lack of discipline all factored into the decision (Ingersoll, 2003).

Pogodzinski, Youngs, Frank, and Belman (2012) cited the main reason new

teachers leave the profession is not the insane workload or the lack of resources, but their principals. They surveyed 184 beginning teachers in Michigan and Indiana on the factors that might influence them to leave or stay in the profession. Topping the teachers' list, the researchers found, was how well a school's principal works with the staff. The quality of the relationship with their principal was a stronger predictor of the teachers' intent to remain in the profession than factors related to workloads, administrative duties, resource availability, or the frequency of professional-development opportunities. Given that nearly a third of teachers quit or change schools in their first 2 years of teaching, the study's findings highlight a potential need for better training for principals in leadership and interpersonal skills (Pogodzinski et al., 2012). "The focus, would be on how principals could increase their knowledge of setting a healthy, productive school climate and understanding ways that their actions and leadership can impact new teachers' attitudes and outcomes" (Pogodzinski et al., 2012, p. 24).

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study was that many teachers today are leaving the profession because they feel dissatisfied with their jobs. Increased accountability, stress, heavy workloads, poor pay, working conditions, a negative school atmosphere, low morale, excessive bureaucracy, and specifically perceived inadequate principal support are some of the major factors creating job dissatisfaction among teachers and a desire to leave the profession (MetLife Survey of the American Teacher, 2001). Teaching is a profession that loses 25% of its members during the first 5 years (Varlas, 2013). The issue of teacher job satisfaction must be addressed to retain qualified teachers (Parkinson, 2008). In addition to recruiting new teachers, school districts must focus on retaining veteran teachers (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). School administrators affect the satisfaction

of teachers in schools (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Markow (2003) stated,

Job satisfaction is often related to experiences with the leaders of the organization. In the schools, this leader is typically the principal. Who are the satisfied and dissatisfied teachers and how do their experiences with the principal differ from each other's. An examination of several measures indicates that teachers who are dissatisfied with their careers have less satisfying and less frequent interactions with the principal of their school. Overall, three-quarters (74%) of teachers who are satisfied with their jobs are also satisfied with their relationship with their principal. In contrast, only half (49%) of dissatisfied teachers were also satisfied with their principal. Teachers who are dissatisfied with their careers are less likely than satisfied teachers to have daily or weekly contact with their principal in a range of situations, including one-on-one meetings (13% vs. 25%), informal conversations (63% vs. 80%) and having their principal observe them while they are teaching (7% vs. 20%). Dissatisfied teachers are also consistently less likely than their satisfied counterparts to rate their principal's performance highly. In particular, fewer dissatisfied teachers than satisfied teachers report that their principal is excellent at being an overall leader of the school (15% vs. 32%), being a visible presence throughout the school (17% vs. 41%) and supporting teachers to be the best they can be (16% vs. 35%) (p. 64).

In 2014, the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey (NCTWS) was conducted to assess the perceived working conditions of teachers in North Carolina. According to the survey, teachers felt that a collegial atmosphere (30%) led by a principal with a strong instructional emphasis (16%) mattered most when deciding whether or not

to remain in a particular school. In North Carolina, the biggest turnover problem seems to be in the category of teacher dissatisfaction with their jobs. North Carolina lost about 2,700 teachers in 2015 due to causes that suggested personal dissatisfaction with the state's public schools. Many teachers left due to outright exit from the profession, poaching by other states, or early retirement. That compares to about 2,245 teachers leaving for such reasons in 2013-2014, which is a 21% increase. North Carolina employed about 96,000 teachers during the 2014-2015 school year.

According to NCDPI (2015), the teacher turnover rate for the state was 14.8%. The category departures for "personal reason" rose sharply in the past 2 years. In 2012-2013, just over 2,100 teachers in North Carolina left for personal reasons; in 2013-2014, just over 5,680 cited this reason. In 2015, 1,209 teachers cited job dissatisfaction as the reason for leaving the profession (Hui & Helms, 2015). In the urban area where this research was conducted, the turnover rate was even higher at 20% due to low pay, long hours, and lack of administrative support (Hui & Helms, 2015).

Almy and Tooley (2012) using School and Staffing Surveys (SASS) reported that teacher attrition was higher in high poverty schools. This caused a significant gap in the school with the highest need. The research further stated that there was a significant relationship between teacher attrition and positive working conditions. Almy and Tooley concluded that one of the conditions that consistently emerged as important to teachers was school leadership. Almy and Tooley stated, "school leaders who created shared mission, focus on student achievement and uphold a commitment to teacher learning can grow, attract and retain effective teachers" (p. 3).

The need for research surrounding teacher job satisfaction served as the grounds for this study. Results from this study could potentially help principals keep teachers

more satisfied with their jobs which could aid in decreasing the current trend of high rates of teacher attrition. This study will add to the existing body of research regarding teacher job satisfaction, preferred leader behaviors, and determining the relationship between teachers' preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction particularly in urban settings.

It is the desire of the researcher that the results of this study will be helpful in assisting principals in the public school system to work more effectively with teachers and administrators. This study is very timely given the search by educators to enhance administrator and teacher effectiveness in schools. The results of this study might aid in principals choosing leadership behaviors that promote job satisfaction which in turn would lead to increased teacher retention in all schools and not just in selected schools.

Operational Definitions

The following definitions were included in this study. Leadership behavior and leadership style are used synonymously.

Job satisfaction. Positive and or negative judgments people make about their jobs (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2011; Weiss, 2002).

Teacher attrition. Teachers who leave the teaching profession altogether (National Center for Education Information [NCEI], 2011).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X (MLQ5X). The MLQ5X is the short version of the original MLQ designed to measure the concepts of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Job satisfaction survey (JSS). A self-report instrument designed to measure employee attitudes about their jobs (Spector, 1985).

Passive-avoidant leadership. Passive-avoidant leaders, also referred to as

laissez-faire leaders, are generally inactive in the decision-making process and often avoid supervisory responsibilities. Such leaders are neither proactive nor reactive; rather, they remain uninvolved (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997).

Transactional leadership. Leaders who primarily focus on policy and procedure. They manage by an exchange process between the leader and the subordinates that is reinforced through rewards or consequences (Wells & Peachy, 2011).

Transformational leadership. Refers to the process of influencing major change in the attitude and assumptions of organizational members and building commitment for the organization's mission or objectives (Yukl, 1989).

Theoretical Framework for the Study

Many accepted theoretical frameworks were plausible for this particular study. These include but are not limited to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) was used primarily to frame this study. The Motivation-Hygiene Theory, also known as the Dual Factor Theory and Two-Factor Theory, arose in the late 1950s, making it one of the longest-standing theories used in job satisfaction studies. Herzberg Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell, (1957) conducted an extensive literature review during the development of the theory Herzberg et al. (1957) did not completely agree with the multiple levels of human needs previously described by Maslow. Instead, Herzberg et al. (1957) consolidated Maslow's needs model into two distinct categories, motivators and hygiene factors (Foor & Cano, 2011). Herzberg et al. (1957) found "there was inadequate information about the individuals concerned, their perceptions, their needs, and their pattern of learning" (p. 11). The literature review in Chapter 2 expounds on

motivational theories and provides a framework for this study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction. The participants in this study were teachers from 13 secondary high schools in an urban district in North Carolina. Chapter 1 included the purpose of the study which formed the basis for studying teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and its effect on teacher job satisfaction. This study is a correlational study conducted in an urban district. A correlation study examines variables in the natural environment and does not include researcher-imposed treatments. Correlation studies conduct research after the variations in the variable have occurred naturally (Simon, 2006). The variables in the current study were not manipulated or controlled; therefore, a correlation design was deemed appropriate for this study (Johnson, 2004). The remainder of the chapter highlighted the operational definitions and the theoretical framework.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction. Current research points to a myriad of contributing factors regarding teacher job dissatisfaction including increased accountability, heavy workloads, low salary, and perceived lack of principal support (Markow, 2003). Subsequently, these feelings of teacher job dissatisfaction have led to increased levels of teacher attrition across the United States; and, interestingly, principal leadership and support has been cited as influencing factors (Ingersoll, 2003).

School districts throughout the country are facing teacher shortages. Approximately 33% of beginning public school teachers in this country left the profession before completing their first year in the classroom (Hill, 2013). According to Hamilton (2007), nearly 50% of new teachers leave the profession after only 5 years. Many teachers across the United States have become increasingly dissatisfied with their profession because of heightened levels of accountability, low salaries, poor working environments, negative school climates, and particularly insufficient perceived principal assistance (Popham, 2004). This trend has led to high rates of teacher attrition, and school principal leadership has been identified as an influencing factor in relation to teacher job satisfaction (Ingersoll, 2003).

This chapter examines an overview of the literature that focused on the perception of the relationships between leadership behavior and teacher job satisfaction. For the purpose of this study, the terms leader and principal are used interchangeably where applicable. Additionally, the terms leadership behavior and leadership style are used

synonymously.

Specifically, the literature reviewed the concept of leadership, motivational theories, and the relationship between leadership and teacher job satisfaction. The following research questions were explored to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of leadership behaviors on teacher job satisfaction.

Research Questions

1. How do teachers perceive their own job satisfaction as measured by JSS?
2. What were the significant leadership behaviors that teachers prefer as measured by the MLQ5X?
3. What is the relationship between teachers' preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction?

To gain greater insight into the history of principal leadership behaviors and their impact upon teacher job satisfaction, this chapter examined the literature related to leadership theory including a definition and discussion of different leadership styles. This chapter then discussed research and literature on motivational theories which provided the context for determining strategies that motivate teachers. The chapter then concluded with a discussion of the principal leadership styles' influence on teacher job satisfaction.

Leadership Theory

A leader was broadly defined as a “person who has commanding authority or influence” (Merriam-Webster, 2015). Hollander (1978) observed, “Leadership is a process of influence between a leader and those who are followers” (p. 1). You must become someone others can trust to take them where they want to go (Maxwell, 2007).

However, many studies related to leadership styles (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bass, 1990) lacked a clear definition of the parameters of leadership. Those researchers who define leadership tend to do so in the context of their individual perspectives and the aspects of the phenomenon of most interest to them (Yukl, 1989). Bass (1990) defined leadership as,

Leadership has been conceived as the focus of group processes, as a matter of personality, as a matter of inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behaviors, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, as initiation of structure, and many combinations of these definitions. (p. 11)

These definitions implied that leadership was an action or a process of leading, influencing, or motivating others to achieve a desired goal (Waters, 2013).

Bass (1990) described leadership as “one of the world’s oldest preoccupations” (p. 3). From Aristotle to St. Paul to Machiavelli, writers and thinkers have analyzed the behavior of leaders, and this interest has prompted extensive studies about topics such as the importance of leadership, the ingredients of a good leader, typologies of leaders, and methods of cultivating effective leadership skills (Short & Greer, 2002). There are many different definitions of leadership as there are different kinds of leaders (Mann, 2014). Kahn (1978) stated, “the essence of organizational leadership was the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization” (p. 528). Some definitions of leadership reflected current organizational paradigms, and many recognized the importance of interpersonal influence over position titles or other formal status. Stogdill (1994) presented seven different categories for summarizing the various definitions of leadership that occurred in the research he

reviewed and found that “the consistent theme was that leadership involved a social phenomenon in which a person may exert power, persuade, direct a group or individual behavior, facilitate goal achievement, or otherwise influence other people” (p. 22).

Stogdill further defined leadership as a social influence process that included at least two individuals acting in interdependent roles: one individual acts as a follower and one acts as an influential leader. Pearce and Conger (2003) described leadership as broadly distributed among a set of individuals instead of centralized in the hands of a single individual who acted in the role of a superior. As Bass and Avolio (1993) noted, the field of leadership often reinvented itself without regard to previous theory.

The process of leadership is multidimensional and though no one specific explanation captured the concept in its entirety, evidence of a common element has been presented. The idea that leadership involved a “process of influence” (Mello, 2003, p. 345) is shared across disciplines. More specifically, leadership is the ability to influence people toward the achievement of a common goal (Armandi, Oppedisan, & Sherman 2003). It was one of the most impactful factors that influences the work environment, the climate of an organization, and employee experiences (Djibo et al., 2010). Moreover, Robbins (2003) argued that leaders have the responsibility of developing a vision, effectively communicating their ideas to their subordinates, and finding ways to motivate those individuals to participate in the process of achieving the defined goals. In essence, leaders in organizations played an intricate role in the development, growth, and advancement of the organization itself and its members (Thomas, 2014).

Senge (1990) described leaders in learning organizations as responsible for “building organizations where people continually expanded their capabilities to understand complexity, clarify vision, and improve shared mental models” (p. 340). The

first step was to inspire or “breathe life into the vision of learning organizations” (Senge, 1990, p. 340). A shared vision was the most important leadership quality (Senge, 1990). Shared vision allowed for a commitment by the follower because they wanted to reach the organization’s goal. The ability of the leader to establish an organizational vision is possible if solid relationships are formed (Guthrie & Reed, 1991). Donaldson (2001) stated, “leadership satisfies a basic function for the group or organization. It mobilized members to think, believe, and behave in a manner that satisfied emerging organizational needs, not simply their individual needs or wants” (p. 2). When a school’s principal embodied all of the positive characteristics listed above, motivation and teacher job satisfaction increased (Ismail, 2012).

Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (2000) maintained that leadership is the heart of any organization because it determines the success or failure of the organization. Oyetunyi (2006) argued that in an organization such as a school, the importance of leadership is reflected in every aspect of the school like instructional practices, academic achievement, learner disciplines, and teacher retention. This argument was further augmented by Sashkin and Sashkin (2003) who contended that leadership mattered because leaders help reduce ambiguity and uncertainty in organizations. School leadership can be situated within the larger framework of institutional leadership where leadership skills are necessary for effective management and performance. Research findings indicated that there is a positive relationship between teacher morale, job satisfaction, and motivation on the type of leadership in schools. Indeed, head teachers (principals) have the capacity to make teachers’ working lives so unpleasant, unfulfilling, problematic, and frustrating that they become the overriding reason why some teachers do not perform as expected and some have to exit the profession (Linda, 1999).

Linda (1999) quoted one of the teachers he interviewed in his research who had this to say about her principal:

I don't know what it is about her, but she made you want to do your best and not just for her, but for yourself. . . . You are not working to please her, but she suddenly made you realize what was possible, and you, kind of, raised your game. (p. 27)

The key question is what is it about the head teacher to whom she referred that made her leadership so charming and hence effective? It therefore goes without saying that if the secret of effective staff management lies in the leadership style that is adopted, it is clearly important to identify the features of such a style (Sayed, 2013).

In the early 1980s, the United States started to become increasingly aware of critical issues facing its schools such as declining academic performance, poor student motivation, and teacher attrition (Ulriksen, 2000). The primary responsibility for addressing most of the problems fell on the principal who is accountable for everything from student performance on standardized tests to teacher morale. Sergiovanni (1976) stated 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. Goodlad (1984), however, believed it would be a mistake to identify the principal as the main factor influencing teacher satisfaction; rather, he felt that the principal's leadership style was one of many factors that influenced teacher job satisfaction. Bass and Avolio (1994) observed that there is no single leadership style that was appropriate for every situation, but some were more effective than others in bringing about change in teacher morale. Burns (2003) stated that "leadership is not only a descriptive term but a prescriptive one, embracing a moral, even a passionate, dimension"

(p. 2). Principals were expected to be strong instructional leaders as well as to embody other facets of leadership, including teacher retention (Burns, 2003).

Leadership theories were developed and revised many times in the United States. In the 1800s, Taylor's (1911) scientific management theory addressed improving the efficiency of work processes. This theory did not work well in schools because it focused on factories and products, not people (Keith & Girling, 1991). In the 1940s and 1950s, many leaders based their interactions on the trait theory, which suggested that certain traits made a leader effective; though it has shortcomings, this theory led to behavioral theories, which stated that a person's behavior as a leader made a difference in the organization. Behavioral theories led in turn to the development of situational leadership theories, in which different ideas and situations determined the style of leadership.

Bottery (2001) traced the development of the head teacher's leadership role in schools in England. Head teachers in the 19th century had the roles of "social control and the transmission of upper and middle-class moral, spiritual and cultural values" (Bottery, 2001, p. 209). Until the end of World War II, the head teacher's primary role was to control teachers and students and to require their subordination. From the 1940s to the 1980s, they were given much autonomy, which encouraged innovation in curriculum and instruction; and they continued in the role of the "trusted standard-bearer" in their schools. By the mid-1990s, the role of the head teacher required more public relations and marketing. He or she had to have more business savvy of a chief executive officer than the moral and scholarly characteristics of head teachers of earlier times. According to Bottery, this transformation of school leadership roles greatly limits the possibilities of true transformational leadership. More recently, however, with the implementation of a national curriculum, benchmark testing, student standards, and

school evaluation in England, head teachers had to become adept strategists who examined student data and fostered school improvement based on the trends of that data. They were identified as being the essential factor in school improvement and teacher job satisfaction (Bottery, 2001).

Korkmaz (2007) studied the effects of leadership style on the organizational health of schools in Turkey. He cited studies that related the dissatisfaction of teachers to low salaries, lack of resources, inappropriate administrative leadership styles, and job-related stress. In addition, he cited studies that attribute strong correlations between the principal's leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Korkmaz said, "In many respects, the principal is the most important and influential individual in the school. It is his or her leadership that shaped the school's learning climate, the level of relationship between staff, and the teacher morale" (p. 25). Leaders with transformational styles had a positive influence on teacher job satisfaction because they encouraged innovation that led to climates more conducive to learning and positive relationships among administrators, teachers, and students.

Johnson (2004) described the need for school leaders to reform their schools into more effective learning communities in which teachers have the opportunity to learn and grow as professionals. She illustrated how schools have not changed much from the days of the one-room school house in which one teacher worked in isolation to educate students from multiple grade levels. As student enrollment grew in the mid-19th century, larger schools were developed, but they functioned as a cluster of one-room school houses in which teachers continued to work in isolation. Johnson described contemporary schools as egg-crate organizations in which teachers still worked independently in isolation and were left to sink or swim on their own. School reform, on

the contrary, included “team teaching, job-embedded professional development, and differentiated roles for expert teachers” (Johnson, 2004, p. 97). In addition, the new teachers in Johnson’s study identified the importance of administrator support and effective induction programs in determining their success and job satisfaction.

Johnson cited research studies that identified the school principal as having the most significant influence in determining how and how well a school will function. The teachers in Johnson’s study desired school leaders who were “present, positive, and actively engaged in the instruction life of the school” (p. 98). They hoped to work in a school where order was maintained and where they received support in classroom management. More of the new teachers than not described dissatisfaction with their principals; however, principals who received accolades from the new teachers were identified as being visible, innovative, fair, supportive, effective problem solvers, positive in their interaction with teachers, strong instructional leaders, and clear communicators. Eleven of the 50 teachers in Johnson’s study left teaching by the third year of the study. After 4 years, two thirds of the teachers in study had left teaching or switched schools. Those who moved to other schools or left teaching expressed dissatisfaction with the overwhelming demands of teaching, low salaries, and few prospects for improvement. They described their principals as being “arbitrary, abusive, or neglectful” (Johnson, 2004, p. 113). They described themselves as being isolated and unsupported.

Maxwell (2007) said that everything rises and falls on leadership, which attested to the extreme importance and influence of a leader and his or her leadership. Fullan (2007) acknowledged that leadership is a universal concept that filters into every aspect of human endeavors including business, government, church, and education. A leader who encouraged, supported, guided, and empowered others is one who distributed the

control of leadership from self to others (Waters, 2013). One factor that influenced effective leadership style centered on the relationship between leader and follower. Guthrie and Reed (1991) noted that these relationships depended upon several factors, including the personal characteristics of those involved, how the leader interacted with the followers, and the situation at hand. Short and Greer (2002) took this a step further and stated that these relationships depended on situational favorableness, task specificity, leader-member relations, leader personality, and group maturity. Fullan (2002) noted, “Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement” (p. 16). Accordingly, educational leadership required school principals to demonstrate administrative talents with thought patterns that contributed to teacher retention (Hamilton, 2007).

Leadership Styles

Fullan (2004) stated that leadership styles have four main characteristics including (a) having moral purpose, (b) allowing for change processes, (c) developing rational skills, and (d) being able to achieve consistency in the workplace. If a principal shifted the educational paradigm in a school, he or she would exude these characteristics in order to foster change and not dwell upon systems that are no longer functional. Goldman (1998) believed that these different leadership styles are deep-seated, learned behaviors.

Similarly, McBer (2000) found that leadership styles are greatly influenced by the emotional intelligence of each leader and included attributes such as being coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetter, and coaching. These six emotional intelligences allowed a principal to lead the school with soul and not merely guide teachers as if they were robots.

In the early 1800s to the mid-1970s, the dominant models for the study of leadership evolved from researchers emphasizing traits, behavior, and situations that influenced a person's leadership to the more dynamic leadership models seen today (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Prominent leadership styles such as authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire, situational, transactional, transformational, and passive avoidant have been the target of many research studies (Dale, 2012). Leadership styles and how researchers have interpreted their effectiveness in the workplace were briefly examined. Each leadership style provided positive as well as negative frameworks for leaders to assess themselves in order to improve their own leadership behaviors.

Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) laid the foundation for what was termed behavioral approaches to leadership (Hemphill & Coons, 1957). More specifically, Lewin et al. identified three styles of leadership: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. Authoritarians, also known as autocratic leaders, make decisions without the input of others (Lewin et al., 1939). These leaders are clear about distinguishing between who is the leader and who are the followers. Authoritarian leadership is directive and task oriented. The leader is often very organized and concise about providing directions of how, what, and when the tasks are to be completed by the followers (Lewin et al., 1939). Authoritarian leaders are micromanagers and dictators in their leadership behaviors (Jensen, White, & Singh, 1990). Autocratic leadership refers to a system that gives full empowerment to the leader with minimal participation from the followers (Ismail, 2012). Yukl (1989) found that autocratic leaders have the following five characteristics: (a) they do not consult members of the organization in the decision-making process, (b) the leaders set all policies, (c) the leader predetermines the methods of work, (d) the leader determines the duties of followers, and (e) the leader specifies technical and performance

evaluation standards. Since this style of leadership usually only involves one person deciding, it permits quick decision making. Although the autocratic style is relatively unpopular, in certain circumstances it can be an effective strategy, especially when the leader is short on time and when followers are not productive.

Lewin et al. (1939) described leaders who exhibited a democratic leadership style as leaders who encourage subordinates to provide input and ideas. Democratic leadership was both participative and relationship oriented. Democratic leaders invited their followers to participate with them in the decision-making process. Democratic leaders also provide the freedom for subordinates to work with each other in order to accomplish their goals (Lewin et al., 1939). Subordinates were allowed to take risks, expand their professional growth, and their sense of well-being was protected by the democratic leader (Jones, 2003). Democratic leadership referred to a situation where there is equal work among leaders and followers. Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002), stated that democratic organizations typically have the following six characteristics: (a) policies are determined by a group of organizations, (b) technical and job performance measures are discussed so they are understood by all, (c) leaders provided advice to members with regard to implementing tasks, (d) members are free to choose with whom they work, (e) the group determines the distribution of tasks, and (f) leaders try to be objective in giving praise and criticism. Goldman (1998) stated that leaders using a democratic style of leadership build consensus through participation, but these leaders also expected a higher level of excellence and self-direction.

Lewin et al. (1939) identified laissez-faire leaders as those who provided subordinates with what they needed in order to accomplish their tasks but did not take any initiative in a leadership role or intervene unless subordinates asked for assistance.

This leadership style is nondirective and lacks formal leadership (Thomas, 1997).

Laissez-faire leaders did not involve themselves in the leadership role. These leaders are hands-off and allow group members to make the decisions. Laissez-faire leadership was defined by Korkmaz (2007) as a style of leadership where leaders refuse to make decisions, are not available when needed, and choose to take no responsibility for their lack of leadership ability. These leaders were nonexistent and eluded leadership duties and responsibilities at all costs. Bass (1990) labeled the laissez-faire leader as not clarifying goals and standards that the followers must achieve or basically having no expectations for the followers in the organization. This style of leadership may occur due to the avoidance of leadership behavior altogether, which enables the followers to ignore assignments and expectations. This leader exuded an attitude of indifference as well as a non-leadership approach toward the followers and their performance. This kind of non-leader lacked responsiveness and refused to check the performance of followers. According to Korkmaz (2007), this leadership style actually decreased the commitment levels of teachers to stay at a particular school.

Lewin et al. (1939) were among the first to begin to consider leadership as a style rather than a trait. They observed Iowa school children while conducting their study. For the study, groups of children were broken into three groups to complete an arts and crafts project. Each group was assigned a leader. Each group had autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire leaders. The researchers observed the behavior of the children as they responded to the exhibited leadership style. The autocratic leaders told the boys what they would do and how they would do it. The leaders made comments of criticism or praise without explaining the reason behind the comments. The democratic, or participative, leaders discussed possible projects with the boys and explained their

comments but ultimately let the boys make their own decisions. The laissez-faire, or delegative, leaders offered the boys no advice or guidance. The researchers found democratic leadership to be the most effective. The study found the children of this group to be less productive than members of the authoritarian group, but their work was of higher quality. The children in the laissez-faire leadership group were the least productive of the group. These children also made more demands of the leader, lacked the ability to work independently, and showed little cooperation.

Mullins (2002) noted that principals, who use authoritarian leadership to get things done, were too strict in the formality by which things were done. This hindered teacher creativity, especially in instances where creativity and planning were imperative to anchor the achievement in schools.

The most prominent leadership style discussed in research literature is the Hersey and Blanchard (1988) situational leadership style, which stated that there is no single best style of leadership. Situational leadership was task-oriented and defined around four characteristics: directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating (Hersey & Blanchard, 1976). The directing characteristic was based on one-way communication where the leader defined the role of the individuals/followers based upon specific tasks. Generally, there was little to no importance placed upon relationships, and this can be an effective leadership style when subordinates lack motivation. Principals used this style when giving directions or instructions to teachers and when supervising staff at the school. As related to the impact of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction, this style was suitable when dealing with a teacher who was in their first year of teaching and someone who required more attention and supervision (Edutopia, 2011).

The coaching style was also oriented around tasks, but it also focused on

relationships. There was two-way communication between the leader and followers, and this often allowed for greater buy-in from the followers toward the leader's ideals or instructions. Principals used this style to explain their decision-making process and at the same time continued to direct individuals on tasks. This leadership style was best used for teachers who have 2 or 3 years of experience at the school (Chell, 1995) to enhance their job satisfaction.

The supporting style focused less on tasks and more on relationships. The leader became more relational in engaging the follower's knowledge and maturity. A principal used this style when making decisions together with teachers and school staff (Ismail, 2012).

Finally, the delegating style focused neither on tasks nor relationships. The leader allowed the followers to take on greater responsibilities and was only involved to monitor their progress. This style was most effective with teacher job satisfaction when the teachers and staff were very experienced and highly motivated to do well (Ismail, 2012).

Hersey and Blanchard (1976) believed that there was not a particular leadership style that was more effective than another. They believed the situation dictated which leadership style was most effective. Hersey and Blanchard (1976) also believed that the leader must be adaptable. The leader uses experience and maturity to adapt to any given situation.

Transactional Leadership was grounded in the idea that there is an exchange between the leader and follower, which resulted in positive or negative consequences (Cemaloglu, 2011). These leaders have certain skills and expect respect when leading in the organization. They believe that followers are motivated by rewards or punishments. If a follower does something good, they are rewarded; if they do something wrong, they

are punished. According to Burns (1978), a transactional leader takes a direct approach and clearly defines the roles, goals, and expectations of the organization for his or her followers. The leadership behaviors described in Bass and Avolio's (2004) transactional leadership model include the following:

1. Contingent reward. The leader and follower agree upon an exchange of work for rewards. The leader clearly defined the expected outcome and what benefit one will receive upon successful completion of the task.
2. Management-by-exception (Active). The leader's primary focus was on irregularities, mistakes, and failures within the organization. The leader kept an active record of all errors and complaints.

Bass and Avolio (1993) found that transactional leadership could be extremely effective. Additionally, Shieh, Mills, and Waltz (2001) noted that leaders must understand the social environment of the school and must realize the needs of their employees. To meet these needs, the transactional leadership style is able to set rewards for good performance that in turn provide constructive feedback to the employee (Bass, 1999). Transactional leadership necessitated that the leader motivate followers with higher goals instead of immediate self-interest for achievement and self-actualization rather than safety and security (Murray & Feitler, 1989). Leaders give followers the capacity to develop higher levels of commitment as they relate to the organizational goals of the school (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Burns (1978) described transactional leadership as one person taking action to contact another for collaboration in making something of value. The leader must satisfy the needs of his or her followers with these "valued things" and provide needed services to followers if he or she wishes them to accomplish independent objective (Barker, 1994).

Burns (1978) created a theory of transformational leadership that described leaders as being an inspirational guide to teachers and staff to achieve a higher level of morale and motivation at work. These leaders can alter the workplace, encouraging collaboration and raising the role of the follower to leader. Transformational leadership was “the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organizational members and build(s) commitment for the organization’s mission, objectives and strategies” (Yukl, 1989, p. 24).

There are four important dimensions in transformational leadership style (Avolio, Bass, & Jung 1999) such as having consideration for the teacher, having inspirational motivation, promoting intellectual stimulation, and making individualization a priority. This leadership style was also associated with participative and supportive leadership, which referred to a leader’s ability to build a team-oriented culture and influence positive change in an organization (Jones & Rudd, 2008). These leaders promoted cohesion and collaboration through shared decision making, support, intellectual stimulation, motivation, and shared values (Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 2004). They were also characterized as friendly, charismatic, supportive, and attentive (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 2004). When assessing the needs of an organization, transformational leaders take a holistic approach in which they focus less on personal desires and more on the needs of the organization in its entirety (Smith, 2011).

The four behavior components of Bass and Avolio’s (2004) transformational leadership model are as follows.

1. Individualized consideration. The leader acts as a mentor and coach. The leader recognizes individual needs, strengths, and aspirations.
2. Intellectual stimulation. The leader engages individuals in the group in

problem-solving matters and welcomes differing perspectives.

3. Inspirational motivation. The leader enthusiastically and clearly defines the goals, vision, and the expected outcome; sets high expectations for the group; and maintains optimism about the future of the organization.
4. Idealized influence. The leader becomes a role model. The leader's display of honesty, integrity, and genuine care for others is admired by his/her followers.

In practice, transformational leaders in schools influenced teachers to buy into the vision of the school, create a pleasant environment that fosters collaboration, include teachers in the decision-making process, pay attention to the needs of his or her employees, and support teachers experiencing challenges in the classroom (Thomas, 2014).

The MLQ5X developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) was designed to measure a full range of leadership behaviors. Passive-avoidant leadership behaviors were added to give a complete assessment. Passive-avoidant leadership refers to leadership behaviors that are characterized by the leader's inactive role. Passive-avoidant leaders generally fail to take an active role in important decision-making processes and are generally not engaged until a problem exists within the organization (Horwitz et al., 2008). Bass and Avolio (2004) characterized passive-avoidant leadership behaviors as the following.

1. Management-by-exception (Passive). The leader acts in a reactive manner rather than proactive. The leader does not communicate goals, visions, and/or expectations. The leader intervenes when a problem arises.
2. Laissez-faire. The leader is virtually obsolete in the organization. The leader has no voice in important decision-making processes and tends to be unavailable when needed.

The laissez-fair leader exudes an attitude of indifference as well a non-leadership approach toward the followers and their performance (Biggerstaff, 2012). According to Korkmaz (2007), this leadership style actually decreased the commitment levels of teachers to stay in a particular school. Bass and Avolio (1995) also asserted that there is no transaction or transformation of any kind with the followers because laissez-faire leaders do nothing to affect either the followers or their behaviors.

Leadership styles differ in many aspects that involve the interactions between leaders and followers. Leadership styles influence a teacher's overall outlook on his/her environment (Nir & Kranot, 2006). Goleman (1998) stated, 'leadership styles reflect deeply held personal or organizational values' (p. 63). As a result, leaders must make significant efforts in understanding their beliefs and how those affect their teachers (Mann, 2014).

Motivation Theories

An examination of the factors that encouraged individuals to be successful and satisfied is key to understanding what methods leaders should use to motivate their staff (Ismail, 2012). In Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, Herzberg et al. (1959) interviewed approximately 200 randomly selected engineers and accountants from nine companies. The study utilized the critical incidents methods to interview the participants in hopes the data would focus on the individual rather than the group. The participants were asked to describe a situation at their work that was a source of satisfaction and a situation that was a source of dissatisfaction.

After studying the responses, Herzberg et al. (1959) deduced that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction did not exist at opposite ends of a single continuum. Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction represented two independent, unique dimensions.

According to Herzberg et al. (1959), the finding meant the decrease in sources of job satisfaction would not cause job dissatisfaction and vice versa. Herzberg et al. (1959) grouped the characteristics that led to job satisfaction into the category of motivation and the characteristics that led to job dissatisfaction into the category of hygiene. Motivation factors include: (a) achievement, (b) recognition of achievement, (c) responsibility for task, (d) interest in the job, (e) advancement to higher-level tasks, and (f) growth. Hygiene factors include (a) working conditions, (b) quality of supervision, (c) salary, (d) status, (e) security, (f) company, (g) job, (h) company policies and administration, and (i) interpersonal relations. The motivation factors are sometimes referred to as intrinsic, while the hygiene factors are referred to as extrinsic (Freeman, 1978).

Herzberg (1968) later used the two-factor theory to study motivation of employees from 12 different career paths, one of which was teaching. The dichotomy proved true in all 12 investigations. Ewen, Smith, Hulin, and Locke (1966) conducted a study of female clinical employees in an attempt to refute the theory. Controversy has surrounded Herzberg's theory (Sergiovanni, 1976). Criticism of the theory stems from its development in an industrial setting. Critics questioned its validity outside of that area (Pardee, 1990). Bellott and Tutor (1990) questioned the relevancy of Herzberg's work due to the elapsed time since the development of the theory. Bellott and Tutor (1990) believed it occurred too long ago to be relevant. Sergiovanni (1976) believed the controversy lay in the methodology employed by researchers. Sergiovanni (1976) reported studies in which researchers used similar methods yielded results supporting Herzberg's theory. Studies in which researchers employed differing methods yielded results that did not support Herzberg's theory.

While the Two-Factor Theory has been the subject of scrutiny and debate, it is

still considered relevant today (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). The Two-Factor Theory is one of the most replicated studies in the field of job attitudes with Herzberg himself replicating the study (Herzberg, 2003). Studies by Sergiovanni (2006) and Dinham and Scott (1998) supported the use of the Two-Factor Theory to reflect job satisfaction of teachers. Dinham and Scott listed “student achievement, teacher achievement, changing pupil attitudes and behaviors in a positive way, recognition from others, mastery and self-growth, and positive relationships” (p. 364) as some of the intrinsic factors related to teachers.

In a study of engineers and accountants in Pennsylvania, Herzberg et al. (1959) found that the factors related to job satisfaction were very different than those causing job dissatisfaction. Table 1 shows factors affecting job attitudes. Herzberg et al. (1959) believed there are motivating factors and hygiene factors that lead to dissatisfaction (Dinham & Scott, 1998). Based on these factors, he created the theory of motivation hygiene that explains why workers are dissatisfied with their jobs.

Table 1

Factors Affecting Job Attitudes

Factors Leading to Dissatisfaction	Factor leading to Satisfaction
Company Policy	Achievement
Supervision	Recognition
Relationship with leader	Work itself
Work conditions	Responsibility
Salary	Advancement
Relationship with coworkers	Growth

Within this theory, Herzberg (1968) discussed employee attitudes about their work and what creates job satisfaction. Herzberg (1968) defined two types of individuals in this theory: satisfier/motivators and dissatisfier/hygiene factors. He noted that satisfiers described themselves in terms of their relationships, how they related to how

coworkers act, and general work conditions. Satisfiers tend to work well with their principals and other coworkers, which leads to professional growth. Conversely, dissatisfiers defined themselves in terms of the context of particular situations and how people act in such situations. They are highly concerned with job security, company policies, pay, and personal achievement. Within both categories, if the proper conditions are not met, workers will end up dissatisfied in the workplace. If psychological growth is achieved, satisfaction will ensue.

Maslow (1954) developed a theory of various human needs and how people pursue these needs. Table 2 identifies Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs.

Table 2

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Types of Need	Examples
Physiological	Thirst, hunger
Safety	Security, protection
Love and Belongingness	To escape loneliness, love
Esteem	Self-respect, the respect of others
Self-Actualization	To fulfill one's potential

Maslow (1970) identified five types of needs and stated that once one of these sets of needs is met, they will no longer act as motivation. The needs were classified as cognitive needs, genitive needs, and aesthetic needs which are often represented on a pyramid. The needs at the bottom of the pyramid were the cognitive or physiological needs. These are the basic needs that include food, water, and air. Basic needs must be met first before individuals can attain higher needs.

Maslow further believed the safety and security needs, the second layers, developed after the physiological needs were met. The needs in this section included safety, protection, and stability. The third layer, the love and belonging needs, involved a loving relationship and feeling a sense of community. The esteem needs have been

divided into a lower need and a higher need. The lower esteem need is respect for others. Glory, fame recognition, and attention are some characteristics at this level. The higher esteem need is characterized by a need for self-respect including confidence, achievement, mastery, and freedom. The last layer, self-actualization, involves the continuing desire to fulfill potentials. These needs are based on a continuous desire to “be the best you can be” (Maslow, 1970, p. 46).

If a leader can identify which needs a follower has yet to fill, he or she can then use that knowledge to their advantage as a motivating cause. As these needs are met, followers need to be motivated in different ways, and it is up to an astute leader to identify the methods by which they may continue to motivate their followers. Followers advance when their needs are completely satisfied (Ismail, 2012).

Principal Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction

Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2000) review of the literature on teacher job satisfaction strongly connected teacher motivation and commitment to satisfaction. Bogler (2001) surveyed 745 Israeli teachers and found that teacher job satisfaction, principal leadership style, and decision-making strategies had a significant correlation. Teachers who reported their principals were visionary, innovative, supportive, and collaborative decision makers were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction. Additionally, teacher perceptions of occupational prestige, which refers to their feelings of professional value and significance, self-esteem, autonomy at work, and professional self-development, significantly contributed to their level of job satisfaction (Bolger, 2001). Hongying (2007) found that teacher job satisfaction is greatly affected by the overall attitude of the public toward teachers and their working conditions. Teachers who are not satisfied in the workplace are more likely to leave the profession (Choy et al.

1993). If teachers can receive support from their principal and local parents, if they are involved in the decision-making process, and if they work within a positive school climate and culture, they are more likely to succeed and remain in the profession (Lumsden, 1998).

Nguni, Slegers, and Denesen (2006) studied 560 primary school teachers in Tanzania who were given questionnaires related to job satisfaction, leadership, and organizational commitment. The results of this study indicated that leadership greatly influences the job satisfaction of employees. Current studies have shown that a principal's leadership style can have an effect on the satisfaction of school teachers (Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009).

Buchanan (2010) examined the factors that contribute to teacher attrition or retention. More specifically, the study was conducted to gain a better understanding of the trend of events surrounding teacher decisions to leave the teaching profession from the perspective of former teachers. A series of phone interviews was conducted for data collection. Upon completion of the study, the findings revealed several related trends among the former teachers. Dissatisfaction attributed to participant decisions to leave the teaching profession. The primary factors included (a) workload, (b) support, (c) classroom management/discipline issues, (d) working conditions, (e) salary, and (f) prestige of teaching or the lack of. According to Buchanan, several of the participants reported that teacher workloads are enormous and that the pay does not compensate for the amount of work demanded by the position. They also reported that working conditions in many schools could not compare to those of corporate America. Classroom management and discipline issues were also reported as significant job dissatisfiers. Many of the participants reported that they did not feel highly regarded nor did they feel

respected. However, as revealed in the aforementioned study, leadership played a significant role in teacher work experiences. Of the many factors identified as contributors to teacher decisions to leave the teaching profession, the lack of administrative support appeared to be the most significant factor that influenced the participants' decisions to leave the profession of teaching (Thomas, 2014).

Richards (2003) examined long-term teacher/principal relationships and job satisfaction. Teachers who have worked for long periods of time with the same principal tend to be able to work closely with that principal. Richards examined principal leadership behaviors that encourage teachers to stay in teaching. The behaviors were based on teacher perceptions. The teachers were chosen from three career stages (1-5 years; 6-10 years; and 11+ years). The teachers all identified the same top five behaviors as being most important to their job satisfaction: (a) respects and values teachers as professional; (b) has an open-door policy and is accessible and willing to listen; (c) is fair, honest, and trustworthy; (d) supports teachers with parents; and (e) is supportive of teachers in matters of student discipline. These teachers felt comfortable with their principal and his or her leadership style, and this long-term interaction improved the level of satisfaction between the teachers and the principal. Hughes (1999) believed that creative and transformational leaders create a positive relationship between teachers and principals, which affects everyone's overall job satisfaction.

Many factors identified as contributors to teacher decisions to leave the teaching profession; the lack of administrative support appeared to be the most significant factor that influenced participant decisions to leave the profession of teaching (Thomas, 2014). Many studies appeared to focus on why teachers leave the profession. Perrachione, Rosser, and Petersen (2008) decided to investigate factors that identify reasons teachers

choose to stay in the profession. The study was conducted in an effort to identify intrinsic and extrinsic factors that influence teacher retention and job satisfaction. The primary purpose examined the relationship between job satisfaction and intrinsic variables (e.g., personal teaching efficacy, working with students, job satisfaction) and extrinsic variables (e.g., low salary, role overload). Overall, the results revealed that teachers who expressed the most satisfaction with their job felt as though they were evaluated fairly, valued as professionals, and were a part of a professional community that shared similar beliefs about the central mission of the organization. Teachers who responded favorably to intents of remaining in the profession shared a variety of reasons for their decisions to include feelings of high levels of overall satisfaction, opportunities to work with children and make a difference, and years in service (near retirement); however, teachers who reported dissatisfaction and intent to leave the profession expressed concerns for low salary, work overload, and principal support.

The findings in the before-mentioned studies supported past research (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Herzberg et al., 1959), which suggested that leadership style influenced job satisfaction. The studies (Bolger, 2001; Buchanan, 2010; Perrachione et al., 2008) also supported the theoretical framework for this research.

Summary

This chapter focused on theories related to principal leadership behaviors and how teacher preference of these behaviors affects their job satisfaction. Leadership and motivational theories were also discussed. Several different leadership styles were reviewed along with their relationship to job satisfaction. The chapter also discussed research related to principal leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. All of these factors were interrelated and were pivotal for understanding if principal leadership

styles have a direct effect on teacher job satisfaction. In Chapter 3, the methodology of this study is discussed.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction. More specifically, in this study, job satisfaction was assessed using the JSS; and preferred leadership behaviors were analyzed using the MLQ5X. The effect of principal leadership behaviors on teacher job satisfaction was analyzed using a correlation of both surveys. Secondary school teachers in an urban district in North Carolina were invited to participate in this study. Teachers were asked to voluntarily complete one survey including both scales via the internet regarding their perceptions of principal leadership behaviors and their level of job satisfaction in the workplace. Teachers were asked to voluntarily complete the online short form of the MLQ5X designed by Bass and Avolio and then the JSS developed by Spector (1985) which measures levels of job satisfaction. Both of the instruments are widely used and have established reliability and validity.

School districts across the United States are facing shortages of teaching personnel. Approximately 33% of beginning public school teachers in the United States leave the profession before completing their first year in the classroom (Hill, 2013) and nearly 50% of new teachers leave the profession after only 5 years (Roth & Tobin, 2005).

The following research questions were explored to determine the relationship between teacher perceptions of principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction.

1. How do teachers perceive their own job satisfaction as measured by the JSS?
2. What were the significant leadership behaviors that teachers prefer as measured by the MLQ5X?
3. What is the relationship between teachers' preferred leadership behaviors and

teacher job satisfaction?

Participants

The general population for this study consisted of approximately 639 certified secondary school teachers in an urban school system in North Carolina. All secondary schools that met the following criteria were selected to participate in this study: (a) the school's current principal must have worked there for at least 6 months, and (b) teachers participating in the study must have completed at least 1 year of teaching at the secondary school level. The sample for this study included certified teachers (6-12), from the 10 secondary schools from an urban district in North Carolina. This study used convenience sampling to construct a representative sample for this study. It was chosen as the most appropriate method to obtain a representative sample for this study because it allowed the investigator to solicit voluntary participation from a smaller subset of the overall targeted population, cut costs, and minimize the time needed to collect data (Creswell, 2003). The target sample for this study was a minimum of 10% of the sampling population of certified teachers (6-12).

Research Design

A correlation quantitative study was selected as the method of investigation, where the research is conducted after the variations in the independent variable have occurred naturally (Simon, 2006). Quantitative designs define, test, and elucidate; whereas qualitative designs explore and help comprehend (Creswell, 2002).

Correlational studies are ex post facto studies where the research is conducted after the variations in the independent variables have occurred naturally (Simon, 2006). This study is classified as a correlational research study as one of the purposes of this study was to investigate the relationship between the preferred leadership behaviors and teacher

job satisfaction. The researcher explored the significant factors that contributed to job satisfaction as identified by certified high school teachers based on their responses to the JSS. This investigation is also a correlational research study with a quantitative, non experimental research design because the researcher measured the perceptions of the subjects without attempting to introduce a treatment and collected data on two variables (leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction) to determine if they were related (Slavin, 2007).

The primary purpose of this research study was to investigate teacher job satisfaction, preferred leadership behaviors, and the relationship between teachers' preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. The certified teachers were based on the North Carolina State classification obtained from the human resources department of the district included in the study. This particular study was considered a quantitative investigation because the researcher measured two variables of interest (perceived principal leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction) by using online surveys.

The quantitative research is to seek explanations and predictions that will generalize to other persons and places (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). This study met that criterion because results could assist in making school principals more aware of their own leadership style and assist them in developing their own leadership capacity to support teachers in handling the increased demands placed on them in this educational age of accountability (Biggerstaff, 2012). Principals may learn which factors teachers perceive as critical in maintaining high levels of job satisfaction which could help them learn to modify their own style of leadership or behavior to more appropriately create and maintain strong systems of support for their teachers and possibly help in decreasing

attrition rates (Biggerstaff, 2012).

Instruments

This study utilized two instruments, the MLQ5X (Appendix A; Bass & Avolio, 2004) and the JSS (Appendix B; Spector, 1994), to collect the necessary data to analyze the independent variable (leadership behavior) and the dependent variable (job satisfaction). Both instruments have been utilized in a variety of settings (national and international samples) and across different organizations. This section provides a brief description of each instrument and provides detailed information regarding the reliability and validity of each survey.

MLQ5X

Bass and Avolio (1995) developed the MLQ5X as an extension of the work of Bass (1985). It has since been updated and now offers a short version of the original, the MLQ5X (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The instrument was designed to measure a full range of leadership behaviors to include (a) transformational leadership, (b) transactional leadership, and (c) passive-avoidant leadership behaviors and their organizational outcomes. The MLQ5X uses a 5-point Likert scale (0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently, if not always). The survey instrument contains 45 items that are categorized into nine leadership components (i.e., idealized influence, idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent rewards, active management-by-exception, passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire) and three outcome effects (i.e., extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction).

Validity. Several studies have been conducted to establish the validity of the new MLQ5X. As a result of the analyses, when compared to the earlier version of the MLQ,

the MLQ5X showed significant improvements ($p < .001$) in the chi-square value for the new model (Bass & Avolio, 2004). With the exception of management-by-exception (active), the estimates for internal consistency for all other scales were above .70. The significantly high correlations between the subscales of the previous instrument and the current version determined the validity of the new MLQ5X. The MLQ5X has been extensively researched and validated, as evidenced by being used in over 300 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and master's theses (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Validity of the MLQ5X from a meta-analysis of 87 studies found the overall validity coefficient of 0.44, which illustrated the predictive validity of transformational leadership with follower satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Results from factor analysis studies also supported the argument that the nine scales of leadership based on the MLQ5X were the best reflection of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). The authors established reliability of the MLQ5X survey instrument as a means to determine the extent to which the MLQ5X consistently showed the same results over repeated testing. Reliability scores for each of the scales ranged from 0.74 to 0.91, which indicated a moderate to good internal consistency and statistical testing level (Bass & Avolio, 2000). The MLQ5X has been successful in measuring the factor constructs of transformational leadership theory. This will provide researchers with the confidence in using the MLQ5X to measure the leadership components representing transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008).

Reliability. A series of studies was conducted to establish the reliability of the latest version of the MLQ5X. The reliability scores for the total population ranged from .69 to .83 for factors related to leadership style. Scores for leadership outcomes ranged

from .79 to .83. The intercorrelations among the subscales were high and positively correlated among the five transformational leadership scales, which indicated test reliability.

Scoring and cost. The MLQ5X is scored on a 5-point scale. The instrument was designed to measure three leadership styles (i.e., transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant). Questions are assigned to specific subscales. Adding the total of the responses and dividing by the number of responses achieves the mean score for each subscale. The cost of the MLQ5X varies depending on the number of licenses purchased and the personalized services desired by the researcher. A copy of sample items from the MLQ5X is located in Appendix A. Permission to use the MLQ5X (see Appendix C) was granted through online purchase from Mindgarden.com.

JSS

The JSS was developed by Spector (1994) to measure job satisfaction. The JSS is a self-report instrument that is designed to measure employee attitudes about the job itself and various aspects of the job (Spector, 1985). The instrument is comprised of 36 items that are divided into nine facets to include (a) pay, (b) promotion, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards, (f) operating procedures, (g) coworkers, (h) nature of work, and (i) communication. It uses a 6-point Likert response scale that ranges from 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much). The instrument has been tested and retested across multiple organizations that range from education to retail (Thomas, 2014).

The JSS has been used by a number of researchers (Astrauskaite, Vaitkevicius, & Perminas, 2011). The researcher used the JSS to assess satisfaction levels. According to Spector (1995), the JSS has an internal consistency reliability of above 0.5 for each subscale with an overall internal consistency reliability of 0.91. Spector reported the

correlations between the JSS and the Job Description Index (JDI) to show the validity of the instrument. The reliability and validity were both confirmed years later in a study by Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, and Frings-Dresen (2003). The JSS is efficient because it takes respondents a short amount of time to fill out. The JSS consists of 36 questions related to attitudes about their job and aspects of their job. Each facet was assessed with four items. About half of the items were written positively, while those remaining were written negatively. Since items are written in both directions, about half must be reverse scored. Respondents rated their agreement with each statement on a 6-point scale from 1 representing disagree very much to 6 representing agree very much. The overall score ranged from 36 to 216, while the score on each facet ranged from 4 to 24. Spector granted the researcher permission to use the instrument online via an email (Appendix D).

Validity. The validity of the JSS was established through a multitrait-multimethod analysis of the JDI and the JSS (Spector, 1985). A correlational analysis of the five equivalent subscales (i.e., work, pay, promotion, supervision, and coworkers) ranged from .60 to .81. The significantly high correlations between the subscales determined the validity of the instrument. Additionally, as noted by Spector (1985), the interrelationships between the JDI and the JSS were reasonably consistent. With the exception of one correlation, the interrelationship between the subscales ranged from .20 to .37. This would indicate that the internal consistency of a specific scale was unsatisfactory (Astrauskaite et al., 2011). Internal consistency reliability of the nine facets was computed for a sample of 2,870. Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to assess the internal consistency of the instrument. The coefficients for each of the subscales ranged from .60 (coworkers) to .91 (overall satisfaction). Since each of the

subscales scored above Nunnally's (1967) suggested minimum of .50, the JSS is assumed to be a reliable instrument (as cited by Spector, 1985). Test-retest methods were conducted between 12 and 18 months following the initial assessment with smaller samples (Spector, 1985). The correlation coefficients of the nine subscales ranged from .37 (benefits) to .74 (operating procedures). Although a substantial amount of time elapsed between assessments, the correlation coefficients for the second assessment were still high. The results suggested that there is sufficient reliability and stability in the JSS.

Scoring and cost. The JSS is scored on a 6-point scale. The statements were divided into both negatively worded and positively worded statements. The positively worded statements indicated job satisfaction, while the negatively worded statements indicated job dissatisfaction (Spector, 1994). Each of the nine subscales included four items. The score ranged from 4 to 24; however, the total satisfaction score is based on 36 items and ranged from 36 to 216. Since high scores indicated job satisfaction, negatively worded items must be scored in reverse order prior to adding to the score of the positively worded items (e.g., 6 = 1, 5 = 2, etc.). The JSS is free for noncommercial educational and research purposes (Spector, 1994). A copy of the JSS can be found in Appendix B.

Procedures

This study utilized the short-form MLQ5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995) to measure leadership behaviors that teachers preferred. The JSS (Spector, 1994) was used to measure the level of job satisfaction among the certified teachers.

Upon receipt of approval from Gardner-Webb University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and written consent from the local school district IRB board where this study took place, the assigned district research IRB coordinator was contacted to discuss the plans and goals of this study. A mass email list of the certified teachers from the

secondary school was generated based on district policy. As directed by the district policy, the email was delivered from the researcher's personal (non district related) email account that included a general invitation to the study. All further activity for this research was based solely on the voluntary participation of the respondents. If the respondents considered participating in the study, they were initially presented with an electronic consent form that described the purpose of the study, the rights of the participant, confidentiality measures taken, and contact information. The online survey link was designed specifically for the purpose of this study and included a brief demographic questionnaire, an electronic consent (see Appendix E), and an electronic copy of the MLQ5X and the JSS (Appendix F). The survey design allowed both instruments to be administered in a single session. The survey also concluded with an opened-ended question asking for addition leadership behaviors that teachers preferred. The entire session took approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Final analyses of the data were limited to teachers who met the following criteria: (a) must have a state certification, and (b) must be currently employed in the secondary school for a year.

The International Business Machines Statistical Package for Social Sciences (IBM SPSS Statistics) was used to analyze and manage the data collected for this study. Descriptive statistical techniques were used to describe the sample demographics and the research variables. Additionally, a Pearson r correlational analysis was conducted, and partial correlation analyses, to determine whether a relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables, the strength of the relationship. A data file consisting of all raw data, scale scores, and results applicable to this study was saved on a password-protected external drive. A copy of the final results of this study was presented to the district IRB board. Additionally, a copy of the final results was emailed to the

developer of the JSS as requested in return for the free use of the survey.

Data Analysis

After completion of surveys from the sample population, the researcher compiled all data and reported significant findings using IBM SPSS Statistics to disseminate data with regard to determining preferred leadership behaviors, job satisfaction levels, and the relationship between preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction.

Research Question 1: How do teachers perceive their own job satisfaction as measured by the JSS?

Research Question 2: What were the significant leadership behaviors that teachers prefer as measured by the MLQ5X?

Research Question 3: What was the relationship between teachers preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction?

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis was performed because the researcher sought to determine the strength and direction (positive, negative, none) of the relationship between preferred principal leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction as perceived by the teachers surveyed. The purpose of a PPMC is to determine a correlation between values and to see if they are related. This analysis was also used to determine the leadership behaviors that have the highest correlation to teacher job satisfaction.

Limitations

While correlation studies can suggest a relationship between two variables, they cannot prove one variable causes a change in another variable. Thus, correlation does not equal causation (Simon, 2006). A relationship between perceptions of leadership styles and teacher satisfaction could be obtained in this study, but the relationship cannot lead to

determination that a certain leadership style of principals will lead to higher or lower levels of job satisfaction. Other variables could play a role, including past and present experiences in the classroom; mentorship; and quality of student learning, educational training, and a variety of other factors.

Delimitations

The study was limited to only secondary high schools in an urban school system in North Carolina. Teachers had to have completed 1 full year of teaching in a high school.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter 3 was to define the research design framework. Two survey instruments were used: the MLQ5X that measured leadership behavior and the JSS that measured overall level of job satisfaction. In addition, both surveys were used for conducting a correlational study to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. Three major research questions and the research design used to test them were presented. Population and sampling procedures were described. In addition, the validity and reliability of the instruments, data collection, and analysis procedures were explained. The results and findings of this research are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction. The ability of schools to create and maintain standards of academic excellence and to foster student achievement is largely determined by the performance of the teachers they employ (Denton, 2009). Faced with the daunting task of staffing their schools with effective teachers, administrators must possess a clear understanding of what attracts such teachers to their schools and what motivates them to continue teaching in their schools year after year. This chapter includes the participant response rates for the MLQ5X and the JSS achieved by the study, a profile of the sample, and analytical findings to the research questions. Results are reported first by simple descriptive analyses according to the instrument and then by correlational analysis. The research questions that guided this research were

1. How do teachers perceive their own job satisfaction as measured by the JSS?
2. What were the significant leadership behaviors that teachers prefer as measured by the MLQ5X?
3. What is the relationship between teachers preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction?

First, this chapter describes an overview of the data collection process as discussed in Chapter 3. Second, descriptive statistics of the sample are presented. Third, the data are presented. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary.

The study employed surveys as its method of data collection to include the

MLQ5X (Bass & Avolio, 2004) and the JSS (Spector, 1994). The study was launched using an electronic invitation via mass email to 639 perspective participants. Of the 639 perspective participants, 81 participants responded, which yielded a response rate of 12.67%. The goal was to obtain a minimum of 10% of the sample population. A total of 81 surveys were included as a sample for the study; and all 81 teachers completed both instruments, the MLQ5X and the JSS. The 81 participants were all secondary school teachers from an urban public school district. The district housed 10 secondary schools. All principals of the 10 campuses agreed to allow their teachers to participate in the study. The district-approved contact information (email addresses) was used to contact the 639 secondary teachers who had served at least 1 year in the district. After receiving a final written approval to conduct research from both, Gardner Webb University's IRB and the school district, an introductory email was sent to each of the 639 perspective participants. A mass email list of the certified teachers from the secondary schools was generated based on district policy. As directed by the district policy, the email was delivered from the researcher's personal (non-district related) email account that included a general invitation to the study in the first week of June 2016. All further activity for this research was based solely on the voluntary participation of the respondents. If the respondents considered participating in the study, they were initially presented with an electronic consent form that described the purpose of the study, the rights of the participant, confidentiality measures taken, and contact information. The online survey link was designed specifically for the purpose of this study and included a brief demographic questionnaire, and an electronic consent, and an electronic copy of the MLQ5X and the JSS. The survey design allowed both instruments to be administered in a single session. Final analyses of the data were limited to teachers who met the

following criteria: (a) teachers must have a state certification, and (b) teachers must be currently employed in the secondary school for a year. To ensure anonymity, no identification information (i.e., teacher names, school names, district names, employee identification numbers, or principal names) was collected for this study.

Demographics

The data for this study came from 81 secondary school teachers in an urban school district. Each teacher was asked to complete a short demographic questionnaire that asked them to report their gender, highest level of education, and number of years teaching. This section presents the demographical data as they related to the participants in this study.

A total of 54 females and 25 males completed the survey. Two participants did not provide gender information. Male participants accounted for 31.6% of the sample population and females accounted for 68.4%. In the system in which the study was completed, of the total 639 teachers, 376 (59%) were females and 263 (41%) were males; this is a little larger than the national level. The disproportionate representation of males in this study is not alarming, although the numbers are a little lower than the total sample population. A large number of females are in fact an appropriate reflection of the actual population of educators in our public school systems (Thomas, 2014). According to NCEI (2011), national data reports suggests that females continue to account for the largest majority of teachers (84%) in classrooms; male teachers only make up 16% of the national teaching population in America and even fewer are in elementary classrooms (Thomas, 2014). Of the total 81 participants, 71 participants reported years of service; of the 71 participants, 58 ranged from 10-25 years of service (82.1%) and 13 ranged from 1-10 years of service (18%). Only 67 participants responded with degree information. A

master's degree was the highest level of education reported by a majority of the participants ($n = 40$, 59.7%). The remainder of the sample reported bachelor and doctorate degrees as their highest level of education; 22 held bachelor's degrees only (32.8%), and five held doctorate degrees (7.4%).

Descriptive Statistics

Two instruments, the MLQ5X and the JSS, were used to collect data for this study. The JSS was used to collect data regarding participant attitudes towards their jobs and the characteristics of the job. The data collected from the JSS provided information about the participants' overall job satisfaction. In this section, details regarding each instrument are presented. Additionally, descriptive data for each variable and its subsets are presented and discussed to explain how the outcomes relate to the research questions.

Research Question 1

How do teachers perceive their own job satisfaction as measured by the JSS?

The descriptive statistics from the JSS such as means and measures of variability was used to provide data for overall job satisfaction. The 36-item, 9-facet scale was developed by Spector (1994) to assess employee attitudes about their jobs and aspects of the job. The nine facets include pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures (policy), coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Overall satisfaction is a calculation of all responses to all facets. The JSS is scored on a 6-point scale that ranges from 4-24. The response scales ranged from 1 = disagree very much to 6 = agree very much. The statements are divided into both negatively worded and positively worded statements. Each of the nine facets includes four questions. Table 3 has a breakdown of the questions and definitions of the nine subscales.

Table 3

Subscales and Corresponding Questions for the JSS

Subscales and Definitions	Questions
Pay – Pay or remuneration	1, 10r, 19r, 28
Promotion- Opportunities for promotion	2r, 11, 20, 33
Supervision – Immediate supervisor	3, 12r, 21r, 30
Fringe Benefits – Monetary and non-monetary fringe benefits	4r, 13, 22, 29r
Contingent Rewards – Appreciation, recognition, and rewards for good work	5, 14r, 23r, 32r
Operating Procedures – Required rules and procedures	6r, 15, 24r, 31r
Coworkers - People you work with	7, 16r, 25, 34
Nature of Work – Job tasks themselves	8r, 17, 27, 35
Communication - Communication within the organization	9, 18r, 26r, 36r
Total- Total of all Facets	1-36

Note. r=reverse scored.

Since high scores indicate job satisfaction, negatively worded items must be scored in reverse order prior to adding to the score of the positively worded items (e.g., 6 = 1, 5 = 2, etc.). Given the JSS uses 6-point agree-disagree response choices, we can assume that agreement with positively worded items and disagreement with negatively worded items would represent satisfaction, whereas disagreement with positively worded items and agreement with negatively worded items represents dissatisfaction. The summed scores for the 9-item subscales ranged from 4-24; scores of 4-12 are dissatisfied, 16-24 are satisfied, and between 12-16 are ambivalent (Spector, 1994). The overall teacher job satisfaction was measured by summing the total of all 36 items. Spector's (1994) guideline for interpreting the total job satisfaction score from his JSS ranges from

36-108 indicate dissatisfaction, from 108-144 indicate ambivalent or ambiguous feeling about their job, and from 144-216 indicate satisfaction with the job (Gu, 2016). The mean and standard deviation of each facet is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the JSS

N=81	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Pay	7.58	3.12	4.00	16.00
Promotion	10.5	4.39	4.00	20.00
Supervision	15.9	4.72	7.00	24.00
Fringe Benefits	12.5	3.81	4.00	21.00
Contingent Rewards	13.5	2.99	8.00	22.00
Operating Procedures	11.2	3.73	5.00	21.00
Coworkers	17.1	2.53	9.00	23.00
Nature of Work	20.0	2.94	11.00	24.00
Communication	12.9	3.18	8.00	20.00
Overall Satisfaction	121.00	15.43	96.00	158.00

In this study, overall job satisfaction had a mean score of 121.39 and a standard deviation of 15.43 (N = 81). Related to Research Question 1, the teachers in this study fell in the ambivalent range. They were neither overly satisfied nor dissatisfied with their jobs. Of the nine facets, based on the scores, they were most satisfied with the nature of their work with a mean score of 20.0 and relationship with coworkers with a mean score of 17.1; and were most dissatisfied with pay with a mean score of 7.58 and opportunities for promotion with a mean score of 10.5. They were ambivalent about communication with a mean score of 12.9, fringe benefits with a score of 12.5, and operating procedures with a score of 11.2. In summary the teachers in this urban area were ambivalent regarding job satisfaction: The scores indicated neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction. Their highest area of satisfaction was with the work they did itself and the relationship with coworkers. They were least satisfied with pay and opportunities for promotion.

Research Question 2

What were the significant leadership behaviors that teachers prefer as measured by the MLQ5X?

The MLQ5X provided a full range leadership scale to include (a) transformational leadership, (b) transactional leadership, (c) passive-avoidant leadership, and (d) three outcomes of leadership: effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction. However, for the purpose of this study participants used the questions on the survey to identify behaviors that they preferred in leaders. The MLQ5X identified subsets of behavior related to transformational leadership as identified by Bass and Avolio (2004) which included (a) idealized attributes, (b) idealized behaviors, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individual consideration. The subsets and related questions for transactional leadership included (a) contingent reward and (b) management by exception (active; Bass & Avolio, 2004). In this study, the questions were used to identify leadership behaviors that were preferred by teachers. A description of each subset is found in Table 5.

Table 5

Description of Subsets of the MLQ5X Leadership Behaviors and Related Questions

	Attributes	Questions
<u>Transformational Leadership</u>		
Idealized Attributes	Builds trust	9,11,13
Idealized Behaviors	Acts with integrity	14,15,22,28
Inspirational Motivation	Inspires others	8,12,18,25
Intellectual Stimulation	Encourages innovative thinking	3,19,26
Individualized Consideration	Coaches people	8,12,18,25
<u>Transactional Leadership</u>		
Contingent Rewards	Rewards achievement	1,5,10,20
Management by Exception- Active	Monitors mistakes	21,23,24
<u>Passive/Avoidant Leadership</u>		
Laissez-Faire. Passive Management	Avoids Involvement	2,6,17,27
<u>Outcomes of Leadership</u>		
Extra Effort	Able to generate extra effort	31,34
Effectiveness	Able to be efficient in meeting organizational needs	30,32,35,36
Satisfaction	Generates satisfaction in followers	4,33

The MLQ5X was scored on a 5-point scale that ranged from 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently. However, in this study, the response scale that was used ranged from 0 = not preferred, 1 = slightly preferred, 2 = preferred, 3 = very preferred, 4 = highly preferred. Adding the total of the responses and dividing by the number of responses achieved the mean score for each subscale. The averages for each subset were used to aggregate which leadership behaviors were preferred or not preferred by teachers in this study. In addition, the teachers had an exploratory open-ended question at the end of the surveys that was designed to allow teachers to write in additional leadership behaviors they preferred.

The mean score and standard deviation for the preferred leadership style subsets are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for MLQ5X (Preferred Leadership Behaviors)

N=81	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Idealized influence attributed	9.45	2.16	4.0	12.0
Idealized Influence behaviors	11.61	2.89	6.0	16.0
Inspirational motivation	8.77	2.41	3.0	12.0
Intellectual stimulation	7.92	2.43	1.00	12.0
Individual consideration	10.66	2.94	5.00	16.0
Contingent rewards	10.59	2.82	3.00	16.0
Management-by-exception	2.95	2.78	.00	12.0
Laissez-Faire	1.19	2.02	.00	9.0
Outcomes of Leadership Extra Effort	4.71	2.04	.00	8.0
Outcomes of Leadership Effectiveness	12.83	2.90	7.00	17.0
Outcomes of Leadership Satisfaction	6.12	1.68	1.00	8.0

Overall, the data showed that leadership effectiveness was the behavior most preferred by teachers. Leadership effectiveness was one of the behaviors on the outcomes of leadership scale, which also included extra effort and satisfaction. Leadership effectiveness had a mean score of 12.8 and a standard deviation of 2.90 (N = 81). The effectiveness scale is an outcome of leadership; it identifies leaders who are able to be efficient in meeting organizational objectives. Efficient leaders generate a higher level of efficiency in all structures they are involved in, lead effective groups, and create conditions that increase teacher effectiveness (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The lowest preferred overall score was laissez-faire with a mean score of 1.19. The laissez-faire scale identifies leaders who tend to avoid involvement. This leadership style could be easily defined as “non-leadership.” The scores suggested that of the subsets for transformational leadership behavior, as measured by the instrument, idealized influence (behaviors) had the highest score preference of 11.6. The idealized attributes scale identifies leaders who are able to build trust in their followers. They inspire power and pride in their followers by going beyond their own individual interests and focusing on

the interests of the group and of its members (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Of the two subsets for transactional leadership style, contingent rewards scores had the highest mean score of 10.59. The contingent reward scale identifies leaders who are able to reward achievement. Leaders scoring high on this scale tend to discuss in clear terms responsibilities for specific tasks and projects, state performance objectives, clarify rewards and punishments, and express satisfaction when they get the correct output (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

To understand which leadership behaviors teachers preferred based on specific questions, the frequencies were calculated. Table 7 illustrated the questions that were chosen that were most highly preferred behaviors and their frequencies. The behaviors linked to transformation style based on Bass and Avolio (1995) ranked the highest in preference.

Table 7

Summary of the Three Questions with Highest Frequencies of Preferred Leadership Behaviors on the MLQ5X

Item/Description	Frequency
Idealized influence: Attributed Item 13: Acts in a way that builds my respect.	60.5%
Idealized influence: Behavior Item 14: Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.	58.0%
Idealized Influence: Attributed Item 11: Goes beyond the self-interest of the group.	56.8%

Table 8 illustrates the least preferred behaviors by questions and their frequencies. The behaviors linked to laissez-faire or “non” leadership were least preferred.

Table 8

Summary of the Three Questions with Frequencies of Negatively Preferred Leadership Behaviors on the MLQ5X

Item Description	Frequency
Management by exception: Passive Item 6: Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.	87.7%
Laissez-Faire Item 33: Delays responding to urgent questions.	87.7%
Laissez-Faire Item 17: Avoids Making decisions	86.4%

In response to the open-ended question that was included at the end of the survey, teachers were asked to write in additional leadership behaviors they preferred. There were 36 responses (N = 36). Of the behaviors chosen, the ones that were repeated most related to communication, honesty, and integrity. All three responses were repeated six times. The next highest, which was recorded five times, was being a team player. Being a servant leader and being consistent were chosen two times. Fifteen different behaviors were listed as behaviors that teachers preferred in leaders. Table 9 summarizes all of the responses that were chosen.

Table 9

Summary Responses to the Open-Ended Question

What additional leadership behaviors do I prefer?	Summary of Responses
Communication	6
Integrity	6
Honesty	6
Team player	5
Servant leader	2
Consistency	2
Passionate	1
Approachable	1
Encourages the success of others	1
Intelligent	1
Able to delegate	1
Empathy	1
Decisive	1
Visionary	1
Has fun with job	1
Approachable	1
Safety and Order	1
Authentic	1
Open-minded	1
Attends school	1

The responses on the MLQ5X and the open-ended responses summarize the leadership behaviors that were preferred by teachers in this study.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between teachers' preferred leadership behavior and teacher job satisfaction?

Research Question 3 posited the relationship between teacher satisfaction and the preferred leadership behaviors of principals. To test this, a Pearson product-moment correlation was performed between the aggregated teacher satisfaction scores and the aggregated preferred principal leadership behaviors scores. The resulting correlation indicated that there was not a statically significant relationship between the total leadership scores and job satisfaction scores $r = -.001$. Table 10 details the correlation

between the total MLQ5X preferred leaders behavior scores and JSS total satisfaction scores.

Table 10

Pearson r Correlation of the Total Preferred Leadership Behavior (MLQ5X) and the JSS

		JSS Total	MLQ5X Total
JSS Total	Pearson Correlation	1	-.001
	Sig (2-tailed)		.994
	N	81	81
MLQ5X Total	Pearson Correlation	-.001	1
	Sig (2-Tailed)	.994	
	N	81	81

Note. * Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed).

In summary, the researcher sought to determine the degree to which the two variables (principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction) consistently varied in the same direction (positive) or in opposite directions (negative). The Pearson product moment correlation analysis was utilized (Slavin, 2007). The Pearson correlation analysis also sought to determine the degree to which principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction are related as represented by the strength of the correlation coefficient (r). The results show that there was no statically significant relationship between the two variables ($r = -.001$).

To further look at the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and preferred leadership behaviors, each of the subscales of the JSS and MLQ5X was analyzed. The top three preferred behaviors and the top three areas of job satisfaction total job satisfaction were correlated. The resulting correlations indicated no significant relationship between any of the subscales. Table 11 illustrates the correlations of the top three preferred leadership behaviors and measured by the MLQ5X and the top three areas

of job satisfaction as measured by the JSS.

Table 11

Pearson r Correlation of the Three Highest Preferred Behaviors and the Three Highest Areas of Job Satisfaction

		Supervision	Coworkers	Nature of Work	JS Total
Individualized Consideration	Pearson	.214	.178	.201	-.011
	Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.056	.112	.072	.923
	N	81	81	81	81
Effectiveness	Pearson	.095	.188	.197	-.012
	Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.401	.092	.079	.918
	N	81	81	81	81
Idealized Influence	Pearson	.025	.155	.066	-.090
	Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.827	.167	.557	.423
	N	81	81	81	81
Total Leadership Preference	Pearson	.129	.184	.174	-.001
	Correlation				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.250	.100	.119	.994
	N	81	81	81	81

The results indicated that no statistically significant positive or negative correlation existed between preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. Leadership effectiveness had the highest mean score on the preferred leadership behaviors based on the MLQ5X. Nature of work was the highest category that satisfied teachers based on the JSS; however, there was no significant statistical relationship between the two ($r = .197$). Idealized influence and relationship with coworkers were the next behaviors preferred and area of job satisfaction; again no statistically significant relationship existed ($r = .155$). Individualized consideration and satisfaction with the supervisor were the last two areas; there was again no significant relationship

($r = .214$). Various combinations of these subsets were correlated with no significant relationships being found and any combination of the two variables.

Pearson correlation coefficients were determined for all individual leadership characteristics on the MLQ5X and the JSS. Drawing from the work of Cohen (1988), the correlations were interpreted using his scale of magnitudes. The scale interpretation is as follows: greater than 0.5 is large/high correlation; 0.5-0.3 is a moderate correlation; 0.3-0.1 is a small/low correlation; and anything smaller than 0.1 is classified insubstantial or otherwise not reporting (Cohen, 1988). The results of all the correlations are presented in Tables 12 and 13. Based on the scale, there were no or low correlations between the variables. The results indicated that there was no or little relationship between preferred leadership behaviors and job satisfaction of the teachers in this study.

Table 12

Job Satisfaction (JSS) – Subscales of Pay, Promotion, Supervision, and Fringe Benefits with Preferred Leadership Behaviors (MLQ5X) Pearson Correlations

MLQ5X	JSS	Pay	Promotion	Supervision	Fringe Benefits
Contingent Rewards	Pearson Correlation	-.192	-.069	.147	.079
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.086	.541	.191	.485
	N	81	81	81	81
Laissez-Faire	Pearson Correlation	.114	-.025	-.036	-.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.311	.827	.751	.839
	N	81	81	81	81
Intellectual Stimulation	Pearson Correlation	-.114	-.006	.151	.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.310	.960	.177	.848
	N	81	81	81	81
Leadership Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	-.187	-.019	.025	-.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.095	.866	.824	.782
	N	81	81	81	81
Inspirational Motivation	Pearson Correlation	-.107	.105	.092	.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.344	.350	.414	.647
	N	81	81	81	81
Individualized Consideration	Pearson Correlation	-.114	-.116	.214	.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.310	.301	.056	.473
	N	81	81	81	81
Individualized Influence Attributed	Pearson Correlation	-.241	-.063	.059	-.113
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.579	.598	.314
	N	81	81	81	81
Management by Exception	Pearson Correlation	.137	-.131	-.040	.161
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.224	.242	.722	.151
	N	81	81	81	81
Extra Effort	Pearson Correlation	-.101	.117	.165	-.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.370	.298	.141	.576
	N	81	81	81	81
Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	-.162	-.075	.095	-.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.149	.508	.401	.512
	N	81	81	81	81
Idealized Influence	Pearson Correlation	-.180	-.107	.025	-.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.109	.343	.827	.878
	N	81	81	81	81
Total Leadership Preference	Pearson Correlation	-.159	-.065	.129	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.157	.562	.250	.862

Table 13

Job Satisfaction (JSS) – Subscales of Contingent Rewards, Operating Conditions, Coworkers, Nature of Work Communications and the Total JSS with Preferred Leadership Behaviors (MLQ5X) Pearson Correlations

		Contingent Rewards	Operating Conditions	Coworkers	Nature of Work	Communications	JS Total
Contingent Rewards	Pearson Correlation	-.018	-.070	.292	.131	-.184	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.876	.535	.008	.243	.100	.856
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Laissez-Faire	Pearson Correlation	-.025	.148	-.198	-.062	.149	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.822	.186	.077	.582	.185	.881
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Intellectual Stimulation	Pearson Correlation	-.039	-.075	.213	.139	-.168	.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.728	.507	.057	.216	.133	.804
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Leadership Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	-.132	-.109	.029	.184	-.029	-.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.241	.334	.800	.100	.794	.585
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Inspirational Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.016	-.051	.017	.166	.017	.078
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.887	.649	.882	.138	.882	.489
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Individualized Consideration	Pearson Correlation	-.141	-.239	.178	.201	-.108	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.208	.032	.112	.072	.338	.923
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81

(continued)

	Contingent Rewards		Operating Conditions	Coworkers	Nature of Work	Communica-tions	JS Total
Individualized Influence Attributed	Pearson Correlation	-.033	-.142	.101	.225	-.068	-.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.769	.205	.367	.044	.544	.523
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Management by Exception	Pearson Correlation	-.046	.006	.123	-.147	-.047	-.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.682	.957	.274	.190	.679	.949
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Extra Effort	Pearson Correlation	.100	.053	.084	.190	-.052	.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.375	.640	.455	.090	.648	.289
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	-.036	-.085	.188	.197	-.044	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.747	.452	.092	.079	.697	.918
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Idealized Influence	Pearson Correlation	-.097	-.100	.155	.066	-.106	-.090
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.391	.373	.167	.557	.346	.423
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81
Total Leadership Preference	Pearson Correlation	-.066	-.101	.184	.174	-.099	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.558	.367	.100	.119	.378	.994
	N	81	81	81	81	81	81

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher preferred leadership behaviors, teacher job satisfaction, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job satisfaction.

Three research questions guided this study. The first question used the results from the

JSS to gauge teacher job satisfaction levels in this study. The data in this study indicated that for overall job satisfaction, teachers scored in ambivalent range. The subscale scores indicated most satisfaction with nature of work and least satisfied with pay. The second question used the MLQ5X to determine leadership behaviors that were preferred by teachers. The highest mean scores fell in the range for leaders' behaviors that were labeled as outcomes of leadership, extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. The effectiveness scale had the highest score. The behaviors that scored the highest were linked to the transformational style, and the lowest scoring behaviors were labeled as laissez-faire. The teachers also chose specific behaviors in an open-ended question in the survey. The third question sought to determine if there was a relationship between teacher preferred leadership and teacher job satisfaction. Using a Pearson r correlation to determine if any relationship occurred, the data showed that no statistically significant relationship was found between teacher job satisfaction and preferred leadership behaviors.

Chapter 5 presents further discussion of the findings of the research along with implications, limitations, recommendations, and conclusions of this research.

Chapter 5: Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Overview

The teacher shortage has been on the radar of education advocates, school leaders, researchers, analysts, and policymakers since the early 1980s. Warnings of the possibility of severe shortages of qualified teachers have threatened for a number of years (Ingersoll, 2001). According to United States Department of Education's (2015) Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing report, there has been a teacher shortage of some sort in all states across the country from 1990-1991 through 2015. Hiring and retaining qualified teachers has become a difficult task for schools all across America (Cunningham, 2015)

Teachers, more than any other factors, have the greatest impact on student achievement (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012). In recent years, members of all levels of the American public education system have turned their focus toward a national problem that regards teacher shortages at all levels of our public schools. Though a number of incentives have been made available at the federal, state, and local levels, public schools continue to experience high levels of teacher attrition (Kaiser, 2011). NCDPI (2015) reported that teacher attrition rose to the highest in the past 5 years. NCDPI found that 14.8% of the state's 96,081 teachers left their positions in the 2014-2015 school year up from 14.1 the prior year. The district that was included in the research had the highest rate of attrition in the state at 20.4%. As leaders in education move towards a resolve, it becomes critical to identify factors that strongly influence teacher satisfaction and foster retention.

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher job satisfaction, teacher preferred leadership behaviors, and the impact of these behaviors on teacher job

satisfaction. The JSS was used to collect data regarding teachers' overall levels of job satisfaction. The MLQ5X was used to collect data regarding the teachers' preferred leadership behaviors. The quantitative data were analyzed using the IBM SPSS Statistics program for windows. A Pearson correlational analysis was used to determine the relationship between teachers' preferred principal behaviors and their overall level of job satisfaction.

A total of 639 secondary school teachers from an urban school district were invited to participate in the study; 81 participants completed the total survey. The participants were asked to complete the JSS and the MLQ5X, an open-ended question and a short demographical questionnaire. A total of 54 females and 25 males completed the survey. Male participants accounted for 31.6% of the sample population, and females accounted for 68.4%. Of the total 81 participants, 71 reported years of service. The majority of the teachers had 10-25 years of service. Only 67 participants responded with degree information. A master's degree was the highest level of education reported by a majority of the participants ($n = 40$, 59.7%).

Findings and Interpretations

Research Question 1 asked how did teachers perceive their own job satisfaction as measured by the JSS. The data from the JSS indicated that the teachers in this study were overall ambivalent about their jobs. The overall teacher job satisfaction was measured by summing the total of all 36 items. Spector's (1994) guideline for interpreting the total job satisfaction score from his JSS has a range from 36-216 for the overall satisfaction score. The interpretations of the score ranges were 36-108 indicated dissatisfaction, 108-144 indicated ambivalent, and 144-216 indicated satisfaction with the job. The mean scores for the 4-item subscales ranged from 4-24. The interpretations of the score ranges were:

4-12 indicated dissatisfied, 16-24 indicated satisfied, and 12-16 indicated ambivalent (Spector, 1994). The teachers in this study mean overall job satisfaction score was 121. The score indicated that teachers in this study were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (ambivalent) overall with their jobs. When looking at the data, it seems that the scores fell in every category on the scoring range. They fell almost equally in the ambivalent, satisfied, and dissatisfied range, which seems to have affected the overall satisfaction score. The subscales however indicate that the teachers were satisfied in very specific areas. These fell into the intrinsic areas of satisfaction, such as nature of work and coworkers. The implication is that they were most satisfied in areas they could control. The teachers were dissatisfied or ambivalent about those that seemly they had no internal control over. These were areas that were influenced or controlled by outside influence; that is, the government, the central office, the state; and this swayed their overall ambivalence score. These areas included the lower scoring areas such as pay, general communication, operating conditions, opportunities for promotion, and fringe benefits. This response is not surprising and was seemingly very accurate. The social and political climate and the fact that this survey was given at the end of a long school year may have been reflected in the results. Low pay levels and a climate of uncertainty in the local and national forefront as it relates to education were also strong political topics, and there was a sense of loss of hope or lack of control in the profession and its future needs. It is surmised that these factors may have been reflected in the responses related to overall job satisfaction.

What is interesting in this data is that teachers in this study were most satisfied with nature of work ($M = 20.0$), which in itself is about job satisfaction. In looking at the subscale nature of their work, this related to how teachers felt about their jobs. Teachers

were not just satisfied but were very satisfied based on this score. The questions that related to this subscale were items 8 (reversed scored-r), 17, 27, and 35. The questions from the JSS were “sometimes I feel my job is meaningless (r), I like doing what I do at work, I feel a sense of pride in my job and my job is enjoyable.” The scores in this subscale were about teacher job satisfaction and were given the highest mean score. This would suggest that teachers were satisfied with their jobs. Based on the highest mean score of nature of work, teachers were intrinsically satisfied with their jobs, regardless of the social and political climate at the time. They liked what they did, enjoyed their jobs, and felt a sense of pride in their profession. The nature of work, sometimes termed work itself, is one of the intrinsic factors noted in Herzberg’s (1968) Motivator and Hygiene Factor Theory. It was identified as** producing satisfaction in “the actual doing of the job or tasks of the job” (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 48). Sergiovanni (1976) supported its importance by noting that factors associated with high attitudes of teacher satisfaction were often related to the work itself. Additional research studies (Judge & Church, 2000) have shown that when employees are asked to evaluate job satisfaction factors for their jobs, the nature of the work itself often emerges as the one of most important job facets. Darling-Hammond (2001) noted that at least two factors, advancement and work itself, operate differently in the field of education than in other professions. Due to the organizational structure of the profession, teachers rarely have opportunities for advancement other than advancement into school administration. Thus, the nature of work, that is teaching, created more job satisfaction among teachers than the nature of work in most other professions (Darling-Hammond, 2001).

This research was completed to investigate job satisfaction, with the underlying premise that teachers are leaving the profession because they are dissatisfied.

Understanding that the data indicated that teachers are intrinsically motivated can add to the body of knowledge of behaviors that can sustain and retain teachers. Cui-Callahan (2012) used the JSS to explore the job satisfaction of teachers who worked in seven urban high schools. All teacher respondents scored higher in intrinsic job satisfaction than extrinsic job satisfaction. A similar study with elementary and secondary teachers in five rural school districts (Grades K-12) was conducted by Bumgartner (2013). This study, too, found intrinsic rewards were more important than extrinsic ones for teachers. In addition, the study noted greater levels of satisfaction for elementary teachers over secondary teachers.

In addition, the data suggested that coworkers ($M = 17.1$) was another area of satisfaction. The questions in this item included liking people that you work with and valuing them. Working with others in the teaching profession is one of the areas that adds to the profession's enjoyment. Inger (1993) conducted research on intentional teaming: He concluded that it could "save teachers from the usual sink or swim ordeal" (p. 1). Collaboration "breaks the isolation of the classroom and leads to increase feelings of effectiveness and satisfaction" (Inger, 1993, p. 1). Inger also concluded that even for experienced teachers, "collegiality prevents end of year burnout and stimulates enthusiasm" (Inger, 1993, p. 1). The research concluded that relationships among coworkers resulted in higher levels of job satisfaction.

Teachers in this study had other areas that they seemed neutral about, but coworkers were important, valued, and added to their feeling of job satisfaction. Supervision was the other item; this subscale had a mean score that bordered on satisfaction ($M = 15.9$) but also added to the areas that teachers felt positive about. The supervision scale items assessed areas related to liking their supervisors and feeling

supported and respected by their supervisor. While this area was not in the strong satisfaction area, it was important to the teachers and seemed to skew to the positive end of satisfaction. The score on the supervision scale on the JSS, along with the score on the coworkers scale, supported the fact that the feeling of satisfaction that teachers exhibited was more related to their internal feeling of worth and love of their profession.

The teachers were least satisfied with pay ($M=7.58$); the pay subscale items reflected questions that assessed not just being financially compensated for what they did but also what they were worth as professionals. There was also the feeling of hopeless with opportunities for salary improvement. Studies of teacher job satisfaction in rural schools by McCoy-Wilson (2011), Salazar (2003), and Chambers (2010) all suggested that pay was less of a concern for rural teachers than the intrinsic factors such as sense of accomplishment, achievement, and recognition. The researchers also cited pay from the same sources as a factor that negatively impacted teacher retention in rural schools (Bumgartner, 2013). As reported by Kim and Loadman (1994), their study of 2,054 practicing classroom teachers on job satisfaction indicated that job satisfaction and pay were significantly related. In addition, a study conducted by Cunningham (2015) found that money was the most significant contributor to teacher attraction and retention. Goodlad (1984) found that although pay was not a primary motivator for new teachers entering the profession, it was a significant factor for those leaving it. Again, this seems to be an accurate sentiment for the climate of the district in which this study was completed. The teachers were clearly not happy with pay, but the researcher believes this goes beyond financial compensation to being more about being valued for the work that they did. This study was administered in the time of year when pay and valuing teachers was not only a national debate but also a local issue. Morrison (2015) stated,

Teachers are used to being on the sharp end of public criticism, but even by these standards the results of a recent survey are disturbing. According to the survey, eight out of 10 teachers do not feel their profession is valued by society. Among school leaders, the proportion who feel teaching is undervalued rises to 90%. But a survey, carried out by the U.K.'s Times Educational Supplement (TES) with polling organization YouGov, does no more than reflect a widespread perception of the teaching profession. One school leader interviewed about the survey by the TES put a considerable share of the blame on the media. There appeared to be a default setting among some, he said, to blame schools whenever anything went wrong, even though children spend far more time out of school than in it. Whether it's failing to equip students for the workplace or failing to prevent children from trying to join Islamic State in the Middle East, the finger always points at schools and teachers for not doing their job. We not only expect schools to educate our children, we also demand that they make up for parenting deficiencies, society's problems and diplomatic blunders. It's no surprise, then, that teachers feel undervalued, because they are. This appears to be a worldwide phenomenon. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Teaching and Learning International Survey, (TALIS), found that only in Finland, Singapore and Abu Dhabi did the majority of teachers feel that their profession was valued in society. (p. 1)

Results of the promotion and operating procedures scales were as follows: promotion had a low mean score ($M = 10.5$) as did operating procedures ($M = 11.2$). These scales were related to opportunities for promotion and the day-to-day bureaucratic issues that affect efficient performance of their jobs. The teachers were not satisfied with these

two areas along with pay. While it seemed that they enjoyed what they did in their profession, it is clear that “red tape” and lack of opportunities for promotion were clearly areas of dissatisfaction. These seem to point to areas that hinder them from doing their jobs and were more extrinsic factors, which may have contributed to the scores being on the ambivalent end of the scale. They were ambivalent about fringe benefits ($M = 12.5$). This item was related to additional benefits afforded by the profession; this would be an accurate score as most teachers were ambivalent about benefits and they knew going into the profession what these benefits would involve. Cui-Callahan (2012) investigated a variety of studies related to fringe benefits and job satisfaction. Her conclusions supported this research. “Research findings are mixed at best and contradictory at worst. Thus, the theoretical impact of fringe benefits on job satisfaction is not immediately clear” (Cui-Callahan, 2012, p. 45).

Communication was the other area of ambivalence (12.9). This was surprising to the researcher, as a high or low score would have been predicted. The assumption would be that teachers wanted and valued communication from their school leaders and this would be an important area of job satisfaction. When reviewing the items in this subscale, it becomes clear as the questions related more to clarity of communication in the larger organization versus at the school level. Again, based on the climate and system at this time, a satisfaction rating of ambivalent seems very accurate. This system had just adopted a new leadership and had gone through serious budget cuts and loss of teaching positions and central office positions. The atmosphere of uncertainty and lack of clarity may have added to a level of paralysis on the part of the educators; basically they were unsure of what would come next. The feelings of uncertainty were reflected in the feelings of ambivalence. It can be suggested that their overall ambivalence score seemed

to be related to other issues such as pay, communication, fringe benefits, and operating conditions and not the job itself. While the overall feelings of satisfaction were ambivalent, the subscales that reflected satisfaction were supported by theories on job satisfaction. Herzberg (2003) discussed employee attitudes about their work and what creates job satisfaction. He defined two types of individuals in this theory: satisfier/motivators and dissatisfier/hygiene factors. He noted that satisfiers described themselves in terms of their relationships, how they related to how coworkers acted, and general work conditions. Satisfiers tend to work well with their principals and other coworkers, which led toward professional growth. Conversely, dissatisfiers defined themselves in terms of the context of particular situations and how people act in such situations. They are highly concerned with job security, company policies, pay, and personal achievement. Within both categories, if the proper conditions are not met, workers will end up dissatisfied in the workplace. If psychological growth is achieved, satisfaction will ensue. While the overall results indicated ambivalent satisfaction, as a general response, the data indicate that teachers were satisfied with their job itself and motivation by intrinsic factors. They were not satisfied with compensation, promotion opportunities, and operating procedures, basically the bureaucracy of the organization. According to Spector (1994), operating conditions can encompass many aspects of the organization that sometimes positively influence job satisfaction but more often can lead to dissatisfaction and can include policies and procedures that are perceived as red tape or barriers to good job performance. In educational organizations such as schools and school districts, teacher job satisfaction can be greatly influenced by operating conditions (Johnson, 2010). Promotion was the other area and in the field of education is an anomaly as teachers only have the opportunity to be promoted to administration, which is

seen as a different profession. Therefore, in education, advancement and promotion play a different and perhaps less motivating role in job satisfaction. It does not match closely with Herzberg et al.'s (1959) theory as an intrinsic motivator associated with the nature of the work (Bumgartner, 2013). To a great extent, teachers perceive the principal as the key in creating and implementing school policies, procedures, and operating conditions that can either enhance or impede the teaching process (Reeves, 2007). Goldberg and Proctor (2000) reported a significant correlation between the behaviors of administrators and the job satisfaction of teachers under their supervision, including the operating conditions they create for their employees. Consequently, in schools, operating conditions and supervisor support are closely linked and can greatly influence teacher satisfaction on the job. Included in operating conditions are school climate, school management, principal interactions with staff, and support of teachers and staff in the performance of their duties (Dickens, 2010).

The areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction give much indication to leaders of the topics of importance to teachers. Leaders should focus on meeting the needs of teachers based on these results, as this would contribute to sustaining teacher job satisfaction and increasing teacher retention. The researcher in this study sought to look at teacher job satisfaction or dissatisfaction initially as the first question. The study concluded that teachers in this study were overall ambivalent about their satisfaction; their scores generated from the JSS fell in the ambivalent range. The teachers however were highly satisfied with their jobs themselves (nature of their work), relationship with their coworkers, and supervision. This supported the theoretical framework of this study, which is Herzberg's (1968) theory. They were very dissatisfied with pay and opportunities for promotion. In reflection, based on the community and the political

climate at the time this survey was given, ambivalent as it relates to overall job satisfaction is most likely an accurate description. This district was in the midst of budget cuts, lack of pay raises, and changes in leadership. In addition, this study was given at the end of the school year; many overly satisfied teachers may not have chosen to respond, as compared to teachers feeling a sense of frustration and ambivalence who may have needed to vent or give feedback at the end of a long year.

Research Question 2 discussed the leadership behaviors teachers preferred as measured by the MLQ5X. The teachers also had an open-ended response at the end of the survey where they could write in additional leadership behaviors they preferred. The MLQ5X provided a full range leadership scale to include (a) transformational leadership, (b) transactional leadership, (c) passive-avoidant leadership, and (d) three outcomes of leadership (i.e., effectiveness, extra effort, and satisfaction). The participants in this study used the survey to identify behaviors they preferred in leaders. The data indicated that the teachers overall preferred leadership behaviors that supported them as professionals. The highest mean score fell into one of the three outcomes of leadership, the effectiveness category ($M = 12.83$). This category addressed leader behaviors that supported the teachers within the organization. It was clear that the teachers wanted leaders who were almost protective and would support them within the larger institution. Questions such as “represents me well to the higher authority” were included in this item. This is consistent with the responses in the job satisfaction category; teachers were not satisfied or ambivalent in areas that were more district or state controlled. In the district in which this study was completed, there was a climate of distrust based on the insecurities within the profession and issues with low pay in the profession. This also seemed to be reflected in the types of behaviors that teachers preferred and did not prefer.

The researcher believes that this can be generalized to teachers nationally as the sense of education not being valued is pervasive at this time and teachers seem to feel the need for an advocate to support them in their profession. Richmond (2014) stated,

America's public school teachers love their jobs, despite feeling underappreciated by society and facing enormous challenges in the workplace, according to a new international survey of educators. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which oversees the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), surveyed a representative sample of educators in 34 countries, including 1,900 teachers across the United States. The findings for American teachers, particularly on job satisfaction, are consistent with similar studies including the latest Gallup Poll and a survey by Scholastic and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. There are some consistencies in responses internationally: Teachers feeling undervalued is the headline for the OECD survey story in a number of countries including Australia, England, and Sweden. (p. 1)

In addition, the teachers in this survey preferred behaviors that fell in the idealized behaviors category (11.61), those behaviors that reflected a leader who acts with integrity. They also preferred behaviors that fell in the individualized consideration category ($M = 10.66$), a leader who coaches people. The final category was contingent reward ($M=10.59$), leaders who reward achievement. Based on frequencies, the teachers in this study chose questions that indicated a preference for leaders who paid attention to the needs of their employees and created a supportive honest environment. It is clear that they wanted behaviors from leaders that were supportive of them in their profession; honesty and integrity was also a significant theme in the behaviors that were chosen. As

it relates to behaviors that leaders could employ, the teachers in this study have indicated a baseline of behaviors they preferred. A supportive, trusted, and honest leader who recognized them for their hard work would be the behaviors that seemed to emerge from their choices.

The teachers overall did not prefer behaviors that fell into the laissez-faire or non-leadership category ($M = 1.19$). The scores for the negative were very high, in actuality higher than the positive scores. This indicated that teachers were very specific about behaviors they did not like. Questions such as “waits for things to go wrong” were scored very negatively (87%). Teachers did not prefer leaders who exhibited behaviors such as delaying responding and avoiding making decisions. The teachers were very clear that they wanted leaders who exhibited leadership behaviors. They did not want behaviors that could be described as a non-leader or leaders who avoided being involved in decisions related to them. In this study, scores for the lack of preference for the negative behaviors were significantly higher as compared to behaviors that were preferred. This researcher sought to determine behaviors that leaders should exhibit; in turn, it was clear that “non-leadership” was a behavior that teachers definitely did not prefer.

The teachers also responded to an open-ended question that asked what additional leadership behaviors they preferred. A summary of the behaviors indicated that the behaviors chosen were similar to those on the results from the MLQ5X. The theme of supportive and honest types of behaviors continued even in the open-ended responses. The behaviors chosen with multiple selections were communication, integrity, and honesty (6); team player (5); and servant leader and consistency (2). The open-ended question did not ask for behaviors they did not prefer, so this was not gained from this

portion of the research. Overall, they preferred behaviors that indicated leaders who, based on the literature review and research, were more similar to transformational leaders. These leaders understood and demonstrated behaviors that reflected charisma, support, challenge, cohesiveness, collaboration, and shared decision making; they also have the ability to motivate and influence positive change in an organization (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Additionally, transformational leaders are committed to restructuring the school by improving the overall conditions related to the educational environment (Stewart, 2006). The literature also suggested based on the works of Bass (1985) that leaders exhibit behaviors that are transformational and transactional which are distinct processes but are not mutually exclusive. He suggested that the transformational behaviors complement transactional behaviors. This study supports that research, as teachers chose behaviors that were supportive and rewarded achievement. The results from the MLQ5X and the open-ended questions lend themselves to prefer behaviors that were overall both transformational and transactional. Their preferred behaviors indicated a need for support, honesty, and also recognition of teacher accomplishments. As was earlier discussed, negative behaviors was the more significant outcome of this research; teachers did not wish to have leaders who could not make decisions and were not involved as leaders. Bass (1990) labeled this as the laissez-faire leader who did not clarify goals and standards that the followers must achieve or basically having no expectations for the followers in the organization. This leader exuded an attitude of indifference as well as a non-leadership approach toward the followers and their performance. This kind of non-leader lacked responsiveness and refused to check the performance of followers. According to Korkmaz (2007), this leadership style actually decreased the commitment levels of teachers to stay at a particular school. As it relates to

the goal of this research, this behavior seems to be the one that should be avoided as opposed to increasing behaviors that promote good communication, teacher support, and honesty.

In summary, the researcher also sought to determine leadership behaviors that teachers preferred. The teachers in the study chose leadership behaviors that supported them as professionals. These leadership behaviors, based on the survey, were linked to transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is described as participative and supportive leadership; this behavior incorporates a leader's ability to build a team-oriented culture and influence positive change in an organization (Jones & Rudd, 2008). These leaders promoted cohesion and collaboration through shared decision making, support, intellectual stimulation, motivation, and shared values (Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 2004). The teachers also chose additional leadership behaviors in an open-ended question. The behaviors that were added included similar themes as those chosen from the MLQ5X. They preferred leadership behaviors that included good communicators, integrity, honesty, team player, and servant leader as the top choices. The behaviors chosen were supported in the literature by Burns (1978) who created a theory of transformational leadership that described leaders as being an inspirational guide to teachers and staff to achieve a higher level of morale and motivation at work. These leaders can alter the workplace, encouraging collaboration and raising the role of the follower to leader.

The traits that were not preferred were those that reflected non-leadership or those in the laissez-faire category based on the survey. Interestingly, the scores on these were much higher than the preferred behaviors; it was clear that the teachers did want leaders who did not lead, avoided making decisions, and delayed responding to urgency. In this

study, leadership behaviors that were preferred were clearly chosen, along with those that were not preferred. As was suggested earlier, the teachers in this study may be responding to the social-political climate, and these results are reflective of their feelings about current leaders. The researcher also believes that the population used the timing of this survey, the end of the school year, as a method to give feedback, particularly regarding the negative behaviors. They also sought to make statements about specific behaviors that they wanted to see in their leaders. While they are the same supportive behaviors espoused by prior research, for example of Bass and Avolio, it was clear that these were important to them as both the MLQ5X and the open-ended questions reflected similar types of behaviors.

Research Question 3 examined the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and preferred leadership behaviors. The mean aggregate scores of the MLQ5X and the JSS were used. Pearson correlation coefficients were determined for all the individual subscales of both surveys and the total scores of both. Overall, the results indicated no statistically significant relationship between the two variables. For the total score of the JSS and the MLQ5X, the relationship was not significant ($r = -.001$). The correlation results, when combined with the job satisfaction results, indicate to this researcher that there were other variables that influenced teacher job satisfaction outside of leadership behaviors. The satisfaction scores indicate that leadership was not an issue but that the teachers were motivated by extrinsic or intrinsic factors. The teachers scored highest on the nature of work scale, which indicated a level of satisfaction intrinsically. The teachers also preferred behaviors that lend some level of support to the bigger organization and those that reflected honest behaviors in the leaders versus behaviors that contributed to their level of satisfaction. It is again surmised that the political and local

climate at the time of this investigation may have affected the outcome of this study. Teachers were not dependent on leaders for their level of satisfaction, but more in a protective, supportive role. They basically were already satisfied with their jobs and mainly dissatisfied with the areas that were out of their control. The areas reflected in the JSS scores were dissatisfaction in pay, operational procedures, and opportunities for promotion; and they scored ambivalent in fringe benefits and communication. They are not reflective of intrinsic satisfaction.

Prior studies have shown that a principal's leadership behaviors can have an effect on the satisfaction of teachers (Hulpia et al., 2009); yet based on the findings of this research, results were not in alignment with prior research. The current study showed no significant correlations between the principal's leadership behavior and teacher job satisfaction. There was no correlation performed on the results of the open-ended questions, but the responses align well with the same themes and qualities on the MLQ5X. It can be suggested that the results would have been consistent; possibly because the teachers in the current study may have experienced their job satisfaction not as much from their perception of the principal's behavior, but from their own internal job satisfaction as reflected in the JSS scores. It did not seem that the teachers in this study related their job satisfaction to preferred leadership behaviors at all. This study also looked at preferred leadership behaviors, behaviors that teachers wanted from leaders; and they may not have connected or assumed that these behaviors had anything to do with their job satisfaction but just reported on behaviors that they wished to see in leaders, particularly since they had just responded to questions about their level of satisfaction and in turn reported satisfaction and/or ambivalence with certain aspects of their jobs. This would possibly lead to no correlation at any level with the two variables.

Neither were results of the current study in alignment with results of prior research, because significant correlations were not found between the subscales of idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management by exception, laissez-faire and the three outcomes of leadership, extra effort, leadership effectiveness, leadership satisfaction, and teacher job satisfaction. Research has indicated a positive correlation exists between teacher-perceived principal leadership behaviors, specifically transformational leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Nguni et al., 2006). The research also suggested that the effects of the transformational leadership behaviors on teacher job satisfaction show potential for providing more satisfied and committed teachers within the school. The results of the current study did not agree because no correlation was found between the measures of job satisfaction and any leadership behaviors. With regard to this question, this seemed to indicate that it is very unlikely the teachers in this study felt that there was a relationship between their preferred principal's leadership behaviors and their own sense of satisfaction with their job.

According to Herzberg's (1974) hygiene-motivation theory, factors leading to teacher job satisfaction were intrinsic motivator factors such as achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, and recognition. Hygiene extrinsic factors such as supervision, interpersonal relationships, salary, job security, and working conditions can lead to job dissatisfaction if these areas are not supported. Teachers in the current study may have experienced their job satisfaction not as much from their perception of the principal's leadership behaviors, but more from intrinsic motivator and extrinsic hygiene factors. The JSS scores indicated strong levels of satisfaction on the subscale nature of

work ($M = 20.0$). They liked their jobs, enjoyed what they did, and took pride in their jobs, based on the survey questions. These questions did not refer to leadership behaviors but got a high score. In addition, there was the subscale of supervision where the teachers rated very close to the satisfaction scale; they did not indicate dissatisfaction with supervision.

While the results of the current study did not agree with prior findings, as the teachers were ambivalent about their overall job satisfaction, they were satisfied with the nature of their job, which is satisfaction in the job itself. This is an intrinsic motivator. There were also several other aspects of their job that were highly satisfying such as relationship with coworkers. There were several that promoted dissatisfaction such as pay and operating conditions.

There were also specific leadership behaviors that they preferred; they wanted leaders who were supportive, honest, acted with integrity, and rewarded them for their accomplishments. They strongly did not prefer behaviors that were non-leadership or nonresponsive. They did not want leaders who did not lead and were unresponsive to questions or issues of concern.

The results from this study indicated that there were no significant correlations between the two variables. Pearson correlation coefficients were correlated for the total of both surveys and for each of the sets of the MLQ5X and the JSS, with no indication of significant relationship between any of these items. There is a large amount of prior research indicating a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction (Hulpia et al., 2009). The transformational leadership behaviors specifically in previous research are significantly correlated to teacher job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Nguni et al., 2006). In addition, other past research, teacher

satisfaction was significantly correlated with principal transactional leadership (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). This study did not agree with prior research findings. The findings of this study led this researcher to surmise that there were other variables that influenced the teachers' preferred leadership behaviors in relation to teacher job satisfaction. As mentioned prior, the teachers seemed to be already satisfied with their jobs, and the link with leadership was not significant. This was supported by the fact that they did not feel dissatisfied as educators based on their internal motivation as teachers; that is, they liked what they did as educators. The teachers did not indicate that there was a relationship between the leadership behaviors and their job satisfaction levels.

The political climate and the time of year when this study was conducted might have been additional variables affecting the outcome of this study. The study was conducted at the end of the school year in June, and teachers may have been focused on using the study as an outlet to give feedback regarding leadership behaviors. The sampling may have been teachers who chose to respond because they wanted to report preferred leadership behaviors and were satisfied with their jobs. In addition, the climate of lack of control over certain areas in education may have caused teachers to reflect on their job satisfaction as very internal and not at all related to the leadership at the school level.

The results of this study indicate that teachers may have perceived their job satisfaction as influenced more from other intrinsic and extrinsic factors based on the areas that indicated high job satisfaction. According to Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory, factors leading to teacher job satisfaction are the motivator intrinsic factors such as achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, and recognition, as well as hygiene

extrinsic factors such as supervision, interpersonal relationships, salary, job security, and working conditions, leads to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). Teachers in the current study may have experienced their job satisfaction not as much from their perception of the preferred principal's leadership behaviors but more from intrinsic motivator and extrinsic hygiene factors.

In summary, the final area that was analyzed was the relationship between teacher job satisfaction and preferred leadership styles. The results from this study indicated that there were no significant correlations between the two variables. Pearson correlation coefficients were correlated for the total of both surveys and for each of the set sets of the MLQ5X and the JSS, with no indication of significant relationship between any of these items. There is a large amount of prior research indicating a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership and teacher job satisfaction (Hulpia et al., 2009). The transformational leadership behaviors specifically in previous research were significantly correlated to teacher job satisfaction (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Nguni et al., 2006). In addition, other past research indicated teacher satisfaction was significantly correlated with principal transactional leadership (Bogler, 2001; Korkmaz, 2007; Nguni et al., 2006). This study did not agree with prior research findings. As mentioned earlier, the findings of this study led this researcher to surmise that there were other variables that influenced the teachers' preferred leadership behaviors in relation to teacher job satisfaction. The negative political climate that was mentioned prior and the time of year that this study was conducted may have influenced the outcome of the survey results. The study was conducted at the end of the school year in June, and teachers may have been focused on using the study as an outlet to give feedback regarding leadership behaviors. Along with the fact that teacher scores indicated satisfaction with their

profession, based on their internal motivation as teachers, they did not feel that there was a relationship between these behaviors and their job satisfaction levels.

The results of this study indicate that teachers may have perceived their job satisfaction as influenced more from other intrinsic and extrinsic factors based on the areas that indicated high job satisfaction. According to Herzberg's hygiene-motivation theory, factors leading to teacher job satisfaction are the motivator intrinsic factors such as achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, and recognition. The hygiene extrinsic factors such as supervision, interpersonal relationships, salary, job security, and working conditions can lead to job dissatisfaction if these factors are not supported (Herzberg et al. 1959). Teachers in the current study may have experienced their job satisfaction not as much from their perception of the preferred principal's leadership behaviors, but more from intrinsic motivator and factors, such as their love for the profession itself.

Limitations

There were several limitations of this study that need to be acknowledged. The study was quantitative and correlational in nature. Correlations do not indicate causation but just how they relate to each other and the strength of those relationships. The study utilized a survey method with 72 questions. The number of questions may have affected the quality and quantity of the sample participants. Teachers view their time as valuable, so opening up a survey that seems longer can be a deterrent to acquiring participants. An electronic survey was utilized to provide ease and convenience for the participants; it is possible that additional qualitative data could have been gathered from interviews or additional open-ended questions. The survey was also administered at the end of the school year in June. This could have affected the sampling size and the

responses. This study was conducted in an election year; the political climate may have skewed the results. The study also was limited in the fact that the survey instrument used to measure principal leadership style (MLQ5X) measured principal leadership style in terms of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. Other survey instruments may have been a better measure of leadership behaviors. The questions however were effective in allowing participants to choose a wide range of leadership behaviors.

Implications

The study addressed the idea that a principal could possibly impact teacher job satisfaction and create conditions that could influence, positively or negatively, the number of teachers leaving the profession. This study sought to investigate teacher job satisfaction, leadership behaviors that teachers preferred, and the relationship between these leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. The open-ended question answered by teachers also provided an indication of what behaviors teachers preferred from their leadership in order to help them be more effective.

Several implications for practice may be drawn from the results of this research. Based on the findings of this study, teacher job satisfaction does not necessarily rely on the principal's leadership behaviors. There were no significant relationships between the preferred leadership styles and teacher job satisfaction. The results from the Pearson correlation on the mean JSS scores and the mean MLQ5X scores indicated no significant relations between the two variables ($r = -.001$). In fact, results indicated no significant relationship in any subscales, basically indicating that teachers did not rely on leadership behaviors for their job satisfaction. The scores on the JSS survey indicated that teachers were satisfied with the nature of work ($M = 20.0$). The implications of these results

might indicate that teachers may rely more on other factors for job satisfaction than leadership behaviors. Spector (1994) developed the JSS which was used to indicate overall job satisfaction levels of teachers in this study. The survey consisted of 36 questions covering nine subscales of pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Spector developed the survey for additional variables other than supervision that may influence a person's job satisfaction (Dale, 2012). Significant to this study, teachers indicated a total mean job satisfaction score of $M = 121$ which, according to the research, indicated teachers overall were ambivalent about their jobs. They were very satisfied with the category of nature of work ($M = 20.0$) and coworkers ($M = 17.1$); yet when correlational tests were conducted, there were no statistically significant positive relationships between the preferred leadership behaviors to teacher job satisfaction, again indicating that the leadership behaviors may not be of importance but for leaders to support the areas that increased teacher satisfaction. Leaders should create conditions that increase satisfaction within the work environment, as satisfaction in the job was internal.

Additionally, possible implication may be revealed through Herzberg's (1968) hygiene motivation theory of job satisfaction. According to the hygiene motivation theory, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate dimensions of work experiences. One does not affect the other. The motivator factors producing satisfaction operate independently of the hygiene factors producing dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). The implication is that leaders of organizations and principals of schools must focus on the variables that influence greater levels of job satisfaction. It is possible that the job satisfaction the teachers in this study perceived was more intrinsically motivated. This

may suggest that even if teachers do not perceive leadership behaviors as directly influencing their job satisfaction, principals must be aware of the other factors that could raise their teachers' job satisfaction level. The practical implication is that even if the teacher does not perceive the principal's leadership as influencing their job satisfaction, it does not mean that the principal has no influence. In reality, the principal can influence satisfaction by addressing the real needs of the teachers that promote and encourage higher levels of job satisfaction (Dale, 2012).

Though this study indicated no statistically significant relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction, there were data that were interesting regarding preferred leadership behaviors. The teachers in this study were very specific about which behaviors they preferred and even more significantly which behaviors they did not prefer. It should be noted the teachers did not prefer passive-avoidant leadership behaviors. The scoring of the MLQ5X indicated a strong disagreement (87%) with these negative behaviors. They did not prefer leadership behaviors that indicated non-leadership. They did not prefer behaviors where a leader waited for things to go wrong or one that was not proactive in responding and addressing issues of concern. They did prefer behaviors that leaned towards the transformational scale. These behaviors included some of the following characteristics: support, respect, availability, communication, encouragement, caring, sharing leadership, showing fairness, promoting a sense of community, and honesty.

Leaders who are concerned about specific behaviors that would be most effective with teachers should be aware of the behaviors that were identified in this study that teachers preferred. The implication is that in order to raise teacher job satisfaction, leaders should be aware of conditions that increase teacher job satisfaction. While they

may not affect the intrinsic satisfaction level, they can enhance conditions in the workplace to promote satisfaction. Based on this study, teachers prefer leaders who do not employ passive avoidant traits. They would prefer leaders who are good communicators, supportive, honest, team players, full of integrity, appreciative, and rewarding of their accomplishments.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on this investigation.

1. A causal comparative study could be beneficial in examining whether preferred principal's leadership behavior has a direct or indirect influence on teacher job satisfaction.
2. A qualitative study where teachers were asked about their job satisfaction and preferred leadership behaviors would help to bring a deeper understanding of the opinions and feelings from participating teachers about their perceptions of the influence their principals have on teacher job satisfaction.
3. A qualitative study with a focus group that outlined top detractors from teacher job satisfaction and solutions for improvement.
4. A replicate study with only first-year teachers examining their job satisfaction levels, specifically looking at the intrinsic versus extrinsic scores.
5. Follow-up study related to teacher leadership could be completed based on the data related to teacher intrinsic motivation.
6. Follow-up research based on factors that motivate teachers to stay in the profession based on years of service should be completed, since leadership was not correlated.
7. A qualitative study with teachers with 10 plus years of service, examining

their job satisfaction level and factors that contribute to the remaining in the profession.

8. Follow-up research specifically related to new teachers and factors that contribute to increasing retention outside of leadership behaviors.
9. Research related to mentoring teachers and does this build capacity and lead to higher teacher retention.
10. Follow-up research on teacher leadership behaviors and do they increase job satisfaction.
11. Follow-up research to determine which leadership behaviors were most effective in building teacher capacity.
12. Follow-up research on how does leadership behavior encourage or discourage the development of teacher leaders.
13. Follow-up research on teacher leadership and if empowering teachers increases retention.
14. The timing of this study is pertinent. This study was conducted during the 2015-2016 school year; this was an election year both locally and nationally. The tone and climate of the region and the nation may have been reflected in the teacher satisfaction results. It was also conducted at the end of the school year. A replicate study with the same or similar population and a different time of year could produce different results.
15. A replicate study in a nonurban area should be conducted to determine teacher job satisfaction levels and leadership behaviors they prefer.

Conclusion

USDE (2015) reported that every state in the country was struggling to fill vacant

teacher positions; this comes at a large financial cost. Retaining teachers is crucial as they have the most significant influence on student achievement (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012). Many teachers become dissatisfied and leave the classroom; policymakers, school boards, and school superintendents need to seek ways to fill classrooms with quality teachers. This study examined teacher job satisfaction, leadership behaviors that teachers preferred, and the relationship between the preferred leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. Teacher attrition is an area of concern. Identifying and examining those factors which hinder teacher retention and those that promote job satisfaction and reduce dissatisfaction is vital in lowering the turnover rate of teachers. It is recommended that states and districts develop carefully designed policies that will increase both the supply and quality of teaches (Darling-Hammond, 2001).

Practical and effective methods need to be looked at and considered. The finding of this study could impact leadership behavior that principals employ. While this research did not find a correlation between job satisfaction and preferred leadership behaviors, there are implications for leadership behavior choices that could influence overall school climate and teacher retention rates.

References

- Adams, C. (2010). How satisfied are you? *Instructor*, 119(4), 44-47.
- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2005, August). *Teacher attrition: A costly loss to the nation and the states*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2012). Recruitment and retention. Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/about_the_crisis/teachers/recruitment_and_retention
- Alliance for Excellent Education. (2014, July). Teacher attrition costs United States up to \$2.2 billion annually, says new Alliance report. Retrieved from <http://www4ed.org/press/teacher-attrition-costs-united-states-up-to-2-2-billion-annually-says-new-alliance-report/>
- Almy, S., & Tooley, M. (2012). Building and sustaining talent, creating conditions in high poverty schools that support effective teaching and learning. *The Education Trust*. Retrieved from <https://edtrust.org/resource/building-and-sustaining-talent-creating-conditions-in-high-poverty-schools-that-support-effective-teaching-and-learning/>
- Amos, J. (2012). Building and sustaining talent: Improving conditions for teaching and learning key to attracting and retaining high-quality teachers in hard to staff schools. Retrieved from http://www.edtrust.org/sites/edtrus.org/files/Building_and_Sustaining_Talent.pdf
- Armandi B., Oppedisan, J., & Sherman, H. (2003). Leadership theory and practice: A case in point. *Management Decisions*, 41(10), 1076-1086.
- Astrauskaite, M., Vaitkevicius, R., & Perminas, A. (2011). Job satisfaction survey: A confirmatory factor analysis based on secondary school teachers' sample. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(5), 41-50.
- Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ)*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Barker, R. A. (1994). The rethinking of leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 47-48.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance*. NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B. (1999). Current developments in transformational leadership: Research and applications. *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 3(1), 5-21.
- Bass, B., M., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers (Ed.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire form 5x*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *Technical report, leaders form, rater form and scoring key for the MLQ form 5x short*. Binghamton, NY: Center for Leadership Studies, Binghamton University.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Basset-Jones, N., & Lloyd, G. C. (2005). Does Herzberg's motivational theory have staying power? *Journal of Management Development*, 24(10), 57-56.
- Bellott, F. K., & Tutor, F. D. (1990). *A challenge to the conventional wisdom of Herzberg and Maslow theories*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Biggerstaff, J. K. (2012). *The relationship between teacher perceptions of elementary school principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.wku/diss/22>
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662-683.
- Bottery, M. (2001). Globalization and the UK competition state: No room for transformational leadership in education? *School Leadership & Management*, 21(2), 199-218.
- Brenneman, R. (2015). Teacher attrition continues to plague North Carolina. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/10/14/teacher-attrition-continues-to-plague-north-carolina.html>
- Buchanan, D. A. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. England: Harlow.

- Bumgartner, M. (2013). *A study of factors that impact teacher job satisfaction in rural schools*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (UMI Dissertations Publishing. No. 3566242.)
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teacher for the 21st century*. (Report of the Task Force on teaching as a Profession). New York: Carnegie.
- Cemaloglu, N. (2011). Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health, and workplace bullying. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(5), 494-512.
- Chambers, S. K. (2010). *Job satisfaction among elementary school teachers*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill). Available from ProQuestDissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3403216)
- Chell, J. (1995). *SSTA research in brief: Introducing principals to the role of instructional leadership* (95-114). Regina, SK: Saskatchewan School Trustees Association.
- Choy, S. P., Bobbitt, S. A., Henke, R. R., Medrich, E. A., Horn, L J., & Lieberman, J. (1993). *America's teachers: Profile of a profession*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 93-025.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher educator: For better or worse? *Educational Research*, 34(97), 3-17.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences* (2d ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erbaum.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting an evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, and mix methods approaches* (2d ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cui-Callahan, N. (2012). *An examination of job satisfaction among urban high school teachers*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI Dissertations Publishing No. 3511778.)

- Cunningham, S. L. (2015). *A quantitative analysis of the factors associated with teacher attitudes and perceptions towards job satisfaction*. Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs). Paper 2127.
- Dale, J. (2012). *The correlation of the perceived leadership style of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1655&context=doctoral>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 58(8), 12-17.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 19-34.
- Denton, E. M. (2009). *Teacher's perception of how leadership styles and practices of principals influence their job satisfaction and retention*. Lynchburg, VA: Liberty University.
- Dickens, K. R. (2010) *Factors influencing teacher job satisfaction and their alignment with current district practices in a suburban school district*. (Doctoral dissertation, Lindwood University), Retrieved from Proquest dissertations and theses database. (UMI No: 3441099).
- Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1998). A three domain model of teacher and school executive satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 362-378.
- Djibo, I. J., Desiderio, K. P., & Price, N. M. (2010). Examining the role of perceived leader behavior on temporary employees' organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(4), 342.
- Donaldson, G. A. (2001). *Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Edutopia, S. (2011). Why is teacher development important? Because students deserve the best. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/teacher>
- Ewen, R. B., Smith, P. C., Hulin, C. L., & Locke, E. A. (1966). An empirical test of Herzberg's two-factor theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 544-550.
- Flores, A. (2007). Examining disparities in mathematics education: Achievement gap or opportunity gap? *High School Journal*, 91(1), 29-42.
- Foor, R. M., & Cano, J. (2011). Predictors of job satisfaction among selected agriculture faculty. *Journal of Agriculture Education*, 52(1), 30-39.

- Fowler, W. J., & Mittapalli, K. (2007). Where do teachers go when they leave teaching? *ERS Spectrum*, 24(4), 4-12.
- Freeman, R. B. (1978). Job satisfaction as an economic variable. *American Economic Review*, 68(2), 135-141.
- Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 16-20.
- Fullan, M. (2004). *Leadership and sustainability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *Jossey Bass reader on educational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Gardner, R. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Factor the influence retention, turnover, and attrition of K-12 music teachers in the United States. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111(3), 112-121.
- Goldman, E. (1998). The significance of leadership style. *Educational Leadership*, 55(7), 20-22.
- Goldberg, P., & Proctor, K. (2000). *Teacher voices: A survey on teacher recruitment and retention*. New York, NY: Scholastics, Washington, DC.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Gu, X. (2016). *Teacher job satisfaction in public schools: The relation to the years of teaching experience*. Elementary Education and Reading Theses Paper.
- Guthrie, J. W., & Reed, F. J. (1991). *Educational administration and policy: Effective leadership for American education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hamilton, L. (2007). *The relationship between perceived leadership styles of principals and teacher satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). *Development of the leader behavior, descriptive questionnaire*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1976). *Situational leadership*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Leadership Studies.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1988). *Management of organization behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46, 53-62.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 1, 87-96.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, D. F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinions*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.
- Herzberg, F., Maunser, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hill, V. (2013). *Principal leadership behaviors which teachers at different career stages perceive as affecting job satisfaction*. Dissertations. Paper 145.
- Hollander, E. (1978). *Leadership dynamics*. New York: Free Press.
- Hongying, S. (2007). Literature review of teacher job satisfaction. *Chinese Education and Society*, 40(5), 11-16.
- Horwitz, I. B., Horwitz, S. K., Daram, P., Brandt, M. M., Brunicardi, F. C., & Awad, S. S. (2008). Transformational, transactional, and passive- avoidant leadership characteristics of a surgical resident cohort: Analysis using the multifactor leadership questionnaire and implications for improving surgical education curriculums. *Journal of Surgical Research*, 148, 49-59.
- Howard-Baldwin, T., Celik, B., & Kraska, M. (2012) *Administrator job satisfaction in higher education*. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov>
- Hughes, L. W. (1999). *The principal as leader* (2d ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hui, K. T., & Helms A. D. (2015, October 2). Teacher turnover rate rises in North Carolina public schools. *The News and Observer*, p. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/education/article37387488.html>
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the principal perception of distributed leadership in secondary school and the teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness and Improvement*, 20(3), 291-317.
- Inger, M. (1993). *Teacher collaborations in secondary schools*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364733).

- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An Organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Seattle, WA: Author.
- Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.
- Ismail, M. R. (2012). *Teachers' perception of principal leadership style and how they impact teacher job satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University.
- Jensen, T. D., White, D. D., & Singh, R. (1990). Impact of gender, hierarchical position, and leadership styles on work-related values. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(2), 145-152.
- Johnson, S. (2004). *Finders & keepers: Helping new teachers survive and thrive in our schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Johnson, D. (2010). *Teacher's perception of factors that contribute to attrition*. (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Retrieved from Proquest dissertation and theses database. (UMI No: 3418940).
- Jones, D. (2003). Autocratic leadership-until it fails. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-6-05-raines-usat-x.htm>
- Jones, D., & Rudd, R. (2008). Transactional, transformational or laissez-faire leadership: An assessment of college of agriculture academic program leaders' (deans) leadership styles. *Journal of Agriculture Education*, 49(2), 88-97.
- Judge, T. A., & Church, A. H. (2000). Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp. 166-198). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004) Transformational and transactional leadership: Meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755-768.
- Kahn, R. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2d ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Kaiser, A. (2011) Beginning teacher attrition and mobility: results from the first and third waves of the 2007-2008 beginning teacher longitudinal study. First look. National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.gov/fulltext/accno=Ed 523821>
- Keith, S., & Girling, R. H. (1991). *Education, management and participation: New directions in educational administration*, Boston, MD: Allyn and Bacon.

- Kelly, S. (2004). An event history analysis of teacher attrition: Salary, teacher tracking, and socially disadvantaged schools. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 72(3), 195-221.
- Kersaint, G., Lewis, J., Potter, R., & Meiseis, G. (2007). Why teachers leave: Factors that influence retention and resignation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 775-794.
- Kim, I., & Loadman, W. (1994). Predicting teacher job satisfaction. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED383707>
- Korkmaz, M. (2007). The effect of leadership styles on organizational health. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 22-42.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with the school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(2), 112-129.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-301.
- Linda, L. (1999). *Shifting conceptions of leadership: Towards a redefinition of leadership for the twenty-first century*. London: Cassell.
- Lumsden, L. (1998). Teacher morale. *Eric Digest*, 120, 1-2.
- Mann, R. (2014). *Leadership practices: Perceptions of principals and teachers of a small rural school district in Western North Carolina*. Education Theses, Dissertations and Projects. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1015&context=education_etd
- Markow, D. (2003). *MetLife survey of the American teacher. Key elements of quality schools*. New York, NY: Louis and Harris and Associates.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2d ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

- Maxwell, J. C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership* (Rev. Ed.). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Mayes, B. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1986). Role of social support in the experience of stress at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 102-110.
- McBer, H. (2000). A model of teacher effectiveness. *Department for Education and Employment*, 15, 1-6.
- McCoy-Wilson, K. (2011). *Teacher's perceptions of job satisfaction in an economically depressed rural school district*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3443645)
- McCoy, M., Wilson-Jones, L., & Jones, P. (2013). Selected North Carolina beginning and veteran teachers' perceptions of factors influencing retention and attrition. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 1(1), Article 7. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/jri/vol1/iss1/7>
- Mello, J. (2003). Profiles in leadership: Enhancing learning through model and theory building. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(3).
- Merriam-Webster. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com>
- MetLife Survey of the American Teacher. (2001). *Key elements of quality schools*. New York, NY: Louis and Harris and Associates.
- Morrison, N. (2015). If teachers feel undervalued, it's because they are. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/nickmorrison/2015/04/27/if-teachers-feel-undervalued-its-because-they-are/#35b546bb4c6>
- Muenjohn, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008). Evaluating the structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), capturing the leadership factors of transformational-transactional leadership. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4(1), 3-14.
- Mullins, J. (2002). *Management and organizational behavior* (6th ed.). Italy: Lombarda Rotolito.
- Murray, F., & Feitler, F. (1989). *An investigation of transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness in small college settings*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.
- National Center for Education Information. (2011). *Profiles of teachers in the U.S.* Retrieved from http://www.ncei.com/Profile_Teachers_US_2011.pdf
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1994). *The condition of education-1994*. Washington, DC: United States Printing Office, 94-149.

- National Education Association. (2014, March). Rankings of the states 2013 and estimate statistics of schools. Retrieved from www.nea.org/home/rankings-and-estimates-2013-2014.html
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denesen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satiation, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in primary school: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145-177.
- Nir, A. E., & Kranot, N. (2006). School principal's leadership style and teachers' self-efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 37(3&4), 200-218.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2015). Executive summary. Retrieved from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/educatoreffectiveness/surveys/leaving/2014-15turnoverreport.pdf>
- North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey. (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.ncteachingconditions.org/>
- Nyode, A., Img, S. R., & Parker, M. (2010). Empowerment, leadership and teachers' intentions to stay or leave the profession or their schools in charter schools. *Journal of School Choice*, 4, 174-190.
- Oyetunyi, C.O. (2006). *The relationship between leadership style and school climate: Botswana secondary schools*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of South Africa.
- Pardee, R. L. (1990). Motivation theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor, & McClelland. A Literature review of selected theories dealing with job satisfaction and motivation. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED316767.pdf>
- Parkinson, K. E. (2008). *An examination of the relationship between the perceived leadership style of the principal and late career teacher job satisfaction in selected elementary schools*. Doctoral Dissertation for University of Arizona.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Perrachionne, B. A. Rosser, V. J., & Peterson, G. (2008). Why do they stay? Elementary teachers' perception of job satisfaction and retention. *The Professional Educator*, 32(2), 25-41.
- Pogodzinski, B., Youngs, P., Frank, K. A., & Belman, D. (2012). Administrative climate and novices' intent to remain teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113(2), 252-275.

- Popham, W. J. (2004) *America's failing schools: How parents and teachers can cope with No Child Left behind*. New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.
- Public Broadcasting Service. (2001). School: The story of American public education. Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/kcet/publicschool/roots_in_history/index.html
- Reeves, D. (2007). *Daily disciplines of leadership*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Reiman, A. J. (2016). New teacher support: Report to the UNC dean's council on teacher education. Retrieved from <http://docslide.us/documents/report-to-the-unc-deans-council-on-teacher-education-alan-j-reiman-edd.html>
- Richards, J. (2003). *Principal behaviors that encourage teachers to stay in the profession: Perceptions of K-8 teachers in their second to fifth year of teaching*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Richmond, E. (2014). US report: Teachers love their jobs but don't feel valued. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/emily-richmond/report-us-teachers-love-t_b_5534127.html
- Robbins, S. (2003). *Organizational behavior*. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Roth, W., & Tobin, K. (2005). Implementing coteaching and cogenerative dialoguing in urban science education. *School Science and Mathematics*, 105(6), 313-323.
- Salazar, R. M. (2003). *Examination of the factors associated with teacher retention in small rural high schools*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3092725)
- Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M. G. (2003). *Leadership that matters*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Sauer, S. J. (2011). Taking the reins: The effects of new leader status and leadership style on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 574-587.
- Sayed, H. (2013). *The influence of principal leadership on school performance: A case study in selected Gauteng schools*. (Masters Thesis). Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/16387275.pdf>
- Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J., & Osborn, R. (2000). *Organizational behavior* (7th ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1976). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction in teaching. *Journal of Education Administration*, 5, 62-68.

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2006). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Shieh, H., Mills, M., & Waltz, C. (2001). Academic leadership style predictors for nursing faculty job satisfaction in Taiwan. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, 40(5), 203.
- Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (2002). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Simon, M. (2006). *Dissertation and scholarly research: A practical guide to start and complete your dissertation, theses or formal research project*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Skaalvik, E., & Skaalvik, S. (2011). Teacher job satisfaction and motivation to leave the teaching profession: Relations with school context, feeling of belonging and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1029-1038.
- Slavin, R. E. (2007). *Educational research in an age of accountability*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, D. (2011). Educating preservice school librarians to lead. A study of self-perceived transformational leadership behavior. *School Library Media Research*, 14. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org.aasl/files/content/aaslpubsandjournals/slr/vol14/SLR_EducatingPreservice_V14.pdf
- Spector, P. (1985). Measure of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Spector, P. (1994). *Job satisfaction survey*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.
- Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-29.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1994). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principle of scientific management*. Retrieved from www.drluisortiz.com/doc/articlefrontpage.pdf
- Thomas, V. (1997). What research says about administrator's management style and effectiveness and teacher morale? Retrieved from Eric EBSCOhost.
- Thomas, S. (2014). *The effects of principal leadership behavior on new teachers' overall job satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation, Walden University.

- Trait, M. (2008). Resilience as contributor to novice teacher success, commitment and retention. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 57-75.
- Ulriksen, J. J. (2000). *Perceptions of secondary school teachers and principals concerning factors related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction*. Retrieved from Eric document reproduction service No. ED 424 684.
- United States Department of Education. (2015). Teacher shortages area nationwide listing 1990-1991 through 2015-16. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/pol/tsa.pdf>
- Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction: A systematic review. *Occupational Medicine*, 53(3), 193-200.
- Varlas, L. (2013). Focus on retention: How to keep your best teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 55(3), 1-3, 7.
- Waters, K. (2013). *The relationship between principals' leadership styles and job satisfaction as perceived primary school teachers across NSW independent schools*. University of Wollongong of Research Online. Retrieved from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5081&context=theses>
- Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstruction job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 173-194.
- Wells, J., & Peachy, J. (2011). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leaders matter? *Team Performance Management*, 17(12), 23-40.
- Wetherill, K. M. (2002). *Principal leadership style and teacher job satisfaction*. Doctoral dissertation. Seton Hall University.
- Yukl, G. A. (1989). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Sample

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ5X)
Bass and Avolio (1995) Mind Garden Inc.

This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of your principal, as you perceive it. PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS ON THIS SURVEY. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer the questionnaire anonymously.

Question: The person I am rating... Not at all 0 Once in a while 1 Sometimes 2 Fairly often 3 Frequently, if not always 4

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts 0 1 2 3 4
2. Avoids getting involved when important issues arises 0 1 2 3 4
3. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems 0 1 2 3 4
4. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her 0 1 2 3 4
5. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying 0 1 2 3 4
6. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets 0 1 2 3 4
7. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action 0 1 2 3 4
8. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished 0 1 2 3 4
9. Spends time teaching and coaching 0 1 2 3 4
10. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 0 1 2 3 4
11. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group 0 1 2 3 4
12. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of the group. 0 1 2 3 4
13. Acts in a way that builds my respect 0 1 2 3 4
14. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions 0 1 2 3 4
15. Displays a sense of power and confidence 0 1 2 3 4
16. Articulates a compelling vision of the future 0 1 2 3 4
17. Avoids making decisions 0 1 2 3 4
18. Helps me develop my strengths 0 1 2 3 4
19. Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments 0 1 2 3 4
20. Expression satisfaction when I meet expectations 0 1 2 3 4

Source: Copyright © 1992 B. M. Bass and B. J. Avolio.

Appendix B

Job Satisfaction Survey Sample

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. 1.Disagree very much 2. Disagree moderately 3.Disagree slightly 4. Agree slightly 5.Agree moderately 6.Agree very.

1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I like the people I work with. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Communications seem good within this organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Raises are too few and far between. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. My supervisor is unfair to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. 1 2 3 4
17. I like doing the things I do at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. The benefit package we have is equitable. 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. There are few rewards for those who work here. 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. I have too much to do at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. I enjoy my coworkers. 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6
28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have. 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. I like my supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5 6
31. I have too much paperwork. 1 2 3 4 5 6
32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. 1 2 3 4 5 6
33. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion. 1 2 3 4 5 6
34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6
35. My job is enjoyable. 1 2 3 4 5 6
36. Work assignments are not fully explained. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix C

Permission to use MLQ5X

For use by Jackie Tobias only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on September 28, 2016



www.mindgarden.com

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material for his/her research:

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*

Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

Five sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any published material.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Most", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

Appendix D

Permission to use JSS

Dear Jackie:

You have my permission for noncommercial research/teaching use of the JSS. You can find copies of the scale in the original English and several other languages, as well as details about the scale's development and norms. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, "Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation). You also have permission to translate the JSS into another language under the same conditions in addition to sharing a copy of the translation with me. Be sure to include the copyright statement, as well as credit the person who did the translation with the year.

Thank you for your interest in the JSS, and good luck with your research.

Best,

Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor
Department of Psychology
PCD 4118
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620
813-974-0357
pspector [at symbol] usf.edu
<http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~spector>

From: Lorna Tobias (Jackie)] **Sent:** Tuesday, November 24, 2015 12:08 PM **To:** Spector, Paul < **Subject:** permission for use of JSS

Dear Dr. Spector,

This email is to request permission to use your Job Satisfaction Survey. I am completing my doctoral studies from Gardner Webb University in North Carolina and I am in the process of writing my dissertation. I would love to use your survey as one of my instruments. I will be studying how the principal's leadership style affects teacher job satisfaction. Your survey will of course be used to target the teacher's job satisfaction. I would also like permission to reproduce it electronically, as my instruments will be disseminated using survey monkey.

Thank you ahead of time for any assistance that you can provide.

Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire and Consent

Dear Fellow Educator,

My name is Jackie Tobias. I am a doctoral student at Gardner Webb University and the principal. As a part of my dissertation research, I would like to invite you to take part in a research study on leadership behaviors and teacher job satisfaction. The results of this study may reveal valuable information that may be used to develop future leadership training programs that emphasize the importance of principal-teacher relationships in schools and its impact on teacher retention. The research will target your levels of job satisfaction and leadership behaviors that you prefer to enhance your satisfaction in your profession. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary and your responses will remain anonymous. Neither the district nor any school will be identifiable. Research and Accountability has reviewed and approved my survey and research.

Procedures:

If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete 2 short surveys necessary for this research study. The entire session takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. The surveys will be followed by a voluntary demographic questionnaire. The link to the survey is below.

The Research window will open June 9th and closes June 16th. I unfortunately cannot send reminders, so I solicit your input into this valuable research.

<http://goo.gl/forms/Ff2gRGVUet5LnBKf2>

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Your participation is greatly appreciated. If you wish to participate and cannot open the link please email me and I will send you an additional link.

Yours in education,

Jackie Tobias

L. Jackie Tobias

If you have any questions about the research study, please contact L. Jackie Tobias at This research has been reviewed according to Gardner-Webb University IRB procedures for research involving human subjects.

Demographic Questions for Survey

1. Gender
 - a. Male Female
2. How Many Years have you taught at this school ____
3. Years of Experience in Education _____
4. Highest Education level _____

Appendix F

Electronic Example of MLQX5 and JSS

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: This questionnaire is to describe the leadership style of your principal, as you perceive it. PLEASE ANSWER ALL ITEMS ON THIS SURVEY. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer the questionnaire anonymously.

Question: The person I am rating... Not preferred 0, 1 Slightly preferred, 2 Preferred, 3 Very preferred, 4 Highly preferred

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts 0 1 2 3 4
2. Avoids getting involved when important issues arises 0 1 2 3 4
3. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems 0 1 2 3 4
4. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her 0 1 2 3 4
5. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying 0 1 2 3 4
6. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets 0 1 2 3 4
7. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action 0 1 2 3 4
8. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished 0 1 2 3 4
9. Spends time teaching and coaching 0 1 2 3 4
10. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 0 1 2 3 4
11. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group 0 1 2 3 4
12. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of the group. 0 1 2 3 4
13. Acts in a way that builds my respect 0 1 2 3 4
14. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions 0 1 2 3 4
15. Displays a sense of power and confidence 0 1 2 3 4
16. Articulates a compelling vision of the future 0 1 2 3 4
17. Avoids making decisions 0 1 2 3 4
18. Helps me develop my strengths 0 1 2 3 4
19. Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments 0 1 2 3 4
20. Expression satisfaction when I meet expectations 0 1 2 3 4

Source: Copyright © 1992 B. M. Bass and B. J. Avolio.

Job Satisfaction Survey JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology.
PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. 1.Disagree very much 2. Disagree moderately 3.Disagree slightly 4. Agree slightly 5.Agree moderately 6.Agree very.

1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I like the people I work with. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Communications seem good within this organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Raises are too few and far between. 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. My supervisor is unfair to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape. 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with. 1 2 3 4
17. I like doing the things I do at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. The goals of this organization are not clear to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
19. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me. 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates. 1 2 3 4 5 6
22. The benefit package we have is equitable. 1 2 3 4 5 6

23. There are few rewards for those who work here. 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. I have too much to do at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6
25. I enjoy my coworkers. 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6
28. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases. 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. There are benefits we do not have which we should have. 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. I like my supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5 6
31. I have too much paperwork. 1 2 3 4 5 6
32. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be. 123456
33. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion. 1 2 3 4 5 6
34. There is too much bickering and fighting at work. 1 2 3 4 5 6
35. My job is enjoyable. 1 2 3 4 5 6
36. Work assignments are not fully explained. 1 2 3 4 5 6